



CITY OF PALO ALTO CITY COUNCIL TRANSCRIPT

Regular Meeting
May 9, 2016

The City Council of the City of Palo Alto met on this date in the Council Chambers at 6:08 P.M.

Present: Berman, Burt, DuBois, Filseth, Holman, Kniss, Scharff, Schmid, Wolbach

Absent:

Special Orders of the Day

1. Appointment of two Candidates to the Human Relations Commission, two Candidates to the Library Advisory Commission, and Three Candidates to the Utilities Advisory Commission for Terms Ending May 31, 2019 and one Candidate to the Utilities Advisory Commission for one Unexpired Term Ending May 31, 2017.

Mayor Burt: Our first item is a Special Order of the Day which is appointment of two candidates to the Human Relations Commission (HRC) and two candidates to the Library Advisory Commission (LAC) and then three candidates to the Utilities Advisory Commission (UAC) for terms ending May 31st, 2019 as well as one candidate for the Utilities Advisory Commission for one unexpired term ending May 31st, 2017. Would the Clerk share with the Council on the final one, the Utilities Advisory Commission, how the voting process works for the one single-year term versus the three years.

Beth Minor, City Clerk: What you'd be voting on first is the three full-term that will be expiring the end of this month. After that is completed, then we'll do a final vote for the unexpired term on the UAC.

Mayor Burt: Thank you. We'll go ahead and do the first round of voting. While the Clerk is tabulating that, we can go ahead and begin Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions.

First Round of voting for two positions on the Human Relations Commission with a terms ending May 31, 2019:

TRANSCRIPT

Voting For Jill O’Nan: Berman, Burt, DuBois, Filseth, Holman, Kniss, Scharff, Schmid, Wolbach

Voting For Greer Stone: Berman, Burt, DuBois, Filseth, Holman, Kniss, Scharff, Schmid, Wolbach

Ms. Minor: Both Jill O’Nan and Greer Stone have been elected to the Human Relations Commission.

First Round of voting for two positions on the Library Advisory Commission with a terms ending May 31, 2019:

Voting For Allan Bennett:

Voting For Sheena Chin: Berman, Burt, DuBois, Filseth, Holman, Kniss, Scharff, Schmid, Wolbach

Voting For Natasha Kachenko: Wolbach

Voting For Bob Moss: Berman, Burt, DuBois, Filseth, Holman, Kniss, Scharff, Schmid

Ms. Minor: Sheena Chin and Bob Moss have been elected to the Library Advisory Commission.

First Round of voting for three positions on the Utilities Advisory Commission with a terms ending May 31, 2019:

Voting For Chris DiBona:

Voting For Lisa Forssell: Filseth, Wolbach

Voting For A.C. Johnston: Berman, Burt, DuBois, Filseth, Holman, Kniss, Scharff, Schmid, Wolbach

Voting For Henrik Morkner:

Voting For William Ross: DuBois, Filseth, Holman, Schmid

Voting For Judith Schwartz: Berman, Burt, Holman, Kniss, Scharff, Wolbach

Voting For Terry Trumbull: Berman, Burt, DuBois, Kniss, Scharff, Schmid

TRANSCRIPT

Ms. Minor: A.C. Johnston with nine votes, Judith Schwartz with six votes and Terry Trumbull with six votes were all elected to the full-term UAC positions.

Mayor Burt: We will now vote for the one-year for the Utilities Advisory Commission. While we do that, we will go forward with Oral Communications.

First Round of voting for one position on the Utilities Advisory Commission with a term ending May 31, 2017:

Voting For Chris DiBona:

Voting For Lisa Forssell: Berman, Burt, Kniss, Scharff, Wolbach

Voting For Henrik Morkner:

Voting For William Ross: DuBois, Filseth, Holman, Schmid

Ms. Minor: Lisa Forssell with five votes has been appointed to the unexpired term that ends 5/31/2017 on the Utilities Advisory Commission.

Mayor Burt: Thank you. Congratulations to all the candidates, and thank you to all the candidates who applied for the positions and went through the interview process.

Study Session

~~2. Council Study Session on Sea Level Rise (Continued to May 31, 2016).~~

Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

Mayor Burt: We had initially scheduled a Study Session on Sea Level Rise. This item has been continued to Tuesday, May 31st of this year. We have no other Agenda changes, so we can now go on to City Manager Comments. Mr. Keene.

City Manager Comments

James Keene, City Manager: Thank you, Mr. Mayor and Council Members. I wanted to share with the Council—in fact, actually more importantly with our community and the public. Next on your Agenda you have a Study Session which is a prescreening related to a project at the address 550 Hamilton. You've been getting a lot of emails in relation to that project. I did just want to clarify the purpose for pre-screenings in general, because I think that there might be confusion in our community about this process itself and

TRANSCRIPT

actually its purpose. Pre-screenings before the City Council are scheduled at the request of the developer and applicant, and not because City Staff or the Council have expressed a desire to pursue the proposal at any given site. The City's Municipal Code allows a developer or property owner to request initial feedback from Council Members on legislative changes, in other words zoning changes potentially, on land use or other major projects. The intent of the prescreening session is to allow Council Members and members of the public to offer comments in a format similar to that of a Study Session. No formal action is taken. Based on the testimony, the applicant gets a sense as to how their proposal may be received by the community and the City and whether it is worth pursuing or if modifications are necessary. There is not really a discretion that is exercised by the City on these proposals as it relates to them coming forward. I think that's important to clarify. On the subject of the Professorville Design Guidelines, on May 2nd the Planning Staff posted a public review draft of the Professorville Design Guidelines on the City's website for review and comment. We also mailed postcard notices inviting all Professorville property owners and residents to review the draft guidelines and provide comments over a two month timeframe. Planning Staff will provide information, answer questions and receive feedback at a public meeting tentatively planned for May 26, and Historic Resources Board Meetings on June 9th and July 14th. The Staff is targeting September for Council review and adoption of the Professorville Historic Design Guidelines. The draft guidelines project schedule and other information can be found on the Professorville Design Guidelines webpage on the City's website, cityofpaloalto.org/gov/departments, and then you can find your way to it from there. Did you want me to continue, Mr. Mayor? Are you ready to ...

Mayor Burt: Clerk need a little more time?

Beth Minor, City Clerk: We have two of them back, and then we can finish while he finishes, if you'd like.

Mr. Keene: I'll keep talking then. Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) transit service changes. VTA will be hosting a community meeting in Palo Alto Wednesday, next Wednesday, May 18th at Rinconada Library, to discuss their next network initiative. VTA or the Valley Transportation Authority has engaged a consultant to review existing routes and make recommendations for future routing and scheduling resulting in the development of three concept maps for public review and comment. Two of the concepts proposed would significantly reduce VTA bus service in Palo Alto including one concept that would eliminate all routes except for the 22 and 522 buses along El Camino Real. This meeting will provide an important opportunity for our community to review their proposed concepts and provide very necessary local feedback. More information is available on

TRANSCRIPT

VTA's website, vta.org/nextnetwork. Just a reminder and appropriate for tonight's Council meeting. This Thursday, May 12th is the 22nd annual Bay Area Bike to Work Day, and the City of Palo Alto will be participating again. We hope to see many of you out there riding your bike to work and school. We've been part of this green commute program for 17 years and are hosting four volunteer stations at the locations we have been staffing for years, at key commute locations including the Alma Bike Bridge on the north end of town, the Wilkie Way Bike Bridge on the south end of town, Downtown on Bryant Street right outside of here at City Hall, and at the busiest station California Avenue near the Caltrain station. The California Avenue (Cal. Avenue) is a busy spot, but volunteers are needed at all stations. To help, email jeffery.heckathorn@cityofpaloalto.org. Folks who have never made the trek along with the Mayor and Council Members and myself, for example, can stop at the Bike to Work energizer stations, get a snack and coffee, pick up a canvas bag, and get details on biking to work. The 94th annual May Fete Children's Parade was held last Saturday. It was a big success with this theme this year of Happy Healthy Habits. There were 62 parade entries from local schools, clubs and organizations, and participants were encouraged to express what they do to keep happy and healthy. The students of Escondido Elementary School and the Green Team volunteers created an award winning bicycle-powered float using unrecyclable food packaging from school lunches to display the impact of how much landfill material is used. Although rain was forecast for the entire day, not a single drop could have kept the kids from participating on that fun-filled day. I have—thank you, Roger—some slides to show related to our Public Art program, in case you've been Downtown this week. Our Public Art program in cooperation with Public Works and the Downtown Business and Professional Improvement Association installed five creative seating elements along University Avenue last week. The sleek and colorful benches by Walnut Creek artist Colin Selig were created from upcycled propane tanks. The pieces will be on loan to the City for one year, and members of the public are encouraged to let the Public Art program know what they think of the pilot project and if they would like to see more functional, creative artworks in Palo Alto. There will be a brief celebration with the artist hosted by the KEEN Garage, that's the shoe store, May 26th at 5:00. Lastly, I don't know if I've got a slide from the Children's Theatre 2015-2016 Main Stage season comes to a close with *James and the Giant Peach*, running for 11 performances May 12th through 22nd, featuring 26 local youth cast members. The final production of the 2015-16 Playhouse series in which high school teens perform fairy tales for young audiences on the Magic Castle stage ends with its final production of the year. We will have reached more than 4,700 audience members over the nine productions. The Teen Arts Council's final open mike night will be Friday, May 27th, at 7:30 P.M. at the Palo Alto Children's Theatre. That's all I have to report.

TRANSCRIPT

Mayor Burt: Thank you. Does the Clerk have results from the voting?

Ms. Minor: Yes, I do.

[The Council returned to Item 1.]

Oral Communications

Mayor Burt: We have ten speaker cards, so each speaker will allotted two minutes each to speak. Our first speaker is Lynn Krug, to be followed by Hamilton Hitchings. Welcome.

Lynn Krug: Good evening, Mayor Burt and City Council Members. I'll try and make my two minutes quick. I'd like to say thank you to Ed Shikada and Rumi Portillo who have taken over labor management, and that means they're working with myself as Chapter Chair of Service Employees International Union (SEIU) employees for the City of Palo Alto. We're grateful for being able to work with them for positive issues and working forward with the City. The reason I'm here tonight is because unfortunately I didn't find this out until I saw the Budget a week ago Friday. There's a position in there that Utilities is promoting that is a heavy equipment operator/installer/repairer assistant to be converted to heavy equipment operator/installer/repairer. I've worked in construction 22 years now. I've worked in heavy and highway 90 percent of that time. Combining a heavy equipment operator with a pipefitter installer is—although it might sound fine if you don't work in the field, these two jobs have distinct communication and duties for safety reasons. I'm here tonight to ask you to pull this Budget item under Utilities Budget Adjustment, Item 3, from the Budget. It is not a matter of scheduling and employee shortage. We have seven equipment operators, 20 installer/repairer, installer/repairer assistant, installer/repairer lead total. One of the issues is whether or not they share a calendar. The heavy equipment operators, of which there are seven, share four supervisors. Those supervisors, were they merely to share a calendar, would take care of any employee assignments. This primarily is a safety issue. When it comes down to it, the reason I'm here is because I strongly and firmly believe combining these two job descriptions, one of a heavy equipment operator who operates equipment that can kill somebody. I've witnessed someone get hit with the heavy equipment on a loader before. It's not safe. Thank you.

Mayor Burt: Thank you. Hamilton Hitchings to be followed by John Guisun.

Hamilton Hitchings: Good evening. First, I wanted to thank you for passing 80/30 and taking leadership in climate reduction. I'm very excited about that and about your action. The reason I'm here tonight is to talk about the

TRANSCRIPT

crossing guards. I just saw a local television broadcast on May 3rd about the lack of attendance of traffic guards at night. I also read an article in the *Palo Alto Weekly*. That's why I'm here. I want to encourage the City Council and the City Staff to prioritize enforcing the contract with Cypress. The Cypress employees are often not at their stations at night, and that poses a risk to our teenagers. Studies have shown a lot of suicides are impulsive and not premeditated. I really appreciate the City doing the program and allocating significant budget including good salary of \$22 an hour, but I want to request that they start to enforce the contract, consider withholding payments temporarily and not paying for delivery of services so that we can have a good implementation for that program. Thank you for your time.

Mayor Burt: Thank you. Our next speaker is John Guisun, to be followed by Andrea Lichter.

John Guisun: Good evening, Council. My name is John Guisun. I live at 225 Middlefield Road. If you've been reading your email, you know what I'm here to talk about. Middlefield Road from University Avenue to the Menlo Park border is four continuous blocks of driver mayhem. We have a history of having serious accidents and dangerous conditions, speeding, congestion, etc., on Middlefield. We've been working with the City; I've been doing it for two and a half years, other residents for more than 10 years, and we've yet to achieve anything that makes a difference. Tomorrow morning we're going to present to the City a petition signed by the residents of Middlefield North, and I'll read the brief petition to you. The residents of Middlefield North hereby request the City of Palo Alto implement a pilot road diet on Middlefield Road from University Avenue to the Menlo Park border in order to reduce the number of accidents, increase safety for pedestrians and bicyclists, increase traffic compliance with the speed limit, improve traffic flow, improve safety of access to our driveways, and improve quality of life for residents. To date four Council Members have engaged with us, working on these issues, but no one more than Council Member Kniss. I wish to thank her for her guidance and support. You're now going to hear from a group of other residents of Middlefield who will talk about their personal experiences on this residential street. Thank you.

Mayor Burt: Thank you. Our next speaker is Andrea Lichter.

Andrea Lichter: Good evening. I've made Palo Alto my home for 35 years, and 30 of those years have been on Middlefield Road. You can imagine I've seen the evolution of traffic. In fact, when I first moved on Middlefield Road, you could actually park on Middlefield Road, and you were actually able to bike on the sidewalks. There were signs permitting bike riders on the sidewalk. It's changed drastically, and it's very, very dangerous. I'm in my

TRANSCRIPT

home every night, and I hear near crashes. I just cringe; I get so concerned and so upset waiting to hear the impact. Quite often there is an impact. In fact, several years ago there was a young man driving north on Middlefield—I live two houses off the corner of Middlefield and Hawthorne Avenue—and this young man was driving an SUV. He was speeding, and he literally pulled down our fence, drove up my front yard, took out all the shrubbery. I'm just so thankful that my husband wasn't out there gardening, which he regularly does. A couple of years ago there was another accident on that corner of Middlefield and Hawthorne, again coming from Willow where the cars speed. This time this young man wasn't very lucky; he actually was killed as he hit a tree at the corner of Middlefield and Hawthorne. That was a terrible experience for all of us in the neighborhood. Even the other day there were two cars vying for a space right in front of my house, and there was an accident. It wasn't reported, as many of the accidents are not reported. Right in front of my house, two people got out of their cars. One was a taxi, and the other was a regular car. They were going at it for a while, but no police were called. That's what happens, a lot of accidents happen. I'm really concerned, and I'm hoping that you hear us this evening and could consider our pilot. Thank you.

Mayor Burt: Thank you. Our next speaker is Neeraj Pendse. Welcome.

Neeraj Pendse: Good evening. Thank you for the opportunity. My name is Neeraj Pendse; I'm on 300 block of Middlefield Road. I'm a father of two preschoolers. My neighbors and I are here in support of John's petition. I just wanted to talk about two things. Number one, there's a lot of buses and trucks that use Middlefield Road, and they actually don't fit in our lanes because the lanes are too narrow. Second issue, there's left turns from Lytton Avenue—actually two lanes, but the lanes are so narrow that two cars at a time can't actually turn together. If they try, they either honk at each other because they get too close to each other or worse. I hear those honks every day, because I'm very close to that intersection. There is safety, there is the transportation capacity, and then there is our quality of life, who live there and can't get out of our driveways. Right now, I think we're way prioritizing the transportation capacity and completely ignoring safety as you have seen from the accidents and completely ignoring our quality of life. I urge you to consider the proposal of a road diet pilot and would love to help and would love to engage with you. Thank you.

Mayor Burt: Thank you. Our next speaker is Mark Eden, to be followed by Priti Dusane. Welcome.

Mark Eden: Hi, thank you. Just to reiterate some of the things from our neighbors. I live at 201 Middlefield; I'm directly across from Andrea, about

TRANSCRIPT

a block from Neeraj, and two doors down from John, who has been leading our effort here. This is just reciting a letter that we sent to Mayor Holman; my wife sent this to Mayor Holman last December. I just wanted to kind of go through this again. The letter said Dear Mayor Holman, our stretch of Middlefield Road continues to worsen to the point of our family considering selling our home to move to a safer street. Due to the low inventory of homes in Palo Alto, we would probably have to buy elsewhere. It's distressing this seems to be our only solution. When we purchased our home 13 years ago, the traffic was nowhere near as terrible, unbearable in fact, as it is today. Now, after 3:00 P.M. we are reluctant to leave our home. We close our windows to reduce the smell and ingestion of exhaust fumes. We advise friends and relatives not to visit during certain times. We cannot allow our daughter to play outside. This not good quality of life. I realize the City has made attempts to reduce some of the Middlefield traffic issues, but they simply are not working. As our neighbors have previously requested, the configuration of Middlefield Road needs to be changed from four lanes to two. Why is a two-lane configuration feasible for University Avenue and Middlefield south of Channing Avenue? Is the safety of those residents more important than ours? We are now begging you for a solution. Please help. Thank you.

Mayor Burt: Thank you. Priti Dusane to be followed by Jacob Whiting.

Priti Dusane: Good evening, Council Members. This is my first time here. I've been living on the Middlefield Road, 120 Middlefield Road, for the last eight years. This is my daughter, Abigail. I'm here supporting the petition to improve the traffic around the Middlefield area. I've been in this area for a very long time and noticing gradually the traffic has been, I would say, negatively impacting young families like mine. My daughter, Abigail, I just can't see her biking or staying closer to the traffic in front of our front yard, because there is just so many cars passing by. For me, backing up, in and out, oh my, God, is just a chaotic. I have to (inaudible) time myself; 9:00, I should go in and out quickly. If I miss that timeframe, I'll be sitting in my driveway for a long time. Pollution is another concern I have. I've noticed with the three lanes, sometimes they're blocked end to end. It takes at least five minutes for cars to go back and forth. I literally have to tell my daughter, "Close all the windows. It's going to be all smoky inside the house," because we're so close to the streets. Lastly, I myself personally witnessed a casualty right in front of my home where there was a lady trying to go on Palo Alto Avenue. A guy on Middlefield just struck head-on, and there was a fire. It was nerve wracking for me. Thank you again for listening to us. We love the community. We love Palo Alto. Hopefully you can help us. Thank you.

TRANSCRIPT

Mayor Burt: thank you. Jacob Whiting to be followed by Walt Hays.

Jacob Whiting: Thank you for hearing us tonight. That part of Middlefield, specifically where it intersects with Palo Alto Avenue, is a dangerous intersection, and it's one that I think doesn't get on the radar. The number of near misses and near accidents, I believe, is incredibly high compared to the number of full-out accidents, which is also high. As one my neighbors explained earlier, when two cars are trying to turn at the same time side by side, there's oftentimes a collision of the inside car with the curb on Middlefield Road in front of the addresses 136 Middlefield Road, which is my address, and also 142 Middlefield Road. As testament to this, you can often find hub caps and car parts in the couple of addresses that follow that corner. I see at least one hub cap per month there that's from a car hitting the curb, trying to avoid the other cars and breaking off. I've spoken with the Transportation Department; they say that the lane meets the minimum width, but they say it's far from ideal. They say it's just minimum. Certainly I would never recommend anyone to bicycle on the street as we're supposed to do these days. I've lived in Palo Alto for 30 years and at that address for 16 years. I've encountered few intersections and streets that are as bad as that particular section. I'd like to encourage you to consider this pilot program that we want to do, which is we want to test out what would happen if we reduced the lanes down to two lanes. Thank you.

Mayor Burt: Thank you. Walt Hays to be followed by Lin Jiang. Welcome.

Walt Hays: Good evening. I'm here just to give a brief explanation about Item 6 on your Agenda. Georgetown University is administering a program that will give a \$5 million prize to the city that saves the most energy over a two year period and does so in an innovative way. The segments that are being measured to achieve the prize are city government, residences and schools. Since schools are going to be playing a major role in winning the prize if it is won, the student green teams and the staff, which they are doing. The sustainable schools committee, which I chair, recommended that the Utilities Staff recommend to you that if you win, a portion of the prize be shared with the District. I see they've done that, and I hope you will do the same. Thank you.

Mayor Burt: Thank you. Lin Jiang to be followed by Sea Reddy.

Lin Jiang: Good evening, Council Members. Thank you for the opportunity to speak tonight. My name is Lin Jiang, and I live on the 600 block of Webster. I'd like to express my strong objection to the massive construction project proposed for 550 Hamilton. My family moved here nine years ago. Only three blocks away from Addison Elementary and one block from the

TRANSCRIPT

vibrant Downtown, this location seemed ideal for us to raise a family. Our daughters are eight and 11 months old. Over the years, we've witnessed a drastic transformation of more and more dense office buildings adjacent to our neighborhood of residential housing. A quick scan of the Palo Alto development map today reveals some 20 office buildings currently in construction, 20 new buildings. We say enough office development already. My neighborhood is residential with mostly one-story, single-family homes and two-story multifamily homes. The idea of two massive, tall, intrusive, glass buildings right across the street with no setback from all the residential homes is truly outrageous. The existing building on 550 Hamilton serves the community well. The parking lot serves as a buffer from office buildings for residential homes with many mature trees. This proposal intends to build out the entire lot, in the process removing many trees including four large, mature Sequoia redwoods. The density, traffic congestion and noise will increase significantly. The proposal also presents some serious daylight plane encroachment issues and intolerable privacy issues for the abutting neighbors on Webster Street. It is a blatant disregard of careful planning, transitioning from Downtown commercial into residential neighborhood. We ask that you oppose this intrusive and massive project. Thank you for your time.

Mayor Burt: Thank you. Our final speaker is Sea Reddy.

Sea Reddy: Good evening, Mayor and the citizens of Palo Alto and the communities. I'm not going to take time to campaign on things. I have things that I want to talk about. As you get the absentee ballots in the mail—this is happening this week—I want you to really think through to see why do we need \$1 million, up to \$1 million, of people's money to find two representatives to represent us. Think hard. Why is there a revolution here? Why is Donald Trump getting a lot of attention? We don't need that money. I think you could give that money to schools, people that are in need. We don't need to give it to campaign committees, and then they turn around and give it to the advertisement and put billboards and all that. Please consider that. We don't need that. You're well educated; you have a lot of courage to decide who you want. Let it be someone that you really know, but you don't need to waste that money; you don't need to (inaudible) that money. What I'm afraid is that you need to do favors when you get back to Sacramento. The second thing I want to talk about is I am again saying that if you are running for something, you should go for that position and give up other things. There are Council Members here, Council Members in Mountain View, Council Members in other parts of the town, I request them to resign where they are today and then go for the June 7th primary so they can decide the people who want to go to the next step. Thank you.

TRANSCRIPT

Mayor Burt: Thank you. That concludes our Oral Communications. For those members of the public who are not familiar, the Council is not allowed to comment on items that are not on the Agenda.

Minutes Approval

3. Approval of Action Minutes for the April 25, 2016 Council Meeting.

Mayor Burt: Our next item is Approval of Minutes from April 25, 2016. Do we have a Motion to approve?

Vice Mayor Scharff: So moved.

Council Member Berman: Second.

MOTION: Vice Mayor Scharff moved, seconded by Council Member Berman to approve the Action Minutes for the April 25, 2016 Council Meeting.

Mayor Burt: Please vote on the board. That passes unanimously.

MOTION PASSED: 9-0

Consent Calendar

Mayor Burt: Our next item is the Consent Calendar. Go ahead, the Clerk can announce the vote for the fourth position on the Utilities Advisory Commission.

[The Council returned to Item 1.]

Mayor Burt: We now have the Consent Calendar, and we have one speaker, Bob Wenzlau, who would like to speak on Item Number 5. Welcome.

Bob Wenzlau, speaking regarding Agenda Item Number 5: Thank you, Council Members. I'm here as a Board Member of the Neighborhoods Abroad organization. I'm joined by Barbara and Joe Evans who are the Presidents of Neighborhoods Abroad. Basically, wanted to speak in support of an item on the Consent Calendar to share or donate an ambulance to our Sister City Oaxaca, Mexico. The timing of the donation will coincide with probably the 30th or 40 years. Everything in Neighborhoods Abroad is 40 years and going. In this case, we're going to be sending a great group of young students to Oaxaca to learn and practice Spanish and bring back a group of students from Oaxaca to equally live in our community. One of the events that we're hoping this will coincide with is an ambulance showing up from Palo Alto to be celebrated in Oaxaca and basically save lives in Oaxaca. It's a great story of older equipment that, by State law, is obligated to be

TRANSCRIPT

retired, but lives probably another 25 years of service. There's actually a potential that it might even serve Palo Altans down there if you have some bad Mescal. Thank you very much for considering it. It's a delight to be able to be part of the project. I hope you see us again someday when we have another surplus vehicle that we can share with that community.

Mayor Burt: Thank you. Do we have a Motion to approve the Consent Calendar?

Council Member Wolbach: So moved.

Council Member Kniss: So moved.

MOTION: Council Member Wolbach moved, seconded by Council Member Kniss to approve Agenda Item Numbers 4-8.

4. Approval of a Contract With the United States Geological Survey for Five Years in the Amount of \$60,023 per Year for a Total of \$310,315 for San Francisco Bay Monitoring Near the Regional Water Quality Control Plant's Discharge.
5. Approval of the Donation of a Surplus Ambulance to Oaxaca, Mexico.
6. Approval of an Allocation of \$1 Million to the Palo Alto Unified School District in the Event the City of Palo Alto Wins the \$5 Million Georgetown University Energy Prize.
7. Resolution 9584 Entitled, "Resolution of the Council of the City of Palo Alto (a) Endorsing the Community Plan to end Homelessness in Santa Clara County 2015- 2020;" and Resolution 9585 Entitled, "Resolution of the Council of the City of Palo Alto (b) Supporting City Programs to Encourage and Fund Affordable Housing as Urged by the Santa Clara County Housing Task Force."
8. Authorize the City Manager to Execute an Agreement Between the City of Palo Alto and Team Sheeper LLC, for the Learn to Swim Program for Summer 2016 at an Amount Not-to-Exceed \$236,500, and Approve a Budget Amendment in the General Fund.

Mayor Burt: Motion by Council Member Wolbach, seconded by Council Member Kniss. Please vote on the board. That passes unanimously on a 9-0 vote.

MOTION PASSED: 9-0

TRANSCRIPT

Action Items

9. Approval of the Concept Plan for Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements Along Amarillo Avenue, Bryant Street, East Meadow Drive, Montrose Avenue, Moreno Avenue, Louis Road, Palo Alto Avenue, and Ross Road (Continued from April 18, 2016); Approval of Professional Services Contract Number C16163533 With Alta Planning + Design, Inc. in the Amount of \$824,542 for Preparation of Plans, Specifications and Estimates for the Amarillo Avenue-Moreno Avenue, Bryant Street Update, Louis Road-Montrose Avenue, and Ross Road Bicycle Boulevard Projects; and Approval of Professional Services Contract Number C16161534 With Fehr & Peers in the Amount of \$544,509 for Preparation of Plans, Specifications and Estimates for the Bryant Street Extension, Maybell Avenue, and Park Boulevard-Wilkie Way Bicycle Boulevard Projects. Environmental Assessment: Exempt From the California Environmental Quality Act per Section 15301.

Mayor Burt: We will now move on to Item Number 9. This item is approval of the concept plan for bicycle and pedestrian improvements along Amarillo Avenue, Bryant Street, East Meadow Drive, Montrose Avenue, Moreno Avenue, Louis Road, Palo Alto Avenue and Ross Road. This item is continued from April 18th, 2016. It also includes approval of professional services with Alta Planning and Design in the amount of \$824,000 for preparation of plans, specifications and estimates for the Amarillo-Moreno Avenue, Bryant Street update, Louis Road-Montrose Avenue, Ross Road Bicycle Boulevard projects and approval of a professional services contract with Fehr & Peers for \$544,000 for preparation of plans, specifications and estimates for the Bryant Street extension, Maybell Avenue and Park Boulevard-Wilkie Way Bicycle Boulevard projects. This project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act. Welcome, Mr. Mello.

Joshuah Mello, Chief Transportation Official: Greetings, Mayor, members of Council. I'm Josh Mello, the City's Chief Transportation Official. I'm joined by Hugh Louch, our consultant on these projects, with Alta Planning and Design.

Molly Stump, City Attorney: Thank you, Mayor Burt. City Attorney Molly Stumps. Just to alert the public and the Council to the order of the item tonight. We do have one Council Member who has a real property interest very close to the Bryant Street Bicycle Boulevard; that's Council Member Tom DuBois. As a result, Mr. DuBois will not be participating in the Bryant Street item. That item is segregable under the rules that are provided by California Fair Political Practices Commission. We'll follow that practice tonight to both provide for the recusal but allow participation to the

TRANSCRIPT

maximum allowed by law. The Staff has divided the presentation into an initial general description of the bicycle boulevard program generally. It's my understanding that the Mayor will allow some Council questions at that general level. When it comes to the specific bicycle boulevard plans, the Council will take the Bryant Street plan and the associated contract first. Council Member DuBois will not participate; he will recuse himself. Once that item is resolved by Council, then Council will move to the South Palo Alto boulevards and the contract associated with that with Council Member DuBois rejoining the Council. Thank you.

Mayor Burt: Thank you.

