

Brettle, Jessica

From: Rice, Danille
Sent: Friday, February 21, 2020 2:18 PM
To: Council, City; Council Agenda Email
Cc: Executive Leadership Team; ORG - Clerk's Office
Subject: Council Agenda Consent Questions for February 24: Items 2, 4, 6, 7, 9 and 11



Council Question Response

Dear Mayor and Council Members:

On behalf of City Manager Ed Shikada, please find below the staff responses to inquiries made by Vice Mayor DuBois, Council Member Cormack, and Council Member Tanaka in regard to the February 24, 2020 Council Meeting agenda.

- **Item 2: Police Department Study Session with Council**
- **Item 4: Approval of Contract for PWD Watershed Protection Public Outreach**
- **Item 6: Climate/Sustainability and Climate Action Plan, Transportation and Traffic**
- **Item 7: Three-Year Microsoft Licensing with Insight Public Sector Contract Approval**
- **Item 9: EKG Monitor Acquisition**
- **Item 11: Approval of the Appointment of Council Member Kniss as the Alternate to the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) Group 2 Cities Working Group**

Item 2: Police Department Study Session with Council (Question from Vice Mayor DuBois)

1. **Can you please make sure the presentation includes some details and result from the Internal Affairs investigations, particular the 26 done in 2019?**
 The presentation will include limited details about the number and type of the Department's administrative investigations as appropriate for personnel matters. We are unable to discuss the particular details of Internal Affairs Investigations due to Penal Code 832.7.
2. **Can you explain the interaction if any between Internal Affairs and the Police Auditor?**
 The Personnel & Training Lieutenant is the primary point of contact for the Independent Police Auditor (IPA). When new Taser application investigations, Citizen Complaints, or Administrative Investigations are opened the P&T Lieutenant notifies the IPA. When the aforementioned investigations are complete, the P&T Lieutenant arranges for copies to be mailed to the IPA for review. After review of the investigations, the IPA communicates any questions, concerns, or comments with the P&T Lieutenant to assist with the preparation of the IPA report. The IPA and the P&T Lieutenant conduct a phone meeting to discuss the DRAFT version of the IPA report, prior to publishing, as an

opportunity to clarify policies, processes, training, or questions about the incident. The IPA also sends the DRAFT report to the police officer union to ensure that the proper anonymity of involved officers has been considered. Throughout the year, if the IPA receives any communication from the public regarding police conduct, the IPA calls the P&T Lieutenant and discusses the issue.

Item 4: Approval of Contract for PWD Watershed Protection Public Outreach

(Question from Council Member Cormack)

- 1. Is the ratio of \$130,000 for design and outreach services in year 1 to \$25,000 for advertising reasonable?**

Yes, given that advertising is one of several methods used for delivering the products and services involved. The reason that the amount for advertising (media buys) is so much less than the amount for design and other types of outreach is that most of the design products are not for use in paid advertising. The design products include visuals for reports, fact sheets, flyers, mailings, handouts, school program materials, translations, website materials and the like. Over the years, paid advertising has become a smaller and smaller part of the outreach budget as more targeted vehicles have emerged.

Item 6: Climate/Sustainability and Climate Action Plan, Transportation and Traffic

(Question from Vice Mayor DuBois)

- 1. Why were only 2 firms invited to oral interviews? What were the price ranges for the 6 bids received?**

Out of the 6 proposals received, 2 proposals were not responsive to the requirements of the Request For Proposals. Of the remaining 4 proposals that were responsive, 2 firms were invited to oral interviews because they provided clearly better proposals and overall solutions. The price range for the 6 proposals received was \$189,320 - \$248,500.

- 2. AECOM appears to have been selected on a bid of \$212,000 but then additional services were added to reach \$573,000. Were the other bidders asked what they could achieve for \$500,000? Were we comparing apples to apples here?**

All proposers were asked for and provided cost proposals for the required scope of services. In addition, proposers were asked for proposed innovations and optional services to supplement their basic cost and service proposals. The proposers' innovations and optional services were considered relative to the project goals as reflected in the RFP's criteria for selection, and AECOM is recommended for approval based on its proposal being determined superior.

- 3. The Comp Plan says that Palo Alto will continue to use Level of Service (LOS) as well as VMT when making decisions. Is AECOM aware of this when it comes to decisions about how Palo Alto does transportation impact analysis? The report suggests a shift, while I think its Council's intention to do both.**

SB743 mandates that all agencies develop an assessment of VMT as a part of a development's transportation impact as part of CEQA analyses. The City will maintain LOS as a part of local analysis including CMP roadway facilities. The AECOM task will develop a new tool and policy the City will need for CEQA

analyses. Their task does not limit the City's ability to also use LOS, or other techniques.

