



SPECIAL AND REGULAR MEETING AGENDA

Date: 4/12/2016
Time: 7:00 p.m.
City Council Chambers
701 Laurel St., Menlo Park, CA 94025

6:30 p.m. Closed Session (City Hall Administration Building, 1st Floor Conference Room)

Public Comment on this item will be taken prior to adjourning to Closed Session.

CL1. Closed session pursuant to Government Code Section 54956.8 regarding real property negotiations (1 matter):

- Property: Property owned by the City of Menlo Park located adjacent to 1080 O'Brien (APN 055434030), Menlo Park, CA
- City Negotiators: City Attorney Bill McClure, City Manager Alex McIntyre, Assistant City Manager Chip Taylor, Public Works Director Justin Murphy
- Negotiating Parties: City of Menlo Park (Owner) and John Tarlton, Tarlton Properties Inc (potential buyer)
- Negotiation: Potential sale of real property owned by the City of Menlo Park, including but not limited to sales price and other terms of sale

7:00 p.m. Regular Session (as soon as Closed Session is concluded)

- A. Call To Order**
- B. Roll Call**
- C. Pledge of Allegiance**
- D. Report from Closed Session**
- E. Presentations and Proclamations**
 - E1. Proclamation regarding Earth Day (Attachment)
 - E2. Presentation by Dr. Stefan Heck regarding innovation, energy and transportation issues
 - E3. Presentation by the Bicycle Commission regarding the proposed Oak Grove bicycle boulevard
- F. Commission/Committee Vacancies and Appointments**

- F1. Consider applicants and make appointments to fill vacancies on the San Mateo County Mosquito and Vector Control District, the Sister City & Friendship Committee, Finance & Audit Committee and the Bicycle, Environmental Quality, and Housing Commissions (Staff Report# 16-062-CC)

G. Public Comment

Under "Public Comment," the public may address the City Council on any subject not listed on the agenda. Each speaker may address the City Council once under Public Comment for a limit of three minutes. Please clearly state your name and address or political jurisdiction in which you live. The City Council cannot act on items not listed on the agenda and, therefore, the City Council cannot respond to non-agenda issues brought up under Public Comment other than to provide general information.

H. Consent Calendar

- H1. Authorize the Public Works Director to accept the work performed by Syserco Inc. for the New Energy Monitoring System of the Administration Building and Library Project (Staff Report# 16-060-CC)
- H2. Reject all bids for the construction of the Menlo Park-Atherton Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvement Project (Staff Report# 16-057-CC)
- H3. Authorize the Public Works Director to accept the work performed by Knorr Systems Inc. for the installation of the Variable Frequency Drive Systems for the Burgess and Belle Haven Pools (Staff Report# 16-059-CC)
- H4. Approve a comment letter on the California High Speed Rail Authority's (CHSRA) 2016 Draft Business Plan (Business Plan) (Staff Report# 16-063-CC)
- H5. Authorize the City Manager to enter into a master professional agreement with 4LEAF Inc. for building permitting and inspection contract services (Staff Report# 16-061-CC)
- H6. Consider accepting and relocating the Roger Reynolds Carriage Stop Building (Staff Report# 16-065-CC)
- H7. Approve minutes for the City Council meeting of March 15, 2016 (Attachment)

I. Regular Business

- I1. Consider a request by the Transportation Commission to review the current 1300 El Camino Real development project and provide potential direction of review of future development projects by Commissions (Staff Report# 16-064-CC)

J. Public Hearing

- J1. Adopt a resolution amending the City's Comprehensive Master Fee Schedule for Community Development, Community Services, Police, Public Works, and the Menlo Park Municipal Water District - **CONTINUED TO THE APRIL 26, 2016 CITY COUNCIL MEETING**

K. Informational Items

L. City Manager's Report

M. Councilmember Reports

N. Adjournment

Agendas are posted in accordance with Government Code Section 54954.2(a) or Section 54956. Members of the public can view electronic agendas and staff reports by accessing the City website at www.menlopark.org and can receive e-mail notification of agenda and staff report postings by subscribing to the "Notify Me" service at menlopark.org/notifyme. Agendas and staff reports may also be obtained by contacting City Clerk at 650-330-6620. (Posted: 4/7/2016)

At every Regular Meeting of the City Council, in addition to the Public Comment period where the public shall have the right to address the City Council on any matters of public interest not listed on the agenda, members of the public have the right to directly address the Commission on any item listed on the agenda at a time designated by the Chair, either before or during the City Council's consideration of the item.

At every Special Meeting of the City Council, members of the public have the right to directly address the City Council on any item listed on the agenda at a time designated by the Chair, either before or during consideration of the item.

Any writing that is distributed to a majority of the City Council by any person in connection with an agenda item is a public record (subject to any exemption under the Public Records Act) and is available for inspection at the City Clerk's Office, 701 Laurel St., Menlo Park, CA 94025 during regular business hours.

Persons with disabilities, who require auxiliary aids or services in attending or participating in City Council meetings, may call the City Clerk's Office at 650-330-6620.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



STAFF REPORT

City Council

Meeting Date: 4/12/2016
Staff Report Number: 15-062-CC

Commission Report: Consider applicants and make appointments to fill vacancies on the San Mateo County Mosquito and Vector Control District, the Sister City & Friendship Committee, Finance & Audit Committee, and the Bicycle, Environmental Quality Commission, and Housing Commissions

Recommendation

Staff recommends making appointments to the San Mateo County Mosquito and Vector Control District, Sister City & Friendship Committee, Finance & Audit Committee, and the Bicycle, Environmental Quality, and Housing Commissions.

Policy Issues

City Council Policy CC-01-004 establishes the policies, procedures, roles and responsibilities for the City's appointed commissions and committees, including the manner in which commissioners are selected.

Background

Staff conducted recruitment for the vacant positions for a period of eight weeks by publishing ads in the *Almanac online* and *Mercury News online (targeting Menlo Park residents)*, posting notices on the City's Facebook page, twitter and website, displaying ads on the electronic bulletin boards throughout the City's recreation facilities, the main library and by reaching out to the community through the social media site Next Door.

Analysis

Pursuant to City Council Policy CC-01-0004 (Attachment A), commission members must be residents of the City of Menlo Park and serve for designated terms of four years, or through the completion of an unexpired term or as otherwise designated. Residency for all applicants has been verified by the City Clerk's office. In addition, the Council's policy states that the selection/appointment process shall be conducted before the public at a regularly scheduled meeting of the City Council. Nominations will be made and a vote will be called for each nomination. Applicants receiving the highest number of affirmative votes from a majority of the Councilmembers present shall be appointed.

