



PLANNING & TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION MINUTES

MEETINGS ARE CABLECAST LIVE ON GOVERNMENT ACCESS CHANNEL 26

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

Wednesday, March 12, 2003
REGULAR MEETING – 7:00 PM
City Council Chambers
Civic Center, 1st Floor
250 Hamilton Avenue
Palo Alto, California 94301

ROLL CALL: 7:10 PM

Commissioners:

Annette Bialson, Chair-- absent
Michael Griffin, Vice-Chair
Karen Holman
Patrick Burt
Bonnie Packer
Phyllis Cassel
Joseph Bellomo

Staff:

Steve Emslie, Planning Director
Lisa Grote, Chief Planning Official
Wynne Furth, Senior Assistant City Attorney
Joseph Kott, Chief Transportation Official
Julie Caporgno, Advance Planning Manager
Amy French, Current Planning Manager
Virginia Warheit, Senior Planner
Alicia Spotwood, Staff Secretary

AGENDIZED ITEMS:

203 Forest Avenue – Continued to March 26, 2003

- 1. Caltrans/El Camino Real Feasibility Study and Master Schematic Design Plan.**
- 2. Presentation on Methodology and Applications of a Geographic Information Systems Analysis of Stanford Research Park Commuter Trip.**
- 3. Approval Of Minutes: Special Meeting of February 4 and Regular Meeting of February 12, 2003.**

Commissioner Griffin: Good evening ladies and gentlemen. Welcome to the Wednesday, March 12, 2003 regular meeting of the Planning and Transportation Commission. Will you call the roll, please?

The first item on our agenda is Oral Communications.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS. Members of the public may speak to any item not on the agenda with a limitation of three (3) minutes per speaker. Those who desire to speak must complete a speaker request card available from the secretary of the Commission. The Planning and Transportation Commission reserves the right to limit the oral communications period to 15 minutes.

1 Commissioner Griffin: If people would care to say something during the Oral Communication
2 you may pick up a speaker card here at the front desk. It looks like we have two so therefore if
3 we could hear from Irvin Dawid followed by Tony Carrasco.
4

5 Mr. Irvin Dawid, 753 Alma Street, Palo Alto: Good evening Planning and Transportation
6 Commission members. There was an item in today's paper that I wanted to bring to your
7 attention in case you hadn't seen it. It is on the front page of the second section of *The Mercury*
8 *News*, "Hit Run Suspect Turns Self In." A 79-year old retired physician suspected of hitting a
9 five-year old bicyclist last month then driving off surrendered to Los Altos police Tuesday. I
10 couldn't help but think of the recent incident with Amy [Malsvander] and I just wanted to
11 basically ask, I know you don't obviously have to answer, as Planning and Transportation
12 Commission members do you have certain values when you approach transportation projects?
13 Are you concerned with speed? In other words trying to get the vehicles from A to B as fast as
14 possible. Are you concerned with capacity, trying to fit as many vehicles as possible into the
15 roadway? Are you concerned with safety? If you are concerned with safety, who's safety? I
16 just sort of ask those as sort of rhetorical questions. My request is that whenever you evaluate
17 projects your number one priority must be safety and the most important safety should be for
18 pedestrians and cyclists and in that order by the way. I just recently saw a presentation on traffic
19 calming and we actually came across an issue where there was a cyclist versus pedestrian type of
20 issue and it was quite clear in my mind that the most important issue always must be the safety of
21 the pedestrian. Thank you.
22

23 Commissioner Griffin: Thank you Mr. Dawid. Now Tony. Carrasco, please
24

25 Mr. Tony Carrasco, 1885 El Camino Real, Palo Alto: Mr. Chairman I wanted to speak about the
26 El Camino project. I am not sure if this is Oral Communication.
27

28 Commissioner Griffin: Actually we could probably have that when we deal with that particular
29 agenda item. It will be Item Number Two.
30

31 Mr. Carrasco: I will come back at that point then.
32

33 Commissioner Griffin: Thanks, Tony.
34

35 If there are no more speaker cards for Oral Communications we will move to the Consent
36 Calendar.
37

38 **CONSENT CALENDAR.** Items will be voted on in one motion unless removed from the
39 calendar by a Commission Member.
40

41 Commissioner Griffin: We do not have a Consent Calendar for this evening. We go to Agenda
42 Changes.
43

44 **AGENDA CHANGES, ADDITIONS AND DELETIONS.** The agenda may have additional
45 items added to it up until 72 hours prior to meeting time.
46

1 Commissioner Griffin: As perhaps you have seen on the Agenda Staff has deleted the agenda
2 Item Number One for tonight and continued it to March 26. So that then takes us to New
3 Business.

4
5 Mr. Steve Emslie, Planning Director: Mr. Chair, we do need a motion to continue that item.

6
7 ***UNFINISHED BUSINESS.***

8 ***Public Hearings:*** None.

9
10 ***Other Items:*** None.

11
12 ***NEW BUSINESS.***

13 ***Public Hearings:***

14
15 1. **203 Forest Avenue***: Appeal by Neal Aronson of the Director of Planning and Community
16 Environment's approval of a Conditional Use Permit application to allow the establishment of a
17 Commercial Recreation (fitness) Facility at 203 Forest Avenue. Environmental Assessment:
18 Exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act.

19
20 Commissioner Griffin: I so move.

21
22 Commissioner Cassel: Second.

23
24 Commissioner Griffin: All in favor? (ayes) Done.

25
26 That takes us to New Business and I will open the public hearing now on Item Number Two
27 which is the Caltrans/El Camino Real Feasibility Study and Master Schematic Design Plan.

28
29 **2. Caltrans/El Camino Real Feasibility Study and Master Schematic Design Plan.**

30 Feasibility Study and Master Schematic Design Plan for possible future improvements to El
31 Camino Real (State Route #82) in Palo Alto including a transportation analysis that analyzes
32 options for meeting regional traffic requirements under peak hour conditions in the year 2020
33 and maintaining travel time along the corridor, while providing improved facilities for
34 pedestrians, bicycles and transit riders, and accommodating large canopy trees in sidewalks and
35 medians. The two Alternatives considered include retaining the existing six travel lanes
36 throughout the corridor or reducing the number of travel lanes to four or five lanes in two
37 selected locations while retaining six travel lanes in the remainder of the corridor. **Weblink:**
38 <http://www.city.palo-alto.ca.us/cityagenda/publish/planning-transportation-meetings/1639.pdf>

39
40 Commissioner Griffin: Would Staff please make a presentation?

41
42 Mr. Emslie: Thank you. Mr. Chair, members of the Commission it is my pleasure to again be
43 before you presenting the El Camino Design Plan as it has been worked on by Staff over the past
44 little over a year and last reviewed by the Planning Commission back on November 19 of last
45 year. We are fortunate to bring back to you a set of recommendations that address the many
46 concerns that we heard from the community, the Commission and the various stakeholders as we
47 proceeded through the planning process through the last year and two months.

1
2 The team will be presenting the plan in greater detail but I did want to recognize our Project
3 Planner, Virginia Warheit who will be speaking to you in a minute, who has been the guiding
4 force on the City's team in moving this forward and working with a variety of interests and
5 framing the issues in a way that really captures the essence of what the design objectives and the
6 urban planning objectives are trying to achieve on El Camino. So I did want to acknowledge
7 Virginia and all her hard work in that area.
8

9 I want to start off with emphasizing the recommendations that we are asking the Planning
10 Commission tonight to review the draft study and to direct Staff to begin the preparation of the
11 Environmental Impact Reports on the Option Two that is presented in the Staff Report, which is
12 the option that looks at the potential lane reduction in strategic areas primarily retaining the six
13 lane configuration but in the two strategic areas that we discussed with the Commission back in
14 November the possibility of lane reductions and maintaining the average vehicle travel times and
15 maintaining a consistent speed as recommended by the design and the consulting team. We also
16 are recommending that the City Council direct Staff to return to the Planning and Transportation
17 Commission and to the City Council to report on the funding alternatives for implementation of
18 Phase I recommendations in the Report. So we have the recommendation. We will leave that up
19 at the end of the presentation for the Commission's reference as it proceeds through the hearing.
20

21 I just would like to call to mind a couple of points to consider. These are points that we made
22 back in November but wanted you to keep them in mind as you go through and listen to the
23 presentation. One thing we know for sure is that traffic will continue to increase. If we don't
24 build another home traffic will continue to increase. So the time to do something with El
25 Camino and address the long-term safety aspects and the pedestrian nature of this and the
26 alternative modes of transportation is now. It is really in that spirit that we are bringing the
27 recommendations and the plan that has come before you.
28

29 Secondly, this is an opportunity to not only address safety and other alternate modes of
30 transportation as well as to keep traffic flowing and it smooth and efficient and consistent way it
31 is also an opportunity to make the situation better. It is possible to improve pedestrian safety,
32 improve the pedestrian experience and improve El Camino, which as we all know serves as a
33 main street for our community, to have it transform into the aesthetic boulevard that I think it
34 really has the potential to grow into. So really these recommendations are brought to you in that
35 spirit. I would to now turn it over to Virginia, who will give you a little bit more background and
36 some of the reasoning for some of the recommendations.
37

38 Ms. Virginia Warheit, Senior Planner: I am going to give a summary of the issues that is
39 essentially an outline of the presentation that the consultants are going to give with details. I am
40 just going to have three slides that will summarize what you are going to hear from them.
41

42 First, Why Change El Camino? The short answer is it is not working very well right now for
43 anybody. They are going to be talking more about what they found when they went out there
44 and did a very thorough analysis of the current conditions.
45

46 What are the Goals for the Project? We had an advisory group of people representing a number
47 of interests out there on the street. The general goal is that the new design has to work for
48 everybody. We didn't prioritize things. We didn't make a hierarchy. We didn't try to sacrifice

1 some objectives for others. We tried to find a solution that makes the street work for all interests
2 and all modes.

3
4 Then they are going to talk about the transportation analysis that was done; a very focused,
5 detailed transportation analysis about conditions out on the street now and also an evaluation of
6 what the transportation impacts of each of the alternatives would be. The transportation analysis
7 came up with three pieces of good news. I think these three things are essentially what the whole
8 project is built on. Number one, we found out that you can get a lot of benefits, the street can
9 work a whole lot better than it is, by coordinating the signals. Something as simple as that, you
10 would think maybe that was already working optimally, but it is not. So there is opportunity
11 there for things to be quite a bit better. Secondly, in order to meet the goals of all kinds of
12 interests we need to reallocate the space because now the road is only designed for one mode and
13 that is the motor vehicle. The good news is the lanes were very generously proportioned in the
14 1960s and there is some extra room there. They are going to talk more about how and where
15 they are getting some extra room. The third thing is, and this was really the key to everything,
16 the whole four miles have six travel lanes. We don't need six travel lanes everywhere. That is
17 actually a very intuitive and logical thing when you realize that at the major intersections there is
18 four to five times as much cross traffic as at all the other intersections. So if there is only a third
19 or a fourth as much traffic at the other intersections it is logical that you wouldn't need the same
20 size intersection. They will talk more about that. So the traffic analysis found some
21 opportunities for us to design the street in a different way.

22
23 Out of that information we came up with two alternatives that are going to be presented to you
24 tonight. One of them leaves the six lanes throughout the whole corridor. That eliminates any
25 concerns anyone might have with making a very significant change to the street because you still
26 have the same number of travel lanes that we have right now. With those six lanes we can still
27 make some very important improvements but everything gets a little bit tighter. You don't
28 optimize everything. In fact, you just meet the minimum standards on some things like the
29 bicycle lanes and the sidewalks and so on. So we could have six lanes throughout, we could
30 make many important improvements but we wouldn't be optimizing some of the objectives of
31 better pedestrian environments and so on. Because we don't need six lanes everywhere, by very
32 selectively finding those places where you don't and looking to see what is going on there we
33 have two locations where we think, one, we don't need the six lanes and in those locations we
34 have a lot of other things going on that need some space. You have school crossings, you have
35 commercial activity in those areas, higher pedestrian traffic and so on. So in those two limited
36 locations there is the possibility of having only four travel lanes and then using that space to
37 better meet those other objectives. Then the consultants are also going to talk about crosswalk
38 improvements, how to get across the street. That is a very important part of the improvements.

39
40 Lastly they are going to talk about implementation and phasing, how do we take on something
41 like this especially in the current funding environment. One of the project goals set by the
42 advisory group and based on information that we heard from the community was set this up in a
43 way that we can actually get started on it, that we can have some improvement soon. So it
44 doesn't just sit on a shelf and nothing can happen until there is a huge pile of money, which there
45 isn't going to be. So a lot of thought went into developing a phasing plan that can let us actually
46 get started and be positioned for what we hope might be better times in the future. Then the cost
47 estimates for the project both for the total project and also for Phase I. They will talk more about
48 Phase I, which is how we can, with a relatively smaller amount of money, go out there and get

1 started. Also how much it would cost to do these field tests that we are committed to. If you
2 have less than six travel lanes we are recommending that we field test those and there is cost
3 associated with that. So they will address that too.

4
5 I will introduce our consultants and turn it over to them. You have all met many times but Phil
6 Erickson from CD&A, the prime consultant and Jerry Walters from Fehr & Peers, the traffic
7 consultant.

8
9 Mr. Phil Erickson, Community Design & Architecture: Good evening. It is nice to be back and
10 I am ready to present to you where we have ended up in terms of recommendations. This has
11 been a really exciting project for us as consultants, being challenged by trying to take El Camino
12 make it a better street for the community and I also wanted to acknowledge the really good help
13 and support that we have gotten from your staff, also our advisory committee of citizens that
14 came together around this issue and working with them and really developing a consensus
15 around that and then a really strong technical advisory committee that we worked with, a
16 combination of Staff, people from VTA, Caltrans and others. It has really been a joint effort of
17 everybody to get to where we are today.

18
19 I wanted to start with just quickly going over some of the issues about why we want to even
20 think about changing El Camino Real. In terms of the driving experience Jerry will talk about
21 this in more detail but the key issues are that there are some intersections that do have more
22 accidents than we would like to see. There is a little bit higher frequency at some intersections.
23 There is an abrupt stopping and starting in the flow of the traffic and that is somewhat related to
24 these accident situations and also related to the third issue which is the design of the street really
25 does encourage people to drive faster, wider lanes, straight runs on a lot of the street, the changes
26 that were made in the 1960s took some of the kinks out of the street. So it really has been
27 oriented since then towards the automobile. There are some concerns that came out of that.

28
29 For the transit experience there is fairly high bus ridership along El Camino Real but the
30 conditions for the bus riders are really minimal at best in a lot of locations. That also relates
31 back to the pedestrian, the thing that we always need to think about is that at a certain point
32 whether we are driving or taking transit, when you get out of the car or the bus you are a
33 pedestrian. So what is the experience for pedestrians on the street? Again, the sidewalks are
34 narrow, some of the crossing distances are quite long, at intersections signals may not be timed
35 well for pedestrians to make it safely across the street. When you get into the middle of the
36 street, this is one of the more extreme examples at Page Mill, there isn't a place in the middle of
37 the street where you can stop and be safe. So if you do walk slower and you can't make it all the
38 way across the street, there is a push button there to activate the crosswalk again but you really
39 are out in the middle of all this moving traffic. There are things that we can do about that.

40
41 The bicycle experience on the street, if you spend time out on El Camino Real, you do see that
42 there are people that are using it to move around the City and really the sub-region to some
43 degree, as bicyclists. Again the speed of traffic, width of the lanes, the minimal accommodation
44 for bikes and the crossing distance, an important factor in terms of schools, were some concerns
45 that we were looking at.

