This memorandum transmits additional information requested by the Finance Committee and/or provided at staff’s behest in regards to the Fiscal Year 2017 Proposed Budget.

**Planning Transportation Commission Findings**
On Tuesday, May 17th, the Planning and Transportation Commission (PTC) reviewed the 2017-2021 Capital Improvement Program for compliance with the Comprehensive Plan, per Municipal Code requirements. The PTC approved a motion finding the plan to be in compliance with the Comprehensive Plan. Attached to the May 17th memorandum distributed at places is a letter from the Chair of the Planning and Transportation Commission (PTC) summarizing the Commissions review of the Fiscal Year 2017-2021 Proposed Capital Improvement Plan (attached again as Attachment A for convenience). Due to the timing of the PTC meeting schedule and the Finance Committee Budget Hearing schedule, full minutes from this meeting were not transmitted to the Committee on the 17th of May and are therefore attached to this memorandum (Attachment – B).

The 1998-2010 Comprehensive Plan is in the process of being updated. As the Comprehensive Plan is reviewed by staff, the public, the PTC, the City Council, and others, the PTC’s suggestion regarding the Governance Element about including policies or programs relating to prioritization of capital projects can be considered.

Staff currently aligns each capital project to the Comprehensive Plan, notating the specific alignment for each capital project within the budget document. Upon adoption of the updated Comprehensive Plan, staff will consider the PTC’s recommendation to measure capital projects against Comprehensive Plan policies and determine whether policies have a target embedded for which a meaningful, sustainable, and usable measure can be developed for particular CIP projects.
Subsequent to the distribution of CMR #7018, it was noticed that the chart on page 8 of the CMR has an incorrect total in the chart. Once restated, it should read as follows:

**Municipal Service Center A, B, & C Roof Replacement (PF-17000): $1.9 million**

Of the $1.9 million project, all funding was designated for construction costs partially offset by the following transfers totaling $1.0 million outlined below. The balance of the construction cost, $859,328, was to be paid for the Capital Improvement Fund Infrastructure Reserve.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Construction Budget in FY 2017 ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transfer from the Utilities Administration Fund</td>
<td>684,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer from the Vehicle Replacement and Maintenance Fund</td>
<td>380,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer from the Refuse Fund</td>
<td>19,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total Transfers to Capital:</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,083,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Improvement Fund – Infrastructure Reserve</td>
<td>859,328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,942,328</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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RE: Review of 2017-2021 Proposed Capital Improvement Program (CIP)  

The Planning and Transportation Commission (PTC) reviewed the 2017-2021 Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) at a special hearing on Tuesday, May 17, 2016 and determined that all of the Capital Improvement Projects included in the 2017-2021 Capital Budget are consistent with the adopted 1998-2010 Comprehensive Plan. The Commission determined that the proposed 2017-2021 Capital Improvement Programs (CIP) are consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and forwards the finding to the City Council Finance Committee and the City Council. The Commission approved the motion by a vote of 4-0-3 (Commissioners Tanaka, Alcheck and Downing absent).

Respectfully submitted,

Adrian Fine, Chair  
Planning and Transportation Commission
PLANNING & TRANSPORTATION
COMMISSION
MINUTES

Wednesday, May 17, 2016 Special Meeting
12:00 PM, Council Chambers

Call to Order / Roll Call: 12:03 P.M.
Commissioners Alcheck, Downing and Tanaka absent

Chair Fine: Thank everyone for showing up and sorry for the delay in doing this meeting. Today
I would like to open the Planning and Transportation Commission (PTC) meeting, May 17, 2016
and we have only one item today. But first let’s open it up to oral communications are there any
speaker cards? Sorry, Robin, will you take the roll please?

Robin Ellner, Administrative Associate: Commissioner Alcheck, Commissioner Downing, Chair
Fine, Vice-chair Gardias, Commissioner Rosenblum, Commissioner Tanaka, Commissioner
Waldfogel. Four present.

Chair Fine: Thank you very much. Do we have any speaker cards on non-agenda items.

Ms. Ellner: No.

Chair Fine: Ok. Any agenda changes? I don’t think so. Let’s move to the Assistant Director’s
report please.

