

REVISED AGENDA

Agenda posted according to PAMC Section 2.04.070. A binder containing supporting materials is available in the Council Chambers on the Friday preceding the meeting.

Special Meeting
Council Chambers
January 23, 2006, 6:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL

STUDY SESSION

1. Presentation by the Child Care Advisory Committee Attachment

SPECIAL ORDERS OF THE DAY

2. Council Recognition of Three Palo Alto Businesses that were Recently Certified by Santa Clara County as a Green Business: Gunn High School, Agilent and Roche

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

Members of the public may speak to any item not on the agenda; three minutes per speaker. Council reserves the right to limit the Oral Communications period to 30 minutes

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

CONSENT CALENDAR

Items will be voted on in one motion unless removed from the calendar by two Council Members.

3. **(CMR:102:06)** Approval of Two Contracts for Capital Improvement Project (CIP# TE-05003), Internet Site Upgrade: 1) Contract with Pixelpushers Inc. DBA Civica Software in the Amount of \$132,695 for the Implementation of a Website Content Management System; and 2) Contract with Creativewerks, Inc. in the Amount of \$92,400 to Provide Graphic Re-Design for the City's Website – Capital Improvement Project # TE-05003 Attachments
4. Recommendations to Authorize the Mayor to Submit Comments to Mountain View on Traffic Mitigation Measures in the 100 Mayfield Project Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) Attachments

AGENDA CHANGES, ADDITIONS, AND DELETIONS

HEARINGS REQUIRED BY LAW: Applicants and/or appellants may have up to ten minutes at the outset of the public discussion to make their remarks and up to three minutes for concluding remarks after other members of the public have spoken.

OTHER AGENDA ITEMS: Public comments or testimony on agenda items other than Oral Communications shall be limited to a maximum of five minutes per speaker unless additional time is granted by the presiding officer. The presiding officer may reduce the allowed time to less than five minutes if necessary to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

PUBLIC HEARINGS

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONS

5. **(CMR:119:06)** Request from the Finance Committee for Council Direction Regarding Institution of a Business Registry Fee or a Business License Tax Attachment or on an Increase to Transit Occupancy Tax

ORDINANCES AND RESOLUTIONS

REPORTS OF OFFICIALS

COUNCIL MATTERS

6. Colleagues Memo from Mayor Kleinberg and Vice Mayor Kishimoto re Quimby Act Regarding Adoption of Park Fees
7. **(CMR:118:06)** Policy and Services Committee Recommendation Regarding Council Review of Responses to Audit Report Recommendations on Restructuring Efforts and Management Span of Control Attachment

COUNCIL COMMENTS, QUESTIONS, AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Members of the public may not speak to the item(s).

CLOSED SESSION

This item may occur during the recess or after the Regular Meeting.

Public Comments: Members of the public may speak to the Closed Session item(s); three minutes per speaker.

ADJOURNMENT

Persons with disabilities who require auxiliary aids or services in using City facilities, services, or programs or who would like information on the City's compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990, may contact 650-329-2550 (Voice) or 650-328-1199 (TDD) 24 hours in advance.

Attachment A

DRAFT

January 30, 2006

Mayor Nick Galiotto

City of Mountain View

500 Castro Street

Mountain View, CA 94039-7540

SUBJECT: 100 Mayfield Project Traffic Mitigation

Dear Mayor Galiotto,

The City of Palo Alto received the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the 100 Mayfield Project in mid-December. The purpose of this letter is to focus on a specific traffic mitigation identified in the DEIR that is of concern to Palo Alto. Palo Alto staff will submit comments on the overall DEIR under separate cover.

Since circulation of the DEIR, Palo Alto residents in the vicinity of the project have expressed concern to the City Council regarding impacts from the traffic circulation and

which will be the responsibility of Palo Alto; both the underpass and the San Antonio Road/Nita Avenue intersection are located within Palo Alto.

In closing, the City would also like to commend Mountain View for working closely with Palo Alto in the preparation of the DEIR and appreciates Mountain View's efforts to incorporate staff's comments in the DEIR. The City Council further appreciates Mountain View's consideration of this concern regarding the project's traffic mitigation.

