



ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
DRAFT MINUTES: May 4, 2017
City Hall/City Council Chambers
250 Hamilton Avenue
8:30 AM

Call to Order/Roll Call

Chair Lew: [Video started mid-sentence] ...May 4th, 2017. Can we do the roll call, please? Claire, you can do the roll call.

Present: Chair Alexander Lew, Vice Chair Kyu Kim, Board Members Robert Baltay, Wynne Furth, Robert Gooyer,

Absent:

Oral Communications

Chair Lew: Now is the time for oral communications. The public may speak on an item that's not on the agenda. I don't have any – oh, I do have a speaker card. Is it Shani Kleinhaus?

Ms. Shani Kleinhaus: Good morning.

Chair Lew: Great and you have 3-minutes.

Ms. Kleinhaus: I'm giving you the new American Bird Conservancy – Bird Safety Design Guidelines. I know that you have been looking at some buildings and bird safety design. Oh, I should have introduced myself. I'm Shani Kleinhaus, Environmental Advocate for Santa Clara Valley, Audubon Society, and I'm also on the Executive Committee of the Local Chapter of the Sierra Club and – but I don't speak for them and I'm a resident of Palo Alto. The reason why I wanted to give you the new guidelines is that there are things that we have learned since the San Francisco ordinance that you've been looking at that has come out. Even since this document came out, there are already new things that we know. We know now that collisions are not limited to the first 60-feet. They are actually happening even at higher altitudes. Especially very tall buildings, which in Palo Alto we don't have skyscrapers but those are big problems. We're learning also that some of the methods that have been used to mitigate bird collision with buildings are not very effective. One of the ones that I see often used in Palo Alto as well, is creating slanted walls. Those don't seem to work very well. It's – unless the wood is reflected in the slanted glass surfaces, it's very, very urban and there's no vegetation in it but that rarely happens. Another thing that doesn't work very well are surfaces that have UV or other things that we don't see. It seems like what we don't see, the birds don't see also so if you can't see it, the birds can't see it. UV may work for a very limited set of birds that actually are attracted to flowers that have UV in them but that's really – a lot of species don't see it so I hope you use this when you move forward and you're looking at different buildings. One other thing that I probably should have mentioned is that birds collide anywhere in the City and outside of the City. Most of the new guidelines that we see, actually look at buildings anywhere so thank you.

Chair Lew: Great, thank you very much.

Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

Chair Lew: Ok, moving onto agenda changes, additions and deletions and we do have one change today and that is that I think that we're going to hear the – item number three which is the bicycle bridge first, ahead of the study session for the ARB report template. Right?

[Board moved to item number three]

City Official Reports

- 1. Transmittal of the ARB Meeting Schedule and Attendance Record, and Administrative Staff-Level Architectural Review Approvals**

Study Session

- 2. Study Session - ARB Review of Staff Proposed Report Template and Submittal Checklists**

[The Board started with item number 3]

Chair Lew: So, we have item number two which is a study session for ARB review of Staff proposed report template and submittal checklist.

Mr. Jonathan Lait, Assistant Director of the Planning Department: Great, thanks, Chair. I'll just frame this a little bit and then Jodie may have some more comments to make about some of the details about what's being presented. Just by way of background, the Board may recall that when we presented the ARB findings – the re-do of the ARB findings, that was sort of the first phase of a couple of efforts that we wanted to take to streamline our applications review process and improve the product that we are generating out of our office. Also, improve the materials that are being presented to the Board so you can make informed decisions and recommendations on to the Director and Council. During that time, we had made some changes to the Staff report and we're at a point now that you've had a chance to see that for a bit of time and you might find that there are things that are useful and helpful in reviewing those project and other things that you gloss over or don't find as useful or helpful. So, we're seeking the Board's input on the Staff report and just as your thinking about those comments, keep in mind that these Staff reports serve a number of audiences. Including from a Staff perspective, documenting the administrative record and putting some information in there that the public might want to be aware of. There is – yeah, I guess there are different lenses that people might look at the Staff report. Whether an applicant, an applicant opponent or proponent and Council – when they look at – when the Council looks at the prior Staff reports and so for. Then there's also you, as the primary audience, because you're the ones who we are writing the Staff report for and so there may be some things that you want to see that is important to your quick, sort of getting up to speed on the project. There may be some things that we can put in the attachments and they can be referenced as needed when you're conducting your review. Staff does put a fair amount of time and energy into writing the Staff reports and reviewing the Staff reports and there is a whole process of packet preparation. So, if we're going to put this energy into it, we just want to make sure that we're getting it right and it's the most useful document that it can be for you and for the public. The other thing that we would like your guidance on is the application submittal checklist. Now, this is another sort of element that we're approaching where we want to get a consistency in the type of material that's coming in and presented. We want to also establish some – maybe some thresh holds for when somebody who's proposing a project of a certain size, they might need to provide a little bit more information like a model or some kind of 3-D illustration or something that provides a little more sense for the context. You may not need it for – you likely won't need it for every project and there are scales of projects and so we're trying to find out what is the specific information that this Board needs in order to render the best, most thoughtful decision that you can, based on the findings that are required by code. So, we have some existing requirements and Jodie has, I think included in the Staff reports a proposed draft of what we would then seek to ask of applicants.

We're looking to modify that and adjust that based on the Board's comments. I'll note that one of the challenges that we have or maybe even an applicant has is when an application is filed and it's not complete for filing, a notice of incomplete letter is sent out and that's sort of like the default way of doing business but it doesn't always have to be that way also. In our – our intent here is to have a very clean submittal checklist that's clear to the applicant. That if I submit these things, I'm going to be deemed complete at the end because really that's what we are assessing. Is having application completeness and when you get that notice of incomplete, we're adding – not only is there the first 30-days that we send out that letter. There's the next amount of time where the applicant has to work with the architect and the client's needs to modify and revise the project. So, there are another probably couple months – up to a couple of months before the plans actually come back. So, there might be a way for us to trim a little bit of that time off before we head onto the Board. So, I'll stop there because we really would like to hear from you. Jodie, did you want to add anything else to that or just respond to questions? Ok, so thank you, Chair.

Chair Lew: Are there questions or should we just move onto comments? Nobody? So, Robert? Yeah, we'll just start with comments.

Board Member Gooyer: I'm fairly happy with the way the report or I should say the – your report is. I wanted the idea that is some – over the years, it's fluctuated as far as how much of an opinion that you give but I like the fact that I like to hear what Staff's opinion is on certain items. Now whether I agree with them or I don't agree with it, I guess is – I do like seeing that. Going to the -- going through the actually submittal applications, the only thing I have -- and I'm looking at it maybe just from a user rather than from this side, is you always ask for an incredible amount of copies and what printing cost these days, my god that – I've had projects where I've got \$1,500 worth of printing charges for a submittal. I'd love to see some way that maybe there aren't as many required and you include a set of PDFs or something like that; I'd be much happier with. Other than that – and of course, maybe I guess, it's a little bit aside but the minutes, where they are verbatim, I think is ridiculous. I mean the first time I inadvertently pressed print and got 37 sheets printed out of my printer for – is I think, absurd. It – I'd prefer – you know, I don't need to – obviously, there should be a verbatim copy somewhere but I don't think it needs to go as the general one. I'd prefer to just the summarized version if you want to call it that. Then, if I want more input, I can press on the link and look at it verbatim.

Ms. Gerhardt: Just for clarification on the number of plans sets. We did recently go back around and think through how many departments a particular project needs to go too and so that's reflected in the number of plan sets that we're asking for. We can certainly – there are some departments that are willing to take just the electronic kind.

Board Member Gooyer: Well, I understand that but -- and I've gone – you know, having done this long enough, it's – there are two ways to do this. You can run – for instance – I mean this is the extreme but you go run one set from one department to another department to a third department. That way – the advantage of that, that I've seen, is that other departments also see what – for instance, planning's comments are or whatever. Rather than each department going into their own little isolated entity and marking things up because from a user standpoint, you get comments back that planning is directly opposite of what Public Works wants for instance; that sort of thing. It – there should be some flexibility there or whatever or – like I said, I'm sure it doesn't work completely one way or the other but I have seen it work both ways.

Ms. Gerhardt: We do certainly try and coordinate our comments. We have -- sort of three weeks into any major process like this, we have a Development Review Committee where all the departments are coming together with the applicant to make sure that we're not having those comments that don't align.

Board Member Gooyer: Ok.

Chair Lew: Peter.

Board Member Baltay: Thanks. Let me just pick up on what Robert was talking about. It just stirred my mind that maybe if you had a point person for each application or at least for major ones, that were sort of the ombudsmen, A person who takes the application, gets it to Public Works or traffic or trees and gets the response back. You might be able to do a hybrid. What Robert is saying tends to slow the process down because each department waits for it to come. Guys on vacation this week, it's just really frustrating for applicants but he's also right that we're wasting so much paper and there are other technologies out there. I felt – we've done numerous applications that we sort of feel like we fall into the pit and then he's absolutely right. We get a comment from the Traffic Department which contradicts Public Works which contradicts Planning and we're sort of left having to figure this out. It just takes time and we're kind of – go back to our client and they say well, I just paid you a \$10,000 fee, what's going on? That's the public – the user's point of view on it. Maybe if you were to, on a big project, put a point person that everybody went to – each department and they shepherd it through because what Jonathan is saying is true. We want to make the application complete at the beginning and get proper feedback. Even if it's not what they want to hear but give it to them clearly up front. Let me address what you're asking for. I think your templates for your Staff reports are pretty good. I think you do reach a nice balance of – it's nice to hear what you think, it's nice to hear the code background. If anything, I would just say would be to try to write less and probably that's just me. I'm a visual person and I'm finding that when I get something this thick, it's like jeez, you know am I going to read all this again? You're right, when I look through it, you need to have a record. You want to put it out there for everybody over time to have seen what the decisions were so I don't – I'm not an attorney. I don't know where you do draw the line and don't, but let me instead point to the drawings because I frequently find that those -- when I look at them architecturally, I feel like – even from my own office sometimes, just how did that get out? Frequently on elevation, it is a very – a drawing that guys whip out at the last minute in the office and it's not as carefully done. It's not conveying the right design intent; the line weights aren't right. We've seen so many of them here that are really difficult. What I would encourage you to do at the Staff level is to push back on applicants. When their drawings aren't really telling the story, or aren't saying the message, push back early on. I think you'll find applicants when told their drawings aren't satisfactory, will be embarrassed more than anything else but set a high standard for that. I get the sense frequently that as Staff, just elevation, check. Rather than actually looking at the elevation for is it there? Is it consistent? Does it line up with the plans? It's nice to see a little bit of work put into that. It's really great to have more 3-D images and as a practicing architect, I can assure that it's easy to produce 3-D images these days. It jumps out of our computers almost too much but if you say again to an applicant, we need to see what this looks like from both sides, not just the main corner. Again, insist on getting that rendering or that image. You're not asking for too much and it really helps when we're analyzing the project, to see this visual 3-D conveying what it's like in context. Overall though, I think your reports and stuff are pretty good. Compared to other jurisdictions where we work, you guys do a pretty good job. If I could, what really doesn't work and it's not just Palo Alto but it's this increasing requirement for Public Works grading and drainage information very early in the project. Just in the past year and a half, we've done three now through Palo Alto and it's ridiculous. Each time we're doing really detailed engineering work to satisfy a Publics Work Department, which is totally out of touch and it's not necessary. It's not helpful and our clients – it really has a counterproductive effect because the client grudgingly pays for the engineer and then digs their heels in when you have to make changes because – first thing I say is ok, we have to do the resubmittal, we have to get the engineer back and the engineer says another \$4,000 to redo grading arrows on a driveway plane. That can be worked out at the building permit stage. If I really could ask you strongly, just cut out all of that grading and drainage as a defacto. requirement and instead, only require it on projects that really will be sensitive for that and that's very few. Good engineers can work out almost anything. Very rarely does it affect our architectural judgment of the project but it really slows down the process. You don't even have that in your checklist because it's such a separate department from you guys in Planning but I tell you again as an applicant, it's really frustrating to get an incomplete letter because we didn't show a traffic study. There's nothing on the checklist about a traffic study. Nobody picked it up because the Planners don't connect on it either. Why does it matter? If you're talking about whether the building should be there, it doesn't. Same thing with – we're doing a project now. Three small houses on Alma Street and we've gone through so much trouble on grading and drainage. Setting the heights of these pads to the nearest hundredth of a foot. It doesn't affect the architectural issues but it sure affects the client's budget and it sure slows down the process. So over and over again,

