

The following transcript is provided for your convenience, but does not represent the official record of this meeting. The transcript is provided by the firm that provides closed captioning services to the City. Because this service is created in real-time as the meeting progresses, it may contain errors and gaps, but is nevertheless very helpful in determining the gist of what occurred during this meeting.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: I am Councilmember Liccardo, and Councilmember Herrera will be joining us shortly. So I think we have got a quorum. We'll move on to review of the work plan, and we have two items which are set for deferral, I believe. One for deferral, one for addition, I'll entertain a motion at this time, or comment.

>> Councilmember Rocha: I would recommend the action items as proposed.

>> Second.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: All in favor, that passes unanimously. We have no consent calendar, so we'll move on to reports to committee. Ashwini, unless you suggest otherwise, we'll start with number one, environmentally preferable procurement report. Say that fast three times. We have a brief review.

>> Jo Zientek, environmental services. I believe you have a copy of the six slides we have on this item. I just wanted to give you an update on our accomplishments for fiscal year 10-11, and the items we are working on for 11-12 for environmentally preferable procurement policy. We've actually been a leader in EP 3, we've had a policy since 1990, and the main goals of that policy have been to create markets for environmental friendly products, reduce environmental impacts of city purchases, city operations, and improve worker health and safety. We also include, as directed by council in January of this year, a policy, proposed policy revision for your consideration to ban using city funds to buy and use expanded polystyrene, also referred to as styrofoam food packaging. Council directed staff in January to add a ban on city purchase of EPS, what we call expanded polystyrene foam food packaging early this calendar year. The direction to staff was to ban purchase and use of EPS food service where at city facilities and require city sponsored events to receive city funding or other in-kind services to ban EPS purchases of EPS service wear. This direction from council to support the several council regional actions. One was the Santa Clara County recycling commission asked cities to consider taking action on EPS this calendar year. And the Santa Clara cities association also in of 2012, recommended that the 70s in Santa Clara County take action on EPS this year. This is in large part driven by trash and litter issue, plastics andpoint does make up a significant portion of litter in our storm drain systems and in our creeks and this action to amend this policy to support the City's trash load reduction plan which came before this committee I think January or

February of this year. We did a survey of where EPS is still being used regularly, and it was the police admin building, the senior meal nutrition program cafeteria, the senior meal program run by PRNS, and two airport concessions. Most of the airport concessionaires have phased out EPS, and we're down to the last two. And our staff will be working to evaluate those uses and those groups and see if we can minimize those as part of our next steps in this report. So the revisions to the policy would be the city would no longer buy EPS food service ware with city funds. We already have language to encourage using alternatives to EPS in the policy, but the revised language strengthens that original text. The guidelines would apply to vendor contracts grant and concession agreements and all permits and leases of city property. They would not apply to public use of parks, so you can still have a birthday party for your kid and bring EPS. Does not apply where there's no practicable alternative exists to the foam food service wear. And we're currently doing an administrative policy to guide the implementation of this and phasing this policy wherever practicable, especially with new contracts and new service contracts. We will need a phasing in period. And the rollout of this policy revision should be completed by the end of this fiscal year. So on to the highlights of the purchasing policy for 10-11, we actually are proud to report about 32% of our dollars spent buying goods were spent buying green goods. We incorporated and implemented several EP 3 innovations last year. Including in our operating agreements, our Christmas in the park sponsorship, and in our car share RFP, we have great success with green fleet purchases. About 43% of the city fleet now runs on alternative fuel and 4.2% are hybrids. We brought 14 new diesel powered vehicles that meet the 2010 emission standards and are far cleaner than the city cars they replaced. In our other contracts, our large solid waste contracts we're phasing out old diesel trucks in our residential contracts, and our new commercial contracts coming on line in July will have a brand-new fleet of CNG vehicles. The fire department, and this is actually a firefighter proudly showing use of new greener city cleaning supplies at the fire station. This helps improve the health and safety of staff and the toxics in environment. We are working on printers to phase out stand alone printers in favor of multifunction twices which are cheaper to operate and use far less resources per image. And less energy use. At Dot was able to use another example, recycled asphalt where they actually recycled asphalt on Mont ray road, that had other environmental benefits. Since implementing this policy over this past year, we were able to significantly reduce the impact of our operation. For example, the biodiesel we used saved about 3.8 million pounds of carbon emissions and other air emissions. The recycled asfalt project that I mentioned before used about 17,000 old tires and reduced the need for truck trips to bring in new materials to pave the road. And

then the rechargeable battery project we did saved the purchase and disposal of single-use batteries. For next steps, we are going to move forward to implement the ban on EPS food service ware. We're also looking at packaging as a collaborative effort with other cities in the Bay Area to see if we can get manufacturers to reduce the EPS packaging on the goods they deliver to the city. We are also going to be working with the city Green Teams that we already have in place that meet at lunch periodically through the year to help facilitate EPS alternatives, at the staff level. For the Office Max, as you know, the City buys its routine office supplies through Office Max online, and the city auditor and identify that there are ways to set up that system to more easily drive staff to the greener purchasing options, so so we'll be implementing that with purchasing this year. We'll be also building on our successes in though areas that we identified this year that would be good for us to tackle including expanding the use of rechargeable batteries. Alternative fuel vehicles, continue to procure them especially as grant and other fundings allow. And then to use our green EP3 practices to facilitating getting LEED certification for city facilities. And with that, we open it up for questions.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Great, thank you for the great presentation, Jo. Questions or comments? I don't think we have a card from the public -- we don't have any cards from the public, do we? Thanks, Susan.

>> Councilmember Rocha: No I had one question. It was mainly the section, page 2, the reference to the analysis under prohibition of city purchases of expanded polystyrene service wear. These changes that you also spoke to here, I'm expecting this to happen now, not waiting for the ban from the city?

>> Yes, that's correct. We're planning to implement them this fiscal year.

>> Councilmember Rocha: Wonderful. Thanks for the report.

>> Councilmember Campos: Going back to the airport, so besides jamba juice, who is the other one that is still using polystyrene?

>> Councilmember Liccardo: You busted them.

>> Yes. It's Linden Shay, environmental services. It is my understanding it is one of Asian food concessions and that they have some soup that they haven't found something else to put it in.

>> Councilmember Campos: So for -- I'm not going to pick on jamba juice, we'll use their product. They have a cold product that the insulation of the particular cups, I would think that it would help prolong how long that lasts without it melting. So you know, I mean you can make an argument that we, you know, by implementing this, we could potentially be telling jamba juice, you know, thanks but no thanks, we don't want you at the airport. I mean, what has been the communication between the city and jamba juice for something to replace them with? Because I would imagine if there was something they would have done it already. It seems that jamba juice is an environmentally friendly company.

>> I'd have to refer that -- I would have to refer that to the airport what their conversations have been with jamba juice. But many other jurisdictions have banned EPS from food service ware. And I believe jamba juice and other restaurant serving both hot and cold food are still doing well in those areas. So I imagine there is a replacement, I'm not confident -- I don't know what the cost is and what that looks like, but it seems to me that in San Francisco and other areas, jamba juice still seems to be doing well.

>> Councilmember Campos: Okay and given that these are private companies that have put out -- they responded to RFPs to come in and serve the airport, this kind of, I mean it's not exactly the same of what we've been dealing with at the council with contractors that you know, the whole time, you know paid time off and you know so forth, I mean, it's almost like we are we are -- I don't want to say giving a pass but we are giving a pass on what very many of us on the council feel you know when, contract you should be doing a much better job with human beings than here we are ready to tell jamba juice and everyone else, you know what, you want to do business with the city, then you have got to follow these environmentally superior standards, which is great, because we should be going in that direction. But I just couldn't sit here and not make the correlation. Thank you.

>> Thank you. My hope is we are caring for the people and the environment at the same time.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: I think this is an and rather than oposition poop I away want to say thanks for your team, I know you guys have been sort of leading the charge here. I see on page 3 there's a reference of providing technical support in terms of selecting appropriate alternatives to EPS. And I know that's going to be really important as we help the businesses that do business with the city to find transitions to affordable options. I got off the phone last week with the executive director of save our shores who had been working a lot in Santa Cruz county and some of the neighboring counties, I know Salinas and some other towns, I think there are, what, 49 cities that have banned this so far, and she related to me a remarkable observation that you know often the case is that the businesses are finding there's a less affordable or more affordable option available, they simply weren't considering because everybody expects a package. Giving an example of several taquerias, I think they were in Salinas, that said they were saving money by switching from the EPS packaging to just serving the burrito in foil. And the foil of course can be recycled and simple enough and it preserves the heat just as well. I guess as we're providing the technical support, I hope we sort of incorporate a broad view that it doesn't necessarily have to be a package that looks the same, it may be another item that can perform the same function. And I just thought that was an interesting insight I gained from her.

>> And Lyndon Shay has actually been leading this effort, as we look across the city organization, we have been looking at what are we trying to achieve so what's the result to keep the food hot or cold and then the best, cheapest method to get there not just what is another form of clamshell as an example. So we're trying to stay focused there and I'm confident Lyndon will continue that.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: That's great. I mean, I think we'll get information through this effort in the next half year as we implement this that will help inform us about what we want to do more broadly, and hopefully we will learn more things that will be helpful. Councilmember Herrera, did you have any questions or comments on this?

>> Councilmember Herrera: I'm just -- appreciate the staff's report on this and look forward to future updates as we move forward. I think it's definitely a goal we should be working towards achieving.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Great, there's a recommendation to accept the report and cross-reference I believe.