Appointments will be for 4-year terms expiring April 30, 2020. Appointments to the Finance and Audit Committee will be for 2-year terms expiring April 30, 2018.

***All applications will be provided to the City Council under separate cover and are also available for public viewing at the City Clerk's office during regular business hours or by request.

Applicant to the San Mateo County Mosquito and Vector Control District - 1 vacancy

- Justin Evans

Applicants to the Sister City and Friendship Committee – 5 vacancies

- Jim Clendenin (resident)
- Fran Dehn (business representative)
- Kristy Holch (resident)
- Analisa Pratt (resident)
- Carol Schumacher (business representative)

Applicants to the Finance and Audit Committee – 2 vacancies:

- Anne Craib (incumbent)
- Sahil Desai (also applied to the Housing Commission)
- Shaun Maguire
- Soody Tronson (incumbent)

Applicants to the Bicycle Commission - 2 vacancies:

- Katie Behroozi
- David Gildea
- Soody Tronson (if not reappointed to the Finance & Audit Committee)
- Jonathan Weiner (incumbent)

Applicants to the Environmental Quality Commission – 2 vacancies:

- Alan Bedwell (incumbent)
- Janelle London

Applicants to the Housing Commission – 1 vacancy:

- Jamie D’Alessandro
- Sahil Desai (also applied to the Finance & Audit Committee)
- Meg McGraw-Scherer

Impact on City Resources

Staff support for commissions and funds for recruitment advertising are provided in the FY 2015-16 budget.

Public Notice

Public Notification was achieved by posting the agenda, with the agenda items being listed, at least 72 hours prior to the meeting.

Attachments

- A. Excerpt from City Council Policy CC-01-004

Report Prepared by:

Pamela Aguilar, City Clerk

City of Menlo Park		City Council Policy
Department City Council		Effective Date 3-13-01
Subject Commissions/Committees Policies and Procedures and Roles and Responsibilities	Approved by: Motion by the City Council on 03-13-2001; Amended 09-18-2001; Amended 04-05-2011	Procedure # CC-01-0004

Application/Selection Process

1. The application process begins when a vacancy occurs due to term expiration, resignation, removal or death of a member.
2. The application period will normally run for a period of four weeks from the date the vacancy occurs. If there is more than one concurrent vacancy in a Commission, the application period may be extended. Applications are available from the City Clerk’s office and on the City’s website.
3. The City Clerk shall notify members whose terms are about to expire whether or not they would be eligible for reappointment. If reappointment is sought, an updated application will be required.
4. Applicants are required to complete and return the application form for each Commission/Committee they desire to serve on, along with any additional information they would like to transmit, by the established deadline. Applications sent by fax, email or submitted on-line are accepted; however, the form submitted must be signed.
5. After the deadline of receipt of applications, the City Clerk shall schedule the matter at the next available regular Council meeting. All applications received will be submitted and made a part of the Council agenda packet for their review and consideration. If there are no applications received by the deadline, the City Clerk will extend the application period for an indefinite period of time until sufficient applications are received.
6. Upon review of the applications received, the Council reserves the right to schedule or waive interviews, or to extend the application process in the event insufficient applications are received. In either case, the City Clerk will provide notification to the applicants of the decision of the Council.
7. If an interview is requested, the date and time will be designated by the City Council. Interviews are open to the public.
8. The selection/appointment process by the Council shall be conducted open to the public. Nominations will be made and a vote will be called for each nomination. Applicants receiving the highest number of affirmative votes from a majority of the Council present shall be appointed.
9. Following a Council appointment, the City Clerk shall notify successful and unsuccessful applicants accordingly, in writing. Appointees will receive copies of the City’s Non-Discrimination and Sexual Harassment policies, and disclosure statements for those members who are required to file under State law as designated in the City’s Conflict of Interest Code. Copies of the notification will also be distributed to support staff and the Commission/Committee Chair.
10. An orientation will be scheduled by support staff following an appointment (but before taking office) and a copy of this policy document will be provided at that time.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



STAFF REPORT

City Council Meeting Date: 4/12/2016
Staff Report Number: 16-060-CC

Consent Calendar: Authorize the Public Works Director to accept the work performed by Syserco Inc. for the New Energy Monitoring System of the Administration Building and Library Project

Recommendation

Authorize the Public Works Director to accept the work performed by Syserco Inc. for the New Energy Monitoring System of the Administration Building and Library project.

Policy Issues

The acceptance of the project requires City Council action. The one-year construction warranty period starts upon City's acceptance.

Background

On April 14, 2015, the City Council awarded a contract for the New Energy Monitoring System of the Administration Building and Library to Syserco Inc. This project consisted of removing the old energy management system software and hardware along with their controlling devices. A New Energy Monitoring System was installed in both buildings including new software, hardware, control wiring, control devices with valve actuators, thermostats and CO2 sensors.

Analysis

The work for the New Energy Monitoring System project has been completed in accordance with the plans and specifications. A notice of completion will be filed accordingly. The project was completed within the approved project budget.

Contractor: Syserco Inc.
215 Fourier Ave.
Fremont, CA 94539

Impact on City Resources

Acceptance of the work has no impact on the City's resources. The total construct cost was \$51,311 under the total construction budget.

Construction Contract Budget	
	Amount
Construction contract	\$345,000
Contingency	\$30,000
Total construction budget	\$375,000

Construction Expenditures	
	Amount
Construction contract	\$304,885
Change orders	\$18,804
Total project cost	\$323,689

Environmental Review

The project was categorically exempt under Class 1 of the State of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) guidelines.

Public Notice

Public Notification was achieved by posting the agenda, with the agenda items being listed, at least 72 hours prior to the meeting.

Report prepared by:
Carl Thomas, Facilities Supervisor

Report reviewed by:
Ruben Niño, Assistant Public Works Director



STAFF REPORT

City Council
Meeting Date: 4/12/2016
Staff Report Number: 16-057-CC

Consent Calendar: **Reject all bids for the construction of the Menlo Park-Atherton Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvement Project**

Recommendation

Staff recommends that the City Council reject all bids for the construction of the Menlo Park-Atherton Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvement Project (the Project). The Project includes improvements at isolated locations on Valparaiso Avenue, Glenwood Avenue, El Camino Real, and Middlefield Road.

