5:00 p.m. Closed Session (City Hall - “Downtown” Conference Room, 1st Floor)

Mayor Taylor called the meeting to order at 5:09 p.m.

Present: Carlton (arrived at 5:20 p.m.), Combs, Nash, Mueller, Taylor
Absent: None
Staff: Deputy City Manager Justin Murphy, City Clerk Judi A. Herren (excused at 5:10 p.m.), Administrative Services Director Lenka Diaz, Human Resources Manager Theresa DellaSanta

Public Comment

None.

CL1. Public employment (Gov. Code section 54957.)
City attorney recruitment

Mayor Taylor adjourned to the special session at 6 p.m.

Special Session

A. Call To Order

Mayor Taylor called the meeting to order at 6:06 p.m.

B. Roll Call

Present: Carlton, Combs, Nash, Mueller, Taylor
Absent: None
Staff: Deputy City Manager Justin Murphy, Interim City Attorney Cara Silver, City Clerk Judi A. Herren

C. Pledge of Allegiance

Mayor Taylor led the Pledge of Allegiance.

D. Presentations and Proclamations

D1. Proclamation: Recognizing Naomi Campbell (Attachment).

Mayor Taylor read the proclamation and Tony Ali, Mrs. Campbell’s granddaughter, accepted.
Mayor Taylor reordered the agenda.

F. Consent Calendar

F1. Direct staff to add one vacancy listing to the current recruitment effort for commissions/committees and consider extending the current term for Sister City Committee members to October 1, 2020 (Staff Report #20-061-CC)

ACTION: Motion and second (Combs/Carlton) to approve the consent calendar, passed unanimously.

D2. Presentation of the 2019 biennial community survey results (Attachment)

President of Godbe Research Bryan Godbe made the presentation (Attachment).

- Lynne Bramlett asked how staff will use results to better the life of Menlo Park residents and commented on the survey questions and behaviors.

The City Council received clarification that the full report contains details related to the methodology, top line data, and cross tabulations. The City Council discussed the results of Menlo Park compared to other cities and received clarification that Menlo Park has been one of the more transparent cities with the survey results.

E. Study Session

E1. Receive an update on the status of the capital improvement plan and provide direction on project priorities

Assistant Public Works Director Chris Lamm made the presentation (Attachment).

- Lynne Bramlett spoke on concerns about missing financial and status information for capital improvement projects (CIP).
- Josie Gaillard spoke of the opportunity to look at the CIP with climate conscious reasoning.

The City Council commented on the history of the downtown parking structure and discussed the climate action plan in conjunction with the CIP.

Mayor Taylor continued this item to a future meeting.

G. Adjournment

Mayor Taylor adjourned the meeting at 7:23 p.m.

Judi A. Herren, City Clerk

These minutes were approved at the City Council meeting of March 26, 2020.
Proclamation

RECOGNIZING NAOMI CAMPBELL

WHEREAS, the longevity of life is a blessing for an individual and for a community which benefits from the wisdom, knowledge and experiences that this individual brings to all; and

WHEREAS, Naomi Claudette Presley was born in Tulsa, Oklahoma on February 22, 1919, to Arthur and Preshia Presley, as a proud member of the Muscogee Creek Tribe; and

WHEREAS, Naomi and her six siblings (Lauren, Helen, Mary, Faye Ann, Ruth and Arthur), grew up during The Great Depression, with a hardworking father and stay at home mother. Although it was a time of economic crisis, Naomi grew up with the stories of Tulsa's own Greenwood District, or Black Wall Street, as it was most affectionately known; and

WHEREAS, Naomi grew up grounded in the love of family, and it was during the years in Tulsa, that she was able to see that no matter what happened in the world as long as you had the love of family, you could get through anything; and

WHEREAS, it was the love of family that led Naomi to move to California during World War II to be with her older sister. It was during this time that she worked in the Shipyards. Naomi earned the respect of her fellow workers in the shipyard, which was a major feat for a Native American / African American woman during this time, as she was part of the Bay Area's major contribution to victory during World War II, as she assisted in the shipbuilding; and

