



CITY COUNCIL STUDY SESSION MINUTES

STUDY SESSION MINUTES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

7:00 p.m.

City of Menlo Park

The Menlo Park City Council Chambers

701 Laurel Street

Menlo Park, CA 94025

A. ROLL CALL – Winkler, Jellins, Cohen, Duboc, Fergusson

B. PUBLIC COMMENT

A member of the public, representing Policewatchdog.org, addressed the Council asking that police officers be required to use an audio recorder when they interact with the public.

C. STUDY SESSION

1. Status of the Community Services Department Reorganization.

Curtis Brown, Community Services Director, provided an overview and introduced staff. Mr. Brown explained that staff is committed to finding solutions to certain challenges associated with the reorganization. Aaron Johnson, Senior Supervisor provided his perspective. Council asked questions about the challenges the program is facing including the decrease in programs participation. Staff will explore attendance issues and is committed to neighborhood needs and will report back to the City Council.

Council took a break at 8:20 p.m. and reconvened at 8:25 p.m.

2. Overview on Traffic Impact Fee Study.

Justin Murphy, Principal Planner, presented a brief staff report covering all the steps related to complying with State Law AB 1600. He also elaborated on the Sun Microsystems situation. Council asked questions of staff regarding various impact fees currently in effect. Mr. Murphy enumerated the five main impact fees: traffic, storm drain, Recreation in-lieu, below market rate housing and school. The AB 1600 process was discussed as well as the one time fee paid at the time of building permit issuance. Council would like staff to study all current fees and Mr. McClure, City Attorney, explained that first cities study the fees and then assess implementation.

Mayor Winkler agrees with conducting a study that may bring revenues in the long run. Some Council Member would like to review the income generating businesses versus those who don't. Staff was asked if other cities charge traffic impact fees and staff said that 10 to 12 other Bay Area cities have fees. Council asked about timelines and Mr. Murphy explained that the next step would be to prepare a request for proposals and then possibly return in the next 12 to 18 months with the fee study. At that time Council could adopt an

ordinance setting the fee. Mayor Winkler would like this item to come back and include an overview of the other City fees.

Roxanne Rorapaugh shared concerns that neighborhood projects create cut through traffic and jam traffic lights. She opined that this impacts neighbors and should be considered.

D. ADJOURNMENT – the meeting adjourned at 9:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Silvia M. Vonderlinden, CMC

Approved at the City Council meeting of July 19, 2005.