Policy Issues

This Project is consistent with several policies (e.g. II-A-12, II-D-2, II-E-4, etc.) stated in the 1994 General Plan Circulation Element. These policies seek to maintain and strengthen a circulation system that provide for the safe and efficient movement of people and goods throughout Menlo Park for residential and commercial purposes.

Background

In 2012, under the City of Menlo Park's Safe Routes to School (SR2S) Program, the City developed a comprehensive Valparaiso SR2S plan to address safety concerns for children and families that use Valparaiso Avenue and surrounding streets to travel to and from nearby schools. The Project includes recommendations from the Valparaiso SR2S plan.

In 2012-13, the City submitted an application to the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG) for project funding consideration under the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) OneBayArea Grant (OBAG) Program. The grant funds are intended to fund the construction of the Project.

On November 20, 2015, the City received the Program Supplement Agreement No. 016-N (Agreement) from Caltrans, the agency responsible for administering the grant fund for the Federal government. The City Council authorized the acceptance of the grant at the January 12, 2016 Council meeting, and a bid request for the construction of the Project was publicly advertised on February 19, 2016.

A summary of the proposed Project improvements include:

- Continuous asphalt concrete (AC) pedestrian pathway on the south side of Valparaiso Avenue between Pulitzer Drive and University Drive
- Lighted crosswalk systems and red curb treatments on Valparaiso Avenue at Elder Avenue

and Emilie Avenue

- Green bicycle lane markings at approaching intersections along Valparaiso Avenue, Glenwood Avenue, and Middlefield Avenue
- Speed feedback signs on Valparaiso Avenue; eastbound near Robert S Drive and westbound near Hoover Street
- Audible pedestrian signal system at six signalized intersections along El Camino Real

Analysis

On March 11, 2016, two bids were received for the construction of the Project. The lowest bidder, Redgwick Construction Co. of Oakland, California submitted a bid in the amount of \$674,586. This amount is approximately 40 percent over the engineer's estimate of \$485,620. The second bidder, Tennyson Electric, Inc. of Livermore, California, submitted a bid in the amount of \$793,812, which is approximately 65 percent over the engineer's estimate. Attachment A provides the bid summary. As shown, the bid results for the Project included base and alternate scope items. Staff anticipated the bid results would be close to the programmed budget, and therefore had designed the contract documents so that the City could award a contract within the budgeted amount.

The lowest bid amount of \$674,586 is approximately 20 percent over the available budget of \$564,007. Furthermore, the total construction cost will have to be increased to include construction engineering cost to cover agency staff time during construction.

Staff recommends that all construction bids be rejected since they are significantly over budget and would require a substantial increase to the City's cost. Staff will modify the scope of work and re-advertise the modified project.

In order to reduce construction costs, staff is recommending the following changes:

- Remove all green bicycle lane markings along Valparaiso Avenue, Glenwood Avenue, and Middlefield Avenue and install these improvements through the Citywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Visibility Project
- Change the lighted crosswalk systems from In-Road Warning Lights to Rectangular Rapid Flash Beacons

In-road Warning Light systems are similar to the crosswalk enhancement devices located at Oak Grove Avenue and Merrill Street, Ravenswood Avenue and Alma Street, and currently at Valparaiso Avenue and Hoover Street. This system has a high maintenance cost and is currently only manufactured by one supplier. The Rectangular Rapid Flash Beacons (beacons) are a newer device approved for installation by the Federal Highway Administration in 2013 that have been demonstrated to be more effective (motorist yield rates upwards of 85%), more cost effective to install and lower cost to maintain. Photos of each device are provided in Attachment B. Additionally, the Town of Atherton maintains the existing system at Valparaiso Avenue and Hoover Street, which is in need of replacement. Town staff has indicated their intention to replace the In-road system with beacons later this year, and was supportive of the change in scope for this Project. Staff recommends modifying the proposed design to incorporate the beacons in lieu of the In-road system to provide a more consistent treatment along Valparaiso Avenue and lower the capital cost for construction of this Project.

Staff has notified the contractors, the Caltrans Local Assistance Office and C/CAG staff of the City's intent to reject the bid proposals and submitted the modified scope for approval. Pending their approvals, staff plans to re-advertise the modified project as soon as April 15, 2016 so construction can occur in Summer 2016 when schools are out of session, and be completed prior to Fall 2016 when schools are back in session.

Impact on City Resources

The Project is funded in the 2015-16 Capital Improvement Program. Grant funds allocated are \$498,783 and the City contribution is estimated at \$65,224. Caltrans indicated that the potential delay in the Project advertisement and construction periods would not jeopardize the grant fund earmarked for this Project. Staff anticipates the next round of bid proposals would be more competitive based on recommended modifications to the project scope listed above. However, depending on the bid results, additional City budget might be needed for the completion of the Project. Staff will identify any additional budget requests necessary to complete the Project at the time of construction contract award.

Environmental Review

The Project is categorically excluded under Section 326 of Chapter 3 of title 23 of the United State Code (23 U.S.C. 326), Code of Federal Regulation 771.117(c)(3) under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Under this code, the state determines that the construction of pedestrian and bicycle paths has no significant environmental impact as defined by NEPA.

Concurrently, the Project is categorically exempt under Section 15304 - Class 4 of the current California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines. The section allows for minor alterations of existing facilities, including existing highways and streets, sidewalks, gutters, bicycle and pedestrian access, and similar facilities, as long as there is negligible or no expansion of use.

Public Notice

Public Notification was achieved by posting the agenda, with the agenda items being listed, at least 72 hours prior to the meeting.

Attachments

- A. Bid Summary
- B. Crosswalk Device Photos

Report prepared by:

Kevin Chen, Assistant Engineer, Transportation

Report reviewed by:

Kristiann Choy, P.E., Senior Transportation Engineer

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



BID SUMMARY

Menlo Park-Atherton Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvement Project

Bid Opening: Friday, March 11, 2016 at 2:00 PM

Apparent Low Bidder: Redgwick Construction Company

	COMPANY	BASE BID	ALTERNATE BID	TOTAL BID
1	Redgwick Construction Company	\$646,936.55	\$27,650.00	\$674,586.55
2	Tennyson Electric Inc.	\$749,762.00	\$44,050.00	\$793,812.00

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Rectangular Rapid Flash Beacons (RRFB)



In-road Warning Light System



THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



STAFF REPORT

City Council Meeting Date: 4/12/2016
Staff Report Number: 16-059-CC

Consent Calendar: Authorize the Public Works Director to accept the work performed by Knorr Systems Inc. for the installation of the Variable Frequency Drive Systems for the Burgess and Belle Haven Pools

Recommendation

Authorize the Public Works Director to accept the work performed by Knorr Systems Inc. for the installation of the Variable Frequency Drive Systems for the Burgess and Belle Haven Pools.