46
47 The merchant experience of the street, it may be great for merchants to be there where there is a
48 high volume of traffic coming by but again, what is the experience when somebody is coming to

1 your store and they get out of their car and they are walking to your business? There are some
2 aesthetic changes that could help, widening the sidewalks, that sort of thing, could really help
3 some of the merchants on the corridor.
4

5 The neighborhood experience, we heard a lot about this throughout the entire project, from the
6 Committee and from the workshops that we went to. The street is really seen as a barrier to a lot
7 of people particularly again the issue of school children. Then the character of the street, it is not
8 really seen as a positive aspect to the neighborhoods that are behind it. We did pay a lot of
9 attention and again you will hear some of this in Jerry's part of the presentation, about while we
10 look at making changes to the street to make it better for all modes, we want to make sure that
11 we are not encouraging cut-through traffic to go into the neighborhoods.
12

13 So what were the goals that we came up with? These goals build from the Comprehensive Plan,
14 build from feedback from the Advisory Group and what we heard from the public when we had
15 our workshops. There is an interest in making the street more multi-modal and basically that is
16 to make it better for all those people that I just talked about who are trying to move on the street
17 and also to improve safety and convenience for pedestrians and bicyclists. Other project goals
18 were to look at the design of the street and come up with a design of the street that does what we
19 call speed management, encourages people to drive the speed limit rather than to speed down the
20 street. Also in doing that we are trying to even out the flow of traffic so that people can move
21 smoothly down the street, maintain travel time for movement down the corridor and to some
22 degree just make it a less frustrating experience for drivers. There are a lot of other benefits that
23 come for other modes from doing that and for the design of the street. Again, some of the goals
24 of getting at community character issues, trying to make the street less of a barrier, finding
25 opportunities where it can be the center for a community and making aesthetic changes. There is
26 a lot of interest in the community in terms of trees on the street and there are also a lot of other
27 issues in terms of the aesthetics of the street.
28

29 With that as an introduction, let me turn it over to Jerry. He is going to talk about the
30 transportation analysis and how that played through the different alternatives that we developed.
31 Then after he talks about that I will get back to talking about the design issues again.
32

33 Mr. Jerry Walters, Fehr & Peers: Thanks, Phil. Steve, Virginia and Phil did a very good job of
34 crystallizing the transportation findings. I am going to spend a few minutes and take you a little
35 bit deeper into what we found and how those findings led to the conclusions.
36

37 We did a very comprehensive evaluation of the balanced uses of El Camino looking at all of the
38 traffic through local traffic, truck traffic, the bus requirements, some fairly extensive evaluations
39 of the signal timing systems, travel time runs repeatedly up and down El Camino using fairly
40 sophisticated equipment. We measured pedestrian crossing times. We did accident studies, etc.
41 Our findings begin to come clear in several key categories on the next slide.
42

43 This is an example of the travel experience as one drives El Camino in one of the peak hours.
44 On the vertical axis we have the speed which ranges pretty dramatically from zero miles per hour
45 at a number of locations reflecting repeated stops and on up to approximately 50 miles per hour
46 in a few locations, 45 to 50. Even in the peak hour there are speeds occurring between
47 intersections that are above the speed limit but every so often through the corridor, on the
48 average seven or nine times through the corridor, one stops and waits. The sum total effect of

1 that is that your average travel speed through the corridor today in peak hours 25 to 30 miles per
2 hour when you are moving but when you figure in the stops it is about 16 to 18 miles per hour. I
3 think you will be hard pressed to find anybody actually traveling at the average speed in this
4 whole profile. So one of the objectives that we derived from that is both in terms of the health of
5 the traffic movement in the corridor and in terms of the health of the other uses, the pedestrian,
6 bicycle, transit, etc. uses of the corridor. It would be preferable to have the speeds moderated.
7 We think that through signal timing improvements, and we have analyzed this pretty thoroughly,
8 that that can be accomplished. So that the average speed through the corridor will still be 25 to
9 30 miles per hour, you will experience far fewer stops and delays and fewer situations where you
10 will want to or need to or through design be able to travel 45 or 50 miles per hour.

11
12 Next slide. The accident analysis also yielded some generalized findings and some fairly
13 interesting specifics. The average accident rate along El Camino is consistent with statewide
14 averages but as you look into the details and you look at where the color symbols are located you
15 will see locations that have higher than expected levels of certain types of accidents. So for
16 example, and I realize you can't read the text, speed related accidents are shown in the yellow
17 boxes. Speed related accidents that also involve rear-end collisions, another symptom of high
18 speeds leading to stop conditions, are also shown there in the blue. Then the higher overall
19 accident level related to those two conditions when compared to those conditions at a statewide
20 level is shown in red. So we have repeated situations in the corridor where these speed related
21 stop/start related accidents are occurring which one can see reflected in the speed survey itself
22 and which suggests that substantial benefit can be provided to vehicular accidents and pedestrian
23 and bicycle situations. There are also locations in the corridor that have pedestrian and bicycle
24 accident history. That also is not higher than the state average but many of the locations you see
25 there are locations where accidents involving pedestrians and bikes have occurred. One of them,
26 Cambridge, which is in the middle of one of the sections where we think some degree of speed
27 management can be most effective had three pedestrian and one bicycle accident in the recorded
28 history over three years.

29
30 Next slide. When we then look at the accommodations for pedestrians as they attempt to cross
31 El Camino we look at it in terms of, number one, whether pedestrians are afforded enough time
32 to get across the intersections at reasonable walking paces. When traffic engineers time signals
33 they try to provide an adequate allowance of time for one to walk at a reasonable pace and get all
34 the way across the street. That adequate level, by Palo Alto standards, is represented by the red
35 line. Over half of the intersections in the corridor do not provide that amount of time. Several of
36 them are even below Caltrans standards, which are lower standards than Palo Alto's. So that
37 through adjusting signal timing and shortening some crossing distances we believe that we are
38 going to be able to provide adequate crossing times at all intersections.

39
40 Next slide. So to summarize, and some of this derives from comments that Phil and Virginia
41 made, we do see that the traffic volume profiles are such that we have four critical intersections
42 at which six lanes on El Camino are absolutely necessary to move the traffic. There are
43 segments of El Camino at which fewer lanes are needed to handle the traffic. Reducing the
44 number of lanes provides a variety of benefits including benefit to traffic movement through
45 metering traffic flows to downstream locations. By reducing those widths we can also
46 accomplish shorter pedestrian crossings and a number of other benefits. Through signal
47 coordination we can also reduce the stopping and starting the speeding between intersections to

1 achieve the same basic travel time through the corridor. In that process we can improve
2 conditions for pedestrians, bicycles and all other modes.

3
4 This illustrates the locations at which we have no opportunity to do any modification to the
5 capacity of El Camino. The black segments as shown there are the high volume crossing
6 intersections at Arastradero, Page Mill, Embarcadero and Alma, locations where the capacity is
7 absolutely essential at its current level. The locations between offer some opportunities and we
8 have several alternatives on how to deal with potential lane reductions in those segments.

9
10 Summarizing then the traffic findings and projecting them into the future, we have done a very
11 careful job of forecasting future traffic in the corridor. As Steve mentioned, we are taking into
12 consideration the Comprehensive Plan build-out and approximately 20 years of projected growth
13 on El Camino when we make these findings. Those findings lead to the obvious conclusion that
14 travel will be slower but taking that slower moving traffic situation as a base we can make the
15 variety of changes that we are proposing, including signal coordination and the other adjustments
16 and not reduce the travel time to a lower level than it would otherwise be. In doing so we
17 provide considerable benefits to the variety of users of the corridor above and beyond the
18 automobile.

19
20 Next. This is the arrayed conclusion of the travel time analysis. You can see there the existing
21 typical travel time in the PM peak hour is presently a little over 12 minutes with project traffic
22 growth that will become approximately 14 minutes. If we perform signal improvements alone
23 we can improve that situation. We can maintain approximately current travel times through the
24 corridor. The additional derived benefit that you see in the middle two bars, that savings of
25 about two minutes, is approximately equal to the amount of time that would be added through
26 the four-lane narrowings along certain sections of the corridor. So the second from the right bar
27 reflects a modest reduction to four lanes and the bar on the extreme right is a longer extension of
28 the four lane segment. Each of them are within about five percent travel time of the trend
29 alternative, the second bar from the left.

30
31 Commissioner Burt: Could you clarify the difference between the third and the fourth bars
32 again?

33
34 Mr. Walters: Yes, in terms of travel time they are identical for all perceptible purposes. The left
35 most of those yellow bars reflects pure signal timing, the one to the right of it is signal timing
36 changes and performing narrowings to the individual traffic lanes without reducing the numbers
37 of lanes, changing the signals so that pedestrians have the adequate walking time provisions, etc.
38 So that set of steps, the context sensitivity built into the six-lane alternative does not reduce
39 travel times.

40
41 Mr. Erickson: Now we will actually get into the part of the presentation where you will see what
42 is that six lane alternative, what makes the one to the right a little bit different. So if we look at
43 an intersection today this is El Camino at El Camino Way and Los Robles. The average time to
44 cross the street is about 30 seconds. You can see that the narrow median that is out in the middle
45 of the street today at least does come up to the crosswalk so you can get out there as a pedestrian
46 and jump up on top of a four foot wide curb. No trees can be planted through this area because
47 that median is as narrow as it is. The space on the sidewalks themselves, you really see that
48 eight foot sidewalk and how little space that leaves for landscape. Again you see the width here

1 that is given up to pavement and that can really help encourage people to drive faster. Bicycles,
2 if they are on El Camino, need to fit here between parked cars and this outside travel lane.

3
4 So if we made the six lane improvements to the street what might that look like? We get bulb-
5 outs at the intersections. Even though we still have six lanes, by making the lanes narrower and
6 then taking the curb out approximately the width of the parking we reduce the crossing time to
7 27 seconds. We also can in changing the dimensions of the pieces of the street widen the median
8 and get an eight-foot area in the middle of the street where you can be protected as a pedestrian.
9 So here might be some kids walking to school in the morning and they wouldn't have to get all
10 the way across the street before they could be some place that is safer and protected. We get
11 more room for bus stops, more room for trees to be planted. That eight-foot wide median, after
12 much back and forth now through a pilot project with Caltrans, we can look at planting large
13 trees out in that eight-foot median. So now we can have trees coming out much closer to the
14 intersection. We can get a bike lane that goes all the way up and down El Camino. So those are
15 some of the basic benefits that you would get through redesigning the six lane street.

16
17 How did we do all that? The lanes today are 12 feet so we pick up some width by narrowing
18 those to 11 feet. All of these dimensions have been gone over and worked through with Caltrans
19 staff both from the district and from headquarters in Sacramento. So redesigning all of this lets
20 us widen the sidewalks a bit but not too much. Ten feet is still pretty narrow for a sidewalk for
21 the pedestrian activity we are going to see in some parts of the corridor but it does help the trees
22 be a little healthier. There is some coordination that is being worked out hopefully with the
23 design guidelines and the rezone in the area so as new development occurs to have a three foot
24 wide or a two foot wide, the details are still being worked out, but to get an easement so that
25 there can be a wider sidewalk over time where new development comes in.

26
27 As Jerry was pointing out and Virginia pointed out, there are these benefits to looking at places
28 where we can narrow the street. So we have gotten into quite a bit of detail of looking at what is
29 the context of the street, what is the activity trying to cross the street, where do these
30 opportunities exist where we don't need the six lanes to basically store cars to get through the
31 more congested intersections? So this Alternative A looks at four lane in that area that we were
32 just looking at, Los Robles is here, so narrowing to four lanes in this location but then widening
33 up again as we get to Arastradero. This starts to give us some tighter crossings, safer crossings at
34 some school crossing locations. So these yellow symbols are school crossings. Red is where
35 there is more retail activity, green is bicycles, then here around California coming up to Park and
36 getting a four-lane segment through there. You will see when you look at the final report and
37 can actually see this drawing a little better that we have also looked at what are five lane
38 sections. So we have gotten down to a detail level where we figured out given what is happening
39 with the traffic that is trying to get through California as it is moving away from Page Mill, we
40 really want to carry three lanes a little bit further in the northbound direction. But in the
41 southbound direction two lanes will work just fine. So we have this sort of hybrid of a five-lane
42 section and that still gives us pedestrian crossing benefits and a lot of those other things that the
43 four lane does.

44
45 What if we tried to do even more of that? Looking here in the second option extending the four
46 lanes up to this location, having more five-lane. Again this is Page Mill. So coming back from
47 Page Mill maintaining three lanes and then getting into a five-lane section, then at Matadero
48 going to four. Again extending some of this getting all the way down to the high school and

1 getting a five-lane section there. So there is a place where high school kids walking from
2 different neighborhoods will have a safer place to cross the street. These were played out
3 through the traffic analysis tool by Fehr & Peers. All of this work, developing these alternatives,
4 figuring out where we need three lanes, where we can have two lanes, was all played out through
5 an analysis using that tool and the 20-year traffic projections that Jerry was talking about. So we
6 have gone to a very high level of analysis figuring out that at smaller intersections, at certain
7 times of the day, it is actually the pedestrian crossing the street who is keeping traffic from
8 moving on El Camino. The cars that are trying to move off of that side street can get through the
9 intersection much faster. Narrow it to four lanes you can reduce the red time for traffic on El
10 Camino and that is a benefit. So we have looked at all of these things at a high level of detail.

11
12 What are the additional benefits then that we were looking at of going down to four lanes? Much
13 larger area for sidewalks, we get up to 17-foot wide sidewalks in the four lane areas. A much
14 wider center median, again, shortening this crossing distance and it now only takes 21.5 seconds
15 to cross the street with a nine-foot wide pedestrian refuge area, again, the continuous bike lanes.
16 So just getting a lot more room for these other activities to happen in the street that is the kind of
17 thing that we are getting from the four-lane, really changing the character, supporting what the
18 Comp Plan is saying the City would like to see here in terms of land use. Getting a sidewalk that
19 is really adequate for a mixed-use pedestrian oriented kind of place on El Camino Real. Again,
20 in section, this shows you how the different elements played out. So the 17-foot wide sidewalks
21 and a much wider center median.

22
23 So how does that look if we focus on the pedestrian experience trying to cross the street? Here
24 we are at Stanford Avenue today. We heard a lot about this intersection. There are a lot of
25 concerns both for bicyclists and for pedestrians crossing this intersection. You see here too the
26 kind of experience you get sometimes on El Camino where because the center median has been
27 held back you have to walk diagonally to get across the street. What are some things that we can
28 do to fix that? In a six lane configuration again the bulb-out is there so you can see our
29 pedestrian has a much shorter distance to cross and it can be a straight way to cross, that actually
30 cuts down the time a little bit more. Again that refuge out in the center of the street. So today
31 and what it could be with the six lane improvements. Then if we go to the four lane
32 improvements we are staying in the same place but the pedestrian is getting that much of a
33 shorter distance to cross the street. So you really can change the character of El Camino.

34
35 Again looking at starting to get into the implementation and phasing one of the things I will get
36 into a little bit more in a bit is the initial improvements but one of the things that is being talked
37 about as a consideration is should these four and five lane segments be tested. Is there still going
38 to be enough concern in the community? We have done a lot of traffic modeling. We have
39 looked at this carefully but let's test it. Let's build it out there in the corridor and see how it
40 works. So these are the areas that have the potential for the four and five lane improvements. So
41 these are candidates for where we might look to test. Then one of the things that we are
42 recommending is that when you build one of these test areas also take a part of the street that is
43 next to it that we know needs to be six lanes and make the permanent six lane improvements.
44 This way people will actually see some of those community character benefits. You can try your
45 hardest with these temporary improvements but it is still not going to have that look and feel of
46 the real improvements. So getting some of the six lane improvements in there early on. Clearly
47 you can't read this but just as an idea of how this flow chart works it is a decision tree of how
48 you can move forward to incrementally improve El Camino. I will talk in a little bit more detail

1 about Phase I in a second but there are some things that can start happening right away to
2 improve the street. Then there is this point of deciding does Palo Alto want to test these
3 improvements. Then you would go into the green boxes where you are looking for money. The
4 yellow boxes are where you are doing more design, working with the public more, getting down
5 to the real detail, doing the construction documents to go out and do what you want to do. The
6 blue is when you are doing construction. Then these orange places are where you are making
7 decisions. So you might decide to test, fund, design, build, analyze, decide what you want to
8 build, build the six-lane improvement, build the hybrid with the four or five or maybe you even
9 loop back and want to test some more. So we played out how that decision-making process can
10 move forward.