4. The report suggests an exemption is needed for competitive bidding because the VMT thresholds must be adopted by July 1,2020. Why wasn't this requirement part of the RFP?

The RFP included Scope of Work Task 2: Calculate Transportation-Related Emissions, included a deliverable to develop, test, and validate a methodology that could provide annual analysis of vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and GHG impacts of road travel. The additional scope recommended would provide support to City adoption of a new policy implementing SB743. At the time the RFP was issued, City staff were still confirming the details of SB743's requirements for VMT thresholds, and therefore were not able to draft additions to the RFP scope, vet new tasks with stakeholders and incorporate new tasks into the S/CAP scope without delaying both tasks. Opting to include AECOM's proposed additional scope is recommended as the best means to complete the work and coordination needed for both the S/CAP and SB743 implementation in a timely and coordinated manner.

5. Did the other firms bid on the VMT analysis?

Yes, the S/CAP Scope of Work included VMT analysis focused on calculating its contributions to GHG emissions as part of the S/CAP Scope of Work Task 2.

Item 7: Three-Year Microsoft Licensing with Insight Public Sector

Contract Approval (Question from Vice Mayor DuBois)

1. Has the city done a competitive bid recently for these productivity software applications? Have we evaluated other office suites, such as Google G-Suite which includes built-in collaboration capabilities, is more modern technology, is designed to be high performant with all data stored in the cloud, and is lower cost?

While the city has not completed a competitive bid for productivity software we have conducted market research. In 2014 the IT department conducted an internal evaluation of different productivity software, which included Google G-Suite, and Microsoft Office 365 was selected. The city requested quotes from multiple Microsoft partners leveraging the County of Riverside Agreement to ensure we receive the best prices and customer service. An updated review of enterprise productivity options should involve staff developing an appropriate workplan, and could be discussed during the annual budget process.

2. How much has been spent by the City on Microsoft Office suite, SharePoint and email from 2005 through this contract?

The city has spent \$3,378,752.74 on Microsoft Office Suite, email and SharePoint from 2005 through February of 2021.

Cost breakdown by years:

2005-2014: \$150,307.90 Annually

2015-2016: \$215,053.90 Annually

2017: \$322,767.10 Annually

2018-2019: \$366,400.50 Annually

2020: \$389,998.44 Annually

Item 7: Three-Year Microsoft Licensing with Insight Public Sector

Contract Approval (Question from Council Member Cormack)

1. **Are there circumstances under which the city would contemplate using a different provider of enterprise software?**

Yes, if the cost savings would be significant enough to justify the impact of migrating to a new enterprise productivity software including but not limited to training, migrating current applications, and productivity disruptions. In 2014 the IT department conducted an internal evaluation of different productivity software, which included Google G-Suite, and Microsoft Office 365 was selected. An updated review of enterprise productivity options should involve staff developing an appropriate workplan, and could be discussed during the annual budget process.

Item 9: EKG Monitor Acquisition (Question from Council Member Tanaka)

1. **Given the vendor lock in presented by lifepak's ecosystem, will Palo Alto ever be able to transition from the LifePak products to other vendors?**

The Lifepak ecosystem is the best option right now for purposes of interoperability with the monitors and the primary receiving facilities, i.e. Stanford University Hospital and El Camino Hospital, etc. When the monitors are up for replacement, we will continue to evaluate all monitors that meet FDA standards, and our standards for interoperability. With the advancement of technology, we anticipate that more vendors will standardize the features that are currently available on the Lifepak units.

Item 11: Approval of the Appointment of Council Member Kniss as the Alternate to the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) Group 2 Cities Working Group

(Question from Vice Mayor DuBois) forwarding responses on behalf of City Clerk Beth Minor:

1. **The bylaws on packet page 210 say the alternate should have 4 years of term limit eligibility remaining. Doesn't this remove Councilmembers Kniss, DuBois and Filseth?**

This is only a one-year term completing the 2-year term that Adrian Fine had that ends in December 2020. The board elected Liz Kniss to complete Adrian Fine's term.

Assuming they are re-elected, Council members Tanaka, Fine and Kou have 5 years remaining and Council Cormack has 7 years, correct?

Correct.

2. **Is Palo Alto next after Mountain view in the rotation to be the VTA Board member for Group2?**

Staff could not find any information on this.

3. **If Council member Kniss is appointed as the alternate, and then terms out, don't the bylaws state that Palo Alto would lose its opportunity to have a council member on the board the following year?**

This is only a one-year term completing the 2-year term that Adrian Fine had that ends in December 2020. The board elected Liz Kniss to complete Adrian Fine's term. She was on the Policy Advisory Committee last year.

Thank you.



Danille Rice
Executive Assistant to the City Manager
250 Hamilton Avenue, Palo Alto, CA 94301
(650) 329-2105 | Danille.Rice@cityofpaloalto.org