Policy Issues

The acceptance of the project requires City Council action. Acceptance of the work starts the one year warranty period.

Background

On October 21, 2014, the City Council awarded a contract for the installation of new Variable Frequency Drive Systems for the Burgess and Belle Haven Pools to Knorr Systems Inc. This project consisted of installing new variable frequency drives to control the existing circulation pumps along with controls and devices associated with the upgrade.

Analysis

The work for the new Variable Frequency Drives Upgrade project has been completed in accordance with the plans and specifications. A notice of completion will be filed accordingly. The project was completed within the approved project budget.

Contractor: Knorr Systems Inc.
2221 Standard Ave
Santa Ana, CA 92707

Impact on City Resources

Acceptance of the work has no impact on the City’s resources. The total construct cost was \$5,272 under the total construction budget.

Construction Contract Budget	
	Amount
Construction contract	\$55,272
Contingency	\$5,000
Total construction budget	\$60,272

Construction Expenditures	
	Amount
Construction contract	\$55,272
Change orders	0
Total project cost	\$55,272

Environmental Review

The project was categorically exempt under Class 1 of the State of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) guidelines.

Public Notice

Public Notification was achieved by posting the agenda, with the agenda items being listed, at least 72 hours prior to the meeting.

Report prepared by:
 Carl Thomas, Facilities Supervisor

Report reviewed by:
 Ruben Niño, Assistant Public Works Director





STAFF REPORT

City Council

Meeting Date:

4/12/2016

Staff Report Number:

16-063-CC

Consent Calendar:

Approve a comment letter on the California High Speed Rail Authority's (CHSRA) 2016 Draft Business Plan (Business Plan)

Recommendation

Staff recommends that the City Council approve a comment letter on the California High Speed Rail Authority's (CHSRA) 2016 Draft Business Plan (Business Plan).

Policy Issues

This action is consistent with the City Council's adopted Rail Policy and prior actions taken by the Council on the California High Speed Rail (HSR) project.

Background

Established in 1996, the CHSRA is charged with planning, designing, constructing, and operating a state-of-the-art high speed train system. The HSR system as a whole would serve San Diego to Sacramento, including other major cities in-between. A branch of the system would separate and run from the Central Valley to the San Francisco Bay Area. The system is planned to access San Jose as well as San Francisco along the Peninsula within Caltrain right-of-way, with other local stops.

On April 12, 2012, the CHSRA Board approved a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) among and between the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (Caltrain), the CHSRA, the San Mateo County Transportation Authority, the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority, the Transbay Joint Powers Authority, the city of San Jose, the City and County of San Francisco, and the San Francisco County Transportation Authority to pursue a "Blended System" between Caltrain and HSR along the San Francisco to San Jose segment.

On October 30, 2012, the City Council adopted the Rail Council Subcommittee Mission Statement, Statement of Principles and the Council Position Statement on Rail Issues ("Rail Policy"). These documents were prepared and adopted in response to HSR and Caltrain Blended System preliminary planning concepts which included potential four-track elevated structures between San Jose and San Francisco. The Rail Policy was modified on May 5, 2015 to allow consideration of an elevated rail option to be considered as part of the City's Ravenswood Avenue Grade Separation Project. The Rail Policy expresses the Council's adopted position on rail, as summarized below:

- Approves of a blended system proposal
- Opposes any elimination of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) for the HSR environmental review process
- Opposes addition of passing tracks in Menlo Park, or more than two tracks within the existing Caltrain right-of-way (Policy allows for very minor exceptions)

The full Rail Policy is included as Attachment A.

On February 18, 2016, the CHSRA released the 2016 Business Plan for the HSR project (Attachment C). On March 15, 2016, the Council directed staff to bring forward a draft comment letter on the Business Plan emphasizing the City's current position on HSR.

Analysis

The Business Plan calls for \$64.2 billion in capital costs and provides details on the path forward to construction and operation of a portion of the rail program with three objectives:

1. Initiate HSR passenger service as soon as possible, with the first phase between Silicon Valley and the Central Valley by 2024.
2. Make concurrent investments in the system in other areas to connect state, regional and local rail systems.
3. Construct additional segments as funding becomes available.

The CHSRA is holding a 60-day public comment period on the Business Plan that closes on April 18, 2016.

The Business Plan also includes projected schedules for environmental clearance for each operating segment. Environmental clearance for the Peninsula segment (San Francisco to San Jose) is anticipated to be completed in 2017. Staff will continue to monitor the environmental review process and schedules as more information becomes available from the CHSRA. The comment letter including the City's position on High Speed Rail as well as specific comments on the Business Plan is Attached B.

Impact on City Resources

The City has allocated funds to reviewing and responding to CHSRA efforts on the Peninsula segment through the Capital Improvement Program for 2015-2016. No additional funds or resources are required at this time.

Environmental Review

CHSRA is the lead agency for the HSR project. The City's action to submit a comment letter on the Business Plan does not require environmental clearance.

Public Notice

Public Notification was achieved by posting the agenda, with the agenda items being listed, at least 72 hours prior to the meeting.

Attachments

- A. [Menlo Park Rail Policy: http://www.menlopark.org/DocumentCenter/Home/View/6388](http://www.menlopark.org/DocumentCenter/Home/View/6388)
- B. Draft Comment Letter on the 2016 Draft Business Plan
- C. Hyperlink: Draft 2016 Business Plan:
http://www.hsr.ca.gov/docs/about/business_plans/DRAFT_2016_Business_Plan_0201816.pdf

Report prepared by:
Nicole H. Nagaya, P.E., Transportation Manager

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

April 13, 2016

Mr. Jeff Morales, CEO
Attn: Draft 2016 Business Plan
California High-Speed Rail Authority
770 L Street, Suite 620 MS-1
Sacramento CA 95814

RE: Comments on the Draft 2016 Business Plan

Dear Mr. Morales,

I am writing to submit the City of Menlo Park's comments on the Draft 2016 Business Plan for High Speed Rail (HSR).