Jonathan Lait, Assistant Director: No report.

Chair Fine: Ok, let’s move on to the action item, just one today. Review and recommendation to
the City Council on the proposed 2017 – 2021 Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) and Compliance
of the Comprehensive Plan. I believe there is a short report.

Mr. Lait: Chitra will give you a brief presentation and I believe everybody in this Chamber is
here to answer any questions you may have.

Chitra Moitra, Planner: Good afternoon Commissioners, I am Chitra Moitra, planner, Long
Range Planning. Today, staff requests the PTC review the 2017 – 2021 CIP Programs to be
consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and forward the findings to the Finance Committee and
City Council. The section 19.04.040 of the Palo Alto Municipal Code (PAMC) describes PTC’s
role in the reviewal process, which really includes review of the CIP in the Comp Plan for
consistency, for commenting on individual projects and suggesting improvements that can
increase the efficiency of the process and identify any CIP’s which the Commission deems to be
missing from the list. This year we have in the Capital budget, 211 CIP projects of which 29 are
new. Like last year we are focusing only on reviewing the new projects, so the rest of the other projects included in the Capital Budget book has already been reviewed by the PTC. Staff has used the same matrix as last year, which is aligning each CIP with the Comprehensive Plan Element, a goal, a program and a policy. The staff has also added information on the types of boards and commissions reviews required and the type of environmental review required. This slide up here shows the number of CIP’s which have been aligned, so over 80 percent of the new CIP’s have been aligned with the Natural Environment Element and the Community Services Element. Staff has also linked each of these CIP’s with the 2016 City Council priorities and has found that more than 83 percent of all the infrastructure improvements amounting to about $13 million dollars for the year 2017 is being allotted for all sorts of infrastructure improvements. Staff has also done a summary of the Capital Budget, the 2017 Capital Budget invested by elements and has found that about 50 percent of them are invested for improvements and are linked with the Natural Environment Element while 39 percent is for the Community Services Element. So all of these above analysis proves that the 29 of the new CIP’s are in compliance with the Comprehensive Plan and staff requests PTC to forward the findings to Finance Committee and City Council.

Thank you, this concludes my presentation.

Chair Fine: Thank you very much, do we have any speaker cards?

Ms. Ellner: No.

Chair Fine: None? Ok, let’s open it up, I think we can mix comments and questions if that’s alright with everybody. Let’s just start with five minutes each. Vice-chair.

Vice-chair Gardias: Thank you Mr. Chairman, welcome back. I have a question to, actually Josh about transportation item, if we can start with them. A couple of comments, there were a couple of recent projects that came to us and the biking routes that we reviewed and as you remember, we didn’t review Bryant Street because of procedural constraints, I know that it went to the Council. Is Bryant Street included in this budget for downtown mobility and safety improvements?

Josh Mello, Chief Transportation Official: Josh Mello, Chief Transportation Official. Thank you for the question, the downtown mobility and safety strategies project is envisioned as kind of a on-going trial and pilot process where we look at different bike-ways along Bryant Street, University, Alma Street. We are also going to look at whether it makes sense to convert High Street and Homer and Channing to two-way operation. We hope to test out different pedestrian and bicycle accommodations, we’re also looking at improving the signal timing downtown for both transit, motorists, pedestrians and cyclists. There is a segment of Bryant Street that passes through the study area for this particular project. The Bryant Street bike upgrade project was not very visionary when it came to Downtown. We’ve heard a lot of concerns about folks using the bike boulevard through Downtown and wanting to see better accommodations, so this project will look a little more in depth at what those may be.

Vice-chair Gardias: Ok, so it’s going to take a look from the concept perspective but it will not include investment in Bryant Street portion.
Mr. Mello: The Downtown mobility and safety strategies is both a planning and implementation project, so we want to use tact to go Urbanism, pop up street type thing. So we want to test out different configurations in practice, see how they work and make adjustments.

Vice-chair Gardias: Ok, so the part of Bryant that will be considered under this investment would be including implementation of the solutions, right?

Mr. Mello: Yes, the bike boulevard, I don’t feel we had enough direct outreach to business owners along Bryant, so the Downtown mobility and safety strategy will include a significant amount of outreach to the business community and patrons as well to determine if there is a better treatment for Bryant Street.