11
12 In Phase I we realized you can make a lot of these initial improvements. The initial
13 recommendations are to start looking at coordinating the signals so you can get that benefit in the
14 corridor. It helps both movement up and down the corridor and it can also help pedestrians and
15 bicyclists crossing the street. Do a detailed survey of the street. This is something that comes up
16 on all of these old streets. Just exactly where is that curb? Exactly where is that PC utility?
17 Caltrans has as built somewhere in their basement but even once we find those there is going to
18 need to be some more detailed look at really getting a very detailed understanding of what is
19 there today. We are going to need that to do construction documents later. Do the initial
20 environmental reviews so you can do a restriping. So you would actually create a plan to
21 restripe, to narrow from the 12-foot lanes to the 11-foot lanes, get the bicycle lane in there.
22 There is an opportunity to maybe look at one or two intersections and make some of the
23 intersection improvements at a couple of locations. Again, probably look to where we expect it
24 to be six lanes no matter what decisions you make later so that people can again see some
25 positive physical change. Here you see sort of independent of working on these details of the
26 street we have also been looking at where more trees can be planted. So you can start doing
27 some planting of trees in the medians now and there are other things you can do to help some of
28 your existing trees. Again, this idea of while all of this is going on work at this issue of do you
29 want to field test, where do you want to field test and begin preparing for Phase II where you can
30 get into that.

31
32 We have looked at the costs. How much is it going to cost to do this? It is interesting when you
33 look at the full build-out. The key finding is six lane, four lane and six lane, some more four
34 lane and less six lane, the costs are really quite similar. It is basically because you are moving
35 curbs around, you are changing asphalt, changing landscape. It really ends up being a fairly
36 similar cost. So building out the entire corridor in a six lane or a four lane is around \$30 million.
37 Those are the capital costs of building the street. You do need to do more design work,
38 environmental work, getting out there in the community and really working with people to figure
39 out those details and that is the range of about \$2.5 million for the entire corridor. So that gets
40 you up to about \$32 to \$33 million. Then for this level of planning and even when you are down
41 to doing construction documents and you are ready to put it out to bid you always have a
42 contingency in place because things can come up on an older road. We again are at a level of
43 planning and design detail where the contingency is relatively large and conservative. We want
44 to play it safe, so 30% contingency. As a total, that gets us up to about \$41 to \$42.5 million to
45 build-out the entire thing.

46
47 What about getting started? What if you wanted to do the restriping, the signal retiming and
48 construct a model crosswalk? Well that including the soft costs and the 30% contingency is in

1 the range of about \$1.5 million. That is something that again can get you some immediate
2 improvement and start to really show the community that you can change El Camino. I think
3 that is one of the issues here, that it seems so scary, it is so big, can we really change it? Well,
4 you can start making some positive changes relatively cheaply.
5

6 The four and five lane options, the idea of doing a field test, we have thought about this a lot.
7 There aren't a lot of examples of field-testing. It is usually something that you see more often
8 done with traffic calming. In a lot of communities that is done with those temporary plastic
9 tubes that get stuck to the ground or just knobs and paint simulating where the curbs would be in
10 the future with these bright orange or bright yellow vertical objects. We were really concerned
11 that if you did something like that it would just be so shocking and disconcerting that it really
12 wouldn't show people the positive aspects. So these two costs that you see here represent the
13 idea that what you would do is you would actually go out there, you would design it to a high
14 level of detail and you would lay concrete curbs out there. You would do concrete handicap
15 ramps. But rather than have concrete behind that, do it as a temporary improvement layer in
16 asphalt, allow your drainage system to work through that. You would end up probably having
17 some new landscaping that you could bring in in pots or trees in boxes that could either become
18 the permanent tree that would be installed when you did the final improvement or by selecting
19 the right kind of species it could be something that you could use on another street in Palo Alto.
20 So we want to come up with a way of simulating the temporary improvements so that they feel
21 and look more real. Again, that is the idea of building a piece of the six lane at the same time
22 because then people can really go out there and sort of kick the tires on the new street, street
23 lights, street trees, all of those kinds of changes would be there as they would be permanently.
24 Then people can think that's what that piece of four or five lane street could really look like. So
25 simulating and showing people in detail what it could look like. So again, go out stand by the
26 road today and it is really quite daunting here at California even where you do have a lot of
27 pedestrian activity today. It could be something much better in the future and that is the
28 recommendations that are before you today. Thanks.
29

30 Commissioner Griffin: Thank you for the presentation. Unless Commissioners have an
31 questions immediately for Staff or the consultants I would like to open the public comment
32 section here if we have some cards. Great.
33

34 Again we have Tony Carrasco, I think this is the topic you were interested in commenting on,
35 Tony, to be followed by Paul Goldstein and Kirsten Luehns.
36

37 Mr. Carrasco: Chairman Griffin, members of the Planning Commission. Commissioners I think
38 this is a really beautiful vision. Unfortunately it is going to take us on the order of \$150 million I
39 think to do this project. Commissioner Bellomo knows that the two parking structures that are
40 not even one hundredth of this size cost \$70 million. That puts us probably 25 years away from
41 achieving such a dream as beautiful as it is. The state has a \$34 billion deficit. The City is
42 trying to cut back \$5 million this year and is having a horrendously hard time cutting services.
43

44 Some of us have been thinking about the street for over 20 years. Over 20 years ago Ken
45 Artunian and I sat down while I was a Staff member in this City and asked what would make this
46 street look much, much nicer. The conclusion that we came to at that time and we continue to
47 feel at this point after doing study after study is that shade trees in the median of this street would

1 be a huge benefit. So while we search for the ideal let us not forget the good that we could
2 accomplish in the short time.

3
4 In the past it has been difficult to plant trees in the median because it was a narrow median and
5 Caltrans owns it. Joe Simitian and Byron Sher have come to the Caltrans Director and asked him
6 to relax that standard and has allowed us to come down to an eight foot median with shade trees.
7 I urge you to go in that direction and allow us to plant them now.

8
9 To change to my Chamber of Commerce hat, if you actually go to page 5.13 both those cross-
10 sections don't allow median trees when you get a turn lane and that is devastating to the
11 appearance of this street. I don't think you should follow either of those cross-sections. Putting
12 a Chamber of Commerce hat on both those cross-sections remove parking and that is not
13 acceptable to retail businesses along that street.

14
15 So give the cost and given that we want to do something in the short term hopefully before I
16 leave this earth and transport to the universe we are able to shade this street well with street trees
17 in the median and in the sidewalks immediately. Betty Meltzer is going to speak about trees for
18 El Camino. We have already started collecting money for these trees and we would like to do it
19 now. So I suggest that the Commission recommends to the City Council that we plant trees in all
20 the medians including increasing the size of the five-foot medians to eight feet so that we can
21 plant those trees. Thank you.

22
23 Commissioner Griffin: Tony, I am wondering if I can ask you for a little more information here.
24 Now your group is trying to raise money for the tree planting process. Are you asking for
25 matching funds from the City or is there some sort of a co-payment arrangement that you are
26 working with?

27
28 Mr. Carrasco: Chairman Griffin I would rather defer that question to either Betty or Susan
29 Rosenberg who will address that question.

30
31 Commissioner Burt: Tony, if I understood you correctly you alluded to an expense of \$150
32 million for this project.

33
34 Mr. Carrasco: That is my guess at what this is going to be.

35
36 Commissioner Burt: We had seen numbers up by the consultants of \$30 million something plus
37 contingency. Are you referring to the same scale of project as they were there?

38
39 Mr. Carrasco: Yes.

40
41 Commissioner Burt: So you are saying what they said was \$32 million is going to cost \$150
42 million?

43
44 Mr. Carrasco: Probably off by a factor of four.

45
46 Commissioner Burt: What basis are you saying that?

1 Mr. Carrasco: Just past experience on buildings. We are building two buildings in East Palo
2 Alto they are \$120 million. These are on a quarter of a city block. Our two parking structures
3 cost \$70 million.

4
5 Commissioner Burt: I guess I just don't follow how a parking structure or an office building
6 compares to a street improvement. I can't follow that.

7
8 Mr. Carrasco: There is block of parking structures and this is four miles of street. On our
9 project that we are working on now in East Palo Alto we are looking at one block and that comes
10 to about half a million dollars just for that one block.

11
12 Commissioner Burt: Okay, thank you.

13
14 Commissioner Griffin: Our next speaker is Paul Goldstein. Welcome, Paul.

15
16 Mr. Paul Goldstein, 1024 Emerson, Palo Alto: Thank you Chairman Griffin and members of the
17 Planning Commission. I have been on the Citizen's Advisory Committee to this project and
18 have been working with them. I am on the Palo Alto Bicycle Advisory Committee. As a
19 bicyclist why should I even care about El Camino? Many of you who know me know I love to
20 ride and I go riding in the hills. Why would anybody want to ride on El Camino? The reason I
21 ride my bicycle on El Camino is the same reasons that you drive there because sometimes it is
22 the best way and the fastest way for me to get from where I am to where I want to go. Just the
23 other day I needed to get Chinese food, take-out, from my house and El Camino was virtually the
24 only way I was able to go without a lot of detours and riding on sidewalks and things that I don't
25 want to do.

26
27 As you see in the Staff Report bicycle counts have shown there are over 100 bicyclists a day who
28 use the street. I am strongly in favor of bicycle lanes on the street. You note in all of the
29 recommendations before you including the low cost first phase of the project include bicycle
30 lanes the entire length of the street. We can install bicycle lanes without reducing the number of
31 lanes although we do have to narrow them down to 11 feet. The width of the lanes needs to be
32 narrowed down to 11, which our consultants say is perfectly acceptable.

33
34 So why bike lanes? Bike lanes do several things. They provide a designated place on the
35 roadway for bicycles. They signal to drivers that bicycles can be there. They signal not only to
36 drivers when they are driving but also when they are parking their cars and opening their doors
37 that there could be a bicycle in the bike lane. They also provide designation at intersections to
38 the left of a right turn lane of where a bicycle should position itself. Often this is one of the most
39 difficult maneuvers on a bicycle. You want to be on the right-hand side of the road but in
40 approaching an intersection you don't want to be so far to the right that you are cutoff by a right
41 turning vehicle. Bicycle lanes generally become pockets to the left of a right-hand turn lane at
42 these intersections.

43
44 The other thing I just want to say as a member of the Committee and seeing this project evolve,
45 the benefits of option number two I feel are very great and I feel they are worth considering. I
46 understand the costs are high but as an integrated package we can start doing it with the signal
47 timing, the six lane option, putting those things down and seeing how things work out. If we just
48 started piece-meal and say let's just plant trees we may find ourselves in a situation where we

1 have an opportunity later to widen the median a little further and we have sort of cut it out by not
2 proceeding in a more planful manner. So I think that the first phase of this project is relatively
3 low cost and gives us an opportunity to explore the very great community benefits of the full
4 bore project. Thank you.

5
6 Commissioner Cassel: Paul, I have a question. In some spots in some proposals they talk about
7 a 4.5 width instead of a five-foot wide lane. Do you feel comfortable in a 4.5-foot lane or is it
8 just better to have anything that is marked “lane?”

9
10 Mr. Goldstein: It is not better to have anything that is marked “lane.” A 4.5 is getting narrow,
11 five foot is more acceptable. I would say it is probably better to maintain the lane at that point
12 than to just drop it but a 4.5 lane is getting pretty narrow when there are parked cars there. If
13 there are no parked cars there it is not too bad. The problem in the lane width is the drivers
14 opening doors without looking.

15
16 Commissioner Griffin: Thank you, Paul. Kirsten Luehns.

17
18 Ms. Kirsten Luehns, 231 Stanford Avenue, Palo Alto: I wanted to just say that I would really
19 like you to lend as much support to this project as you possibly can. There are two points that I
20 wanted to make. The first is that El Camino is a primary entryway into our City for a lot of
21 people. It is a primary thing to see for outsiders and ourselves to potentially enjoy and it is a
22 great opportunity to improve that gateway.

23
24 The second point is a little bit more personal with being on Stanford Avenue and being part of
25 Evergreen Park neighborhood. Our neighborhood school is on the other side of El Camino. I
26 have three little girls who are about to enter elementary school, one of whom attends Bing. My
27 husband works at Stanford and rides his bike across El Camino. As a family we do 15 to 20 trips
28 across El Camino each week and it is very important to me not only just in concept but as a
29 mother and a safety issue crossing that street is a big deal for me. I would like to see safety
30 improvements. It is not just a beautification project. That is really the point I wanted to make.
31 Thank you.

32
33 Commissioner Griffin: Thank you for your comments, Kirsten. Our next speaker is Sanford
34 Furte to be followed by Sukie Stanley and followed by Susan Rosenberg.

35
36 Mr. Sanford Furte, 280 College Avenue, Palo Alto: I would like to recommend that the
37 Committee at least consider some of the improvements that were suggested by the consultants.
38 El Camino is, to be blunt, a dangerous and dirty thoroughfare. Something needs to be done
39 essentially about the danger factor. Kirsten just spoke of the concern that parents have. My
40 daughter attended Escondido School and I was frightened every day near the end of her stay
41 there when she was in the fifth grade and taking the crosswalk crossing over at Stanford. Many
42 times I went with her to begin with and it is just really frighteningly dangerous. I, myself, cross
43 at the College Avenue intersection every day either to walk to JJ&F, I know several dozen
44 neighborhood individuals from both sides of College Avenue that cross at College and El
45 Camino. Cars, as the consultants indicated, are spiking their speed between lights because they
46 are trying to make lights. There is good evidence for instance to show that a crosswalk like the
47 crosswalk at College and El Camino are actually more dangerous than having no crosswalk at all
48 because citizens make the assumption they are safe in those crosswalks but cars don't see them.