especially with Public Works and not just this agency, everyone we work in now. We've gone overboard for whatever reason and really that's a building permit level review. It's not appropriate or necessary for Planning level for architectural level.

Mr. Lait: If I may, just on that. I couldn't agree more actually and that's a conversation that we've been having internally. There is this interest and – well, actually, I should say that there's a balance that we have of wanting to convey to an applicant all of the things that might possibly go wrong so that there are pre-planning and an understanding of the implications of compliance with the different utility requirements, the (inaudible) requirements and so on and so forth. I think there has been and Jodie will correct me if I am wrong on this but just my own observation, it seems to me that we're trying to get to a level of perfection before it comes to you for review. So that when the plan check – when you get into plan check, that's a simple process, that's smooth and the City has the blueprint effort. There – a lot of energy went into having the plan check process be streamlined and quick and get permits out the door. A lot of that has relied on – has resulted in the Planning Department getting a lot of these things embedded into the preliminary review to facilitate that process but I do think that it does slow things down. These – this is – in a large part, this is a conceptual review because things will get refined and worked out in the building permit when we start putting all the pieces together at a finer grain level. I appreciate hearing that comment and it is something that we're working on. I wanted to ask if – one of the things that we were thinking about was that you go through the Design Review Committee process. Every, I think, application that goes to the ARB goes through this process. It's within the first three weeks. The applicant can sit with City Staff and you get a list of comments and we convey all that stuff and it's pretty much a lot of boilerplate – you know, these are the things that you have to do. What happens is that we also embed those into our approval letters and so if you get the approval letter, you've got 60, 70, 80 conditions of approval. A lot of it is boilerplate stuff that you see – you know, that you can find in the code. What we want to do is sort of get away from that and say, here are the major specifics – here are the two or three specific conditions related to your project. Here are some standard things, legal and compliance with the plans but then kind of shorten these conditions to maybe there's a dozen of them that are really relevant because our concern is that contractors aren't reading 100 conditions on their plans and we're going to miss the important things that we do care about. In this DRC, we want to just reference that you got all these things and say hey, we expect that you're going to comply with the details of irrigation or the Public Works requirements and all that stuff. You don't have to worry about it now but you do – you're on notice, you do have to worry about it and you will have to address it during plan check. That's sort of the sentiment that we're – the direction that we're heading on and I'd like to get your feedback on that if you think that's an appropriate path.

Board Member Baltay: I think what you're saying makes sense. If I can throw in, we've had two of these design review conferences and respectfully, both times we felt that the City wasn't prepared. Nobody had looked at the plans until we got to the conference and in an essence, their telling us what you're saying but there really wasn't any substance because nobody made a judgment over which things were and weren't important. Again, maybe if you just had one person in charge of it and they had to solicit this feedback, it might help. I don't know. That's a Staff issue on really how you do it but that's our – my feedback to you is that twice now it hasn't worked well because the City wasn't prepared, in our opinion.

Board Member Gooyer: Yeah, let me just reiterate on this. The same sort of thing where – let's face it after you do this after a while with a particular jurisdiction, you begin to understand what some of their boilerplate items are so you figure ok, fine. I'll include those in my drawings and so, I include all those in there. Then when I get the comment's back, it still has those and I look at it and say nope, they just took the first four pages that were standard boilerplate. Didn't even look at the drawings and then went from there. Then the client sees this and goes, my god, what did you guys do? There's an eight-page or whatever of comments and then you have to show them, no, no, these three items at the very back are really the only ones that count and I've actually already covered those or I should say that I've covered the 85 other ones that are there. It is – I agree completely that they don't look at the boilerplate stuff because we're also – we go through the same thing. I'm not going to constantly have you guys do that when it's easier for me just to put those in my general notes or whatever the case is, that it – I already understand that they are covered.

Board Member Baltay: You asked for it, Jonathan.

Mr. Lait: Listen, absolutely, this is the kind of information that we need because I do think that we – part of it is that there's a lot of work coming in and people and some vacancies and people are just trying to kind of get through it all but it's – getting through it is not the point. We want to have a quality product. We want to be – we want the architects to have a relationship with us where they can – they know that we're taking the time to read the plans and we're giving thoughtful information back and so that's the transition that we're trying to get to.

Ms. Gerhardt: I think I just wanted to go back to the grading and drainage question for a second. I -- Board Member Baltay, I understand where you're coming from on smaller projects but I'm just – the larger projects that mainly the ARB sees. There are the C3 requirements that need to be adhered too and so my concern about the grading and drainage is that we want to make sure that there's not a bio-retention area that needs to be planned for and we don't want that popping up later at the building stage and so I'd like to just hear your thoughts on that.

Board Member Baltay: Well, I think your right that occasionally, you need to have a bio-retention area. You want or most architects are thinking about that with their consultants but somehow, this just morphed way beyond just filling out a C3 form. A C3 form is essentially asking you to look at how much change you're making on your pervious or impervious surface, bottom line and then what are you going to do about it? Public Works starts with that and then, the instant you fill it out and there's one square foot more impervious surface, they throw the book at you. There's not this sort of baseline, ok, you're going to have to put something in for bio-retention, how are you going to do it? As an architect I say ok, I realize that I'm going to have this grassy area that we're going to have to reserve or I'm going to have to tell my client that we're going to have to do an underground system with filters and pumps or on a real dense spot, we have some more issues in the building structure. Very rarely does it – does anything – those questions go beyond that as far as affecting the design and the review. I think it's pretty well understood that you have to do storm drainage and the design team is responsible for that. I mean, you have to have a building that holds itself up with the engineering but you're not asking them to size the beams. These are basic things that they have to do so it's really just a matter of judgment of when it's necessary. That's my feeling but maybe...

Chair Lew: So, I use to work on really large projects and the grading was a driving factor – on hilly sites, often times large projects – the grading was a driver of the project. Like it would affect the general – the basic parts of a project and it was a struggle to get those to work. So, I can sort of see where the Staff is coming from and then I think it you're – again if it's like a small project on a relatively flat plate in an urban infill thing then yeah, I think you're right.

Board Member Baltay: On a big project, a civil engineer is an integral part of the team and yeah, their work needs to be put into the package but only on some projects.

Chair Lew: Ok, Kyu.

Vice Chair Kim: My comments are more specific to the checklist submittal requirements. I know it's been brought up before but just little things like if we're getting a reduced set, that we have some kind of a graphic scale so that we can at least get an estimate of what a certain dimension is. Then some other minor things like public outreach images, I know previously it was a CD requirement but now it looks like it's been changed to USB flash drive. Could that be just a cloud link? Whether it's Dropbox or Google drive. Also, just some basic clean up on the checklists. I think if we refer to 24x36 or 11x17 instead of writing inch all the time. I agree that the more 3-D images and views are a good thing. That really helps us on the Board as well as members of the public that aren't used to seeing just straight sections, elevations and floor plans to really get a sense of what the volume of a building perhaps looks like so I'd be in favor of asking for more of that information. I agree with Board Member Baltay that it's not that difficult to produce. Just a super specific question but on the revised ARB major project submittal requirement checklist, under G for sections, it says provide illustrative lustration wall section. I was

wonder what does that mean, lustration? I mean we're asking for it to be a minimum of a certain specific scale so when I read that without seeing the portion at the end of scale, I would think oh, maybe it's a sectioned perspective or just an illustration of what the section might look like but I think if it's at a certain scale then maybe that word becomes ambiguous or we can strike it out.

Ms. Gerhardt: I think we're looking for a sample wall section – an example just to understand the depth of the windows and things like that.

Vice Chair Kim: Ok, so maybe just provide example wall sections instead of lustration. Board Member Furth thinks lustration is a good word.

Board Member Baltay: We use the term schematic in the office. A schematic detail is one that's not technically correct. Maybe the flashing is not shown but it shows the depth of the window and things like that.

Vice Chair Kim: Then a couple other minor comments with regards to the shadow shade studies and something else that I think was tossed around out there is perhaps having a sample for some of these applicants. Some applicants are very familiar with the process. You know they've been through it so many times. We've seen them a lot but other perhaps are less familiar with it and if we have a sample section, that can help the applicant or even clients that don't understand why we have to present or spend the time to put together these submittal items. Overall, I'm very pleased with the Staff reports and I'm in favor of having these booklets that you introduced at the beginning of this year. I agree that maybe the verbatim minutes are a little overboard but overall, I think we're heading in the right direction and I'm appreciative of the work that the Planners are putting forth. It hasn't made my job harder. If anything, it's made it easier to review things so thank you.

Chair Lew: Ok and Wynne.