Vice-chair Gardias: Ok, so is there a chance that it will come back to our Commission after the study is concluded or it will go directly into the investment phase.

Mr. Mello: We can bring back some concepts to the Planning and Transportation Commission if you wish.

Vice-chair Gardias: It will be interesting to see what are some outcomes of the pop-outs and some other studies that you are going to conduct, some investment. So thank you.

So the second question I have about the Railroad grade separation, as you may know, there was a town meeting yesterday in Burlingame and they were just discussing the grade separation along their tracks in Burlingame and I think the concept they had was just a partially elevate the tracks and the press crossing roads and because the grade separation it just seems to me that it just keeps increasing in the volume and the discussions may be not as intense yet, but, it may get there in the next year or two. I was wondering if there was any discussions that you may be aware of between the municipalities about solution or potential solution that would address grade separation, Caltrain grade separation from San Francisco to San Jose.

Mr. Mello: San Mateo County already has a grade separation program through its sales tax measure and they actually dedicate funding annually to different grade separations, I believe Burlingame was able to secure some of that funding. In the discussions we were having surrounding the different sales tax measure for Santa Clara County in November the preliminary list of funding allocations includes $700 million dollars for grade separation within Palo Alto, Mountain View and Sunnyvale. That’s still preliminary the VTA board hasn’t included, hasn’t approved that officially yet. However, it’s looking like it’s going to make the final list, so that would open up a pretty significant pot of funding for us to advance our grade separations. We do talk with Menlo Park’s working on Ravenswood, Mountain View is doing a study on Castro Street. We do talk to our counterparts, we have an RFP out on the street right now for services related to this Capital Improvement Project, and we used a lot of materials from other communities that already moved farther along than we are on grade separations. I don’t think there is currently an opportunity for some kind of peninsula wide mega project that would fix all of the grade crossings, but I think we are getting to a point where there is going to be better coordination within Santa Clara County around prioritization of the different grade crossings.

Vice-chair Gardias: Ok, it looks like a good start. My concern was pretty much coming from that grade separation in our minds, it just goes, it relates to the depressing, the tracks and then up North, in San Mateo County, they pretty much talk about elevating the tracks. So pretty much they think about different approach, it would be nice if somebody was thinking about putting the
common denominator among all of this different efforts. I think for now those are the questions I had for you. Thank you for the answers.

Chair Fine: Commissioner Rosenblum.

Commissioner Rosenblum: Yes, thank you. A few questions, I just circled the big ticket items, so mostly I am going to go just one by one, mostly items over $1 million dollars, but there’s just a couple I am curious about that are below that threshold. The Cubberley amenities improvement, there’s a number of things around Cubberley and the description it notes, I’m concentrating on CB17000, but there are a number of items that are all stacked around Cubberley. It notes that it is allocated pending the result of the Cubberley Master Plan, when is the Master Plan expected to be done and how is this figure arrived at, is it the Master Plan is already proposed and the figures here is about $1.5 million dollars are expected to be the result of that plan or are there a number of scenarios expected to be developed?

Rob DeGeus, Director Community Services: Good afternoon Commissioners, Rob DeGeus, Director of Community Services and this is Brad Eggleston, Assistant Director of Public Works. So we are working on a Master Plan with Palo Alto Unified School District (PAUSD), we have five years of the lease agreement to be able to work on that plan. We haven’t really gotten started on it yet, this year will be the first year we really get down and work on the process of the Master Plan, I think our approach with the capital work at Cubberley is to do what’s absolutely necessary, roofing, those types of things and wait to see what the Master Plan will define as a future of Cubberley before spending too much money, that we then have to rebuild. Brad do you want to add?

Brad Eggleston, Assistant Director Public Works: Brad Eggleston, all that I would add is that if you’re specifically asking about the CB17000 project, Cubberley amenities improvement, that it’s discussing being placed in a reserve, that definitely there is no cost estimating for any future projects that went into that, that was just kind of a round figure to place in a project and have available for future uses.