WHEREAS, while in California, Naomi Presley married, became Naomi Campbell, and moved to Menlo Park in the mid 1950's and has been part of the community for over 50 years; and

WHEREAS, while contributing economically to the community, Naomi also embodied the spirit of, "It takes a village to raise a child," as she was known to have fed many of the neighborhood kids hot meals before their days of school started and after they ended. Because of this, she has an extended family throughout the Menlo Park community; and

WHEREAS, Naomi has enjoyed gardening, playing musical instruments, painting, bowling and watching the community evolve from her living room window; and

WHEREAS, Naomi has a legacy of 4 children, 4 grandchildren, 6 great-grandchildren, and 3 great-great grandchildren; and

WHEREAS, the United States has a number of centenarians in the world, and today, Naomi Campbell should be celebrated and honored for her 101 years on this earth.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT PROCLAIMED that I, Cecilia Taylor, Mayor of the City of Menlo Park, do hereby recognize and gratefully acknowledge Naomi Campbell on her 101st Birthday. May happiness, good health, and much joy follow you in the years to come.

Cecilia Taylor, Mayor
February 22, 2020
City of Menlo Park:
2020 City Satisfaction Survey

March 3, 2020
Overview and Research Objectives

The City of Menlo Park commissioned Godbe Research to conduct a survey of its residents to gauge community satisfaction and priorities, with the following research objectives:

- Track against 2015 baseline data and 2017 tracking survey results;
- Gauge the overall quality of life in Menlo Park;
- Identify the resident satisfaction with various City issues and services such as, the Downtown area, parks and recreation, public libraries, public safety, and public works;
- Assess satisfaction with City customer contacts;
- Determine the preferred sources of City communications; and,
- Identify any differences due to demographic characteristics.
## Methodology Overview

- **Data Collection:** Landline (56), cell phone (51), text to online (520), and email to online (220) interviewing.

- **Universe:** 25,028 adults ages 18 and older in the City of Menlo Park, with a subsample of registered voters (18,823).

- **Fielding Dates:** January 8 through January 19, 2020.

- **Interview Length:** 25 minutes.

- **Sample Size:**
  - \(n=847\) Adult residents ages 18+
  - \(n=733\) Registered voters.

- **Margin of Error:**
  - ± 3.31% Adult residents ages 18+
  - ± 3.55% Registered voters.

*Note: The data have been weighted by respondent age and ethnicity to reflect the actual population characteristics of the adult residents and registered voters in the City of Menlo Park (Based on 2017 ACS (American Community Survey)).*
Key Findings
Satisfaction With Overall Quality of Life in Menlo Park Adults 18+

2020
Total Satisfied = 79.5%
Total Dissatisfied = 20.3%
Ratio Sat to Dissat = 3.9 to 1

2017
Total Satisfied = 86.0%

2015
Total Satisfied = 72.9%
Q2. Opinion on Aspects of Quality of Life in Menlo Park Adults 18+

Note: The above rating questions have been abbreviated for charting purposes, and responses were recoded to calculate mean scores:
"Excellent" = +3, "Good" = +2, "Fair" = +1, and "Poor" = 0.
Q3. Satisfaction with Job the City is Doing to Provide Services
Adults 18+

2020
- Very satisfied: 67.9%
- Somewhat satisfied: 44.2%
- Somewhat dissatisfied: 15.5%
- Very dissatisfied: 7.7%
- DK/NA: 8.9%

2017
- Very satisfied: 70.1%
- Somewhat satisfied: 46.2%
- Somewhat dissatisfied: 19.3%
- Very dissatisfied: 7.8%
- DK/NA: 2.8%

2015
- Very satisfied: 79.8%
- Somewhat satisfied: 49.2%
- Somewhat dissatisfied: 11.9%
- Very dissatisfied: 3.6%
- DK/NA: 4.7%

