

**Compiled Responses to Council Questions  
City Council Regular Meeting – May 12, 2020**

**Study Session**

I realize this is out of scope, but are ever going to get a report on the current inventory of units being administered and verification of appropriate use?

Yes. Palo Alto Housing has done a check of BMR units being administered. I will ask them to provide us with an update – as I recall there were a few “households” that had not responded.

Will PAH be able to comment on how our Affordable Housing Priority Rankings compare to other jurisdictions?

Yes, will advise so they are ready to address.

**Consent Calendar**

Please identify where the money for items 3,4,5,6,7,8 and 9 are going to come from?

Agenda Item 3: Street Slurry Seal Contract Award: Gas Tax (100%)

Agenda Item 4: Street Resurfacing Contract Award: The FY-19/20 CIP budget: CIP (\$250K); Gas Tax (\$700K); SB1 (\$500K); Measure B (\$550K). Funds carried-over from previous years are CIP / General Fund dollars. Today the carried-over amount was confirmed to be \$110,566 from the \$90,176 in the staff report.

Agenda Item 5: Street Construction Inspection: 50% will be funded from the Gas Tax budget of the Slurry Seal project and 50% from the budget sources in the Street Resurfacing project.

Agenda Item 6: SB1 Project List: California Transportation Commission

Agenda Items 7,8,9: General Fund

What are the plans for recovering these funds? I want to ensure there is a cost recovery plan.

There is no need to recover any funds for Agenda Items 3-5. Those funds were approved by the City Council in the FY-19/20 CIP Budget for the projects listed. The \$589K is SB1 dollars is reimbursed by the state.

Is there a possibility that we could have a color coded analysis of which money will be reimbursed, are already allocated in the general fund, or in CIP.

Staff intends to provide more comprehensive information regarding the source of funds for projects in the future.

What total additional funds have being requested for approval that have not already been allocated?

**Compiled Responses to Council Questions  
City Council Regular Meeting – May 12, 2020**

None

Can funds that have already been allocated be moved?

Yes they can be moved as long as they are not promised under contract or other obligations that are tied with funding. And that the revenue source is not restricted to a certain purpose or Fund.

**Agenda Item 1**

Minutes – item 6. Name should be Kathy or Katherine Cuervo, not Kater.

Will correct

Why don't we have minutes for 4/14 & 4/28 before us?

Staff is working on those minutes and we expect that they will both be on the 5/26 agenda.

**Agenda Item 2**

Could staff kindly put a version control identifier on the bottom of each page of the exhibits for the final document? I think this is generally a good practice. Please also consider modifying the Now Therefore of the resolution to better reflect the attachments by title (at minimum, e.g. Attachment 2 and Attachment 3) as well as version control identifier. In general the Attachments should not leave on guessing as to whether or not there is an Attachment 1. Isn't it better to have an Attachment 1 and 2? IMHO, these changes could just be made on the copy for the Mayor's signature and not have to be resent to Council

Okay. We will make the recommended edits to the version the Mayor signs.

**Agenda Item 3 and 4**

Thank you for providing the table of costs and budget sources.  
Thank you also for the bid sheets and the maps.

Same set of questions for both items:

To which figure in the table should I compare the Engineer's Estimate? Should it be compared to the Total or to the Base construction bid or something else?

It should be compared to the Total bid.

Do the bids call out cost of materials (which is sinking), and is there any way to garner savings on this or other projects because of the free-fall of prices?

Each item on the bid schedule includes the \$/unit to do each particular work task (e.g., 6-in White Solid/Broken Bike Line in Thermoplastic = \$3/lineal foot). Since the unit prices reflect a blend of labor

**Compiled Responses to Council Questions  
City Council Regular Meeting – May 12, 2020**

and materials, it's not possible to discern the percent that covers materials. If the 15% contingency is utilized to cover additional quantities in the work-scope of the proposed project, the cost would be based on the unit prices in the bid. Cuesta Avenue is currently out to bid and will hopefully reflect the competitive prices we saw on the street resurfacing and slurry bids.

Are these the only projects that will draw against the budget line items shown in the tables (taking note of the allocation of striping between the two). Therefore, we will carry over for FY 20-21 approximately \$64,000 for (3) and \$490,000 for (4)?

Yes

As soon as we approve an FY 20-21 budget, can we accelerate bidding for FY 20-21 projects to take advantage of low cost of materials, rather than waiting until near the end of 2021 to approve the next year of work?