Commissioner Rosenblum: Is there an estimate for the Master Plan process is supposed to be decided upon, so this is just allocating money for reserve in the event the Master Plan is approved to begin this work. Is that right?

Mr. DeGeus: That’s correct, the Master Plan will take two to three years to complete.

Commissioner Rosenblum: So then why would this money be allocated for the 2017 budget?

Mr. Eggleston: My understanding is that the first thought was to place the money for more specific projects and then as we have some discussions about that, we decided to keep it in reserve until decisions have been made.

Commissioner Rosenblum: Ok, thanks for the understanding. Me second question, are, they are similar but they are two different projects. Probably not for you guys, EL17003, which is probably the VA Hospital customer load requirements, $3 million dollars, and the question is, I understand this is about upgrading the electrical capacity given the increased needs of the VA Hospital. I am wondering , what is the VA Hospital’s responsibility in this, is this something that the City has to bear the cost in conjunction with the Veterans Administration or if this is
something that, actually I just don’t know how the budgeting is apportioned when there’s a
Federal agency that is upgrading and therefore needs us to accommodate.

Dean Batchelor, Assistant Director Utilities: Dean Batchelor, Assistant Director Utilities. So the
way that that works is we have to extend some of our own infrastructure portions of it to, where
this new substation that they want to build on their premise so anything that’s built on the
substation costs is going to be relied on from the VA standpoint but we need to actually increase
our capacity from our other substations our internal substations so there’s going to be two
substations that we have to upgrade and then we have to trench and do some overhead
infrastructure improvements of about two and a half miles to get to where this new substation is
going to be. The City is obligated to fix those pieces so that we can serve that one substation of
theirs but the cost of the substation on their property and the building of their substation will
actually be on the VA. That’s how we budgeted, we looked at what our cost would be for
increasing our capacity as well as what it takes to do all the infrastructure improvements.

Commissioner Rosenblum: And a quick question for staff. Jonathan is this something where our
purview is to try to figure out if this is in accordance with our Comp Plan is not really around,
does the VA, who is responsible for what, but we’re just looking is this in accordance with the
Comp Plan. Is that right?

Mr. Lait: That’s correct, the former.

Commissioner Rosenblum: Ok, second just a clarifying question then. EL17006, which is
electrical pole replacements for fiber and the description is this would be a Google project and
this would be our estimate for what the City would have to do in replacements for accommodating but that final costs are not yet there? I would just like to understand, this is the
biggest single item on the ledger, I think at $5 million dollars. So, I would like to understand this
one a bit better.

Mr. Batchelor: I think the thing is what we have to do Commissioner it still hasn’t been
determined yet if we are going to get into this co-build with Google at this period of time, if we
do then we’ve estimated out that about 600 poles, about 10 percent of our poles need to be
replaced because of the height limit or that the pole just needs to be replaced because the loading
of the calculations of the pole are not going to be able to withstand the extra cables on that pole
so we will have to redo those poles. Now if the City decides that we’re not going to go joint
venture with them, then at that point Google would be on the hook for that cost of what those
pole replacements would look like. But we needed to put it in the budget because we don’t know
where we are going to go at this period of time.

Commissioner Rosenblum: Ok. And then finally at least from my perspective, things understand
around the downtown mobility, I think this might be someone different which is the downtown
parking, downtown mobility and safety improvements PL16001. So, this estimate is highly
specific $563,143 and it’s for planning design and construction of multi-modal safety
improvements in downtown Palo Alto, so does that mean this already, we’ve had engineering
estimates that this dollar figure feels like it’s down to the construction cost. Have we already
designed this?

Mr. Mello: The number is not a round number because it includes staff time allocated to the
project as well which gets us to the kind of wonky numbers that we see in here. The estimate is
based on our best guess planning level cost estimate that’s for the type of improvements that we would like to do downtown which includes signalization, and signing and striping and some other potential changes.

Commissioner Rosenblum: Thanks. That’s my final question, that’s it for me.

Chair Fine: Commissioner Waldfogel.

Commissioner Waldfogel: Thank you. Josh, since you’re here right now, I will just ask you one very tactical question, which is whether the Embarcadero Signals are budgeted in this cycle or, there seems to be some concern about whether those have been addressed yet. The ones at Town and Country.