The City would like to take this opportunity to reiterate its current position on the HSR project. Enclosed is a copy of the City's current Rail Policy. The City supports the "blended system" proposal for the San Francisco and San Jose segment outlined in the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (Caltrain), the California High-Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA), the San Mateo County Transportation Authority, the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority, the Transbay Joint Powers Authority, the City of San Jose, the City and County of San Francisco, and the San Francisco County Transportation Authority as approved by the CHSRA Board in April 2012.

We are opposed to any elimination of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) for the HSR environmental review process. Given the current anticipated schedule shown in the Business Plan, environmental clearance for the San Francisco to San Jose segment is shown to be completed in 2017. The schedule should be developed to ensure sufficient time and input from potentially affected stakeholders.

The City is also opposed to the addition of a third passing track along the rail line through Menlo Park. The City requests that the CHSRA outreach and engage with the City to review passing track options within the City as the environmental review proceeds.

Additionally, the CHSRA has identified a limited amount of funding in the Business Plan for potential mitigation measures and local system improvements for at-grade

crossings, including grade separations and quad gates. The City is currently completing a Project Study Report (PSR) for grade separation alternatives for Ravenswood Avenue. As part of that study, the City will also be considering implications for the other three grade crossings along this rail corridor within the City limits.

The City will continue participating in the business plan and future environmental review process to review any impacts and proposed mitigation measures within Menlo Park. The City expects these issues to be resolved and further information provided to allow the City of Menlo Park to make an informed opinion of the project.

If you have any questions, please contact Nikki Nagaya, Transportation Manager, at 650-330-6781 or nhnagaya@menlopark.org.

Sincerely,

Richard Cline, Mayor

Enclosure: [Menlo Park Rail Policy](#)



STAFF REPORT

City Council
Meeting Date: 4/12/2016
Staff Report Number: 16-061-CC

Consent Calendar: **Authorize the City Manager to enter into a master professional agreement with 4LEAF, Inc. for building permitting and inspection contract services**

Recommendation

Staff recommends that the City Council authorize the City Manager to enter into a master professional agreement for a three year period for plan check and inspection contract services with 4LEAF, Inc.

Policy Issues

This action is consistent with past practice in which master professional agreements have been established to streamline the request for proposal and purchase requisition process on a per project basis.

Background

The City has utilized contract services through the master professional agreement process to augment City staff on an as-needed basis over the past two decades. The use of master professional agreements establishes continuity with contract personnel that are familiar with the regulations and policies of the City of Menlo Park and helps to streamline the work of the Building Division. City Council authorization is required for the City Manager to execute master professional agreements in excess of his financial authority.

The most recent master professional agreements for building contract services were authorized by the City Council on June 4, 2014 for a five year period with three separate firms. The current agreements expire on June 30, 2019. These agreements supplement staff on an as-needed basis to provide services in a timely manner.

In March 2016, the City contracted with 4LEAF, Inc. under the City Manager's authority for permitting and inspection services. The need for an additional service provider is a direct result of the increase in development and construction-related activity coupled with a vacant building inspector position.

Analysis

The city is currently experiencing a very high level of construction activity driven not only by an increase in single-family development but also by several large scale projects including the Facebook campus, Menlo Gateway, and residential projects on Haven Avenue, Hamilton Avenue and Willow Road. It is expected that this level of activity will extend for the next several years. Staff currently uses a combination of City building inspectors and contract inspectors to meet the demand. However, resources have been stretched thin by an ongoing vacancy in one of the four building inspector positions due to a resignation in November 2015. The City currently subsidizes permitting and inspection staffing with contract services from three providers,

Kutzman and Associates, Shums Coda Associates and Interwest Consulting Group. Staff has been in regular contact with these firms since September of 2015 inquiring about inspector availability however the availability of qualified inspectors is extremely low due to the increase in construction in the region. As an example of the impact of the limited resources, the Building Division averaged 850 inspections each month with 93 percent of those inspections completed within one day of the request prior to the resignation of the staff building inspector. Since the departure, the Building Division has averaged 503 inspections each month with 66 percent of those completed within one day

In order to address the need for additional inspection capacity, staff has been inquiring about inspector availability with additional firms in the region. 4LEAF, Inc. has responded to the City's inquiries with a qualified inspector. 4Leaf, Inc. is a multi-discipline consulting firm that provides service to over 100 jurisdictions in the western United States including the cities of Cupertino and Palo Alto. They guarantee all staff provided to Building Departments is qualified and certified. Entering into the master professional agreement with 4LEAF, Inc. will insure that the Building Division is able to continue to provide necessary inspection services in a timely manner. If necessary, the terms of the agreement allows for termination if work is found to be unsatisfactory.

Impact on City Resources

The budgeted amount for building contract services in Fiscal Year 2015-16 is \$1.2 million and sufficient funds remain for the 4LEAF, Inc. master agreement. The revenues to support the building contract services are fully covered by building permit fees. Expenditures to support building contract services will be proposed in future Fiscal Year budgets based on the level of building activity in each of those years.

Environmental Review

Entering into a master professional agreement is not deemed a project under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

Public Notice

Public Notification was achieved by posting the agenda, with the agenda items being listed, at least 72 hours prior to the meeting.

Report prepared by:
Ron LaFrance, Assistant Community Development Director



STAFF REPORT

City Council

Meeting Date:

4/12/2016

Staff Report Number:

16-065-CC

Consent Calendar:

Consider accepting and relocating the Roger Reynolds Carriage Stop Building

Recommendation

Staff recommends that the City Council not accept and relocate the Roger Reynolds Carriage Stop Building (more commonly known as the Carriage House) currently located at 133 Encinal Avenue to another location.

Policy Issues

The recommendation does not represent any change to existing City policy.

Background

The Carriage House is a 1-story structure, 635 square feet in size that was built in 1947. It is currently located on a 1.7 acre property at 133 Encinal Avenue in the El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan zoning district. The property is on the north side of Encinal Avenue between El Camino Real and the Caltrain railroad tracks.

The Roger Reynolds Nursery, a commercial garden nursery, operated for 94 years between 1919 and 2013. It was the oldest nursery on the San Francisco Peninsula until it closed in September 2013, and it has been unoccupied since that time. The Carriage House was originally located on El Camino Real, and it was moved to the current location at 133 Encinal Avenue in the 1950s. There are currently three buildings and several storage sheds on the property. Attachment A shows the location of the Carriage House relative to the other structures on the property. Attachment B shows photos of the exterior and interior of the Carriage House.