Mr. Mello: I'm going to give a brief overview of the Bike Pedestrian Transportation Plan program, talk a little bit about the progress that we've made over the last couple of years, and then give you a little bit of overview of some of the treatments and things that you'll see in the concept plans that are attached to the Staff Report. As you know, back in 2012, the City of Palo Alto adopted the Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Plan. This includes a network of bicycle boulevards, enhanced bikeways, and shared-use paths across the entire City. It's intended as an illustration of what the ultimate build-out of the City's bike network would be. There's really no timeline associated with the build-out of this network. It would be fairly expensive to construct the entire network at once. In 2014, funding was allocated, about \$1.2 million per year in the Capital Improvement Program, by Council. Staff selected several corridors to begin the concept planning process for. These corridors are shown on the map on this slide. They were identified from the Bike and Pedestrian Transportation Plan, and they followed a very logical planning process starting in 2014. Staff started by kicking off the planning process with bike-alongs through the community. There was an online mapping exercise where folks could identify different constraints and opportunities along these corridors and challenges. There's been a series of public meetings that combined different variations of the corridors, moved around different meeting locations through the City, and were held at different seasons and different months of the year, both in 2014 and 2015. Recent accomplishments. Over the last two years, we have presented several concept plans for your approval. Those include the Churchill Avenue Phase 1 concept plan, the Charleston Road-Arastradero Complete Street concept plan as well as Park Boulevard, Wilkie Way, Stanford Avenue, Maybell Avenue and the Bryant Street extension. All of those projects, the concept plans for those were approved in 2015. One of the items that we're requesting tonight is approval of a contract to advance those projects into final design. This is something we developed at the Mayor's request, and we're hoping to develop more of an interactive dashboard so folks track our progress on the Bike Plan implementation. This

TRANSCRIPT

set of graphs here illustrates—as of today, we have 7.9 miles of bike boulevard corridors in the concept planning phase. We have 5.0 miles that have had their concept plans already approved by City Council. If you elect to move forward with all of our recommendations this evening, we'll move to the bottom chart where we'll have 11.1 miles of bike boulevards in the final design phase, and then only 4.5 miles remaining where we have not conducted any work to date. Just a brief primer on bike boulevards. We really had four objectives when we developed the concept plans for these bike boulevards. First and foremost, these are bicycle projects, but they are really traffic calming projects at their heart and soul. One of the primary goals, if not the overarching goal of the entire program, is to reduce motor vehicle speeds on these streets and to get motor vehicles operating at moderated speeds closer to the speed at which bicyclists travel along the corridors. Lower speeds save lives. Study after study shows that your chance of surviving a collision when hit by a motor vehicle moving at 25 miles an hour is vastly greater than a motor vehicle traveling 35 or above. We also worked very closely with the Safe Routes to School program. You recently just approved the last set of the Walk and Roll maps that were developed by the Safe Routes to School team. Those played an integral part in the treatments and some of the elements that you'll see in the concept plans for the bike boulevard corridors. We've also looked very closely throughout the process at ways that we can add vegetation, greenery and improve the aesthetics of some of the roadways that are involved in these projects. That's particularly relevant in the corridors in the South Palo Alto area where there were a lot of wider streets that were built more recently that didn't really have a lot of street trees or vegetation. You'll see that in some of the concept plans that we'll discuss a little bit later. Some of the treatments that you'll see in the concept plans include speed humps which, in this case, we've elected to identify slotted speed humps. This is based on community feedback. These look like traditional speed humps, but they have gaps that are set at about the wheel base of an emergency vehicle, an ambulance or a fire truck. It enables fire trucks to pass at a higher speed over the speed hump to reach emergencies. Whereas, a typical passenger car cannot straddle those two slots. It also allows cyclists to travel through the slots and not have their travel interrupted by a speed hump. We also have several curb extension identified along these four projects. Curb extensions typically are constructed where you have a parking lane and you have roadway space that you can add vegetation and street trees within the curb extension. They also serve to tighten up the roadway, and psychologically drivers tend to slow down when the roadway feels tighter and more constrained. Several places we're recommending raised intersections. This would be where the entire intersection is brought up to the level of the sidewalk. This basically forces drivers to yield at pedestrian crossings at the intersections, because they have to slow down as they're

TRANSCRIPT

approaching the intersection anyway. It encourages them to yield much more consistently. Chicanes are where we provide horizontal deflection for vehicles. This is where the travel path of a vehicle is interrupted; they have to move either right or left to pass either a center island or a curb extension on the side of the roadway. In several locations we're recommending median islands which would serve two purposes. They would slow down turning vehicles by not allowing vehicles to encroach into the oncoming travel lane. When they make a turn, they would have to go around the median island. They also provide a refuge for pedestrians crossing at those intersections. There would be a raised median where a pedestrian could temporarily pause if they felt uncomfortable or felt as though they were not going to make it across the entire intersection. Last but not least, mini roundabouts or traffic circles. We're going to go into a little more detail on those. Traffic circles or roundabouts. One of the main benefits of these is to reduce the conflict points. We have a lot of intersections along our bike boulevard network that are always stop controlled or two-way stop controlled. A traditional traffic signal control or stop controlled intersection has upwards of 32 points of conflict. When you throw in pedestrian conflicts, that almost doubles. That's because there's left turns, right turns; there's through movements, all within the same space and all with the potential to have a collision or a conflict. There's also the points of conflict at the crosswalk. Pedestrians are relying on motor vehicles to come to a complete stop; they're relying on right turning and left turning vehicles to see them at the same time that they're judging gaps in oncoming traffic. Roundabouts eliminate all of these decision points. The only decisions you to have make are whether you're going to yield to a pedestrian upon entering the roundabout, whether you're going to yield to a vehicle that's already in the roundabout, and then whether you need to yield to a pedestrian upon exiting the roundabout. Those are really only the three points of conflict that you have when you're using a roundabout. When we talk about safety, the only type of collision that can really occur between vehicles in a roundabout is a side-swipe collision. Those are the least dangerous type of collision when compared to a T-bone or a head-on collision, which tend to be the most serious. Even if there is a collision in a roundabout, it tends to be much less severe than at a traditional intersection. Throughout the concept plans, we're recommending the installation of bike boulevard legends, which are shown on the left. These are not sharrows. Our first proposals that we brought to the community included the greenback sharrows, which are shown on the right there. Rightly so, a lot of folks were concerns about the aesthetics of those in their community. We also had them spaced rather closely together originally, I think 300 feet staggered. Since then, we've greatly reduced the number of pavement markings, and we've changed them to the bike boulevard legend which is shown on the left there. We now only show them at the beginning of every block instead of spaced every

TRANSCRIPT

couple hundred feet. We're also recommending some strategic parking removal along the bike boulevard corridors. This is based on observed safety concerns, both from Staff and from residents that we heard at the community meetings. One of the things that we're hoping to achieve is what's called daylighting. This is where you pull the parking back from the intersections in order to improve the sight lines for both motorists, pedestrians and cyclists. This is shown to be highly effective. Two studies that we've identified show a 30 percent reduction in pedestrian collisions at intersections that have been day-lighted. In most instances, we're only recommending removal of one to two parking spaces on each approach of the intersections. That provides a really big benefit to sight lines at the intersections for all users. We hosted kind of a wrap-up public meeting back in March at the Ohlone Elementary School. We got some great feedback from the public. We presented the concept plans that are in front of you this evening. Some of the major comments were around roundabouts. There were both positive and negative comments about roundabouts, generally more positive, but there were folks who were concerned about how cyclists and motorists would navigate them. There were also some requests to increase our education around bike boulevards and some of the treatments that we're recommending. We're definitely going to look at that as part of our Safe Routes to School program. We also presented these concept plans to the Planning and Transportation Commission (PTC) and Palo Alto Bicycle Advisory Committee (PABAC) in April and May. Again, we received general comments from PTC and PABAC which include the roundabouts should include landscaping, which we have always assumed that we would include some type of landscaping. There were assorted comments regarding stop sign removal, some concern around the color of directional signage as well as curb extensions forcing cyclists into the travel lane. That concludes our presentation on the general overview and general comments received on the bike boulevard concepts that are before you this evening. The next step in the presentation will be the Bryant Street update specific elements.

Mayor Burt: We can now entertain questions of Staff on the general nature. I have a question for the City Attorney. We have a number of public comments. Do we need to be concerned about restricting which public comments apply to the general versus the specific Bryant, where the conflict is?

Ms. Stump: It's fine to take the public comment as part of the general. If Council Members wish to pick up particular portions of the public testimony or questions that arise through that process, perhaps you can allocate them into the various bucks as you respond to Staff and as you sometimes pass questions onto Staff.

TRANSCRIPT

Mayor Burt: At this time, we'll just be looking for essentially technical questions of Staff regarding the general elements of the plan and not specific to the Bryant boulevard. Council Member Schmid.

Council Member Schmid: A general question. You've done a great job in working with the pathways identified and getting public comment about them and looking at the details. Let me step back a little bit. When we originally—you also mentioned that as we move along, the \$20 million we've committed to this gradually decreases. These obviously have some priority as we move ahead. I just want to ask a question about the Midtown connector. There was a public event around Hoover Park a couple of weekends ago that seemed to be received well. I noted that Redwood City has just committed to build a pathway to their Baylands utilizing a right-of-way roadway, costs \$3 million. Where does the Midtown connector stand in terms of feasibility, thinking about it, working?

Mr. Mello: We're actually bringing the Midtown Connector Feasibility Study to Council in June. We're going to provide you with a detailed presentation on the study that we're wrapping up. A lot of it's based on the comments you gave us at the end of last year. We'll be back in June to give you a full update on that project.

Council Member Schmid: Thank you.

Mayor Burt: Council Member Berman.

Council Member Berman: Just a quick question about the difference chicanes and speed bumps or humps or whatever we call them. Why would you use one over another? What circumstance would a chicane be preferable?

Mr. Mello: Our general thought process along the bike boulevards was that we wanted to encourage motorists to operate at moderated speeds. Right now there's a lot of stop and go and speeding. There's a lot of stop sign control. As we look to remove stop signs, we wanted to put in place kind of alternating traffic calming devices, so that drivers didn't become comfortable and know that there's going to be a speed hump. We combined vertical deflection, which is a speed hump, and a horizontal deflection, which would be curb extensions or chicanes. We also looked for opportunities to add street trees and vegetation where possible, and the chicanes and curb extensions allow us to add vegetation and street trees, particularly on streets that are really wide and don't have a lot of shade currently.

Council Member Berman: Thanks.

TRANSCRIPT

Mayor Burt: Council Member Kniss.

Council Member Kniss: Thanks for the report tonight. Appreciate it. A couple of questions on two aspects of this. I think you've addressed sharrows pretty well. I really appreciate that. I have a neighborhood that was very vocal about particularly the green signs that would have been on the pavement. There are other parts of town that are equally concerned about a lot of signage on the pavement. Will you—because primarily this is to lay out where the route is. The second or third part of this is going to be indicating what is about to happen or when, which is what the sharrows would have done, but you have found, I think, a better way to do that. I think there's some resistance to too much of—I don't recall the exact plastic name that is used instead of paint. Can you tell me?

Mr. Mello: Thermoplastic.

Council Member Kniss: Thermoplastic, which is now being used in a number of places in town. Correct? After a certain length of time, it is pretty unsightly. It cracks, it gets dirty, and it looks like it's going to stay forever. Paint wears off, and this doesn't seem to do that. Maybe you'd comment back to that. At the same time, let me ask the second question. Your traffic circle, which is on page whatever here—I grew up with traffic circles. We called them rotaries where I grew up. This one is particularly attractive, and a lot of them aren't. After the first question regarding signage and paint and so forth, the second one would be how do we keep these looking like that? That's not inexpensive, and it takes water.

Mr. Mello: I grew up with rotaries as well. Your first question, recently we made a conscious decision to start to limit our use of thermoplastic and green pavement markings to only areas where there's conflicts between motor vehicles, which primarily occur on—major conflicts where a bike lane is transitioning across a right turn-lane or a high volume driveway. Most of those occurrences are on arterial streets or collector streets. We're not typically recommending the use of green thermoplastic in residential neighborhoods anymore. We've also switched to a material called MME which is an epoxy. It's different than thermoplastic, and it seems to be more durable and hold its color a little bit longer and not crack, but only time will tell how it performs. In regard to the traffic circles, City Staff currently is using a watering truck to water the traffic circles that are in Downtown north and some other isolated landscape areas.

Council Member Kniss: I hope it's purple water.

Mr. Mello: I think it's recycled; I'm not sure where it comes from. We can find that out from the Operations Staff, if you'd like. That's our intent for

TRANSCRIPT

these. If any landscaping is added, we have consulted with the Operations Staff, and watering by water truck is feasible.

Council Member Kniss: I'm not going to beat this to death, but what gets planted in those roundabouts is really important. I certainly hope they're watering with recycled water. It would be a shame to do it otherwise. I think thinking carefully about what goes in there, water-resistant types of things that they use in the Southwest and so forth. They're very attractive, but they're not attractive when everything in them has died and it's dirt. It just is unsightly in any neighborhood. I think there are places where neighbors say they are willing to take care of them and keep them up, but I don't know if that's a good long-term solution. I think both those things—delighted with the rest of the Bike Plan, but I think there are these two aesthetic issues that have troubled me. Thank you for paying attention to them. One last thing. You're also going to use some type of medallion or indicator at the beginning of an intersection where you will have the bike boulevard designated. Correct, or you're just thinking about that?

Mr. Mello: At the beginning of each block, there will be a—it's called a bike boulevard legend, and it'll be on the pavement at the beginning of each block. It's just a simple white bike boulevard pavement legend. It was shown on one of the slides earlier. I can bring that back up if you'd like.

Council Member Kniss: It's all right. If you'll just show it to me later. Thank you. I think that also will help. What I've noticed with Bryant Street is that people are so used to using that as a bike boulevard that that almost doesn't need to be either sharrowed or marked in any other way, because people are so aware of that. I think with the new ones, it is a different situation. Thanks, Josh.

Mayor Burt: Council Member Filseth.

Council Member Filseth: Thanks very much. Thank you for this really, really clear and explanatory presentation here. I guess I wanted to sort of continue sort of the thread that Council Member Kniss was pulling on. In the plan, there are sort of a considerable range of conditions in different parts of the City. There's a big range of the number of vehicles per day, the number of bicycles per day, the average speed of vehicles, and so forth. I guess my question is how do you decide, at least from 90,000 feet, which basket of tools to apply. Is there sort of a standard template and we just apply that everywhere or do we say, "This is one set of conditions. We use this approach here. A different set of conditions, we use this approach there"? If it is, is it based on sort of usage or is it based on physical geometry like

TRANSCRIPT

the width of the streets and what the sidewalks are like? How does that work?

Mr. Mello: This has been a two year process. One of the concept plans in particular is in its sixth draft. It's in its sixth draft because we have continually worked to refine every single one of these over the last two years. We've had over ten public meetings, several kind of professional staff charrettes where we just laid out the plans, we looked at all of the data. This was consultant staff, City Staff. We even pulled elements from NACTO, National Association of City Transportation Officials. They have a bike boulevard chapter in their Urban Bikeway Design Guide. There's lots of studies out there that have pretty substantial guidance on how to construct bike boulevards. I would say I think we're more at the 5,000-foot level with these. We've gotten so enmeshed in the details, and we've gone out and done nighttime surveys to determine where additional street lighting is required. We've walked the corridors at all different times, ridden bikes, looked at parking demand, talked to schools along the corridor, looked at demand for parking near public parks. I think that's why you'll see that what we're recommending on the Ross Road Bike Boulevard differs a great deal from what we may recommend along some of the other corridors, because they are all different contexts, different roadway widths. We did kick off the entire process by conducting traffic counts, bike-pedestrian (ped) counts, looking at speeds. There were really only a couple of segments where we were concerned about speed. The traffic calming is mainly intended to just moderate speeds and account for some of the areas where we're removing stop signs. We don't want to remove a stop sign and then have the travel speed creep up because people are no longer required to stop. We're trying to anticipate that by putting in some proactive traffic calming in the blocks approaching the intersection that no longer has stop control. I don't know if you want to add anything, Hugh.

Hugh Louch, Alta Design and Planning: I think that covers it.

Council Member Filseth: Maybe I could just extend it a little bit and ask it a slightly different way. Do you look at things and say, "This is a really wide, busy street, and the cars go fast, and there's a lot of bikes on it. We need to throw a lot of stuff at it"? In other places, you say, "This is a quiet, residential street. Not too many cars drive on it. We don't need to do very much there." Is that part of the formula?

Mr. Mello: Yeah, that's exactly the process. We also looked at the data that we had around traffic counts and speeds. Some of the streets, just going out and looking at how wide the street is, you can tell that people probably travel too fast, especially in the evening, at night when they're in a rush.

TRANSCRIPT

Those stretches in particular, you'll see a lot more aggressive traffic calming recommendations.

Mayor Burt: Before next question, I just wanted to let the members of the public know that we have a large number of speakers. We'll be having two minutes per speaker to speak, so you can time your comments accordingly. Council Member Holman.

Council Member Holman: Thank you. Following on the prior two questioners and looking at—future reference, page numbers on the slides would be really helpful, because then we can quickly. The one that has proposed treatments on it, that slide, if you want to put it up. Looking at these, I'm looking at, let's say for the moment, median islands and mini roundabouts. That looks like it has a lot of paint on the street from each direction. I'm trying to understand if that is what is indicated there and then how does that work with the—on one of the other slides—bike boulevard symbol. There are two bike boulevard symbols or legends, one with a bicycle and boulevard and an arrow, and then one that has a bicycle and just the arrows. I don't know which ones—how does that all work? If you're going to have a legend at the beginning of every block, it looks like you could have all of this plus the bike legend at each one of those four occasions.

Mr. Mello: The bike legends are actually shown on the median island and mini roundabout graphics that you see. If you can see my arrow there, that's the bike boulevard legend.

Council Member Holman: That's what that is.

Mr. Mello: There's one on the corresponding—the opposite departure lane as well. This cross-street is not a bike boulevard, so there's no bike boulevard legends on that. There's only the stop. A lot of these pavement markings are existing. The crosswalks and the stop bars and the stop stencils would typically already be in place. What would be added would be the yellow center line to guide people around the island. In the case of the mini roundabout, there's not much additional pavement markings. It's mainly just civil—hardscape elements that would be added including the deflection islands and the center circular island.

Council Member Holman: Looking at the mini roundabout, what you're saying is because stop signs are going out, going away in such an occasion. The cross strips are already on the pavement because of the stop sign that's there now, and then you're adding the—what did you call that?

Mr. Mello: This yellow center line here?

TRANSCRIPT

Council Member Holman: Yeah, the center line. You're adding that yellow, center line. There's also going to be signs in the roundabout, directional signs in the roundabout?

Mr. Mello: The typical signage in a roundabout would be on each approach there would be a short, white regulatory sign with circular arrows. It's, I think, 24 by 24 maybe.

Council Member Holman: These are small roundabouts, because we don't have very many large intersections. A mini roundabout is small. It still seems like anybody approaching this is going to see the directional—it seems like a lot still. I don't know; I'm not the pro in this, but it seems like a lot. Jim, you had something?

James Keene, City Manager: I was just going to say we don't have four stop signs at a four-way stop which is also quite typical at non-roundabout situations. We kind of get used to some of these signs, I think. When we think about a new one, it's very different than what we've sort of been acclimated to.

Council Member Holman: I appreciate that. What it looks like, though, is that we've got on the pavement—again, looking at the mini roundabout—it's as if there was four stop signs because there's paint on each of the four streets.

Mr. Mello: These are just crosswalks that may or may not already exist at the intersection. If they don't exist, we would probably look to mark them sometime in the future, if they're near a school or along an important bike route. I will say that we can definitely, as we move into the final design phase, we heard loud and clear from the community that there are aesthetic concerns around signing and striping. We can certainly look to minimize the amount of signage.

Council Member Holman: I appreciate that, because in this it's not obvious that it's going to be this plus, then the directional signs at the roundabout, and they're not very big. You don't quite have side-to-side roundabout signs, but kind of almost. Talk to us a little bit about raised intersection. What's the run-up to a raised intersection?

Mr. Mello: It would be a slope typical to a speed hump. You would go up six inches to the level of the sidewalk; you would go up the raised intersection. As you entered the intersection, the entire intersection is raised, and then you would go back down after you left the intersection. It encourages motorists to yield, because typically there's a crosswalk at the beginning of the intersection. In this case there would be bike lanes along the corridor

TRANSCRIPT

that you're entering, that's intersecting the street. It would encourage yielding to both pedestrians and cyclists. It also allows pedestrians to obtain control of the crosswalk a little easier. They don't have to cross as directly, and it's not as rigid as a typical intersection.

Council Member Holman: I think just two other questions. Thank you. I got so used to speed tables, and now we're using speed humps. Are speed tables not be utilized anymore? They're so gentle.

Mr. Mello: We still use speed tables on collector streets. Speed humps are a little more dramatic; we use those on local, residential streets. The majority of the bike boulevards that are before you tonight are on local, residential streets.

Council Member Holman: Last question. The areas in, let's say, Ross, they are the wider streets. What did you discover—two things in the same questions. What did you discover in terms of planting opportunities along the sides? The other is was there any consideration for any street closures to automobile vehicles because that certainly seems to slow traffic in these days of Google maps and all of that. We get a lot more cut-through traffic. Was that considered as a means to slow down traffic, keep some of the traffic out of the neighborhood from cut through? Two questions in one there, sorry.

Mr. Mello: We're going to talk a little bit more about the Amarillo, Moreno and the Ross Road corridors later in the presentation. Those are the ones specifically where we found a lot of opportunities to add street trees and vegetation. On the Amarillo Bike Boulevard concept plan, there's actually a pretty significant curb extension that would add several street trees. Along Ross, we found a couple of great areas where it made great sense to add curb extensions and some street trees to break up the wider sections of the street. In regard to closures, full and partial closures, those were taken off the table relatively early in the process due to some guidance that's in the Comprehensive Plan. There are some corridors, I think, where it may make sense to look at that in the future. Greer Road is one that we're still working on the concept plan. We should be bringing that forward in probably about 6 months. There's a partial closure that I want to look at for that corridor, but I'd rely on Council guidance on that when we bring the concept plans forward.

Council Member Holman: Interested in that. Not just the bulb-outs, but the further application for trees is what I was kind of looking for too. Thank you very much.

Mayor Burt: Council Member DuBois.

TRANSCRIPT

Council Member DuBois: Thanks for the comments and the responses. You guys have asked a lot of my questions. I think when we approved the National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO) guidelines, we said at that time or the Staff Report said that we'd consider it in the Palo Alto context. Appreciate your comments that it was kind of the 5,000-foot level, and now we've been kind of applying it to what we see and what we hear. It's a good process. In terms of this kind of context for signage, have we applied like a different pattern near schools in particular?

Mr. Mello: A lot of the elements that you see near the schools are actually pulled from the work that was done by the Safe Routes team along with the Walk and Roll maps. They were actually infrastructure maps that were done for all of the walking routes to each school. There were signing and striping improvements recommended for all of those walking and biking routes. A lot of the infrastructure recommendations around the schools were pulled directly from those Safe Routes maps.

Council Member DuBois: I think that makes total sense. You might have a very quiet street with fewer markings. You get closer to a school, and there may be more markings, and then it might fade back down as you get away.

Mr. Mello: Yeah. In California, the crosswalks are yellow within a certain radius of a school. You'll see that in the concept plans; some of the crosswalks are yellow, while ones outside of schools areas are white.

Council Member DuBois: Let's talk a little bit about parking impacts. How was context considered there? If you're looking at Downtown where maybe it's office parking versus a local street.

Mr. Louch: We'll talk about this more in a minute. We did do a parking study for each of the corridors, that looked at observations at different times of day and different days of the week. For each corridor that we looked at, as Josh said, the one thing that we tried to do was consider daylighting. At every intersection where especially if you're putting in roundabouts or you're trying to create other safer pedestrian crossings, kind of moving the parking back away from the corners of the intersection. There are a few other places where parking was removed really to accommodate the additional street trees and landscaping. That's primarily where parking is removed as a part of this. There are a couple of other specific examples that I'll get into in a minute. That's basically what we did.

Council Member DuBois: Did you apply different approaches based on the context of its kind of Downtown urban setting versus suburban or residential? Or was it really just based on the occupancy?

TRANSCRIPT

Mr. Mello: We were very conscious of parking impacts to residents and adjacent property owners as we developed the infrastructure recommendations. That being said, there were some intersections even though there's a high parking demand, it really made sense to make some modifications to on-street parking. We did consider the context of these. The large-scale parking modifications happen mostly along the South Palo Alto corridors. Those wider streets where we're trying to add street trees, you'll see there's a lot more impact to parking on those than, let's say, some of the more congested Downtown corridors.

Council Member DuBois: I guess the other thing is if it's multifamily apartment buildings versus R-1, were you more hesitant to remove parking if it was multifamily?

Mr. Mello: We struggled with that, particularly on the Amarillo Bike Boulevard because we wanted to add greenery and street trees, but we knew that the multifamily housing at the West Bayshore end probably generates a lot of parking demand. There's a lot of alternative parking locations in that area that is a little bit underutilized, and you see that in the parking study. We actually identified alternative parking locations for each spot that we're recommending be removed.

Council Member DuBois: Is Ross Road considered a collector or a local street? It seems to act as a collector.

Mr. Mello: Ross Road is a local street, and I believe Louis is a collector street.

Council Member DuBois: That's interesting. Do you know why?

Mr. Mello: I think the functional classification map is in the last Comprehensive (Comp) Plan. We can verify that. I think it was adopted as part of the last Comp Plan.

Council Member DuBois: I appreciate your answers to my questions I submitted ahead of time. One of the questions was just really on the methodology for the parking intrusion and this idea of kind of average versus peak. I was really just asking for the individual four measurements when I was asking for the peak. Is that really difficult to get?

Mr. Mello: We have an Excel spreadsheet that we can provide you. When we get into the specific corridors a little bit later, I've pulled the peak out for each one of those and highlighted that. The methodology we used was a little bit of a hybrid. There's no real best practice for a parking modification

TRANSCRIPT

study or parking occupancy study, so we had to kind of develop our own methodology.

Council Member DuBois: My concern is particularly on residential streets. You get the peaks at night when everybody comes home, and they're actually a very common peak. If you average it out where it's empty during daytime, you're going to really get a false reading.

Mr. Mello: I will tell you based on my look at the data today, each one of the corridors has a different peak period. It's not uniform across all four corridors.

Council Member DuBois: Thank you.

Mayor Burt: Vice Mayor Scharff.

Vice Mayor Scharff: Thanks. At the really high level, we have the map on one of your slides of the entire Bike and Pedestrian Transportation Plan for 2012, and then we have what we're currently doing. Maybe you could just explain—I see we're only doing some of by the bicycle boulevards. What are our plans to do the rest of this and the context? The \$20 million we talked about, that's just for what we have here. Is that correct?

Mr. Mello: We have several corridors where the concept plans were already approved last year. We're going to talk about those a little bit later in the presentation. These four corridors will all move into the final design phase. We also have the Greer Road Bike Boulevard that's in the concept planning phase, the Homer-Channing enhanced bikeway. There's a couple of corridors that Google has contributed funding to, San Antonio Avenue, Middlefield Road South. There's a connection through Cubberley that was originally part of the Louis-Montrose Bike Boulevard that we haven't moved forward because of the development plans for Cubberley. I think those ones will probably follow pretty much immediately after these. Within the next six months, we'll get those into the final design phase. Then, we need to have a conversation about what the next group of corridors that we move forward is. There is sufficient capacity over the next five years to do additional corridors beyond what's already in the planning phase.

Vice Mayor Scharff: The capacity, is it money or is it Staff time that's really (inaudible)?

Mr. Mello: We have both. We have Staff capacity and financial capacity to move some more corridors forward.

TRANSCRIPT

Vice Mayor Scharff: For instance, when I look at Webster is a bike boulevard on the map, that's not something we've talked about doing other than we have it in the concept plan, but we're not moving forward on that yet. Right?

Mr. Mello: No. I think Webster is a great candidate for the next phase based on the feedback we got on the Middlefield Road corridor back in January. I certainly think Webster may be a candidate for the second phase of projects.

Vice Mayor Scharff: There's a bunch of these roads that go—I always get confused if we're going north-south or east-west. The east-west connections, I'm think of like Kingsley and Everett and those kind of things. We've talked about doing those as well. Where are we on all of that?

Mr. Mello: There's several other corridors in Midtown, Loma Verde Avenue and East Meadow Drive, that we're currently advancing concept plans for. That's separate from the package of bike boulevards that we've been advancing. We're doing those as part of the Midtown connector project. We haven't talked about Addison or Everett yet. We're certainly willing to talk about beginning the planning process for those as well.

Vice Mayor Scharff: The big difference between—maybe you could just walk me through it. We have bicycle boulevards, which I understand what we're doing. Like California Avenue we put down, I think that's a Class 2 bicycle lane. What does that mean, a Class 2 bicycle lane?

Mr. Mello: A Class 2 bicycle lane is a dedicated lane for bicycles. It's typically four to six feet wide. California Avenue, in particular, is going to be resurfaced in the coming year. We're upgrading those to standard bike lanes. They don't meet current standards today. After the resurfacing project is complete, they'll be standard bike lanes.

Vice Mayor Scharff: That's helpful. If we could just go back to the project—where we had the raised tables and all that kind of stuff. That one. When would you choose, for instance, to use speed humps versus curb extensions versus the rated intersection versus the chicanes? Why would you choose one over the other? What's the thought behind that?

Mr. Mello: First, when we collected our data on speeds, we identified segments that had an existing speeding issue. In those areas, we looked at regularly spacing traffic calming devices every couple hundred feet. We didn't want to provide people with the ability to accelerate between traffic calming devices. We want to maintain that moderate, consistent speed. We also tried to vary between vertical deflection, which is a speed hump, and

TRANSCRIPT

horizontal deflection, which is the median islands, the chicanes and curb extensions. We generally tried to mix it up. We didn't want drivers becoming comfortable and knowing there's going to be a speed hump every 100 feet. You want to get drivers to pay attention, require them to actively participate in driving. That was our main goal. The second reason we utilized traffic calming devices is in a lot of instances we're removing stop signs along the bike boulevards to facilitate bicycle travel. We didn't want the motor vehicle speeds to creep up, because there was no longer a stop sign. In that case, we looked at treatments like raised intersections, roundabouts. Roundabouts are great because they get everybody going the same speed around the intersection, but they don't cause unnecessary delay, and they also don't encourage people to—that stopping and accelerating creates a lot of noise in residential neighborhoods. They create more of a moderate traffic flow. Any other things we considered?

Mr. Louch: I think the one other thing to say is there are some unique situations where we considered specific. The raised intersection that's shown there is really specific to the school that it's connecting to and some of those kinds of things. There are these sort of general considerations. As Josh said before, we kind of worked at a pretty detailed level to look at what the specific conditions were and the right improvement that was needed.

Vice Mayor Scharff: If you do curb extensions rather than, for instance, some of these others, that narrows it so people see it as narrow, so they feel they have to slow down. That's the theory behind it.

Mr. Mello: That's correct.

Vice Mayor Scharff: Do you ever get situations where—if you're not paying attention and you go over a speed bump, you're like "whoa" and you're paying attention. If you hit the curb and go over the curb, you could injure someone. I'm just wondering if the curb extensions are really—I'm sure they are or you wouldn't have done them. It just intuitively doesn't seem as safe frankly, a curb extension, if you're a driver who's not paying attention and not expecting a curb extension.

Mr. Mello: We consciously made a decision to design these corridors for motorists operating at the proper speed, which is at or below 25 miles an hour. If we were to design these around a design speed higher than that, we would be encouraging higher travel speeds. That's a tricky proposition—that's something that traffic engineers and transportation engineers struggle with. Do you want to provide that kind of shy distance and ability for error or do you want to reinforce the proper operating speed by tightening up the roadway, designing the road around people that are traveling at the

TRANSCRIPT

appropriate speed? In these cases, because they're local streets and folks should generally be operating under 25 miles an hour in order to safely operate around cyclists and pedestrians, we elected to be somewhat aggressive in our traffic calming treatments.

Vice Mayor Scharff: You didn't quite answer the question, or maybe you did and I just ... What I heard you say was this—you didn't answer the question if it's more dangerous, but the implication is it is. If people are driving—if you go over a curb at 25 miles an hour, you could still hurt a pedestrian. If you're not paying attention—obviously when you go over a speed bump and you're not paying attention, you then pay attention and you then slow down. If you hit the curb because you're not expecting it, maybe that doesn't happen, but it seems to me intuitively it could. Even if you're doing 25 and, in fact, maybe you're doing 30 miles an hour, people do that sometimes. I'm just wondering if there's a safety issue for going up onto someone's lawn. If you hit the curb even at 25, 30 miles an hour, can't you do some damage? I think you could.

Mr. Louch: I think the advantage of the curb extensions really is that you're more likely to slow people down. People are going to be distracted driving on a wider street and likely driving faster anyway. All the things that you say could be true, but they would be just as true or more true on a wider street where they could also take the curb and go up and hit a pedestrian. This actually creates a buffer and it's more likely that they'll be going slower. Yes, it's true that people could not be paying attention. I think there's a certain likelihood of that when people are driving. If anything, this draws their attention more to need to be paying attention.

Vice Mayor Scharff: Am I misunderstanding? The way it looks on the map is that there's no curb extension, the street is the wide street. Driving along the wide street and then suddenly there's a curb extension, and then suddenly you're like looking at it.