>> I'll move the recommendation.

>> Councilmember Herrera: Second.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: All in favor, opposed, that passes unanimously. Thank you. We're moving on to item number 2, the recycle plus! pilots summary report. Welcome.

>> Kerrie Romanow: Hi, Kerrie Romanow, environmental services. I'm joined today by Donna Perala. Donna leads the residential recycle program, and Allen Tie, and Allen has been intimately involved with this process. With that I'll turn it over to Allen.

>> Thank you, good afternoon. So we're here today to talk about the results of our residential recycle plus! pilot which took place between October of 2009 through August of 2011. To give you some background, our zero waste strategy focuses on trying to recapture if resources that are currently still being disposed in the garbage stream. In 2008, we conducted a waste characterization study and this pie shows the components of this study. What we found in this single family residential garbage carts is that 42% of that garbage is still made out of food scraps and organics. You know, 30% of that is recyclable. So that provides a really good opportunity for us to recapture those materials, and to divert it from the landfill. Which is kind of a metric that we use to measure our success, the tonnage we collect and the percentage of that that's being recycled or diverted from the landfills. Currently the diversion rate for the single family residential program is about 60%. So what we wanted to pilot with this program is to test the collection of food waste, in yard trimmings carts. And as part of that to evaluate how residents would accept the switch from the current use in the street program which they set up leaves and piles in the street to using a cart system for weekly collection. We also wanted to pilot how effective use -- the use of carts were, on reducing the amount of debris in the streets, and in the storm drains. And finally,

we also wanted to test back-end processes to recover recyclables and compostables from the garbage stream. With that we developed three pilot programs, the food scraps pilot, the yard trimmings cart pilot and a garbage processing pilot. The food scraps collection pilot involves about 5,000 households in different areas citywide. The residents were given a yard trimmings cart, a kitchen pail and compostable bags, and they were instructed to collect their table and kitchen leftovers during the week and place them in bags and place them in the yard trimmings cart. And instead of putting out their yard trimmings loose in the street, they were asked to collect the yard trimmings and put them also in the yard trimmings cart along with bagged food waste. The material that was collected was subsequently brought to a materials recovery facility where the food scraps were separated from the yard trimmings and both materials were sent to a composting facility for further processing. The yard trimmings cart pilot is very similar to the food scraps pilot in that the residents were also giving the yard trimmings cart and instructions to not set out piles loose in the street except for a once-a-month collection where the claw tractor would come and collect larger yard trimmings. But the residents in the yard trimmings cart pilot were not instructed to collect food scraps. And the purpose of this pilot is really for us to gather comparison data to compare how residents perceived the differences in the two programs. Finally the garbage processing pilot is something that we have done for city facilities. And materials and multifamily residences, where the garbage is simply brought to materials recovery facility and processed to recover recyclable and compostables. Because the food scraps pilot and the yard trimmings pilot is that the success of those programs is really predicated on participant outreach, staff implemented a large public outreach campaign. We included traditional means of outreach such as letters, surveys, printed calendars. We also conducted eight community meetings throughout the city and we provided multiple avenues of customer service including an e-mail hot line a dedicated telephone hot line, our regular customer service call center and even a dedicated website with forms where residents can request staff to speak at their neighborhood associations. And pilot program was even featured on KRON 4 news for television coverage. We did a lot of outreach to ensure there is continuous and frequent dialogue for residents to ask questions and provide feedback. With the food scraps program what we found is that the participants -- participation level average about 32%. While that sounds low, we compared our participation level with established programs such as the programs at stopwaste.org in Alameda County and those programs have existed for more than five years. They've spent millions of dollars on outreach and they've only averaged participation levels between 20 to 40%. In terms of participation I think we did a pretty good job and we did the

best we can for outreach. That said we were a little bit disappointed in the amount of organics that we actually captured from the garbage stream. You know we would expect a lot more than the 7% that we see that was being recovered from the food scraps program. And overall, when we projected this statistic under a citywide application scenario, we would anticipate our recycling rate to only increase by 5%. So meaning if we implemented a food scraps program citywide, assuming the same participation level, the same amount of outreach that we've done we would really only increase our residential sector diversion by 5%. However, from the resident perception, and satisfaction what we saw from our surveys were that residents were pretty satisfied with the program. They saw the addition of food scraps collection as an upgrade in their service, meaning they had another opportunity to free up what goes into their recycling bin by diverting it into their yard trimmings cart. And residents even inserted written notes on their surveys saying that their ability to actively participate in this program, working to better the environment was the reason why they were so satisfied. On the other hand, with the yard trimmings cart pilot, we really saw -- didn't see any increase in diversion. We're really testing a different method of collection. There's no new material involved. What we found was that switching through the carts from street collection, the claw track for was no longer driving down the street scoops up the leaves in the street gutters. As a result there were a lot more debris in the street. Residents certainly did not see it as their responsibility to go out in the street and put it in their carts. As a result we actually saw a number of complaints related to a lot of leaf debris accumulating in the street. We think that's a reason why resident satisfaction for this program was really less than 40% for most of the time. And through the yard trimmings cart pilot we found that in areas where there's dense street foliage that the problem of leaf accumulation and leaf debris in the street was exacerbated during the fall leaf season. So that really tells us that we can go to carts but during leaf season we need special programs to address that issue. As part of our pilots we also took the opportunity to see -- to evaluate whether using a cart system would result in less debris. And argument that we heard over and over again that hey, the streets have a lot -- the streets currently have a lot of debris in it because of loosened street collection. People are pushing leaves on the street. But what we found is when we used the cart system there was actually more debris. Again the same reason I had explained, the claw tractor was again not coming down the street as frequent and leaves accumulated over time. Our way of measuring this was really just looking at the catch basins that are in the storm drains and comparing that data with levels that we attained before we implemented the pilot. So really the data during the loose in the street scenario and data during cart pilot system and we found that with the carts there

was really a lot more leaf debris in the storm drain. That isn't really a scientific test per se in terms of whether it affects storm water pollution, but that was our bay to see whether there was more debris accumulation. And overall, the claw tractor isn't effective to remove the debris that is in the gutter. With the garbage processing pilot that was actually a fairly easy pilot for us to implement. It didn't require any active outreach to residents because most of the operations occurred behind the scenes. Success was predicated on the equipment at the materials recovery facility, and how well the facility and our haulers can sort the recyclables and compostables from the garbage. Overall we were able to divert 75% of the materials from the landfill meaning most of that was recycled. And overall if we project in to a citywide implementation scenario, we think we can increase our diversion rate by 22%, getting the residential sector recycling rate to about 82%. So by far, this is the most effective out of the three pilot programs in terms of increasing our diversion. And this option also provides an opportunity for us to provide feedstock to waste energy application. So overall when you compare the results of the three pilots the percentages on this slide show what we would anticipate under a citywide implementation of these options, for the food scraps program it would increase our diversion from 60% to 65%, with the yard trimmings cart option there's really no increase in the diversion and with the garbage process be option we think we can get to 82% which is really outstanding. Here's a look at our preliminary estimates for what it would cost. I just want to throw out there that these are actual costs, assuming that ratepayers would be burdening the cost of the program. But actual implementation cost would vary once we factor in economies of scale, any savings from lesser trips to the landfill and also, any unknown cost or savings once we sit down with the haulers to narrow down actual implementation cost. But overall we could see with the yard trimmings cart option the annual cost would be about \$5 million. It would not gain any diversion increase. With the food scraps collection program it would cost us about \$7 million, and the estimate here with the percentage rate increase is assuming that every incremental cost of \$1 million is equivalent to a 1% rate increase. And with the food scraps option well, we're getting an additional 5% increase, it would cost \$7 million per year. And with the garbage processing option, we're getting 22% additional diversion at \$12 million a year. So in conclusion, we didn't really get the result that we wanted with our food scraps program. And through our survey results, surveying the 5,000 residents in the food scraps program and the 5,000 residents in the yard trimmings cart program, the majority of those residents would prefer loose in the street collection as they have now. Although again, residents in the food scraps pilot do enjoy the fact that they're actively working to better the varietal. What we also found is that with cart collection, that does

not equal less debris on the street. In fact what we found was the vice versa. And finally garbage processing is really most effective for single family organics recycling. In terms of next steps. Staff recommends that you accept this report. I want to say our recycle plus! program is a really good program and we are pretty much leading the nation in terms of our recycling accomplishment. I wanted to end this presentation by announcing that just last Friday, Waste and Recycling News, a national publication, awarded San José with the 2012 green city award for our recycling accomplishments and efforts to engage the public. With that said, staff will still continue to evaluate any cost effective options for getting to zero waste. That includes the staff report.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Thank you very much. And thank you for the report. Again I don't have any cards from the public so if any member of the public would like to speak please send them on in. With that we'll turn it to the committee. Councilmember Herrera.

>> Councilmember Herrera: Great report. I'm just wondering since we received, congratulations on you all of us on this reward, congratulations to staff on all the great work. What is the next step other than the options we see up here, in terms of best practices to achieve close to 100% diversion in terms of waste, organic waste, what's the next kind of stuff we would be looking at?

>> I would say San José is doing a lot of cutting edge programs, we're implementing a lot of cutting edge programs. Some of the things I would see is frequency in collection, looking at maybe different variations of how we implement these programs, those are kind of the next steps for staff to evaluate further.