Mr. Mello: The signal at the Town and Country driveway and the adjacent signal at the pedestrian crossing were updated last year, they are not yet linked to our central traffic control system, we are working on that right now. We have to do a wireless connection because we can’t get through across the Caltrain Corridor with fiber, the rest of our signals are linked by fiber so that one is in process, we are going to link that one by mobile, probably a mobile cellular technology. And at that point we are going to coordinate all the signals along Embarcadero Road all the way from 101 to the Town and Country driveway, we are also going to secure the timing plan from Caltrans for the Embarcadero at El Camino signal and we are going to integrate our signal timing with Caltrans as best as we can. That’s going to be done with internal resources this year.

Commissioner Waldfogel: Ok, so it’s all built in.

Mr. Mello: Yes.

Commissioner Waldfogel: Great, that’s fantastic. I think a lot of people will be thrilled with that. The other one, I’m not sure if there is a specific line item for this, but, is there any category I should be looking at for Smart City investments or data collection infrastructure? I mean is that a traffic issue or sort of, whose area would that be in? No one wants to touch that one.

Lalo Perez, Chief Financial Officer: Lalo Perez, Chief Financial Officer. We have some ad hoc projects but not a central project. That’s why we were looking at each other, saying what do we have? Jonathan Reichenthal has started an internal group of staff members to try to get this coordinated and have some visibility to it as well. We would have to dig through and figure out which ones fall into that category and submit them to you. We probably wouldn’t be able to do it right off the bat.

Commissioner Waldfogel: That’s great. I think it’s something that probably ought to be visible in some fashion. Although I don’t know a hundred percent if it’s a capital project or how much of that would be an innovation fund or where that would fit.

Mr. Perez: It probably mostly operating but I could see some of it falling in capital and would probably land more on the IT fund if anything.

Commissioner Waldfogel: Although some of the sensors might fall onto transportation or other categories. I don’t think anybody else wants to weigh in on that one before I go on to. Then the
other one I wanted to raise is the Bayland Flood Protection Levee Improvement, which I guess is an RND, it’s a planning exercise this year. I’m just curious, is there a Baylands Master Plan coordination that’s going on, I mean in conjunction with that project or what’s the status of that project?

Mr. Eggleston: Brad Eggleston, Assistant Director Public Works. We are coordinating that with the San Francisquito Creek Joint Powers Authority (JPA), so what’s currently going on is the feasibility study phase of the project and then the CIP project you’re looking at is to add funding to that for an actual design. Yes, during the feasibility study phase, there is coordination with City staff, between the JPA and their consultant, City staff from various departments including the Planning department and consideration of the Baylands Master Plan.

Commissioner Waldfogel: But it’s also looking at things like coordination with the Golf Course Plan and I mean whether the levee protects Golf Course or doesn’t protect it or airport or other facilities.

Mr. Eggleston: The Water Quality Control Plant.

Commissioner Waldfogel: Water Quality Control Plant.

Mr. Eggleston: The landfill.

Commissioner Waldfogel: That’s a small detail, so it’s all coordinated around those activities?

Mr. Eggleston: Yes it is.

Commissioner Waldfogel: Great, thank you.

Chair Fine: Thank you, I just have a couple comments and a few questions. One, I really appreciate this chart that staff put together. It’s really nice, the only comment is, it would be helpful on this green chart is to have where the funding source is so you don’t have to go digging for that, but otherwise I found it really helpful and easy to understand. My only question actually, and I just wanted to get some clarity here. On EL17004, Stanford customer load requirements, it’s a half a million bucks for the medical facility and Stanford Shopping Center. I was talking to Commissioner Waldfogel before, I was hoping somebody could explain what is the status of utilities on Stanford? Do we pay for it? Does Stanford pay the City back for it? How does that work?

Dave Yuan: Dave Yuan, Utilities Administration. For that project, I think we are estimating about 80 percent reimbursement by Stanford and the rest, the City would probably fund.