Mr. Mello: The curb extensions are in a parking lane. You wouldn't be in the path of the curb extension unless you were driving in the parking lane.

Vice Mayor Scharff: I misunderstood that. I thought it narrowed the actual width of the road a little bit.

Mr. Mello: No. One of the benefits of the curb extensions is if the parking is underutilized and you effectively have a street that's twice as wide as it needs to be when there's no parking, the curb extensions kind of make that parking lane permanent and get people driving in the center of the road at all times of day.

TRANSCRIPT

Vice Mayor Scharff: Got it.

Mayor Burt: Council Member Wolbach.

Council Member Wolbach: Just three questions at this time. In comparing chicanes to curb extensions, tell me if my understanding is correct. With chicanes, you allow a cut through for bicyclists; whereas, with the curb extension, the bicyclist would be forced into the same path of travel with the automobile. Is that correct?

Mr. Mello: This is something we struggled with throughout the design process, the concept planning process for this. There are a lot of cyclists who ride in the parking lanes currently today, because a lot of the parking lanes are unoccupied during the day when folks are at work. There's kind of a culture of straddling the curb and then weaving in and out of the travel lane as they pass parked vehicles. That's not the way we encourage folks to operate a bicycle. A lot of these streets are intended to be shared travel lanes, shared roadways. That's the whole goal of the bike boulevard program, to bring motor vehicle travel speeds down so that cyclists can feel comfortable taking the travel lane. All of the curb extensions and the chicanes that you see in the concept plans are in locations where there's a parking lane. A cyclist really should not be using the parking lane to travel in; a lot of them do. We're trying to discourage that behavior. We do that in our Safe Routes to School program. The students are taught to follow the sharrows, take the lane, not weave in and out of the travel lane which creates a dangerous situation. That's something we struggled with throughout the concept planning process, do we operate under the assumption that cyclists are going to be riding in the parking lane, which could preclude us from implementing curb extensions and adding street trees and creating these kind of shorter crossing distances, or do we actively try to encourage cyclists to take the lane and share the roadway. We've opted for that second recommendation.

Council Member Wolbach: Next question. Do you ever see cases of trees and landscaping actually obstructing visibility? I'm thinking of a couple of examples that I've experienced. I'm curious if that's—how do you go about thinking about that challenge or that potential, especially as trees and vegetation mature over time? This question of if we take away parking and put in vegetation instead and over time it grows and ends up with the same loss of visibility. It's still prettier than parked cars, but you're not getting the safety benefits which are the best argument in favor of taking away somebody's parking space.

TRANSCRIPT

Mr. Mello: We do have vegetation interrupting sight lines in quite a few locations. I think we could make a conscious effort in the final design process to look at the sight lines and pick species that are not going to obstruct the sight lines as they mature.

Council Member Wolbach: That would probably be something worth—I guess I'm veering into comments here—something to consider for the middle of roundabouts as well, so you can see across. My third and final question for now. Regarding stop sign elimination, are there other options that are available other than fully eliminating the stop signs, such as potentially converting the stop signs to yield signs or any other third option that I'm not considering?

Mr. Mello: You cannot have a four-way yield intersection, which means that we would put the yield signs on the cross-street approaching the bike boulevard, which then means the bike boulevard becomes uncontrolled, which would increase travel speeds along the bike boulevard without some type of treatment like a roundabout. If we put the yield signs on the bike boulevard approaches, then the cross-street would be uncontrolled, and it would require most people on the bike boulevard to stop when approaching the cross-street. Yield signs don't really get us the benefit of removing control along the bike boulevard corridor.

Council Member Wolbach: Any slow sign or warning or—this is what I'm asking also. Is there another option aside from—is it just the binary choice, either a stop sign or a yield sign or nothing? Are there other choices?

Mr. Mello: In some places, we've elected to recommend removal of stop sign without any additional treatments because there's a nearby stop sign. I think along Ross Road in particular what we've done is actually just better space the stop signs. Instead of every block, it's every two blocks. In some cases, there was a stop sign, stop sign and then no stop sign, no stop sign. We've redistributed the stop control so that you have one every two blocks; it's more consistent, but it also reduces the total amount of time that cyclists are delayed traveling along the bike boulevard.

Council Member Wolbach: Just one quick follow-up then based on that discussion. Do you incorporate foliage and fencing and building design into determining whether maybe a stop sign should be preserved even if it's not convenient for travel, just because there's a visibility issue? Is that incorporate in your consideration before the removal of stop signs?

Mr. Mello: There were a couple of spots where we wanted to remove a stop sign, but we elected to leave it in because there were sight line issues. Again, the far southern end of Ross Road, there's an intersection where

TRANSCRIPT

there's a blind curve. We elected to leave a stop sign in place because of that curve.

Council Member Wolbach: Thank you.

Mayor Burt: I have a few questions. First, returning to this question on speed tables versus speed humps or bumps. Back when we had transitioned toward speed tables, the studies that we were presented at the time had favored speed tables because cars would essentially maintain a pretty steady speed of 20-25 miles an hour, and the speed humps would cause cars to slow down to 10 and then gun it in between them. Is your speed hump proposal today different from what we had had before?

Mr. Mello: I think this might just be a nomenclature issue. These would be designed at the operating speed of the roadway. They wouldn't be designed at 10 miles an hour.

Mayor Burt: There were questions around daylighting and shrubbery. I think I heard you answer about our selection of vegetation. A lot of the daylighting problems are when people on corner lots have tall shrubs right out to the corner of the lot. Do we presently permit or have any restrictions on that in our landscaping Codes?

Mr. Mello: The Chief Transportation Official actually has the authority to remove vegetation that presents safety issues at intersections. We're hesitant to use that authority unless it's a pretty significant safety concern. We do have that authority to remove vegetation. We do review new development for sight line issues with the landscaping.

Mayor Burt: I'm not sure that people even know that this is something that they should be including in their landscaping plans when they do that.

Mr. Louch: Just one other thing. When we remove the parking and add a bulb-out, it creates safety just by putting the pedestrian more visible even if you continue to have auto conflicts.

Mayor Burt: That's where we have the bulb-outs, not ... Where we're crossing a bike boulevard, for instance on Bryant, does the plan have additional signage to notify drivers that they are crossing a bike boulevard? That's one absence that I noticed today.

Mr. Mello: We are recommending adding "cross-traffic does not stop" sub-plaques to all stop signs that don't currently have them on the cross-streets. We've had preliminary discussions about testing a new type of sign that would be more specific to a bike boulevard that would tell people you're

TRANSCRIPT

crossing a bike boulevard. That's not currently in the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD), so we would need to request permission to experiment with that. We are considering asking for that permission.

Mayor Burt: I think that's a really good idea. As a cyclist, when occasionally I drive and cross, I just really welcome the reminder that I'm not principally looking for cars. When I cross bike boulevard, I'm principally looking for bikes. It's just a different consciousness. I'm trying to remember how long ago it was. There was discussion at the Council level about whether we would want to be looking at what are called Idaho stops, which are basically requiring bicyclists to function as in a yield approach at stop signs. I think we all see that there are a lot of bicyclists who just blast through stop signs, and very few who come to a full stop, put a foot down and all that. It becomes difficult to have an enforcement when we're trying to say, "Everybody's breaking the law if they don't put a foot down" and we can't distinguish between those who are just blasting through and really a safe measure. Are we permitted in California to adopt what's called an Idaho stop practice for bicyclists?

Ms. Stump: Thank you, Mayor Burt. City Attorney, Molly Stump. The Vehicle Code requires bicyclists to follow all of the same laws as motor vehicles and does require all vehicles to stop at stop signs. That said, traffic enforcement is like any other type of enforcement activity subject to a certain amount of discretion of the enforcing officer. It is likely the case that good decisions are made in terms of prioritizing dangerous behavior over behavior that is consistent with good safety practices. I hope that's helpful.

Mayor Burt: Thanks. That concludes questions from members of the Council. We now have comments from members of the public. We have 14 speaker cards, and we're going to close off comments momentarily. If anybody wants to do so, they better bring them up quickly to the City Clerk right here. Thank you. Our first speaker is Kirk Fry, to be followed by Zoe Hoster. Welcome.

Kirk Fry: Thank you for letting me speak tonight. My name is Kirk Fry; I've lived for 38 years on the corner of Ross and Moreno. Those are a cross section of two proposed bike boulevards. I oppose the awarding of these contracts tonight for four reasons. First is that Ross is a poor choice for a bicycle boulevard, and I'll go into that in a minute. Then, there's going to be a larger than expected loss of parking due to uncounted cars when they did their survey, based on my observations. The excessive costs of these contracts, and I think it's an example is misplaced priorities. First of all, let's talk about Ross. Why Ross? This route connects the long proposed and

TRANSCRIPT

nonexistent Adobe Creek U.S. 101 overcrossing via Ross Road to Garland Drive, which is a small residential area just north of the Oregon Expressway. Then it just ends right there. I sit there and I watch Ross, and there are no bicycles on it much. For 38 years, I've watched it. If you look on page 44 and page 61 of the manual that was handed out before this meeting, they counted bikes and pedestrians at the most popular hours. It turns out that there are three bikes and pedestrian per hour on Ross in the morning, and six total pedestrians and bikes total going every which way. There's hardly any traffic at that intersection at all. In the evening, there are six bikes that are on Ross going up and down. There are 20 going on Moreno back and forth. It's an odd choice of choosing Ross for a bicycle. Most people use Ross or use Louis or Middlefield. The other thing is that they're going to put a mini roundabout in my intersection. Down on Colorado and Ross, basically they're going to put some traffic diverters, but the signs are still there. Yes?

Mayor Burt: Your time's up. Can you just wrap up?

Mr. Fry: Thank you.

Mayor Burt: Thank you. Our next speaker is Zoe Hoster, to be followed by Amie Ashton. Welcome.

Zoe Hoster: Good evening, thank you. My name is Zoe Hoster from Palo Alto, speaking in favor of the bicycle and pedestrian improvements that we learned about this evening. In my view, our ability to bike and walk in Palo Alto is one of the great advantages of living in this City. I grew up biking to school in Palo Alto. Now, I bike to work, walk and bike for the majority of my trips around the City. As we heard from the commenters about Middlefield Road earlier, especially dangerous traffic and congestion are a major issue in Palo Alto. Now, we have the opportunity through these improvements to solve a lot of these issues in a responsible way. A lot of you asked very good questions about these improvements. A lot of them are new. We haven't seen them in Palo Alto before, but I'm confident that they are the right answer to solve these congestion and safety issues in the right way. As a young and healthy person myself, I'm able to walk and bike around Palo Alto without much hassle. That's not the case for a lot of children and for a lot of people who are more cautious than someone like I am. With these improvements, they will be able to enjoy the benefits of walking and biking around the City. All of us will enjoy the benefits of reduced traffic congestion and increased safety. Thank you.

Mayor Burt: Thank you. Amie Ashton to be followed by Penny Ellson.

Amie Ashton: I also wanted to speak in support of the item. I really believe if you build it, they will come. I bike everywhere in Palo Alto, and it's

TRANSCRIPT

because of these bike paths. I never get in my car, and it's a wonderful way to live life. I wish more people could experience that. It's projects like this that make it possible. I just wanted to support it. Thank you.

Vice Mayor Scharff: Thank you. Penny Ellson to be followed by Ken Joye.

Penny Ellson: Good evening. I'm Penny Ellson, and I'm here tonight with Sonya Bradski, who is traffic safety rep at Jane Lathrop Stanford (JLS) Middle School. Also as an avid bicyclist in Palo Alto. Please do not delay implementing the bike network envisioned in the 2012 Bike Pedestrian Transportation Plan. These improvements that you're considering tonight come at a time when they are very badly needed. The upturn in the economy has brought new jobs—that's great—but also thousands of new car trips into the community. A large percentage of these trips converge with school commute traffic, making routes less comfortable for students and their concerned parents, while bike facility improvements have not kept pace with the needs of increased numbers of bicyclists and the new safety impacts from growing additional car volumes Citywide. Our 2012 Bike Ped Plan contains many projects that were in the 2003 Bike Plan, but were never implemented. In fact, less than 10 percent of the 2012 Bike Ped Transportation Plan has been implemented to date. We know that each time we've improved bike facilities, especially in school route areas, we've drawn greater numbers of bicyclists. Tonight, you can approve solid steps toward rolling out Palo Alto's future bike network. Let's implement the long-awaited safety improvements families have been calling for. Mode shift will follow; we know that; it always has. Let's get this show on the road, so to speak, to provide needed improvements for safety and comfort that will draw more people to choose active, healthy and sustainable commutes more often. Please support Staff's recommendation. Thank you very much for considering my comments.

Mayor Burt: Thank you. Ken Joye to be followed by Alex Thompson.

Ken Joye: I'd like to thank you and previous Council Members going back to Ellen Fletcher for your support of our bicycle infrastructure. I live in the Ventura neighborhood. My children rode their bikes to Palo Alto Unified School District (PAUSD) schools. My wife commutes via bike to her job. I ride to the library, the grocery store and meetings like this on my bike. I ask you to approve the matters before you tonight, to support Goal T-1 of the Comp Plan. Thank you for listening.

Mayor Burt: Thank you. Alex Thompson to be followed by Neilson Buchanan.

TRANSCRIPT

Alex Thompson: Hi. My name is Dr. Alex Thompson. I just moved here from Los Angeles, and I like it a lot. It's a much better place to ride; I'm a cyclist. I ride to work every day via Amarillo, Louis, California. Those are the main streets I ride on, sometimes Ross. I think these are pretty relevant streets at least for me. I'm happy to tell you that I'm a data scientist at work, and I study car risk, driving risk, so I'm glad to be here talking about work after work. The packets I passed around show two things. One are some basic traffic stats for Palo Alto, and another thing they show are some photos I took this morning of the bike racks at Jordan Middle Schools, which you'll recall is bordered by Louis and also Ross feeds in there. It shows basically about 300 bikes at the middle school. If you check the enrollment of Jordan Middle School, it's about 1,100 students. That tells that around 27 percent of middle school students there are riding to their work, to school. I think we should consider that it's not if we build it, they will come. They're already here, and they're short and they need our protection. The other stats there show that while Palo Alto is the best place to live in the Bay, it's actually one of the kind of not so great places as far as traffic safety. It's actually more comparable with Los Angeles than it is with San Francisco or with Sacramento than Davis. In order to kind of be robust and be the best city in the Bay, I think these kinds of things are really needed. Thank you very much.

Mayor Burt: Thank you. Just to let you know, there are other racks, I think, at Jordan. We're at about 45 percent bike share. N. Buchanan to be followed by Eric Nordman.

Neilson Buchanan: Nelson Buchanan, I live on Bryant, and I spend a fair amount of time not driving on Bryant because of the bikes which, I think, is a good idea. It's much better for us that drive our cars to take Waverley. That's one point I want to come back to. I'm fully supportive of this Bike Plan. I don't understand it all; I do understand the impact on the Residential Preferential Parking (RPP) parking district area. I'd like to confine my comments on that. I drive those intersections. Every time we do a Midtown survey, our survey team goes through every intersection twice, so I have a pretty good pulse on what traffic's like on every intersection. We can cover that neighborhood in less than two hours at Midtown. I'm just interested in how well funded this is. I'm sort of pleased and shocked to understand that the Planning Department is fully funded and fully staffed. That says loads about other priorities. We'll get to that later in the evening, because a shortage of resources will be coming up. A couple of quick things. This program is probably going to push the large commercial trucks off of Bryant onto Waverley between Embarcadero and University Avenue. I urge you to look at that. If any parking is reduced in the permit area, I ask you—we can look at August 1st—to reduce the 2,000 parking permit limit by the number

TRANSCRIPT

of parking spaces you eliminate from the parking district area. That's only fair to not increase the density of nonresident cars. It's certainly fair to reduce the parking spaces as you need them along Bryant. I have no problem with reducing parking space; all I ask is to reduce the limit of 2,000 accordingly. Thank you.

Mayor Burt: Thank you. Eric Nordman to be followed by Emma Shlaes.

Eric Nordman: My name is Eric Nordman. I've lived in Palo Alto for over 40 years. The bicycle boulevard network is critical to addressing key Palo Alto goals, to double the bike commute rates and cut greenhouse gas emissions by 15 percent. This is not just my view. Sam Adams, when Mayor of Portland, said, "We did a lot of research and we did a lot of focus groups on what it would take to get from eight percent to 25 percent of all trips by bike. What we learned is that bike boulevards are the way to go." Palo Alto established the first bicycle boulevard in the United States (U.S.) on Bryant Street in 1982. On average over 1,000 bicyclists pass through the barriers on Bryant and Lowell Avenue, and about 1,500 are on Park Boulevard. Bike boulevards can be very effective at reducing traffic and parking problems. Reductions of stop signs that make bike boulevards good for cyclists can make them attractive for drivers. To minimize car traffic, Bryant has four places where through car traffic is blocked, but due to a City policy this was not an option to consider in these past ones. It's probably not important for these ones because of the nature of much of how South Palo Alto is set out. I think the City should consider allowing blocking on future bike projects like Webster. I strongly support approval of Bike Plan lines for the bicycle boulevard and continued funding for the final design phase. Thank you.

Mayor Burt: Thank you. Emma Shlaes to be followed by David Coale.

Emma Shlaes: Hello. My name's Emma Shlaes. I'm the policy manager for Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition (SVBC). Thank you to Council Staff and PABAC and the Planning and Transportation Committee and the consultants for all the work that you guys have done, in particular the extensive public outreach process. SVBC supports the implementation of the 2012 Bike and Pedestrian Plan and the vision that it set forth. We urge you to approve these concept plans and final design contracts. These projects will help to lower speeds and create a safer street network for everyone, whether biking, walking or driving. Shifting some trips from cars to bikes can help the City meet your goals in reducing traffic, pollution, greenhouse gas emissions and parking concerns. Palo Alto's long been a leader in bike infrastructure, as Eric mentioned, with the first bike boulevard on Bryant Street. As also Josh mentioned, vehicle speeds over 20 miles per hour can drastically increase the severity of injuries and likelihood of death when

TRANSCRIPT

collisions occur. These traffic calming measures, the roundabouts, can help to eliminate the conflict points. Studies show that there's a direct correlation between feelings of personal safety and the number and percentage of weekly trips taken by bike. I urge you to continue your leadership, increase the already high percentage of bike ridership in Palo Alto, and approve these important projects. Thanks.

Mayor Burt: Thank you. David Coale to be followed by Richard Brand.

David Coale: David Coale, member of Carbon Free Palo Alto and Bike Palo Alto. I support the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan before you this evening. This plan has been vetted many times by Staff each step of the way along with many community meetings, and needs to move forward. In looking at the report, I think Staff did an excellent job in assessing the parking impacts, which seems to be one of the issues here. Staff did drill down and identify the potential problems and identified in most cases more than twice the parking needed to solve the problem only one block away. For those that would argue that another parking study should be done after the RPP is in place, I would suggest that, since the RPP is to make more parking available, this will only be easier once the RPP is implemented, and we do not need another parking study with more costs, more delay, more Staff time and expense. We need to move forward with this plan. As our Chief Sustainability Officer has mentioned many times, we have to make other modes of transportation more attractive than driving. This is exactly what this plan is trying to do. If we are going to address climate change where transportation accounts for 60 percent of our greenhouse gases, we need to move forward with the Bike Ped Plan as expeditiously as possible. This well-vetted plan will increase a cleaner and healthier form of transportation by making it safer for everyone. Please approve this plan without delay. Thank you.

Mayor Burt: Thank you. Richard Brand to be followed by Celine Heck.

Richard Brand: Good evening. I am here to reinforce what I wrote in my email to you. This plan is not yet ready. Three weeks ago when this came up on the Consent Calendar, several of us said there's more work to be done here. I have to say that myself and Neilson Buchanan and Michael Hodos who were RPP—I guess we're emeritus stakeholders—sent an email to Mr. Mello and said, "Would you please talk to us about parking?" No response. I think there's work to be done here. It also shows in the lack of answers to several of your excellent questions. I think your questions were well founded. I think this thing growing from 282 pages to over 600 pages says that there's a lot of new stuff in here, and it has not been vetted with the residents and people in the City. I absolutely support the Bike Plan. I

TRANSCRIPT

knew Ellen Fletcher; I love the idea. I watch people go by my house; that's great. This plan needs, before we throw a lot of money at it, because we're going to hire a consultant, let's have Staff do some final work. Yes, the RPP in Phase 2 is changing the parking dichotomy. We've got a little more space, but we don't have any data yet because enforcement is still catching with the whole program. I would say that, yes, we need to do this plan. I support the bicycling but not yet until we get some more work done in terms of outreach to the people that are affected. Thank you very much.

Mayor Burt: Thank you. Our next speaker is Celine Heck, to be followed by Stefan Heck. Welcome.

Celine Heck: Hello. My name is Celine Heck; I'm nine years old and go to Addison Elementary. I love to bike, especially to my school. However, I think that biking can be scary occasionally because the lanes are not continuous and sometimes have intrusions by cars or garbage bins. There also are not always marked out clearly which, from what I saw one time, almost caused an accident. I really, really like biking, not just to school. Please support bike lanes. You might already have kids or you might have kids one day, but either way I would assume you'd want them to be safe. That's a good reason for bike lanes if they love to bike. It would make things safer for all of us. My friends and I love to bike, and that's how we get around to each other's houses. Sometimes it's unsafe, and I see cars whipping past, and I can't ever get across. Sometimes it's a little bit too small, and there are a bunch of bikers. Thank you.

Mayor Burt: Thank you. Stefan Heck to be followed by Shannon McEntee. I don't know you're going to top that.

Stefan Heck: I'm not going to top that. She did write that herself; I had no hand in it. I'm Stefan Heck; we live on Bryant Street. I've been a resident since 1988. I'm here to challenge the Bike Plan not because of "Not in My Backyard" (NIMBY) and not wanting improvements in our backyard and our street, because we already have RPP zoning that requires two off-street parking spaces. The RPP plan has taken care of your third, fourth, fifth and sixth car and is actually working quite well. Not because of some inchoate fear that paint might actually diminish housing value. If you look at the data of bike studies—this has been done in Omaha, Seattle, Portland, Colorado and in most detail in Delaware—shows an increase of up to six percent in housing value. At Palo Alto housing prices, that's a damn good return, I have to say, and we should do it. As a professor at Stanford and as a Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of a startup that employs 26 people here in Palo Alto, half of whom I'm proud to say bike or take Caltrain to work, there's another old-fashioned reason which is you should look at the data. What the

TRANSCRIPT

data says is that we did a very good job in the '70s with our first bike boulevard. It was innovative; it was a world first; it was true spirit of Silicon Valley. Now it's time to go beyond that; it's time to go beyond signs and paint to actually really add safety improvements and learn from the rest of the world. If you look at some of those cities, there are two new insights: reduce the cross-traffic and separate the bikes and the cars. This plan doesn't yet do that, so I support what's in the plan, but we need to go beyond it. I like the network aspect. I love the roundabouts, because they do reduce injuries by 80 percent. We should definitely do that. We also need more dedicate cycle tracks. I'm personally willing to give up some more parking on Bryant Street to actually have a dedicated cycle track and really go beyond what we have today and to introduce some safe, green phases for bikes to cross at intersections and, ultimately also, to be able to come Downtown on a bike trail, because pretty much the bike boulevard disappears here. Then, we have a monument worth of Ellen Fletcher. I fully support that. Thank you.

Mayor Burt: Thank you. Shannon McEntee to be followed by our final speaker, Bret Andersen.

Shannon McEntee: Mayor Burt and Council Members, I first want to thank you for your good work, for keeping Palo Alto a really healthy and safe place to live. I want to support this program, and I've been really impressed by the comments tonight, how carefully thought out all of this is. I'm a homeowner here; I've lived here for 45 years. The benefits that I see are obvious, and I think they're obvious to you too, but let me just repeat them. If we get more people on bikes by making it safer, we'll reduce congestion, we'll reduce pollution, we'll reduce our parking problems because it's really easy to park bike. We'll also have health benefits for the people that are riding the bikes. We'll have health benefits indirectly for corporations and employers when health costs go down, because people have a more healthy lifestyle. Also, we'll have safer streets for both pedestrians, for bike riders, for older people with walkers, for everybody, when traffic slows down and we get more people on bikes. I also just wanted to say that two to three times a week I go down Ross Road to that Moreno intersection, and that's a great street to bike on, because it's extra wide, so you have a lot of visibility. I feel very safe there, and I can't imagine that making that a bike lane would cause any problems for the residents nearby. There aren't any parking problems on that street by the way, as far as I can see. Again, thank you very much for all you do for this City. I love living here.

Mayor Burt: Thank you. Our final speaker is Bret Andersen.

TRANSCRIPT

Bret Andersen: Hi, resident of Midtown. I really appreciate the roads of Ross Road, Louis and Greer getting on the radar for our Bike Plan, because that's where I spend my time and raise my son. Those roads I use all the time on a bicycle. They're really important paths to go south into Mountain View or north in Palo Alto along Greer and Louis and Ross. The other thing I really like about the plan—I hope you all support it fully as written—is that it does concentrate on, one, safety to ensure success, but also on removing the obstacles, that is, stops for cyclists. When you're making the choice at the margin of choosing bicycling versus driving that car Downtown or to an errand, a lot of it comes down to how much effort and how convenient and how enjoyable your ride is. Safety is a concern, but also the number of stop signs you have to go through, the number of dangerous intersections is a big factor. When you remove those on a bike boulevard, cycling increases greatly. If we can put more circles in that don't require stops for cyclists, if we can investigate the Idaho stop concept, I fully support that. I think it's a very reasonable way to treat cyclists. Practically, you just can't stop at every stop sign if there's too many. That's just the way people work. We have to get into a situation where we respect the interests and the limits that a cyclist has as the slower moving, safe vehicle and the car being the one that has to always give way and should always be treated that way in any intersection, whether there's a stop sign or not. That's my spiel. Glad to have the last word.

Mayor Burt: Thank you. On that last word, we get to return to discussion and a Motion. Who would like to go first?

Vice Mayor Scharff: What are we discussing?

Mayor Burt: I'm sorry. That's right. At this time, we should have Council Member DuBois leave, and we have the discussion around Bryant, and then have a narrow discussion there and then have him return and have the broader discussion. Correct?

Ms. Stump: That's correct, yes. Thank you.

Mayor Burt: When we do the voting, how do we work that? Do we need to adopt the Bryant recommendations or can Council Member DuBois return to vote on the entire package?

Ms. Stump: No. The voting should be divided. You should take up the Bryant, adopt the plan there. Maybe the Staff can clarify. There's a contract that needs to be adopted; that should be done, and then some plan work.

Mr. Mello: Our recommendations for this next stage of the discussion is to adopt the concept plan for the Bryant Street Bike Boulevard, and then also

TRANSCRIPT

approve the contract for final design for Bryant, Amarillo, Moreno, Louis, Montrose and Ross Road.

Mayor Burt: We have to divide those, right?

Mr. Mello: No, that's the first section. The second section is approval of the concept plans for the remaining three-quarters, and then approving a final design contract for the previously approved concept plans from 2015.

Mayor Burt: Council Member DuBois.

Council Member DuBois: If you could just clarify that. I appreciate you splitting these. If you guys could approve the Bryant Street components, like that second one you mentioned all the other bike plans as well, I hope I can return for that piece. I'm going to recuse myself because I own property a block from Bryant Street.

Council Member DuBois left the meeting at 8:21 P.M.

Mayor Burt: Thank you. Now we will discuss the first set of projects. Go ahead.

Mr. Louch: I'll give you a quick review of the Bryant Street Bicycle Boulevard, and then we can go into the other three. We've already talked generally about what is proposed for these, so I'm really going to focus on some of the things that we heard that are specific to each of these bicycle boulevards and some of the comments we got. Just wanted to start with the amount of time we've been out. Folks have mentioned that already. We did have a set of workshops that were sort of specific to Bryant Street as well as a more general workshop just in March of this year that had a lot of folks at it. That was really for all four of them. We did also bike-alongs; we had a farmers market; we had web-based input. A lot of different opportunities to have input in this whole process. For Bryant Street, a couple of the major concerns that we heard really were around some of the roundabouts, especially the roundabout at California and Bryant. We had quite a few folks who were in favor of that and quite a few folks who were concerned about safety issues there. We had a number of folks also concerned about parking. I think you've heard those pretty clearly tonight. From the PTC and PABAC, we also had a variety of concerns raised again. A lot of interest in understanding what would the parking impacts be from this particular bicycle boulevard, and then also wanting to make sure that they understood why roundabouts or traffic circles were being chosen in the locations, much in the way you all asked about tonight. There were some questions about do we need speed humps south of El Verano on Bryant Street. I think that really referred to the low level of vehicle traffic on that. For Bryant Street,

TRANSCRIPT

the parking question is one of the ones that's been raised most frequently. You've seen a couple different presentations at this point, I believe, about the parking including a map. There's a small version up here, but hopefully you all have a larger version of the map that we produced, that identifies all the places that parking is proposed to be removed. I think what you'll see from the map is that parking is being removed from intersections generally one or two spaces along Bryant. There are a couple of other places where there's a little bit more substantial parking removal, but by and large we're talking about removing, as we discussed earlier, kind of daylighting the intersections along Bryant. By and large, those have very limited impact. On this map, the little clip of the map that's up here, the things that are in black don't have any substantial impact on parking utilization. That is to say, once you remove those spaces, there's still at least 20 percent or more available curb space for parking. Those that are in red are places where that's not the case. What I will do just quickly—you can see here that we have both as the average, which folks asked about, so 279 average cars across the observations that we made. We made four observations of the parking, two during the daytime, one in the evening during the week, and one on the weekend. Slightly higher, so 279 parked cars in the average and 329 during the peak period. One of the major intersections that folks have raised of concern is the intersection of Bryant and Everett. We have a quick graphic that kind of shows you for every leg and every side of that intersection what is the current parking utilization. You'll remember we're removing about one space from each corner of this. In some cases, for example—I don't know how well you can see my mouse here. This corner of Everett and Bryant, there's significant overutilization of the parking, and that refers to folks—we counted every car that used the parking regardless of whether they're parked legally or not. There's some illegal use; there's also smaller than average car is used. We used a fairly conservative 22-foot standard for parking, and that really enables more cars to park than you might otherwise expect. This is a congested intersection obviously. I think folks are aware of that. There are some spaces right at the intersection remaining even when you remove the parking that's proposed. If you were to move a block or two up or down in either direction, there certainly would also be parking available. I made the ones that are actually congested at the end of this kind of stand out here. There's sort of five of the legs of these eight legs that would be congested. That kind of concludes the Bryant part.

Mr. Mello: Our Staff recommendation for this section of the presentation is to adopt the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) exemption and approve concept plans for the Bryant Street Update Bicycle Boulevard, and also approve the contract with Alta Planning and Design for the final design

TRANSCRIPT

of the Amarillo-Moreno Avenue, Bryant Street update, Louis Road-Montrose Avenue and Ross Road Bicycle Boulevard projects.

Mayor Burt: We have before us the Staff recommendation. Do we have either discussion or a Motion? Council Member Holman.

Council Member Holman: A couple of questions please. We didn't talk about vertical signage, in other words not signage on the pavement but vertical signage. How much vertical signage is being proposed here? Can you review that for us just quickly? That's also been a concern.