>> Councilmember Herrera: I guess what you're saying, intuitively I would have thought the carts would work better in terms of picking up the leaves. I think a lot of folks -- I hear people say a lot of times if they would just provide a cart, it would make the streets cleaner. But I guess you're saying in reality that isn't what happened.

>> Yeah, we didn't see that.

>> Councilmember Herrera: Is that because the process just -- the process itself creates more waste, or people weren't participating the way they should have been?

>> I would say people generally weren't participating in the way they should be. And really, with the cart system we are addressing yard trimmings that are generated on the private property. And so when there are street leaves dropping from street trees, that material really isn't being addressed.

>> Most residents aren't collecting the leaves and then putting them in their cart. So they seem to be you know better able to sort of scoot them to the pile and then the claw comes and gets a lot of it.

>> Convenience is really a major factor.

>> Councilmember Herrera: So puts more responsibility on homeowner than to collect the leaves. Maybe they're not feeling like those are their responsibility to collect the leaves.

>> Exactly.

>> Councilmember Herrera: And also, it highlights that the truck coming down and scraping the leaves actually does do something in terms of removing the debris. I'm heartened that folks perceived a value in the additional recycling for the organic waste. It's a shame that it's not producing more. So you're saying that even if everyone did it it still wouldn't be as effective as having the single receptacle and having it done for them?

>> That's correct.

>> Councilmember Herrera: Thanks for the report.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Okay. I was -- one of the districts in which one of the pilots was attempted and I really appreciate the efforts. I am curious, though, about the leaf, the yard trimmings carts. I know other cities do

this, in fact as I understand it we're just about the only city that does it the way we do. That is, with this claw of sorts. Is that right? So trying to figure out how it works in other cities. They have bigger carts? Do they also have a claw come out when they have a cart? Why are they able to do it?

>> Other cities have a separate leaf program. For example the city of Campbell, they send out vacuum trucks every now and then during leaf season to basically scoop up all the leaves that are in the street. So what we're finding with our program is, in addition to carts we need -- we need another program also to address the seasonal leaf.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Okay. Would a larger cart help? The complaint I often heard was, people felt like there was just too much debris and they wouldn't fit and they couldn't just store it in their side yard week after week until they could -- has there been consideration to resize carts?

>> Yes, as part of our program we provided residents an option to receive unlimited number of yard carts. There was a resident who requested 15 carts and we provided it to them. But it's really the responsibility falls on the resident to collect the street material.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Okay. I appreciate these are sticky issues. I -- you know when I was running for office in the downtown neighborhoods I always became under the impression that in the downtown, parking was the most important issue to anyone at any time. And that was more important to them about how you felt about parking than you felt about the Iraq war. Now I realize it's really garbage collection because I got calls that were just really out of control. So people felt strongly on both sides of this issue. There was the pro-cart party and probably a louder set of objectors and it became apparent to me, it is an area you have to deal delicately. The issue about as we contemplate these different options, I understand the most expensive option is also the most cost effective, which is somewhat unusual. But as you come back to council, if you are going to come back at some point with the various options, I just ask if you could also consider what the various cost effectiveness, the comparison of cost effectiveness just not among this universe of options but also other options of more expensive service. I'm going to give you an example. Certainly the garbage pickups and the dumpster days that we have out

in the neighborhoods are wildly successful and very popular, and how much more would people be willing to pay for those, for better service or more frequent service, and how does that compare with some of this in terms of both our recycling goals and satisfaction. I think it would be helpful if we are going to consider more expensive options we look at all the options on the table. The last question I just had was, the 35% or so, I think participation rate that we had on food scraps collection, I recognize there are limitations in any pilot projects. This was what, a year that we did this for?

>> 18 months.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Anticipate months, okay. Would you expect that participation rate to increase over time as people got used to it and kind of got over the novelty of it?

>> Yes, again we looked at that critically and tried to answer that question ourselves. We did talk to Alameda County. They're kind of -- they have had programs that have been implemented for more than five years. They spent millions in outreach and over the course of that time period again their participation average was between 20 to 40%. So we can project that if we spent more money on outreach more time maybe participation would increase a little bit. But it's not going to bring us close to 100% participation.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Producing marginal returns. Councilmember Rocha.

>> Councilmember Rocha: Something you asked about prompted me to ask a question and this is more economic or market rate question. And you may not be able to answer it. But looking at how long we've been doing this recycling program do we ever expect the cost to level out? Because I know like everything else cost keeps going up. But as we enter into these new contracts, I am looking at the rate increases and then looking backwards at the budget we just adopted and the rate increases there, and I'm not sure if we're assuming another rate increase and how that plays into it. But at a certain point I would expect as the facilities improve and the programs improve and the public does a better job, we might see a little bit of a leveling off. But it looks like I'm

completely wrong in that, we continue to see such higher cost even though the service is actually getting if anything better for the customer.

>> Kerrie Romanow: There's two things that influence our cost today, and those are the cost of fuel, so as the cost of fuel goes up, that is something that we do need to compensate the haulers for. And then the cost of labor. So as Teamsters and other groups have contracts with raises in them, we need to also pass that through.

>> Councilmember Rocha: Raises, someone is doing raises?

>> Kerrie Romanow: Yes.

>> Councilmember Rocha: That's something you don't hear too often. Now if, to the point that Councilmember Liccardo just made, as you go forward and bring something back, it would be also helpful for me to just keep in mind that the residents tend to call you or our office, and understanding and looking at the impact to those residents, I see you have that here in terms of based on the million and the percentage. But I'd also, if you wouldn't mind, include how the rate increases have looked for the past just ten years. Just as a snapshot so I can keep in mind what I may be making a decision on at some point and brace myself for the criticism or comments that I may be receiving. Now, I think that all falls under the same issue so thank you. Nice report.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Okay. Then their recommendation is to accept the report.

>> Councilmember Rocha: I'll move to accept.

>> Councilmember Herrera: Second.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: All in favor? Any opposed? That passes unanimously. Thank you very much. Move on to the bike plan 2020 update. Hi, Hans, hi, John, hi, Manuel.

>> Hans Larsen: Mr. Chair, members of the committee, I'm Hans Larsen director of transportation. Joining me on this presentation is John Brazil, our pedestrian bicycle coordinator. We also have in the audience Yves Zsutty, who is our trails manager. We have for you our annual report on the implementation of the San José bike plan 2020. And as the committee is aware, we provide you two reports each year one is focused on the trail aspect of the bike plan and then this report in the spring is primarily focused on the onstreet network. We have an integrated bike plan that includes a vision for 500 interconnected miles of bike facilities, about 100 miles are trail network many and then 400 miles on our on-street system. We have these plans are part of the adopted plan, bike plan 2020 was approved by the city council November of 2009. It has a vision of completing the 500 mile network and increasing bike mode share to 5% by the year 2020. Right now we're approximately 1% of the bike mode share for commuter travel in our city. Our bike goals were reinforced and really accelerated by the approval of the new general plan update and envision 2040. That has a very bold goal of increasing our bike mode share to 15% by the year 2040. So we're looking at 5% increments each decade, 5% by 2020, 10, and then 15% by the year 2040. Our bike plan has two components as we've discussed in past reports. We have a primary bike network which is about a 130 mile network of high quality bike facilities, that includes the off street trails system, but a -- and then on street we have these enhanced facilities that are bike boulevards, or separate on-street bike ways, and you can see an example of that in the bottom right. So there's a degree of separation of the bike lanes from car traffic. And so some have referred to those as on-street trails. So the intent is to provide a very convenient, safe system for people to encourage increased bike use. On the accomplishments that we've had in this past year include building 6.3 miles of bike lanes in different parts of the city that are highlighted in the report. We're now at 260 miles out of our total 500 mile network, so we're more than halfway done. One of the key accomplishments this year is enhancing a bike lane that we have on San Antonio street. This is a corridor that already had a bike lane on it, but through combined efforts with a pavement maintenance project where we did a sealing of the street, we actually restriped the bike lane and reconfigured the lanes on the street to add a two-foot buffer. And so this is a practice that we plan to continue as we resurface, seal other parts of our street system with limited dollars that we have. Hopefully we can get some more pavement maintenance money. But this will provide an opportunity for us to not only build more bike lanes but enhance the ones that we have. And this is an example that we implemented this last year, of adding a buffer, a striped buffer that separates the car traffic from the bike lanes. Other accomplishments of the addition of more bike parking spaces. We added 300 more bike