In theory, we can. Under normal circumstances it would take about three months to inspect, ID and measure all of the areas to be resurfaced for the 20/21 slurry and resurfacing projects. However, Transportation staff will be very busy this summer managing the 19/20 slurry/resurfacing and the Cuesta Dr construction projects, several intersection designs, CC Strategic Priorities, possible "Downtown Open Streets" for businesses trying to open in social-distanced fashion, and a number of other projects in the hopper. In a perfect world, we can bid out the 20/21 slurry & resurfacing projects by the end of summer. But if the rainy season or cold temperatures start early, the projects would likely be delayed until Spring 2021.

Does the anticipated period for this work (presumably summer of 2020) preclude getting started on FY 20-21 work during the summer/fall of 2020?

See answer to the previous question.

Could staff please send the following info (*insuring actual amounts/sources are reflected*) to all Councilmembers and Financial Commissioners:

Item 3 Sources of Funding

\$250,000	Gas Tax (for Annual Slurry Seal)
\$ 88,655	Carry-forward from FY18-19
\$ 50,000	Gas Tax (for Annual Street Striping)
<u>\$ 0.00</u>	General Fund
\$388,655	

Staff confirms the above Funding Sources for the Streets Slurry Sealing contract are correct.

Ditto above

Item 4 Sources of Funding

\$ 350,000	Gas Tax (for Annual Resurfacing)
\$ 500,000	SB 1
\$ 550,000	2016 Measure B

**Compiled Responses to Council Questions  
City Council Regular Meeting – May 12, 2020**

	<u>\$ 250,000</u>	CIP - General Funds
	\$1,650,000	
5/11/2020)	\$ 110,566	CIP-General Funds Carry-forward from FY18-19 (updated
	<u>\$ 50,000</u>	Gas Tax (for Annual Street Striping)
	\$ 1,790,176	

The above Funding Sources for the Streets Resurfacing contract are now correct. Staff's edits are in red.

**Agenda Item 5**

5. Please confirm this contract is covered by the line items for “inspection” in the tables for items 3 and 4.

Yes it is.

**Agenda Item 6**

Page 2 of staff report: Discussion/ Analysis – should the second paragraph begin:

“As part of the DRAFT FY 2020-21 budget...”,  
as we have not yet approved an FY 20-21 budget?

Technically, you are correct. Since the City Council approved a Five-Year Capital Improvement Plan Budget (FY 2020-2024), staff didn't include the word DRAFT to reference the FY 20/21 CIP budget.

What are the possibilities that the State will find a way to reduce the allocation because of State budget deficit and, potentially, less gas tax resulting from less driving as a result of COVID?

California Transportation Commission (CATC) staff are presenting on this topic at tomorrow's CATC board meeting.

Their slides for the presentation project up to a 30% drop in revenue and a 1.5 - 10 year recovery. The presentation is found at <https://catc.ca.gov/-/media/ctc-media/documents/ctc-meetings/2020/2020-05/pinks-and-presentations/tab-15-4-3-presentation-a11y.pdf>.

Please clarify the schedule shown in the table in attachment 1. All projects are shown as “Jun-Sept 2021” – however, the fiscal year for ‘20-‘21 runs July 1, 2020-June 30 2021. The timeframe thus seems to span parts of 2 fiscal years. Please clarify the actual calendar dates for which the work is proposed.

The schedules on the project list assumes that construction will begin in June 2021 and utilize FY 20/21 SB1 funds. Since the estimated duration of the construction project is 3-months, it will span into the next fiscal year that begins July 1<sup>st</sup>.

**Compiled Responses to Council Questions  
City Council Regular Meeting – May 12, 2020**

Staff report states that the City will receive \$589,081 in FY 20-21. Is this a pre-COVID-19 figure or has it been adjusted downward based on projections (State or VTA)?

The \$589,081 was published by the state in January 2020, before the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic was known by the state. Staff has confirmed that the city's FY 19-20 SB1 allocation is 574,616 and the FY 20-21 allocation is \$589,081. At this time, it is unknown how the pandemic will impact either allocation. Tomorrow the California Transportation Commission will receive a presentation from its staff regarding the projected range of cost impacts and recovery timelines, based on various COVID-19 scenarios. Their presentation estimates up to a 30% drop in SB1 revenue and a 1.5 - 10 year recovery period. The presentation is found at <https://catc.ca.gov/-/media/ctc-media/documents/ctc-meetings/2020/2020-05/pinks-and-presentations/tab-15-4-3-presentation-a11y.pdf>

Its clear that the city could do less the projects defined (based on how far one can stretch the SB1 monies) but can it also be used for projects not submitted via this resolution (with justification provided in year end reporting)?