In March 2015, a qualified architectural historian, Corri Jimenez, conducted a historic resource evaluation to determine whether the buildings met the qualifications to be included in the National Register of Historic Places and the California Register of Historical Resources. The evaluation determined the following:

- The buildings are not historically significant, and therefore not considered historic resources under the California Environmental Quality Act for the Treatment of Historic Properties and Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings.
- The buildings lack integrity specific to design, materials, and workmanship due to significant alterations and replacement of original materials.

On January 12, 2016, the City Council approved development on the 133 Encinal Avenue property to construct 24 residential townhouse-style units and associated onsite improvements. At the meeting, Council members expressed an interest in exploring a potential idea to relocate the Carriage House.

The developer has offered the Carriage House to the City if the City is able to arrange moving the structure to another location. Construction of the new development will begin shortly, and the Carriage House would need to be moved within the next 30 days in order to keep it. If the City chooses not to relocate it, the developer will be responsible for demolition and/or repurposing. Thus far the developer has not applied for a demolition permit.

Analysis

In order to evaluate the feasibility of keeping the Carriage House and relocating it to another location, staff investigated costs involved and other items that must be considered.

Staff contacted several firms that relocate structures to obtain a ballpark estimate. Only one firm provided an estimate as some specifics of the relocation are still unknown such as the consideration of street widths to the new property and whether overhead utilities needed to be considered based on the height of the structure. Estimated costs range between \$15,000 and \$20,000 to move the house in one piece. Traffic control costs associated with moving the structure are approximately \$1,500 assuming one lane closure and two flaggers on each end for one entire day.

In order to relocate a structure, other factors and costs must be considered such as a new foundation for the structure, bringing the structure up to current code in order to utilize it, connecting it to existing utilities such as water, sewer, and electricity, and hiring an architect to redesign the structure for a future use. Fire sprinklers would typically not be required since the structure is under 1,000 square feet. In order to move the structure, the previous additions would need to be removed which may necessitate additional cost to rebuild portions of the structure, such as the rear wall. Staff estimates that these costs could total approximately \$250,000. Given the uncertainties, it would be prudent to consider at least a 30 percent contingency, bringing the preliminary cost closer to \$325,000. (As a means of comparison, construction of a new structure at \$300 per square foot would equate to \$190,500). If the City Council decides to proceed forward with acceptance and relocation, a more in-depth analysis of costs would be necessary.

Another consideration would be identifying a location for a permanent home for the structure along with the necessary parking, disabled access to the structure, and associated site modifications. The City could also choose to temporarily move the Carriage House until a permanent location is found. Staff has investigated potential sites to temporarily store the structure and at the moment there is no known available location within the City's control without disrupting either an open space or parking spaces.

Although the idea of the relocating the Carriage House has some merits in terms of preserving a part of Menlo Park's history, it does not appear to be a feasible project given all of the unknowns and uncertainties. In addition, there would be time and effort needed to secure the necessary permits and conduct the competitive bids to perform the work. If the Council did wish to consider this idea further, then there would be impacts to other projects in the Council Work Plan.

Impact on City Resources

The acceptance and relocation of the Carriage Stop Building is not currently budgeted. If the Council opted to pursue this initiative, then a budget appropriation would be required.

Environmental Review

An environmental review is not required if the Council decides to not accept and relocate the Carriage House. If the Council opted to pursue this initiative, then staff would determine the appropriate level of environmental review.

Public Notice

Public Notification was achieved by posting the agenda, with the agenda items being listed, at least 72 hours prior to the meeting.

Attachments

- A. Aerial Map with Carriage House Location Marked
- B. Photos of the Carriage House

Report prepared by:
Sally Salman, Assistant Engineer

Report reviewed by:
Justin Murphy, Public Works Director

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

133 Encinal Avenue, Menlo Park



THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



2010 Aerial photograph by EDR, Scale 1'=500' (AST 2014:349). Red arrow depicts the nursery's current setting, as well as the finish of 1600 El Camino Real as a multiuse office building.



View of both the Carriage Stop (left) and Nursery Building (right).



Carriage Stop, front facade, looking northwest.



Carriage Stop, side elevation with roof dormer and rear addition, looking southeast.



Carriage Stop, rear addition facing courtyard, looking southeast.



Carriage Stop, interior looking southeast.



Carriage Stop, interior, marble fireplace add-on.



Carriage Stop, interior shops, looking north.



SPECIAL AND REGULAR MEETING MINUTES - DRAFT

Date: 3/15/2016
Time: 5:30 p.m.
City Council Chambers
701 Laurel St., Menlo Park, CA 94025

5:30 p.m. Closed Session (City Hall Administration Building, 1st floor conference room)

Mayor Cline called the Closed Session to order at 5:37 p.m.

- CL1.** Closed Session pursuant to Government Code Section §54957.6 to confer with labor negotiators regarding current labor negotiations with Service Employees International Union (SEIU), American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME) and the Menlo Park Police Sergeants' Association (PSA)

Attendees: City Manager Alex McIntyre, Administrative Services Director Nick Pegueros, Finance and Budget Manager Rosendo Rodriguez, Human Resources Manager Lenka Diaz, City Attorney Bill McClure, Labor Counsel Charles Sakai

7:00 p.m. Regular Session

- A.** Mayor Cline called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

B. Roll Call

Present: Carlton, Cline, Keith, Mueller, Ohtaki
Absent: None
Staff: City Manager Alex McIntyre, City Attorney Bill McClure, City Clerk Pamela Aguilar, Deputy City Clerk Jelena Harada

C. Pledge of Allegiance

Mayor Cline led the pledge of allegiance.

D. Report from Closed Session

Mayor Cline stated that there is no reportable action from the Closed Session held earlier.

Agenda items F, G and H were called out of order.

F. Presentations and Proclamations

- F1.** Proclamation recognizing Eagle Scout Henry Marks for completing the renovation of Plant Identification Trail on the civic center campus ([Attachment](#))

Henry Marks received the proclamation.

- F2. Proclamation recognizing Menlo Park employee Mary Liedl on her retirement ([Attachment](#))

Mary Liedl accepted the proclamation.

- F3. Proclamation declaring March Red Cross Month ([Attachment](#))

Tricia Clement received the proclamation.

G. Commissioner Reports

Mayor Cline announced that the City commission recruitment is closing on March 17 and encouraged the residents to apply for the vacancies.

Item G2 preceded item G1.