Board Member Furth: Thank you. Well, I'm a word person so I want you to write less also. First drafts are always much longer than second drafts in things like this. I think Staff is talented, sophisticated and experienced and I think the documents show that. I love the bound volumes and now that I realize that my Adobe program will let me convert Staff reports to word documents and comment and edit on them online, you're lives are going to be hell. Actually, it's really helpful to me and probably helpful to the public too, if they want to do that. In order of importance, I would like the guidelines to emphasize what we need in order to make finding number one. Finding number one is about consistency with zoning and implacable special plans and guidelines. I often get the impression that the applicant hasn't read those documents. They didn't know they were downtown guidelines or south El Comino guidelines and sometimes I get the impression that people reviewing the document didn't know those guidelines exist either. I would suggest that you highlight not just the implacable zoning but another implacable SOFA I, SOFA II, whatever. Those documents are really helpful in design review because they're site specific. I mean I often – some of them are a bit old but zoning often frustrates us because it's numbers and squares and dimensions and it can get in the way of what we're trying to do. Where are the more qualitative characteristics of those documents, like SOFA I and SOFA II, help us understand the vision that we're supposed to be implementing here. So, I would like – I wrote – I'll give you my specific notes on that but I think that might help. I'm very support of the notion that we have scales on the drawings that work for the drawings in the size that we got them because I'm often sitting there trying to scale something off and am completely lost. I also want to say that on page two of your Staff report, you talk about basically a better checklist can make for a better and quicker process and I think that's true. I also think that initial intake is not at all mechanical. That's a skilled and time-consuming part of the job and much of what frustrates us, has to do with – for example, the quality of the drawing that we receive and so I'm all in favor of saying that this drawing – it may be a whatever but it doesn't provide the necessary information at that stage. I would of course prefer that we not have drawings that are – leave us trying to read (inaudible) type space – type face; very tiny typefaces. It particularly seems to be a problem with landscape work. For me, when a project, unlike this bridge, is on a street grid, it's very helpful if the elevations give me my street frontage because this town is not oriented to the Cardinal points and so

east, south, north, west isn't necessary accurate or revealing when you can say Addison. That would help me misread plans less and I think it would be helpful for the general public too. Sometimes I think it would be very helpful to have dimensions of open space but again, if we have an adequately described scale, we can figure that out ourselves. Sometimes the keying is inadequate so there are lines going across the drawings and no indication of what they represent. Some of the them are standardized and we can be expected to know what they are but maybe the general public can't and sometimes they are not standardized. I ask my more knowledgeable colleagues and they say, don't know what that is so that would be something to check to see how readable they are. On landscape planning and plans, one of the problems I have is trying to figure out what the vertical of the 3-dimensional experience of the landscaping is going to be so I end up looking up trees in western flora or something to try to figure out how high a particular plant is. They could of course, give us that information and sometimes they do. I mean, I think we got a set of plans from Stanford that had, they will grow to be this size, information on it but I tend to find the landscape information inadequate. It's very helpful to see an elevation or whatever, that shows me what 5-years out from now what this is going to look like. On a project in which landscaping is important, that information is important. One of the things that I hear in listening to my colleagues up here, who are not my professional colleagues, is that part of the problem that maybe people experience is about scale of the project, not the drawings. So, that what you require – so, that basically, we are supportive of Staff having flexibility to respond to the scale and nature of a project in terms of asking for more or less. That's risky for Staff because you make a judgement call that somebody may question but that might help. One last thing, sometimes the CEQA document says a project won't have an adverse aesthetic environmental impact. We know that because these documents – this project has to comply with a compatibility standards and the ARB will make sure that will happen. It says something very similar to that of the hotel project that is presently under review. In situations where the CEQA review finding of no aesthetic impact depends on us making accurate and supported findings based on that standard. I would like to have that called out because that makes me feel an extra level of pressure in thinking about that. I know that often the CEQA language is more complicated than that but if that's what we're counting on, we need to be reminded that that's what the project is counting on. The other thing that I am reminded of and I don't know what, in this case, the printing cost is. How useful color is in trying to understand documents? I mean, I end up hand coloring green for trees and red for existing but when I'm trying to figure out how, or a member of the public, is trying to figure out how new construction overlays existing footprints or where the green stuff is or isn't. Color is really helpful and sometimes we get plans that use that. I don't know when that makes economic sense but it does let you convey a great deal more of information. I believe that a 120 item condition lists are not helpful for us in reviewing a project unless you highlight with an alternative type those conditions which have been tailored to the project so I want to see that box or bold italic or something so I can get there fast and not get lost trying to understand things that I really don't need to understand. So, taking advantage of current technology by using highlighting, backstage attachments that we can go look at if we need to, that's all very helpful. Finally, I can't quite resist, I can tell when you've had time to edit reports and when you haven't and on this report, I would have liked to see a red line between version A and version B of these documents instead of trying to hold them up to the light. Sometimes – I don't think you highlighted the changes in your revised versions of the guidelines? The intake sheets? Yeah, track changes. Sometimes track changes is useless. I would not want you spending your time making it useful, that's too hard but in terms of pros, you say refine the submittal checklist will improve the consistency of information presented to the Board and enable Staff in taking the application to ensure that only complete applications are being received. This in turn may serve to reduce the amount of time that it takes to process applications. If you had more time, you would have said a better checklist can make for a better review – a better and faster review process. That's 10 – you know, that's half as much text so when you have time.

Mr. Lait: As we move onto our last set of comments. There's – I want the Board Members to sort of think about references to – if there is a differentiation that we should be thinking about for what's a big project? When do you want the 3-D modeling? Is it for all projects and what does that mean in terms of what are we asking for? We need to put something in print that the public is going to understand as far as what the need is so perhaps as we're hearing from the Chair's comments, if there can be some more thought to what are these fine lines where we're going to require something of one project but maybe

not of another project. What is that scale of the project that we're going to make that decision point on because again, we're trying to get to a clear place where your application is complete for filing because you satisfied these requirements. If we have a discretion where Staff is saying well, on this one we might need a 3-D rendering on this one. That creates some of the ambiguity as far as when is it complete or incomplete or things of that nature. Thank you.

Chair Lew: So, thank you to the Board. I think you guys made some comments and I don't have that many that haven't been mentioned already. I would want to follow up on Jonathan's point about the 3-D modeling. In a way, I expect everything to have some 3-D modeling these days because it's not that hard. There is some reluctance -- like in the architectural offices that I've worked at. There's some reluctance to release an image that's not perfect and beautiful and I think sometimes we just want to see -- I want to see the back of the building and I know it's not going to be as -- maybe it's not as nice as the front of the building or maybe it's just because of the viewpoint -- you know, it's in a built-up area, it's hard to get a really good image and the client may not want to spend the money on something on the back corner of the building but I think there are times that we've wanted to see it. I think on some projects -- recent projects, I think Kyu was asking for the back side of the building and we never got it and it was a big important project. I think on major projects, I think we should ask for at least two -- I don't know, front and back. I mean even on smaller projects, say like a more -- something more along the lines of a house or a duplex or something. Usually, the back neighbors what to know what the -- how their back yard is going to be affected so even on a small project, I would think that some kind of view from the back is warranted.

Ms. Gerhardt: I'm just wondering that there are many different vantage points too.

Chair Lew: Yeah, high or low.

Ms. Gerhardt: Bird's eye view versus pedestrian view. Is there...

Chair Lew: It's really -- that's a tough one. I mean a lot of the times other Cities do require it, like more of an eye level view from the neighbor back yard. I mean they ask for it and it's really hard to do them and to get something that looks good but I think that's the expectation from neighbors. We've had some -- a few models over the years -- it's sort of like a dying -- it's like a lost art now. We do get the occasionally. I would argue that the 3-D models are so much less expensive than a physical model in terms of the amount of time it takes. 3-D model, once you start doing all the fancy rendering it can get just as expensive but I think there are a lot of smaller projects -- you know, like three unit townhouses projects that have just done very simple sketch up level of 3-D views and they're not really -- they don't have the full on super realistic rendering. I think that those are -- at least for our -- for somebody whose use to looking at drawings, those are fine. Ok, so the things that I think that haven't quite been mentioned by others. Kyu mentioned the shadow -- shade and shadow studies and I think -- my take on it is that the Board has been inconsistent about when we want to see them and so those are sort of hit or miss. I think we should be more consistent about that if we can. The photographs -- context photographs are also sort of (inaudible) quality and I brought an example of a recent project. So, this is the High Street and Channing project but like these tiny little things and their gray and fuzzy. I don't even -- I don't spend any time looking at them so those aren't useful but the 3-D -- I think the simulations where they plunk in a drawing into the photograph, those are always helpful. There's -- we're often asked to weigh in on a neighbor's privacy next to a new project and we don't really have a great -- there isn't necessarily a great way of showing that. I think sometimes we ask for a site section after the fact; like after the first hearing. Maybe there is a way of getting that included at the beginning if we know that there's a mix use project going into -- next to a single-family house. The -- on lighting, I think this is a universal problem. It's not limited to Palo Alto but often times the sort of metric drawings are really hard to read and then sometimes they include the cut sheets and sometimes they don't. Sometimes they're on 8 ½ by 11 supplements or sometimes they put them in the drawings but it's inconsistent. I think most of the time they tend to put them in the drawings but not always. Often times what I find myself doing is going on the website and looking up the list of the model number and so I do my own research and find the virtue on my own, typically.

Ms. Gerhardt: All of that type of stuff we've definitely have been trying to get them more into the drawings because that way we know that they get to you. When they are sort of these loose other pieces, there's the potential that it doesn't get to you.

Chair Lew: Right and sometimes they change – and they change over time and stuff. So, that's what I have. Oh, and on Staff report, I think you guys have been doing a great job on Staff reports. I think that in years – a long time ago, I would say that Staff reports tended not to ever say anything negative about a project. If there was – if the Staff was unsure, they would just leave it unsure and wait to see what the Board thought about a project. I think it's fine for the Staff to express – to be opinionated and we can debate – and we can debate it. In the past, I think Staff was asking me about where the little tables – the zoning compliance tables useful and I actually do use those a lot on the complicated projects. Like a project that has multiple zonings on it or like a project on El Comino, where our zoning on El Comino has so many footnotes. That I actually don't really know – I don't really know what the code requires unless I read every footnote or whatever so the tables are useful in those instances. Then I think I would just say that often times when I'm reading the Staff reports, I'm always thinking shorter but that -- I've been reading them for a long time. Sometimes on very complicated projects, I really like reading through all of them so yeah, I don't think there's generally a problem with them. So, that's all that I have. I think you guys are on the right track. I think everything is good. Do you have any other – Wynne?