Mr. Mello: I think the majority of the additional signage would be associated with new intersection configurations, where we're adding roundabouts. The raised intersection may need some warning signage initially to get people to adapt to using the intersection. The 2012 Bicycle Plan actually recommends wayfinding signage along the bike boulevard network. The recommendation in the Bike Plan is to use purple signage similar to what's on the Castilleja Bike Boulevard as you head south from Churchill Avenue. However, PABAC has expressed concerned continually around the use of purple and actually prefers the green and white wayfinding signage that's found on some of our other corridors like Wilkie Way.

Council Member Holman: How frequent are those?

Mr. Mello: Those are at the major decision points, so at the beginning of a bike boulevard and then when you are passing cross-streets that are other bike boulevards or had significant destinations along the cross-street. Bryant and Churchill, for example, would have wayfinding signage to direct people down Churchill.

Council Member Holman: We're not talking every so many feet along each block face, which has been previously—okay.

Mr. Mello: No.

Council Member Holman: Parking removal at roundabouts, especially at California, as was mentioned here. How many parking places are being removed there? That area is the topic of a lot of conversation, especially given the uses at the church causing a great demand. How many spaces is that being removed?

Mr. Louch: I believe that a space is being—eight total spaces, I believe, are being removed there. That's based from each corner approximately. From each side of each corner.

TRANSCRIPT

Council Member Holman: Has the church had any input in that in terms of their assistance with not filling up the ...

Mr. Mello: The pastor has attended the majority of our community meetings, and he has expressed concern around the parking removal. He's generally not supportive of it.

Council Member Holman: Not support of this. The one intersection that you showed, it's like there were more parking—whichever slide it was. The one at Bryant Street and Everett, there was 12.5 (inaudible) but eight spaces. Removing a space exacerbates that.

Mr. Louch: Certainly.

Council Member Holman: None of the other allocations have much room to pick up that or absorb that.

Mr. Mello: I think between now and when we go to construction on these projects, we're going to have conducted three to four rounds of occupancy data collection for the RPP program within the Downtown RPP district. We may need to consider reducing the number of permits available if there is going to be a significant impact on the parking supply related to these projects.

Council Member Holman: That was my last question. Is the RPP designed such that the number of permits could be reduced in such a finite area?

Mr. Mello: Yes. The Planning Director has the authority to adjust the number of permits by zone.

Council Member Holman: Zone meaning finite enough to address ...

Mr. Mello: The employee zones that were created under Downtown RPP Phase 2.

Council Member Holman: Understand that, but finite enough to address the parking removals on Bryant? That's more finite than a zone.

Mr. Mello: If the reduction in the supply reduces the availability of parking for residents, I think we definitely need to look at whether the total number of permits needs to be adjusted based on the impacts of these projects.

Council Member Holman: Thank you.

Mayor Burt: Council Member Kniss.

TRANSCRIPT

Council Member Kniss: Not to be too preemptive, but I would actually like to move the Staff recommendation which you see here, which includes the CEQA exemption, the concept plans and also the contract with Alta Planning. I'm going to guess that included in this, Josh, you would also like to have approve professional services contract that's on the following page. I'm looking at Page 1 of the Packet. I'm at Packet Page 274. It looks to me as though you want to include adopt and approve the professional services contract. Is that correct? It's Numbers 1, 2 and 3.

Mr. Mello: Not "3." "3" is in the next section of the presentation.

Council Member Kniss: You don't want "3" now. Moving we adopt the one that's on the screen at this point.

Vice Mayor Scharff: Second.

MOTION: Council Member Kniss moved, seconded by Vice Mayor Scharff to:

- A. Adopt a California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) exemption and approve the Concept Plan for the Bryant Street Update; and
- B. Approve professional services Contract Number C16163533 with Alta Planning + Design, Inc. in the amount of \$824,542 for a period of one year for the preparation of plans, specifications and estimates for the Amarillo Avenue-Moreno Avenue, Bryant Street Update, Louis Road-Montrose Avenue, and Ross Road bicycle boulevard projects.

Council Member Kniss: May I speak briefly?

Mayor Burt: You may.

Council Member Kniss: We've heard lots of really good comments tonight. I think the one that still moves me the most, not that I don't love everyone riding to work and everyone who gets around and enjoys Palo Alto on a bike, I think the biggest impact is on kids going to school. There is no question, even though tonight I didn't see the figures adding up to quite the same numbers, if you are anywhere close to Bryant in the morning or North California, which happens to be the area I live in, you would get run over by the bicycles. I simply wouldn't go in that direction. That's I would hope would happen; you really want everyone riding to school. You can see the bike cages are filled. I think that makes one of the biggest differences in our community, this change from the year '99 to 2000 to taking up this plan and moving kids around the City in a comfortable way. I think Stefan Heck's daughter said it so well tonight. If you're that articulate when you're nine

TRANSCRIPT

years old, I can't imagine what she'll be like when she's 19. I don't think I need to say a whole lot more with this. This is a concept plan. I think we've given you lots of information, instruction and so forth tonight as we go forward. There clearly are some concerns about the roundabouts, about the other kinds of traffic calming devices. I think you've heard that. Also, I understand that PABAC is very involved with this at the same time. If this isn't an idea whose time has come, I don't know what would be that idea. I urge us to move forward.

Council Member Holman: Mr. Mayor, point of order. I thought we were going to divide this and vote on just Bryant and then talk about the rest of it so Tom could come back and participate. As we just had the presentation on Bryant alone.

Mayor Burt: Josh.

Mr. Mello: We can sever the concept plans, but the contract includes all four of the corridors, so we cannot sever the contract. The second item that's on the screen is the approval of the contract. The first item is just Bryant Street. The other three corridors will be considered in the next section.

Council Member Kniss: He said we need to separate out Number A from B in order to allow—the other way around?

Vice Mayor Scharff: He said it's fine the way it is, because you have to move the contract.

Ms. Stump: Mr. Mayor, it sounds like this is the way that it can be broken up. It does need to be handled this way. Even though it's overbroad from the conflicts perspective, it's the way the work is organized. Council should take it up in this manner.

Mayor Burt: Thank you. Vice Mayor Scharff.

Vice Mayor Scharff: I want to thank Staff for all the hard work on this. I know you did a lot of outreach. I know that you responded to a lot of neighborhood concerns, especially on the green sharrows, on other areas. I can tell when we talked about this that you thought carefully about each intersection. You removed parking judiciously. While I want to say my heart is with Stefan Heck in terms of remove the parking all along one side and have a dedicated path, I don't think the community is ready to do that in terms of losing that much parking. I do think you've been very thoughtful about this. I think it's a great program. I'm really glad we're moving forward on our bike boulevards. It's been a long time since we did this kind of intensive "let's get the bike boulevards done." Thanks for all your work.

TRANSCRIPT

Mayor Burt: Council Member Berman.

Council Member Berman: I want to add my thanks to Staff and to the community. We've had an extraordinary amount of outreach around this plan over the past four years, meetings in the community. Staff has been flexible and has listened to concerns from the community and will continue to do so, as was indicated by answers in regards to concerns about parking in some of our Downtown neighborhoods. It's important that we continue to evaluate the impacts that this has on certain stretches of road and adapt as necessary. That doesn't mean that we throw the entire thing out. It means that we kind of track success and see what works and what doesn't. Some folks in the community have questioned the prioritization of this. This has been a priority in our community for longer than I've been on Council. It was an integral part of Measure B in 2014 to fully fund our infrastructure, because this is a critical part of our infrastructure. If we have a comprehensive Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan, more people will bike, more people will walk, less people will drive, we'll need fewer parking spaces, there will be less traffic, there will be less greenhouse gas emissions. Everybody wins. That's the system we're trying to create here; that's why it's a priority. Residents voted 76 percent, I think, to pass Measure B, and this was a critical part of it. I'm happy to see that we're moving forward. I'm excited to see the implementation.

Mayor Burt: Council Member Filseth.

Council Member Filseth: Thanks. My question was really the procedural one about parsing it out correctly so that Tom could vote. Thank you. Other than that, I think all my questions got answered, and I'm happy to support it.

Mayor Burt: Council Member Schmid.

Council Member Schmid: I would refer to the diagram of the Bryant Street-Everett Avenue parking impact. Three of the eight sides of the side are typically over-parked. I assume from your response to questions it is over-parked on the average over the full day. During the business day, it might even be more. I would ask the maker of the Motion for a friendly amendment to say that Alta Planning would come back six months after the data is available for the RPP Phase 2 for an opportunity to relook at the parking spaces to be eliminated in the Downtown parking district.

Council Member Kniss: Is that going to be a sufficient amount of time, do you think, the six months?

TRANSCRIPT

Council Member Schmid: Six months after the full data from Phase 2 is available. That's probably a year from now.

Mayor Burt: May I ask a question of Staff to clarify this? Under the plan as we would be approving tonight, what discretion does the Staff still have for these various adjustments? My understanding is we're not locking into each and every one of these. We're giving a concept plan direction. Adjustment could be made before implementation, and adjustments could be made after implementation by Staff in response to situations. Is that correct?

Mr. Mello: If you approve the contract award for final design, we will begin I an approximately one year process of surveying, refining the design, looking at things like where signage is placed, doing a more thorough kind of analysis of exactly how long the red curb needs to be. We kind of gave you a best guess at how many spaces we think will be removed. At that same time, we'll be collecting the RPP parking occupancy data on a quarterly basis. We'll be looking at that as we move through the final design process.

Mayor Burt: Did I understand correctly that the final design will actually be subsequent to additional RPP data?

Mr. Mello: Yes.

Mayor Burt: The other half of my question is after we implement a final design, will Staff have authority to make minor adjustments if we see that there are greater problems than we anticipated or whatever?

Mr. Mello: Yes. We can also modify the number of permits in the RPP district. That's another solution.

Mayor Burt: I don't know if that clarifies the intent.

Council Member Schmid: I think my intent is to have a public meeting about that as opposed to a decision made by Staff.

Vice Mayor Scharff: I wouldn't accept that.

Council Member Kniss: The seconder is balking, so I think that's a problem, Council Member Schmid.

Council Member Schmid: I'd propose it as an amendment, if there is a second.

Mayor Burt: I don't see a second.

TRANSCRIPT

AMENDMENT: Council Member Schmid moved, seconded by Council Member XX to add to the Motion, "Alta Planning to return in six months, after data is available from the Downtown Residential Preferential Parking Permit Program Phase 2 (RPP) for an opportunity to relook at parking spaces in the RPP District."

AMENDMENT FAILED DUE TO THE LACK OF A SECOND

Mayor Burt: Council Member Holman.

Council Member Holman: I wasn't clear if the proposed amendment was capturing what I was going to suggest as a friendly amendment, to direct the Staff to reduce the number of permits being sold in the area as a result of removing parking spaces. Do that in a proactive rather than a reactive manner.

Mayor Burt: I think the City Attorney needs to weigh in.

Ms. Stump: Just looking at the scope of the agenda item, I think that's getting into some specific direction on RPP Phase 2. I think probably the approach that the Staff has suggested, which is that that's something that they can take into account in implementing this item. It's probably as far as we can go on this noticed item this evening.

Mayor Burt: Will the RPP be returning to the Council prior to full implementation of this plan in any way?

Mr. Mello: We're estimating that construction on these corridors will start in the beginning of 2017, probably around March. That's about the time that RPP Phase 2 is coming to an end, and Council will be deciding whether to continue the program permanently.

Mayor Burt: Mr. Keene.

James Keene, City Manager: I was just going to add I think in addition, despite this provides the direction on the planning, we'll actually have to come back to the Council for the award of the construction projects themselves. If the Council is really concerned with what the data is showing as it relates to RPP, you are going to have an opportunity prior to adopting construction contracts to raise questions.

AMENDMENT: Council Member Holman moved, seconded by Council Member XX to add to the Motion, "direct Staff, in a proactive manner, to reduce the number of permits being sold in the area as a result of the reduction in parking spaces."

TRANSCRIPT

Mayor Burt: Council Member Holman, if I can offer this concept, because I share your interest in that. To request Staff at the time of the awarding of the contract to provide an update to the Council on responses within the RPP program as a result of the impacts of this Bike Plan. We would have that report to Council and an opportunity to review it at that time.

Council Member Holman: That's good.

Mr. Mello: Just to clarify, you would like a report that details based on the latest occupancy study that we've done for RPP, how we anticipate these projects affecting the supply of parking in the immediate area.

Mayor Burt: And whatever adjustments you're making to the permit sale as a result of those impacts.

Council Member Holman: I have one other question.

Mayor Burt: Let's see whether the Staff captured that. The amendment would be at the time of the awarding of the Bryant—how should we describe it? It's not just the Bryant contract—the Bike Plan construction contract, Staff will report to the Council how any adjustments that have been made to the plan in response to the results of Phase 2 of the RPP. I should say any adjustment to parking. That's what it is.

Mr. Mello: There may be adjustments made to RPP based on the bike boulevard as well. It could work both ways.

Mayor Burt: Or adjustments to the RPP in response to the Bike Boulevard Plan. Does that get it right?

Council Member Holman: Yes.

Mayor Burt: Is that acceptable to the maker and seconder as well as Council Member Holman?

Council Member Kniss: Yes. I think that's also going to be interesting. As you look at the end of Phase 1, Phase 2, tying them all in together could be an interesting and difficult Staff response to have. I think having it in there at least takes care of it now, even though it won't be looked at again probably for quite some time.

AMENDMENT RESTATED AND INCORPORATED INTO THE MOTION WITH THE CONSENT OF THE MAKER AND SECONDER to add to the Motion, "at the time of the awarding of the bike construction contract, direct Staff to report to the Council any adjustments to parking that have been made to the Bicycle Boulevard Plan in response to the Downtown Residential

TRANSCRIPT

Preferential Parking Program Phase 2 (RPP) or adjustments to RPP in response to the Bicycle Boulevard Plan." (New Part C)

Mayor Burt: I'll just briefly say that I think Staff and the consultants have developed a better and continually improved and refined plan in response to feedback from the community. I think one of the latest things that we heard is that we're eliminating the sharrows on Bryant, which was a concern that was expressed by a good number of members of the community. My understanding is that sharrows are not necessarily significant safety benefits, so there's not a loss to effective safe biking as a result of that. I think that overall we were national leaders in biking in the '60s and '70s and remained near the top nationally largely because of the great success of our Safe Routes to School program. What we're doing right now is the first real significant reinvestment in our Bike Plan since the '70s. This is a major step for our community. There's a great deal of opportunity that, as Council Member Berman stated, benefits everybody. Supervisor Simitian told me a story that I think I had said recently, but I'll say it again. Back in the '90s when there was significant discussion on biking. Supervisor Simitian was very supportive of it. His best friend, Council Member Fazzino, said, "Joe, why are you so supportive and worried about the biking? You haven't been on your bike in 20 years." Supervisor Simitian said, "That may be true, but every person who's on the bike means that I've got one fewer car on the street and one more parking space for me to park. I think it's great that they're doing it." It really benefits everybody. I think this is a win for the entire community. I do want to add that back 20 years ago, when I was involved in neighborhood traffic calming initiatives, there was a study on roundabouts that I still remember roughly the statistics. I have to dig it up in my files. Before roundabouts are installed, the support for them is around 50 percent. After they're installed, it goes up to around 90 percent. There are apprehensions and then the experience is strikingly different from what the apprehensions were before they went in. I see Council Member Holman has a light.

Council Member Holman: I'm just going to throw this out there. On these streets, some of them are wider streets and (inaudible) upcoming, but I'll stick to this right now. I've also been a proponent, as Stefan Heck's comments indicated, of separating bicycles and pedestrians from cars. It may sound like an odd suggestion—it's not even a suggestion. It's a question. On the wider streets, is there any opportunity to introduce trees, say, mid-block or along the avenues as opposed to just adding landscape at the corners? Trees have all kinds of environmental impacts. They slow traffic. They make it safer for bicycles. It's not exactly separate, because you're still going to have cars parked at the curb. Interestingly, we have rolled curbs in a lot of our South Palo Alto neighborhoods. That actually isn't

TRANSCRIPT

the safest thing either. Can you comment on either one or both of those please?

Mr. Mello: Could you clarify the first questions? Trees within a median in the roadway?

Council Member Holman: We've got these bulb extensions or curb extensions and you could say bulb-outs, whatever. In the older parts of town, they have trees that are in the street. They're accepted. I don't know if there's any way to introduce those in the street or in the parking area at least in the older parts. Is there any way to introduce trees into those streets?

Mr. Mello: We could look at additional opportunities to add street trees. Are you particularly interested in the Bryant Street corridor?

Council Member Holman: The current Motion covers more than just Bryant Street, but the wider boulevards. It's for two reasons. It's to slow traffic, make it safer, potentially maybe in some occasions separate bikes from cars. Also a comment that we hear a lot from South Palo Alto residents is that it's lacking in street trees, where North Palo Alto has a lot more because of its design nature. It's related to the bike safety and bike paths, but if you could look at that and respond. The rolled curb versus vertical curb, that isn't part of this project, but do you have any thought on safety and ...

Mr. Mello: We can look at adding additional street trees as we enter the final design phase. There may be opportunities that don't affect parking substantially. As far as rolled curb, we actually just produced an informational handout that's been posted on the City website, remind folks the proper way to park at rolled curb. There seems to be several streets around town where people have gradually migrated up onto the sidewalk and actually created a wider travel way, increasing speed. We're trying to get people to start parking more on the roadway itself. I don't think wholesale reconstruction in the curbing would be a wise investment of the Bike Plan funding. In the areas where we're recommending curb extensions and other infrastructure along the curb, we'd probably be installing vertical curbing in places where there's currently rolled curbing.

Council Member Holman: I think the Comprehensive Plan says that when curbs are redone, they're supposed to revert to vertical curbs, but we haven't done that. Thank you.

MOTION RESTATED: Council Member Kniss moved, seconded by Vice Mayor Scharff to:

TRANSCRIPT

- A. Adopt a California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) exemption and approve the Concept Plan for the Bryant Street Update; and
- B. Approve professional services Contract Nnumber C16163533 with Alta Planning + Design, Inc. in the amount of \$824,542 for a period of one year for the preparation of plans, specifications and estimates for the Amarillo Avenue-Moreno Avenue, Bryant Street Update, Louis Road-Montrose Avenue, and Ross Road Bicycle Boulevard Projects; and
- C. At the time of the awarding of the bike construction contract, direct Staff to report to the Council any adjustments to parking that have been made to the Bicycle Boulevard Plan in response to the Downtown Residential Preferential Parking Program Phase 2 (RPP) or adjustments to RPP in response to the Bike Boulevard Plan.

Mayor Burt: Please vote on the board. That passes unanimously with Council Member DuBois abstaining. Council Member DuBois will now be rejoining us as we move on to the second half of the discussion.

MOTION AS AMENDED PASSED: 8-0 DuBois not participating

Council Member DuBois returned to the meeting at 8:53 P.M.

Mayor Burt: Would Staff like to kick this off?

Mr. Louch: Thank you. Now we're going to talk about the Amarillo-Moreno, Ross Road and Louis-Montrose Bicycle boulevards. (inaudible) Bryant one, we wanted to start with just the events that were held that were kind of specific to these bicycle boulevards. As you see, we had separate events targeted around Midtown, around South Palo Alto. Again, we had this workshop that was for all the bicycle boulevards as well as the bike-alongs and other events that were held. We heard a lot of different comments at our most workshop in addition to the general comments we've already discussed. We heard a lot of interest and support for the landscaping along Amarillo-Moreno, certainly an interest and concern about parking. Along Amarillo-Moreno is one of the areas where quite a bit of parking is proposed for removal, mostly due to the school there, the Ohlone School, as well as an extension of the park further down the road. Along Ross Road, we heard interest in, as folks mentioned here earlier, making sure the landscaping is low for maximum visibility; some interest in retiming the traffic signal at Oregon Expressway so it better accommodates bicyclists; some interest in the roundabout proposed at Moreno. Some interests supported that, and some opposed to that as well as potential to retain some of the stop signs that were proposed for removal. Finally, on the Louis-Montrose Bike Boulevard, we heard just one comment supportive of the roundabouts there.

TRANSCRIPT

At the PTC and PABAC meetings, the one comment that we heard was to look more closely at the Louis Road and East Charleston intersection and whether that can accommodate large buses that might use that. That's something that needs to be looked at in more detail potentially. Again, back onto the parking issue because was one of the more significant issues that was raised throughout. Again, I've got a piece of a map here that shows you for these three bicycle boulevards what's proposed. In most cases, you'll see that we're proposing removing at intersections, as before. As I mentioned, there are a couple more significant removals specifically around the Ohlone School and then down by Greer Park and then a little bit more around the mid-blocks of Ross Road. Again, mostly those were chosen as places where—as was just requested, opportunities to put in landscaping and trees maybe in the mid-block of some of these wider streets where you can create some additional landscaping. That's really why those are there. Overall, 262 parked cars were observed on all these corridors. That's quite a long of set of corridors, about 300 during the peak and relatively low average occupancy. Of course, those vary a bit from corridor to corridor and block to block. There may be some interest and ability to mitigate some of that. We didn't find anywhere, as we discussed previously, you couldn't park about a block away either on the main street or off onto side streets, as we were doing the parking studies.

Mr. Mello: Thank you. Our recommendation for this section of our discussion is to adopt the CEQA exemption and approve the concept plans for the Amarillo-Moreno, Louis-Montrose and Ross Road Bicycle Boulevards; also approve a contract with Fehr & Peers for final design of the previously approved Bryant Street extension, Maybell Avenue and Park Boulevard, Wilkie Way Bicycle Boulevards.

Mayor Burt: We have a Staff recommendation before us. We can entertain a Motion and discussion. Vice Mayor Scharff.

Vice Mayor Scharff: I'll just move approval of the Staff recommendation.

Council Member Berman: Second.

MOTION: Vice Mayor Scharff moved, seconded by Council Member Berman to:

- A. Approve Concept Plans for the Amarillo Avenue-Moreno Avenue, Louis Road-Montrose Avenue, and Ross Road Bicycle Boulevard Projects, and direct Staff to move forward with the Final Design phase for these four Bicycle Boulevards Projects; and

TRANSCRIPT

- B. Approve professional services Contract Number C16161534 with Fehr & Peers in the amount of \$544,509 for a period of one year for the preparation of plans, specifications and estimates for the previously-approved Bryant Street Extension, Maybell Avenue, and Park Boulevard-Wilkie Way Bicycle Boulevard Projects.

Mayor Burt: Motion by Vice Mayor Scharff, second by Council Member Berman. Would you like to speak to your Motion?

Vice Mayor Scharff: I'm not going to repeat the thanks to Staff. Again, I do appreciate that. I think it's great that we're expanding our bike boulevards south in this comprehensive way. I think that's something that's really going to—the community's really going to benefit and be very pleased with this when it's done.

Mayor Burt: Council Member Berman.

Council Member Berman: Given the time and the comments I already made, I'll just say I agree with everything Vice Mayor Scharff said.

Mayor Burt: Council Member DuBois.

Council Member DuBois: I didn't get to speak earlier, so I have to talk now. First of all, if you could, I think we've said this before. A lot of times when these bike concept plans, they should come as Action Items rather than Consent. I think it'd be smoother, the whole process of pulling it off Consent and bringing it back. We have a focus right now on parking, transportation. I would just suggest that. I think a lot of what you're hearing from us is really trying to strike the right balance of implementing these standards, but doing it kind of with a light touch where it makes sense to have a lighter touch. I think we're getting there. It'd be great to just kind of tune that in. My biggest concern, if you look at Attachment D where you show the parking intrusion levels, is really thinking about a policy in that sweet spot of 60 percent utilization. When it starts to go red, like it does on Figure 9 and Figure 10 in particular I'm concerned about, which is Greer Park, maybe that's the point where we need to really think about the policy and adjust. This Greer Park one, there's affordable housing there; there's multiunit housing, and then there's a very popular park. I'm concerned about permanently removing the parking there. We measured a certain a time of year. I know in soccer season, particularly on weekends, we want people to come and use the park when the soccer fields are right there on that edge. I'm wondering if that in particular is one place you could consider maybe daytime parking restrictions. During the weekdays and maybe weekend at nights, we could have more parking.

TRANSCRIPT

Mr. Mello: The section of Amarillo at Greer Park, the parking there is being removed to add street trees and a curb extension. That's a very sun-baked, wide-open, wide street. People are coming off West Bayshore relatively quickly. We wanted to set the tone that they were entering a park area and a residential neighborhood, so we kind of went heavy-handed with the street trees on that section purposefully. The result is a lot of parking needs to be removed in order to accommodate those trees.

Council Member DuBois: It's fairly significant. It's probably my area of single biggest concern. The other thing is just again the idea I brought up before of kind of peak versus average, particularly in residential neighborhoods. When you're Downtown, if you have to park and walk a couple of blocks to your office building, that's probably more reasonable, but these are some large residential blocks. People have parked in front of their house for years. I'm just concerned that a lot of people aren't aware of this, and they're going to be pretty upset when we say there's plenty of parking a block or two away from your house.

Mr. Mello: The peak along these three corridors occurs in the evening. Even at peak, it's only a 26 percent utilization of the on-street parking. They don't have to go a block; it's probably on the same block face, just a couple—50 feet down the road.

Council Member DuBois: That's good to hear. If we're just sensitive to that ...

Mr. Mello: With the exception of Amarillo. Amarillo, there's a pretty significant parking impact at Greer Park and at the Ohlone School where we're recommending a shared-use path connecting the school to Louis.

Council Member DuBois: I like the Ohlone changes myself. The other question I had is—I just offer this really for discussion. Is Ross correctly classified? It seems to act more as a collector these days. I wonder if it used to be more of a local street. I guess I'll offer a friendly amendment. I'm not sure exactly how to word it, but I would ask that we reconsider removing the parking at Greer Park and look to minimize the number of spots that we lose.

Vice Mayor Scharff: Just to clarify, is it Staff to reconsider without direction to do so or is it direction to do so?

Council Member DuBois: I guess it would be direction to do so. In terms of how many, I would leave that up to Staff. Just to highlight that it's a particular area of concern. I'm open to suggestions.

TRANSCRIPT

Vice Mayor Scharff: Does Staff have some response to—is this all or nothing in terms of this—what do we call it?

Council Member DuBois: Bulb-outs.

Vice Mayor Scharff: It's not a bulb-out. It's a ...

Mayor Burt: Curb extension.

Vice Mayor Scharff: A curb extension. That's what's causing the loss. It's a large curb extension there.

Mr. Mello: It's a series of three curb extensions and a total of 14 street trees that we're showing. We're recommending curb extensions at Tanland Drive, both legs of Tanland Drive. The one at the western leg is actually fairly extensive along the park. That includes about eight street trees.

Vice Mayor Scharff: How many parking spots are lost? It was unclear.

Mr. Louch: By the park, you're losing about 11 spots on that side of the street, and then seven on the other. Further down by the school, you're losing about 10 on one side and about 16 on the other.

Vice Mayor Scharff: I'll accept it.

Council Member Berman: I'm sorry. What is the amendment? Is it to remove ...

Mayor Burt: It says to reduce the removal of parking spaces, not eliminate.

Council Member Berman: It's not to completely ...

Council Member DuBois: It's not a fixed number.

Council Member Berman: It's to look for optimal ways to maybe—I'm fine with that. It's to Staff's discretion.

INCORPORATED INTO THE MOTION WITH THE CONSENT OF THE MAKER AND SECONDER to add to the Motion, "direct Staff to reduce the removal of parking spaces near Greer Park." (New Park C)

Council Member DuBois: Just one last comment. We heard from folks on Middlefield Road earlier about legally minimum width of car lanes. Stefan heck talked about this idea of actually separating tracks. I don't think it's appropriate for these bike routes. In the future, I think we should entertain

TRANSCRIPT

actually widening the road to add bike paths rather than trying to squeeze everything into the existing space. I'll just throw that out. Thanks.

Mr. Keene: Mr. Mayor, the way I read direct Staff to reduce the removal of parking spaces near Greer Park, that's not actually setting a specific number.

Vice Mayor Scharff: That's correct.

Mayor Burt: Council Member Wolbach.

Council Member Wolbach: I also wanted to talk about that same intersection. Something I was referring to vaguely earlier in thinking about intersections and visibility from landscaping. It's actually an intersection also on Bayshore at the other end, beyond Greer Park and then some housing, at Loma Verde and Bayshore, where there are bulb-outs and there are cars that often park half onto the bulb-outs, which raises some safety concerns there. I won't make it as a Motion, but I'll suggest thinking about making sure we've got red striping on the bulb-outs themselves, so that people don't park right up on them. The way the landscaping works at that intersection, the visibility is a little bit tough. That's something to think about. At this intersection that we were just talking about as well, really thinking about what the visibility of adding street trees would do there. Speeds of vehicles on Bayshore can be quite rapid. It's certainly commonly exceeding the 35 posted speed. Because of that, I do think that having a really clear anything to indicate that there's a need to slow down around this intersection, especially given that it's a very popular park. We have kids on bikes leaving the apartment complex, people are going to the park, jogging, biking, playing, lots of soccer fields, soccer balls fly out from soccer fields. I'd suggest maybe even looking at what's going on, on Bayshore itself. As far as the amendment that was just made, I'd actually offer a friendly amendment so that it would read "direct Staff to explore reducing the removal of parking spaces." It gives you a little bit more flexibility.

Mr. Mello: Could I just highlight a couple of elements in the concept plan at the West Bayshore-Amarillo intersection? We're recommending a chicane along West Bayshore that would actually force vehicles to slow ...

Council Member Wolbach: I missed that.

Mr. Mello: ... as they approach the intersection, and the installation of a median on Amarillo at West Bayshore. Turning vehicles would not be able to make the turn at high speeds; they would have to go around a median. That would also serve as a gateway to the bike boulevard.

Mayor Burt: Who needs to approve?

TRANSCRIPT

Vice Mayor Scharff: I guess I need to approve it, and Marc needs to approve it.

Vice Mayor Scharff: I think I liked it better the way it was.

Mayor Burt: It's basically the difference between whether Staff will necessarily do some reduction of parking spaces or whether they will evaluate whether to reduce.

Vice Mayor Scharff: I said no.

Council Member Berman: You said no.

Mayor Burt: That is not accepted unless you want to attempt to have a second.

Council Member Wolbach: I was hoping somebody might second it in that case.

Council Member Berman: I'll second it and hope there's not a lot of discussion.

AMENDMENT: Council Member Wolbach moved, seconded by Council Member Berman to replace in the Motion Part C, "reduce" with "explore reducing."

Mayor Burt: Why don't we see if we can vote up or down on this minor distinction. It is a distinction. The amendment is a difference to direct Staff to explore reducing the parking spaces near Greer Park. I see people feel obligated to speak to this. Council Member Schmid.

Council Member Schmid: (inaudible)

Mayor Burt: Council Member Filseth.

Council Member Filseth: (inaudible)

Mayor Burt: I'm going to clear the board. Vice Mayor Scharff, do you need to speak to it? I've cleared the board. Once we vote on this, then you'll need to hit your button again to get up. Let's vote on the amendment. That fails on a 5-4 vote with Council Members Wolbach, Burt, Berman and Kniss voting yes.

AMENDMENT FAILED: 4-5 Berman, Burt, Kniss, Wolbach yes

TRANSCRIPT

Mayor Burt: We'll return to the initial Motion, and I had some lights. Council Member Filseth.

Council Member Filseth: Just briefly I wanted to weigh in on a point that Council Member DuBois noted earlier. Appendix D is full of charts which say target residential utilization. I think we don't have a Citywide standard for target residential utilization. It maybe that we need one. I see this stuff all over the place, but we don't have one right now. Thanks.