1 So I sense that narrowing the lanes, putting in bike lanes, as a beginner at least and possibly
2 some greenery would create a perception of calming. It would give the driver in the car less of a
3 sense that he or she has a thoroughfare to speed up on. I think it would do something to at least
4 ameliorate those speeds between lights as a beginning and make the thoroughfare safer. The last
5 thing I would like to say is that even though the Planning Commission doesn't address this
6 directly, traffic enforcement on El Camino is virtually nonexistent. It just does not happen. I
7 have personally in fact seen Palo Alto police officers sitting, and by the way this is with due
8 respect to the police department here because they do a wonderful job, they have better things to
9 do than sit on El Camino all day. I have watched patrol cars view vehicles coming at me in a
10 crosswalk and literally driving right by me standing in the middle of the road as well as others
11 and nothing is done. So this is something else that needs to be addressed. It is not a Planning
12 Commission issue but it should be mentioned. Thank you very much.
13

14 Commissioner Griffin: Thank you. Now Sukie Stanley followed by Susan Rosenberg followed
15 by Bob Moss. Sukie, welcome.
16

17 Ms. Sukie Stanley, 253 Oxford Avenue, Palo Alto: Thank you very much and good evening. I
18 just wanted to say thank you to the City for entertaining this whole concept. I think it is a
19 remarkable opportunity. I am a resident of Evergreen Park as well and am very enthusiastic. I
20 also appreciate the concern that the City is taking to recognize the dangers of potential cut-
21 through traffic and acknowledging that and working on measures to prohibit that are much
22 appreciated by us in Evergreen Park. So thank you for this fine work.
23

24 Commissioner Griffin: Thank you for your comments. Susan Rosenberg.
25

26 Ms. Susan Rosenberg, 1425 Stanford Avenue, Palo Alto: Hi. I am Co-Chairing the Trees for El
27 Camino Project with Betty Meltzer. Just to answer your question the City has in the budget
28 already \$1.5 million to plant trees, to replace infrastructure which is replace the soil, replace the
29 trees in the medians along El Camino Real. What this organization is doing is going to the
30 community to raise more money so that even more trees can be planted on El Camino Real.
31

32 I would just like to say that something really is happening on El Camino Real. Now the City's
33 landscape architect is drawing up plans and in the fall they will begin planting hundreds of shade
34 trees in the medians. We are thrilled, Betty Meltzer and my Board are thrilled with this
35 upcoming planting. And despite these challenging economic times we continue to fundraise.
36 Let me tell you it is a challenge right now. Turning El Camino Real into a tree-lined boulevard
37 will have a profound effect on the neighborhoods and the businesses adjacent to El Camino Real.
38 It is much like what happened to University Avenue once the rows of London Plain Trees were
39 planted in the mid-1980s. Anyway, I just want to say that planting trees along the streets in Palo
40 Alto it is the Palo Alto thing to do, it has been done continually since the 1800s.
41

42 I am also a resident of College Terrace and a member of the El Camino Real Advisory
43 Committee working with Phil and Virginia, which was a really wonderful experience. I am
44 really grateful for that. I joined that Committee with the hope that innovative ideas would be
45 generated because Palo Alto has historically had a long history of implementing innovation and
46 this is a very short list but the fact that Palo Alto owns its own utility is a rarity in this state. The
47 fact the Palo Alto has neighborhood libraries all over, that it had bike lanes long before bike
48 lanes were required in cities. Palo Alto really has done a lot of innovative things. I think that the

1 plans presented by the Planning Department tonight were done with an eye to the future. I am
2 really delighted with what has come from their year and one-half of work and I have no doubt
3 that it will make my neighborhood and my community a better place to live. Thank you.
4

5 Commissioner Bellomo: I have one question for you.
6

7 Commissioner Griffin: Certainly.
8

9 Commissioner Bellomo: Is there a concern about the planting of these new trees with the
10 execution of future work along the median and how that might affect the planting in the fall?
11

12 Ms. Rosenberg: I am not quite sure. Say it again.
13

14 Commissioner Bellomo: How does it work in coordination with the bigger picture, the
15 protection of the root balls as curbs are undone as medians might be redone? This might be a
16 question for the engineering folks.
17

18 Ms. Rosenberg: Where the plantings will take place in the fall are in medians that meet these
19 eight-foot wide guidelines by Caltrans. So that won't change. Correct me if I have made a
20 mistake here but I think where trees will be planted in the fall that won't change. Those will be
21 there permanently.
22

23 Commissioner Griffin: Does Staff wish to elaborate on that at all?
24

25 Mr. Emslie: In light of being coordinated, putting trees in the median is the place you want to do
26 it. The centerline of the street is not going to change. It is the perimeters that are going to
27 change for the most part. So you can coordinate better on median trees than you can on the
28 perimeter side trees.
29

30 Commissioner Bellomo: In all respect we are talking construction and we are talking curb work,
31 backhoes. I just want to reiterate that I am just questioning the implementation of the planting of
32 trees and then construction that might come at a later time.
33

34 Mr. Erickson: There has been a lot of coordination on this issue. Just to be really clear we are
35 looking to the locations where there isn't the narrow median, not even the eight. We are looking
36 at places where even today under their current standards if we hadn't been able to get through
37 Joe Simitian this ability to look at narrow medians still the places we are looking at going in the
38 fall are locations where Caltrans basically won't bat an eye and you can go out and plant. There
39 is always the chance for a contractor getting over zealous but they are in locations where if they
40 did get over zealous and do something to them they would clearly be at fault. We may be
41 moving curbs around near the trees later but it is far enough away where that really shouldn't be
42 an issue.
43

44 Commissioner Griffin: All right. Bob Moss, please.
45

46 Mr. Bob Moss, 4010 Orme, Palo Alto: Thank you Chairman Griffin and Commissioners. I
47 certainly support the overall concept of improving El Camino. I have been a big fan of cleaning
48 it up for decades. I was glad to hear Tony remind us about the effort that was made more than 20

1 years ago when Ken Artunian had a really great plan for landscaping which Caltrans shot down
2 because they wouldn't allow the kind of tree planting you need in the medians and along the
3 sidewalks. So I would certainly urge that you go forward with the first phase which is to narrow
4 the lanes, put in the bike lanes, do the upgrading in the sections which are going to be six lanes
5 regardless of what option is picked and do the landscaping specifically in the medians and any
6 sidewalk areas where you are going to have six lanes and stay six lanes. The mere fact of
7 widening the medians and narrowing the lanes and putting in landscaping is going to reduce
8 traffic speeds. So that alone will have a benefit. Then of course the other thing that is a no
9 brainer is doing the signal overall functionality improvements where everything flows together
10 instead of having to start and stop, start and stop, start and stop. So those things just go ahead
11 and do them, you don't have to even think about it.

12
13 The areas where you do have to do some thinking about the details are obviously the narrowing
14 from six lanes to four and five. I certainly agree with the recommendation that you try it first
15 before you buy it. I am very skeptical that it is going to work in some areas. Maybell is only
16 about 700 feet from Charleston and that is not far enough away that you normally would need
17 from a heavily traveled intersection. Some of the other sections, for example from Los Robles to
18 Matadero especially in the southbound direction, on the west side of the street, traffic in the curb
19 lane is turbulent flow not smooth flow because you have people pulling in and out of the various
20 stores and restaurants and fast food places. If you look at the section between Matadero and Los
21 Robles you have people going in and out of Ernie's Liquors, out of the Taco Bell, out of Happy
22 Donuts and in and out of the shopping center where Blockbuster is. That is not the same as you
23 would have in an area say from Los Robles to Maybell where all you have is residential and
24 there is no traffic to speak of for shopping. So it is not the same. The traffic flows are not the
25 same and the parking in particular you have to be very careful about taking out parking spaces.
26 Some of the plans we saw early on had parking spaces removed from most of El Camino
27 between Los Robles and Matadero. Especially on the east side of the street that would be fatal to
28 the businesses there because they don't have any accessible parking for the businesses. They
29 depend on people parking on the street. So that has to be done very carefully. That having been
30 said, I think there is no problem with trying it out and seeing if it works. If it doesn't work then
31 just tearing it out and you would still be able to have adequate space along there.

32
33 One of the things I found kind of amusing is talking about 17 foot sidewalks so that people will
34 promenade along there. Nobody is going to promenade along El Camino basically from Maybell
35 to Curtner. There is nothing there to promenade to. If you look at the section from El Camino
36 Way and Los Robles to Curtner there are ten businesses, six of which are automotive related. So
37 anybody who is going there is going to be driving regardless. Outside of the two restaurants and
38 the Hollywood Video and there is a copy shop that nobody is going to walk to, people are going
39 to drive to. So there aren't any pedestrian oriented operations in that area. There are if you go a
40 little bit farther north. So it is kind of a mixed bag. I would say certainly go for the first phase.
41 Thank you.

42
43 Commissioner Griffin: Thank you, Bob. Build it and they will come perhaps. Could we hear
44 from Kirsten Flynn followed by Joy Ogawa and Irvin Dawid? Kirsten.

45
46 Ms. Kirsten Flynn, 471 Matadero Avenue, Palo Alto: Hi. Thank you for listening, members of
47 the Planning Commission. I live in the Ventura neighborhood of Palo Alto. This has been a
48 very detailed presentation. I think you all have enough paper and details that you will have to

1 peruse to get the details so I would like to step back a little bit and look at the bigger issues as I
2 see them.

3
4 I heard on the radio this morning, and this might be a bit of a tangent, that the current generation
5 of children might be the first generation of Americans to live shorter than their parents. The
6 reason for that is lack of physical activity. That all of the diseases associated with that are
7 shortening the life span of the current generation.

8
9 I walk on El Camino pretty much every day. I bicycle across El Camino certainly every week
10 depending on the weather. I feel that I should do so to teach my children that that's a valid way
11 of getting around and for their health so they have some physical activity in their life. Especially
12 with the school budget cuts we might have no P.E. whatsoever. However, I do feel unsafe every
13 time I let my children close to El Camino. I envision in my head all the time the terrifying
14 accident that could occur. I do have a car and I use it around El Camino and in my
15 neighborhood. So I would be one of those people also slowing down if it is true that all of these
16 great minds' best estimates are incorrect and the traffic would be slowed. However, there are
17 many in my neighborhood who rent in Ventura who do not have that choice, who walk with their
18 families across El Camino to get to elementary school and starting this fall they will have to
19 cross El Camino to get to middle school as will my eldest son.

20
21 I don't need to tell any Palo Alto resident what the effects of a car-bicycle collision are. I think it
22 gave every bicyclist pause a little what happened recently. I think we have to look at the bigger
23 picture. The Comprehensive Plan says that we should encourage alternative transportation. I
24 don't think we are going to get out of our traffic woes by building excess car capacity, because if
25 you build that they certainly will come. These consultants have staked their reputation on the
26 fact that these plans will accommodate present and future traffic. Morally I think we should
27 encourage foot and bicycle exercise for our children and I think we owe it to our citizens to make
28 it safe. So my main concern with El Camino is safety. I believe that the safest plans that you
29 have available are enacting further than the Phase I improvements to El Camino. So I would
30 encourage you to support those as much as you can. Thank you very much for your time.

31
32 Commissioner Griffin: Thank you for your comments. Joy Ogawa.

33
34 Ms. Joy Ogawa, 2305 Yale Street, Palo Alto: Good evening. I am turning in a copy of my
35 comments as recorded in the minutes of the November 19 Study Session. That is because my
36 experience has shown that the CMR that the Council receives often does not include minutes of
37 prior Planning Commission meetings at which the item was discussed.

38
39 I strongly dispute the Staff's claim and the consultant's claim that six travel lanes are not needed
40 between Park Boulevard, Stanford Avenue and California Avenue. I reiterate from my previous
41 comments that reducing the number of lanes in this section will increase the amount of cut-
42 through traffic on my street in College Terrace. I also do not want to see the City waste money
43 by pursuing option two which includes the reduction in lane numbers. We should not be wasting
44 money and Staff time on environmental assessment of an option that likely will not get enough
45 public support to implement. Please be realistic. Pursue option one and don't waste City
46 resources pursuing option two.

1 The opponents to the lane reduction plan may not be here tonight but you can be sure that they
2 will begin to speak out loudly, very vocally, once it becomes widely known that the City is about
3 to spend \$500,000 to \$1.0 million to field test lane reductions in each of two sections of El
4 Camino. That means \$1.0 to \$2.0 million total for field tests.
5

6 I realize the Planning Commission recommended field tests in the Study Session and may not be
7 considering cost implications. I am sure that City Council will carefully consider these costs
8 when making Council's decision. I hope the Council will realize the recklessness of spending
9 \$1.0 to \$2.0 million of our City's limited dollars on what I am sure will be a controversial and
10 unpopular field test.
11

12 I heard the consultants mention Cambridge Avenue intersection as a high incident of bicycle and
13 pedestrian accidents. I don't believe this is a reflection of how unsafe that intersection is. I
14 believe the reason for accidents is because many pedestrians and bicyclists choose to cross at
15 Cambridge instead of Stanford or California Avenue because it is generally perceived that
16 Cambridge is a safer intersection. So I really just think it is a frequency thing.
17

18 I also want to point out that there frequently are double-parked vehicles along this section of El
19 Camino. Especially UPS and FedEx truck but some people are double-parked to drop off
20 laundry at the laundry mat. So if you reduce the number of lanes you could actually be
21 effectively reducing the number of lanes on El Camino in each direction to one lane when you
22 have double-parked vehicles. Maybe it is illegal to double-park but that doesn't keep these
23 vehicles from double-parking. I have been stuck behind them in the past and in traffic so bad
24 that I could not get around them. I basically had to wait until the driver came back in order to get
25 going because I could not shift into the other lane. So the consultants make it sound so hunky-
26 dory I really don't think it is going to be. I don't think that we can afford the money to field test
27 it at this point. Please, just go with option one. Let's try the light synchronization and see how
28 well it works. Let's do that, okay? Thanks.
29

30 Commissioner Griffin: Thank you, Joy. Our next speaker is Irvin Dawid. I want to express my
31 appreciation Irvin for your clever use of nametag here. That is quite beneficial.
32

33 Mr. Dawid: Thank you. As a Downtown resident I don't find myself along El Camino Real all
34 that often in Mid and South Palo Alto. However, if the road was changed to a boulevard as
35 depicted by those attractive simulations I believe that I would frequent Mid and South Palo Alto
36 far more often. Before moving Downtown I lived in Barron Park for seven years. I commuted
37 to North Palo Alto via bus 22 which I caught on El Camino Real just north of Los Robles. It
38 really would have been very, very attractive if I could have crossed El Camino at that
39 intersection the way it was depicted.
40

41 I did want to say one thing that I think the Planning and Transportation Commission should
42 consider and that is a demographic issue. Speaking of the Curtner-Ventura area it is a
43 completely different demographics than basically your white affluent person that we often think
44 of in Palo Alto. This is probably one of our census tracts that is the lowest income, that is most
45 racially diverse, that probably has the least amount of cars that are owned, highest amount of
46 renters. These are you population that is more likely to walk simply out of economic necessity.
47 I think the idea of wide sidewalks in this area is absolutely fundamental. So I am very, very
48 supportive of it. I very much like the idea of the lane reductions. In fact the way the consultants

1 indicated, the way they summed it up at the end with that order of preference, ped, cyclist, transit
2 and cars I think this is a shoe-in for a Transportation for Livable Communities grant or TLC
3 grant, which the City is quite familiar with. The City won one for the Homer Street underpass.
4 East Palo Alto just won one as well. So I think the money will be here. Obviously it does
5 require a match but I think this is an excellent project.
6

7 With that in mind I really think that the City needs to start and you as Planning and
8 Transportation Commissioners really need to start thinking now about the land use along El
9 Camino Real. It wasn't that long ago when one of the residential projects at El Camino and Page
10 Mill went in, it was a Planned Community, and Planning Staff recommended that the public
11 benefit be the giving up of one lane width along Page Mill Road so it would be widened at the
12 appropriate time. What we should be looking at are major improvements for what is going to be
13 a bus rapid transit system along El Camino Real. For bus rapid transit to work we also need
14 higher density land use and most importantly we need the correct pedestrian and transit design of
15 those projects. So I see this as a land use project as much as I do a transportation project. I very
16 much urge you to go forward with this and really to think of this as a livability type of project.
17

18 Finally, I just want to say one thing. I keep thinking back. I was a visitor at one of my classes.
19 Generally in traffic calming exercises or projects the real issue is who gets to vote and it is
20 always the residents of the area. We don't put a poll out on the cut-through traffic or on the
21 traffic and say what do you think about going from six lanes to four lanes or whatever. Those
22 aren't the people that are polled. It is the people that live there. This is their neighborhood and
23 that is what we really need to keep in mind in terms of this project. Thank you.
24