Chair Fine: Great, thank you very much. So just the last comment there, it would be helpful if some of these projects if we could see where the City’s being reimbursed. I saw there is another one by the, I think the Air Quality Management District for the, I think the EV chargers. That’s stuff the City should be promoting and saying we’re getting our money back from another source. Otherwise, I don’t have any other questions, but I will open it up to anybody else. Vice-chair?

Vice-chair Gardias: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. A couple of supplemental questions about the chargers for the City, I think those chargers would be in the City Hall garage. This is right?
Mr. Eggleston: I’m sorry, can you repeat the question?

Vice-chair Gardias: The electrical chargers would be installed in this garage right?
Mr. Eggleston: Actually the grants that the City has received and has indication that we expect to receive have them installed in several different garages downtown and I believe also in the California Avenue district. Really this project where you see the Civic Center electrical upgrade this had previously been scheduled I believe in fiscal year 18 or 19 and what we’ve done now is created a new project where we combined the electrical upgrade with Civic Center along with the fronting of the money needed for the grant for the EV chargers in the hope that we will be able to add some capacity here and shift some of those chargers to the Civic Center garage.

Vice-chair Gardias: I see, thank you for clarification. What I was getting to was pretty much, I live by Rinconada library, prior, it was Main library. There are four charging stations over there, and those are always taken or most of the time taken. It seems to me that pretty much and it may be because some private vehicle owners, they just use charging stations in lieu of their home charging because they have no ability probably to charge it at home. But regardless, it seems to me that the capacity of those stations was not properly estimated because there should be at least maybe six or eight of them to make sure there are empty stalls for some additional cars that would like to just power their batteries. I’m just making this comment, just please take a look at the estimate because it seems to me that demand may be greater than it was assumed at the library and it may be the same reason, may be the same case at other City garages that pretty much the public may not have the capabilities at their homes or residences so they pretty much come to the public spaces.

Mr. Eggleston: Thank you, that’s very helpful. It’s something I think is a future step to develop a kind of Master Plan for where throughout the City the demand is and how many chargers should be added.

Vice-chair Gardias: And the next question is because, as you may know, there is a discussion about those charging stations that I think, they are not, they are specifically regulated this way that the public utilities like Con Edion or Pacific Gas & Electric, they don’t have ability to, they don’t have legal power to invest in those charging stations. I believe that is the current legal landscape, so for this reason small operators invest in those charging stations and they develop the network. I think that’s currently the landscaping in the State of California. I think this was changing or maybe it just changed recently because the capacity was under-capacitated and there was not enough of those charging stations giving the demand. So, my question to you is because it seems to me that we rely on the grants, what is the chance are supposing to using the public money that there could be a private capital investing in those in Palo Alto?

Mr. Eggleston: I have to say, it’s not something I have specifically worked on. I know there is a policy discussion that’s scheduled or going to be scheduled soon that’s going to occur with the Council Policy and Services Committee that’s going to consider the City’s current policy that charging is free and essentially provided by the City, so that may as well be part of that same discussion.

Vice-chair Gardias: Thank you. And then just to, hold on one second. Different question from a different perspective if you don’t mind. Going back to a discussion you had with a colleague of mine, Asher Waldfogel, about the levee’s. When I was reading this funding for the San Francisquito Creek Levee Improvement, it stroke me it is specifically designated for the levee
protections as opposed to complex study of flood protection. Do we already know that resolution of that area would be to strengthen levees of San Francisquito or that still open?

Mr. Eggleston: are you referring to fluvial flooding, from stream flooding? What this study is intending to do is to look at the issue of tidal flooding as it relates to sea level rise and for San Francisquito Creek, there’s a separate effort, a planning effort underway with the San Francisquito Creek Joint Powers Authority and in fact, that’s been a long standing effort and the first phase of that overall project which is the Highway 101 to the Bay project which is going to rebuild the levees in that area and provide flood walls is actually to begin construction this summer.

Vice-chair Gardias: That’s right, I was thinking about that portion, 101 to the Bay because that’s pretty much where the levees are, along San Francisquito Creek. I was wondering if that is already given because there is still some marshes on the other side, on the western side of the San Francisquito Creek adjacent to 101. I was wondering if there was an option to utilize those marshes as eventual overflow when the flood level would be rising as opposed to just creating the wall along the creek.