2020
Total Satisfied = 67.9%
Total Dissatisfied = 23.2%
Ratio Sat to Dissat = 2.9 to 1
Q4. Satisfaction with City Services I
Adults 18+

Note: The above rating questions have been abbreviated for charting purposes. The responses were recoded to calculate mean scores:

L. Police 911 emergency response
N. Library facilities and services
A. Police services
F. Providing park and recreation programs and events
G. Providing programs for senior citizens
J. Emergency preparedness
B. Neighborhood police patrols
K. Providing well maintained streets
M. Opportunities to attend cultural activities and social events

* Item L had a very high don't know, which brings down the % Satisfied, but the intensity score is high among those with an opinion. Item N is 75.6% Satisfied.
Q4. Satisfaction with City Services II
Adults 18+

Note: The above rating questions have been abbreviated for charting purposes. The responses were recoded to calculate mean scores:
Q5. Satisfaction with Downtown Menlo Park
Adults 18+

2015
- Very satisfied: 19.6%
- Somewhat satisfied: 36.3%
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied: 13.5%
- Somewhat dissatisfied: 20.0%
- Very dissatisfied: 0.9%
- Not sure: 9.7%

2020
- Very satisfied: 12.3%
- Somewhat satisfied: 42.1%
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied: 15.6%
- Somewhat dissatisfied: 20.0%
- Very dissatisfied: 1.5%
- Not sure: 8.6%

2020 Total Satisfied = 54.4%
Total Dissatisfied = 28.6%
Ratio Sat to Dissat = 1.9 to 1
Q6. New Shopping Requests for Downtown Adults 18+

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restaurants/Bars</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grocery/Whole Foods</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OK as it is</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing/Dresses/Men's/Kids</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable/Discount retailers</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety of stores/Mall</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffee Shop/Cafe</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other mention</td>
<td></td>
<td>22.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK/NA / Unsure</td>
<td></td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Responses that were mentioned by less than 2 percent of the residents have been added to the “Other” category for charting purposes.
Opinion on City Parks, Recreation Facilities and Programs
Adults 18+

2020
Total Excel + Good = 65.9%
Total Poor + Very Poor = 2.4%
Ratio (Excel + Good) to Poor = 28.3 to 1
Q8. Satisfaction with Parks and Recreation I
Adults 18+

H. Overall attractiveness and cleanliness of parks and recreation facilities
E. Condition of sports fields and courts
L. The ease of getting to a City park or recreation facility
J. Organized sports for youth and teens
G. Aquatics and swimming facilities and programs
F. Availability of sports fields and courts
A. Cost of programs

Note: The above rating questions have been abbreviated for charting purposes. The responses were recoded to calculate mean scores:
Q8. Satisfaction with Parks and Recreation II
Adults 18+

Note: The above rating questions have been abbreviated for charting purposes. The responses were recoded to calculate mean scores:
Q9. Opinion on City Public Libraries
Adults 18+

2020
Total Excel + Good = 60.4%
Total Poor + Very Poor = 1.6%
Ratio (Excel + Good) to Poor = 37.7 to 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excel</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Poor</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not used</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK/NA</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ratio (Excel + Good) to Poor = 37.7 to 1
Q10. Opinion on City Public Library Services
Adults 18+

2020
Total Excel + Good = 60.3%
Total Poor + Very Poor = 1.5%
Ratio (Excel + Good) to Poor = 39.3 to 1
Satisfaction with Menlo Park Public Libraries
Adults 18+

- C. Availability of free Wi-Fi and computers for online access at library branches
- I. Customer service provided by library staff
- F. Overall attractiveness and cleanliness of library branches

A. Library hours

E. Online services including eBooks, eMagazines, library catalog and research databases

J. Literacy services from Project READ

B. The selection of books

G. The selection of Blu-rays, DVDs, CDs, and audio books

D. Programs and activities for youth and teens

H. Programs and activities for adults and seniors

Note: The above rating questions have been abbreviated for charting purposes. The responses were recoded to calculate mean scores: “Very Satisfied” = +2, “Somewhat Satisfied” = +1, “Somewhat Dissatisfied” = -1 and “Very Dissatisfied” = -2.