25 Commissioner Griffin: Thank you, Irvin. Our next to last speaker is Douglas Moran.
26

27 Mr. Douglas B. Moran, 790 Matadero Avenue, Palo Alto: Hello. I live in the Barron Park area
28 and I am speaking with multiple hats. I am a member of the Citizens Advisory Group for the
29 project. I am President of Barron Park Neighborhood Association and I am a heavy user of El
30 Camino. For 12 years I commuted by auto along it and I commuted by bicycle parallel to it so I
31 had to cross it. Every now and then I am foolish enough to be a pedestrian along it. So coming
32 on to the Advisory Committee I knew that there was a lot of inefficiency there but going and
33 standing on the street and looking at this made me realize just how badly engineered and how
34 badly utilized this street is. You can stand at Matadero and you can see from Page Mill to Los
35 Robles and there is no car there because the platoons are being held up at both times. This is one
36 of the things that convinced me that doing the reduction in the number of lanes is possible. I
37 really want the experiment. In my neighborhood a lot of people are very skeptical of it. Part of
38 that skepticism is because they don't see the business along El Camino improving quickly. They
39 see it will eventually come, yes, yes, maybe in my lifetime but probably not. Whereas any
40 changes in the traffic will happen immediately and affect them. El Camino is their way to get to
41 where there actually is usable retail. So the experiment is critical in terms of doing things.
42 Doing the Phase I where you show the increase in efficiency and you show how things will
43 change is important for showing these people that the experiment is possible or reasonable in
44 evaluating at the end of the improvement of the signalization and the crossing.
45

46 The part that hasn't been talked about is improving the crossing so that people can actually
47 experiment with the pedestrian aspects. Bicycling across that street is scary. I never make it all
48 the way on the light. I have to look at the cars in the last lane to make sure I am going there. As

1 a pedestrian I cross, I avoid the signalized intersections. It is easier, safer and faster to go to the
2 other intersections. I get to cross where there is an island where I can stop. There is a big gap in
3 cars to get across. I don't have to fight with left and right turning cars that are trying to get
4 through the light. So it makes life easier and that is why I see a lot of advantages to going down
5 to two lanes for the speed. When we talk about narrowing the lanes, remember, our lanes now
6 are very wide. If you go out with cars there are humongous gaps. It is like freeway out there.
7 So you can narrow, you can get some visual narrowing to cut down the speed and give the room
8 to do the other things. Although I am a bicyclist I don't like the idea of encouraging people to
9 commute long distances along El Camino but they are going to do it. Right now the occasional
10 person bicycling there has a lot of friction with cars. Providing a bike lane will provide a lot of
11 safety. It also provides safety for the people who have to commute the short distance as was
12 noted. In addition for the people who are parking cars it gives a nice big cushion for people
13 getting in and out of their cars from all that traffic zipping by. So I think there are a lot of
14 benefits to the changing of the lanes. For trees, you look at visual narrowing. Take a look at the
15 picture from El Camino at Los Robles up. You just see a massive space. Putting in the trees will
16 help a lot there. So there are a lot of advantages to this. Yes, there are unintended side effects
17 that we are sure are going to pop up and we really endorse the step and evaluate, step and
18 evaluate approach of this thing. Thank you very much.

19
20 Commissioner Burt: Doug, what comparative value do you place on sidewalk widening on the
21 Barron Park side of El Camino and in your zone?

22
23 Mr. Moran: We got a lot of complaints from people that the sidewalk is often blocked by illegal
24 A-frames that merchants put out so their stores can be seen by the speeding traffic going by. So
25 adding a little more width would be a big benefit so that people could walk. People right now
26 drive to El Camino from Barron Park because the sidewalks and the entryways are just too
27 daunting to them.

28
29 Commissioner Burt: One other question. This perspective lane reduction in the area that is
30 proposed around the greater El Camino Way area shall we call it, to what extent do you and folks
31 in your neighborhood envision this as helping to create a stronger pedestrian oriented community
32 there as was envisioned in the Comp Plan? Do you see this as potentially being a major
33 component to that or not?

34
35 Mr. Moran: I can speak partially for the Board. I cannot speak for the community. There is just
36 a whole torrent of different views on that. There is a lot of fatalism about it ever happening. A
37 lot of people think, yes, if they could cross the street and there was more room there it could
38 attract in better retailing establishments. It could cause that because there is a large number of
39 people that go long distances. But it is a matter of we have a number of landlords that are
40 absentee so there have been all kinds of, we are used to development problems, but if it is not
41 this way it is not going to happen would be my assessment.

42
43 Commissioner Griffin: Thank you, Doug. Our last speaker is Betty Meltzer.

44
45 Ms. Betty Meltzer, 1241 Dana, Palo Alto: Hi. I wasn't going to speak tonight. Susan
46 Rosenberg as my Co-Chair pretty well described our position as the Trees for El Camino Project.
47 As I sat here and listened to the divergence of opinion between Joy's stated thoughts and
48 concerns and Doug's stated thoughts and concerns I thought it really is very important for the

1 record to reiterate that we represent, we being the Trees for El Camino Project represent, a non-
2 profit organization that is not involved in whether it is four lanes, five lanes or six lanes. We are
3 simply going to the community to raise money for the purchase of trees. Trees will be planted
4 irrespective of what the laning ultimately ends up being. It is very important for us to be
5 regarded by the community as a separate non-profit organization and that's it. We are going out
6 to the community and asking for community support just for the purchase of trees and that's all.
7 So for the record I felt it was really important to reiterate that. We basically started the whole
8 focus on trees, which has come a distance to say the least. But we just don't want those trees
9 forgotten. Thank you.

10
11 Commissioner Griffin: Betty, I have a question for you. How soon are you prepared to start
12 funding this process? When could you start digging? I know that you are not going to do the
13 digging but when will your funds be available?

14
15 Ms. Meltzer: We are in the process of raising money now. As Susan pointed out it is a tough
16 job in this economy to get people to think terms of large amounts for trees. However, we already
17 did give the City \$20,000. At our kickoff event we gave the City a check for \$20,000. If the
18 community participates with us and we are certainly working very hard in that direction we will
19 be getting more money. We will fund as many trees as we can. It comes right down to that kind
20 of relationship. Part of the reason that I came up tonight even though Susan basically said quite
21 eloquently what we wanted say was that I don't want there to be confusion about this project and
22 all the various opinions that are going to be expressed about the lanes.

23
24 Commissioner Griffin: You did make that point well, thank you.

25
26 Ms. Meltzer: Thank you.

27
28 Commissioner Griffin: Karen.

29
30 Commissioner Holman: Betty, I have a question for you and it is kind of a coordinated question
31 with Staff. What size trees are you anticipating starting with and how does that compare with the
32 size trees that City Staff is anticipating starting with and a kind of a cost per tree?

33
34 Ms. Meltzer: If I hear your question correctly we are raising the money for the trees, however,
35 we are giving it to the City and then they are doing the planting. We are not doing the planting.
36 The tree size therefore will be determined by the City Arborist and people who are working on
37 the plan. We are not making that choice, we the Trees for El Camino Project, we are simply
38 raising money.

39
40 Commissioner Holman: I had an anticipation though that you are out to raise a specific amount
41 of money so there has to be a basis for the amount of money that you are going to go raise. So
42 maybe I should direct the question to Staff later.

43
44 Ms. Meltzer: Yes, I think that would be better.

45
46 Commissioner Holman: Okay, thank you.

47
48 Ms. Meltzer: Thank you.

1
2 Commissioner Bellomo: One question for you. A clarification. Susan had mentioned that this
3 fall trees would begin the planting process.

4
5 Ms. Meltzer: That is correct.

6
7 Commissioner Bellomo: Is that the goal?

8
9 Ms. Meltzer: That is the beginning.

10
11 Ms. Warheit: I can help you with that I think. Starting in January the head of Parks and
12 Recreation assigned Parks and Recreation's landscape architect to start drawing up the bid
13 documents to start planting trees in the median immediately south of Embarcadero Road because
14 that is the longest stretch, you can go over almost half a mile there, with medians that already
15 meet Caltrans standards except where they approach intersections. Near the intersections you get
16 a second issue, which is the sight distance issue. But to the extent that you can deal with that, we
17 can go down to where the medians are eight feet wide now with Caltrans. Essentially, the
18 approach is we are picking the low-hanging fruit first. We are going to medians that don't have
19 to have the curbs moved because we are trying to make our money, the City's \$1.5 million, go as
20 far as possible. So that is the place where you can do the most right now.

21
22 Then the next step after that will be to look for the next best place where it is either already wide
23 enough or with a little bit of curb moving we can make it work. Then you start moving into
24 those areas and then the Trees for El Camino's money makes it go farther because they are
25 paying for the trees.

26
27 Commissioner Packer: Just as a clarification, what I hear you saying is that the decision about
28 this process has been made and nothing is being asked of the Planning Commission with respect
29 to just the tree planting program that you described. Is that correct?

30
31 Ms. Warheit: Yes, that's right.

32
33 Commissioner Griffin: We do have in fact a final speaker, John Ciccarelli.

34
35 Mr. John Ciccarelli, 2065 Yale Street, Palo Alto: Thanks Planning Commissioners. I didn't
36 come in at the last minute just to get the last word. I am glad to see the project has advanced to
37 the Planning Commission. As a member of the Advisory Group who has been sitting in on
38 meetings for about a year now it has been a long process. I think especially with a street like El
39 Camino we have a pretty long horizon and I hope that you do too. You are setting the stage for
40 many years if not decades worth of improvements. Certainly where tree growth is concerned
41 you are talking about decades. So I wanted to encourage you to take the long view especially in
42 today's economic climate. It is hard to imagine that we will ever get back to some semblance of
43 normality as far as funds becoming available for things and I wouldn't want that to unduly clutter
44 your judgments about what constitutes a lot of money. This is a project that can pull in funds
45 from outside Palo Alto. It is not just a big General Fund hit.

46
47 I think the way that the project has been phased by the consulting team and Staff, is conservative
48 and I wanted to applaud that. I think that Phase I is not only affordable but accomplishes some

1 real useful things and I am not talking about bike lane stripes, although I do bike on El Camino
2 now and then. I am talking about getting the tree planting started of course and also choosing
3 one or two intersections where we can actually demonstrate real pedestrian safety benefits and
4 give a taste of what the full build out of a street segment would do in terms of being able to walk
5 and bike across the street.
6

7 I think it is wise in Phase II to approach the potential for lane reduction on a couple of
8 commercial segments as a trial. There seems to be no downside to that. We will know whether
9 it works, we will know whether it doesn't work. By figuring in the traffic projections for our
10 design year, which I guess is 2020, on top of the results of those demonstrations we will get
11 some confidence that those changes that might be proposed would be sustainable. So I think
12 Phase I, Phase II, Phase III makes a lot of sense to me and I encourage you to support it as a
13 package and a process.
14

15 I hope that we are setting the stage for not only trees to grow but commerce to grow and walking
16 to grow because we will create an environment just like we are creating a place for the trees to
17 grow a place for people to walk and locate businesses that want to be more sidewalk intensive
18 than is possible now certainly in College Terrace. So on behalf of College Terrace who's hat I
19 wear as part of the Advisory Group I want to urge you to support it. Thank you.
20

21 Commissioner Griffin: Thank you, John. At this stage I am going to close the public hearing on
22 this item and declare a seven-minute break for Commissioners that have been up here for two
23 hours.
24

25 Thank you for your attention. We are now going to carry on with the Commissioners questions
26 and deliberations. So I am going to invite Commissioners to ask questions of Staff.
27

28 Commissioner Packer: One question I have is more on a higher level. Is there a process in place
29 at the Staff level to work with the people working the Zoning Ordinance Update for the zones
30 that front El Camino, the CS and CN zones, to perhaps consider a design overlay so that when
31 development does happen along El Camino and this 17-foot wide sidewalks are going to be in
32 place? There could be some integration that would help encourage the kinds of businesses that
33 would benefit from the widening of the sidewalks and require a street facing. So in other words
34 have a coordinated effort between the people working on this plan and our Zoning Ordinance
35 Update.
36

37 Ms. Warheit: There has been a lot of informal coordination with sitting in on different
38 committees and so on. But that is a very interesting idea that you are suggesting that we would
39 actually formalize that as an overlay with the new Zoning Ordinance so that some of these things
40 are specifically called for in the Zoning Ordinance. I mean I can think of other things, too, like
41 limiting curb cuts and those kinds of things. So it is a very interesting technique.
42

43 Commissioner Griffin: Karen.
44

45 Commissioner Holman: I have sort of a related question to Commissioner Packer's question.
46 What consideration was the intermodal project that is now put off to the side but someday we
47 may resurrect it? What consideration was that given and that proposal given in this
48 consideration for El Camino?

1
2 Ms. Warheit: Are you talking about the Downtown Intermodal Train Station project? El
3 Camino goes under the overpass there so there isn't actually an interface. But because we know
4 that is coming down the pike there isn't any recommendation in here to go in and make really
5 radical changes to that. For example, going under there is one of the places where there is not
6 enough room for a marked bike lane. But there isn't any suggestion that we go in and have some
7 major infrastructure project and rebuild that bridge and make room for it because the scale of that
8 would be something you wouldn't get into knowing you that you might do something big like
9 that in the future. Then also just immediately north of there, Quarry Road and the medians in
10 front of the shopping center were all rebuilt three years ago when the Stanford Shopping Center
11 was expanded. So this project really focused on south of University Avenue. We looked to see
12 how the bike lane transitions would work. There is a recommendation in the plan for how you
13 deal with it in the current situation. But the focus was mostly from the south.

14
15 Commissioner Bellomo: Virginia, as another add-on to Bonnie's comment regarding the
16 Update, has there been or can there be an effort to include some of the form code? In other
17 words trying to look at the relationship between sidewalk and building.

18
19 Ms. Warheit: I think the sections in this plan where we are in the urban area show a building.
20 Now they maybe only show it one story high. Are you suggesting we show it two or three
21 stories high?

22
23 Commissioner Bellomo: Yes, to elaborate on that because I think distances from centerline of El
24 Camino to building has always been discussed, that type of relationship. So I would like to add
25 that. I think that should be explored.

26
27 Ms. Warheit: That we show the buildings at whatever the height limit is along there.

28
29 Commissioner Bellomo: Exactly. Also there was a discussion of bus stops. Has there been a
30 consideration of bus shelters? I did not see any vision of that in this package.

31
32 Ms. Warheit: Phil, why don't you answer that?

33
34 Mr. Erickson: We have been coordinating with VTA Staff and their planned bus rapid transit. I
35 am trying to remember, I think the California Avenue simulation if it doesn't show the shelter
36 because the person would actually be standing in it but you see a bus sign there that would be a
37 next bus kind of signage. It has lights on it telling people when the next buses are coming. Then
38 we do have, I believe they should be in the document if they aren't we will add them because we
39 have them and we have had them in past PowerPoint shows that we have shown, we have
40 illustrations of their concepts for the bus rapid transit stops and have included those.

41
42 Commissioner Bellomo: Would Caltrans allow or would the City in combination with Caltrans
43 allow competitions on such shelters to encourage viable design that might be beyond what VTA
44 would do?

45
46 Mr. Erickson: I think that would be something that you would need to speak with VTA about.
47 The last we had talked with them they still were looking at a variety of different shelter types.

1 They did indicate the ability to talk to cities and maybe come up with particular designs for
2 cities. So I think there is some possibility of doing that.

3
4 Commissioner Bellomo: The restriping that is proposed, I noticed in some of your simulations
5 that it appears that there is hardscape or brick pavement or hardscape or stamped concrete. I am
6 not sure what that is, what is it? What is the red texture?

7
8 Mr. Erickson: That could possibly occur at the example intersections and what we have been
9 looking at and have been finding is acceptable to most people these days is the idea of actual
10 concrete pavers. There is a chance, another alternative of stamped concrete but it would be
11 something that would have a texture to it and have that kind of rumble brick effect that you get.

12
13 Commissioner Bellomo: My question again is this proposed under the restriping, the Phase I
14 restriping?

15
16 Mr. Erickson: Not on Phase I. I am sorry I can't be clearer. I am trying to remember the details
17 of the crosswalk improvements but it is not in the cost estimate. It could be included but it is not
18 in the cost estimate.