Board Member Furth: Thank you. I had two comments, one is on when do we need more 3-dimensionality or information? It doesn't seem to me to be about the size of the proposed structure but more about where it is. It's about – I find that it's most needful when it's going to be tucked in with existing developments so you can build a very large building in the Stanford Research Park with enormous setbacks and I can get a lot of information from relatively simple -- they're probably actually all very expensive but I never feel that we're short of information but if you're going to put something in SOFA I or II, if you're going to put it downtown, if you're going to put it in the more built up section off California, then it gets really complicated as to how it relates to its surroundings. Then I feel like I need more information from more sides because it's going to be viewed and have impacts from more points of view. Another thing which I don't know how to deal with is when we get a context photograph of El Comino Real, it's not accurate. It's what's there now and it's not what's been approved in the last 6-months and I'd really like to see a photo montage that maybe we have that shows me what does this block or this set of blocks look like as approved. Not as what's there because I mean I'm asking – I'm supposed to compare it to Foot Locker and – but it's not going to be Foot Locker so I felt like I have no way to see how those buildings flow and of course, we know that our experience hasn't been universally positive in that regard. Also with respect to shadows, when I was reading the draft DIR for the hotels, it had a very specific definition of what kind of shadowing constitutes an impact. I don't know where that standard is from, how useful you think it is and what settings? I mean I think it – for example, we might need to look at it more carefully if they are shading a children's play yard, than if they are shading somebodies parking lot. It would be useful to have more information about that and if we have CEQA standards that applicants look at, that we're supposed to have, that would be really helpful to know about because I don't want to go (inaudible) off on excessive shadowing if the City already has a standard that says that's ok.

Board Member Baltay: Can I?

Chair Lew: Yes, Peter.

Chair Lew: I want to give Jonathan a response to the question that he asked about the 3-D stuff. In my opinion, every project that comes to the Board – a major ARB, should have 3-D renderings included. I suggest that you ask for a minimum of three and you provide a statement along the lines of the intended of the 3-D rendering is to show two things; the basic design intent of the building and two, the way it fits into its context. Then you have to leave it up to the applicant to decide whether they show trees and cars and people. Whether it's from the sky or from the ground but that's what we're trying to get them to

show. You might off the record say that we're not looking for photo realistic renderings. It doesn't have to be polished. Straight out of their CAD program is fine but the more the better generally.

Chair Lew: On 3-D renderings, also the other thing that always comes up internally with architectural offices is how to show the landscape. So, the architects are in charge of the project, right? They usually eliminate some of the trees in the landscape to show off the building and I think from the City's point of view is that we actually want to see everything, all together. If the architect chooses to show an additional image with the edited landscape, I think that's fine but I think that we should see it as it's designed. Give them the option of doing more drawings.

Mr. Lait: Does the ghosting of the (inaudible) (crosstalk)?

Chair Lew: Ghosting works but I've noticed on projects like a lot of Page Mill Road projects, they are actually just cutting out trees. They're just not – they're just not showing – they are illuminating them altogether. I think that's just – it's just not – for the public consumption it should be accurate. Ok, are we done? Should we move onto the minutes?

[Board move to approval of the minutes]

- 3. Highway 101 Pedestrian/Bicycle Overpass and Adobe Creek Reach Trail Project [17PLN-00086]:** Preliminary Architectural Review of a Proposal for an Overpass Structure Near San Antonio Road, and Trail, and Reconfiguration of the Adjacent Parking Lot at 3600 West Bayshore Road. Environmental Assessment: Not a Project. Formal Application will be Subject to CEQA and NEPA Review. Zoning Districts: Public Facilities PF (D), ROLM, GM. For more information, contact the project planner Claire Hodgkins at claire.hodgkins@cityofpalto.org.

Chair Lew: So, we have – Claire, can we have the Staff report for – oh, I should announce the item, right? It's item number three, which is highway 101 pedestrian/bicycle overpass and Adobe Creek Reach Trail Project. Preliminary architectural review of a proposal for an overpass structure near San Antonio Road, and Trail, and reconfiguration of the adjacent parking lot at 3600 West Bayshore Road. Environmental assessment is it's not a project. A formal application will be subject to CEQA and NEPA Review and the zone districts are PF (D), ROLM, and GM. We have Claire Hodgkins and yes?

Ms. Jodie Gerhardt: Yes, I would just like to note that Board Member Baltay has arrived. Thank you.

Ms. Claire Hodgkins, Project Planner: Good morning, Board Members. I'm Claire Hodgkins and I'm the project planner for this project. As you mentioned, the project before you today are the 101 bicycle/pedestrian overpass and Adobe Reach Trail Project and I just want to reiterate that today is a preliminary study session only so no action is recommended. The proposed bridge across Highway 101, between east Oregon Express Way and San Antonio Road overcrossing. The purpose is to provide a year-round bicycle/pedestrian connect between commercial and residential uses west of Highway 101 and the walking and biking trails on – in the Bay Lands east of Highway 101. It also completes the Adobe Creek Reach Trail out to East Meadow Drive. Just to give you a brief summary of the zoning context. The project actually crosses four separate parcels within four different zoning districts so it includes the PFD zone on the Bay Land side – on the east side of the east approach. It crosses over the PF zone as it crosses over Highway 101. It crosses the ROLM zone as it goes through and over Google's property and over Adobe Creek. Then it's within the GM zone for the pathway along Adobe Creek out to East Meadow Drive. Following – oops. Following the study session and a study session with the Planning and Transportation Commission, the City Public Works engineering division will apply for a site and design review, which requires that the project goes to ARB and PTC for the recommendation and then to City Council for final approval of the project. Because there have been several previous hearings on this

project, Staff wants to note that through previous meetings and hearings, Council has already selected the alignment of the bridge, the type of the structure and the budget for the structure. So, we may discuss these things today to give context to the project but we want to focus the discussion today on a few key items so I've put those up here. Staff really hopes to obtain your input on this list of items, which has been outlined as well in the Staff report. If there are any questions, I'm available but I'll turn it over to you guys again. We're recommending that you hear from Public Works Engineering next.

Chair Lew: Great and you have a presentation? I think we allow – normally allow 10-minutes for that and then, my understanding is that there was a video as well and so if you need a little bit more time for the video, I think that's fine. We don't have a huge agenda today so we can allow you a couple more minutes if you need it.

Mr. Roy Schnabel: How do I get out?

Ms. Hodgkins: do you want to start with the...

Mr. Schnabel: Yeah, so we'll start with the video, it's already pulled up. [Board watched a short video] Ok, so, my name is Roy Schnabel, I'm with Biggs Cardosa Associates and we're the consultants selected to basically provide this project for the City. I want to start with this image, which is basically the image of the existing creek bridge on the Bay Trail; on the east Bay Shore side. The reason I provided this is to provide some context. We're doing a similar bridge on the other side and so basically, these bridges – this prefabricated, self-weathering, steel bridges are going to be bookends to the POC structure that crossed over 101. Basically, it provides us with some of the contexts which we use to define some of the architectural vocabularies for this project. With that, I would like to try it over to Claudia, who is our project architect. She can talk – discuss some of that vocabulary.

[Ms. Claudia ??:] Good morning, my name is Claudia (inaudible) from [FMGR] Architects and I'm working with Roy and Ms. [Cardosa] on providing the architectural elements for the project. Like Roy mentioned, we took some clues from the surrounding environment. We took them up to develop a theme for this – for these projects and we believe that the architectural theme for – and the approach for these projects would be an industrial look. We're proposing a self-weathering steel that – and the railing to be treated like galvanized steel. However, the base (inaudible) you see includes a chain link – a vinyl coated chain link railing. Within those cost perimeters, we're looking for these (inaudible) alternatives that can meet the budget but they can also give a more enhanced look to the railing treatment so these are some of the options that we're looking at. One of them is a welded wire mesh, which I think it can be used on the main span of the bridge where the railing needs to be an 8-foot high railing and the mesh really needs to be close to a 1-inch square. In addition to that, we are proposing to use a similar mesh on the rest of the railing, outside of the roadways. That railing needs to be about 48-inches high and for that, we would like to propose a similar mesh that perhaps is treated differently -- (inaudible) differently but still within the perimeters of the cost. One of the areas that we're looking for an enhanced treatment is – so, this slide here shows what our standard detail for the railing – the 48-inch railing would be. We're also proposing to treat some of the vertical surfaces – concrete surfaces with a foam liner, that will give it an interesting look to the concrete in the sense that it gives some texture and the texture itself will give an impressed that it's a different color where we have the foam liner. These are some of the enhancements and the different treatments. So, the railing, one of the options that we're looking at is the cable railing and perhaps that can be used in there overlook area. We feel that the overlook is where people are actually going to be stopping and looking at the Bay Lands so they are going to be able to enjoy it more and the experience. In working perhaps, with the artists, this is one area where we are looking into enhancing the railing. We're also proposing a different type of flooring and one of the alternatives is to use some of the recycle wood for the floor. Perhaps install it in a different so it gives a different look and warmer and inviting feeling. That's it. Roy will continue to talk about the additional features.

Mr. Schnabel: We have several connections and where the pedestrians and bicyclists sort of co-mingling with some of the existing trailheads. The first one is the trail head at the Bay Trail on the Bay Lands side and it's adjacent to the East Bay Shore Road. Based on the -- we simply had a 'T' intersection here and