Sincerely,

Judy Kleinberg

Mayor, City of Palo Alto

7. Lane configurations at the Palo Alto intersections shown on Figure 4.12-6 need to be double checked. For example the westbound approach on San Antonio Road (southbound in the report) at Charleston Road contains one left-turn lane, two through lanes, one shared through/right-turn lane, and one right-turn lane; there are no two exclusive right-turn lanes on this approach. It is realized that data entry in the Traffix software would be somewhat different to reflect the volume entering the frontage road.
8. Table 4.12-6 needs to have a notation that the provided volume and density are for the mixed flow lanes (i.e. the HOV lanes are excluded).
9. Field Observations on Page 4.12-18 and 4.12-19 do not have any reference to the parking associated with the Mid-Peninsula Jewish Community Day School that presently takes place on San Antonio Road as well as on the project site.
10. The lists of Approved and Pending projects provided in Tables 4.12-7 and 4.12-14, respectively, are incomplete based on the data base in mid 2005 as previously provided to the City of Mountain View. If the traffic consultant selected only a few of the projects in light of their net trip increase and project locations, then this needs to be clarified in the report write-up. Also both complete project lists should be added to the appendices.
11. The traffic consultant was informed of the City practice to estimate trip generation of a land use based on the higher of either the ITE average trip rate, or the ITE fitted curve. This practice should have been followed in estimating the trip generation associated with the approved projects, pending projects, office use that exists on site, and the proposed residential uses.
12. It is realized that the total number of trips to be generated by the proposed residential uses would be fewer than the existing office trips as stated on Page 4.12-31. However, the proposed residential uses would generate more outbound trips during the a.m. peak hour, and more inbound trips during the p.m. peak hour. The performed analysis applied a reduction factor of 3% (i.e. less than 50% of the surveyed 7%) to the existing office use, yet it applied a reduction factor of 9% (i.e. more than 50% of the 17% surveyed in the City of Mountain View) to the proposed residential uses. The relatively large difference (between 3% and 9%) could result in an underestimation of the net change in trip generation. The project site is relatively large and not all dwelling units would be located within a walking distance of 2000 feet from the Caltrain station. There are also operational and safety concerns that still need to be addressed with regard to the pedestrian and bike connection to the train station. Residents in the different cities within the County have different travel patterns. It is therefore preferable to apply reduction factors that would reflect traveling behaviors in both cities.
13. The description of trip distributions of the existing and proposed uses (provided on Page 4.12-30 and 4.12-35) has no reference to the percentage of traffic that uses/will use the underpass. The trip assignments shown on Figures 4.12-9 and 4.12-12 are less than the estimated trip generation of the current and proposed uses, respectively. If it is assumed that

the trip difference uses the underpass and other local streets the percentages of traffic that use/will use the underpass should be provided. It should also be noted that there is no indication to the underpass usage by the general traffic from the nearby areas.

14. Volumes shown on Figures 4.12-10 and 4.12-13 need to be double checked. For example, the northbound left-turn movement on Middlefield Road (westbound in the report) at San Antonio Road should be 360(414) (i.e., not 330(400)) under Current conditions, and 301(415) (i.e., not 301(401)) under Project conditions. There are also some minor imbalances between the intersection volumes even where there are no intermediate driveways to absorb the difference.
15. A complete list of the Palo Alto significant impact criteria was previously provided to the traffic consultant. The criteria listed on Pages 4.12-44 and 4.12-45 have no reference to potential parking impacts. The EIR should identify where the guest parking will be provided.
16. Traffic counts and analysis of the residential local and collector streets were only conducted for streets within the City of Mountain View. It was repeatedly requested that the TIRE index be applied to the nearby local and collector streets in Palo Alto. However, such analysis was not incorporated in the report. Page 4.12-51 of the report seems to imply that only 14 students would travel to and from Palo Alto schools. It should be noted that there are traffic generators other than schools (such as parks, restaurants, etc.) that would attract traffic to Palo Alto. There could be also the potential for cut-through traffic using residential Palo Alto streets such as Briarwood Way and Nelson Drive. This limited evaluation is also demonstrated on Figures 4.12-14 and 4.12-15 which illustrate current and future site trips on local Mountain View streets without any of the Palo Alto streets located north of San Antonio Road.
17. There is presently a stop control facing motorists exiting the site at Nita Avenue and making a right-turn onto San Antonio Road. The signal phasing shown on Figure 4.12-16 makes sense. Incorporating the northbound right-turn movement (i.e. right-turn out of the site) into the signal phasing could encourage/divert more traffic to use San Antonio Road. For example, would more trips heading to US 101 be made via San Antonio Road rather than via Central Expressway and Rengstorff Avenue. It should be noted that the stop controlled intersection of Thompson Avenue/Central Expressway is expected to operate at LOS "E" and "F" under future traffic conditions. Also the outbound left-turn pocket on Mayfield Avenue at Central Expressway is expected to exceed its maximum queue capacity.
18. The DEIR recommends an alternative mitigation at a number of locations (e.g. first paragraph on Page 4.12-60, and second paragraph on Page 4.12-61) to eliminate the underpass and provide instead an outbound left-turn access at San Antonio Road/Nita Avenue. This mitigation could adversely impact traffic operations on San Antonio Road. Again San Antonio Road serves a considerable amount of truck traffic. Traffic queues often take place on San Antonio Road in the vicinity of Nita Avenue. These queues are worsened during the start and end times of the Mid-Peninsula Jewish Community Day School. This alternative mitigation measure also has the potential to generate cut-through traffic on local Palo Alto streets such as on Briarwood Way and Nelson Drive (e.g. by traffic trying to avoid