Mayor Burt: Council Member Schmid.

Council Member Schmid: I just wanted to add a comment to the reduction of parking spaces near Greer Park. I think the point was made that the weekends are different. There are six active playing fields where games take place on Saturday and Sunday. That's the time where you really need those parking spaces. If you could take that into account.

Mayor Burt: I'll just a couple of final comments. It may be appropriate to reduce the removal of parking spaces at Greer Park, but I think we do need to think differently a bit about the impact of having a significantly better Bike Plan. I think the more likely impact is that we're going to see a shift in our social norm so that we don't have as many kids and parents think that they have to drive their kid to the soccer game, that they ride their bike to the soccer game together as a family or as kids. It reduces the demand for parking. I think there's an assumption that the parking requirements are stagnant. In fact, I believe that they're dynamic and that we're going to see less parking requirements on a value basis, aside from all the other pragmatic impacts of less traffic and less parking as a result of improved and better biking and more convenient biking in town. The whole notion that every time we move about town we should be escorted in a two ton vehicle is a little bit absurd when we really step back and think about it. That's how we do most of our travel. We get into two ton cars to take us most of the time individually to our destinations a mile or two from where we're starting. It'll be very interesting how much we move the needle as a result of making this more convenient. I look forward to the next phase of this plan. I think we'll see a next phase soon. I'm really appreciative of the Staff and frankly the City Manager. When this came to us as an initiative on our new Bike Master Plan three or four years ago—four years ago, I guess, time flies—I recall that I was the dissenter in interest of updating the Bike Master Plan. Everybody was a little bit surprised, but I said, "Why do we need a new Bike Plan? We've had one sitting on the shelf for almost 10 years, and we haven't done anything to implement it, haven't funded it." The prior City Manager really had not commitment to it. Our City Manager said, "No, no, no. We're serious about this, and we're going to move forward with an

TRANSCRIPT

update and a meaningful plan, and it's going to have a real commitment of City resources." I said, "In that case, I'm for it." I'm glad to see that's what we've been doing. I'm looking forward to seeing the implementation of this. I think it'll be kind of a virtuous cycle. The more we have people who willingly and enthusiastically ride more because it's safer and more convenient, the more we'll have people saying, "We want even better biking." We'll invest in it over time. That's what's happened in other communities. We have healthier communities, and people enjoy it, and they waste less time in traffic. I look forward to seeing this go forward.

MOTION RESTATED: Vice Mayor Scharff moved, seconded by Council Member Berman to:

- A. Approve Concept Plans for the Amarillo Avenue-Moreno Avenue, Louis Road-Montrose Avenue, and Ross Road Bicycle Boulevard Projects, and direct Staff to move forward with the Final Design phase for these four Bicycle Boulevards Projects; and
- B. Approve professional services contract number C16161534 with Fehr & Peers in the amount of \$544,509 for a period of one year for the preparation of plans, specifications and estimates for the previously-approved Bryant Street Extension, Maybell Avenue, and Park Boulevard-Wilkie Way Bicycle Boulevard Projects; and
- C. Direct Staff to reduce the removal of parking spaces near Greer Park.

Mayor Burt: Let's vote on the board. That passes unanimously. We have one more big item, which is consideration of next Residential Permit Parking Programs, Item Number 10. Let's take a five minute break, if that's all right.

MOTION AS AMENDED PASSED: 9-0

Council took a break from 9:16 P.M. to 9:27 P.M.

Council Member Kniss left the meeting at 9:16 P.M.

- 10. Direction to Staff Regarding Implementation Priority for the Following new Residential Preferential Parking (RPP) Districts: a Portion of Crescent Park, the Edgewood Plaza Area, the Southgate and Evergreen Park Neighborhoods.

Mayor Burt: Our next item is Item Number 10 on the Agenda, which is direction to Staff regarding implementation priority for the following new Residential Permit Parking districts, RPP districts: first, a portion of Crescent

TRANSCRIPT

Park; second, the Edgewood Plaza area; third, the Southgate; and fourth, Evergreen Park neighborhoods. Welcome. Josh, are you kicking off? Who's kicking off?

Sue-Ellen Atkinson, Interim Transportation Manager: I have the honor of doing that now. Mr. Mayor, Council Members, thanks for having us here tonight. I'm Sue-Ellen Atkinson; I'm the Interim Transportation Planning Manager. Tonight we'll be talking about the process for requesting a new RPP district as it pertains to the petitions that we'll be reviewing tonight from Edgewood Plaza, a portion of Crescent Park, Southgate and Evergreen Park; and then the resource impact and timeline for a potential RPP program. Just taking a step back regarding what drives residents to request an RPP program. Some aspects and suggestions that we've heard include the residents are having an increasing difficulty in finding parking in their neighborhood; they're seeing congestion in terms of vehicles and parking; there are complaints about loitering and noise; and reported difficulty passing on narrow streets. Those are just some comments that we hear that drive people to request an RPP petition and submit. However, an RPP petition and an RPP program is not a magic remedy for parking issues in Palo Alto. There are pros and cons to implementing an RPP program. In terms of the pros, it can improve the quality of life for residents by making it easier to find parking because there are additional empty spots on the streets. That in turn can lead to less traffic and less congestion if you don't have people who are driving really slowly looking for that elusive parking space, etc. Some of the cons that speak against an RPP program are that all cars need permits including residents. That's something that we've heard from residents in existing RPP programs including College Terrace and the Downtown RPP district. They don't wish to buy a permit. If you do want an RPP program, all vehicles that are parking on the street need to have a permit. There's also no cookie cutter program that fits all. We're not able to lift a program from one area of Palo Alto and have it fit directly into another neighborhood. As we can see, the College Terrace program is quite different from what's in place in the Downtown area. There's that consideration. Also an RPP program does limit the public use of public rights-of-way, so it does in some way privatize the public streets. That's also a consideration to take into account. There are also options that are available either in lieu of or in addition to an RPP program, that can be considered. RPP may not be the perfect solution for all parking issues. Some other options include engineering solutions such as red curb; you can't park where there's a red curb. That increases the availability of yield pockets on narrow streets. Implementing time limits, so time restrictions where people are not able to park. Other engineering solutions. There are also Transportation Demand Management strategies that work to get people out of their cars. If people are not driving, then they don't need a parking space. There's also parking

TRANSCRIPT

management solutions to make better use of existing parking supply. Just a few things to take into account when you're evaluating the need for an RPP program. Set forth in the Citywide RPP Ordinance that was adopted in December 2014, the process for a new RPP district is that first residents need to self-organize and submit a petition by March 31st. We received four petitions this year. The residents did an admirable job of self-organizing. It seems that a number of them are here this evening as well. Second the Planning Director will review the petitions, and then the Planning and Transportation Commission will evaluate and recommend prioritization. We went to the PTC on April 27th. I'll discuss their prioritization later in this presentation. The available resources will inform which districts can be implemented, and Staff will begin the community outreach and stakeholder process and data collection for the district or districts that will be working on implementing that year. The Staff will bring the proposed RPP district and a City Attorney-prepared draft resolution back to the PTC. The PTC will make a recommendation to City Council. The City Council will then hold a public hearing to review the proposed resolution and decide whether to adopt, reject or modify that resolution. In the Citywide RPP Ordinance, there is a September deadline for bringing that program back to City Council. Given that we are in May now, that is likely not going to be the case this year, but this is the first time that this ordinance has really been put through this test. We may need to make modifications to that schedule in the future. In terms of evaluation criteria for an RPP district, when we went to the PTC, we did recognize that there are no set criteria for evaluating and prioritizing an RPP district. Per the Citywide ordinance, there are four required findings that must be made in order for an RPP district to be formed, that can serve as a criteria to consider. The first is that nonresident vehicles do or may substantially interfere with the use of on-street or alley parking spaces by neighborhood residents. The second is that the interference by the nonresident vehicles occurs at regular and frequent intervals, either daily or weekly. The third is that the nonresident vehicles parked in the area of the proposed district create traffic congestion, noise or other disruption including a shortage of parking spaces for residents and their visitors that disrupts neighborhood life. The fourth is that other alternative parking strategies are not feasible or practical. Taking that into account, we can move into reviewing of the four petitions that were received by March 31st of this year. The first is a small area near Edgewood Plaza that was submitted in October 2015; a small segment of three streets in Crescent Park that was submitted in January 2016; the Southgate neighborhood in February; and the Evergreen Park neighborhood in March. First, we had a small segment of streets near the Edgewood Plaza Shopping Center that submitted a petition. That shows where those streets are located in relation to the existing Crescent Park no overnight parking program. Nearby but not adjacent, and it's also somewhat nearby the Downtown RPP district but further away. The

TRANSCRIPT

petition notes intrusion on weekdays during the daytime and overnight and on weekends. That parking intrusion was attributed to congestion from East Palo Alto and also from Edgewood Plaza. The policy implications for evaluating a program on those streets is that it's a very small area to implement a permit program, and it potentially sets a precedent for RPP implementation near small, neighborhood shopping centers. Some options to consider in relation to this petition are to evaluate in the future after the shopping center is fully occupied. That area could be incorporated into the existing overnight parking program or could look at a larger area or you could direct Staff to create a small RPP district that is freestanding in that area. The second petition received is from three streets in Crescent Park. These streets are adjacent to the boundary of the Downtown RPP district. Residents on these three streets submitted these petitions requesting annexation into the Downtown RPP district. Those petitions were due in November, and this petition was received in January. The request for annexation into the Downtown RPP district was past that deadline. The streets in this petition that are part of the eligibility area that's been approved for Downtown will be evaluated as part of that process. The residents were told that these three streets would be evaluated separately because they fall outside of the eligibility area. Although the petition was for annexation to the Downtown district, the residents indicated interest in resident permits only, which is not the current setup for the Downtown district. Policy implications for a program in relation to this petition. A resident-only program may move employee vehicles to other adjacent streets as we've seen. It again is a very small area for a new program. The Downtown RPP boundary is finalized, and we would require Council direction and an updated resolution to modify. Some options in reviewing this petition are to expand the Downtown RPP boundary and annex these three streets or a new RPP district could be created. The Southgate neighborhood also submitted a petition for the neighborhood as a whole. From the petition, the residents report parking overflow between 8:00 A.M. to 4:00 P.M. on weekdays, primarily attributed by the residents to Palo Alto High School students, School District employees, medical office employees and Stanford employees and students. The residents organized a parking occupancy count and noted high levels of parking on blocks that are nearest to Churchill Avenue and safety concerns related to emergency vehicle access and bicyclists. Here's a screenshot of the occupancy counts that were submitted showing high levels of parking closest to Churchill. Some policy implications related to this program are that resident-only permits would not address the cause of the parking issues and may just relocate the problem. Engineering, enforcement, Transportation Demand Management (TDM) and parking management options in addition to or in lieu of permits have been suggested to residents but have not yet been evaluated. An in-depth outreach and stakeholder process would be necessary to establish other

TRANSCRIPT

options for the people who are parking in the neighborhood. Some options with regards to this petition would be to evaluate and implement engineering, enforcement and TDM options in conjunction with the School District and to monitor for a possible future RPP program. A second option would be to combine with Evergreen Park and implement one large RPP program. A third option would be to create a freestanding Southgate RPP program through a stakeholder process. Finally the fourth petition before you is for the Evergreen Park neighborhood. Evergreen Park residents request annexation into the existing College Terrace resident permit-only RPP district. The resident attribute the weekday parking overflow to the neighboring businesses, Caltrain commuters and Stanford faculty, staff, students and visitors. The neighboring businesses there would be the California Avenue business district. Residents cite safety concerns with regards to the local bike routes. Evergreen Park residents also self-organized and did an occupancy count and noted primarily high levels of parking along El Camino and streets that are nearest to the Cal. Ave. business district. Policy implications for a program in Evergreen Park is again resident-only permits would not address the causes of the parking intrusion. Again, vehicles may move elsewhere. Engage stakeholders and community to create a program that includes both an RPP element and TDM options. Explore parking management strategies to most efficiently utilize the existing supply in the California Avenue district and to support the local businesses on Cal. Ave. Options with regard to the Evergreen Park petition would be to annex into the existing College Terrace RPP as requested. To implement an Evergreen Park RPP program with a stakeholder group and parking management options. A third option would be to combine with Southgate and implement one large RPP program. Following our discussion with the PTC on April 27th, Staff returns tonight with at-places memo that contains this estimated resource impact table that replaces Table 2 in the Staff Report. PTC requested additional information regarding the estimated capital and operating expenses related to the RPP district. Here we've broken out estimated capital expenses and estimated operating expenses for each of the four RPP petitions that are before you. These are very back of the envelope estimates, so please take that into consideration. The proposed budget in the Fiscal Year '17 budget that will be before the Finance Committee, etc., shortly includes \$30,000 in the proposed capital budget for in-house staff and also \$300,000 in the proposed capital budget for capital expenditures. There's a \$50,000 line item in the proposed operating budget for planning of RPP programs. Those are the funds that have been proposed. You can the estimated funds for both capital and operating expenditures for each of the programs. Again, we went to the PTC on April 27th, and the motions that came out of that passed 5-0, that all programs should be prioritized for funding and implemented in the following order. Southgate and Evergreen were both first priority, followed by

TRANSCRIPT

Crescent Park and then Edgewood Plaza. Second, PTC passed a Motion 4-1 that the City Council should direct Staff or the PTC to set a standard for which to evaluate parking capacity and utilization goals. Based on comments from the PTC, the goal of the RPP programs is unknown. We don't know if we want empty streets or if want to be able to have two or three parking spaces available per block. That concludes the Staff presentation. We welcome your questions.

Mayor Burt: Thank you. We can have an opportunity for Council to ask technical questions. Given the hour and the number of speakers, I'd encourage colleagues to be succinct. Does anyone have any technical questions for Staff at this time? Council Member DuBois.

Council Member DuBois: Two quick questions. What's going on at Edgewood Plaza? We don't have a store there. It's completely full during the day. We need to figure out what's happening. Who's parking at Edgewood Plaza and on the streets around Edgewood Plaza?

Ms. Atkinson: We haven't undertaken data collection near Edgewood Plaza yet, and we would if directed to move forward with a parking program in that area. Colloquially, I visited just before the PTC meeting, and there was sufficient parking on the neighborhood streets. I ...

Council Member DuBois: I mean the parking lot itself. There's no store there, but it seems 100 percent parked.

Ms. Atkinson: There were quite a few empty spaces in the parking lot also.

Council Member DuBois: The other question is—looking at these high-level financials on packet page 886, you're including the capital costs. That's the total capital cost, right? For the signs and ...

Ms. Atkinson: Right. That's based on our experience in the Downtown RPP district with signage and materials.

Council Member DuBois: If I look at Figure 1, Downtown RPP, now that we've bought the signs, we should be highly profitable next year, like \$225,000 revenue.

Joshuah Mello, Chief Transportation Official: I just want to make sure that you're looking at the at-places memo. That table has been replaced by the one in the at-places memo.

Council Member DuBois: I did see that. I'm looking at the Downtown RPP part. We lost money this year, but we paid for all the signs. Next year ...

TRANSCRIPT

James Keene, City Manager: What page are you on?

Council Member DuBois: Page 6 of the Staff Report.

Ms. Atkinson: That's not an indication of loss money; that's an expense. That's the amount of money that has been paid out to the signage contractor to date for installation of signs.

Council Member DuBois: I'm just saying next year we won't have that \$300,000 expense, and we'll still have \$560,000 of revenue.

Ms. Atkinson: The revenue from permits sold this year is slightly different than it will be in years to come, because we don't know the number of employee permits that will be sold in the future nor the permit price, because this is still a pilot program for the Downtown RPP district. We also had Phase 1 and Phase 2 permits sold this year.

Council Member DuBois: At a high level, it looks like it's a very quick payback, a highly profitable year 2.

Ms. Atkinson: Potentially.

Council Member DuBois: Thank you.

Mayor Burt: Vice Mayor Scharff.

Vice Mayor Scharff: Thanks. The first question is on the sign with the black and the red, page 22 of the PowerPoint. My eyes aren't that good enough. What is the black, red and green? What's the breakdown on that? It's confusing as to where it—black looks like it's 87 and above. What's the ...

Ms. Atkinson: This is the resident-submitted occupancy counts for the Evergreen Park neighborhood. They use a slightly different color scheme than Staff typically uses. I can thumb through and double check, but I believe that the black is to represent greater than 80 percent occupancy, which Staff would typically use a red color for.

Vice Mayor Scharff: Red itself is below 80 but above what?

Ms. Atkinson: Per the petition, red indicates an occupancy of 50 to 84 percent occupied, and then black is 85 percent and above.

Vice Mayor Scharff: That's helpful. I wanted to understand a little bit about what the PTC did. I thought our Ordinance said that the PTC had to prioritize and give a recommendation. What I see here is not a recommendation for either Southgate or Evergreen. Was their

TRANSCRIPT

recommendation implicitly to be one RPP district or did they just not do what they were supposed to do which was prioritize Southgate or Evergreen?

Mr. Mello: They elected to assign the same priority to Southgate and Evergreen Park

Vice Mayor Scharff: I don't think they did their job then. I think that's not what we asked them to do. When it comes to funding, here a little bit, I guess my question is if we were to create more funding, then you could do both Southgate and Evergreen or it's not a question of funding, it's a question of Staff time, so we couldn't do that even if we added an extra \$200,000 to do both.

Hillary Gitelman, Planning and Community Environment Director: Thank you, Vice Mayor Scharff. Hillary Gitelman, the Planning Director. If you look at the updated table that we included in the at-places memo and in the PowerPoint, we have budgeted sufficient resources in the capital budget to do multiple RPPs. In the operating budget, we have not budgeted for any RPPs because of discussions that happened during the development of the proposed budget we had this discussion about should we put in money for the enforcement contracts. It was decided that we would wait and see which RPPs and how big they were that we would take forward. Then, we have to have a discussion about how to accomplish the enforcement, whether by using Staff or contractor and the like. There were ways we just couldn't estimate what the operating costs would be. Any RPP would require us to come back with a budget appropriation next year. Separate from the budgeting issues, we do have Staff constraints. We have one significant vacancy in the department with Jessica Sullivan's departure. That will affect our ability to deliver in terms of the time it will take to do multiple RPPs. I think the Council can prioritize and direct us to proceed with as many of these as you like, and we will have to just assess the amount of time it will take to follow through.

Vice Mayor Scharff: We could direct you to do both Evergreen and Southgate, but it will just take longer due to Staff constraints as opposed to just saying, "Go ahead and do one of those two." Is that ...

Ms. Gitelman: I don't know whether the City Manager wants to add, but that's our assessment. As Sue-Ellen pointed out in her presentation, there's some alternatives for some of these other programs that might be desirable to pursue first.

Vice Mayor Scharff: It wasn't—this is a technical question that I'm trying (inaudible). The technical question really is do we have the option to tell you to do both or do we not have the option. What you've told me is that

TRANSCRIPT

we do have the option because you have the Staff resources; it just will take you longer. If I'm repeating that incorrectly, clarify. That's what I heard.

Mr. Keene: I think you'll hear from the public too and weigh in yourself. I think that there's some triage factor here. Everything is not entirely equal. One of the things we want to think about is how quickly we can improve the worst conditions. I think those need to be factors when we look at what the scaling of these projects would be.

Vice Mayor Scharff: If we did have an interest in the Crescent Park one of saying just go ahead and annex them to the Downtown RPP district, which then would be subject to the selling of permits and would be that. We could do that, I suppose, or could we not do that because I heard it was closed. Is there a reason we couldn't do that tonight on a technical basis? I'm trying not to give a value judgment. I'm not saying I want to do that. I'm just technically is that an option on the table or is it not on the table.

Ms. Gitelman: If Council's interested in going in that direction, it involves a change to the Resolution establishing the Downtown RPP. We'd have to bring that back. As those of you who participated in the Downtown RPP discussions know, we're coming back around the August timeframe with a report back on the RPP for Downtown. It was intended to be kind of a status update or an informational report. It would have to actually be an Action Item to amend the resolution if that's the Council's desire.

Vice Mayor Scharff: Thanks.

Mayor Burt: Council Member Berman.

Council Member Berman: Thank you. I have a couple of questions about the cost estimates, starting I guess with Crescent Park. My main questions revolve around the annual enforcement costs. Would it really cost—we're talking about a couple hundred yards at most of street. Does it really cost \$35,000 a year to enforce just those couple of blocks?

Ms. Atkinson: That's an estimate based on contracting the enforcement out as in the Downtown RPP district. If Crescent Park were annexed into the Downtown RPP district, the cost would be significantly less, because we do have existing enforcement. If it was enforcement of a new program with different requirements, they can't simply have an expanded boundary for somebody to have as part of their beat. It would be an entirely different enforcement officer.

Council Member Berman: That makes sense. Thank you. For Southgate and Evergreen, if we were to do both at once, would there be any

TRANSCRIPT

efficiencies in the enforcement cost? That's \$165,000 of annual enforcement. Those are solid neighborhoods, but they're not huge cities. Would there be any efficiencies with combining the two?

Ms. Atkinson: There may be, but we would have to evaluate that and return an answer to you.

Council Member Berman: I think those were the main questions I had for now. Thanks.

Mayor Burt: Council Member Filseth.

Council Member Filseth: Thanks. First of all, I don't see the money involved here being a show stopper on moving forward or not moving forward. That being said, I did have a couple of questions on the cost structures. On the website cost, it's dramatically higher for Southgate and Evergreen than it is for Edgewood and Crescent Park. Why is that? It's the same website, right?

Ms. Atkinson: That would be for the online permit sales website. It's a little more complicated than it actually appears. It's different permits that need to be added in, and it's different user types that need to be added in. When you're looking at the potential of an area that you would go through a stakeholder process and potentially have different types of permits. That's a more complicated website to set up than a smaller, concise area.

Council Member Filseth: Would you have to go through a stakeholder process to modify the website?

Ms. Atkinson: No, I'm speaking about the type of RPP that may be set up or may be directed in the Southgate and Evergreen Park areas. If Council directs Staff to do resident-only programs in those areas, it would be one type of permit essentially or maybe a resident permit and a guest permit, what have you. If we did move forward with a stakeholder process and look at the potential for other types of permits including for employees, those are different types of permits.

Council Member Filseth: We've set all that stuff up already for the Downtown program. I don't understand why it's not—we just say some of those and some of those.

Ms. Atkinson: It may be, but we haven't evaluated the full process for each yet; these are back of the envelope estimates and what could this potentially cost. We wanted to make sure that we represented the field of what could be involved.

TRANSCRIPT

Council Member Filseth: My next question is—I'm guessing it's going to be the same answer. I noticed the in-house Staff costs for Southgate and Evergreen Park are like 10 times what they for Edgewood and Crescent Park. Why is that?

Ms. Atkinson: That would be a potentially more involved stakeholder process including ...

Council Member Filseth: It's the stakeholder process.

Ms. Atkinson: ... identification of stakeholders, holding community meetings, doing outreach and gaining input from those who need to provide input into those programs.

Council Member Filseth: Finally, I want to sort of—I was curious on your answer to Council Member Scharff's question which is on the enforcement cost in Crescent Park, for example. You said that if we just had the existing contractor enforce three more blocks, then it would cost less than that. I can't imagine a scenario where we wouldn't do that. What scenario would we not do that in? Irrespective of what we decide for permits and so forth, that's the contract for the contractor. Is there any scenario we wouldn't do that?

Ms. Atkinson: That's entirely up to Council to review the petition and direct Staff if we are annexing or if we're evaluating as a separate district. If it's a separate district, it may require its own enforcement Staff.

Council Member Filseth: Why is that? Because it's a separate—how we define the district versus how we contract with the enforcement group seems like two separate things.

Ms. Atkinson: Perhaps I'm misunderstanding the question. If a Crescent Park RPP were set up independently of the Downtown RPP district, we would likely need a half-time enforcement office to cover those streets. That would be the cost that's estimated here. If it were to be annexed into the Downtown RPP district, it would just be adding three blocks to somebody's existing route. That would be a significantly lower cost. The cost estimate was made based on the petition that was for a resident-only permit program that is not the current Downtown RPP program. If the direction were to annex to the Downtown RPP district, that cost would be significantly lower.

Council Member Filseth: I still don't understand, but I'll leave the issue.

Mayor Burt: Council Member Holman.

TRANSCRIPT

Council Member Holman: I wasn't going to ask any questions before the public spoke given the time of the evening it is, but I do have maybe just two questions. The difference in cost between Southgate and Evergreen Park because they're essentially the same size neighborhoods, it seems to me. Either three by five or three by six blocks it seems. Southgate is configured a little bit differently, but they're essentially the same size. I'm not understanding why the costs are different for those two neighborhoods. They've both asked for—their suggestions for both neighborhoods is the same, to be annexed into a residents-only permit program. I don't understand the difference.

Ms. Atkinson: They are slightly different sizes. Evergreen Park is ever so slightly larger, so we did estimate a higher cost for the program in Evergreen Park.

Council Member Holman: The enforcement, you sort of answered this. Let's just say for Southgate and Evergreen Park—I won't go to Crescent Park or Edgewood at this moment—are those numbers addressing or assuming contract enforcement as opposed to Staff, right?

Ms. Atkinson: Yes, for all of these it's assuming that the enforcement would be contracted out.

Council Member Holman: That's all for now. Thank you.

Mayor Burt: Council Member Wolbach.

Council Member Wolbach: In particular, I have some questions around Southgate. First, let me ask you a question about Evergreen Park. We got a letter from Sven Thesen asking if it's possible to have an exception from an Evergreen Park district to allow any Electric Vehicle (EV) to park in front of his home, Project Green Home, because he has an EV charger on the street. I was just wondering if that's something that would need Council direction in order to do. If somebody has an EV charger on the street in front of their house that's available for the public to use. Something to think about, come back to it later. I'll move on to my other questions while we move on.

Ms. Gitelman: Maybe I'll just say—we are so far in advance of being able to anticipate what the design of the program would be, that's an issue among many that we could look at.

Council Member Wolbach: I will move on. There are a lot of nuances here. Regarding Southgate, given that the concerns here are primarily about students parking at Palo Alto High School (Paly), some also from Stanford but particularly from Paly. That's exacerbated by very, very narrow streets

TRANSCRIPT

in Southgate. Three things that I'm curious if it's possible to do either in addition to, separately from, maybe in advance of, kind of regardless of RPP in Southgate. One, is there any way to enforce something like—I'll see this at private properties where it'll say no parking for X. If you park here and go to the business next door, we're going to tow our car. Is it possible to have a "no Paly parking" sign set up? I'm absolutely serious. Is it possible to do something like that? Is it possible to enforce it? Again, I've seen the private property examples, and I'm wondering if it's possible to do that for public use.

Ms. Atkinson: In terms of restriction by user group, that would be fairly difficult. That would require technology to determine whose car belongs to who. What we have seen and what is actually in place, I believe, near Gunn High School is a time restriction, no parking between 10:00 A.M. to 11:00 A.M., for example. That can be enforced, but we have—I think a user group restriction would be considerably more difficult.

Council Member Wolbach: Secondly, is it possible to add—because one of the concerns is people blocking driveways and also parking dangerously at corners. Is it possible to just add more red pain at the corners of driveways and the corners of intersections to prevent unsafe and blocking parking behaviors?

Ms. Atkinson: That is something that we can consider doing.

Council Member Wolbach: Also where the streets are too narrow to have a car parked on both sides and have an emergency vehicle pass in the middle, it seems to me that you'd want to stop people parking on one side or the other regardless of who's doing the parking. We'd want our emergency vehicles to pass through. Is that something that we could also direct Staff tonight to do? To explore eliminating parking on one side of the street or the other where the street is dangerously narrow.

Mr. Mello: As currently configured, the majority of the streets in Southgate will allow an emergency vehicle to pass when both sides are parked up. Two vehicles cannot pass each other without pulling over in the parking lane to yield. We did proactively install some red curbing at Castilleja on Manzanita about a month and a half ago. We saw it as good opportunity. There were a couple of homes that were under construction, so we went in and cleared and little bit of yielding area there. We do think there's an opportunity to create additional yielding areas both for our emergency vehicles and passenger vehicles. I think that in itself would also take a little bit of a stakeholder process with the community, because certain property owners would lose parking in front of their property.

TRANSCRIPT

Council Member Wolbach: As far as timeline, because we're talking about what's the most appropriate use of our time here—the most expeditious way to get relief especially for Southgate where there's danger issues and others. Which would be faster, to explore the signage changing, painting changing, etc., or to set up an RPP? Which would be able to get on the ground faster while exploring the other perhaps as a long-term buffer solution?

Ms. Atkinson: I would expect that the engineering solutions would be the short-term solution, and would be able to be implemented faster than an RPP program.

Council Member Wolbach: Thanks.

Mayor Burt: Council Member Schmid.

Council Member Schmid: I'd like to ask a strategy question. This RPP program is getting very complicated. It's growing and it's going to take longer than we thought it would to reach a solution. We have in place a December 2014 Ordinance for Citywide RPP program. It's likely to bring in other neighborhoods to us shortly because of nonresident parking intrusion. Would the City Manager recommend that we suspend consideration of any comprehensive plan scenario that brings in new jobs above additional employed residents until this RPP issues is fully resolved?

Mayor Burt: Council Member Schmid, I think we're getting off of the focus of tonight's discussion. We have coming up our Scenario 5. You're talking about an action that is outside of the agenda item tonight.

Council Member Schmid: Can we make a decision on RPP without having some context of what's causing it?

Mayor Burt: We certainly don't have it agenda item for discussion. That's a broad community issue that the public should be able to weigh in on, and that's really out of order. At this time, I'd like to proceed to the public. We have a large number of speaker cards, larger yet apparently. We have several groupings. Per our policies, we allow five members of the public to combine and then speak for up to 10 minutes. That's usually to help consolidate—it's two purposes. To allow a group of people to have a longer, more thoughtful presentation and to be more efficient. When we have this many speaker cards, we would be limiting the time per speaker to two minutes, so we don't do anything under our current rules by allowing the consolidation. Nevertheless, it's permitted. I say this as an encouragement. For those who have consolidated in groupings, you have up to 10 minutes to speak. If you're able to convey your message in five minutes, that would be great to allow us to have the prospect of actually completing this item

TRANSCRIPT

tonight, which I know everybody here would like us to do. Our first speaker is David Schrom, speaking on behalf of Hillary Hugg [phonetic], Robin Bayer [phonetic], Andrew and Francois Chave [phonetic]. Welcome.