based on some input from the PRC, they wanted us to take a look at providing a little bit more safer connection here so we envisioned doing this as a traffic circle. Traffic circles are the thing now for traffic calming so it has the potential to slow down the speeds, it's traffic calming and it has improved safety. The City has a bike project in and around this area that is also installing traffic circles and crosswalks and raised sidewalks so the sort of fits into that same theme. With regards to that, we've talked to Chris over at transportation for some of the cues for both the traffic circle and there's a potential for a raised curb as well. The second trail head is at the Adobe Reach – Adobe Creek Reach Trail and at the end of the POC structure and basically, there are not a lot of opportunities here for changes. It's totally controlled by the requirements of the Santa Clara Valley Water District. They want a very wide, open, flat surface because they do – they stage a lot of their maintenance equipment here when they are doing their maintenance. They don't want anything that they're going to damage and have to replace so they are very sensitive to just something that is very resilient and very, very open. The third trailhead is the one at Meadow Drive and here's the potential to utilize – there's going to be a crosswalk here and potentially do a raised crosswalk to provide addition safety to both the bicyclists and pedestrians that are utilizing it. We also have several areas for landscaping. The landscaping is predominantly replacement landscaping so we're going to affect these areas and this area includes a bio-retention area to collect water, to filtrate it and then treat it before it enters into the storm drain system. This can also be planted over but basically, we're going to – this area is predominantly non-native grasses or non-native landscaping and we're going to replace it with native grasses. We're also planning to utilize the area close to the channel – to the creek to plant some of the replacement plantings that we have with some native trees. We can't put them into the Bay Lands area because the Bay Lands guidelines want a wide-open space so we figured that we would put it there; adjacent to the riparian area and get some native plantings there. The other area is basically where we're affecting a number of trees in the landscaping areas on the Google lot. We're realigning their entrance and replacing their existing parking slots. The darken configuration there is basically a revised parking scheme for them. Then, with the affected trees, we're planting additional landscaping trees in and around the triangle and their landscaping buffer. Lighting, basically for the lighting, this will consist of a variety of high efficient LED lighting. It will be in the warmer colors because that's more sensitive to the wildlife that we'll also be addressing. That will consist of both pole, rail mounted, hand rail mounted, and edge mounted and marker puck style fixtures. We're basically, from right to left, we're transferring from a very urban setting, which is fairly well lit, over to an open space area which is not light as well as that other side. Our goal is to – for the illumination levels to focus on the functional path and making sure we have the correct illumination for the path; for safety reasons. We also want to minimize any impacts of light pollution, especially to the Bay Lands, the creeks and to the traveling public on Highway 101 so we have to be very sensitive to those three distinct areas. We will also have lighting controls and the lighting controls will allow the lights to dim during low usage and it will since somebody coming and then power up to the high levels for safety reasons. This is a rendering of what the lighting would look like and it shows the difference between pole lighting, photometric and the rail lighting photometric. Definitely the pole there is spaces out larger distance and they are broader. The rail lighting once is denser and more frequent so they tend to be more expensive. Then for amenities, Council has approved for us do some enhanced amenities but we've discovered that we have some very limited amenity opportunities here. The only locations that we really can effectively do the amenities are at the trails heads and there's not a lot of opportunities to expand on those amenities. We're going to try to keep it as low key as possible on both trail heads. With that, questions?

Chair Lew: Ok, so we'll get to the questions in a minute. I think what we normally do is open up the hearing to the public so we do have – I think we have one speaker. Again, it's Shani Kleinhaus and you have 5-minutes.

Ms. Kleinhaus: Shani Kleinhaus again for – speaking for Santa Clara Valley Audubon Society and a couple of things as a resident. The easy, there is still no dog water pictures on the fountains so dogs are thirsty too. Things from the Audubon, I think it would be good to allow structures under the bridge in areas that don't have a lot of traffic of people underneath for Swallow. Swallow will probably look for places to nest and instead of looking at that as a nuisance, we can incorporate that as some kind art into the bridge in areas where – when they poop, it doesn't bother people so maybe you can look into that. This is a confluence of two creeks and the Bay Lands. It's a really important area for nature and I think that's

probably why the previous bridge did not get through. This one is more sensitive and that's wonderful but I would really like to see part of this design to look at the creeks and see where can we enhance trees along the creek corridors. While trees are not necessarily wanted in the Bay Lands, anywhere that you can plant them in the creek corridors and maybe in those swells, would be good. Water from here doesn't really have to go into a drainage system. It can be a self-contained thing in the Bay Lands. It's already a wetland, part of it and very wet. Here, some of that plain area may get flooded so use that in that way and make nature part of this design because there is an opportunity here. It may be a little bit more difficult but maybe consult a biologist but bring somebody who can really bring nature and combine the bridge with its setting and not just oh, where doing this and – the grasses are not that important there; trees are. When you have planting opportunities, look for those and really consider nature is that something that we really need there and those Eucalyptus will probably need to be removed. It should probably be replaced with Sycamores and Cotton Wood because those are the trees that grew there before. Willows, a willow grove in the swell would be absolutely perfect in that area so maybe you can consider that. In the bio-retention basin, instead of native grasses – LEDs are not good for birds, even the warmer colors, and lower intensities so you have to be really careful with that or potentially think about not doing LED in those areas. I guess – and otherwise, I'm glad this is moving forward. Thank you.

Chair Lew: If there are no other speakers we will move onto Board Member questions and I'll close the public hearing. Wynne.

Board Member Furth: I just had one question, we got a – the Board received an email from Roy Snyder, raising some issues and I wonder if Staff could respond to them. I wasn't exactly following everything he said. (Inaudible)...

Ms. Gerhardt: Microphone.

Board Member Furth: ...which I think is not in our purview but some of it was about immediately implementing the West Side Trail so if you could just take me through what he was saying so I will understand. Oh, it was printed out.

Ms. Hodgkins: It's not in here it doesn't look like. I believe if I remember correctly as I look through this comment. This comment was basically, talking about how – he has a lot of concerns about the bike trail along West Bay Shore Road and he really wanted to see – let's see, hold on. So, he doesn't want the overlook, that was one of the things that he mentioned.

Board Member Furth: It was his comments about safety and access and I was trying to figure out his concerns related to the proposal, which appeared to me to address his concerns but I wasn't sure.

Ms. Hodgkins: Yeah, sure. If you would like to. I think – what I will say is that the project actually does the things that he's looking to do, which is to connect – to have a bike trail that is separated from West Bay Shore Road and connects out to East Meadow Drive so that you're not continuing immediately adjacent to the traffic. Maybe you can say a little bit more than but I think that's...

Mr. Schnabel: Yeah, I think he also has some concerns with regards to the bicycles on its – outside the limits of this project. Basically, connecting to the trail that's behind the Google building and looking for improvements to access that trail, which is basically outside the scope of this project.

Board Member Furth: Thank you.

Mr. Schnabel: So, he sent us some of that information and we're reviewing it to see what can be incorporated. Especially, with regards to the right-of-way access and the easements in the Google parking lot.

Board Member Furth: Thank you.

Chair Lew: Peter.

Board Member Baltay: Good morning. Two quick questions if I could. First simply, is there more detail on the light pole? The proposed design of that pole. All I see in the rendering is that it just seems like a pole with something on top.

Mr. Schnabel: (Inaudible)

Board Member Baltay: So, it's the one on the left here?

Mr. Schnabel: (Inaudible)

Vice Chair Kim: If you could speak – turn on your mic when you speak. Thank you.

Mr. Schnabel: Oh, I'm sorry. It's 12-foot high but it has – at the top you can actually mount additional extensions. 4-foot – I think they are 4-foot increments so you could raise the increment of or the height of the poles. We're trying to keep it as low as possible so we're envisioning utilizing the 12-foot. The light fixture on the top can also be extended. Utilizing multiples so you can actually add more of those cones at the top which contains the light fixture. If you need a deeper, more bright light but we're only envisioning one. Our goal is to sort of focus the light onto the pathways and prevent some of the – any pollution outside of the fixture.

Board Member Baltay: Ok, thank you. The second question is that I know that this is not something that we're looking to change but just for the record, as I go up and down 101, it seems that every bridge is a pre-cast concrete structure. When I talk to my son who's an engineer, he says dad, why aren't they doing it out of concrete? It would be cheaper so can you just address that for the record. Why do you choose the steel trusses?

Mr. Schnabel: There are several reasons and the first reason is that one of the things that we were trying to avoid was a column at the center of the freeway. The freeway had just gone through an HOV lane expansion. That is going to be also revised to an express lane in the future by the VTA and so there is potentially some construction that is going to occur in the median. Placing a column in the median would of basically, taken away those HOV lanes for the period of the construction of the bend in the middle. One of the ways to mitigate that is to span across it. So, once you get into the longer span structures, you tend to go to different types of structures. Obviously, you could still do a concrete structure but the problem with the concrete structure is that the depth exists below the deck and that increases the profile so basically, you're having to travel to a higher distance. We have some very challenging profile issues with regards to this project. One of the main ones is to get underneath the high voltage P (inaudible) lines and provide enough clearance. Right now, we're providing the exact clearance requirement there, while meeting the ADA requirements. Then for longer span structures, such as this one, where we're looking 160-foot span. Steel actually becomes cheaper and cost effective than concrete so it had multiple reasons and as a result, we picked the most cost effective and most engineering wise solution here.

Board Member Baltay: Thank you.

Chair Lew: I have a question. Will you – the Staff report mentions signage as something that the Board should comment on and I don't recall seeing anything. I was wondering if you could explain the thinking on signage at the moment?

Mr. Schnabel: Yeah, we haven't gotten to the point where we're addressing signage. We've started to get input from the different discipline areas in the City with regards to what they would like to see signed. We're looking at normal traffic signs – just a standard traffic sign. At this point, we know we'll have to do something a little bit more special for the trail head areas, especially, because there's a confluence of both pedestrians and bicyclists. The traffic circle will definitely have signs indicating what the traffic circle will be but we're looking at basic green signs with white markings for those. We also have an artist on

board and one of the things that may be incorporated – one of the ideas that were kicked around was potentially doing some kind of specialized sign both describing the bridge. We also have informational signage and educational signage on the overlook. We haven't done a full rendering of all of those things and I think one of the things that we want to do is basically input what we should see on those, especially, that educational signage. Do we want it to refer to the Bay Lands? Do we want it to refer to Palo Alto? Do we want it to refer to the birds and the wildlife? The salt harvest mouse, which is a – marsh mouse, which is the species of concern in this area. We'd like some input as to what, in general, that will reflect.

Chair Lew: Thank you and I think Robert has a question.

Board Member Gooyer: Yeah, I have one question. On the front page of the drawing, it's basically – obviously, you have three sections of truss and on this one, they are connected but yet in other drawings in here and also on your video, there are three distinct trusses.

Mr. Schnabel: Yes.

Board Member Gooyer: So, which is it?

Mr. Schnabel: There are three – there will be three distinct trusses.

Board Member Gooyer: So, this is not correct, the front page of this drawing?

Mr. Schnabel: I don't see what you have. That is correct. We will –

Board Member Gooyer: That's what I am talking about. Is that there's a link right here, that shows on this but doesn't show on a couple of others and doesn't show in your video so I wanted to...

Mr. Schnabel: Yeah, those are – that's a non-structural link and that was one of the first renderings we did and so obviously, it makes sense to – if we could do a continuous because the less joints you have, the better it is for the bicyclists and pedestrians.

Board Member Gooyer: No, I mean I understand its non-structural but I mean, it will be there. That's the intent?

Mr. Schnabel: Yeah, I – it should have a flow where it looks like an integrated structure from an architectural standpoint.

Board Member Gooyer: Ok, that's all I needed. Thank you.

Vice Chair Kim: I have a quick question. It mentions a vinyl clad fencing and I – could you just clarify where the vinyl clad fencing occurs?