Mr. Eggleston: Actually, I believe that is a feature that has been built into the JPA’s design for that particular levee. If you’re thinking of the tract of salt marsh that’s kind of to the northwest of the levee, I believe they’ve built in, what they are calling a degrade of the levee in that area so that flows over a certain capacity flows over the levee into the wetland.

Vice-chair Gardias: Very good, thank you very much for the clarification. Thank you.

Chair Fine: Just one other comment and I want to hand it back to everyone else as well. On page 3 of the table, there is a number of projects around the City Hall, the Civic Center, electrical upgrades, Foothills which are referencing C4 as their primary Comprehensive Plan goal. C4 is more about collaborative relationship with the school district and maximize use of school facilities, is that purposeful? I was just wondering, I just didn’t see that complete connection there. So, there’s just a whole row of them on pages 3 and 4 of the table from 17008 to 21001. I think the reason I’m asking is the secondary goal that is cited here C24, reinvesting aging facilities to improve their usefulness and appearance seems like that might be the primary.

Mr. Lait: Yes, we can certainly take a look at that and make that adjustment.

Chair Fine: It just seemed like C4 is being used in places it might not apply. Any other questions, comments? Commissioner Rosenblum?

Commissioner Rosenblum: Just as a comment, I personally as with all of these infrastructure reviews, they always fit our Comp Plan to a certain extent. I mean it’s very hard not to fit our Comp Plan which emphasizes having top of the line infrastructure. It’s very difficult, one thing I have asked for in the past and I’ll ask for again, it’s difficult to really understand how well this fits our Comp Plan without having in the context of other potential plans. So, when you put this together, there were choices made, there’s probably a long list of things that everyone in the City wants, then you made some tradeoffs and decided this is what we are going to go for within a budget constraint and so one thing that would be helpful to the Commission would be to understand different packages and to say, ok, here’s a choice that probably with a higher budget, here’s a choice with a lower budget, we pick this and here’s why and I think it would be helpful for us help give better input. The way we currently try to evaluate whether or not this is
alignment with the Comp Plan is exactly what you do, which is you take each line item and you find the relevant line in the Comp Plan that refers to something like that item and going back and making sure that that’s a one-to-one connection. I think that all of us trusts that you’re mapping was done properly. Given what this is, I find it difficult to say this is not in align with the Comp Plan, everything here seems quite logical, there’s some items that for a matter of clarity as Chair Fine referred to, I would recommend adding so for example, what things are being reimbursed for, what things are merely being budgeted for but not intended to be spent that year and that includes some fairly large ticket items so that would change the idea of what you are actually spending and what portion of it would be either back to you or would not actually go out the door. So from a legibility standpoint I think that would be useful for Council if this goes further and for anyone who is trying to review this budget, but from my standpoint if there are no other questions I am happy to propose a Motion.

Chair Fine: I generally agree with Commissioner Rosenblum on that and one other way to think of it, especially now if we’re going through the Comp Plan is, this may be a little unorthodox, but if the City were to essentially given a hundred bucks, where would you put those dollars on each Comp Plan goal and that would kind of give us a way to add up, you know, we should really be focusing on C24 because there’s fifteen dollars there and fifteen dollars being spent towards that, so it’s an issue of prioritization. With that, I am also open for any Motions. I think Commissioner Rosenblum was going to.

Commissioner Rosenblum: Sure, I will make a Motion that we find the 2017-2021 Capital Improvement Plan consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and forward it to the Finance Committee and City Council.

Chair Fine: There’s a Motion on the floor for us to recommend approval of this and forward it on to the Finance Committee. Do we have a second?

Commissioner Waldfogel: I second.

Chair Fine: Commissioner Waldfogel seconds, would you like to speak to your Motion? Would you like to speak to your second? All in favor? And the Motion passes unanimously. Excellent.

Thank you all so much for that item, thank you everyone who showed up and for the information, you helped us, you provided to us. There’s no approval of Minutes, no Study Sessions. Any Committee Reports? Any questions? Alright, we are adjourned at 12:44 and thank you all so much for the lunchtime meeting. Thanks to staff to for organizing it.

Adjournment 12:44