19
20 Commissioner Bellomo: So down the road in Phase III that restriping would have to be
21 obviously redone to include the hardscape pattern. Saying that eventually the concept is to
22 include a hardscape crosswalk.

23
24 Mr. Erickson: In some locations.

25
26 Commissioner Bellomo: In some locations.

27
28 Mr. Erickson: And the striping is just the thermo plastic on the street and the crosswalks you
29 would come in cut out the asphalt and put in the brick pavers.

30
31 Commissioner Bellomo: Okay, thanks.

32
33 Ms. Warheit: Maybe I could just clarify a little bit there. Phase I includes as many fully built-
34 out crossings as we can find money for. That is really the limiting factor. So what we are
35 suggesting in here is that when we go out looking for money we would try to get enough money
36 to at least do one of them with the bulb-outs, the right paving, everything. Now the design of
37 those things, that is in the next level down. What this plan says is there will be these
38 enhancements, art will be incorporated on the street, etc., but the design of it happens in the next
39 phase not part of this phase.

40
41 Mr. Erickson: One last clarification. When we talk about restripe that is really mostly referring
42 to moving the lane lines around. So that is the intent of that early phase restriping is to
43 implement the 11-foot lanes. So you are taking up the striping that is there and restriping the
44 street.

45
46 Commissioner Bellomo: So it does not include restriping crosswalks.

1 Mr. Erickson: There are two ways that we have been looking at it. One of them would, the one I
2 showed you the cost estimate for tonight would include restriping of the crosswalks because it
3 would include a new seal over the street which would cover up what is there. The other lower
4 cost approach just removes the striping and replaces it in the lanes. So there are a couple of
5 different ways that you could go on that depending on the cost considerations.
6

7 Commissioner Griffin: As long as we are talking about hardscaping and buses maybe you could
8 help me understand more clearly. In the draft report you talk about the buses will use bus bulb-
9 outs as opposed to pockets. The idea there was to avoid the bus having to pull back into traffic
10 lanes. Did I get that part of it correctly?
11

12 Ms. Warheit: That is exactly how it is for the bus rapid transit. I will have to ask Jerry and Phil
13 if they know if that is where VTA wants to go for all stops or if it is just the bus rapid transit that
14 would do that.
15

16 Mr. Erickson: The plan as it stands would have that at BRT but I think we would recommend
17 that you continue to have discussions with VTA to evaluate whether that should occur at more
18 bus stops. Basically, bus driver behavior, even when the pullouts are designed so that they don't
19 block a lane and can pull completely out of the street that isn't always what happens as you go
20 around and see the way that buses drive. So having them stop at a bulb-out and block a lane for
21 a period while they are loading passengers, that can then get going right away, so depending on
22 the situation there are times when you get improvement to traffic flow by going ahead and using
23 bulb-outs. But it is something that you would need to evaluate more with VTA but definitely for
24 the bus rapid transit that would be the approach.
25

26 Commissioner Griffin: I guess my concern was if we do in fact go with these lane reductions
27 and the bus comes to a screeching halt we are now then looking at a single through lane.
28

29 Mr. Walters: That was exactly one of our considerations in deciding where to drop the lanes.
30 One of the locations that is a good example of that is northbound on El Camino as it passes
31 through California. That is one of the locations where VTA is identifying a potential BRT stop
32 and that is why we carried the existing lanes all the way through the intersection.
33

34 Commissioner Griffin: One more on this bus business. The BRT buses are equipped with a
35 priority or preemption system that allows them to have the through green apparently. This
36 system does not interfere, I am asking the question, with our signalization coordination scheme
37 for the entire El Camino Real?
38

39 Ms. Warheit: That's right. I will have Jerry explain in more detail about that. I went through
40 the same learning experience that you are just now asking about, the bus does not go willy-nilly
41 down the street and change all the lights and just keep going. It is much more limited than that.
42 Essentially all they can do, and Jerry tell me if I am not right here, they can extend the green a
43 second or two, or they could shorten the red by a second or two. It doesn't preempt the signal
44 synchronization. Just that little bit can increase their on time and their service by about 20%.
45

46 Commissioner Griffin: Without short-circuiting this expensive signalization process.
47

1 Mr. Walters: That is correct. Those requirements would be taken into consideration in devising
2 the ultimate coordination scheme. In fact there is an added advantage of having VTA have these
3 requirements at this point, which is that they now have the need and desire to work on the signal
4 coordination including doing plans but also installing some new equipment. It is possible to
5 couple their needs with the other needs in the corridor to have a mutually beneficial cost sharing
6 for the signal improvements in the corridor.

7
8 Commissioner Holman: Is the assumption that when you are going for instance from three lanes
9 to two lanes is the assumption that you won't have a bottleneck in that reduction of lanes because
10 the traffic load in those areas is less? Is that now and in the future?

11
12 Mr. Emslie: Let me just take a stab at that. Where there is a lane reduction it is where you don't
13 need the storage of vehicles. Lane capacity is about storage. You need the storage at the
14 intersections and the two sections that were selected have enough distance between intersections
15 that traffic can move through there and not require the additional lane. There is storage provided
16 at the intersections where it is most needed. That is the concept behind the lane reduction.

17
18 Commissioner Holman: One more question. The crosswalks that are differentiated is that
19 differentiation for artistic purposes or is it more what I would suppose that it is identification of
20 the crosswalk because street patterns and such have been shown in a lot of studies to be traffic
21 calming. Is that part of the reason at least for that?

22
23 Ms. Warheit: Yes, all those.

24
25 Commissioner Burt: A number of issues were raised by members of the public and I just want to
26 ask you about a couple of them. One has to do with in the South El Camino area and the need
27 for sidewalk widening. We may have two slightly different need levels depending on which side
28 of El Camino we are on and I wanted to ask for your comments on that. On the Ventura side we
29 have a more dense population and it is the same side as El Camino Way and a lot of the
30 pedestrian activity that is currently there and hopefully will be enhanced. On the Barron Park
31 side we have a bit less density of housing and development and perhaps less pedestrian activity.
32 Is there a prospective differentiation that we should make in the need for sidewalk widening on
33 those two sides or how much widening would be appropriate?

34
35 Ms. Warheit: Well, at this level I don't think we need to make that distinction. The reason is
36 that what you are looking at are templates that can be pick and choose when you really get down
37 to designing a section. Say you wanted to start doing that for a particular section then those
38 questions can be asked. Then you do the parking study and you decide whether or not you need
39 parking on both sides. Depending on what you find there are some variations on the theme that
40 can be applied.

41
42 Commissioner Burt: On the funding issue what are the prospects for different funding sources of
43 this project?

44
45 Mr. Emslie: I think several of the speakers urged the Commission to take a longer view and we
46 would also urge to take a longer view in terms of funding. I can tell you one thing that is
47 absolutely essential to getting any funding even if the state didn't have the umpteen billion dollar
48 deficit is you have to have a plan. You have to have a roadmap for you to essentially qualify for

1 any funding. It is a prerequisite to accessing any state or federal monies that may be out there.
2 Maybe they are short in supply now but conditions, as we know, can change fairly rapidly.

3
4 Commissioner Burt: Steve, on that subject I appreciate that you can't predict the amount of
5 funding that would be available but on a project like this is it historically appropriate to expect
6 that half of these funds might come from other sources or what kind of ballpark are we thinking
7 of?

8
9 Mr. Emslie: I think a lot of monies require local matches of 50% and sometimes less than that.
10 Throughout the 1990s and into the year 2000 there were monies through federal programs that
11 have funded many, many improvements. Ice Tea funds had monies specifically earmarked for
12 landscape improvements. The TLC program, the Transportation for Livable Communities, is a
13 very prolific source of funding that, although competitive, a project like El Camino I think would
14 compare very favorably. So I think, and don't hold me to it, but I think you could probably
15 expect to get in a normal economic times 50%.

16
17 Commissioner Burt: Thank you. A final question for the consultants. The overall costs of the
18 project, I appreciate that you had a 30% contingency fund in there. Can you explain a little bit
19 on how you derive the base cost? Where did that number come from?

20
21 Mr. Erickson: The base costs were developed with our civil engineering consultant. Basically
22 what we did is looked at the cross sections and figured out for each of these cross sections for a
23 certain length of street how much square foot of concrete, how much square foot of asphalt, what
24 are we having to take out, what are we having to put in new. Basically then applying the
25 sections to the alternatives and there are this many feet in the entire corridor that are this kind of
26 improvement. Then looking at intersection types, how much is it going to cost to do the bulb-
27 outs that we are talking about at these different intersections, the paving treatments that we
28 looked at. Then again going through the corridor and saying there is this many of those kind of
29 intersections. So getting down to unit costs, getting down to the details of design, how many feet
30 of this, how many feet of that, thinking about road striping and all of those sorts of things. So at
31 the level of the street section it is quite detailed and then we take that and apply it down the
32 corridor depending on the design.

33
34 Commissioner Burt: Is there also any benchmarking against comparable projects that gives you
35 a rule of thumb?

36
37 Mr. Erickson: Yes. We have a background of projects that we look at. We look at different
38 sources that are out there and what are construction costs today, looking at the same kinds of
39 sources that all cost estimators use to figure out what are the costs today. Then we have also
40 been making some phone calls to cities and engineers that we know who have recently
41 implemented projects and learning from them where they see things happening. We are kind of
42 in an odd spot in the construction market right now where you could, if you had the money, this
43 would be a great time to build this street because things are pretty cheap. We didn't go down
44 that road with these cost estimates. We stayed with conservative cost estimates back at the unit
45 cost level and then also adding the 30% contingency on top of that. So like with the traffic study
46 where we are not being fooled by dips that might occur because of an economic slow down,
47 same with the costs. We are planning on this for the longer term.

1 Commissioner Packer: On the costs, have you also figured any additional maintenance costs for
2 example to maintain the additional trash receptacles or the cost of the trees? Just something for
3 the decision-makers to think about if there is an incremental increase in maintaining the new
4 amenities along the sidewalk. I don't imagine that it would a great cost but it is something that
5 the decision-makers might want to be aware of for the future.
6

7 Mr. Erickson: No, we haven't looked at that cost. One of the things, I wanted to bring this up at
8 one point, one of the things that is a real benefit in terms of the cost of the project over its life
9 and in terms of maintenance that is unusual is that up until basically this year proposing this kind
10 of reconstruction of a Caltrans state highway Caltrans would have been showing up at all the
11 meetings and saying okay, so when is Palo Alto going to take this street back from us because
12 this doesn't meet our standards. So then maintenance of the entire street would be on your dime.
13 When we have looked around the state at similar project almost every one of them has been that
14 kind of project. So there will be some increased costs because of tree maintenance and those
15 sorts of things but at the same time the roadway itself would still be maintained by Caltrans.
16

17 Commissioner Packer: I just want to ask another question. Maybe you are not there yet because
18 that will come in the design level but somewhere in the plan you talked about trying to eliminate
19 pork chops. Are those those little islands that exist to allow for a right turn? I was wondering
20 how that works with the concept of making it easier for pedestrians? I guess that will go into the
21 design phase but is there a general philosophy that you would like to get rid of pork chops
22 wherever possible? That would mean that the right turn would have to go around the bulb?
23

24 Mr. Erickson: If you look at the drawings that are here for the Stanford Avenue intersection they
25 show that kind of removal of pork chops. There are safety reasons for doing that. That was one
26 of the things that in our first meeting with Caltrans when we brought that up they said, great that
27 is the direction we are moving in as well. They allow traffic to turn a corner too quickly. But we
28 have then gotten down to thinking about for example at Stanford Avenue that right turn people
29 being able to move up there and make a free right turn even when there is a red is important to
30 how much traffic is backing up on Stanford. So not having a bulb-out to allow that right turn
31 coming from the west side of that intersection but eliminating the pork chop still makes it better
32 for a pedestrian. They don't get that little benefit of the bulb-out but removing the pork chop
33 helps that. So it is again balancing pedestrian and auto in all the decisions we make.
34

35 Commissioner Bellomo: A quick question on the temporary field tests. There is an order of
36 magnitude of \$500,000 to \$1.0 million per temporary installment. I was looking and I asked
37 Virginia today on the phone of a thumbnail sketch of in a sense what is the anticipated design
38 intent. You described it eloquently but I guess I look at drainage, all of the problems associated
39 with temporary installations that for \$2.0 million and the duration of this maybe just a bit more
40 of an understanding to know where we are heading with such an installation and the transition
41 you spoke of sounds good but I think the possibility of seeing a thumbnail sketch of the concept
42 could be helpful.
43

44 Mr. Emslie: That is a good point. That certainly would be something that would be developed
45 and brought back to the Commission as the plans were developed.
46

47 Commissioner Griffin: Before we go to the motion both Karen and I have comments or
48 questions I should say.

1
2 Commissioner Holman: Mine is actually a question, a comment and a request. Some months
3 ago we had a discussion here about paving materials. As there have been comments tonight
4 about cost implications here. I keep hearing the word asphalt being used and that is what we
5 typically do pave with but we have had previous discussions and I would like to encourage and
6 request that there be other materials that are considered for paving. Things that are more
7 renewable, more recycled materials, perhaps some paving areas that are removable as opposed to
8 having to be cut out and thrown away and something new created and poured in and also
9 aesthetically. So economically it could be more sound, aesthetically it could be more sound
10 because you won't have patches happening and the other thing would be environmentally it is
11 more sound. So again that is a question, comment and a request all rolled into one.

12
13 Commissioner Griffin: I love that request actually because I am familiar with a new kind of
14 pavement of asphalt emulsion that involves recycled tires that adds a rubber component which
15 does two things. It recycles the tires and it attenuates the noise problem. They are using that in
16 Woodside in particular here on the Peninsula and other places as well. That is a good comment.

17
18 Ms. Warheit: Actually though this project doesn't foresee any repaving of the driving surface.
19 There is potentially a slurry seal to cover old stripes and give a base for the new stripes but
20 Caltrans just repaved the entire road I think within the last two or three years. Nothing that is
21 being proposed here would require a total removal of asphalt and base and repaving the entire
22 road. So I don't know how much opportunity we will have for that but in the crosswalks we
23 could certainly deal with it.

24
25 Commissioner Holman: In the crosswalks certainly and also I kept hearing asphalt being
26 referred to as if there might be areas that would be repaved. So I thought it was pertinent to put
27 the comment in.

28
29 Commissioner Griffin: My comment just before we go to the motion involves the amount of
30 future impacts on the southern portion of this project. I am thinking specifically around the
31 island, taking into the consideration the new impacts we are going to see from the Hyatt project
32 just to the south, the Elks traffic generated from that housing project as well as perhaps greater
33 cross traffic from Barron Park down Meadow in order to access the Alma Plaza Albertson's
34 Shopping Center and that sort of thing. I just want to assure myself that those increased
35 developmental impacts have all been dialed into this 2020 forecast that the traffic consultant
36 worked on.

37
38 Ms. Warheit: I spoke with Lisa Grote, Chief Planning Official, about those projects and how
39 they might fit into our traffic projections and she told me that the alternative in the
40 Comprehensive Plan that was approved by the Council matches pretty closely with the intensity
41 of those projects on those sites that you mentioned. Of course that was all figured into the traffic
42 projections and then our consultants went back and looked at actual traffic figures over the last
43 ten years and found that the trend almost exactly mirrors what the Comprehensive Plan predicted
44 we would have in terms of a long 2010-2020 kind of movement. There is a graph of that
45 information in the study here. So we feel like we are on target here, that the projections are
46 consistent with what the Comprehensive Plan expected, what is being proposed and what we
47 have seen actually happen over the last ten years.