Mr. Schnabel: So, the vinyl clad fencing is something that – when we were first looking at this project, it was to develop cost effective solutions and chain link fencing is probably the most cost effective solution out there. We thought we would – the original vision was to paint the bridge and to have the vinyl clad fencing echo the painting of that. We sort of – since that time, we've sort of rethought the industrial look and we thought that the self-weathering steel would probably be a better, cheaper, maintenance-friendly solution and now we're looking at more of a galvanized finish. What Claudia has done is looked at costs similar fencing materials that can still meet the cost factor that the Council wanted us to achieve but also was more integrated with the design vocabulary that we're sort of utilizing in other parts of the structure. Then, we're also looking at potentially utilizing maybe two or three different types of fencing details. We definitely want to look at the overlook as something different, especially, with the integration of some art in those areas.

Chair Lew: Ok, any other questions Kyu?

Vice Chair Kim: No.

Chair Lew: Ok, so let's move onto Board Member comments and again, this is just preliminary. It's coming back to us later once it's an official project. Anybody want to start? Wynne?

Board Member Furth: Thank you. Well, I must say, I look forward to seeing this and using this. It's nice to have a project which is essentially about pleasure. I had a couple of questions and comments. I am glad you're looking at weathering steel. The thought of people repainting that thing constantly is not a good one and I also like the way that it looks. I certainly think that it sounds like its providing good accommodations for birds and dogs. This is a good idea that should be pursued unless it conflicts with some other serious problem. I'm pleased that you're doing replanting. I actually think grasses are pretty important but -- I think there is a member of the public trying to talk to Staff. I am -- I never knew that the underpass commemorated Mr. [Lekovic] but if this is a commemorative underpass and it's going to be replaced, I hope that when we do the replacing, we don't obliterate the commemoration. On the benches, I was out hiking in Edgewood last week and one of the people who was hiking on the trail was severely crippled with osteoporosis and hiking with a walker. It reminded me that people make great efforts to use places that are at least moderately accessible like this but they need places to rest and benches with no backs or handrails are not places to rest for people who have difficulty standing. Although flat benches look great, they do a disservice to some of the people who should be able to use this place and who will enjoy using it. I hope you can find something that will both accommodate that group of people which actually, includes most of us at some time or another. I was struck by Debra Baldwin's query about the height of the fencing over the freeway and the risks that can pose for facilitating impulsive self-destruction. We have a sad history in that regard in this community and we certainly have all seen the great efforts that the Bay Areas has had to go to, to try to retrofit structures when they become areas that people seek out when they are in great distress. I would like to hear from Staff and when we see this again, how we're going to address that issue because I think we need too. Also, when you present this again, it would be really helpful to have a clear train map. We don't have a very clearly labeled trail map in the actual -- the big -- this thing. The Master Plan does not clearly identify the trails particularly as they exist now so a schematic that makes it easier for those of us who don't really know where these trails and trail heads are would be great. Similarly, it's helpful to have the simulation of the overcrossing but again, if you're not familiar with it, you can't figure out where the overcrossing is going to go so just a little sketch there would be helpful. Thank you.

Chair Lew: Kyu.

Vice Chair Kim: Yeah, thank you. I also look forward to using this bridge, as it is kind of in my neighborhood and also driving by it and under it. I think I'm in favor of going with the self-weathering finish materials and without having to paint anything. Just really letting the materials speak for themselves and be as natural as possible to also go along with the Bay Lands design guidelines. I think currently as is, there may be too many types of fencing. I appreciate that you're looking at different ways to go about that but I think maybe just a different fencing at the overlook area and then a consistent fencing throughout will kind of simplify things. That probably will just be enough, rather than having too many different types of fencing. One thing that I don't think you spent too much presenting was the Adobe Creek Reach Trail. I think that's a critical component of this project as a whole and I think that also needs to move forward along with this project. I hope that they're concurrent because I think there's a large safety concern right now with bicyclists and pedestrians going along West Bay Shore where it turns into Fabian as is. I like the light fixtures that have been chosen. Originally, I had some concerns about the pole fixtures but it does look like from the cut sheet that you briefly presented and the way that you had explained it, that some of the light pollution concerns that I had will probably take care of themselves. I think overall, I'm with a lot of the public in that I really want to see this bridge move forward. We've been through a long process so design competitions and looking at different alternatives. I think it's just a matter of people needing to use it and getting over but looking at this design, while I think it gets the job done. I -- it just looks really massive in certain areas and I'm just wondering if there

is a way that we can engineer that so that perhaps some of the steel members can either be reduced or to appear less bulky than it currently is. Overall, I'm in favor of the path that the bridge takes, the connections, the trail heads and I'm also very much in favor of that traffic circle at the eastern trailhead. I think that would be -- the presented drawing of the eastern trailhead looked a little odd to me in the way that it flared out like that but I think the traffic circle takes care of that quite nicely. Perhaps enclosing -- this doesn't have to be answered now. It can be mentioned later but I was just curious to know what the future of the Adobe Creek Trail is on the western side of this bridge? I know that in the past -- even the City Manager has set up a temporary area of the Adobe Creek Trail but I think eventually if that were to become a larger trail through this neighborhood of Palo Alto. How does that Adobe Creek Trail tie into the Reach Trail and the pedestrian bridge?

Chair Lew: Robert.

Board Member Gooyer: Thank you. Yeah, this has been a very long process it seems like. I was here when we went through the whole design competition and although I haven't designed a whole lot of bridges, it was pretty obvious that the designs that we had were quite incredible but I was amazed at the -- just thinking to myself about what the numbers would be. I'm not surprised that they came in over budget but unfortunately, with this, all I keep hearing is cheaper and cost effective and it's almost the extreme opposite end. The biggest thing I have a problem with is the way it's set. It's obviously three separate trusses that are -- and there's no real integration between the three of them. I would like to see -- even -- that's why I said with the -- as you said, the non-structural link. I'd -- rather than it budding straight in, I'd like to see it curve so that it's a continuous line at the top of the actually trusses. Even if that means that the -- yeah, ok. Exactly, it's that sort of thing that, I'd rather see it flow. The reality of it is that I can't imagine it would be that much more expensive to cut those non-structural pieces with a bend in them, then -- so that they actually flow better. The -- I mean I understand, there have been a lot of these bridge type thing built and it is a very ecumenical, logical system; it gets very open. There is one, obviously, that I'm sure we've all seen driving into San Francisco and this is the blue one right near Hospital Curve. It's been there for, I don't know, 40-years or something but I mean it -- and it's still doing well. The only problem I have with this -- well, let me back up. A bridge like this or a truss system like this on a small bridge in a forest or this or even on the trail heads, the core ten or the rusted steel is, I think appropriate. Going across a freeway, I just don't think it works. I don't like the -- looking down and seeing this sort of brown bridge going across. Here, I'd rather see a -- some sort of a painted system. There's enough to make it a little bit more urbanized, I guess if you want to call it. I understand that it's a bicycle trail and going from a two-way -- a wetlands area but that doesn't to me, have to look like something that belongs in a forest somewhere because it's not. It's crossing an eight-lane freeway. It -- like I said, those would be my two main comments. To make the thing a little smoother and also just get away -- it's too rustic, the way that it is right now.

Chair Lew: And Peter.

Board Member Baltay: Thank you and good morning. Right off the bat, I wonder if I could just pass this sketch to the Board Members and the forward. I share exactly Roberts comments about on the main principle span, where the two trusses join. I find it very problematic to have the square- Pratt truss sort of bumping into the bottom of the bowstring truss and then have this filler piece of metal on top, that doesn't have any architectural integration. I made a -- so, the sketch that I have shown essentially a curve top of the bowstring truss, which engineering wise would work just fine, an alternative which is what's been done historically. That's to use three bowstring trusses so that at the point of zero moments, on top of the span, they're right down to zero again. The trusses are arching out of that. In any case, I don't want the sketch to be seen as trying to design it but rather to convey an idea that I think that juncture of the trusses on the principle span needs a little bit more refinement from a design point of view. It is important too -- I understand to keep the cost down but this is going to be there a long time and this is not a large ticket change of cost kind of thing. A little more effort on that design element, I think will be successful. If we could get that sketch to the -- I like the idea of the self-weathering steel, although I'm cognizant of Robert's comments about this being a bridge over a very urban area. I think it

would nice to know which is going to be more cost effective over time. If it needs to be painted every 10-years, that's something the City doesn't always do and then having a structure that's rusting defective.

Board Member Gooyer: It will be rusty anyway and (inaudible).

Board Member Baltay: Well, then I'd rather have it be naturally self-rusting. I think there is some merit to saying that this is a pedestrian bridge and a link to the Bay Lands. So, the more earthy, a naturalist of the self-weathering steel is appropriate. I think in the end, I would support the self-weathering steel approach. I think that the traffic circle intersection of the East Bay Shore Trail is a very nice enhancement and that should be kept. It really has a very nice appeal to it about how the bike riders and pedestrians might interact at that juncture. On the overlook, I find that the wood surfacing is a very nice detail. That just sets off enough that this is a separate spot where you don't bike ride through it and it just looks really nice in your renderings and I encourage you to keep that idea. Perhaps on the railing, just put a wood cap on the railing and keep the rest of the railing. I share Vice Chair Kim's concern that you have so many types of the railing. A simpler refinement, less is more, might carry the day again. Just consider putting a wood cap or some other warmer detail on it. On the railing as well, I've had bad luck with stretched cable railing being durable over time. There's something about those connections that loosen and just a slight shift in the bridges structure; shifting over thermal changes or something. The cables sag, they are not safe, they look sloppy and they are really hard to fix. I've had great luck trying to go a step above chain link by using welded wire fabric meshes. Any welding company can put them into any shape of a grid, you paint them and they last forever. They just look really nice when you detail them out and they are cost effective. Whereas a chain link fence, it's really hard to put lipstick on it and pull it off. I'd urge you guys to – again if you have to stretch your budget or get rid of some of the amenities, make a railing that is simple, consistent and durable. I think the welded wire mesh or fabric is a good choice and a good way to do that. One thought I had was to try to get you to integrate that mesh with the bowstring and other trusses across the span. In other words, make it go maybe the full height of the truss, rather than introducing that line at the top of the fence. It's an 8-foot railing line, which is an arbitrary height but rather you could just let it fill in all the panels of the truss completely. It would look a lot nicer and I bet it's not more expensive really. Again, it's just something to think about in integrating the smaller detail into it. My last comment has to do with the lighting pole which I don't find attractive or appropriate to the design that you are doing. It's a very urban integrated thing and you'd expect to see that on some commercial office building in downtown San Francisco. I'm reminded that every time I walk across the Golden Gate Bridge, the light fixtures are so wonderful there. They came out of the design of the rest of the bridge. That sort of eye beam that splits and curves and hang over the road, it's an iconic thing. When you really think about it, it's the small things like the railing and the light fixtures that the public experiences and sees as they go over this bridge. The shape of the trusses is something that pretty much only drivers racing by wouldn't really notice these things but the lights are really important actually. These curved poles to me -- is that there's something about when the light is coming down, you want the fixture to arch or cap or do something geometrically to express what it's trying to do. What you've got is a pole with a clever arrangement of reflectors and it just, to me at least, doesn't sort of carry the day – carry the weight of what you want to do. There must be some other way that you could design that to integrate the design style with the rest of the bridge and perhaps give a visual clue as to what it's trying to do. I support what you're doing and I want to see this go forward as fast as possible. If there's any additional help that the ARB could do to make it go fast, I certainly support that. That's the end of my comments, thank you.