parking spaces this year. And one of our major projects is the implementation of a public downtown bike share system which we hope to have complete by the fall of this year. This is a participate project that's being led by VTA in Santa Clara County, it's a five-city effort with the cities of San Francisco, Redwood City, Palo Alto, Mountain View and San José. To put in a bike share system that's centered along the CalTrain stations in each of those five cities but that would provide bikes that you can rent for a period of time, and then circulate around the areas of the CalTrain station. So within Downtown San José we expect to have between 150 and 200 bikes located at 15 stations. So we'll have Diridon station as the hub, we'll serve San José State, City Hall, urban market, sofa districts, Chavez plat so we'll look forward to making bike sharing even more conducive for our downtown area. Another thing we accomplished in year in partnership with the Silicon Valley bicycle coalition, was to provide free valet parking for special events in the downtown. And you can see in this picture, is the bike corral or cage that was staffed by the Silicon Valley bike coalition volunteers. We had this up and running for the 13 events of the music in the park series. And we averaged 200 bikes at each of those. So very successful launch of making it convenient for people to bring their bikes into the downtown and having a safe and easy place to park their bikes. So this is like a coat check where you turn in your bike, you get a little number tag, and there's somebody to watch your bike during the event. So this is something we're hoping to continue this summer in the downtown with other special events like the jazz festival and some of the other great happenings that occur in downtown San José. The next slide highlights some other activities we have in the downtown, so in addition to the bike share program, we are going to be demonstrating our first green bike lane project and the San Fernando corridor is a corridor where we received a grant to stripe the bike lane on San Fernando Street from Diridon station through the downtown core to San José State university, with green bike lane striping. You can see an example of a green bike lane they have in San Francisco. This is something that's becoming more common in cities like Portland and San Francisco and New York City. And the intent is to further highlight the presence of a bicycling within key corridors. Another project that we have, which will be coming to council on April 10th is a series of road diets. And these are projects where we actually reduce the number of lanes and install bike lanes. And so we have five road diets in the downtown core, on Alameda boulevard, third, fourth, 10th and 11th street. We've gotten good response as part of our community outreach for reducing the lanes and making the community more bike friendly. As I mentioned we'll have the actions associated to implement this project coming to council in a couple of weeks. We have included in the staff report a work plan, highlighting the key projects that

we're currently working on. And have in the planning phase over the next three years. So we've got 11 projects that help expand our primary bike way network. We've got ten projects that are funded to enhance the secondary bike lane network which is the more standard bike lanes. And then we have nine projects that are in the planning stage, these are projects where we've invested efforts to try to get these projects eligible for future grants. In addition to developing the facilities, we are focused on encouraging more bicycle use. And we have a number of programs oriented towards encouragement. Perhaps our most prominent new program is the walk and roll San José program, in which we're currently now outreaching with schools in San José. Our grant allows us to work with 35 schools over the next three years to encourage greater use of walking and biking to the local schools. And we're receiving applications through the end of this week for our inaugural schools as part of this program. Coming up in May, we have the annual bike-to-work day on May 10th. We are again hosting the Amgen tour of California which will be here on May 15th and part of that is a promotional king of the mountain ride. And then we continue to have a number of community organizations that engage the community in the love of bicycling like San José bike party and just last month, we had a special bike party event, it's pictured here, with the lord mayor of Dublin, Ireland, who is a big bike advocate. And there's a picture there of Councilmember Herrera, with the lord mayor, and Carlos Babcock who is one of the leaders of putting this on, and myself. And that concludes our presentation. We're happy to take any questions.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Thanks, Hans. Any questions or comments? Okay, again I don't have any cards from members of the public. Just had a quick question. John, I know I probably got an e-mail from you this morning about the grant money that you got from the loops for bike parking. Has that pretty much run its course or do we have money left?

>> Fortunately, we have a new grant that we were awarded. We apply every year, and we keep our fingers crossed, so we do have racks in stock and more on the way.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: That's great. Businesses are always asking for them, so it's great to be able to say we've got the money to do it. I just wanted to say I'm really thrilled with the buffers you guys are doing, like you rolled out over San Antonio street in Councilmember Campos' district I think that's fantastic and I hope we can

continue to find ways to increase that buffer treatment as we're repaving streets. It's really something that makes people feel a lot safer out there, that's feedback I've been getting, at least, and I hope that's a way that a lot of folks are hearing it. The last kind of issue I was going to raise and something that I know I'd mentioned just in passing. But it seems as though the opportunities for us to really improve mode share shift to bikes, particularly and to really increase mobility in a community is a lot of our immigrant communities where car ownership and the cost of car ownership is so very steep particularly with rising cost of gas. And I wondered, to what extent are we now engaged with many community groups? I'm thinking of the some of those May fairs and Communivercitys and others that are deeply engaged in those opportunities. Are there opportunities for us to be getting the word out about the bike improvements that are coming and how people can get bikes relatively inexpensively and get access to bike repair through you know wonderful likes good karma and other programs? Is that something we have any hand in?

>> Hans Larsen: It's certainly something -- yeah I think it's part of the encouragement program is getting the word out and working with organized neighborhoods and communities. And we are open to finding ways to get more people to ride their bikes. So we do have, I think this is something we can talk further with the Silicon Valley bike coalition. There's a bike exchange which is a program that they've started up that provides free bikes to communities primary lower income communities. I think we've been challenged with just sort of limited resources with our program. And have focused on trying to get grants. But as we develop a more comprehensive network, you know, what we've seen in cities like Portland, you can build the facilities, but you also need to complement it with encouragement. And as I think there are more grants available that are oriented towards the encouragement, and I think the walk and roll San José is one opportunity that we have to get out in neighborhoods, and into schools and sort of talk up the benefits of bicycling and helping people to do that, so I think ah as -- certain an area that we'll continue to focus on and see what we can do.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: I appreciate that Hans. I recognize it can't -- the city doesn't have the resources, we've got a one-man show in our program, John does a great job. But this is an area that we have to lean on our partners in the community a big way and a little can go a long way and I look forward to seeing how we can do that. Rose.

>> Councilmember Herrera: I just wanted to thank you for your report. And I have to say that the Lort Mayor of Dublin was very impressed as the Irish contingent were very impressed with the amount of streets that they could bike without having to go up a hill. The flat nature of our landscape was very impressive. So they thought you know the whole population should be out bike riding as we have such a great area to bike-ride in. And I just wanted to say how much easier, how much more motivating it is when you are riding a bike and you have others riding too. It is very motivating. To Sam's point, too, they encourage people to get on a bike. As they find ways on our streets that are more safe. Because certainly thought all streets feel as safe to ride a bike on as we're able to help our streets become more friendly to bikes. We will encourage more people to ride. Just want to say how excited we are again about the improvements that are going to happen on Capitol Expressway, that are happening right now that our city is very involved in along with VTA that will benefit District 5 and District 8 just it's going to transform Capitol expressway from what is kind of a freeway right now to a lot more friendly pedestrian and bike way. So we're all looking forward to that. And the last thing is, I'm on the capitol corridor board and at the meeting last month I suggested that they include a bike sharing as part of their vision. So that was part of a motion and they're going to look into that because I think that would be great to have that system also use bike sharing as a methodology. And with that I'll move approval of this item.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Okay. I see no members of the are public, jumping to the microphones, so all in favor? Any opposed? That passes. Thank you very much. We'll move on to number 4, update on deferred maintenance and infrastructure backlog. Now for the bad news. Welcome, Dave.

>> Dave Sykes: Okay, I think we're getting ready. Thanks, committee. David Sykes, director of Public Works. I'm joined by many of our partners up here: Hans Larsen, representing Department of Transportation, Matt Morley from Public Works representing our building facilities, Matt Cano, represent the parks facilities, Vijay representing our IT infrastructure, Mike O'Connell who's helped me put the report together representing sanitary sewer facilities and others in the audience from the other asset types. The objective of this report and this is actually the sixth time we've prepared this report.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Keeps getting better Dave.

>> Our information is getting better certainly oops the objective of the report is really an attempt to document and quantify the backlog if you will and to facilitate the discussion that the council needs to have around how to address the backlog. A couple of things to note about this year's report. It is in some ways a living document. So we've attempted to go through each asset type and update information as we have it available to us. The report this year we've attempted to actually quantify the assets within each asset type, and you'll see that through the report. I think it's important to understand kind of what we're talking about here in terms of the magnitude of each of the asset types. We've also attempted to discuss how we've historically funded the infrastructure within each asset type. And also, describe the asset management tools that we're using to help us manage each particular program. You will notice that there's some fluctuation in the overall numbers, and we'll talk about that in a minute. We've also attempted to tighten up the definitions that we're using, and the nomenclature that we're using so that there's consistency between each of the different program types in terms of how we're quantifying things. This slide really is an attempt to show where we've been and where we are now. And so you'll note that the overall backlog number has risen from 754 million to 810 million. So there is a slight increase. But there has been more fluctuation within the individual program numbers. And I want to note a few of those. In the areas of building assets, parks, pools and open space, and transportation assets, those numbers have all gone up. For buildings and parks, primary, that's due to additional asset assessment work that we've done in each one of those areas. Previously we hadn't done much assessment work and now we've done quite a bit and more will continue through this next year. I think in the area of transportation it is more a natural growth of that number due to lack of investment. A couple of the categories the numbers have gone down. You'll see that the numbers have gone down with sanitary sewers and also with the technology assets. For sanitary, I think two things. One, we've recognized the increased investment that we're getting in the funds that we share with the plant. And also, we've kind of redefined what the backlog is. And we're looking at the fact that in the sanitary program, the five year CIP, we have sustainable funding identified and I felt comfortable lowering that number because of that commitment through the CIP. I think with technology assets, it's more of a change in strategy, and Vijay is here to describe that. Many of the other asset types, the numbers say somewhat similar to what we reported last year. I think this slide respects a good picture of the overall needs, and some of the shifts that I already described. As I mentioned