* Item C had a very high don't know, which brings down the % Satisfied, but the intensity score is high among those with an opinion. Item N is 61.9% Satisfied.
Q12. Likelihood of Using the New Library in Belle Haven
Adults 18+

- Very likely: 8.7%
- Somewhat likely: 11.6%
- Somewhat unlikely: 11.6%
- Very unlikely: 51.7%
- DK/NA: 16.5%
Opinion on Effectiveness of Police Dept. Addressing Neighborhood Concerns
Adults 18+

2015:
- Excellent: 26.9%
- Good: 39.8%
- Fair: 10.9%
- Poor: 3.5%
- Very poor: 1.4%
- DK/NA: 17.4%

2017:
- Excellent: 26.9%
- Good: 40.5%
- Fair: 16.4%
- Poor: 6.4%
- Very poor: 2.9%
- DK/NA: 7.0%

2020:
- Excellent: 22.9%
- Good: 33.2%
- Fair: 14.6%
- Poor: 3.1%
- Very poor: 5.1%
- DK/NA: 21.0%

Overall:
- Excellent: 56.1%
- Good: 67.4%
- Fair: 66.7%
Q14. Feelings of Safety Walking Alone in Different Areas/Times
Adults 18+

Note: The above rating questions have been abbreviated for charting purposes. The responses were recoded to calculate mean scores:
Q15. Reasons for Feeling Unsafe
Adults 18+

- Dark/Need lighting: 39.7% (2020), 32.1% (2015)
- Won't go out walking at night/Not safe: 49.7% (2020), 21.2% (2015)
- Homeless people/Transient people: 10.8% (2020), 12.5% (2015)
- No police around: 13.7% (2020), 8.1% (2015)
- Drugs: 1.5% (2020), 2.5% (2015)
- Fast Driving: 0.9% (2020), 2.4% (2015)
- Need additional traffic controls/Signs: 0.9% (2020), 7.6% (2015)
- Other mention: 8.0% (2020), 7.6% (2015)
Satisfaction With Public Works Customer Service/Response
Adults 18+

- 2015
  - Excellent: 14.5%
  - Good: 17.7%
  - Fair: 7.1%
  - Poor: 4.2%
  - Very poor: 2.4%
  - Not contacted Menlo Park regarding these services: 51.7%
  - DK/NA: 2.3%

- 2020
  - Excellent: 12.1%
  - Good: 17.8%
  - Fair: 9.2%
  - Poor: 4.2%
  - Very poor: 6.1%
  - Not contacted Menlo Park regarding these services: 44.6%
  - DK/NA: 6.0%

Legend:
- Excellent
- Good
- Fair
- Poor
- Very poor
- Not contacted Menlo Park regarding these services
- DK/NA
Q17. Satisfaction With Public Works Services
Adults 18+

Note: The above rating questions have been abbreviated for charting purposes. The responses were recoded to calculate mean scores: “Very Satisfied” = +2, “Somewhat Satisfied” = +1, “Somewhat Dissatisfied” = -1 and “Very Dissatisfied” = -2.
Q18. Contact With City Employee in Past 12 Months
Adults 18+

- 2015:
  - Yes: 45.9%
  - No: 50.4%
  - DK/NA: 3.7%

- 2020:
  - Yes: 42.1%
  - No: 45.5%
  - DK/NA: 12.4%
Q19. City Department Contacted Adults 18+

- Police Department: 47.8%
- Public Works: 23.3%
- Parks & Recreation: 18.0%
- City Council: 13.1%
- Administrative Services: 12.2%
- City Managers Office: 6.0%
- Community Development: 3.8%
- Other: 18.1%
- Not sure / DK/NA: 2.8%
- Other: 18.1%
Satisfaction With City Customer Service