David Schrom, speaking for five people: I want to present Palo Alto parking from a resident's perspective, and I want to begin by saying that the residents in my neighborhood feel a deep and sincere thanks to Tom DuBois, Eric Filseth, Karen Holman and Greg Schmid for their Colleagues' Memo. The way we perceive the current policy is the City Council is taking from residents in order to inflate commercial landlords' profits. This amounts in our eyes to stealing, to take the property of another wrongfully especially as a habitual, regular practice. Happens every day and every night to us in our neighborhood. We have a reasonable expectation as homeowners that we're going to be able to park in front of our homes or that our guests are going to be able to park in front of our homes. That's been taken away from us and is promised to be taken away even more as we continue to allow building without providing adequate parking in the nearby commercial district. If the City Council makes it legal to steal kids' lunch money, most of us are going to just recoil from that. At the same time, people who are employed in the business district think nothing of taking away the amenity and the convenience of our parking and the impact on our property values that they have and our safety and our health and our well-being. Nor do the commercial landlords who profit from the escalating rents and who benefit by not having to provide parking worry about taking from us. Basically, even though it's legal, I think it's stealing. We think it's stealing. What we're really effectively doing—commercial landlords typically also own their own homes, but few residents own commercial property. We're taxing the less wealthy to support the more wealthy, while we in our neighborhood are by and large progressive people and we're happy to be taxed in order to make the world more fair, we feel a little crummy when you tax us to make it less fair. The Lytton garage which you approved in December 2015 produced 214 incremental parking spaces for \$13 million. That's \$64,500 per space. In Evergreen Park, we have 240 residential parcels, we have 600 on-street spaces, at \$64,500 per space, that's \$39 million worth of capital investment in parking. Admittedly the neighborhood is not currently entirely filled with nonresident parking, but it's headed that direction fast. The commercial landlords win, the residents lose. Commercial landlords avoid \$39 million in capital cost. Estimating a 10 percent annual return on this investment and with long-held properties and rapidly escalating rents in the business district, that's a very conservative thing, we've got \$3.9 million in added revenue going to them because Evergreen Park residents are losing \$3.9 million in parking services and who knows how much in health, amenities and safety. A typical residence parcel in Evergreen Park is 50x150 feet with 50 feet of frontage, so you've got two parking spaces plus a

TRANSCRIPT

driveway. That's \$129,000 in lost parking capital value per residential parcel, 12,900 annual lost parking services per parcel, and we don't know how much lost health, amenities and safety per parcel. The health, safety and amenity losses are real. We get 1,200 extra auto trips a day to put 600 cars in the neighborhood and get them out. We get noise, air pollution, injury to people. The gentleman right here witnessed a person hit two parked cars and drive away from them just two weeks ago. We get property damage, landscape trampled, litter. We can't sweep our streets because they're lined with cars when the street sweeper drives down the middle of the street, and we pay for that. We get increased crime, lower property values, strangers in the neighborhood, less control over public space, reduced caring and respect among neighbors because we don't interact as much. We get reduced feeling of safety and inconvenient or no parking in front of our homes. We expect better. Will all Palo Alto neighborhoods be improved to encourage (inaudible) on the automobile. That's our Comprehensive Plan from the Land Use and Community Design vision. The adverse impacts of automobile traffic on the environment in general and residential streets in particular will be reduced. Once again the Transportation vision, our Comprehensive Plan. Parking demand may only be managed effectively when users pay directly for its cost. Are you listening Staff? Protect residential areas from parking impacts of nearby business districts. Listen up please. Provide sufficient parking in the University Avenue, Downtown and California Avenue business districts. Treat residential street as both public ways and neighborhood amenities. They are public streets, but I can't ride my bike on 101. It's a public street. The purpose of the streets in our neighborhood is to provide access to adjoining property. It's not to be supplementary parking for the business district. Implement the Comprehensive Plan. Permit parking is everywhere supported and nowhere opposed by the Comprehensive Plan. With delay the Council will perpetuate these ills. Every residential street parking space is a 6,450 annual subsidy to somebody who drives to work. The Staff tells us those cars will just go to another neighborhood. I'm standing here and not talking just about Evergreen Park. I'm saying fix it everywhere. Let the cars go away. The City Council was paying hundreds of drivers millions of dollars to drive to work in Palo Alto this year even as you say that you want to make that go away. In Evergreen Park with two spaces per parcel, the subsidy is provided with a \$36 daily charge on the adjacent resident and homeowner. I had some friends here from—one was from Geneva, another was from New York City. They asked me what I was doing after our meeting this afternoon because I excused myself at 5:00. I said I was coming down here to talk about permit parking. The words they used were how can this be in Palo Alto. It is hypocrisy, incompetence, impotence? We claim we want housing and neighborhood quality, then we steal from the people who buy homes and live here. We claim we want civic spirit and neighborliness,

TRANSCRIPT

and then we undermine community spirit by pitting neighbor against neighbor for relief from abuse. A solution is readily available in adjacent College Terrace, where resident permit parking has worked for years. The same sources of the on-street parking that exist there exist in Evergreen Park and Southgate with very few differences. That program can be expanded to us. Evergreen Park and Southgate can opt in block by block using existing rules. Annexation is cheap. Why spend to create a new program in every different neighborhood in the City? We don't have that kind of money. We've got a successful one; let's use it. Annexation is cooperative. It leaves enough to go around to other neighborhoods instead of hogging them to deal with the single neighborhood. Finally, I want to say that this is really an issue of fairness. If you want cost recovery, up the cost of permits in the business district. Those are the people who are imposing the cost. The economist on the Council will tell you that externalized costs are the bane of free market economics. They are patent unfairness; they're why we have an environmental problem; they're why we have many of our social problems. You guys are allowing them wholesale by not putting resident permit parking all over Palo Alto. Would the people who approve of what I just said please stand. I want to thank you for listening. I know I was not as delicate as I sometimes am. I hope you understand that after years and years of putting up with this, I feel some passion about it. Thank you.

Mayor Burt: Our next speaker is Irene, and I can't make out the last name, to be speaking for Bradley Horowitz [phonetic], Chi Won Ow [phonetic] and Susan Spangler [phonetic] and Elizabeth Parada [phonetic].

Irene August, speaking for five people: Hi. I would like to share with you a visual diary of what the parking situation looks like in Evergreen Park. These photos were taken on Friday, April 29th, at 11:00 A.M. which is typically a slow day compared to most other days. Each photo here corresponds to a block in Evergreen Park, and I've labeled every intersection and drawn an arrow corresponding to its location on the map. You can see that every block is full. All these photos are geotagged and date and time stamped, so you can look at these on your own at this URL: tinyurl.com/epcantpark. There's a QR code here for you too in case you can't type in the URL. In this photo album there are several videos where you can see cars trolling through neighborhood looking for parking, even though this footage was captured in a short period of time. Karen Holman asked about Evergreen Park versus Southgate. College Avenue is filled with apartment buildings and multi-residential properties. You can't just count the number of streets; you have to look at the number of people living in this neighborhood. There are far more people living in Evergreen Park than Southgate. These buildings accommodate one covered parking space per

TRANSCRIPT

dwelling, but most of these residences have multiple drivers which means that the people who live on this street need to park on the street, which means that people who work around the California Avenue district push further out into the residential streets with single-family houses to park. Here is a photo of Ash at Oxford toward Stanford Avenue. The whole block is filled; there's only one house on this entire block. It's filled with daytime parkers. I choose to live in Evergreen Park because of the walkability of the neighborhood. We try to do the right thing by having dense housing. My household is a multigenerational household of six on an R-2 lot. We walk and we bike as much as possible. The kids bike to school. Their father bikes to work in Mountain View. Inevitably, we do have to leave the house during the day, and we have to drive. For some things there's just no way around it, especially for my father who at 70 has only one operable lung. We come back from running errands or from work, and there's no place to park with four drivers in the household and several apartment buildings across the street and all along College Avenue and Ash and across from us on Oxford. Each apartment has one parking space, but most have two drivers and cars. Residents need to park on the streets, and employees along California Avenue exacerbate the parking situation. I myself am deeply entrenched in the tech community, and I have long embraced the rise of the tech industry in our community. I have several friends who work in offices along California Avenue area. I have invested in some of the companies who have offices right there. In fact, I joined a startup just three blocks away from my house, partly because they were three blocks away from my house. I also teach yoga at Avalon Yoga Center on California Avenue. I see all perspectives. Let me say this. No one wants people to park in the residential streets. Of course the residents don't want it, but neither do the workers, nor the patrons on California Avenue. They feel bad about parking into our streets. We all sustainable, predictable parking that doesn't reach into the residential streets. Until you force the issue, they are going to continue parking here. I mentioned to you the last time I stood up here that my father had to park four blocks away when he came home from the grocery store one day. I'll tell you a little bit more about what it's really like to live here. I get woken up at 1:00 or 2:00 A.M. every night by the man who parks his car across the street from my house as he's leaving work to go home. That sound when you unlock your car, it wakes me up every night. We see cars parked in front of fire hydrants. We have a photo of this at this website, tinyurl.com/epcantpark. Cars constantly block driveways. I had a neighbor across the street who had to call the police to help her deal with a car blocking her driveway. The police ended up helping her negotiate her way out of her driveway by driving over the curb and around the tree in her front yard to get out. They ticketed the car that was blocking her driveway. I was later mortified to learn about this because it turns out that it was my friend who blocked that driveway when she stopped at my house.

TRANSCRIPT

Now she will never come over. This parking problem has made us even more isolated from our neighbors, our friends and our community. Most importantly, this is a safety issue. I've seen and heard stories of people's cars getting hit by daytime parkers who speed off and have no relationship or regard for the people who live here. Cars troll up and down the streets in our neighborhood looking for parking. I almost got run over by a car last Thursday morning as I was walking to my yoga class, because there was a man speeding through a stop sign on College Avenue towards El Camino. People walking and biking through the neighborhood are at risk, which scares me to death when I think my kids riding their bikes to school. The City Council needs to have a sense of urgency around this. If anyone gets hurt, that is on you. How bad does the situation need to get before you take action? I am at my wit's end. I don't really expect my little poster to change the world or anything, but I don't know what else to do to get you to take action. As residents, my family pays almost \$100,000 a year in property taxes for the three houses we collectively own in Evergreen Park and Southgate, and we still can't park in front of our own houses. That just seems wrong, an egregious lack of oversight and service by the City Council who was elected by these same residents to act in our interests. We need a timeline with milestones and a deadline to annex Evergreen Park neighborhood into the College Terrace RPP now. Thank you.

Mayor Burt: One thing I'd like to let members of the public know is that we encourage the public to neither boo nor clap because there may be people who are intimidated in being able to speak out if they're strong expressions like that. Our next speaker is Neilson Buchanan. Each speaker will have up to—I'm sorry? Can I have the list here? Our next is Christine Shambora to speak for five people, Cathy McGinn [phonetic], Peter Shambora, Nadalyn Smith [phonetic], and Jim McFall [phonetic]. Welcome.

Christine Shambora, speaking for five: Thank you. I'm sorry I will not have any high tech exhibits along with what I have to say. It's just going to be some words to you. I hope you will take them to heart. First of all, I'd like to say good evening to Mayor Burt and members of the City Council. My name is Christine Shambora, and I live at 1565 Castilleja Avenue in the Southgate neighborhood. I'm one of the members of the steering committee who put together the RPP application for Southgate. I'm speaking tonight to highlight a few points for your consideration regarding the Southgate application which is before you this evening. First of all, the obvious. We sincerely hope you will approve our application and that you have had a chance to visit our neighborhood just to see how badly things are and that we need your help in addressing the parking and safety issues. The situation has reached a crisis both in terms of safety and quality of life. We ask you not to pit Southgate against the Evergreen neighborhood by

TRANSCRIPT

choosing one over the other. We urge you to find the resources to make this happen. The Council has stated that traffic and parking are a priority and approval of these applications will demonstrate that you mean it. I don't need to remind you that an important bike boulevard goes directly through our neighborhood, and safety for bikers is extremely threatened with the current parking situation in Southgate. We have some of the narrowest streets in Palo Alto. Most are no more than 24 feet wide. With cars parked on both sides of the street, bikers and cars are left with only nine feet to traverse our streets. As you can ascertain through application, being adjacent to Palo Alto High School has caused the biggest impact on parking in our neighborhood. As of today, I mean today, we have had approximately 100 students parking in our neighborhood every day, Monday through Friday. Recently we appeared before the PAUSD Board and the City School Liaison Committee to raise awareness of what we are dealing with. We've received little response from Paly in seeking a resolution to our issues. However, the fact of the matter is with increasing enrollment from 1,700 in 2007 to projected enrollment in 2020 of 2,300 students, there will never be adequate parking to accommodate the students who wish to drive to school. In 2007, there were 400 spaces for student parking. Today, there are 183 spaces. When construction is done in 2020, there will be 215 spaces. The school needs to address this issue without using Southgate as their overflow parking lot. We've heard the suggestion that Evergreen and Southgate applications could be lumped together and that we would both get the College Terrace solution. Speaking on behalf of the neighborhood, Southgate would prefer to have its own RPP process so that we may best find the fit for our neighborhood and the opportunity to work within the stakeholder process. Thank you for taking the time to listen and thoughtfully deliberate on this important action.

Mayor Burt: Thank you. Our next speaker is Neilson Buchanan, to be followed by Eileen.

Neilson Buchanan: I'm very pleased to see that there has been an outbreak of neighborhood concern about this that validates the concerns that four or five neighborhoods on University Avenue have been articulating for 10 years. I think the political time has come that something has to be done. I wish I had 10 minutes to talk, but I simply don't have the physical stamina if I had it lined up to talk to you. We've got a lot of experience to offer from University Avenue parking permit. I think you have a binary decision tonight. You're either going to ramp up and do a Manhattan-type project to stem the insult to the neighborhoods from spillover parking or you're not. The Planning Commission, I was pleased with their decision. They basically said we have no idea how to prioritize. Staff has not given us any criteria. We'll let the Council do it. I think that was the right decision. Somehow in

TRANSCRIPT

your divine wisdom, you're going to have to figure this out. Either ramp it up or kick the cans down the road. Whatever you do—I mean this in all seriousness—do not transfer the elements of the program on University Avenue to any other neighborhood. The program is not working well enough to transfer it to another place. This is not the time or the day to go into that. In the very near future, the former resident stakeholders are going to get ourselves together to brief you on how it's actually working in Phase 2. We're not going to wait 'til August 1st to let you know how it's going. We're going to give Staff a little time to get Phase 2 working. Quite frankly, you do not want to transfer it to the other neighborhoods. Jessica is gone. Sue-Ellen, Josh, they need help. You're going to have bring in a lot of help somehow. I'd like to close with Pat Burt's appeal at a late night meeting two weeks ago, I believe it was, when he made an appeal for the transportation tax. He said if you don't like parking and traffic now, just wait two years. Defer the mitigation and see what happens. The truth of the matter is none of the mitigation efforts that have been talked about are even funded. Demand is going to outpace supply a lot. Thank you for the extra time.

Mayor Burt: Thank you. Eileen Skrabutenas.

Eileen Skrabutenas: Eileen Skrabutenas, I live at 1044 Hamilton. I am here to talk about the three blocks in Crescent Park that were put up on the map. I was responsible for circulating the petitions to request annexation into the DRPP Phase 2 program. At the time, you all in your collective wisdom and foresight said no way will employees park in that neighborhood because it's too far from Downtown. Until four months ago, these three blocks did not have a parking problem. As the DRPPP zone moved further and further up Hamilton or down Hamilton depending on your perspective, parking has become a problem for residents. At the time we circulated these petitions, we were looking for something hopefully expedient. The only thing that was available was annexation. I'm here to request that those three blocks, 1000 Hamilton, 1100 Hamilton, the 500 block of Chaucer, be considered for its own RPP. We did not have a parking problem until you kicked the can down the road and allowed people trying to escape other permitted areas to park all day in these neighborhoods. Has created a burden on a section of town that did not have a burden previously. Please after telling me at prior meetings that we could not be expediently annexed into the RPP, don't come back now and say it's a lot faster if we just add those three blocks to something that already exists. Please consider it for its own Residential Parking program. Thank you.

Mayor Burt: Thank you. Lucinda Lenicheck.

TRANSCRIPT

Lucinda Lenicheck: I'm so delighted to be here. I thank you all for your thoughtfulness. I've been here since—hours and hours and hours. I loved hearing about the bicycles. I salute you. My family has been at 342 Oxford Avenue. This is the middle block between the railroad tracks and El Camino, one block in from College Avenue. We are as far as the eye can see on both sides of the street chrome, glass, metal, cars. Every day. I teach cello. My music students come; they go looking everywhere for parking. If they can, they come into my driveway; they check with me. I have 76-year-old cello students. It's not fun for them not to be able to park near my home. I wanted to say that the notion that we could be annexed to College Terrace's plan, we have already done all the studies, incorporated all the information. We're trying to make this as easy and as quick as possible and painless and effective. It's been years and years and years that we've been in the process of hoping to have our situation remedied. I was absolutely astonished when the Downtown area got themselves a parking program. I thought, "Where did they get a parking problem? We've had it for years." All of a sudden, theirs was remedied. I really hope that you can take care of Evergreen Park. I hope you can take care of Southgate because we do not want neighbors pitted against neighbors. We all have a problem. I thank you very much for listening to our concerns.

Mayor Burt: Thank you. Our next speaker is Paul Machado, to be followed by Mike Meffert.

Paul Machado: Good evening, Mayor Burt and Council Members. Not long ago the Jay Paul Company proposed the largest PC project in the City's history. Seeking residents' acceptance, the vice president of the company held two community meetings. He started meeting with a map and picture of the project that illustrated how close the bus stops and train station were to the project, like the residents didn't know. He was trying to sell residents on the idea of TDMs. During the second meeting, a resident said to him, "This project like all the other projects in town is under-parked. Your project is massive; therefore, it is massively under-parked. I live near your project, and already I cannot park in front of my own house because cars park there all day every day. What are you going to do about it?" The vice president said nothing. I cannot prevent my tenants from parking in front of your house all day every day unless you have a Residential Parking program. Without it, TDMs don't work. My little neighborhood, Evergreen Park, has worked very hard on a simple and streamlined RPP proposal. We are simply asking for the same program that our neighbors across the street have had for years. The program has not harmed businesses, but it has protected their neighborhood in compliance with the City policy. Tonight we are asking for annexation of our neighborhood into the RPP our neighbors have with the

TRANSCRIPT

same rules and respect. We believe our need is urgent and we cannot wait for years. Thank you.

Mayor Burt: Thank you. Mike Meffert to be followed by Jeffry Hook.

Mike Meffert: Good evening, Mayor, Council and fellow residents. My name is Mike Meffert. I've in commercial real estate for the last 15 years. I'd like to talk about the California Avenue district as it relates to Evergreen Park. I'm also a property owner. While I don't necessarily oppose the RPP, I have probably the distinction that I would like to see it delayed until there can be sufficient supply. Everything we're talking about so far this evening is demand and allocating demand, which pits residents against commercial owners and merchants. I'd like not to see that. What I'd like to see is the supply of parking increase. We're talking about garages. We have two garages on California Avenue. There's an opportunity now to build a third behind the Starbucks next to the new policy station. I'd like to see that increased in size so we're not in a contentious mode with our neighbors. I would not like to see my tenants parking in the residential area, but there's not a lot of good alternatives due to the limited supply. A point that should be recognized is there's also a special tax put on commercial owners in the California Avenue core which is maybe not well known. I'd like to see that geography expanded, maybe not into the residents but to other commercial owners which would contribute to building more parking and sustaining more parking. I think that's really the gist of my comments. I've had a chance to meet with Karen Holman and other merchants and property owners who also share the sentiment. It's not like we have anything against the residents. We would prefer not to see our tenants and our employees park in that zone, but we'd like to see more parking. To the extent that we could increase the parking and delay the implementation of this program against the adversity of merchants and owners in the district, that'd be most appreciated. Thank you.

Mayor Burt: thank you. Jeffry Hook to be followed by Tommy Derrick.

Jeffry Hook: Some of you may be old enough to remember the Walt Kelly cartoon, "Pogo." There's one strip where he famously said, "We have seen the enemy and he is us." We humans have created quite a pickle for ourselves. There's a thing called the tragedy of the commons where a resource held in common becomes increasingly abused because the costs are not allocated fairly. I'm sure that 50 years ago we didn't have a parking problem in Evergreen Park, and now we do. We've created this mess by allowing for unfettered growth of both businesses and population. We're now at a point where we have to consider that automobiles really should not be used for commuting. I really applaud all the work that's been done on

TRANSCRIPT

the bike boulevards. I think that's awesome. I really admire everything that was done here earlier. The streets are no longer worker as an unpaid for resource. We have to force the people who are using the streets to pay for it. We have to keep the commercial autos out of the residential neighborhood. It works. We know permit parking works. I don't agree with the previous speaker that we need to defer this until there is an increased supply. Thank you.

Mayor Burt: Thank you. Our next speaker is Tommy Derrick, to be followed by Marilyn Mayo.

Tommy Derrick: My name is Tommy Derrick. I've lived in Evergreen Park for 39 years, and I was part of the process of getting the restricted street closures in the neighborhood. Pat, you can add that to you 50,90 percent. A little over 50 percent approved it when we started, and 95-plus percent approve it now. I think the same thing is the case with putting a Residential Parking program together. We're here because past Councils have failed to do the job. It's time for you guys to step up. Kick the can is a program for kids. You guys are way too smart, too intelligent, too capable to kick this can down the street. I urge you to move tonight and move quickly. I've had many conversations with Staff. They have said to me every time, "We will do what the Council directs." You have the capability of setting up a Residential Parking Permit program tonight by either annexing into College Terrace. If you don't have the will and the courage to do that, set up one for Evergreen Park and/or Southgate. I have opinions on which way that could go. You guys can figure that out. You can set up a program that calls for one commercial space available in every block that has ten or more parking spaces. You do not need an outreach program. You do not need data. You have all of the data in already, that there is a problem. I can't believe anybody would say we need to study more to get that done. I urge you to step above what Staff is recommending, do not put this into the long, drawn out process that's like Downtown has been. Step up. Set up the program tonight. Put it in place. There's three parts to this. A Motion, a resolution and administrative regulations. You know how to make the Motions. The resolution has already been written. Staff can review it and provide it back to you in 30 days. We can have this in place in 30 days if you have the courage to step forth and do it. I urge you to do. Thanks much.

Mayor Burt: Thank you. Our next speaker is Marilyn Mayo, to be followed by Keith Ferrell.

Marilyn Mayo: Good evening, I'm Marilyn Mayo. I live at 404 Oxford Avenue; I've lived there 35 years, but I've become a property manager in

TRANSCRIPT

the last two years. I manage the parking lot of Oxford and Ash. I have six cars every day. They come; I greet them about 8:00 in the morning; they're from out of town. They come; they work on Cal. Avenue. I say goodnight at about 6:30. They're there every day. Two issues I want to bring out, though, are the kids on my street. I feel responsible as a good steward for them. We have the Ananda School on El Camino, and they kind of go their recess on Peers Park. You can't see them; they're little people. With the cars parked, it's really very dangerous. They come back about noon, so twice a day these little people—there are 30 of them in a row—are moving along. I just want to point that out. Also, you have children on bikes, the little kids going to Escondido School when I'm managing my little parking lot. The last thing I want to say is I support the merchants on Cal. Avenue. Many are small merchants. I've gone to their meetings. They need the parking lots, but they won't use them, the employees, unless they have to. We've got to have the permits to encourage that. I'm worried about the security building. When that goes in behind Kinko's and they're going to tear up behind Starbucks for their parking lot, it's just going to exacerbate the problem. Please take action tonight. Thank you.

Mayor Burt: Thank you. Our next speaker is Keith Ferrell, to be followed by Aileen Yang.

Keith Ferrell: Hi, how you doing. I live in Southgate. I had a whole bunch of things written up, but so far everyone has covered most of it. It seems pretty obvious that things need to get taken care of. Mr. Schrom, I want to hang out with him, because his was awesome. He covered all the things that we face in Southgate. We are a little bit different, because we are so close to Paly. We get the occasional—my son had the privilege of riding his bike to Jordan. There were two kids in front of our house smoking pot. We've had kids having sex in their cars at lunch. We get a little bit of fun stuff just to keep you guys awake. We've talked to the school. The staff says we haven't gotten to the root of the problem, Transportation Demand Management, blah, blah, blah. We've talked to the school. The school administration at Paly has told us our only remedy is a Residential Permit Parking. That's what they've said. There is going to be 2,300 students in 200 spots. Right now they only allow seniors. It's like one spot per 10 kids. If you take the ratio of cars to students right now and extend it to 2020, they'll need 380 spots and they'll have 215, which is a shortage of 150 spots. You want to do the biking and force kids to bike, the way to start is with the kids. The same kids who are driving to Paly are the same kids who used to ride their bike to Jordan or as sophomores and freshmen rode their bikes from their bikes to Paly, and now they're driving the half mile from Paly. We have a kid in our neighborhood who drives his car from Southgate around to Embarcadero and parks in Embarcadero lot. Last year when they

TRANSCRIPT

didn't have a permit, he drove down the street and parked on the corner of our block. He literally drove 300 yards and walked 100 yards to school. You can Uber to every students' house and they will still drive to school. The root of the issue is you're not forcing kids to bike; you're allowing them to park. That's the root cause of the problem. Thank you.

Mayor Burt: Thank you. Aileen Yang to be followed by Samina Faheem.

Aileen Yang: Hi, my name is Aileen Yang. I'm here to share the life as a senior in Evergreen Park. I'm a resident at College Avenue. Also we only have one car and try to take public transportation as much as possible. Because we are so close to Caltrain station and California Avenue, our street has served as the parking lot for lots of commuters and business employees. Sometimes they live their car in our street for weeks. Within last 13 years, since we moved to this area, we always see service vendors, like UPS trucks, mailmen, even ambulance that have double park their van or truck in our street. That is very dangerous as there is a lot of young kids running or biking around on our street. Sometimes the commuter's car block our driveway. We have to call police to give citation and tow away their car on several occasions. This is not good use of our police force. Every week when my grandkids visit us, they usually have to search around and end up park far away. Despite that, both my husband and I, we are officially seniors. We still need to unload our shopping bag on other street and walk a long way to reach our front door occasionally because there is car block our driveway. This situation is getting worse every day with so many new constructions going on close our street. We urge you to approve the Residents Parking Permit program for Evergreen Park neighborhood to get annexed to the College Terrace parking permit program as soon as possible. Thank you.

Mayor Burt: Thank you. Samina Faheem to be followed by Patrick Slattery. Welcome.

Samina Faheem: Good evening everybody. Thank you for listening to us. I have been living in Palo Alto for 31 years. I never imagined I would be facing this kind of problems here. I have been living on Park Avenue. It's a very small, quiet part of the Park Boulevard. My house is the only one before the dead end. I have those two huge buildings that have at least three businesses each and then two residential areas each. There are so many delivery trucks from water to United Parcel Service (UPS), you imagine. My car has been hit. That was a big inconvenience before. Since last two months, my knee has gotten worse, and now it is a health issue. I am a diabetic, and I am a morning person, so I used to go to my gym in the morning. Now I don't go to my gym for the last two months. I have not

TRANSCRIPT

been able to do that because I'm afraid when I come back where will I park. I have a driveway that I could park there, but that's always blocked. If I was a mean person, I'd be calling the police every day. Palo Alto Police would be so busy, but I don't want to do that. Once when I did that, I was inside my driveway. When I called the police, they acted like I was doing something wrong. They asked me am I sure that I cannot get out. I said obviously not. Please listen to us. This is not just something that we are doing out of convenience. This is a need. I cannot have visitors ever.

Mayor Burt: Thank you. Patrick Slattery to be followed by Doug Smith.

Patrick Slattery: In the interest of time and hope for action, I'll pass.

Mayor Burt: Thank you. Doug Smith to be followed by Deb Goldeen.

Doug Smith: Good evening. I'd like to—I'm Doug Smith from Southgate. I'd like to support all the pro comments for the Residential Parking Program tonight. A lot of great comments have been said; I don't want to repeat them all. Just want to emphasize that the parking situation really has gotten bad in Southgate over the past few years. It is mostly due to Paly, but there's lots of other impacts in Southgate also. The day parkers definitely take up all the spots on our street. It makes it impossible for our own use as well as visitors, deliveries and all the other things that are supposed to happen. As was noted, Southgate has very narrow streets. It's a safety issue in multiple ways. That's part of the reason it makes it so urgent for Southgate to be addressed. We appreciate what you can do on that. Thank you.

Mayor Burt: Thank you. Deb Goldeen to be followed by Jack Morton, our final speaker.

Deb Goldeen: I live in Evergreen Park, and I've lived there for 30 years. I am against the annexation. I think we need a different program. I would like to see accommodation made for visitor parking. The people who are going to be hurt are my friends who work at Molly Stones and Country Sun and the hairdressers who drive in from East Palo Alto and East San Jose and Oakland. They simply can't afford to live anywhere else, and they have to drive. They're going to be hurt, and I don't like that. I think it's rude and mean. I disagree with David. In the 30 years I've lived there, I think crime has decreased because of the number of people on the streets. There's lots of eyes on the streets. The people coming in are all law-abiding. I disagree about the traffic hazard. I bike; I raised my kids there. Before the streets got crowded, there were a lot of speeding cars. You can't speed through our neighborhood anymore. I have never had a problem getting response from City of Palo Alto Police with parking. I'm on very good terms with the

TRANSCRIPT

parking officer. I call on a regular basis; they're out there in 20 minutes, half an hour. There's never a problem. Thank you.

Mayor Burt: Thank you. Our final speaker is Jack Morton.

Jack Morton: Good evening, Council Members. It reminds of days past. My name is Jack Morton, and I'm the President of the California Avenue Small Business Association. I'm here to support the untenable and impossible situation that Evergreen Park and Southgate face. Those neighborhoods with million dollar-plus homes should be ideal. They walk to an area that has a shoe store, a bakery, a camera store, grocery stores, restaurants, dentists, insurance and mortgage brokers, low-income health services, psychologists, family services. What's the problem? The problem is there is nowhere to park. Most of those small businesses employ three or four people of lower wages, and they need to park there. Many of them all do. Where else do they park? They can't park in California Avenue. If you make that an area for employees, then there's no place for the restaurants to have parking at noon. You can't park anywhere between roughly 10:30 and 2:30 in Cal. Ave. I support the previous speaker who suggested you've got to expand the supply. Instead of waiting to build a parking structure when you move the police building to Cal. Ave., you need to take action now. If you're going to implement a restrictive parking area, some part of that area has to go for the employees of small businesses. The ultimate solution means you have to accelerate the building of more multilevel parking structures. If you don't, this whole area is going to lose most of the things that make that area ideal. There are more people who love California Avenue for what it provides in services. Take a big view. There's not just one problem. Most of the people that are small business are not high tech; they're not Paly people; they're not Stanford overflow. They are generally lower paid people who provide the services that most of the residents love. You have a problem to solve, and it is time to move forward with a solution. Thank you.

Mayor Burt: Thank you. We'll now return to the Council for a discussion and motions. Council Member Filseth, is your light on deliberately?

Council Member Filseth: Thanks very much. I was one of the authors of the Colleagues' Memo. Thank you to all of the people who came out here tonight and to the Staff for the work they've done. I was one of the authors of the Colleagues' Memo. The reason we did it was we felt that there was a dire problem and it didn't feel like we as a City were responding fast enough. We wanted to spur some action. As we went through this tonight, at some level it feels like we might have gone back a half step. We're talking about the pros and cons of RPPPs. I thought we'd moved beyond that. It also has the tenor of looking at neighborhoods as parking lots. We're talking in terms

TRANSCRIPT

of how many parking spaces are there and how many want them. It's really, as most of the public has said tonight, more than that. It's about neighborhood quality, safety, the impacts of having streets that are jammed with parked cars, and the traffic that puts those cars there. That's the real issue here. Going through this, why is this so hard? It feels like we're almost trying to do a custom plan for each neighborhood with all this outreach. I'm reading here we'll conduct a community outreach and stakeholder process to design a program for each area. I thought the point of the Citywide plan was that we wouldn't have to do that. We could do these things fast. We'd have a framework in place, and we could just do them. If we have to customize, what are the differences? It seems to be based on differences in stakeholder demand, because that's what we're talking about, stakeholder outreach and stuff like this. It seems to me there's two kinds of stakeholders. There's residents and there's nonresidents, mostly commuters that want to use that parking resource. In terms of outreach, I think the residents have been very consistent from neighborhood to neighborhood here. I don't think there's big differences between the resident perspective. Residents need to be at the top of the pyramid. This is not a situation where we've got a bag of marbles, and we divide them between everybody that puts up their hand. An unsafe neighborhood does not suddenly become safe because there's ten other guys that want the space. The RPP is about protecting neighborhoods as directed in the Comp Plan. It is the plan for residents. The plan for businesses is TDM. If City Hall don't believe in that, then we have a big self-deception problem. This is the plan of record, and the plan of record is the plan of record until there's a new plan of record. We need to get on with this. Let's fix the resident problem, and then go focus on transportation. To me, Evergreen and Southgate seem very, very clear. I think we should move forward with those as fast as we can. As far as Crescent Park and Edgewood are concerned, I'd like to understand there's a petitioning process and are the petitions meet our criteria. I'd like to see us move forward with those too if that's the case. I don't want to make a Motion yet, because I want everybody else to weigh in. I think the key elements are going to be timeliness. Some accommodation for visitors is reasonable as long as neighborhood quality is protected. One of the members suggested 10 percent is the right magnitude; I think that's maybe a good starting point. The pricing and the mechanics out to be consistent with the Downtown plan because that's the framework we've got in place. I'd like other people to weigh in before we move forward. Thanks.