last year, we're focused mostly on transportation, sanitary and technology. Because of the rethinking that we've done really, this year the focus is on of course transportation, and parks and buildings. The largest piece of the backlog continues to be the transportation backlog, and in particular, the pavement backlog. So we'll just spend a minute and I'll run through these myself, some of the major asset types. And then each of the leaders is here to answer any questions. With regard to buildings, it's important to recognize that the investment that we've made in buildings over the last ten years, the bond programs, the investment at City Hall, airport, convention center, have been a huge boost to those programs. And so the backlog is nothing what it would have been if we'd not made those investments. There's no doubt about that. I think though, it's also important to note though, that in particular with buildings they need an ongoing investment. And some of those buildings we've built with the bond program are thousand reaching ten years old and that's a time frame in a building when you need to start reinvesting in a building to keep it in good condition. And so we've began an effort on the building program to do the assessments that I've mentioned. We've begun that work this year, it will continue into next year and that's why you have seen those numbers increase from last year. Parks program. In many ways kind of similar to the building program. The bond program and other capital funding contributed greatly to that program and was a big boost. But just like buildings, these facilities need a continued investment. The priority for the capital program is funding infrastructure backlog and dealing with sports field renovation and land banking. But also mentioning and not mentioned on the slide, trails and new trails we're building much like roadways need maintenance work to keep them in good condition. And so that is being factored into the assessments. Also, want to recognize that the PRNS staff is working with many other organizations to kind of rethink the way we do, do maintenance with parks facilities, and there are opportunities there. With sanitary sewer system, already mentioned and recognized the fact that we've got an increased transfer. And I think that the work that we're doing right now is focused very much on reducing backups and spills, which that issue's come before the committee several times. And that is the focal point of the sanitary sewer program at this point. On technology, recognizing the fact that our core applications like FMS and HR payroll are very old, and at the end of their life, and so really what's needed here is a modernization effort. Also, recognizing that technology has a shorter life cycle than, say, a building asset. And so that investment also feeds to be ongoing. And so the goal here is to identify ongoing sources of funding for technology. I think we all recognize that the productivity of city staff is greatly affected by the technology that we have available to us. Also, wanted to mention the fact that integrating security is an important thing. Old technology really didn't

address security needs the way we need to look at it in today's terms. And so that's really where our focus will be in terms of addressing our future needs here in technology. With regard to the transportation needs, I think D.O.T.'s done a great job of documenting it. I do think this slide does a really good job, though, of showing that it's more than just payment. There's a lot of different types of infrastructure out there in the street network. And all of these things contribute to making a safe street network. If you look at the next slide, we're able to quantify really where the overall shortfall of 443 is made up in these discrete elements of pavement, curb ramps, signals and markings, bridge rehab and street trees and landscaping. So that's a very brief overview of the report, and we're all here and available for any questions you have.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Great, thanks, Dave. Councilmember Herrera.

>> Councilmember Herrera: Yeah, in terms of the transportation backlog, I'm wondering, what kind of benefit we could get from focusing on the street lights. And when I say focus, converting those to LED. In terms of saving money and being able to apply that to pavement maintenance and other things. And I'm thinking in terms of as we move forward and I think Councilmember Liccardo's made this suggestion before, too, in terms of looking at possibly going out for a bond or some other way of paying for transportation maintenance. Would that make sense to change over street lights and then be able to take the savings on an ongoing basis from that and apply to pavement maintenance? As I'm thinking in terms of public money to be spent we can't really do it on maintenance, it has to sort of being capital expenditure, right, I'm trying to think of how can we attack this in the way to take care of the maintenance issue?

>> Hans Larsen: Councilmember Herrera, that's something we're focused on. Obviously, with the LED street lights we have an opportunity to improve the lighting in our city but also significantly reduce the amount of energy used and the cost associated with that. We're actually going to be coming back to this committee next month with a report that's focused on on LED street lights. We have the three categories of lights, the ones that use the most energy are the ones we have in the downtown. Those are the most cost-effective to change out. The second area that has the best rate of return are the lights on our major streets which are brighter than the neighborhood lights. And then the greatest number of lights we have are out in the neighborhoods. So there are different kind of

rates of return. The neighborhood lights frankly, you know, the cost to change the lights versus the energy savings isn't that much. So I think these are some of the policy issues we want to frame up for you next month in terms of strategies of how far do we want to go with the conversion? I think we want to do all of them, that's consistent with the Green Vision. But some of them we can actually save money on, others will actually cost us money and we'll get into those details next month.

>> Councilmember Herrera: And I see 162 bridges. Do we have any bridges that are in serious shape where we need to be concerned about failure, and if so, what percentage?

>> Hans Larsen: The report identifies that we have four bridges that are of particular concern given their condition. So out of 162, just four with problems. We're doing pretty good on our bridge inventory. And fortunately that are federal grant programs that provide moneys to deal with bridge rehab and replacement. And so we are actively working to get grant funds for those that are in the worst condition.

>> Councilmember Herrera: Thank you.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Councilmember Rocha. Councilmember Campos. Either one, I'm sorry.

>> Councilmember Campos: So going back to bridges, you mentioned that there are four. So what are we going to do with those? Remember when that bridge collapsed in St. Paul? I mean, that was a big, that was a -- what was that, a suspension bridge. But I mean it was out of sight, out of mind until it happened so where are we at on that? And should we be moving towards taking those roads out of service? I mean, have you -- have you identified the severity of deficiencies on those four bridges?

>> Hans Larsen: Councilmember Campos, we have nothing -- none of our bridges are at risk of failure. So this work that we're doing is more proactive to deal with them. As -- they are -- our experience in deterioration due to age and some corrosion of some of the supporting mechanisms, but we don't have anything out there that causes a concern that it's at risk of catastrophic failure.

>> Councilmember Campos: Are these major bridges that if they did fail they would impede significant traffic movement, or are they bridges like you know, the little bridge on Clayton road that gets you over a creek?

>> Hans Larsen: I think -- I mean the ones that -- and we'll have recommendations coming forward to council as part of our capital program for this year's budget cycle. But we've received grant funds to a couple of the bridges that are in worst condition as the Santa Clara Street bridge over Coyote creek that's sitting on wooden piles. So that's one. The noble bridge over Penitencia creek, a small narrow bridge, not a lot of traffic, but that's another one of our bad ones. I think probably our most significant one is the San Carlos street bridge over Los Gatos creek and the railroad tracks over by orchard supply hardware. It is not at risk of failure but it is an old bridge, and it's considered functionally obsolete because it is so narrow that it warrants replacing just for improved operation. So those are sort of the nature of the ones that we have out there on the worst bridge list.

>> Councilmember Campos: Getting over to page 20 when you report the problem of copper wire theft, are we -- you know, have those -- as we lose that material, we have to replace it. But are we insured on that? How does that work? The city doesn't have any type of bonds or insurance that will cover theft of property? Where that might fall under?

>> Hans Larsen: Unfortunately not, no. We went back to council at mid year, asked for a \$150,000 augmentation to help us deal with that. That continues to be a concern but the briefing that I got recently indicates that we're catching up with it, we're getting more lights back on, faster than they're turning off. So they seem to be moving in the proper direction. So I expect that we'll probably need to augment that program to be able to get all the wire back installed that has been stolen. I don't think -- given the -- it's an issue that every city is dealing with. You know across the Bay Area, across the state. I haven't heard, but I imagine it's across the nation, too, if not the world. It would probably be hard to get an insurance policy given the risk that's out there on these days. But we are taking steps to -- working with the police department, and taking steps to make it more difficult to get into the access boxes to get to the wire. So there's a number of deterrent steps that we're taking to try to reduce, if not eliminate, the problem.

>> Councilmember Campos: Okay. Then on page 7 under city facilities operated by others. I notice that the Mexican heritage plaza is not in there. Is that -- is there a reason, not listed there?

>> No reason that I can think of now, I don't know Matt. Mexican heritage plaza. I'm assuming we should have probably identified here in the past it was operated by us we recently did the transfer so I think we should be picking it up in this category for the future, would you agree Matt?

>> Yes, I agree completely it should be on that list.

>> Councilmember Campos: Okay, those are my questions.

>> Councilmember Rocha: Thank you. There is mention of a study that Deloitte did in terms of assets. It was incomplete. Could you speak a little bit more to that?

>> I think I'll ask Matt to kind of fill in the blanks. I don't know if it was incomplete. It was an effort that was started. We got some good information from that but we need to do more assessment work.

>> The Deloitte study addressed a small number of what we call the cultural facilities downtown, the children's Discovery Museum. The tech, the museum of art. And I think those facilities, so in terms of being incomplete it was only incomplete in that it --

>> Councilmember Rocha: limited.

>> Limited, yes, it addressed a small number of facilities. I think the information that we gleaned from the report is valuable. It happens to align well with an effort that we want to do on our own so we are taking the information from the Deloitte study and combining it with our methodology to move that forward in the next year. And I think that's what Dave referred to in the presentation on efforts of identifying and quantifying what the needs are.

>> Councilmember Rocha: I was just more intrigued about the purpose and the focus of it. Was it intended for this type of material in terms of maintenance?

>> It wasn't intended, it was just one of the efforts that they put into it was identifying what the deferred maintenance needs were in those facilities as those cultural facilities were looking for opportunities.

>> Councilmember Rocha: Okay.

>> And what they needed to do as an organization. Part of that, a small part of that study was the deferred maintenance so that they knew what their investment might need to be in order to create an ongoing --

>> Councilmember Rocha: So it's specifically to the cultural facilities?

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Forgive me for barging in. I think those organizations actually reached out to Deloitte. There was more of an effort --

>> Councilmember Rocha: We heard this during the presentation. Thank you very much.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Thank you, I appreciate the thoroughness of the report. I had just a couple of questions. First of all I wanted to point out Vijay you somehow saved us \$60 million miraculously in deferred maintenance. In one fell swoop. So clearly you're underpaid.