- G2. Quarterly update from the Parks and Recreation Commission ([Attachment](#))

Commission Chair Marianne Palefsky reported on the ongoing commission business.

- G1. Quarterly update from the Environmental Quality Commission

Commission Chair Allan Bedwell presented updates on the ongoing commission business.

H. Public Comment

- Jim Lewis spoke about the friendship agreement between Menlo Park and Gallway, Ireland and presented updates on the Two Menlos activities. Video presentation from Gallway ensued. (handout)
- Ernest Kinsolving and Karl Franzen performed traditional Irish music
- Josh Abend spoke about absence of rent control
- Jym Clendenen presented updates on activities of the Menlo Park Historical Association
- Allan Bedwell spoke against drones at Bedwell-Bayfront Park
- Chris MacIntosh spoke against drones at Bedwell-Bayfront Park
- Omar Chatty spoke about the contract with AECOM for the Ravenswood Avenue Grade Separation

E. Study Session

- E1. Provide feedback on the draft 2015 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) which includes the proposed Water Shortage Contingency Plan (WSCP) ([Staff Report# 16-053-CC](#)) ([Presentation](#))

Senior Engineer Pam Lowe introduced the item. Anonna Dutton and Tina Wong, consultants with Erler & Kalinowski, made a presentation and answered questions.

The Council agreed with the proposed conservation goals and are interested in looking into targeting higher usage reductions.

The City Council pointed out that Menlo Park residents overachieved the 2015 State requirements of water reduction in single family residential homes.

I. Consent Calendar

Councilmember Keith pulled items I4 and I8. Councilmember Mueller pulled item I3.

- I1. Amend the Gymnastics Center Power Purchase Agreement (PPA) to incorporate a revised Schedule 10, amend the Corporation Yard PPA to incorporate a revised Schedule 10, and authorize the Public Works Director to accept the work performed by Cupertino Electric (CEI, Solar One) for solar photo voltaic (PV) installations at the Arrillaga Gymnasium, Arrillaga Gymnastics Center, Onetta Harris Community Center, and City Corporation Yard ([Staff Report# 16-046-CC](#))
- I2. Approve a resolution authorizing submittal of application for CalRecycle payment programs and related authorizations ([Staff Report# 16-045-CC](#))
- I3. Authorize the City Manager to sign a contract in the amount of \$631,300 with AECOM for the Ravenswood Avenue Grade Separation Project Study Report and authorize the City Manager to enter into all agreements for this project ([Staff Report# 16-051-CC](#))
- I4. Adopt a resolution supporting the City's Shuttle Program for application to the San Mateo County Shuttle Program FY 2016-2017 and FY 2017-2018 funding and authorize the City Manager to enter into funding agreements ([Staff Report# 16-054-CC](#))
- I5. Authorize the City Manager to enter into agreements with Casey Construction, Express Plumbing and Farallon Company for on-call routine and emergency water system services for the Menlo Park Municipal Water District ([Staff Report# 16-052-CC](#))
- I6. Authorize the City Manager to approve a contract with ICF International in the amount of \$255,660 and future augments as may be necessary to prepare an infill Environmental Impact Report for the Middle Plaza at 500 El Camino Real Project ([Staff Report# 16-044-CC](#))
- I7. Adopt a resolution authorizing the position of Administrative Services Director as Plan Coordinator for the City's IRS 401a and 457 Plans administered by ICMA-RC ([Staff Report# 16-048-CC](#))
- I8. Approve minutes for the City Council meetings of February 9 and 23, 2016 ([Attachment](#))

Councilmember Ohtaki commented on item I1 to congratulate the staff on establishing the Power Purchase agreement.

ACTION: Motion and second (Keith/Carlton) to approve Consent Calendar items I1, I2, I5, I6 and I7 passes unanimously.

Public comments were taken at this point.

- Steve Van Pelt spoke about the Ravenswood Avenue Grade Separation Project Study Report

The Council was in favor of keeping the Ravenswood Avenue Grade Separation Project on its

schedule. It was noted that the City Council Rail Subcommittee participated in reviewing the Requests for Proposals.

ACTION: Motion and second (Ohtaki/Carlton) to approve item I3 passes unanimously.

The Councilmembers pointed out the newly-established morning shuttle from Belle Haven neighborhood to Menlo-Atherton High School.

ACTION: Motion and second (Keith/Ohtaki) to approve item I4 passes unanimously.

The Council discussed the amendments to meeting minutes of February 9.

ACTION: Motion and second (Keith/Ohtaki) to approve the meeting minutes of February 9 with the following amendments passes unanimously:

1. In the motion of item H4 to replace “the City will reach out to businesses” with “the Transportation Commission will reach out to businesses”.
2. In item I6 to replace “There was consensus among Council to direct staff to submit an Informational Item regarding bus shelters” with “There was consensus among Council to direct staff to submit an informational item regarding bus shelters and an informational item regarding crosswalk policy, at a future meeting”.
3. In the motion of item I1 to replace “to appoint the Mayor and Mayor Pro Tem to advocate for Caltrans support” with “to appoint the Mayor and Mayor Pro Tem to liaise with Caltrans”.

ACTION: Motion and second to approve the meeting minutes of February 23 passes 4-0 (Councilmember Carlton abstains).

J. Regular Business

- J1. Accept the 2015-16 Mid-Year Financial Summary and approve recommended 2015-16 budget adjustments ([Staff Report# 16-056-CC](#)) ([Presentation](#))

ACTION: Motion and second (Keith/Ohtaki) to accept the 2015-16 Mid-Year Financial Summary and approve the recommended 2015-16 budget adjustments passes unanimously.

- J2. Review and accept the Annual Report on the status and progress in implementing the City’s Housing Element and the Annual Housing Successor Report ([Staff Report# 16-049-CC](#))

Principal Planner Dianna Chow introduced the item.

ACTION: Motion and second to accept the Annual Report on the status and progress in implementing the City’s Housing Element and the Annual Housing Successor Report passes unanimously.

K. Informational Items

Staff was available to answer questions.