Mayor Burt: Who wants to go next? Council Member Wolbach.

Council Member Wolbach: I'm also not going to make a Motion yet. I'll follow Council Member Filseth's lead and say let's—I'm happy to hear what

TRANSCRIPT

others think. If anyone wants to make a Motion, of course I'll let them and the Mayor decide on when we should do that. Just to confirm, my understanding is that the College Terrace permit system is for residents only, but there is short-term parking allowed, so that you can park there for up to two hours from 8:00 A.M. to 5:00 P.M. That's correct?

Mr. Keene: All of our RPP programs would have short-term parking. Almost every RPP program in the entire region has short-term parking.

Council Member Wolbach: That also means that weekends and evenings are fully available. Because it is 8:00 to 5:00 with two hours allowed, really it's de facto 10:00 to 3:00. If you are visiting a friend, if you're a guest coming to visit your friends, any time until 10:00 A.M. is free and anytime after 3:00. If you park after 3:00, you can stay there as late as you'd like. Come over for coffee in the afternoon and stick around for dinner with your friends. If there's a way to incorporate some guest permits as well, whether it's door hangers or whatever, I'd be interested in hearing what that is. I do think that the PTC did their job and sent Evergreen Park and Southgate to us on par with each other, because they're of equal importance and equal urgency. I fully appreciate that a lot of the residents have been waiting a number of years. Not all of us have been up here for 10 years, but we're definitely—we'll see as comments go around—eager to see some relief for both Evergreen Park and Southgate. I'm interested in hearing what my colleagues have to say about Edgewood Plaza and Crescent Park. I have less definitive views about those. I do think it is worth noting something that I've always felt about permit parking systems. They're always a double-edged sword. There is always a downside. We have heard that, although there is strong outcry from the neighborhoods, it is not unanimous. I just want to make sure that we do recognize that. The residents are not all of the same mind. Some would oppose this. I think if somebody tried to impose this—if people started circulating a petition in my neighborhood right now for this, it would probably wouldn't be very successful. In Evergreen Park and Southgate, it seems very clear that there is broad consensus if not unanimity in favor of taking action and doing it promptly, doing it in a way that puts the residents first. As I asked during the question period earlier, anything that we can do for Southgate to improve safety and provide parking relief through engineering solutions parallel to the institution of an RPP system, I think is worth pursuing. It sounds like Staff is already starting to work on some of those. If it's helpful and allowed for us to incorporate it into our Motion that tonight we're interested in accelerating that, supporting that in whatever ways Staff needs, I'll be very supportive of doing that this evening. Again, that's things like adding red paint at the corners and at the edges of driveways to make sure they're not blocked, having more passing areas so that—even if you can't have a car on one side, a car on the other

TRANSCRIPT

side and an emergency vehicle in the middle, if it's an emergency vehicle and a bike or a car and bike, it gets pretty crowded pretty quick in Southgate. As just a general comment, I think we should have that policy everywhere in the City. If we don't already, there are other streets in other parts of the City where you have the same issues including in Downtown North. I'm never enthusiastic about taking parking spaces, but for safety I'll make an exception. I do think that we should prioritize the engineering solutions separately but not in advance of, not to cause delay of RPP. One of the tough questions I don't have a clear answer on is whether we should do the same system for Evergreen Park as we do for Southgate. We did hear from Christine—thank you by the way for those who came both the City School Liaison Committee where we heard about the challenges there. Thank you for coming again tonight. We heard from Christine that in Southgate not everybody is enthusiastic about being part of the same system as Evergreen Park. I do think that Evergreen Park having a system that's either an extension of the College Terrace one or a parallel system, whichever is most efficient, easiest, fastest, cheapest to get done, I'm in favor of. I don't really care if it's one system that's enlarged or a second one that's parallel. Whatever gets it done fastest. As far as having a separate one for Southgate, if the community is okay with and seems to prefer, from what I heard tonight, having a separate process because they do want to have some community outreach, they do want to have stakeholder engagement, which would especially Stanford and more than anyone Paly. In the meantime, we accelerate some of the engineering solutions. That might be the way to go for those two. I'll leave my comments at that for the time being.

Mayor Burt: Vice Mayor Scharff.

Vice Mayor Scharff: First of all, I think absolutely Evergreen needs RPP parking. That's clear. Southgate does too. The question is what is the best way to approach to this. For Southgate, it seems fairly to me. The person who came up and spoke and said they wanted to create a Southgate RPP through a stakeholder process. That's what I heard from that. It seems reasonable; that's appropriate. I think Southgate and Evergreen are different. That's where I think we should go on Southgate. I also think Southgate should get some interim relief for the summer as the Paly kids go away. There's a little bit more time there on Southgate to do that than on Evergreen. I don't know if most of you know my office is actually right next to Evergreen. I've been there for 16 years now. When I first started in Evergreen, there's always been parking intrusion in that neighborhood. Always. It's gotten progressively worse. Actually I was driving through the neighborhood to get to Sven's house to charge my car. This is a true story. Some women comes out and says there's one parking spot over there if you

TRANSCRIPT

need a parking spot. Obviously some of your neighbors are fairly friendly about the whole parking thing. I said, "No thanks. I'm actually trying to get through the neighborhood." It's a little difficult; you have to weave around to get to Sven's house. There's always been some parking there. I'm very concerned that if we just annex you into College Terrace that we won't have that stakeholder engagement process. The other thing I'm concerned about is we did set up an overall process. We all voted on it. I think it's important that we follow that process. If we're not going to follow that process, then we should do away with it. I think we should follow that process especially in Evergreen. I do think we need to get Evergreen done as quickly as possible. I'm going to push back against you a little bit, David. One of the great things about knowing David is you get to go have tea at his house. That's one of the great things I've really enjoyed about doing that. I don't recall in 2009 when I ran you asking for RPP. I know you didn't, and I don't recall it in 2014 frankly. I don't feel it's really fair to say to us up here that we've been ignoring the situation. We've now set up this process; we're having the hearing tonight. We're moving forward on it; we recognize it. Could we have done this six months earlier? I think we probably could have. In the scheme of things, it hasn't been 10 years that we've sat up here and done nothing. It hasn't been the last seven years. You haven't asked me for it for that long. That's my impression of it. Yes, we do need RPP. I do want to get it done. On the other hand, we do need to take care a little bit of the merchants. We do need to ask ourselves where they're going to park, how are we going to get this done. We are going to build a new parking garage. I think we should build that parking garage bigger and even move parking out of Evergreen. I do think there has to be some level—I actually don't think it's necessary for office workers to park in Evergreen. I think the speaker was correct; these are small businesses with people who drive in from other places and they need a place to park. I think some of that parking—I think that's what the stakeholder process is. How much of that parking so that you get down, so that you can park in front of your house, that you clear out the parking like we have Downtown. When I now go Downtown, there's parking spaces. People can park in front of their house. What we need to do is create that quality of life and move it back to the way it was 10 years ago. That's sort of what I'm thinking. I don't know the answers to these questions, but I think it's going through that stakeholder process. We should expedite that process, get this done as quickly as possible. I don't think we should just annex you in and not think about how we're going to do this process and the effect on California Avenue, which could be dramatic for the merchants. One of the things we really want to do is preserve that retail, preserve those shoe stores. The people that work there, they need a place to park. That's my initial thoughts on that. I actually don't know what to do about Crescent Park. If the person from Crescent Park said annex me into the Downtown one with the rules or

TRANSCRIPT

whatever, I'd say fine. That's not what I heard. I heard for one street basically, they want a separate program. That much more difficult to accomplish given the resources, given what we need to do. I also think that that one gets a lower priority in my view. If they did want to be annexed, then we could accomplish that fairly quickly and do that. I'd have to hear from the neighborhood that that's what they want to do. On Edgewood, I think we just need to understand what's going on out there. From the presentation—this is nothing against Staff—I just don't understand what's really going on out there, do we really need a permit program for that one stretch or is there another way to solve the problems out there once we understand what the problems are. That's my initial comments. I'll leave it there.

Mayor Burt: Council Member Berman.

Council Member Berman: Thank you very much. I've been on Council three and a half years, and I've heard those entire three and a half years and even before then that we need more parking supply on California Avenue. That's why I asked to serve on the Infrastructure Committee on Council with Greg and Pat. That's why I served on the campaign committee to raise the additional resources to build an additional parking garage on California Avenue which is going to add, I think, 200 spots. We're going to build that garage before we build the Public Safety Building. I was conflicted out of the Downtown Residential Permit Parking program because I live Downtown. My colleagues implemented a plan and recently annexed a large chunk across Middlefield into this plan that still allows for some amount of parking for retail workers and other workers in the business core. My question to them is how do we create one plan for Downtown and a totally different plan for California Avenue, and what's the justification to those residents that we just brought into that plan. You guys had a conversation into the early hours of the morning; I wasn't a part of it. I'll leave that up to you guys to draw the distinctions. The bottom line is we can't say we want a parking plan that allows for no workers and yet we want to protect local retail. Those two things don't work. We know from Downtown that a lot of the people that park in the residential neighborhoods, as we heard from one speaker tonight, are retail workers that live so far away that public transit isn't an option for them. They drive in for their jobs. I'm not saying that they should have free parking in your neighborhoods; I don't think that. I think we need to implement Residential Permit Parking, but we have to be realistic about the fact that that exist. They're not going to disappear. We're going to try to build more supply; we can try to do that faster in building the new garage. We also just have to be cognizant of the fact that we have retail workers that need parking. That's a problem that's developed over decades that we're now trying to fix. I do think we definitely need a Residential

TRANSCRIPT

Permit Parking program. I think we need to prioritize Evergreen and Southgate. I'm open to a conversation about the differences between those two plans. I need my colleagues to tell me where those people are going to park. Is it going to be Ventura? Is it going to be across Caltrain? How are we going to provide parking for them? I need to know that we before I can vote for a plan that just eliminates the ability for them to park completely.

Mayor Burt: Council Member Holman.

Council Member Holman: Thank you. I have a question for Staff. As I heard the Staff comments and as I read what the at-places memo was and what the Slide 25 is, it looks like what's in the proposed budget is \$30,000 plus \$50,000 of what the actual need is—let's just assume it's what's being proposed here—\$300,000 and \$380,000 for a total of \$680,000. Can you confirm or clarify for me what those numbers are?

Ms. Atkinson: The numbers that are contained in the proposed Fiscal Year '17 budget are actually in the draft budget. There's a line item in the draft budget for \$30,000 for in-house Staff for capital expenses. There's a line item in the draft budget for \$300,000 for capital expenditures for RPP in Fiscal Year '17. There's a line item in the draft operating budget for \$50,000 for the operating expenses. That's what's in the draft budget currently. There's a total in the draft budget of \$380,000.

Council Member Holman: Thank you for clarifying that. What's needed according to these numbers is \$680,000. Correct?

Ms. Gitelman: The cost will depend on how many of these programs you wish to do and how we implement them, the details of how the programs are designed.

Council Member Holman: That's why I said just based on what's here on this slide, it's \$680,000 that's needed. You said \$380,000 is in the proposed budget. That helps. Where to start? It would be easier if the Crescent Park neighborhood had come across with that application to be just added to the Downtown. I agree with Council Member Scharff who said that. Some quick and easy outreach to them to see if they would accept that would be the quickest solution to that one. As is in the memo drafted by four of us, we talk about how a RPP program is really necessary because it's how you get—I think one of the speakers mentioned this too—office workers out of their cars and into alternative forms of transportation. There are also a number of projects that have been approved in the California Avenue area and other places in town that got parking reductions because of TDM program requirements as a part of their approval process. When projects are approved, though, and after they're built, it seems like the parking situation

TRANSCRIPT

is exacerbated. I'm not sure that we're having a successful TDM program without RPP. I think that just indicates further that we need it. I wonder actually because we've seen in the Downtown how the impacts just spread and spread. Are we headed to a Citywide RPP? There's some talk about that. I don't have the answer to that, but I do wonder. It's the whack-a-mole kind of predicament that we find ourselves in. A couple of questions that I would have that I've posed to Staff previously. Can we prioritize, going back to the memo, smaller employers having access to permits both within the district and without district over larger employers? Can we do that? The purpose of that would be to support the retailers and personal service, because they tend to be smaller employers. Can the retailers and personal services businesses share parking permits? Some would say that doesn't help, but I would say that it does. It means that an employer who pays for parking permits that employees buy, it's less cost to the employer. It doesn't take up more parking spaces, because you have somebody that's using a permit space on Monday and somebody else using a different permit in the other space on Tuesday. It doesn't create more demand. It is a help. It is somewhat different, the situations of Southgate and Evergreen Park. Maybe the answer there is an RPP. Maybe the answer there is an engineered solution. Staff has said that would be a quicker outcome and maybe easier to manager. I don't know how the neighborhood feels about that. In addition to the Comprehensive Plan and all the things that David Schrom brought up about the Comprehensive Plan and how it supports neighborhoods being protected from spillover parking, I would say also that our Council Priority of Healthy City Healthy Community also supports and promotes that. We've heard all kinds of outcroppings of what happens when there is so much intrusion parking into neighborhoods that aren't really good situations that promote safe conditions. I think those are my—just one last comment. Going back to the budget matter, we have in our budget a number of transportation-related items. There's \$2 million for parking guidance. There's a parking management study implementation, \$1.7 million; Downtown mobility and safety improvements, \$1.4 million. I could go on for some others. Surely we could come up with another \$300,000 somewhere, not necessarily, if that's what it really takes to help support these programs.

Mayor Burt: Council Member DuBois.

Council Member DuBois: We have this new RPP Ordinance. We may need to tune it. I think Council Member Scharff said we have it, let's use it. It's the first time we've used it, so there may be some things we need to fix. We've learned that when do we have free street parking, some people will buy permits, and we're price discriminating parking Downtown and seeing how far people will park for free and walk in. I'd say let's not recreate that

TRANSCRIPT

experiment in Southgate and Evergreen Park. Also, we're seeing an issue with this ordinance of pitting neighborhoods against neighborhoods which isn't good. I think we need to think about that as we go forward. In general, it feels like this ordinance is just too complex, it's time consuming and expensive. I know we said we don't want a cookie cutter approach. If we can only do one or two a year, maybe we need to actually err more on a cookie cutter approach or a deploy and adjust approach, something that's a little bit lighter weight. In these neighborhoods, we have multiple buildings coming online. I understand why residents want to get a permit program as quickly as they can. At the same time, I think we all want to protect our local retailers. I think we need shift our process a little bit. Right now it takes too long, take too much Staff time. When you look at Edgewood and Crescent Park, I kind of feel the same way with Edgewood, we have people who petitioned, they followed the process, and there's no grocery store there. What's going to happen when a grocery store goes in? It seems like is a good time to put an RPP in place so that we can expand it when we need to. For my colleagues that weren't part of the Crescent Park discussion, we had a very long discussion about where does Downtown end. We pretty much agreed that Phase 2 should be where it ends. I think what we heard from the people in the extra streets is they feel that too. At some point, Crescent Park becomes a residential neighborhood, and we should just extend the Downtown RPP indefinitely. I know that seems simple and easy, even the last streets we added didn't want that. They wanted a Residential Permit Parking program, and they accepted what was available. In the presentation, it says one of the cons of an RPP is that traffic relocates. If we did a program in Southgate, where is it going to go? It's going to go to Evergreen Park. If we do one in Evergreen Park, it's going to go to Southgate. There's really nowhere else around there to park. I think we absolutely have to do both at the same time. If we don't, we know what's going to happen, the other neighborhood is just going to get hammered. On the Cal. Ave. business district, I think Karen's idea of allowing employers to share permits among potentially retail employees who don't work every day. The idea is one permit that just gets shared based on when a restaurant worker is working. What I want to see is a real emphasis on speed of implementation. It's a quality issue for the neighborhoods. It really does put teeth into the TDM. We want to be able to react quickly and help businesses, but I would say let's put in a program, let's pick a relatively small number, 10 percent, and then have a way to adjust and maybe look at how we share permits in parallel so that we can get more parking in the business district. The other thing with this Evergreen Park area is it starts at College Avenue. There's several streets that are part of the business district. There can be business parking that we could utilize more effectively. I'd support a Motion that gets protection in place as soon as

TRANSCRIPT

possible and allows us to adjust and learn rather than to study it and not get anything in place for a while.

Mayor Burt: Council Member Schmid.

Council Member Schmid: I agree with my colleagues. We do have an approved Citywide RPP program. We've invited people to participate in it. I think we need to move ahead with the applications we have. We need to give Staff the resources they need to process the applications. I think we need to have them be ready for an overflow parking that might take place. Ventura Neighborhood and across the tracks are natural places where this will show up again. I think the Council needs to think strategically about the questions that they need to grapple with. What does retail health mean? How much commercial growth do we want. New garages are necessary. Effective TDM programs. We need to talk with Palo Alto School District about transportation. Ultimately, who pays, who subsidizes all these changes? Finally, how do we put this into what we want our City to look like and be? Through influencing, retailing, commercial growth, neighborhoods' quality of life, we will be creating the City of the future. We need to put our attention on that.

Mayor Burt: I'll lend my support for a number of the comments. First both of these neighborhoods need RPP program relief. I think that Southgate will actually be the easier one to solve because it actually is the place where we can drive what is essentially a simple Transportation Demand Management program, and that is kids at Paly should ride their bike to school and not drive to school. It's not real complicated except that we're going to have spillover. Those who say, "I don't want spillover, and I don't want impacts on retail, and I don't want this, and I don't want that," I want things to fall from the sky too. In reality, we're going to have spillover. The next spillover will be into Old Palo Alto from both the Cal. Ave. area. As we've heard from Evergreen folks, there are people who ride Caltrain, either take it to the airport, park in the neighborhood for days or on a daily basis. They're not going to be allowed to park certainly not in the numbers they have in Evergreen. Some will choose to go over on the other of the tracks in Old Palo Alto. I also suspect we're going to have Paly kids parking on the other side of the tracks, for both entrances, near Churchill and near Embarcadero. We're going to have that spillover. I think we need to be objective about it. That'll be the next impacts. We don't know exactly how much; that's part of the reality and what we had in the Downtown. We can't predict exactly who's going to do what. We might have a sense of it based on patterns, but we're going to see what happens. I do want to address a few of the comments on this shared permit. I sublet an office on Cal. Ave. I've had a permit for years, but I only use it once every couple of weeks, because for

TRANSCRIPT

the last three years I almost always ride my bike. I get there faster, and I park actually right at my stairs instead of in the parking lot. It's better. I have neighbors in offices who live a mile away and drive their car every day. When we talk about this issue of residents versus commuters, in some cases we are talking about commuters that come from elsewhere. In other cases, we're talking about residents who are commuters. Many of them don't need to be car commuters to Cal. Ave. Other than the Paly students, those are the other behavior changes that we may see some positive ones in the nearer term. In the Downtown area, we have the start of this Transportation Management Agency which is underfunded. We've identified how we can reduce the car trips. Remember solving the parking problem also basically solves a lot of the traffic problem at the same time. We get two wins out of this. There are real benefits to the community of having Residential Permit Parking; both the quality of life benefits for the neighborhood and the traffic. Driving the parking out of the neighborhood won't in itself in any way address the traffic problem unless those people take other means to get to their work. The shared permit, I don't think my colleagues have really thought this through very well. If you have shared permits, it doesn't create any new parking spaces in the Downtown. It doesn't in and of itself utilize those parking spaces more. What Staff now does is if they believe that they have capacity for permit parking, they sell more permits. If we share permits, it will simply mean less revenue for the same utilization of those spaces. Right now Staff says, "We've got some spaces. We'll sell more permits." That employer has now, instead of one employee with a permit, they have two. They each paid for a permit. If we share, they only pay for one combined. That's the impact. There's no increase in parking by sharing permits. What it can do is if we want to do something like we've done Downtown is figure out a way to make it more affordable for low-income workers. That's a different argument. That's not the same thing as kidding ourselves that sharing permits is somehow going to in any way improve our problem. It just means less income from selling permits. We have set up this process. I want to talk briefly kind of at a high level. Over the last several years, this problem has gotten worse and worse in these neighborhoods, I'd say especially in Evergreen but also in Southgate. A few years ago it was a moderate problem. Third years ago I remember all the issues around the overflow from the gym on Park and El Camino. This is clearly far and away the worse it's ever been in that neighborhood for parking. It's not the worst it's ever been in traffic, this notion that we also have a severe traffic problem because of this. We have people who go there to park, and those are some car trips. We no longer have cut through traffic for the most part in Evergreen. We haven't now for 30 years. That problem's pretty solved. Evergreen has pretty low traffic problems. This whole notion that somehow these people who come here to park, these workers principally who are working in Cal. Ave. are criminals, I

TRANSCRIPT

think that's really a disservice. It just reminds me of the kinds of arguments Donald Trump would make. I found that really inappropriate. I want to say I think that the arguments that Residential Permit Parking should be there and that the Comp Plan supports protecting residential neighborhoods from the impact of the commercial development is a sound argument, and that's why we set up the RPP program and why I support it for these neighborhoods. The argument that somehow this is a theft of parking is really also a disservice. We don't own the parking spots in front of our homes. They are publicly owned, and we have a reasonable right to say that there should be availability of those parking spots on a reasonable basis to us as residents. We shouldn't have to go a block or two to find a parking spot in front of our home. We don't own them, and others occupying them is not a theft of my property. It's not in front of my house where I have parking all the time for the Children's Library and the Children's Theatre and all those. I don't think of it as a theft of my parking spot. I don't own it. I do feel that we should be able to have reasonable amounts of parking in front or adjacent to our own homes. That's a reasonable expectation. We want to align the problem with the solution, and we want to stay to things that are sound and accurate. Those are good arguments. We have good arguments for putting an RPP program and returning a reasonable amount of availability of parking to people who live there. I would really hope that everybody sticks to those sound arguments and doesn't get into distortion and hyperbole that just isn't reasonable. The other dilemma that we have is—this is the same one that we had in the Downtown. We want to move from where we are to a solution. If we on Day One said that we've banned everybody but residents from the neighborhoods, first we'd have a lot of spare parking space in the neighborhoods. The neighbors know a high percentage of the parkers are not neighborhood residents right now. What we do is create an actual crisis for all those workers, retailers and otherwise. What we want to do is drive the solution, which means get relief for the neighborhood right away—I support the funding in our budget to implement this for both of these neighborhoods sooner rather than later—and begin to have significant relief for the neighborhoods. What we've done in the Downtown is we've said we're going to on Day One significantly reduce the amount of overflow parking in the neighborhoods. We sell a certain number of permits. On Day One those neighborhoods experienced significant benefit, not perfection but significant improvement. Each year, we're going to reduce the number of those permits that are sold. We drive this TDM measure. One of the problems is that we don't have this Transportation Management Agency or Authority that we have for Downtown. It isn't expanded for the Cal. Ave. area yet, so we don't really have a solution for helping to come up with alternatives. I'll give you an example. The cheapest transit is not the Caltrain Go Pass; it is the VTA EcoPass. Some of you may have heard, but the Stanford Research Park was able to negotiate

TRANSCRIPT

with the VTA that got the group rate for treating the Research Park as if it's one company. That same thing could happen for all the Cal. Avenue employers and merchants who are part of the Cal. Ave. Business Association, which would mean that each employee would get unlimited VTA bus pass for \$1.50 a month. Not all of them are going to use that, but we have a good number. The Research Park did what's called heat maps, and they could see where all the employees worked. Even in the Research Park, surprisingly a lot of them worked within a short distance of El Camino in Mountain View and Sunnyvale. That kind of program is pretty darn cost effective. We also Downtown have this ride share app called Scoop. It's really already having an impact. There's a bunch of measures that go into actually solving this problem which also solves our traffic problem if we do that. I'm supportive of moving forward with the budget allocation to begin a program for both of these neighborhoods and to do it on the model of what we've already established as our City program and to do it sooner rather than later. Hoping that the neighborhood will recognize and value that soon as we get this going near-term, significant improvement is a really good thing. A long-term solution meeting medium-term each year better is also very good. We do have tradeoffs that we have to address. I think that's the direction that I'm supportive of. Vice Mayor Scharff.

Vice Mayor Scharff: First of all, I'd like to say I actually agree with everything Mayor Burt just said. I do have a couple of questions. You have options Staff put together in terms of this. When you look at Southgate, the first thing it says is evaluate and implement engineering, enforcement and TDM options with PAUSD, monitor for possible future RPP, and then you have two other ones which are self-explanatory. My first question is what are you exactly mean by evaluate and implement engineering, enforcement and TDM options. Could you be doing that while also putting in an RPP?

Mr. Keene: In Southgate.

Vice Mayor Scharff: In Southgate. I want to understand exactly what you meant by that.

Mr. Mello: That's made up of two components. The first would be a look at the safety issues that were mentioned by the residents, see if there's opportunities to create additional yielding areas by using red curbing, pulling some parking back from the corners, in particularly narrow sections maybe we look at limiting parking to one side of the street. The TDM component would be to establish a working group with the School District and start to talk about promoting bike riding by students more so than they do today. Also addressing some of the staff travel patterns, looking cooperatively with

TRANSCRIPT

the School District at their permitting program and whether they're issuing enough permits for on-campus parking, things like that.

Vice Mayor Scharff: When we talk about creating a Southgate RPP through a stakeholder process, I envisioned that part of that would be what you just talked about with reaching to PAUSD and going through that process. When you talk about the engineering solutions for safety, that's actually creating less parking in Southgate. That's what it sounds like. You're pulling parking away. I wanted to make sure I understood that. With that, I think I'd like to go ahead and try a Motion. See if I can get this right. First of all, I think we should move forward for a budget allocation to do RPP in both the Southgate and Evergreen neighborhoods and budget that money. That would be the first sentence. Then I think we should create a Southgate RPP through the stakeholder process with the understanding that we would also look at and implement engineering, enforcement and TDM options with PAUSD where appropriate and through the stakeholder process. When it comes to Evergreen, I think we should implement an Evergreen Park RPP program through the stakeholder group process including parking management options and through the stakeholder process determine how many permits should be sold to retail and personal service businesses in the area. The only thing I thought I would add to that is determine if the Crescent Park group—I don't know if we refer to it as a Crescent Park street or neighborhood streets—would want to be annexed into the Downtown RPP or not.

Council Member Berman: I second it.

MOTION: Vice Mayor Scharff moved, seconded by Council Member Berman to:

- A. Approve a budget allocation for implementation of Residential Preferential Parking Programs (RPP) for the Southgate and Evergreen Park Neighborhoods; and
- B. Implement an RPP in the Southgate neighborhood through a stakeholder process including looking at engineering, enforcement, and Transportation Demand Management (TDM) solutions with Palo Alto Unified School District (PAUSD) where appropriate; and
- C. Implement an RPP in Evergreen Park through a stakeholder process including parking management options and determining how many permits to be sold for retail and personal service workers; and

TRANSCRIPT

D. Determine whether the Crescent Park neighborhood should be annexed into the Downtown RPP or if a separate RPP should be created for the neighborhood.

Vice Mayor Scharff: On Edgewood I was going see if anyone else wants to handle that.

Mr. Keene: If I just might say something. It's maybe a little unfair to Staff for me to be speaking this way. I think that the urgency related to the main purpose, first of all, of this item was to get a prioritization by the Council on these applications. That Evergreen, then Southgate, then Crescent Park, then Edgewood. I would say even in the lateral two we have probably a little bit more validation that would need to take place. There's two ways we can do this. One would be for you to clearly say on those first two tonight that you're not dismissing these other two this year. That's one of the concerns, that the Ordinance spoke about one a year. I think people misinterpreted that as saying that was going to pit neighborhood against neighborhood and there was only going to be one winner. Clearly it's in the Council's purview to establish stuff. The only thing I worry a little bit about is you say all four of them, and we go away and there's confusion about are we doing them simultaneously, where's our application. We do have a lot of the same people working on this. If you did want to leave it the way the Vice Mayor is saying it, I do think we want to be very clear that there's a sequencing piece here that we would be—we're going to have a lot of the same people working on these same things. We want to be clear that we're dealing with the most critical and the most impacted first. Maybe there's a way we report to the Council.

Vice Mayor Scharff: I completely agree with you, Jim. I meant it to be they're the most impacted, Evergreen and Southgate. Mostly because Southgate has that extra few months in there. I don't want Southgate to walk away from this thinking they're a year away. That's not what I mean by that.

Mr. Keene: I think there are things that can be done.

Vice Mayor Scharff: I think it's sequencing, Evergreen, Southgate, Crescent Park and Edgewood.

Mr. Keene: I understand by the proposed Motion at least the basic recommendation would be to follow your existing ordinance that you have right now.

Vice Mayor Scharff: Yes.

TRANSCRIPT

Mr. Keene: That doesn't mean that there can't be some expedited approaches within that. As far as dramatically reframing the Ordinance, I think the City Attorney would say we may have to bring back some ordinance changes to actually do that. I would just say we want to be thoughtful about that, because I know a lot of the Council has talked a lot about let's establish rules, let's follow the rules. We kind of say those things, and then we at least then need to follow the process to change the rules a little bit if that's we're going to do. That doesn't mean there isn't some latitude within there.

Vice Mayor Scharff: I'll speak to it, then I'll help him write the Motion. I actually appreciated everyone from the neighborhood coming out. I thought that was great; that's the way it's supposed to be. I thought you all did a really good job of talking about the urgency of Evergreen frankly. I want to impress that the Motion—I will probably put something in there just a little that as soon as possible. I want this to be expedited, and I want it to happen quickly and all of that. At the same time, I do think we need to go through the stakeholder process, and we do need to include the merchants in the stakeholder process. With that, I'll let Mr. Berman.