Contact
Adults 18+

A. Getting your problem resolved or question answered

B. The customer service you received

C. Courtesy of the City staff

D. Timeliness of the response

Note: The above rating questions have been abbreviated for charting purposes. The responses were recoded to calculate mean scores: “Very Satisfied” = +2, “Somewhat Satisfied” = +1, “Somewhat Dissatisfied” = -1 and “Very Dissatisfied” = -2.
Q21. Preferred Sources for Community News and Info
Adults 18+

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Website</td>
<td>49.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next Door</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletters</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word of mouth – family/friends/colleagues/neighbors</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public hearing notices / City postcards</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text messages</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City council or commission meetings</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City departments or agencies</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local community blogs</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community meetings</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t ever hear about community / events / city</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water bill</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social media (Generic)</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twitter</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instagram</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Responses that were mentioned by less than 2 percent of the residents have been added to the “Other” category for charting purposes.
CIP OVERVIEW
2020 Goal Setting
CIP OVERVIEW

- 73 funded projects
- 34 received funding in FY2019-20
- 7 categories
  - Buildings & systems
  - Environment
  - Parks & recreation
  - Stormwater
  - Streets & sidewalks
  - Traffic & transportation
  - Water system

- 2019 Goal Setting resulted in prioritization of existing projects (Tiers 1, 2, 3)
- Programmatic categories: Parks (minor), Sports field renovations, Traffic signal modifications, etc.
2020 GOAL SETTING TALKING POINTS

- Is there additional project information that would assist Council in the goal setting process?
- Are there any project priorities that should be adjusted?
- Are there projects that staff should not pursue?
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

- Five-year plan representing the community’s vision for short and long range development, maintenance, improvement and construction of infrastructure assets.
- Updated annually funding the current FY with a 4-year look ahead
- Projects are proposed by department heads through the City budget process and as a reflection of City Council priorities defined through the goal setting process and work plan adoption
- Evaluation and ranking
  - Capacity to deliver/impact other projects
  - Protection of infrastructure
  - Impacts on operating budget
  - Population served
  - Relationship to adopted plans
  - Availability of financing
  - Public health and safety
  - Economic development
  - External requirements
  - Community support
  - Cost/benefit
In FY2019-20 recognizing existing vacancies would not allow for all funded projects to proceed concurrently, CIP projects were prioritized utilizing the following criteria in the adopted budget into Tiers 1, 2, and 3:

- Regulatory compliance
- Public safety
- Preservation of City assets
- Improved efficiencies
- Grant funding timelines
- First in, first out
- Available staffing
## PRIORITIZATION & PROGRESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Tier 1 projects</th>
<th>Total projects</th>
<th>Projects completed</th>
<th>Active projects</th>
<th>Not started</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buildings &amp; systems</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks &amp; recreation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streets &amp; sidewalks</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic &amp; transportation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water system</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TIER 1 PROJECTS

- 22 projects
- All have been completed or are in progress
  - Though 2 were repurposed into BHCCL (BH branch library and BH Youth Center)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Done</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bid Award</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other in progress</td>
<td>6 (8)</td>
<td>27% (36%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IN CONSTRUCTION (ALL TIERS)

- Mobile Operations Center
- Chilco Street and Sidewalk Installation
- Oak Grove SRTS and Green Infrastructure
- Street Resurfacing
- Bayfront, Willow, Marsh Adaptive Signals
- Transportation (minor) – 5 RRFBs
- Emergency Water Storage/Supply
- Water Main Replacement – Monte Rosa
BID/AWARD (ALL TIERS)

- Buildings Minor - Police Records Counter Improvements
- Hydration Stations
- Tennis Court Maintenance
- Santa Cruz and Middle Avenues Resurfacing

- Expected soon (next 3 months)
  - Haven Avenue Streetscape
  - Citywide Slurry Seal, summer 2020

- By end of calendar year
  - Pierce Road Sidewalk Improvements
  - Fire Equipment Replacements
  - Gate House Fence Replacement
  - City HVAC modifications at Arriaga Family Rec.
  - Park Pathway Repairs
  - Bayfront Canal
  - Chrysler Pump Station
  - Reservoir No. 2 Roof Replacement
  - Reservoir No. 1 and 2 Mixers
  - Automated Meter Reading Infrastructure
PROJECT DELIVERY / STAFF RESOURCES