48

1 Commissioner Burt: Each of the prospective study areas have circumstances of non-signalized
2 pedestrian crossings, which we understand are prospective hazard areas. What treatments are
3 intended to be included in the study phase of it and subsequent phases to address the safety of
4 those pedestrian crossings?
5

6 Ms. Warheit: I am going to defer to Jerry on that.
7

8 Mr. Walters: There is actually an array of evaluations that would move forward. At some
9 locations it may be possible to mitigate through adding a traffic signal. We don't see that
10 through the analyses we have done so far but there are some crossings that either by their traffic
11 volumes or by safe route to school considerations could justify pedestrian related signals. Other
12 locations where signals are not justified Caltrans is not willing to add what they would be called
13 mid-block crosswalks. There may be some opportunities to add crosswalks at another variety of
14 location where the median that is currently open would be closed to accommodate tree planting
15 creating a partially opened median from one side for right turns in and out and retain that as a
16 pedestrian intersection in that it is already a pedestrian intersection. That would be treated with
17 non-signalized but traffic speed management types of measures and queuing measures to the
18 crosswalks presence. I think Phil can elaborate on any or all of those.
19

20 Commissioner Burt: If I might just narrow my question. I wasn't envisioning adding crosswalks
21 I was really wanting to explore how we can improve the safety of existing crosswalks through
22 visual cues that either pavers or painting or is it even feasible for more significant measures,
23 speed table crosswalks on El Camino? Is that unfeasible or not?
24

25 Mr. Erickson: Speed tables could be a concern given the kinds of speeds that we are looking at
26 on the street. Again the paving pattern kinds of issues, if it is painted how are you painting it, if
27 you use special paving and then coming up with a hierarchy of how you decide to use those
28 different pavings so again they help signal the driver. Just the bulb-outs themselves make a huge
29 difference in terms of safety because now the pedestrian isn't tucked in behind a parked car.
30 They are out there and can look down the street and drivers can see them. A lot of safety studies
31 have indicated that there is improved safety at crosswalks because of bulb-outs. Also in places
32 where we are narrowing to two lanes in one direction and effectively getting a four lane street the
33 kinds of studies that have been done to look at when you can mark a crosswalk, federal highway
34 studies and that sort of thing. By just eliminating the lanes the rules that are out there will allow
35 you to mark a crosswalk so that is an indication that it is safer. So all of those things help make
36 it safer.
37

38 Commissioner Griffin: All right now. Oh, Karen. I will just point out to Commissioners it is 20
39 minutes to 10:00 and so I would like you to think about wrapping up.
40

41 Commissioner Holman: In going through all of this I think probably the biggest concern and it is
42 one I think the public has raised the most too is the possibility of cut-through traffic with the
43 second phase of this. The purpose of this is to satisfy all goals. There didn't seem to be too
44 many competing goals. It is to satisfy everything, which is a lofty goal and in most ways I think
45 this accomplishes that. What happens if say Phase II is tested and it is wildly successful in many
46 regards but it does offset traffic onto other residential streets? Are there options that have been
47 considered about how to keep that cut-through traffic from happening? What is going to be the

1 measuring stick to determine these goals have been satisfied and those are more important than
2 creating some cut-through traffic?
3

4 Mr. Emslie: Maybe I can address that on kind of a broad basis. One of the assumptions we
5 came at this with was that you can do this and essentially maintain the same travel time. I would
6 posit that if you maintain the travel time and you achieve the findings that were anticipated here
7 and you confirmed them you would not have cut-through traffic. We know that the path of least
8 resistance is going to contribute to the use of the thoroughfare rather than the use of the
9 neighborhood street. So I would recommend that you look at that travel time as your benchmark.
10 If you are not achieving those same results, if you are having congestion, then that is a precursor
11 or a cause of cut-through traffic. I think that would be your bell-weather to determine the
12 success or the not success of this if we were to do the test.
13

14 MOTION 15

16 Commissioner Packer: I would like to make a motion. I would like to move that we approve the
17 recommendations in the Staff Report, one, two and three, which includes the preparing a draft
18 report and that the Staff prepare an environmental assessment for option two, which allows for
19 the narrowing in the two segments to four to five lanes and the six lanes for the remaining part.
20 It is whatever it says in the Staff Report don't write down what I am saying. I would like to add
21 to it my recommendation that we anticipate this change happening to El Camino as we work on
22 the Zoning Ordinance Update. There are a number of CS zones, CN zones and various
23 residential zones that confront both sides of El Camino that we might want to consider overlays.
24

25 A second first then I will give you my reasons.
26

27 Commissioner Griffin: Good. Thank you. Do we have a second?
28

29 SECOND 30

31 Commissioner Cassel: I will second it.
32

33 Commissioner Griffin: Would you like to speak to your motion?
34

35 Commissioner Packer: Yes, I would like to speak to it. I really had a good time reading this
36 report even though it took a long time to do so. I was very impressed with the planning process
37 of defining the problem, defining all the goals, understanding the limitations that we are bound
38 with and going with that. The whole iterative process was a wonderful exercise in planning,
39 which I hope we can learn from this process and apply it to other types of studies that are done
40 with citizen working groups and Staff. I thought that was excellent.
41

42 I don't think I need to repeat all the good reasons for going forward with this approach with the
43 phases that look at the first phase which is the restriping, narrowing down to 11-foot lanes and
44 then proceeding with the field test for the further narrowing I thin is a very excellent way to
45 proceed. An example of the thoughtfulness of this report which is why I want to approve it as I
46 was reading along there was one item that was bothering me and this was the suggestion to close
47 medians at certain T-intersections and I was getting concerned about this. As I read on I said
48 well, we are not going to do this until we have an awful lot of study and input for each of these

1 suggestions. So all these issues in the report were thought out and anticipate further study and
2 analysis, which really impressed me. So this is the kind of plan I feel proud to support.

3
4 Commissioner Griffin: Thank you.

5
6 Commissioner Cassel: I am really excited about this. It is a plan. It is not a final stage. We
7 have a lot more work to do on the details. When Andreas Duany came to speak to us prior to
8 setting up the Comprehensive Plan in the very early stages we started talking about urban
9 communities and what would make a community and how it would work. Some of us asked him
10 what do we do with El Camino. He said, you don't bother with El Camino, there is no hope. So
11 this is really exciting to see this get to this stage. Here we are talking about what we had hoped
12 to do somehow or other, and we talked about it piece-meal on how to do it, putting together a
13 whole plan for the whole street. We are talking about ways of keeping traffic moving but how to
14 make us feel like a better community within it and how to relate the different uses together. This
15 to me is very exciting and I am looking forward to seeing the next steps.

16
17 Then we have to fund it and this question comes up but what I see is the connection into future
18 developments and future projects. So that even if we never get all this fancy money we still have
19 projects that come up as we go along. The road still gets replaced eventually and now we know
20 what we want to do with that or we have some idea. So while I would like to see us get the
21 money and do the projects, and I know we can't do it without planning, we simply can't do any
22 of it without the plan. So I really want to see us proceed with that.

23
24 I also want to mention how important it is to deal with the sidewalks. You may want to work
25 with the language a little differently on sidewalks. The through zone on the sidewalk is what I
26 consider the sidewalk and not the furnishing section, the edge section, the behind section. I don't
27 normally think of that and you may run into some problems with other people understanding
28 that. I finally got it when I read it enough times here. We have a through sidewalk there that
29 isn't and it is very bad. We have been talking up here a long time try to get the utilities
30 department to recognize that for things they put in it and others. So I am hoping that this plan in
31 place will give us a chance to work with our own City Departments to make progress as we
32 move along.

33
34 Commissioner Griffin: Joe, do you have any comments?

35
36 Commissioner Bellomo: I don't know how the other Planning Commissioners feel but there was
37 conversation of the Trees for El Camino and how this package is in one sense coordinated with
38 that, it makes mention of it and takes note that there has been an effort to implement this tree
39 planting into El Camino and that is coordinated within this design package.

40
41 Secondly, the striping issue in the first phase I would like to just reiterate the safe crossing of El
42 Camino, how in fact that striping includes and somehow promotes safety at each and every
43 crosswalk particularly at school crossings. At Palo Alto High School that situation, I have a
44 child at Palo Alto High, that situation between Embarcadero and Stanford Avenues the children
45 are transitioning across the street. Every morning I drive it and I see children. It is easier to
46 cross at the mid block than it is at the crossing. I want to reiterate that is for certain and I am
47 concerned about safety. I slow down and let them cross in front of me every morning. So again

1 not speaking generally to that situation but in an overall broad view what can be done to provide
2 safe crossing on each and every crossing on El Camino. Those are my issues.

3
4 Also I want to speak just briefly to this field test, the amount of expenditure for a field test and
5 the nature and texture of that and how maybe we can bring those costs down. I certainly want to
6 see the thought behind that.

7
8 Lastly, quickly, the corridor in Sand Hill the way that was generated was very effective on how
9 we saw each and every piece. It wasn't civil engineering plan but during the planning process it
10 was very simplistic to evaluate the pieces to see in fact these pieces separated out and to really
11 understand as we move down the corridor the pedestrian, bicycle and vehicular interconnection.
12 It was a very good example of the development of a corridor. I really appreciate the effort on
13 this. Thank you.

14
15 Commissioner Holman: Just a quick clarification on the motion. As I reread the motion I want
16 to make sure that it includes the phasing also regarding trees and such. Is that clear from
17 rereading the recommendation on page one that is the motion?

18
19 Ms. Warheit: It is part of the plan. Recommendation two is that we would go away and do an
20 environmental assessment on option two and option two includes everything in here that relates
21 to option two, that includes the phasing, yes.

22
23 Commissioner Holman: Okay, I just want to clarify that because it isn't specifically mentioned.

24
25 Ms. Wynne Furth, Senior Assistant City Attorney: I know you all understand this but it may be
26 important to clarify for the record that this is a proposed schematic plan. It doesn't deal with the
27 details of each and every intersection. It talks about the things that need to be dealt with as you
28 look at each and every section in the future. The metaphors are always messy here but it is a
29 roadmap. We are asking you among other things to say this is as far as we can go before we do
30 formal CEQA evaluation. This is a feasibility study. It is a feasibility study that as CEQA
31 requires takes environmental factors into concern. In fact, if you look at the definitions for the
32 project, if you look at the project goals, those are designed to avoid adverse environmental
33 effects. That is a major part of those project definitions. So it is to be hoped that when we do the
34 environmental review we don't turn up adverse impacts but we won't know until we do it. That
35 is why there isn't more specificity now at this point. If we want to go further in the design and
36 engineering and study of this and get to the point where you would actually adopt a plan for El
37 Camino we have to bring you the CEQA documentation. So this is as far as we can go before we
38 do that.

39
40 Commissioner Griffin: Thank you for that clarification.

41
42 Ms. Warheit: I want to clarify something that you already addressed and I think it answers
43 Karen's question. That planting the trees in the median is independent of this. The Council
44 already allocated the money, \$1.5 million and we have already started the plans. That is
45 independent of this. We only mention it in here because we want to make sure we are consistent
46 with it.

1 Commissioner Burt: I would just like to concur with my colleagues in their praise of the process
2 that has taken us to this point. I think it has really been excellent. It looks like it is an excellent
3 product and a very inclusive process from different constituencies in the community. I would
4 also like to concur with Joe's comments on the importance of making sure that in this trial phase
5 that we are putting an adequate emphasis on the pedestrian crossings in those areas. I am a bit
6 unclear on the details of that and I am just hoping that that has a big emphasis. Thank you.

7
8 Commissioner Griffin: I think my comments have pretty much all been preempted here this
9 evening. I will say that I am looking forward to the CEQA investigation because I do have some
10 concerns about the southern end of this project but that doesn't diminish my enthusiasm for the
11 entire concept and I will be happy to support the motion.

12
13 MOTION PASSED

14
15 I think it is now time to call for a vote. All those in favor of the motion say aye. (ayes)
16 Opposed? I hear none so that motion does carry unanimously with Chairperson Bialson being
17 absent.

18
19 Commissioner Holman: Before the Staff leaves I would like to just compliment Staff and the
20 consultants on really clear materials and a really good presentation. It is much appreciated.

21
22 Commissioner Griffin: Now we have agenda item three although in fact it is the second one that
23 we are going to be listening to this evening. It is a presentation on the Methodology and
24 Applications of a GIS Analysis of Stanford Research Park Commuter Trips.

25
26. **Presentation on Methodology and Applications of a Geographic Information Systems**

27 **Analysis of Stanford Research Park Commuter Trip.** Review of methodology of and
28 findings from a Geographic Information Systems research study of Stanford Research Park
29 commuter origins undertaken a graduate student at the University of California at Berkeley. The
30 study was conducted under the auspices of a faculty member of UC Berkeley's Department of
31 City and Regional Planning and staff of the City of Palo Alto Transportation Division.

32 **Weblink:** [http://www.city.palo-alto.ca.us/cityagenda/publish/planning-transportation-](http://www.city.palo-alto.ca.us/cityagenda/publish/planning-transportation-meetings/1639.pdf)
33 [meetings/1639.pdf](http://www.city.palo-alto.ca.us/cityagenda/publish/planning-transportation-meetings/1639.pdf)

34
35 Commissioner Cassel: I have to excuse myself because even though this is a generalized
36 discussion on commuter trips and how it works it uses Stanford as a base and so therefore I
37 cannot participate, I work at Stanford and so does my husband.

38
39 Mr. Emslie: To the Chair I also would like to indicate that until June 16 of this year I do have a
40 conflict and will be also stepping down pursuant to recently enacted state law that does require
41 anyone with a conflict to remove him or herself from the proceedings. Julie Caporgno, our
42 Advance Planning Manager and Virginia Warheit, our Senior Planner will be in attendance to
43 answer questions.

44
45 Commissioner Griffin: It looks like we are having a change on the bench down here. The new
46 players are a competent crew. The first thing that we will do here is listen to a Staff presentation
47 and then open for public comments.

1
2 Ms. Caporgno: I just wanted to inform the Commission that neither Virginia nor I were aware
3 that we were going to be presenting this to you until about 20 minutes ago. So we hope that the
4 Staff Report will support as far as the Staff presentation. We can take notes and get back to you
5 if there are questions that you want Staff to respond. I wanted to introduce to you Steve Reiner
6 who prepared the analysis and he will then walk you through what he has done. Hopefully if the
7 Commission has any questions he will be able to respond to those. We will be glad to explore
8 anything or pursue anything if in fact you need some information from us. thank you.
9

10 Commissioner Griffin: Thank you. Welcome.
11

12 Mr. Steve Reiner, Consultant: Good evening Commission. This is a commute map of Stanford
13 Research Park. I am actually a native Palo Altoan. This research was also presented at the
14 Transportation Research Board Conference in January in D.C. I want to thank Palo Alto Staff,
15 Joe Kott, Amanda Jones and Dave Matson who provided a small amount of very, very valuable
16 staff time on this and helped with the map printing of these beautiful maps here. If
17 Commissioners did want to stretch and go look at the map I would definitely recommend it here
18 because it is not going to show up very well on the PowerPoint's at all because it is a very high
19 resolution map.
20

21 So here is the map and it is a map of where people live that work in Stanford Research Park.
22 You see they are disbursed all over the Bay Area. The yellow dots are 5 to 18 people and the
23 brown dots are only one person. I am going to cover why we did the study, the methodology and
24 the results.
25

26 First, why. Here is quote from Joe Kott, "Because of the upcoming Highway 101 Corridor Study
27 the planned Baby Bullet service," which we know is going to improve speed by about 20% or
28 more, "the GUP trip reduction requirements and the ongoing VTA/SamTrans bus route
29 planning," we were talking about BRT tonight, "Palo Alto needed more accurate and more
30 current commute data than other cities and transit agencies". Compared to recent regional
31 transportation studies our data is 20 times more precise and our participation rates are much
32 higher. Another reason for this is just to improve transit route planning. So VTA in 1999
33 conducted their 12 major employment center for Santa Clara County zip code study, a similar
34 study that preceded this, and they came up with from that study recommendations for five new
35 bus routes serving 1,000 riders a day. They modified 50% of their commute routes. They added
36 some new park and ride lots and they found out where they target their marketing more
37 effectively based on the sheds of where everybody lived. So this kind of thing can be pretty
38 effective. With this particular study you can ask very detailed questions like how many people
39 are within a 1,000 feet of a bus stop. So really understanding where the people are that you are
40 serving. Also at the conference in January some folks at the New Jersey Institute of Technology
41 are working on a mathematical way to add some science to the art of bus replanning and
42 basically running an optimization algorithm based on this kind of fine grain data.
43

44 The Bay Area Transportation and Land Use Coalition in their world class transit report in 2001
45 asked for this kind of a study saying that there is no existing means to effectively match new bus
46 service with worker's travel patterns. Transit agencies are forced to predict where commuters
47 need to go instead of being able to use actual data. So again this kind of a database can really
48 help with that kind of planning.