>> Vijay Sammeta: You're welcome.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: I'm trying to understand the mystery of how a \$69.7 million deferred maintenance bill goes down roughly to \$9 million or \$10 million. Is it moving everything to a cloud, or what have you discovered?

>> Vijay Sammeta: Thank you, councilmember. Vijay Sammeta acting director of information technology. A couple of things. Over the last couple of years, and I think to Dave's point, technology kind of changes at a faster evolution than buildings and roadways. And what we've seen is yes, certainly the cloud's there. But whether it's on premise or out in the cloud just in nature of that technology is just changed. We're spending a lot less time customizing solutions, writing special code to get functionality that the city needs. Instead we're making configuration changes that are far less labor-intensive. And really this is us shifting along with the industry or taking advantage of the industry. And no longer doing those large-scale implementations that require hundreds of consultants and millions of dollars to implement, but rather, you know, taking advantage of those, making configuration changes that meet our needs that are far less costly. So we're not going to implement a large enterprise resource planning onsite anymore, because we're kind of caught like that, do you get the highly integrated what I.T. wants or do you get what the business unit needs. and traditionally those have always been at odds and that marketplace has changed where departments can get their best of breed application, if we can focus on a few standards and get the integration that I.T. needs from a support perspective. It's taking advantage of the marketplace. And I think we kind of outlined this is a change in strategy for us. This is the first successful fruits of that effort were really around our network. If we had to replace this today, I'm going project roughly about a million and a half to 2.5 million. We did it for about \$200,000 plus staff labor, so I guess a quick shout-out for my staff for their hard work because it has taken a number of months to implement. But as we look at those types of opportunities, it's a shift in thinking, really. And now, our network is far more modular, if we had bad times or good times the cost is much less. We can upgrade incremental parts of it as opposed to kinds of the big bang. It's kind of like the equivalent of trying to replace every single pothole in the entire city at the same time. Our network is very analogous to you know streets and roadways. So instead of having to do that like we traditionally have had to do, we're able to take it a pothole at a time for lack of a better term.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Okay, thank you for passing on the very happy news and for the innovation that's happening over in your department. I suppose it's one advantage of being so far behind the technology that we didn't implement all the really expensive technology in the last decade so now we're --

>> We certainly are not tied to lots of very expensive implementations currently.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Nice wait of putting it. And Hans I appreciate you pointing out the San Los street bridge because I actually pedal up that bridge and down it once a week. It's terrifying for cyclists in that roadway so I appreciate we're looking at it. You mentioned Councilmember Herrera raised the issue of lights and in that obviously raises the larger question about if we're going out in November, whether it's a bond measure or sales tax measure or whatever it may be, what is the scope of that range of capital improvements, and I know there's a lot of candidates. ADA ramps, pavement and everything else. And I guess what I would suggest, that staff would -- I understand this is the thinking is going on now so we're doing it in real time. But outing that thinking on the scope of that package would be really helpful. Because I think you know obviously we're going to need to have the council really well engaged in that. We're going to need public support for it and having all that vetted early and having those discussions and debates early about what goes in and what stays out and what criteria we're using, I think it would be really important, and if we're coming back next month to talk about lights, I know it's a lot to throw in everything else, too. But I just encourage us to somehow bring something to this committee in the next couple months that at least takes the veil off what the administration's thinking is about what the scope and scale of that measure might look like.

>> Agreed, councilmember. That's certainly something that's needed. Staff's been working on that. We've had two meetings so far. Our intention is to bring some information to the council on the 24th. This is designated to be before the council on the 24th so we'd like to bring some information to the council at that time. And certainly can bring more information back through this committee as we continue to kind of build to that point.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Okay, great, thanks Dave. Then lastly the other number that popped out in my mind, I was looking at the parks program. And the backlog, I can certainly understand that the buildings because you certainly have a lot of community centers and buildings out there to have to deal with. The 57.8 million on neighborhood parks, and the 73 million on regional parks, those numbers are really eye-popping. And I guess Matt I was hoping to get a sense of what are we talking about with those kinds of costs? What exactly are we repairing or replacing?

>> Sure, thanks, Matt Cano, Deputy Director, Parks, Recreation, Neighborhood Services. We, as part of the 11-12 capital budget cycle, we worked with the councilmembers and Public Works to commission a study of about \$400,000 so we could do a detailed infrastructure backlog evaluation. Prior to this study we were really just ballparking numbers. This is looking at existing infrastructure and repair that existing infrastructure. It's not looking at new parks or new trails that need to be built. It's everything from restrooms that need to be rehabbed to irrigation systems that need to be -- all the underground stuff that's you know the irrigation systems et cetera is expensive to replace. It's looking at that. And so Public Works has been working on the project for us since last fall. And it started to do some preliminary work, the report is not done yet. It will be done in late summer early fall. But based on that preliminary work an analysis was done and we've come up with these numbers on what the infrastructure backlog likely is in the neighborhood and community packs. There's also some buildings in a lot of our citywide parks such as the log cabin at Alum Rock, family camp, dining hall that are included in here as well.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Okay, more to come well thank you.

>> Councilmember Kalra: Maybe Vijay can figure out a way to get rid of 60 million or of it sore, anyway thank you very much. Again we don't have any cards from members of the public unless there's additional comments.

>> Councilmember Herrera: I did have one.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Sure.

>> Councilmember Herrera: I just wanted to say thank you to Vijay, I meant to say that earlier. I'm just really impressed with the work done in I.T. And looking forward to future recommendations on how we can increase security and how we can focus on that. Very impressed with the progress we're making.

>> Vijay Sammeta: Thank you, councilmember. Don't expect this every committee meeting. Just to set expectations.

>> Councilmember Herrera: No \$60 million every meeting? Move approval.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: And to place this on the 24th.

>> Councilmember Herrera: Have it cross referenced for the 24th.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: All in favor, opposed, that passes unanimously, thank you. All right we're moving off on to the key legislative items. Hi, Betsy.

>> Betsy Shotwell: Hi. Thank you Mr. Chair, members of the committee, Betsy Shotwell, Director of Intergovernmental Relations. You have before you your regular update on where things are in the legislature on issues of interest to this committee. It's partly of my regular update I go to all the committees this time of year and will return in a few months with additional updates. In between that of course any actions that go to the Rules Committee will go to the full council and then if there's other updates I use the City Manager's weekly report to keep you current. By far, at the federal level, the most news worthy action that just took place was the president signing the extension of the transportation authorization bill for 90 days. As I'm sure you saw the House had their version, the the Senate had their version and it came down to hours before the whole thing would have come to a close on Saturday. So they did the 90-day extension. I can't predict how that will go but something tells me this may follow the lines of other authorizations that we observed and now we're getting into the, you as you know, the election cycle and whatnot. So it remains to be seen how that will fare for the remainder of the year but we shall see and I'll certainly keep you informed. The state report includes a number of bills that are actually -- were introduced last year. This is the second year of the two-year session in Sacramento. Clearly one of the City's highest priorities is AB 57 which would guaranty seats for Oakland and San Francisco on the Metropolitan Transportation Commission. The usually protocol of the committees in Sacramento is to hear the house of origin bills they have to hear those by early May, and getting them through and over to the other house. Being that this bill is in the senate, it passed the assembly last fall, we are hoping it will be heard in the Senate Transportation and Housing Committee in May. So that is something obviously we are following very closely. There are other

pieces of legislation here with city positions other bills that we will be taking forward to Rules I'm sure in the next few weeks and the full council for your review and recommendation. So with that I'd be happy to answer any questions that you might have.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Any questions? Okay, we have one card, for applicant.

>> Councilmember Rocha: I will hear public comment first.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: David Wall. All members of the public have two minutes to speak.

>> Good afternoon. One related legislative matter that is pending now, is a municipal regional storm drain permit. My tardiness for today's soiree is I was in front of the mural in North San Pedro street sweeping the public street for a section of it because parked cars don't leave. Now I know the issue of signage has come up before learned council. But signs aren't going to solve this problem. Now what has happened has leaves and debris has decayed to such a degree that it's superfine dust, not only mechanical sweepers unless they stayed on station for a while can remove this material. Subsequently, you should look in your own gutters to see the effects or better yet, go around established high density living places and look at the gutters and take a broom yourself just to see the complexity of the material that's there. And with reference to Senate Bill 1220, that is pending, that has implied environmental problems. Specifically \$75 per page. There's going to be a lot of trees that aren't going to be planted and a lot of money that's going to be generated I think we'll talk about tom. Thank you.

>> Mayor Reed: Thank you, Mr. Wall. Councilmember Rocha.

>> Councilmember Rocha: Have a process question in terms of the bills you bring before committee for position, the process you go through to identify which ones to are if you wouldn't mind.

>> Betsy Shotwell: Thank you, well, clearly your establishment of the legislative guiding principles and priorities that you do every December really sets the stage for what issues that we will be looking at. Constantly reviewing

bills, our lobbyist in Sacramento, Roxann Miller reviews every bill as it goes through and as it's amended, regardless if it's a local government city related issue or not, just because in case they get amended in the middle of the night we want to make sure. We work closely with League of California Cities, and then we also work closely with our own local bodies, such as the city association, and then we follow legislation that the valley transportation authority staff, Water District staff, I meet with these individuals on a regular basis to discuss what issues and concerns as well as my colleagues with the county. There's a number of different elements in rubing the legislation and obviously the criticalness to the city, whether we support it or whether we oppose it. That also weighs in to the degree we need to have this ability, we need council direction and we need our lobbyist to advocate in Sacramento or in Washington for the city, with your residence.