- Majority of Projects Delivered by Public Works - Engineering

![Diagram showing project delivery and staff resources]

- Public Works - Engineering
  - CIP
    - 7.5 FTE
  - Utilities
    - 3.5 FTE
    - 1 Vacant
  - Land Development
    - 8.5 FTE
  - Transportation
    - 9 FTE
    - 3 Vacant

- Police, Library, PW Maintenance
- Sustainability
- Community Services, PW Maintenance
- Economic Development, PW Maintenance
- City Building and Systems Projects
- Environment Projects
- Stormwater Projects
- Water Projects
- Streets and Sidewalks Projects
- Parks and Recreation Projects
- Traffic and Transportation Projects
PROJECT DELIVERY / STAFF RESOURCES

- Staff Resources categorized as High, Medium, Low
  - Technical Complexity
  - Public Engagement
    - General Public
    - Community Working Groups
    - City Commissions
    - Council Subcommittees
    - City Council
  - Grants
  - Partner Funding Agreements
  - Community Impact
  - Cross Departmental Projects
## CITY BUILDING AND SYSTEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Available Budget</th>
<th>Planned Budget 20-24</th>
<th>Staff Resources</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belle Haven Library</td>
<td>Tier 1</td>
<td>$368,044</td>
<td>$16,750,000</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Repurposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belle Haven Youth Center</td>
<td>Tier 1</td>
<td>$1,138,060</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Repurposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Plan and Equipment Replacement for City Buildings</td>
<td>Tier 1</td>
<td>$173,335</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Operations Center</td>
<td>Tier 1</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Master Plan and Implementation</td>
<td>Tier 1</td>
<td>$1,779,454</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Study/Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Buildings (Minor)</td>
<td>Tier 2</td>
<td>$1,271,910</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-- City Bldgs (Minor) – Police Records Counter Improvements</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Bid/Award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-- City Bldgs (Minor) – ADA Transition Plan</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Pre-design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Parking Lot Security</td>
<td>Tier 2</td>
<td>$22,699</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Done</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### CITY BUILDING AND SYSTEMS (CONT.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Available Budget</th>
<th>Planned Budget 20-24</th>
<th>Staff Resources</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Buildings HVAC Modifications</td>
<td>Tier 3</td>
<td>$530,300</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Maintenance Master Plan</td>
<td>Tier 3</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Not Started</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture Replacement</td>
<td>Tier 3</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Not Started</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gatehouse Fence Replacement</td>
<td>Tier 3</td>
<td>$72,047</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Library Improvements</td>
<td>Tier 3</td>
<td>$436,743</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-- Main Lib Imp. – Basement stairwell security</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Pre-design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Service / Fee Study</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>$48,187</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Done</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ENVIRONMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Available Budget</th>
<th>Planned Budget 20-24</th>
<th>Staff Resources</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Tree Ordinance Program Evaluation</td>
<td>Tier 1</td>
<td>$29,237</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trash and Recycling Strategic Plan</td>
<td>Tier 1</td>
<td>$59,764</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Action Plan</td>
<td>Tier 2</td>
<td>$307,980</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Study/Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electric Vehicle Chargers at City Facilities</td>
<td>Tier 2</td>
<td>$22,391</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydration Stations</td>
<td>Tier 2</td>
<td>$340,005</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Bid/Award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sea Level Rise Resiliency Plan</td>
<td>Tier 3</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Not Started</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## PARKS AND RECREATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Available Budget</th>
<th>Planned Budget 20-24</th>
<th>Staff Resources</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bedwell Bayfront Park Collection and Leachate System Repair</td>
<td>Tier 1</td>
<td>$4,052,368</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Playground Equipment (Nealon)</td>
<td>Tier 1</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,050,000</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Recreation Master Plan Update</td>
<td>Tier 1</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$15,000,000</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic Center Maintenance (Annual)</td>
<td>Tier 2</td>
<td>$646,881</td>
<td>$1,600,000</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Improvements (Minor)</td>
<td>Tier 2</td>