Council Member Berman: Thank you for the Motion. I also want to thank all the residents from the community. I know we still have a couple left, but a lot of folks have gone home. I know it's disappointing to people who wanted an immediate annexation into College Terrace. If I lived in Evergreen, I'd be advocating for the same thing. Unfortunately, it's my job and it's our job to weigh all of the different neighborhoods in the area, weigh the residential needs, the retail needs and try to come up with a solution that provides immediate relief, which I think this will, but also doesn't create a crisis either for the retail workers on California Avenue or for the other neighborhoods around there. There also needs to be some amount of equity across the City. We've established a Residential Permit Parking program in Downtown for people that had never had parking intrusion at all. Now they have a Residential Permit Parking plan that does allow for some small amount of worker permits on their blocks. We will decrease those as we move on, and we will shrink the geographic area as we move on. I just don't know how we would pass one system around the Downtown area and pass a totally different system around the California Avenue area. This hopefully addresses at least some of the residents' concerns. This plus the additional supply that we'll create over the next couple of years will begin to dramatically increase the quality of life in the Evergreen and Southgate neighborhoods. I agree with the Crescent Park annexation into Downtown if they're willing. I agree that we need to figure out better what the deal is around Edgewood Plaza, if that's just an overnight parking thing. To Council Member DuBois' point, once that grocery store is fully occupied, it's going to

TRANSCRIPT

be a different situation, but it also makes sense then to see what that situation is going to be. I'm not sure the neighbors are going to opt into a program now, until they really start feeling some impact. It's a bit of a chicken and egg issue. I think we need more info before we move forward, and we need to prioritize a little bit.

Mayor Burt: Council Member DuBois.

Council Member DuBois: I probably need Council Member Scharff; I have several friendly amendments. In terms of prioritization, I agree with this, but I think it's critical that deploy Southgate and Evergreen Park in parallel, or we'll just have students parking at Evergreen Park and walking through Southgate or we'll have Cal. workers parking in Southgate and walking through Evergreen Park. I would propose before "Southgate and Evergreen Park neighborhoods, to be deployed in parallel."

AMENDMENT: Council Member DuBois moved, seconded by Council Member XX to add to the Motion Part A, "to be deployed in parallel" after "Park Neighborhoods."

Vice Mayor Scharff: I just want to understand. The City Manager thought we should prioritize them. Are you suggesting that we would slow down Southgate, for instance, if Evergreen wasn't ready or we'd slow down Evergreen if Southgate wasn't ready? I personally would rather get either of them with their separate programs—I don't think they're the same program—in as soon as possible. I think what you're going to do is slow one or the other down by saying they have to come out in parallel.

Council Member DuBois: I agree they could be separate district, but I do think they have to come out together. The green area of Southgate is the part that hits Evergreen Park. I'm just concerned we're going to be totally swamped whichever neighborhood comes second. I just think that's an important goal, that they—they may have different characteristics but they could actually be enforced as one large district as well.

Vice Mayor Scharff: I'm not opposed to that for me; it's just a timing issue that we might slow the process down. I'll let the City Manager respond.

Mr. Keene: Can I clarify it in this way? I think the intention is shared, which is what's the quickest and most expeditious way to achieve both of those. That being said, we'd be better off being able to be flexible. As the Vice Mayor said, there are some unknowns that may pop up that would say some bifurcation for a little bit of time may work better than the other. I think the objective is we want to get restricted parking in both of these areas. Again, it's going to be interesting. I don't know how we'll handle the employee

TRANSCRIPT

parking in Southgate in relation to Evergreen. We'll have to work that through. Do you know what I mean? I understand the problem about spillover, but the initial...

Council Member DuBois: We're just hit by spillover every time. I think it's critical that we do them together so it's basically one large enforcement district maybe with different rules. If it's close to the same time, sure. It's really a question of how far apart they come. That's my first friendly amendment, that they be deployed in parallel.

Vice Mayor Scharff: I'd be open to something that says "they will endeavor to have them come out together," so they have some flexibility, but not they have to open the same day. Maybe it's a couple of weeks with each other. I don't know. I'm happy to have something that gives a little discretion to Staff, but gives the impression that that's what we want.

Council Member DuBois: Are you guys having a discussion about this?

Mayor Burt: Council Member DuBois, what if we had something that we direct Staff to attempt to align the launch of both?

Council Member DuBois: That's fine.

Vice Mayor Scharff: That's good.

AMENDMENT RESTATED AND INCORPORATED INTO THE MOTION WITH THE CONSENT OF THE MAKER AND SECONDER to add to the Motion Part A, "and attempt to align deployment of both RPP programs" after "Park Neighborhoods."

Mr. Keene: Just so we're clear, because there will be staffing logistics. To be honest with you, if it were me—I will be involved in it. If push came to shove, I'd say we can get Evergreen out three months in advance of Southgate versus holding them both up, we would recommend that that's what we would do, unless there was an implication that seemed too problematic.

Mayor Burt: The potential implication is whether it will create spillover (crosstalk) Southgate.

Council Member DuBois: I'll say it as a friendly amendment, but it's kind of the opposite of what you have. That Crescent Park be a separate RPP. Having been in the discussion, I think a lot of those people do not want to be part of the Downtown RPP. I also just wonder if this is appropriate since we had a bunch of people recused on this.

TRANSCRIPT

Ms. Stump: We looked at that issue and determined that this small segment of additional blocks, which was a separate application, really shouldn't be analyzed together in the same way as Phase 2, which was a set of rules that encompassed the entirety of the Downtown North, Professorville area. We think it's appropriate that it proceed without recusals except for the one from Evergreen Park.

Council Member DuBois: Again, I would change Crescent Park—in terms of priorities it would be Southgate, Evergreen Park, and then Crescent Park as a separate RPP from Downtown.

Vice Mayor Scharff: No, I think Crescent Park should come back to us and tell us if they want to be annexed, so then we could do it quickly. If not, then we have to have a separate discussion of whether a small separate program makes financial sense (inaudible). Having one (crosstalk)

Mr. Keene: (crosstalk) some comment that at least some neighbors would be interested in the quickest route.

Council Member DuBois: We told them that they missed the deadline.

Mayor Burt: I think that it's problematic to have a separate RPP district for just a few blocks. On the other hand, I didn't get to participate in this because I was 490 feet from the edge of the last extension. I'm not in it. I think that there were two things that maybe weren't done right. One is it would be less onerous on those residents if the permitted parking without a permit was three hours rather than two. I can't imagine, if your guests or workers are there, some Downtown worker is going to go and walk a mile and back every two hours to move the car. That applies when you're adjacent to Downtown. That's a risk. It doesn't apply in these extended areas. What we've done is inconvenience those residents who can't have guests. They have to get a guest permit for every two hours. I just don't think there's any negative impact there. The second one is this fundamental question of when we've created a spillover, should commercial permits be sold in an area that never had an impact. I don't think they should.

Council Member DuBois: That's the definition of not being in the Downtown. I don't know if there's a second for my amendment.

Mayor Burt: That actually can be in the same program but with a different policy on the annexed areas. I don't think it has to be a different area. That's a more complicated issue. I just want to lay those on the table.

TRANSCRIPT

Council Member DuBois: In terms of priorities, basically I'm almost making the PTC's Motion that Crescent Park would be the third priority as a new RPP district.

AMENDMENT: Council Member DuBois moved, seconded by Council Member XX to replace the Motion Part D with, "implement a separate RPP in the Crescent Park neighborhood."

AMENDMENT FAILED DUE TO THE LACK OF A SECOND

Council Member DuBois: Actually I have one more.

Mayor Burt: You can offer something else as a friendly amendment, but as an amendment that we have to take up separately, we're going to have to deal with this.

Council Member DuBois: As a friendly amendment, we would actually list Edgewood Plaza as the fourth priority, which is not currently in the motion.

Mayor Burt: That's just a prioritization.

Vice Mayor Scharff: That's fine.

Mayor Burt: That's accepted.

Council Member Berman: (inaudible) one second. We're good.

INCORPORATED INTO THE MOTION WITH THE CONSENT OF THE MAKER AND THE SECONDER to add to the Motion, "Edgewood Plaza would be fourth priority." (New Part E)

Vice Mayor Scharff: I wouldn't be opposed to it. If we say it's going to be a third priority if they don't want to be annexed in, I'm happy to look at it as a third priority. I think we may need to come back, just like Edgewood Plaza needs to come back. Are you saying they don't need to come back and Staff just goes and works on it? If you're saying that, I'm not going to accept it. It should be the fourth priority, but I think they need to come back to us and we need to think about it. I'm fine with Crescent Park the same way. They should be the third priority. If they want to be annexed, I'm happy to do it quickly. If they don't want to be annexed, then they should be the third priority, and then they come back. I don't know if we're saying the same thing or if we're saying something different.

Council Member DuBois: I'm concerned. I think the speaker said it. They asked to be annexed. They were told they missed the deadline, and then they were told the quickest way to do it was to apply for an RPP which they

TRANSCRIPT

did. Now we're telling them we'll just annex you, which is what you originally asked for.

Vice Mayor Scharff: Which is the quickest way to do it.

Council Member DuBois: We also had a long discussion about it implies that they will get employee permits further out.

Vice Mayor Scharff: It does.

Council Member DuBois: How big is Downtown if we keep annexing it? We had a long discussion about that as well. The five of us that voted kind of said the Phase 2 boundary is at the end of Downtown. (inaudible) strongly because we had this discussion without you guys participating.

Vice Mayor Scharff: What you've got right there, I'm fine with it being a third and Edgewood Plaza being the fourth. Are you saying that you're not accepting them being annexed even if they want to be annexed?

Council Member DuBois: Yeah. The only reason they would want to is they'd be told they don't have a choice.

Vice Mayor Scharff: No, no. I'm not saying they don't have a choice. They know they can come back to Council. The question is what would be quicker. That's really the question. Otherwise, they're the third priority. They're probably looking at not this year. If they won't this year, then they should come back. We should do what the neighborhood wants.

Council Member DuBois: I think what they want is to have residential parking. I will stick with that as a separate amendment. I'd like to have Edgewood Plaza as the fourth priority. You did something interesting which was the retail and personal service workers which is different than Downtown. I think we could generalize that to include Edgewood Plaza. Just say retail and personal service workers.

Mayor Burt: I'm sorry. Can you point to where you're referring to?

Council Member DuBois: Three lines up from where the cursor is. For Evergreen Park, it says "permits to be sold to retail and personal service workers." My amendment would be "in nearby ground-floor districts."

Vice Mayor Scharff: That's fine with me.

Council Member DuBois: That could apply to Edgewood as well.

TRANSCRIPT

AMENDMENT: Council Member DuBois moved, seconded by Council Member XX to add to the Motion Part C, "in nearby ground floor districts."

Ms. Stump: Mr. Mayor, may I make a comment? In some of these details, Council may be getting into actually designing the potential RPP district. That really isn't fully before you tonight. It gets ahead of the Staff process that's contemplated by the ordinance. To the extent that Council wishes to offer some ideas that the Staff should consider, I think that works.

Mayor Burt: Actually I think the language says including determining how many permits should be—that's asking Staff to determine that.

Ms. Stump: Part of that is going to be making distinctions between different types of workers. We have already a program, and we've vetted it and established that there can be a means test, income test.

Mayor Burt: I don't think this narrows that. It just says Staff needs to come back with essentially their recommendations. They determine how that should be broken out.

Ms. Stump: We will have to look at whether it can be broken up like that in addition to the quantity.

Vice Mayor Scharff: I actually don't want to accept nearby ground-floor districts. I just didn't understand what that means. Why don't we just say personal service and retail in California Avenue. It doesn't have to be the street. That's too prescriptive.

Council Member DuBois: I think it's called the Cal. Ave. ground floor retail district.

Vice Mayor Scharff: That's what you mean by nearby the entire California Avenue retail district? Yeah, that's what (crosstalk).

Council Member DuBois: I was trying to generalize. Yeah, I think we're being clear that it's not the same as Downtown which included office workers.

Vice Mayor Scharff: Right, but that's why I already have that retail and personal service workers. That's clearly not an office worker.

Council Member DuBois: It's fine as it is. I was trying to generalize it for Edgewood Plaza.

Vice Mayor Scharff: If you (inaudible) your amendment, I need to change mine, because that makes no sense to me. I would say "if Crescent Park

TRANSCRIPT

annexes into the DP or not. If not, come back as the third priority for a separate RPP district." That would be what I had intended there. Edgewood Plaza would then be the four priority. If you want to change your Motion to make some sense in that context. Your amendment.

Council Member DuBois: I'll strike my amendment if you will accept those changes.

Vice Mayor Scharff: Okay.

Mayor Burt: That makes it simpler.

AMENDMENT WITHDRAWN BY THE MAKER

INCORPORATED INTO THE MOTION WITH THE CONSENT OF THE MAKER AND SECONDER to add to the Motion Part D, "which would be given third priority."

Council Member Wolbach: (inaudible)

Council Member DuBois: That's fine.

Vice Mayor Scharff: Based on resident input.

Mr. Mello: Could I offer a suggestion? We have what's called the eligibility area for the Downtown RPP. That's the larger area that you created as part of Phase 2. Once an area is added to the eligibility area, it's an administrative process to be annexed into Downtown RPP. A simpler way to handle this might be to just add those streets to the eligibility area, and then they could decide to submit a petition to be administratively annexed to the Downtown RPP.

Mayor Burt: If they don't elect to do that, then it comes back to the Council. If they do, you don't have to come to Council. You just give it to them.

Mr. Mello: We would still come, but we could put a resolution on Consent I suppose.

Vice Mayor Scharff: Can you change the language to do that?

Council Member DuBois: Would there be any discussion about how many permits would be sold in those (crosstalk).

Mr. Mello: How would I change the language? I would say ...

Vice Mayor Scharff: Wouldn't the language say if Crescent Park ...

TRANSCRIPT

Mr. Mello: Recommend that the Crescent Park streets be added to the Downtown RPP eligibility area.

Vice Mayor Scharff: Not recommend. Shouldn't we just say add the Crescent Park thing to the eligibility area.

Mr. Mello: It requires changing the resolution for the Downtown RPP.

INCORPORATED INTO THE MOTION WITH THE CONSENT OF THE MAKER AND SECONDER to replace the Motion Part D with, "recommend that the Crescent Park neighborhood be added to the Downtown RPP eligibility area and if the neighborhood is not annexed, the residents can come back as the third priority for a separate RPP.

Council Member DuBois: One last question, Josh. How many permits would be sold in that area? Would it be part of the zone they're in?

Mr. Mello: It would be proportional to the number of spaces that are on those streets. I think Sue-Ellen knows the percentage.

Ms. Atkinson: Those three streets would be added to Zone 10. In Zone 10, we've released a certain number of permits that are proportional to the number of spaces. Roughly 30 percent of all on-street spaces were released as employee permits. What we discussed with Council related to RPP is that when new streets are added to Zones 9 or 10, that a proportional number of permits would be released for sale.

Vice Mayor Scharff: Then you just need to add "if not added to the"—if they don't petition for that, then they get to come back with their separate RPP.

Female: (inaudible)

Mayor Burt: I'm sorry, you can't speak from the audience after we've closed the public speaking. If a Council Member wishes to ask a member of the public a questions ...

Vice Mayor Scharff: I'd be happy to ask. What did you just say?

Eileen Skrabutenas: I appreciate your giving me a chance to further explain. Your question, Council Member Scharff, has to do with do we come back and petition. We have already done that, and that is why this matter came up on Agenda Item 10 for those three streets. Petitions have already been mailed in requesting originally being added to the RPP. All except five of you had to recuse yourselves. The entire audience was filled with not only residents of these three streets but all of Crescent Park that has had the overfill, saying we need a separate RPP. The ground in your decisions

TRANSCRIPT

are changing from meeting to meeting. It's very difficult as a resident to know what to shoot for and bring in front of you, because it changes.

Vice Mayor Scharff: The purpose tonight would be to set that direction, so that you know what we're doing. What Staff suggested, which is easier for you, is if we say we recommend that the Crescent Park neighborhood be added to the Downtown RPP eligibility area, that makes it an administrative process. You don't have to go through the process of coming to Council. You get your petition in. What's the threshold? Staff can probably explain it better than I can.

Ms. Atkinson: The three streets have already submitted signature pages and a petition. 50 percent of residences are required to provide signature for the petition. After the petition, we do a mail survey, which would be the point at which we would take off with these streets if they were added to the eligibility area. We need a positive response from at least 70 percent of the homes on the mail survey.

Vice Mayor Scharff: If 70 percent of the homes do it, then you're in. You're done and you get it.

Council Member DuBois: You'd have to accept 30 percent employee parking.

Vice Mayor Scharff: If don't accept the 30 percent employee parking, then come back as the third priority. It's probably over a year away. It's really your choice.

Ms. Skrabutenas: Right.

Mayor Burt: Council Member Berman, you need to determine if you are also okay with these changes to the Motion.

Council Member Berman: I am.

Mayor Burt: Council Member Filseth. You're good now? If we've solved your problems, that's okay.

Council Member Filseth: I think all this is going very much in the right direction. I think we're right to leverage the framework that's been done. I agree with all the Mayor's comments on why resident-only parking is not the way we should go. I think we do need to make some accommodation for workers so long as we preserve neighborhood quality. One of the comments that Staff made is that 30 percent of the spaces in Downtown are allocated towards commercial parking, but the intent is that's going to ratchet back over time to a smaller number than that. I think that's important. The

TRANSCRIPT

question I had for Staff and for the maker of the Motion, the Vice Mayor, in the Downtown neighborhood, the stakeholder process took over a year. It was a long time. How can we do this in such a way that it doesn't take another year until signs go up and so forth? Can we establish—maybe this is right, maybe this is wrong. Can we establish some parameters now to start with and adjust them a year from now after we finish the process? How can we short circuit this?

Mayor Burt: Can I ask Staff a variation of that question? The learning process that we had for Downtown, how much do you expect it will streamline that stakeholder process here?

Ms. Gitelman: Thank you, Council Members. I think we understand your desire to move more expeditiously with this RPP. We obviously learned a lot from the Downtown plan. We're going to need to regroup and put our heads together and come up with a work plan for this. We will try and keep your desires in mind and come up with a process that's more efficient. We'll communicate back with you.

Mayor Burt: Do we think that the process that we went through for Downtown in all likelihood is going to make this more streamlined because we've figured some stuff out on how to do this?

Ms. Gitelman: Absolutely.

Mayor Burt: Council Member Holman.

Council Member Holman: "A," I'm assuming that the intention there is to ask the Finance Committee, because we're in the budget cycle—I'm speaking to the maker of the Motion here. I'm presuming that is asking the Finance Committee to identify an allocation for implementation.

Mr. Keene: I think that clarification would be helpful. Ultimately, it's going to be the Finance Committee's recommendation back to the Council when the actual approval will take place. It would premature to be talking about approving it tonight. You would be asking ...

Vice Mayor Scharff: It's direct the Finance Committee to approve a budget allocation. I'm fine with that.

Council Member Holman: To identify a budget allocation.

INCORPORATED INTO THE MOTION WITH THE CONSENT OF THE MAKER AND SECONDER to the replace in the Motion Part A, "approve" with "direct the Finance Committee to identify."

TRANSCRIPT

Council Member Holman: Under "C," implement an RPP in Evergreen Park through a stakeholder process including determining how many permits to be sold for retail and personal service workers. I think this is what Council Member DuBois was trying to get at earlier. After the word "workers," "from the adjacent California Avenue Commercial District" and "to be phased out over time." That makes it consistent with the Downtown RPP.

Vice Mayor Scharff: I'll go with the adjacent California Avenue district. Given that we're not putting any office workers in there at the moment and given that it depends on how big a parking garage we build, in my mind, I'm fine with phasing it out. If we don't build an adequate parking garage, then we may not be able to. At some point, we have to figure out where these people actually go. I'm hoping that we build a big enough parking garage. That's a question that Council's going to have to grapple with.

Council Member Holman: You'll accept "from the adjacent California Avenue District"?

Vice Mayor Scharff: Right.

Council Member Berman: Before I do, it looks like Staff's having some concerns or issues. Is there anything ...

Mr. Keene: We were just talking that the sooner you guys get done with this, the sooner we could get started on a program. I think there's a little uncertainty about the ability to specify the retail and personal service workers. We can live with this with the understanding if we dove deeper into this, if we needed some adjustment to it, we'd have to come back to you and let you know.

Council Member Holman: Understood.

Mr. Keene: We're going to be coming back to you anyway with the budget approvals and all of that stuff. There will be opportunities to ...

Council Member Berman: Okay.

Council Member Holman: You're accepting that?

Council Member Berman: If the previous part is what's giving Staff heartburn, then I'll accept your ...

Vice Mayor Scharff: "The permits over time" needs to come out.

Council Member Holman: It stops after the word "District."

TRANSCRIPT

AMENDMENT: Council Member Holman moved, seconded by Council Member XX to add to the Motion at the end of Part C, "from the adjacent California Avenue district, which permits to be phased out over time."

AMENDMENT RESTATED AND INCORPORATED INTO THE MOTION WITH THE CONSENT OF THE MAKER AND SECONDER to add to the Motion at the end of Part C, "from the adjacent California Avenue district."

Council Member Holman: I had a previous convenience with City Attorney about maybe it has to be by the size of employer or something like that. This is what we're looking towards. This what the goal is. I would imagine this has to be a separate amendment, but I'll put it out there. An "F" would be to direct Staff to determine if employees can share parking permits both within the Commercial District and potentially in the neighborhood."

Council Member DuBois: I'll second that if it's not accepted.

Council Member Holman: Is the maker agreeable to that?

Vice Mayor Scharff: Why don't we just have a separate vote on that one? I'd like to hear the reasons if we're going to (inaudible).

Council Member Holman: Tom, did you second?

Council Member DuBois: Yep.

AMENDMENT: Council Member Holman moved, seconded by Council Member DuBois to add to the Motion, "direct Staff to determine if retail and personal service employees can share permits within the district and in the neighborhood."

Council Member Holman: If I can speak to that, Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Burt: Yeah.

Council Member Holman: Speaking to that amendment then. I did hear the arguments about why this doesn't really satisfy the issues. My argument in favor of this is that it really does mean a lot to the employers, the smaller employers, to be able to do this. I understand that it doesn't create more parking, understand that. Understand that it will be potentially some less revenue to the City, but I don't think significant. It is a large gesture to the retail merchants in the California Avenue area. It's something they've asked for; it's something that they want. It's something that would mean a great deal to them by their own statements.

TRANSCRIPT

Council Member DuBois: I would echo that as well. I was on the Cal. Ave. Merchants Association last year. This is for lower wage employees. These are for employees that are parking for free, that would not buy a permit. If the employer can buy a permit and share it with part-time workers, it creates flexibility that we don't have in our permit program today.

Mayor Burt: If I might chime in here. This is now focused on not a notion that somehow this will create parking, which it doesn't. We need to recognize that it will actually diminish revenue. Maybe we're willing to do that. I think first we need to acknowledge those two things are facts. Then we have an issue about whether we're looking at a program similar to what we have in Downtown where what we're trying to do is have lower cost permits for retail workers or companies with part-time workers. My problem is that this Motion doesn't carve those out. It's not talking about retail or low-income workers.

Council Member Holman: My error there is it should be determine if retail and personal service employees.

Mayor Burt: I'm okay with that.

AMENDMENT RESTATED: Council Member Holman moved, seconded by Council Member DuBois to add to the Motion, "direct Staff to explore if retail and personal service employees can share permits within the district and in the neighborhood."

Council Member DuBois: One last point. This was part of the Colleagues' Memo, so I think we're just kind of reemphasizing that.

Mayor Burt: The arguments in the Colleagues' Memo were bad arguments for. It claimed that it was somehow going to address the parking problem. This is a different issue. This is about helping the economics of low-income workers being able to have permits. That's different from what the Colleagues' Memo spoke to.

Council Member DuBois: That's what we were trying to get to. It's not a loss of revenue if they're parking for free today. We're trying to get them into a permit that works for them.

Mayor Burt: Let me respond to that. We sell as many permits as we have spaces for. Right now we sell one permit or more than one permit actually per space. Now you will sell fewer permits for the same spaces. It actually does reduce revenue. If you think it through logically, that's what happens. That may be a decent policy decision. We did something similar Downtown,

TRANSCRIPT

but I just don't to make a false claim that somehow it's not going affect revenue. Council Member Wolbach.

Council Member Holman: If the maker of the original Motion is going to accept this at this point? You were looking like you might be headed that direction.

Vice Mayor Scharff: I am headed that direction. I just think it's phrased incorrectly. I think it should say something like direct Staff to determine the best possible way—if there's a way. It really to get retail and personal service workers to be able to afford to get a permit that works in there. That's a pricing mechanism. You could either say you could share the permit or you could lower the price of the permit and make it less expensive. It's not clear to me which is the better way to go without having explore it. I really want Staff to explore options to ensure that retail and personal service employees can purchase permits. That' really what we're looking at. It might be shared; that might be the best way to go. It might also be putting it at a lower price. I just don't know.

Mr. Keene: Could I add to that? I am getting a little bit worried about the level of detail we're getting into. At least a part of this stakeholder outreach process is to figure out this kind of information. We would have it more contemporary with the idea of when we come back with recommendations, we'd be able to do that. In one sense, we're preempting that stakeholder outreach process.

Mayor Burt: I would support the broader intention which is to look at ways to help support the lower income workers.

Council Member Holman: The way it's worded right now doesn't capture that.

Vice Mayor Scharff: Retail and personal service employees, you want to add in lower-income retail and personal service workers?

Mayor Burt: I think retail and personal service.

Vice Mayor Scharff: I think personal service and retails workers are by definition (inaudible).

Mayor Burt: I'm fine with that.

Council Member Holman: Just saying they can purchase permits; they can purchase permits now. What's ...

TRANSCRIPT

Vice Mayor Scharff: Why don't we say with the idea that it would be economical feasible for them to purchase.

Council Member DuBois: Karen, I think what we heard—we're talking about part-time workers. Lowering the price doesn't address a permit for the week or whatever. I think we're losing that. This was the idea of sharing. If an employer has two employees ...

Vice Mayor Scharff: Why don't we say "including sharing"? Direct Staff to explore options including sharing. Take out the word "ensure."

AMENDMENT RESTATED AND INCORPORATED INTO THE MOTION WITH THE CONSENT OF THE MAKER AND SECONDER to add to the Motion, "direct Staff to explore options including sharing permits so that retail and personal service employees can afford permits." (New Part F)

Mayor Burt: Council Member Berman, you okay with that?

Council Member Berman: Sure.

Mayor Burt: Council Member Filseth.

Council Member Filseth: I was just going to comment that I like the sense that we're asking Staff to explore it as opposed to prescribing something. If at all possible, we ought to have consistent mechanisms between the Downtown plan and the California Avenue plan. I'd hate to see us have a different one for every neighborhood in the City solving the same problem.

Mayor Burt: Please vote on the board. Your light wasn't on. Go ahead. I'm just trying to get us out of here.

Council Member Wolbach: Just a couple of things. As far as differentiation—I just want to say this real quick. As far as differentiation between different neighborhoods, having heard this discussion I do think it is appropriate for these neighborhoods, especially Evergreen, to be at least in some ways potentially comparable to what we have in Downtown. I do think it is appropriate for neighborhoods that are proximate to our major employment centers to be potentially different than neighborhoods which are very distance from major employment centers. I like this. I just wanted to offer a couple of language clean-ups. Suggestions, because it's getting late. I think we might have missed a couple of things here. I'm worried about eh level of detail we've required here. Where it says retail and personal service workers—actually "C" and "F," I was going to hopefully make a friendly amendment to combine "C" and "F." Implement an RPP in Evergreen Park

TRANSCRIPT

through a stakeholder process, and then get rid of after "through a stakeholder process." Take the rest of "C" and include it with "F."

Mayor Burt: Why?

Council Member Wolbach: Just to clean it up a little bit.

Vice Mayor Scharff: It doesn't have to be perfect. Staff can do it. Staff knows what we mean. We're not writing an ordinance here.

AMENDMENT: Council Member Wolbach moved, seconded by Council Member XX to combine Parts C and F of the Motion.

AMENDMENT FAILED DUE TO THE LACK OF A SECOND

Council Member Wolbach: Instead of "retail and personal service workers," change it to "lower wage workers." We've done analysis of that for Downtown, but I don't think we've done that Cal. Ave. It might be more sensible to stick with the differentiation based on income that we've done for Downtown rather than switching here to basing it on what kind of business (crosstalk).

Mayor Burt: I actually that may be appropriate. Say you have janitorial workers. They're neither retail nor personal service.

Council Member Wolbach: Both places that says retail and personal service workers, I would make a friendly amendment to change that to "lower wage workers." That would be in "C" and in "F" if we're not combining them.

Mayor Burt: We're not going to try and define what a low income worker is tonight.

Council Member Wolbach: We've already explored that with Downtown.

Council Member Holman: Can I suggest, as the person who put this in both the Memo and here, define lower income and you have some people who work in retail that aren't necessarily lower income but who also we prefer that they be able to park and facilitate their business than somebody who's in an office which has a TDM program applied to it. I would hope that we stop wordsmithing and leave it as retail and personal service.

Vice Mayor Scharff: Why don't we just put in lower income workers and personal service and retail workers.

Mayor Burt: Lower income including. Is that the intention? You want to cover retail. He wants to cover low income. How about if we simply say low

TRANSCRIPT

income as well as retail and personal services. Let me suggest that we take it and run with it.

INCORPORATED INTO THE MOTION WITH THE CONSENT OF THE MAKER AND SECONDER to add to the Motion Parts C and F, "low income workers as well as" before "retail and personal service."

Council Member Wolbach: If I might. I would actually be determining how many permits be sold for employees. I would actually suggest that "C" just be for employee. As part of the stakeholder process, we figure out how many of those are office, how many are retail, etc.

Vice Mayor Scharff: No.

Mayor Burt: Council Member Filseth.

Council Member Filseth: I just wanted to comment very briefly on Bullet D which has Crescent Park. I concur with the Vice Mayor's original suggestion. The simplest and clearest way to do it is to annex that street into the Downtown plan. We've done a good job of confusing everybody on these things. That's probably the best way for that group to get what they want. If the only reason to try for a separate RPP is to go from a small number of nonresident permits to zero nonresident permits, I'm not persuaded that's a good reason. If it comes back to Council, I'm not inclined to support it. Thanks.

Mayor Burt: Council Member Schmid as our last speaker.

Council Member Schmid: I move the Motion.

Mayor Burt: You don't need to; you're the last speaker.

MOTION RESTATED: Vice Mayor Scharff moved, seconded by Council Member Berman to:

- A. Direct the Finance Committee to identify a budget allocation for implementation of Residential Preferential Parking Programs (RPP) for the Southgate and Evergreen Park Neighborhoods and attempt to align deployment of both RPP programs; and
- B. Implement an RPP in the Southgate neighborhood through a stakeholder process including looking at engineering, enforcement, and Transportation Demand Management (TDM) solutions with Palo Alto Unified School District (PAUSD) where appropriate; and

TRANSCRIPT

- C. Implement an RPP in Evergreen Park through a stakeholder process including parking management options and determining how many permits to be sold for low income workers as well as retail and personal service workers from the adjacent California Avenue district; and
- D. Recommend that the Crescent Park neighborhood be added to the Downtown RPP eligibility area and if the neighborhood is not annexed, the residents can come back as the third priority for a separate RPP; and
- E. Edgewood Plaza would be fourth priority; and
- F. Direct Staff to explore options including sharing permits so that low income workers as well as retail and personal service employees can afford permits.

Mayor Burt: Please vote on the board. That passes unanimously with Council Member Kniss recused. Thank you to Staff and the remaining members of the public who have the perseverance that we do.

MOTION AS AMENDED PASSED: 8-0 Kniss not participating

Inter-Governmental Legislative Affairs

Mayor Burt: Our final wrap-up items are Intergovernmental Legislative Affairs. I don't think we have any reporting.

Council Member Questions, Comments and Announcements

Mayor Burt: Council Member Questions, Comments and Announcements. Anybody have anything they need to report at this hour?

Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 12:34 A.M.

Mayor Burt: On that note, the meeting's adjourned.