Board Member Gooyer: I just wanted to comment that I agree completely. I think the fencing should work better with the truss itself so that you don't have – like this section, you've got basically three – you've got the truss, you've got the fencing, you've got the hand rail. I think it's just too much or it doesn't need to be. Also, the light fixture, I agree completely that it just seems like – I guess maybe it's a very effective solution in the evening on what you're trying to do but in the day time, it looks like they're going to put light poles up and they are not done yet or something or whatever these sort of – they look like light bollards that I've got in front of my office building, only with a 10-foot extension on them.

Chair Lew: Ok, thank you. We do have one last speaker which is Penny Elson and you have 5-minutes.

Ms. Penny Elson: Thank you. I wanted to point out that your Staff report was not – the link wasn't live so I came to the meeting and had to read while I was sitting here. I'm a user of the Lefkowitz tunnel right now. In fact, my whole family does. We are a family of hikers and bird watchers and bicyclists. My husband regularly uses the Lefkowitz tunnel, when it's open, to bicycle to his job in Sunnyvale from south Palo Alto. My daughter and my husband and I do a lot of bird watching out on the Bay Lands in the wee hours so we understand the need for light out there for walkers. I heard your comments earlier about how long this had taken and in fact, my history with this project goes back about 10-years. We had to advocate for the grant funding that was lost because this took so much time. Many people worked on this for a long time before we ever got to the phase you were talking about earlier. I have to say that speed is important here because my husband bikes to work in Sunnyvale. When that tunnel is closed, he is forced to surface streets and many – I have many other bicycling friends who have the same problem. They are forced to streets like Middlefield and Mountain View and Sunnyvale to get to jobs that are south of here. In the winter, when visibility is poor and the streets are wet, cars become a real risk factor for bicyclists. They need to get off the streets. This connector will get them to Bay trails that provide regional connections. This is part of a regional bicycle plan. It's not just about getting the walkers out there. It's about getting commuters safely to work in the south. Let's see, I don't want to take all of my full 5-minutes. I just want to say to expedite this. I mean, move this thing forward. We've been waiting a very long time; 10-years I've been working on this, personally. I get that it's been a few years from your perspective but for those of us who've been trying to make this thing move forward for a long time, we've had some losses. Hard work that we did get lost because of these delays and I'd like to see this thing move forward so that the people who are bicycling – who are helping us all by bicycling; getting our streets less congested and helping our environment. I hope we can provide a safe, regional connection for all of these people from Palo Alto and who are commuting into our community from other communities that connect to those Bay trails. Thank you very much for the work that you do. We appreciate it. I heard many thoughtful comments today but I hope that we can move this forward. Let's work with Staff to expedite it. Thank you.

Chair Lew: Thank you and Wynne?

Board Member Furth: Thank you. I just wanted to say to Staff, when I raised Debra Baldwin's comment about safety for suicides. I wasn't making the case – trying to make the case that you haven't already address that. I would just like to discuss that and how you've addressed that and why you think it's adequate when we go forward.

Chair Lew: Ok, so I have – I think the Board has made really good comments today. I think I agree with most of them and I have a couple other comments. One is regarding the traffic circle and so one is that is there a way to connect that path to East Bay Shore? There are different types of bicyclists, right? There is bicyclist who will not ride on the bike path because the user is too slow so they want to be out in traffic and they are comfortable with that. Is there a way of connecting there or are we limited to the existing connection, which is – what do you call it? South of the bridge of the existing bike trail bridge. Then...

Ms. Hodgkins: I'm not sure I totally understand the question?

Chair Lew: Yeah, so there is a little ridge that crosses the creek on east – just to the east of East Bay Shore.

Ms. Hodgkins: Ok.

Chair Lew: Yeah, if we could get a map, maybe that would be useful.

Male: So, the existing entrance is right here.

Chair Lew: Yeah, I think that's...

Ms. Hodgkins: Like the...

Chair Lew: Right, so there's a...

Male: I was talking to Claire. So, he's talking about the existing entrances here...

Ms. Hodgkins: Ok.

Male: ...and he's wondering if we could incorporate an entrance in here as part of this so that -- as an alternative to that.

Chair Lew: I think this is kind of a dangerous area because the bridge is narrow – the roadway bridge is a little narrower, right? So, the bicycles have to sort of go into the traffic and so it's not an ideal situation in my mind but I'm thinking that there are people who would want that. (Inaudible) if that could be evaluated.

Mr. Schnabel: Yeah and we can take a look at it. One of the things that the bike lane sort of disappears, right?

Chair Lew: Yeah, that's what I under – I totally understand.

Mr. Schnabel: Right there so it actually makes sense to do it on the side that it actually occurs because of the drop in the bicycle lane.

Chair Lew: I agree. I totally agree.

Mr. Schnabel: I don't think that we would probably get rid of that, as part of that but we could evaluate on looking at another entrance on this side but (inaudible)

Chair Lew: Yeah and I actually don't think that it's an issue. Say, we don't do anything and if there a bicyclist who wants to go say north. If they have to ride on one – on part of the path for whatever, a quarter mile before they can get onto the bike lane, I don't think anybody is going to – I don't think that's huge.

Mr. Schnabel: I think one of the benefits of the tight area is that the existing bridge is not very wide. There's already a bollard in the middle of it. It will – it's going to be natural traffic calming. It slows the bicyclist down where pedestrians start – are meeting so it has some benefits in doing that because of its tight nature.

Chair Lew: I agree.

Mr. Schnabel: I agree that it's not ideal because it's so tight.

Chair Lew: Ok, so good. Two is that I think you do need signage. Most of the bridges on the Bay Trail and a lot of the creek trails both don't have any signs and when I'm off in a different – bicycling through a different town, it's really hard to figure out where you are. There aren't any – there is very few waymarking signs so I think what you were explaining before about the street – some sort of street – similar to a street sign, I think that's appropriate. Then I also did look at the Bay Lands Design Guidelines to see if the City had wanted any sort of gateway marker at that point in town. The guidelines sort of suggests that all the gateway signs are sort of over near Embarcadero Road and not on this side. I wasn't crazy about your location in our drawing set for all of the trash and stuff on the East Bay Shore side but I think you're showing a different location on your roundabout – on the traffic circle diagram and I think that looked better.

Mr. Schnabel: That was to address maintenance concern about access to the trash receptacles so we put it on the other side so it's easier accessible from the road.

Chair Lew: On – with regard to the Bay Lands Guidelines, I mean it seems like it would – points the finger towards Corten versus painted. In Mountain View, they have both and I have seen the rust coming through the painted bridges and there's a certain point where it doesn't look good. Then the thought of – yeah, in terms of City maintenance and enclosing the bridge, one is being repainted and it seems like Corten is the better way to go. I'm not crazy about chain link but I have seen other bicycle bridges that if the main truss structure is strong enough and attractive enough, the chain link doesn't look that bad. When it's – when the whole bridge is chain link, that's when it really looks kind of like a prison yard. I would say focus on the truss and the finish of the truss and then we'll work on the chain link or the mesh; the welded wire mesh. Yeah, I would say that chain link is like – I would normally put that down at the bottom of the list of options – recommended options. Then we also had – I did want to address some members of the public who've written emails. They were looking for more – it seems like enhanced landscape in the area and it seems like we've talked – you talked a little bit about that but maybe in the next hearing we could go into that in more detail. What are the exact project boundaries? Where's – yeah, and that kind of thing and the constraints for existing trees. What're wetlands? What's riparian and all of that. What's under the water district's jurisdiction and all of that. I think that's all that I have here today. Then we have some more comments, Kyu?

Vice Chair Kim: Yeah, I just wanted to comment that, I'm just wondering if there is any way that we can bring the arch of the center – bowstring arch – bowstring truss portion down? You know it's 16-feet and when I look at this section that – sometimes it looks like its ok but others, it just looks so tall. I don't know. If there is a way to perhaps bring the arch down or is that really the ...

Chair Lew: Like depth to span, I think that's a structural issue.

Vice Chair Kim: Yeah.

Chair Lew: Yeah.

Mr. Schnabel: Yeah, that's controlled by the depth to span ratios.

Vice Chair Kim: And that's the best we can do, huh?

Mr. Schnabel: We could probably go a little tighter but then it becomes a little bit more flexible and bouncer and so now you're now affecting the user with the – we can go down to the limits of the live load deflections in the middle but that increases the frequency of the period of bridge and (inaudible) (crosstalk).

Vice Chair Kim: Ok, that's what I figured but I also thought that maybe members of the public might question that. Then finally, my last comment is regarding some of these form liners that you were showing for the concrete work. I don't really like either of the options that you've presented. I'm just wondering if there is a way that we can some kind of a board form or perhaps even use some of the reclaimed timber that you're proposing on the view area. Is there a way that we can incorporate that into the formwork of the concrete rather than introduce such an industrial – having nothing to do with nature really, straight line form lines? Thank you.

Mr. Schnabel: One of the benefits of the form liners is it creates – a highly textured finish which mitigates some of the graffiti potentials that you have there. If you put a flat surface like the timber, it just creates a palette for people to graffiti as well so we have to sort of managing both of those conditions.

Vice Chair Kim: So, then both of the form liners that you're presenting are kind of well-known deterrence to graffiti?

Mr. Schnabel: These are the most ubiquities common form liners and we could utilize differently. We could go horizontal, we could go vertical. There are ways to achieve a little bit more look and there are

some other different standard form liners out there. A little bit more individual and we can take a look at that.

Vice Chair Kim: A form that comes to mind I the connection from 101 to 85; on some of those concrete areas. They're like hibiscus or some kind of a flower pattern. I'm not asking for that necessarily but I'm just wondering if there's another pattern that perhaps relates a little bit more to the Bay Lands or becomes a little bit more natural in expression.