<td>$196,098</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis Court Maintenance</td>
<td>Tier 2</td>
<td>$338,610</td>
<td>$480,000</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Bid/Award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Center Campus Improvements</td>
<td>Tier 3</td>
<td>$89,952</td>
<td>$900,000</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Pre-design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Pathways Repair</td>
<td>Tier 3</td>
<td>$698,111</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willow Oaks Park Improvements</td>
<td>Tier 3</td>
<td>$808,830</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Not Started</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# PARKS AND RECREATION (CONT.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Available Budget</th>
<th>Planned Budget 20-24</th>
<th>Staff Resources</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bedwell Bayfront Park Master Plan Implementation</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$3,850,000</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Field Renovations</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Not Started</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## STORMWATER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Available Budget</th>
<th>Planned Budget 20-24</th>
<th>Staff Resources</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chrysler Pump Station</td>
<td>Tier 1</td>
<td>$10,752,973</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Infrastructure Plan</td>
<td>Tier 1</td>
<td>$67,592</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayfront Canal and Atherton Flood Protection</td>
<td>Tier 2</td>
<td>$182,295</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisquito Creek Upstream of 101 Flood Protection</td>
<td>Tier 3</td>
<td>$89,841</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Master Plan</td>
<td>Tier 3</td>
<td>$39,659</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Study/Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>Available Budget</td>
<td>Planned Budget 20-24</td>
<td>Staff Resources</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chilco Street and Sidewalk Installation</td>
<td>Tier 1</td>
<td>$34,617</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Grove SRTS and Green Infrastructure</td>
<td>Tier 1</td>
<td>$102,925</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Resurfacing Project</td>
<td>Tier 1</td>
<td>$1,834,450</td>
<td>$7,300,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-- 2019 – Citywide Street Resurfacing</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-- 2019 – On-call Asphalt and Concrete Repair</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-- 2020 – Citywide Slurry Seal</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Parking Structure Study</td>
<td>Tier 2</td>
<td>$720,718</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Not Started</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce Road Sidewalk and San Mateo Drive Bike Route Installation</td>
<td>Tier 2</td>
<td>$1,160,651</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz and Middle Avenue Resurfacing</td>
<td>Tier 2</td>
<td>$2,219,046</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Bid/Award</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### STREETS AND SIDEWALKS (CONT.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Available Budget</th>
<th>Planned Budget 20-24</th>
<th>Staff Resources</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sharon Road Sidewalk Installation</td>
<td>Tier 2</td>
<td>$899,970</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk Repair Program</td>
<td>Tier 2</td>
<td>$456,940</td>
<td>$2,200,000</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Parking Utility Underground</td>
<td>Tier 3</td>
<td>$161,000</td>
<td>$5,500,000</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Pre-design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Streetscape Improvement</td>
<td>Tier 3</td>
<td>$303,288</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>On Hold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaza 7 Renovations</td>
<td>Tier 3</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Not Started</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaza 8 Renovations</td>
<td>Tier 3</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Not Started</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcome to Menlo Park Monument Signs</td>
<td>Tier 3</td>
<td>$180,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Not Started</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willow Road (Middlefield to US-101) Street Resurfacing</td>
<td>Tier 3</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Pre-design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravenswood Avenue (Alma to Marcussen) Street Resurfacing</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$850,000</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Pre-design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streetlight Conversion</td>
<td>Tier 3</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$3,150,000</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Pre-design</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Available Budget</th>
<th>Planned Budget 20-24</th>
<th>Staff Resources</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Middle Ave Caltrain Crossing Study Design and Construction</td>
<td>Tier 1</td>
<td>$6,137,882</td>
<td>$9,900,000</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravenswood Avenue Caltrain Grade Separation</td>
<td>Tier 1</td>
<td>$295,477</td>