1
2 So let's talk about the methodology here. It was really important to protect the Stanford
3 Research Park employees but still collect their data. So what we do is the employer creates a
4 spreadsheet of address, city, state and zip for each of the employees that work in Stanford
5 Research Park. Usually that is typically a very rapid query of the HR database. Then I show up
6 on site with my laptop with my GIS program and under the employer supervising me I aggregate
7 those addresses up to a one-fifth a mile grid. You see what I leave with is just sort of a set of
8 grids and counts associated with that. I don't leave with any of the address information, which
9 of course is sensitive and personal information. Then, in addition, all that information is
10 aggregated across multiple employers. So when you look at that map you really can't tell what
11 company those employees are coming from within the Research Park. So we spend a lot of time
12 designing the study so we protect privacy while still getting this fine grain data. By fine grain
13 we are talking about this one-fifth a mile by one-fifth a mile grid. There is a picture of Palo Alto
14 and Crescent Park area and typically that covers about four blocks, so about 144 houses. So that
15 is what we are aggregating to, about 144 houses. For the methodology, we positioned the study
16 as it was a study undertaken by a graduate student at Berkeley, myself, but it was kind of blessed
17 by Palo Alto Transportation Department and the privacy aspect of it, the methodology of it was
18 validated by Dave Matson in GIS.

19
20 In the Research Park, there are about 161 companies but really you only need to go after the 20
21 largest companies, that is where all the employees are. That covers about 20,000 employees.
22 Amanda Jones kicked off the campaign at one of her Mid-Peninsula Commute Forum kick offs
23 where she gets the commute coordinators from the different companies together and she kind of
24 urges people to participate. Then Joe Kott sent out a letter appealing to all the companies to
25 participate in the study saying we are going to get better transit planning, we are going to reduce
26 congestion and we are going to clean up the air as kind of a very patriotic appeal that was a little
27 bit hard to turn down. Then I followed up typically with about 25 contacts per company by
28 email or phone or whatever. If a company was not willing to participate right away I had the
29 ability to get Joe or Amanda to follow up and put a little bit more pressure on them to twist their
30 arm to participate. Then I would do the onsite geo coding, and this study took about 280 hours
31 of work to conduct. I am not going to talk about it but there is a way, in a study that I am doing,
32 for another city that has made this a little bit more efficient process.

33
34 It was the worst possible time to go to the Research Park and ask for this data. The HR
35 departments were busy laying off people. They didn't really have time to supply this data. So of
36 the 20 companies 13 participated and we collected 8,200 addresses. Some of the companies
37 declined and there were various reasons, whether there were privacy consideration they were
38 uncomfortable with, they didn't have the time to collect this data or they didn't know a way to
39 query their HR database to get this data. There is another few minutes to talk about the details of
40 the privacy aspects but I am going to spare you that.

41
42 So the results of the study are pretty exciting and pretty promising with the improvements that
43 are coming to Palo Alto and this corridor. Forty-seven percent of these people live within a two-
44 mile radius of a CalTrain station. So the Baby Bullet is going to serve the right people who are
45 commuting into Stanford Research Park. Then 49% of these people live within a ten-mile radius
46 of Stanford Research Park. So a lot of people are very close by. So the improvements on VTA
47 and SamTrans on El Camino and bus rapid transit they are serving these people here. That is
48 really nice. Then if you look at the speed-ups that the HOV lanes provide, on the Dumbarton

1 Bridge in the morning you can save about 19 minutes, on the San Mateo Bridge you save about
2 12 minutes if you take a carpool. Then on Highway 85 I think you can save another 15 minutes.
3 So there are a couple really nice lanes to take to save some time that make it pretty beneficial to
4 get into a carpool with somebody to save some time here. That is also kind of good news for
5 attracting more riders.
6

7 This is the last slide. You can also use this data to do some very proactive marketing to the
8 people who may carpool. So you can imagine maybe sometime in the next six months or sooner
9 a big oil shock with a big spike in oil prices that makes it much less affordable for people to
10 commute into work. Potentially you can use this data in a very aggressive way to get people off
11 the road and save people money. So one thing you can do is you can find pockets of people in
12 San Carlos or Cupertino and kind of market to them directly. You say we can get you out of
13 your cars and save you money and so forth. But also there is this idea that this data in the hands
14 of Palo Alto and VTA, you can identify the neighborhoods, and then you can go back to Stanford
15 Research Park companies and say there are these particular areas that are great for forming
16 carpools, say in San Carlos. We don't have to know who your employees are but you know who
17 your employees are that live in that zip code and you can tell them to contact rides and we are
18 having sort of a special promotion to get everybody from different companies, so somebody
19 from Roche and somebody from EPRI and somebody from Hewlett Packard and somebody from
20 Wilson Sonsini could all join together in the larger Stanford Research Park and rideshare
21 together. That's it. Questions?
22

23 Commissioner Griffin: Thank you, Steve. Do Commissioners have any questions? Does Staff
24 wish to wrap up anything here? Sorry, Joe.
25

26 Commissioner Bellomo: Simple question. In your experience how do you encourage companies
27 when you provide this data to encourage people to use public transportation? What does the
28 outreach look like?
29

30 Mr. Reiner: Really it is spending the time to get the network of commute coordinators and sort
31 of keep current with them so the City or VTA or rides communicating with them every couple of
32 months. That person is sort of keeping it top of mind. Certainly there is a lot of advertising for
33 Commuter Check and services like that which is helpful, but also I think it is designing service
34 that is more amenable to the knowledge-worker commuters who are very finicky. So Caltrain
35 Baby Bullet. Just improving the quality of service and publicizing that goes a long way. When
36 you can really save people time of course they will take it.
37

38 Commissioner Griffin: At this point I would like to open the public comment and I have two
39 cards for this item. The first is Bill Phillips and Bill will be followed by Irvin Dawid. Welcome
40 Mr. Phillips.
41

42 Mr. Bill Phillips, Stanford University: Good evening, Commissioners. I wanted to thank Steve
43 for the work that he has done. I think this is extremely useful work and we are going to see more
44 of this kind of thing in a way of evaluating what is an existing condition and also looking
45 forward to improving the TDM process and usefulness at any employer's location. With respect
46 to the Research Park I think we are going to be using this as well as additional data and
47 information in order to work on and push through a study that we are involved in now looking at
48 both current TDM use by employers in the Research Park and also how we can encourage

1 greater TDM use by existing and prospective employers in the Park. One of the things that we
2 will be looking at very carefully is not only this kind of data but also interviews and comparison
3 with other major R&D parks and business parks primarily in California but even outside of
4 California. We will probably see that study completed by early this fall. One of the things that
5 we are beginning to see is a disparity between how people perceive different kinds of transit. So
6 it should be obvious to all of us that BART for example is very different than Caltrain and that
7 shows up big time in terms of the mode choices that we see in both Contra Costa County, Santa
8 Clara County and what we see in the respective business parks that are located in those two
9 counties and are accessible to BART, which shows very high transit use and those that are
10 accessible to either VTA or Caltrain which shows improving but still much lower types of transit
11 use.

12
13 Two inferences from the data that I wanted to speak to and possibly disagree with. First and
14 probably most important there is no relevancy of this data to the GUP, no new net trips condition
15 for Stanford. The cordon that applies to that assessment and evaluation is very close to the
16 Stanford campus and doesn't involve any part of the Research Park. This methodology could be
17 useful in helping Stanford with its GUP condition. The other thing is that there is an inference or
18 at least I drew the inference that the combination of the closeness of residents to the Research
19 Park and also although it is not as important the closeness of those residents to the Caltrain
20 station brought forward some additional potential for use of implementing public transit. I think
21 the closeness of residents to the Research Park tends to be harmful to a degree. If you think
22 about it and I used to live within that grid and I can tell you that living within this very close
23 proximity to the Research Park if you choose to take your car it is a trip you can envision
24 happening in 15 minutes or so. If you decide you are going to use public transit as it exists today
25 you are talking about at least 50 minutes and possibly even longer. So the percentage multiplier
26 of add by using public transit is much greater in the shorter distances to the Park. So those are
27 my few comments. Again, I thank Steve for his work and effort and it is a very valuable study.

28
29 Commissioner Griffin: Thank you Mr. Phillips. Bonnie.

30
31 Commissioner Packer: Bill, I have a question for you. For the Stanford's tenants in the
32 Research Park what carrots and sticks can you use to implement a TDM program and also
33 encourage their cooperation in collecting the data that you would use for this kind of a study?

34
35 Mr. Phillips: Basically, what we can do is as we do in the shopping center and that is we
36 implement requirements of communication and cost sharing on the part of the tenants to provide
37 participation in and more aggressive use of things like the Marguerite Shuttle with respect to the
38 shopping center. With respect to the Research Park we have at this point not involved any
39 extensive or meaningful shuttle in the Research Park. I see us moving definitely in that
40 direction. One of our first new buildings will have as one of the conditions of its approval a
41 shuttle route that will take the employees from the Caltrain Station to that building and past the
42 College Terrace area and then back down Page Mill and will serve that area that way. A number
43 of the employers including one of our largest employers, Hewlett Packard, has a shuttle program
44 and that has been in effect for quite a long period of time in partnership with the City. We have
45 other tenants that through recent leases and conditions in those leases have to employ incentives
46 not only to their employees but to their customers and visitors for using something other than
47 single occupancy vehicles.

1 Commissioner Packer: So it is becoming part of a lease requirement, is that what you are
2 saying?
3

4 Mr. Phillips: Our recent leases are now definitely requiring not only thought but monetary
5 involvement in this kind of work.
6

7 Commissioner Griffin: Bill, we have another question for you.
8

9 Commissioner Burt: Bill, along the same lines, what would it take to get your primary tenants
10 onboard toward contributing toward a pretty comprehensive shuttle program to serve the
11 Research Park? It seems like their individual contributions would not need to be great for the
12 size of their companies to really have a pretty steady shuttle system at least during peak hours.
13 Why can't we get there sooner?
14

15 Mr. Phillips: Well, I think it always helps to have a requirement or condition or new lease that
16 brings that condition and puts it into place. The contractual negotiation is very helpful in
17 imposing these obligations and making the tenant understand how important it is in the overall
18 scheme of things. To go back on existing tenants is more difficult but it has been done in other
19 business parks, in other business parks in the Bay Area. This is one of the things that we are
20 going to be devoting a considerable effort to in the phase two of the study and that is talking to
21 our existing tenants, getting them to understand how successful these programs are in other
22 locations and why it is important for them to be a participant in the programs in the future. Then
23 I think we will be able to bring some results to you that are likely or possible, they will probably
24 still be subject to overall economic conditions but I think we will be able to have a pretty good
25 perspective on how far we can go.
26

27 Commissioner Burt: Thanks.
28

29 Commissioner Griffin: I would like to call for Irvin Dawid and he will be our final speaker.
30

31 Mr. Dawid: Thank you, Chairman Griffin. I just want to remark first that I find it a little strange
32 sometimes when the Planning and Transportation Commission asks the business owners or the
33 business park how can we get more people using alternatives and then the same Planning and
34 Transportation Commission starts recommending more parking be provided. So I think maybe
35 this is sort of a cruel joke that comes back to land on the same ordinances that require all this
36 parking be built whenever either commercial or residential buildings be placed.
37

38 I remember Ken Schreiber, whom I am sure you all know, once indicated that some years ago
39 they had done a study and they had shown that now there are more options to use public transit
40 to get to the Research Park but fewer people are using them. I think one of the things had to do
41 with the level of affluence of the workers but also simply just the basic amount of parking and
42 having all that parking free.
43

44 Going back to the presentation I really thought it was excellent. I think GIS is indispensable in
45 terms of trying to employ TDM strategies. I just wanted to say that I think the most successful
46 transit alternative from my perspective when I look at the Park because it makes it somewhat
47 unique is the Dumbarton bus. Dumbarton bus is really very successful and it is only just recently
48 that AC Transit is now introducing service on the San Mateo Bridge. SamTrans pulled their San

1 Mateo Bridge trans bay service but the Dumbarton bus was always doing well. Supposedly one
2 of the reasons for that was Stanford Research Park.

3
4 To answer some of the questions, I hope you don't mind if I just give you an article that appeared
5 in the *Pleasanton Weekly*, February 21st. One of the basic strategies to get people on transit is
6 just good old cash. I was really surprised that Bill didn't mention that. The Commuter Choice
7 program, you can write off \$100.00 per month. The Hacienda Business Park and the City of
8 Pleasanton and other Pleasanton business owners are going full throttle in doing this Commuter
9 Choice event where they are really publicizing it to their companies. Pleasanton by the way is
10 somewhat of a unique city in California, it was one of the first cities to introduce a trip reduction
11 ordinance. If the City of Palo Alto is truly interested in doing TDM they should explore trip
12 reduction ordinances. So I leave this for you to ponder.

13
14 Most interesting in South San Francisco that was one of the requirements for a new business park
15 that went up on the east side of the freeway. It is a landmark project because they are requiring
16 parking cash out to my knowledge. I do have some of the materials on that. If it is okay, can I
17 give this for the record? I have it in my own email account but it just basically shows how
18 business owners really got together and really understand the importance of money as an
19 incentive to get employees onto transit. The fact is there is a federal tax code that allows up to
20 \$100.00 per month as a write-off. Thank you.

21
22 Commissioner Griffin: Thank you, Irvin. I am closing the public comment section on this item.

23
24 Now moving to Commission Member Questions, Comments, And/Or Announcements.

25
26 ***COMMISSION MEMBER QUESTIONS, COMMENTS, AND/OR ANNOUNCEMENTS.***

27
28 Commissioner Griffin: Are there any? Seeing none we will move on to the Approval of the
29 Minutes of the Special Meeting of February 4 as well as the regular meeting of February 12. So
30 we will take February 4 first.

31
32 ***APPROVAL OF MINUTES.*** Special Meeting of February 4 and Regular Meeting of
33 February 12, 2003.

34
35 Commissioner Griffin: Are there any corrections to that? Seeing no signals to that let's take a
36 vote on that. May I have a motion?

37
38 MOTION

39
40 Commissioner Packer: I will move approval.

41
42 SECOND

43
44 Commissioner Burt: Second.

45
46 MOTION PASSED

47
48 Commissioner Griffin: All in favor say aye. (ayes) No opposed so that is approved.

1
2 Now for the meeting minutes of February 12, do I have a motion?
3
4 MOTION
5
6 Commissioner Burt: So moved.
7
8 SECOND
9
10 Commissioner Bellomo: Second.
11
12 MOTION PASSED
13
14 Commissioner Griffin: All those in favor say aye. (ayes) Opposed? Those two minutes do pass
15 unanimously.
16
17 ***NEXT MEETING***: Special Meeting of March 19, 2003.
18
19 Commissioner Griffin: Our next meeting is a Special Meeting on March 19. I now declare this
20 meeting adjourned.
21
22 ***ADJOURNED***: 10:25
23