>> Councilmember Rocha: Okay, thank you because there's a few I saw in here that really fit our legislative priorities as you researches heed but I'm sure a number of them are early versions and you don't want to jump in too quick. I'm sorry you were going to say something.

>> Betsy Shotwell: No, to your point we are currently reviewing, and/or it's because it's the two-year cycle, and they may not be moving this year, and we're finding that out and we'll be then following the -- if they're reintroduced next year which most likely they are. In a nonelection year you'll probably see a little bit more activity.

>> Councilmember Rocha: Thank you for the report. Move to accept the staff memo.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Okay, there's a motion and second. I just had a couple of questions, Betsy. One was on the IB district, 2382.

>> Betsy Shotwell: Yes.

>> I see it's been referred. Is it likely to get out of committee?

>> Betsy Shotwell: I can't say. We are working with VTA very closely on that in your.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: I know CalTrans staff can be challenging. Okay. And then on the AB 57, I know MTC did approve the changes. Wonder if we've heard anything from Sacramento in the last few weeks.

>> Betsy Shotwell: What I had heard was when we were in Sacramento, some of the councilmembers and myself, that the author of the bill, assembly member Beall had indicated and others that it looked like it was going to be heard in the senate transportation and housing committee in May.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Great news, thank you very much. Unless there are other questions we will take the motion, all in favor, opposed, that passes unanimously, thank you Betsy.

>> Betsy Shotwell: Thank you.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: On to our final item for the day, this is the local hazard mission plan.

>> Good afternoon, Mr. Chair, members of the committee, I'm Chris Godley, director of the office of emergency services. Before you today is what we call a hazard mitigation plan. As an emergency manager, I can tell you the best way to respond to any disaster is to keep it from happening in the first place or minimize the impacts. Hazard mission is a term that's used to describe the actions that primarily local governments but now increasingly the private sector are taking to either prevent a natural disaster from occurring or minimizing its impacts. Examples might include the use of increasingly sophisticated and powerful building codes that would withstand the effects of fire or flooding or earthquake. Or what we call mitigation -- post-mitigation strategies, for example, when CalTrans goes out and puts steel bands around columns on overpasses. That's designed to keep those columns from collapsing completely, when an earthquake does occur. So these are just a couple of examples of mitigation strategies. And so for the city of San José in the year 2007 they adopted a local hazard mission plan that was developed in partnership with the association of Bay Area governments. In 2010 as part of the federal government's drive to ensure that everyone complies with the disaster mitigation act of 2000 the association of

Bay Area governments undertook again to revise its hazard mitigation plan and at this time increase its outreach and its desire to participate with all local jurisdictions in the Bay Area. And so at that point in the year 2010 San José agreed to participate in that process with ABAG and we were able to join every other city in the county of Santa Clara along with the county of Santa Clara in developing a hazard mitigation annex if you would for the Santa Clara area to the ABAG hazard mitigation plan. In the final ABAG hazard mitigation plan is called taming natural disasters, which is an optimistically titled document, but it does attempt to quantify if you would the threat that natural disaster posed to all communities here in the Bay Area. Whether it's flood, fire, earthquake, sea level rise, tsunami, all the good things that you see in all those disaster movies over the years, plus what we've experienced in real life here in California, the goal of the entire effort was to quantify that to detail sufficient that we could develop mission strategies that local jurisdictions would effectively have a menu from which they 62 address say a flooding threat in their community community. It might be a construction of flood control measures, it might be the use of ability to entrap water on properties before it gets to the waterways, you know settling ponds those kinds of things. And so the City of San José opted to participate in that program. We've developed this annex in not just participate with the regional effort but to ensure that our efforts are in line with the regional effort. This is a requirement of the federal government in order for the city to obtain either pre-disaster or post-disaster hazard mitigation grant funds. So it is incumbent upon us States to ensure that we have a formally FEMA-approved plan in place so that we can remain eligible for those funds. There's also a consideration that the state of California makes contingent full reimbursement after disaster through the California disaster assistance act, that we in fact have a hazard mission plan in place in the city formally adopted by our governing body. I'd mentioned very briefly that the annex improves the city's 2007 hazard mitigation plan in five areas. First we've increased and significantly driven down the detail in terms of inventory of critical facilities, both cultural, community, public safety, as well as infrastructure. That introduces a set of standardized hazard mitigation strategies throughout the entire region. It provides a better analysis of the major threats, natural hazard threats that face San José including earthquake and flooding. It does incorporate the progress we've made in instituting hazard mission activities that occurred since 2000 and it does provide a bit new information or night on the disaster preparedness level of San José residents. Part of the plan included a survey of Santa Clara residents about one-third were from San José and from that we were able to develop some insight as to how well people were prepared for an earthquake. And if you thought the infrastructure backlog was bad news, I'm afraid our

preparedness levels are not quite something we are going to be able to boast about at this point in terms of our general residents. The annex has four sections, basically a brief one discussing the planning process. An assessment of our current city mission efforts, and projects. An identification of our current vulnerabilities that we face especially as it relates to flood, fire and earthquake and a few of the hazard mission strategies including three priorities for the city including the upper Guadalupe river flood protection project, the Coyote creek protection project, and a Santa Clara County fire break construction project that would specially benefit the eastern portion of our city. These hazard mission strategies and the annex are intended to inform our decisions and they are not binding upon us. We can pick and choose them as either staff interest, public interest or funding permit. And pending that I'd be happy to answer any questions you might have.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Thank you, Chris. I have one card from a member of the public, if it's all right with the committee we'll go to the public comment first. David Wall.

>> First off, I would like to give you my sincere appreciation and gratitude, first of all for your service to the nation to what you're doing for the city. This gentleman and his organization has underestimated exactly how bad off this city is with reference to preparation for a disaster. Mayor Reed insofar as either being light of hearted or just plain joking the issue off at Rules the last week, mentioned that when a citizen said that the mayor should use his bully pulpit as well as councilmembers to educate the public repeatedly about how much water and food to have on hand. Now, the mayor, light heartedly or whatever, said, three days. Three days is not sufficient at all. More like a couple of weeks, if not three weeks or a month. And people have to be acclimated to this. Also, what is needed is the infrastructure requirements, such as surplus military hardware, coming home from the war, a citizen has mentioned repeatedly, water trucks would be a very nice thing to have on hand on a major disaster. Or other heavy equipment. That could be actually basically given to cities for free. Another thing that needs to be communicated is how you can air lift or put in place significant numbers of military police units. Because we already have problems in this city as it is, with an understaffed police and fire department. You add a natural disaster and this causes exponential increases across the board, to maintain order. And this also includes rations from the military as well. I would not rely too much on surveys myself. I see survey mania going around the city and I think what we need is prudent common sense planning and I'd like to thank you again, sir. You're doing a

good job. You need a lot more help. And the learned councilmembers need really to step up and start reminding people, life has been really nice here but it can change within a second. Thank you.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Thank you, Mr. Wall. Any questions or comments?

>> Councilmember Rocha: One, more of a comment I guess. The inventory you have here in this report, it's pretty significant. Is this updated each time or is this based on 2007?

>> That information was developed in the year 2010. Subsequent as part of the Homeland Security assessment process we've updated our critical asset inventory as recently as November of last year. This inventory represents those key physical infrastructure components that support our communities, the social infrastructure as well as our utility systems, governance, Public Safety, as well as community and cultural resources. It's not designed to address all those private sector resources that we consider a critical part of our community. As you are well aware, Santa Clara being the home of so many high tech companies, the infrastructure here is profound. This does not even begin to attempt to identify that. In that our goal in the hazard mitigation plan is to address those components that are of a public sector primarily and that might provide the best value for hazard mission assessments in the future.

>> Councilmember Rocha: Coming off the other item in terms of the infrastructure backlog Generally what you've characterized here or captured here is not only just services in the result of an emergency but also facility cost, I guess.

>> Correct. We were able to develop for several of those facilities either their replacement value or their inventory contents value to show and we're attempting to address the federal effort to quantify if you would what's at stake here. If you've got 2.5, 3, 4, \$5 billion worth of public infrastructure, and contents inventory, what is the reasonable investment to attempt to safeguard that inventory? Is it 1%, 2%, much like any insurance policy, at one point do you not pay for insurance and just take a risk? At this point, for example, in the private sector, for the most part, the bulk of our homeowners, well below 7% pay for earthquake insurance because the perceived cost relative to

the potential value. But I can tell you that's going to have a significant impact on our ability to provide postdisaster housing because the last great earthquake in California was the 1994 Northridge earthquake. The bulk of those losses were covered by private insurers. Subsequent to that earthquake is when the California Earthquake authority was established, and the bulk of our California residents no longer enjoy earthquake coverage on their primary homes. And so it's April attempt much like that to quantify what's at risk in termination of what our investment decision going to be going forward in terms of applying for and developing mitigation projects in the city. It's not a small project to take on mitigation. There's -- the feds have made the paperwork pretty significant as D.O.T. can attest to.

>> Councilmember Rocha: Thank you for your work. And --

>> Councilmember Liccardo: I did have a quick question. Just a follow-up on Councilmember Rocha's line of questioning. As you know as you think about what you said about Northridge was you know given obviously as an enormous human toll but as we think of rebuilding after a quake, a quake's going to come one way or another, are there reliable sources that FEMA has or Website or something that we can correct constituents to look at to assess the risk with different soil types, liquefaction, everything else that to allow them to make a more informed decision about whether or not they need insurance?