<td>$25,000,000</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Study/Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Master Plan</td>
<td>Tier 1</td>
<td>$24,157</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Study/Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willow/101 Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>Tier 1</td>
<td>$185,138</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayfront Expressway, Willow Road and Marsh Road Adaptive Signal</td>
<td>Tier 2</td>
<td>$60,440</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haven Avenue Streetscape Improvements</td>
<td>Tier 2</td>
<td>$1,067,930</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Grove, University, Crane Bicycle Extension</td>
<td>Tier 2</td>
<td>$80,825</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Not Started</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Improvements</td>
<td>Tier 2</td>
<td>$28,788</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION (CONT.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Available Budget</th>
<th>Planned Budget 20-24</th>
<th>Staff Resources</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Projects (Minor)</td>
<td>Tier 2</td>
<td>$505,986</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-- Upgrade 5 Crosswalks with Flashing Beacon Systems</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumbarton Rail Corridor Planning Support</td>
<td>Tier 3</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Pre-design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Camino Real Crossing Improvements</td>
<td>Tier 3</td>
<td>$261,401</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlefield and Linfield, Santa Monica Crosswalk Improvement</td>
<td>Tier 3</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$880,000</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Not Started</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Signal Modification</td>
<td>Tier 3</td>
<td>$959,000</td>
<td>$1,400,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-- Middlefield/Ringwood-Ravenswood</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Not Started</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-- Laurel/Ravenswood Signal Mods</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willow Road Transportation Study</td>
<td>Tier 3</td>
<td>$159,692</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>On Hold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willows Neighborhood Complete Streets</td>
<td>Tier 3</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Not Started</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# WATER SYSTEM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Available Budget</th>
<th>Planned Budget 20-24</th>
<th>Staff Resources</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Water Storage/Supply</td>
<td>Tier 1</td>
<td>$2,152,253</td>
<td>$5,600,000</td>
<td>Medium/High</td>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Service Line Replacement Program</td>
<td>Tier 1</td>
<td>$225,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Main Replacement Project (Annual)</td>
<td>Tier 1</td>
<td>$2,184,143</td>
<td>$9,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-- Water Main Repl. – Monte Rosa</td>
<td>Tier 1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-- Water Main Repl. – Haven Avenue</td>
<td>Tier 1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reservoir No. 2 Roof Replacement</td>
<td>Tier 2</td>
<td>$4,032,685</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reservoirs No. 1 and No. 2 Mixers</td>
<td>Tier 2</td>
<td>$98,908</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Water Management Plan</td>
<td>Tier 2</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Pre-design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automated Meter Reading</td>
<td>Tier 3</td>
<td>$1,090,680</td>
<td>$3,400,000</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Pre-design</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FY 2020-21 NEW PROJECT FUNDING

- Staff continuing to work through existing CIP
- New projects proposed for upcoming FY budget
  - Belle Haven Community Center and Library (Buildings and Systems/ Water)
  - O’Brien Drive Streetscape and Utility Improvements (Streets and Sidewalks / Water)
  - Willow Oaks Park Bicycle Connector (Streets and Sidewalk)
  - AHSC Grant Improvements at Willow, Ivy, Newbridge, O’Brien (Traffic and Transp)
  - Fire Flow Capacity Improvements (Water)
  - Emergency Water Interconnect at Alma Street (Water)
2020 GOAL SETTING TALKING POINTS

- Is there additional project information that would assist Council in the goal setting process?
- Are there any project priorities that should be adjusted?
- Are there projects that staff should not pursue?
THANK YOU
# SHARON RD SIDEWALKS SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop concepts</td>
<td>Fall 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiate engagement</td>
<td>December 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community meeting</td>
<td>January 15, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School community outreach</td>
<td>Mid-March 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete Streets Commission recommendation and parking removal resolution</td>
<td>Tent. May 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Council selects preferred alternative and adopts parking removal resolution</td>
<td>Tent. June 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete design</td>
<td>Q3/Q4 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bid/award</td>
<td>Q1 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Summer 2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>