Mr. Schnabel: Yeah, those are what we call reliefs and basically, they relief to the fracture fin or whether the form liner so either they come out or go in with regards to the image. We can implement those. I'm not sure that matches with sort of that industrial look. I think park of the industrial look is to try to stay as basic and clean as possible.

Vice Chair Kim: Ok.

Mr. Schnabel: I think a better usage from an architectural standpoint is a combination of two different form liner types, that could create a little more interest.

Vice Chair Kim: Good to know, thank you.

Chair Lew: If you actually look at the form liners, there are products – I mean they have an amazing array of things. It's almost – yeah, it's almost like too many. It's like a kid in a candy store, they have too many choices.

Board Member Furth: So, I want some that look like grasses.

Chair Lew: Yeah, there you go.

Mr. Schnabel: We have done that. That's expensive though.

Chair Lew: Aw, it's always – the nice stuff is always expensive. Ok, is that it? Do you have any other question for us or if you have any follow-ups?

Mr. Schnabel: No, I think you guys have given us some input. I think a lot of the stuff that you guys have sort of focused on, we're sort of looking at those things. The integration of the truss, we were looking at that. To look at that some way to make that continuous. With regards to the railing difference, it was our intention to pick one type of railing and go with that. We showed the different types in the same image just to give you some context but I think we were, at the most, looking at two different railing types. One for the overall structure and then one special one potentially, for the overlook. I think Elizabeth wanted to talk about – she wanted to talk about schedules since project delivery is a big issue. So, she wanted to sort of address that as well.

Ms. Elizabeth Ames, Project Manager: Yes, thank you. Elizabeth Ames, Project Manager with the City and to just comment, the public has been saying in these emails and Penny and everybody has been saying to us to expedite this project as much as possible. We were trying to show you what we could, given the time constraints and our wish is to come back to you, through site and design review and have one meeting with the ARB. I know maybe this is tough because we need to see the details but if we could consider in August, when you see this and we'll have all the details hopefully, that you wish to – that you feel like you can comment on. Then if there are certain items like lighting or other issues, maybe we could do this at subcommittee level so we can move the process along but thank you so much and hopefully, we will see you in August.

Chair Lew: Thank you, Elizabeth. I think Peter had one more comment? No?

Board Member Baltay: She just covered it. I was going to say let's close this discussion by acknowledging that we've got 10 or more emails and everybody wants this consistently wants this to go quickly. I'd like us to clearly say to Staff that we support that and do whatever we can to make it go quickly.

Chair Lew: Ok, agreed. Thank you, guys.

[Board moved back up to item number two]

Approval of Minutes

4. April 6, 2017, Draft Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes

Chair Lew: Ok, so I have a question on – for the Staff on the minutes. So, you're asking for approval for the minutes for April 6th, 2017 and those are in our packet. Then I think we did get from Staff an emailed copy of corrected minutes from an ARB/HRB meeting and my understanding is that it was 2016 and we had reviewed them once before and has some comments on them. I just want to make sure that if you wanted us to vote on that today or at the next meeting? Yeah, it's not on the agenda. We'll wait on that. Ok, so it's just on this. Are there any comments? I have a lot of comments.

Board Member Baltay: Comments on?

Chair Lew: On the minutes for April 6th, which are in our packet.

Board Member Baltay: Well, I'm just getting to the point where you're asking me Chair, to make a vote and a motion on this and I'm saying that I just can't do that anymore. I mean, this is a verbatim transcript and I'm sorry but I just can't spend the time to read this that carefully to say whether it's accurate or not. It's no longer...

Board Member Gooyer: Or do I even remember exactly whether (inaudible)...

Board Member Baltay: ... so why Chair, are you asking for such a motion? So, sorry for the snarky remark.

Chair Lew: I think you can abstain, maybe? I think you can abstain from it. I look at – I would just say that I look at –I don't read every word in the minutes. I do look for places where the transcript has not identified a person and I know who the person – I know who the public speaker is so I've done that. Then I also do look at the vote to see if that is accurate and so for example, in this case, one of the vote counts is not correct. So, I do look at all of that stuff and then there are little typo things and I notice some of them but I don't usually mention them.

Board Member Baltay: Fair point. I stand correct. You're right, there are things in here.

Chair Lew: Yeah but I think it's fine to abstain. If you – I would just say that the Council wants the verbatim minutes.

Board Member Gooyer: Nobody is arguing that they shouldn't be there but like I said...(crosstalk)

Chair Lew: Yes, I know. It doesn't have to be like (inaudible)...

Board Member Gooyer: ... I agree that (inaudible) (crosstalk) I don't have the time to read a 50-page verbatim...

Chair Lew: That's fine.

Board Member Gooyer: ... with a lot of well, uh, um, you know this kind of thing in it and I just don't want to deal with it. You're right, to a certain extent I'm not going to sit there and go I'll vote for something that I honestly haven't read or at least I've read the gist of it but you know...

Mr. Lait: Again, the intent here is that they are verbatim minutes so we have a professional transcriptionist who is listening to the video recording and typing that out. Unless there are errors related to votes or things of that nature – I mean that's – I think your vote for approval doesn't necessarily need to be one that I've read every single word of the minutes but that this captures the sentiment of the dialog. I understand that the transcriptionist has prepared this. There are going to be some errors in terms of typos or some misidentification but the idea of this is to capture what happened. I do understand and appreciate the desired way to have minutes, which is a short summation of the action that have taken place and that's an administrative function that we just don't have right now. So, we either have action minutes, which says this is the item and this is the vote and we refer everybody to the website to get to the video and listen to it or we go to the other extreme and have somebody do the verbatim minutes.

Board Member Gooyer: To a certain extent, I've been in situations where action minutes, I think are fine because those are the ones that really made a difference and they are a heck of a lot shorter.

Mr. Lait: Well, that's basically the agenda. It's basically the agenda with the votes. I mean action minutes would be this is the item, this is the motion, this is the vote.

Board Member Gooyer: Ok, I think we're...

Chair Lew: My take on it is that the decision has been made up -- higher up in the food chain and I think -- correct me if I am wrong but I think they are entitled to abstain, right?

Mr. Lait: You are certainly welcome to abstain and I will say that I don't know that the Council uniformly or unanimously agrees that verbatim minutes are desired. I've heard the pros and cons of both, just as I'm hearing on this Board too. So, I get the tension there and I'm from a – just trying to manage this part of the system. I kind of feel like it's either all or none and that in between pieces in a Staff resource that I don't feel like we've got the time to dedicate to that.

Board Member Gooyer: I have a question then. I mean I'm all in favor of having a verbatim set of minutes but why do we have to vote on those?

Board Member Baltay: I share exactly...

Board Member Furth: The minutes that you vote to approve are the official minutes of the ARB. Unless the City...

Board Member Gooyer: Ok, fine.

Board Member Furth: ... unless for litigation purposes – unless the City decides that they are going to designate something else as the official record and I don't believe the City has.

Mr. Lait: So, that's – I can explore that. I mean the – maybe the official minutes are this short version of what I am talking about, which is basically the transmittal of the action but we'll still prepare the draft transcript and we'll have that as part of our administrative record for items that end up going to Council.

Board Member Gooyer: In case somebody needs more information as to what's in the shortened version.

Mr. Lait: Yeah, let me – there may be some...

Board Member Furth: Talk to the City attorney.

Mr. Lait: ... Yeah, I will.

Board Member Gooyer: Ok.

Mr. Lait: Board Member Furth comment is to coordinate with the City's attorney's office but yeah, I think before we had – I know that we did have transcribed minutes before so the question is, is the simple report out of the motion and the action items sufficient to constitute the record for the meeting but I'll explore that.

Board Member Baltay: What is the official position of the video then? There's a video out there...

Board Member Furth: It depends on what the City Council decides.

Board Member Baltay: But isn't the video...

Board Member Furth: No.

Board Member Baltay: ...technically a legal record as well?

Board Member Furth: It's a record but whether it's the official recorded is not something that happens just automatically.

Board Member Baltay: Because we don't vote...

Board Member Furth: It gets designated.

Board Member Baltay: ... we don't vote to accept the video.

Mr. Lait: Yeah, the video...

Board Member Furth: That scene is having no discretionary aspects to it. We'll all know that that's a bit of a myth but that's why. I want to say that as somebody – straight action minutes are useless for the applicant, the property owner, the public and everybody else to find out what your comments were and what changes you want. They just – if it just says parking was raised and the matter was continued. Somebody is going to have to go look at something else, whether it's their notes or the video or the transcription. Personally, it's – I find it vastly more efficient to look at a transcript. I, of course, want the unattainable. I want an edited set of minutes that make us all sound brilliant but I think it's an interesting possibility if this is a matter of concern to you. That we approve action minutes but still have transcribed minutes so that people can go back and find that material but if you don't have it in your official minutes, then you're not entitled to rely on it in many settings.

Mr. Lait: Well, you know I think there's...

Board Member Furth: There could be evidentiary in a record so talk to the City attorney.

Mr. Lait: If we were dealing with a court proceeding then we can make it official.

Board Member Furth: Usually, you could but usually the City has a set of rules that it's adopted already that says what set of – which set of records, the video, the transcript or the whatever minutes are the official minutes because in the absence of that kind of decision, then the official is the approved minutes or at least it use to be the last time I looked.

Mr. Lait: Ok, so again, I think the comment where heard and let us run with that and see what we come back with.

Chair Lew: Ok, so I'll go back to the actual minutes, right? So, item number six on page 165 of the packet, it says motion passed 5-0 with Vice Chair Kim abstained. That should be a 4-0. Page 165, 121 of the minutes of 165 of the packet. Oh, yes, yes.

Board Member Furth: (Inaudible)

Chair Lew: Yes.

Board Member Furth: This is two sets of minutes.

Chair Lew: Then I have a whole bunch of typos and I have the names of the speakers who have not been identified so I can give that after the meeting. Are there any other comments?

MOTION

Vice Chair Kim: Otherwise, I'll make a motion to approve the minutes as amended.

Chair Lew: Ok. I will second. All in favor. Opposed? Abstained?

Board Member Baltay: No, I vote aye.

Chair Lew: Ok, so that's a 5-0. Ok, we are adjourned. We do have a subcommittee item who have been very patient so thank you.

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY 5-0

Subcommittee Item

5. **900 N California Avenue [15PLN-00155]:** Subcommittee Review of Revisions to Proposed Setbacks and Design of the Detached Garage and Accessory Dwelling Unit. Review was Required as a Condition of Approval. Environmental Review: Categorically Exempt per CEQA Guidelines Section 15303(a) (New Construction or Conversion of Small Structures). Zoning District: Single Family Residential District (R-1).

Board Member Questions, Comments, Announcements

Adjournment