Yes, SB1 recipients may update their project lists at the year-end reporting.

Absent from the list are Diamond Court and Fremont Avenue. Are funding sources already identified for these projects or do they need to be on this list "just in case"?

Diamond Court and Fremont Avenue Pavement Rehabilitation projects are separate CIPs and have their own funding sources. It is a good idea to add the two projects to the project-list in the Resolution before the Mayor signs it.

**Agenda Items 7 and 8**

Please summarize the pay adjustments that were made for FY 19-20, both as to cost of living granted per the existing contract (please specify the percentage COLA) and whether there were additional comparability adjustments that took effect during FY 19-20.

POA 3.5%  
LAMEA 4.0%  
Unrepresented 4.0%

In addition, some management positions were provided market adjustments based on the Koff and Associates study that was completed in late 2018. And the position of Lead Records Specialist was reclassified to Records Supervisor in 2019.

**Agenda Item 11**

**Compiled Responses to Council Questions**  
**City Council Regular Meeting – May 12, 2020**

The previous proposed master plan did not include cars and traffic mitigation. This new report fails to include the items we have identified and sent back to the commission for revision. Wouldn't a master plan include all the elements?

City staff based the updated scope of work for the Complete Streets Master Plan based on what it heard at the January 28, 2020 City Council Meeting. Since Los Altos' transportation is largely designed around cars, the purpose of the Complete Streets Master Plan is to work towards diversifying the modes of mobility. DOT defines Complete Streets as streets designed and operated to enable safe use and support mobility for all users. Those include people of all ages and abilities, regardless of whether they are travelling as drivers, pedestrians, bicyclists, or public transportation riders. Thus traffic mitigation for cars was not considered for the plan.

Do we plan to send the bid out to other Consultants other than Alta Planning and Design?

Staff issued an RFP late last summer and Alta was the only firm to propose. Agenda Item 11 proposes that City Council award Alta's proposal.

Has there been any discussion with the recommended contractor on how COVID may affect the walking audits and otherwise impact the project? How will we know if there is a temporary (or more long-term) change in walk vs. bike vs. car transit to school?

Not yet. But that discussion will happen. Once we have a better idea of when schools will reopen, the walking audits will be scheduled to coincide with students traveling to school.

How do we indicate, going forward, that this is not really a complete revision to the CSMP because it does not really address automobile traffic, except in the context of the three items?

Since Los Altos' transportation is largely designed around cars, the purpose of the Complete Streets Master Plan is to work towards diversifying the modes of mobility. DOT defines Complete Streets as streets designed and operated to enable safe use and support mobility for all users. Those include people of all ages and abilities, regardless of whether they are travelling as drivers, pedestrians, bicyclists, or public transportation riders. Thus traffic mitigation for cars was not considered for the plan. However, the Plan will include a summary of what was studied and not studied (e.g., motor vehicle congestion relief). Congestion relief could be a follow-on study. And given the state's policy change from LOS to VMT and the cultural shift that the pandemic may have on commuting, it may be wise to wait on studying traffic congestion relief.

**Agenda Item 12**

Will the presenter be able to give specific examples of Location Based Criteria? More specifically slide 11: VMT Policy Framework: Screening Criteria — "sites with 1/2 mile of existing major transit stop or existing stop along high-quality transit corridor"



Compiled Responses to Council Questions  
City Council Regular Meeting – May 12, 2020

## VMT Policy Framework: Screening Criteria

Per OPR's technical advisory, small infill projects\* can be assumed to cause a *less-than-significant* transportation impact.

\*Projects generating fewer than 110 daily trips

These projects would be “screened out” (i.e. no VMT analysis):

- Residential: 10 single family dwelling units or 20 multifamily dwelling units
- Office: 10,000 square feet gross floor area
- Industrial: 20,000 square feet gross floor area
- Nursing Home: 40 beds

### Agenda Item 15

At our prior meeting, in response to a council members question, the City Attorney spoke about the need to make a finding wrt the use of public funds for this program. Is there draft language for a motion to make said finding? Can one be developed and at the ready should Council wish to move forward?

Additional language has been added to the Resolution to cover this.