>> Absolutely. Earthquakes are informed not only by the location, the earthquake fault line in which the earthquake occurs, but also the type of soils in which the home or the business has been constructed. The state of California through the California Emergency Management Agency does have a Website where you can enter you in your zip code, your address and it will give you information specific to your neighborhood. A fairly rough approximation of what your flooding potential might be if you live in a 100 year flood plane or what kind of earthquake intensities you might experience at that residence depending on which earthquake fault line is liable to rupture in your area, there is a gross rough approximation process through that website to be able to do that. And when people buy properties now they're starting to ask questions like that. And realtors have become very good at developing the information through publicly available resources much like we have here at the front

counter in San José or there are actually firms now especially for firms that are making significant investments that will provide a very finely detailed engineering assessment of that property.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Okay, thank you very much.

>> Councilmember Rocha: I'll move to accept the report. Move for adoption.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Councilmember Herrera.

>> Councilmember Herrera: Thank you for the report Chris. I think it's really important and if not, if we're going to have a major earthquake, or some of the disaster, just when 72 hours was mentioned. What is the correct amount of -- I mean I've heard 72 hours too. What is the correct amount of time?

>> The correct amount of time is how paranoid are you.

>> Councilmember Herrera: Well, in terms of emergency services director, what is the information that we should give to our constituents?

>> Right, and certainly I make light of that, because there are members of the community even now up to 1 or 2% of our population is preparing for two weeks of being able to live independently and off the grid if you would. As a minimum, as the director of emergency services, at this point I do recommend 96 hours as being the absolutely minimum time that people should be able to prepare to live by themselves without power, without water or without other resources.

>> Councilmember Herrera: It is 96 hours and I see in the report here you have a question and it's using 72 hours.

>> That's correct. The question is, the 72 hours remains essentially the federal recommendation but based on our experiences here in California, because of the fragility of both our physical and social infrastructures, we're recommending a minimum of 96 hours.

>> Councilmember Herrera: So I think one thing that would be helpful if we get some kind of standardized message. Because I think some places we're seeing 72, now you're saying 96, some people are saying two weeks. If we can get a consistent message out to our constituents, I know I'm making an effort as I move through our neighborhoods and we are talking about safety and neighborhood crime prevention to talk about these issues as well. I think that is really one important thing, whenever we are in front of our neighbors, whenever we have an outreach, whenever we can include information on disaster prevention or looking at these kinds of safety things I think we should use those opportunities to disseminate that information.

>> And we're several doing our best. However the federal government is sticking with 72 hours despite our best efforts. So all the literature and the Websites reference that. So it's very difficult for us to compete with that number. Instead when we do generate our other materials, when it's the San José prepared program, when we roost distinction but people feel they can go 72 hours based on what's in the car or what's in the food pantry. When they start thinking four days thousand they're starting to take it seriously in terms of stockpiling additional resources. We feel that is a real psychological tipping point if you would with how people approach preparedness.

>> Councilmember Herrera: I know we did a questionnaire and were you concerned about the percentage of responses on our questionnaire? I know the one concerned me people not knowing neighbors around them that have issues. Since we're going to have to be out on our own we have to reach out to our neighbors, I think it was 72% had no clue, 79.9% are not familiar with the needs of their neighbors and I'm getting that's immediate neighbors, I don't --

>> That's correct. I think if I could, the survey is of interested people, people that responded voluntarily to the survey. It wasn't you know a scientific sample. So it's not truly reflective of say our general populace that are less

interested in these subjects so their preparedness levels may be even lower. I do think that the ability to not only know your neighbors but interact with them was significantly troubling for me. I've often said since I moved here that San José was if biggest small town you've ever seen but that's because of my own personal experience and knowing everybody on my block. and after disaster it's those personal relationships that are actually the greatest benefit to our public, not God bless what our public safety people can do and what our government can mobilize but ultimately it's that community that comes together whether it's community based organizations or neighborhood groups. And so that was a bit troubling for me given my own personal experience is certainly not like that.

>> Councilmember Herrera: When we see groups coming together doing neighborhood watch or any other type of coming together I think that's the time to suggest San Jose prepared and have having those materials and that's what my office is trying to do and I hope we do that throughout the city. Because you don't always get to have the opportunity to talk to folks in neighborhoods. So whenever they're gathered together I think we need that opportunity to disseminate that information.

>> Thank you. We're modifying our San José prepared program, which is currently a 20 hour community response team training, a two hour personal preparedness course. We are modifying that because we feel people don't even have two hours. So if I can get 30 minutes now I give them just enough to be dangerous I call it, they can take action to prepare themselves and their family. We are also increasing outreach to our established community groups, CBOs, school parent associations, people who already have that network. We find that extremely effective.

>> Councilmember Herrera: Exactly. Use things that are already effective, let's not duplicate efforts. Last the cert trained people, I went through the Red Cross training around the time of Katrina and took those programs and know that the cert programs are really important. What is your sense of how we could recruit people or do you think that we need to recruit more people for cert so they're working with the fire -- with our firehouses, it seems like those people could be invaluable in terms of a disaster.

>> I would suggest that San José has taken an approach where we don't actually run a cert program. That is, we don't maintain contact with our cert trained volunteers after we train them. We jokingly call it train and release and we're looking at training people so that they're prepared to take care of themselves, their neighborhood perhaps their community. But we don't have an auxiliary if you would like many of the cert programs you might see elsewhere in this county or the state of California and that's primary due to the staffing investment. At this point we have one individual who does all our San José prepared program they're grant funded and so their responsible for everything including the cert program. That contrasts with other jurisdictions like say San Francisco that has four and five full time staffers that are assigned to cert that do that team building if you would to maintain that network of community volunteers and then bring them into the emergency response planning process. And I'm afraid we're just not at that point with our staffing investment.

>> Councilmember Herrera: Well not to belabor this too much but I think we should look at ways we can utilize community volunteers to help do that to mobilize those cert folks so they can know each other and know the community organizations. And my sense when I was going through the Red Cross training there was Red Cross trained folks to be part of cert too, right, is there duplicative efforts going on there from the city and through Red Cross?

>> Oh, no, we absolutely do work with Red Cross to deconflict. They have a more formal training program that they provide to more private sector companies or the residents. They don't let you get off with just 30 minutes. You have to sit for the entire two hours. We are trying to be a bit more sensitive to how our community can respond to our offers of support. And the Red Cross provides training primarily in response to their own volunteers. That's when they provide the detailed response like you might see on our emergency response teams.

>> Councilmember Herrera: Okay. Thank you.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Great, thank you very much. Unless there are other comments or questions, we'll entertain a motion.

>> Councilmember Herrera: Move to approve, accept the report.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: All in favor? Any opposed? Thank you very much, Chris. Now we have time for open forum. Roland LeBrun.

>> Good afternoon, and thank you for the opportunity. I'd like to touch briefly on item 6.2 on tomorrow's council agenda. And hopefully start a fresh conversation about how we could maximize our airport resources. I support private aviation, and corporate jets in particular. Because they are necessary part of doing business. We must encourage these in any way that is acceptable to our communities. Because they will make it easier for large corporations to locate their corporate headquarters in Silicon Valley. Having said that, we need to completely rethink our airport in the age of high speed rail. Because the western parking lot is probably the only place left in San José for a large HSR station that could be designed to give a competitive advantage to our airport. In closing, I would like to encourage you to start a new task force whose job it would be to completely rethink, how we could live with a 24 by 7 airport including high speed freight, after curfew. And how we could maximize the same airport infrastructure to support the growth of downtown. And I'll give you an example that would be high speed shuttles again the airport, the arena and the ballpark. Thank you.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Thank you, Mr. LeBrun. David Wall.

>> I'd almost forgot, there was almost four violations of the airport's curfew this Saturday alone. You have significant problems with your environmental services department. Let me underscore significant. The office of the City Manager is a complete utter failure with reference to any responsibilities to take care of the environmental services department. Now what that means to you is referenced by the Cupertino sanitary district's letter of outright rebellion to participate any further in funding of the reclaimed water project. Should their argument prevail, and I have every confidence that it will, every citizen that has to pay for that cursed reclaimed water project can use the same argument. So you're going to have to find a new funding source. The long term obligations for power programs with reference to the environmental services department has yet to surface to you. As far as they

go for grants, you get them, you thank them, and then personnel is assigned. Grant money runs out but the obligations don't. So you really need to stay on top of that. The engines at the water pollution control plant, now that's been a perennial issue, correct? Well, there's significant problems with the gas turbine engines because the gas purification, if you're going to rely on the gas produced, causes problems. The fuel cells that you want are so incredibly asinine that I can't analytically describe to you without violating the code of conduct why those things should be scrapped. Now, that means you're going to have to ramp up with the diesel engines these things, sure there's going to be air problems, tough. It's better than air problems and sewage problems. And you need those engines replaced ASAP. Now as far as the musical chairs that's going on at ESD you should all be insensed. It's to the point of vulgarity, vulgarity about the level of incompetence that is being put in positions of responsibility to take care of that water pollution control plant. Not on the operations side but at the top levels of ESD.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Mr. Wall could you wrap up?

>> Thank you.

>> Councilmember Liccardo: Thank you very much. All right with that, the meeting is adjourned. Thank you.