- K1. Update on the status of bus shelter installation in Belle Haven ([Staff Report# 16-055-CC](#))

- K2. Update on the Water System Master Plan (WSMP) -Recycled Water ([Staff Report# 16-050-CC](#))
- K3. Review of the City's Investment Portfolio as of December 31, 2015 ([Staff Report# 16-047-CC](#))

H. Councilmember Reports

- H1. Councilmember Mueller reported on the Education Equity District actions. He raised a question whether the Council wishes to pursue the carriage house preservation, located at the Roger Reynolds property. Councilmember Mueller spoke about the Belle Haven residents' concerns regarding garbage placement fines they received and about the hours-of-operation signage at the Belle Haven pool. Mueller thanked Jeff Phillips and Mark Bryman with the Menlo-Atherton Little League, and architect Sam Sinnott for donating his time in completing the Burgess Park little league snack bar development.

Councilmember Ohtaki gave an update on the Federal Aviation Association's action in regards to the flight patterns that are affecting Menlo Park residents.

Councilmember Keith spoke about the CalTrain High-Speed Rail Business Plan and the time sensitivity for providing input in regards to the plan, schedule changes and funding for grade separation. Councilmember Keith asked that staff look into submitting a comment regarding the High-Speed Rail Business Plan before the deadline on April 18. She also gave an updat on the San Francisquito Creek JPA progress.

Councilmember Carlton updated on the friendship activities between Menlo Park and Bizen, Japan. Carlton announced the opening of the youth exchange program between the two cities.

Mayor Cline reported on the Excellence in Community Policing award received by the Menlo Park Police Department.

I. City Manager's Report

There was no report at this meeting.

J. Adjournment

Mayor Cline adjourned the meeting at 10:22 p.m.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



STAFF REPORT

City Council

Meeting Date:

4/12/2016

Staff Report Number:

16-064-CC

Regular Business:

Consider a request by the Transportation Commission to review the current 1300 El Camino Real development project and provide potential direction of review of future development projects by Commissions

Recommendation

Consider a request by the Transportation Commission to review the current 1300 El Camino Real development project and provide potential direction regarding review of future development projects by Commissions.

Policy Issues

Development projects have a set review process depending on the type of project that is either administrative or includes the Planning Commission, Housing Commission for Below Market Rate (BMR) Agreements and/or the City Council. Project actions typically include specific findings that have to be made on a project-by-project basis.

Background

The current city process for reviewing development applications is based on specific requirements of Federal, State and local law and policies. Depending on the size, scope, and complexity of the project, it may be reviewed at a ministerial level by staff (such as a small addition to a single family home) or it may require further review up to and including the City Council. Typically, if the project cannot be approved ministerially, it would be approved by the Planning Commission and/or the City Council. The Planning Commission has a specific role within the City based on State and local requirements with the Commission being the final acting body on many occasions with an appeal process to the City Council. The City Council may be required to act on certain components of a development project such as a major subdivision, right-of-way abandonment, or rezoning.

The only other review of development applications by Commissions, based on local requirements, is for specific code related issues. The Housing Commission reviews all BMR agreements as required by the BMR Ordinance. Also, in recent years, the Environmental Quality Commission (EQC) has reviewed any heritage tree removal permits that are included in development projects and provides recommendations to the Planning Commission and City Council. The EQC is only required by code to review appeals of heritage tree removal permits, but for efficiency they have been included to allow the City Council to act on all project actions comprehensively.

Other Commissions are not required by code to review development proposals. Some Commissions have reviewed development projects on an ad hoc basis in the past. Typically, these reviews have been at the request of the Commission and have mainly been for larger projects that included both an Environmental

Impact Report (EIR) and Development Agreement (DA). Staff has provided a report and/or presentation in some cases, but not all, since there is not a formal requirement for Commission review and it was not specifically built into the process. However, Commission review and feedback are included as important components of any of the larger planning policy documents in the City such as Specific Plans and the General Plan process. These documents establish the requirements and policies related to future development.

Analysis

1300 El Camino Real (“Station 1300”) Development

The Transportation Commission has asked staff to place the 1300 El Camino Real project (also known as “Station 1300”) on its agenda in order to review the project. At this time, staff has indicated that review of this project was not within the Commission’s current work plan or approved by the City Council as part of the process. Since historically direction regarding Commission review of development proposals has not been clear, the request is being brought forward to Council for consideration.

The issue is timely as there has been some inconsistency regarding Commission review of this project because there has not been a specific policy discussion on this topic. The Environmental Quality Commission (EQC) did review the 1300 El Camino Real project, at its request, at its March meeting and provided recommendations for the Planning Commission and City Council. Also, a representative for the development project reached out to the Bicycle Commission in March to offer a presentation to the Commission and the Bicycle Commission scheduled that presentation for its April 11 meeting. Staff has not prepared reports or offered any particular project-related analysis as part of either of these EQC or Bicycle Commission meetings.

Any review of the project by a Commission should be consistent with the scope of the Commission’s responsibilities such as transportation focus for the Transportation Commission. Since the time necessary for staff to provide a presentation or staff report to the Commission was not included in the Council work plan, it was not contemplated. A staff report and/or presentation would have an impact on other items in the Council work plan including the General Plan process and other transportation capital projects. The intent of the review would be to provide advice on transportation issues to the Planning Commission and City Council.

Future review of development proposals

Since the City does not currently have a protocol or policy for review of development proposals by the City’s Commissions, the process has varied. The Council may want to provide guidance to staff on the review of future development applications. This guidance would provide clear direction for any future requests from the Commissions. It is important to note that due to scheduling issues related to Commission meetings and the overall timing of development proposals, incorporating additional time to the development review process will be required if the Council directs that additional Commission review of development projects is desired. This would extend the overall review timeline for development projects. Also, depending on the level of information to be provided to the Commission, additional staff time will be necessary that will affect other development projects and capital improvement projects.

If Council would like to have a further discussion on direction related to the future review of development proposals by commissions, staff will bring back an item to Council with further information, questions, and

options at a future Council meeting. The process could continue to be ad hoc or a more defined process could be identified. It would also be important to discuss which commissions would be included in the review as some commissions may not have a specific topic area within their current purview.

Impact on City Resources

Development projects are responsible for reimbursing the City for the review time associated with the project, thus there is not a specific direct financial impact. Staff time for the current required development review process is currently scheduled with the current staffing levels. If additional review procedures are added to the process, then other development projects would be affected with reduced staff time available for those projects. Some of the staff that review development projects also work on Capital Improvement Projects (CIP), which would also be affected by any additional review procedures.

Environmental Review

Environmental review is covered by each individual development project.

Public Notice

Public notification was achieved by posting the agenda, with the agenda items being listed, at least 72 hours prior to the meeting.

Report prepared by:
Chip Taylor, Assistant City Manager

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK