



# Planning & Transportation Commission

## Action Agenda: July 14, 2021

Virtual Meeting  
6:00 PM

### Call to Order / Roll Call

Approximately 6:02 pm

Mr. Vinh Nguyen, Admin Associate III called the roll and announced that all Commissioners are present.

### Oral Communications

The public may speak to any item not on the agenda. Three (3) minutes per speaker.<sup>1,2</sup>

Chair Hechtman asked Staff if there are any speakers for oral communications.

Mr. Vinh Nguyen, Admin Associate III, called on Ms. Fail.

Ms. Francine Fail disclosed that she lives on East Meadow Drive. She shared that she has lived in Palo Alto all her life and East Meadow Drive is her main bicycle route.

Chair Hechtman requested that Ms. Fail provide her comments during the agenda item. He asked if she has any comments regarding items, not on the agenda.

Ms. Fail answered no and that she will hold her comments till the agenda item.

Mr. Nguyen announced that there are no more speakers for oral communications.

### Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

The Chair or Commission majority may modify the agenda order to improve meeting management.

Chair Hechtman asked if there are any agenda changes, additions or deletions. Seeing none, he moved to City official reports.

### City Official Reports

#### 1. Directors Report, Meeting Schedule and Assignments

Mr. Philip Kamhi, Chief Transportation Official, shared that the City Council's summer recess is still in session and so there are no reports regarding Council business. He noted that Planning and Transportation Commission (PTC) will be taking a summer break as well. The meetings on July 28, 2021, and August 11, 2021, have been canceled. The next PTC meeting will be held on August 25, 2021. In terms of the Development Center and the Office of Transportation, Mr.

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 Kamhi announced that those two offices will be opening for in-person services on August 2,  
2 2021. In-person meetings will be offered by appointment only along and virtual appointments  
3 will continue to be available as well. He noted that any unvaccinated Staff members and  
4 customers must wear face coverings.

5  
6 Ms. Sylvia Star-Lack, Transportation Manager, reported that 126 students are participating in  
7 summer bike rodeos. All 2020 3<sup>rd</sup> graders have received online, virtually taught, bicycle safety  
8 instruction and now, on-bike instruction has been provided through the bike rodeos. In June of  
9 2021, Safety Routes to School Staff coordinated with Bay Area Outreach and Recreation  
10 Program to provide an adaptive cycling event for 20 exceptional needs Palo Alto United School  
11 District students. Staff hopes to provide more adaptive cycle programs in the future.

12  
13 Commissioner Templeton asked what is the targeted age group for the bike rodeos.

14  
15 Ms. Star-Lack confirmed the rodeos are for rising 4<sup>th</sup> graders.

16  
17 Commissioner Templeton inquired if Staff has any programs planned for kids who will be  
18 returning to in-person teachings and have not been biking for a year.

19  
20 Ms. Star-Lack acknowledged that many parents are concerned, but Staff has no in-person  
21 programs planned. She suggested parents access the Safe Routes to School webpage where  
22 many safety videos and curricula are available.

23  
24 Commissioner Chang pointed out that during the Objective Standards PTC meeting, Assistant  
25 Director Tanner mentioned that she will be organizing a community webinar discussing the  
26 height limit concerns. She asked if Staff knew when that webinar would be happening.

27  
28 Mr. Kamhi indicated that he did not, but stated he would forward the question to Assistant  
29 Director Tanner.

30  
31 Seeing no more questions from Commissioners, Chair Hechtman moved to the action item.

## 32 **Action Items**

33 Public Comment is Permitted. Applicants/Appellant Teams: Fifteen (15) minutes, plus three (3) minutes rebuttal.  
34 All others: Five (5) minutes per speaker.<sup>1,3</sup>

35

### 36 2. South Palo Alto Bikeways Phase 1 Community Feedback and Concept Plan 37 Alternatives

38

39 Vice-Chair Roohparvar disclosed that due to the proximity of the project to her house, she has  
40 to recuse herself from the item.

41

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 Commissioner Chang disclosed that she attended several of the community outreach meetings  
2 the City conducted and had exchanged emails with City Staff regarding the project.

3  
4 Mr. Albert Yang, Assistant City Attorney, stated that it is important that Vice-Chair Roothparvar  
5 recuse herself, but that there is no need to do traditional disclosures because the City is the  
6 applicant.

7  
8 Mr. Phillip Kamhi, Chief Transportation Official, introduced Joanna Chan and Steve Davis who  
9 presented the item to the Commission.

10  
11 Ms. Joanna Chan, Senior Transportation Planner, stated that Staff is seeking feedback from the  
12 PTC on whether Staff should proceed with the project as well as feedback and recommendation  
13 on the preferred concept plan to Council. The project was awarded a grant from Santa Clara  
14 Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) and the objectives of the grant are to improve bicycle  
15 facilities on the Waverley Multi-Use Path, Fabian Way, and East Meadow Drive. One  
16 requirement of the grant is to provide a protected bikeway along Fabian way or East Meadow  
17 Drive and as close as possible a protected bikeway along the corridor. The grant does not allow  
18 segments of the projects to be removed, otherwise, the funding will be removed. Another  
19 requirement of the grant is that the project must receive all Caltrans approval to initiate the  
20 construction phase by January 31, 2023. The three segments outline in the project serves as key  
21 travel routes for students going to and from school as well as connections to various  
22 community facilities. Data shows that biking to Jane Lathrop Stanford Middle School (JLS) has  
23 increased to 70 percent in 2019. Biking to Gunn High School has also increased from 33 percent  
24 in 2009 to 50 percent in 2019. Based on a survey done in 2020 of Palo Alto Unified School  
25 District (PAUSD) parents, the lack of a protected bikeway is the main reason cited by  
26 elementary school parents who do not allow their children to bike to school. The existing  
27 Waverley Path is bumpy with uneven surfaces, overgrown vegetation, and the path runs  
28 parallel to a chain-link fence that can cause a bicyclist to be thrown from their bike if the  
29 handlebars hit it. The existing conditions for Fabian Way included large crossing distances, an  
30 increase in vehicular traffic and speed, no separation from vehicle traffic, and the shared bicycle  
31 and parking lane exposes bicyclists to being hit by car doors. For East Meadow Drive, the  
32 existing conditions included roll curbs, large parked vehicles, and a lack of space between the  
33 bike lane and parking lane.

34  
35 Mr. Steve Davis, Fehr& Peers, presented the potential improvements that can be made to all  
36 three roads as well as the community feedback that was received. He shared different  
37 examples of improvements that could be used in the project. Including a standard bike lane, a  
38 buffered bike lane, different types of protected bike lanes, barriers, and several others. In terms  
39 of community engagement, Staff used several methods to reach out to the community,  
40 including a project webpage, email blast, social media posts, door hangers, and community

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 events. The goal of phase one for community engagement was to assess support for protected  
2 bicycle facilities. Some considerations may have impacted the assessment of community  
3 support for the project including the constrained project timeline, limited resources, limited  
4 school-based engagement, low webinar attendance, and several others. During the webinars,  
5 Staff did receive key pieces of information from the community. For the Waverley Path, the  
6 community indicated that a lower fence or rigid delineation is necessary for safety and that no  
7 trees be removed. For Fabian Way and East Meadow Drive, the community was concerned  
8 about parking reduction and visibility for cyclists if parking-protected bike lanes are  
9 implemented. The community expressed that biking is difficult during school arrival and  
10 dismissal times along East Meadow Drive. A total of 258 residents responded to the online  
11 survey regarding the project. The conclusion showed that 94 percent of the survey participants  
12 live in Palo Alto, 68 percent are households that have students who bike to school under the  
13 age of 18, 81 percent bike for recreational activities, and over 50 percent of respondents bike  
14 for utilitarian trips. Through the web map that was used in the survey, 17 comments were  
15 received regarding the Waverley Path. The comments contained safety concerns regarding the  
16 parking lot crossings near the bike racks, that the path should be widened, that there needs to  
17 be a parking lane, to keep a barrier between the path and the parking lot, and concerns  
18 regarding the access to Charleston Road. For Fabian Way, 11 comments were received with  
19 more than half of the comments indicating that there needs to be a protected bikeway and no  
20 comments were supporting existing conditions. For East Meadow Drive, 50 comments were  
21 received, with 13 of the comments supporting a protected or buffered bikeway between Alma  
22 Street and Middlefield Road, and 22 comments supported leaving East Meadow Drive as is.  
23 Staff requested that survey respondents vote for preferred alternatives for each road. For the  
24 Waverley Path, Option 1 included widening the path at key pinch points and Option 2 consisted  
25 of widening the path at pinch points as well as near the school buildings. Approximately 2/3s of  
26 the survey respondents supported Option 2 for the Waverley Path. For Fabian Way, Option 1  
27 consisted of eliminating the existing on-street parking and add buffers for the existing bike  
28 lanes. Option 2 consisted of maintaining on-street parking, adding a center turn lane, and  
29 implementing protected bike lanes while removing one through travel lane in each direction.  
30 Approximately 58 percent of the survey respondents preferred Option 2 while 26 percent  
31 supported Option 1. For East Meadow Drive, both options included removing parking on one  
32 side of the street. Option 1 consisted of buffered bike lanes on both sides of the street with  
33 parking being retained between the bike lane and sidewalk on one side of the street. Option 2  
34 consisted of protected bike lanes on both sides of the street with parking being between the  
35 moving vehicles and the bikeways. Approximately 53 percent of the survey respondents  
36 preferred Option 2 while 24 percent preferring Option 1. A total of 23 percent did not express a  
37 preference or preferred a different option. Several respondents requested that Staff provide  
38 additional information on how parking will be affected. Another question asked in the survey  
39 was which section of East Meadow Drive and Fabian Way folks would prefer to see protected  
40 bikeways. Support for protected bikeways was strongest on East Meadow Drive between Alma

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 Street and Middlefield Road as well as on Fabian Way. Respondents showed less preference for  
2 protected bikeways on East Meadow Drive east of Middlefield Road. After all the data was  
3 gathered from the community outreach, Staff drafted preferred concepts for each road. Staff  
4 proposed Option 1 for the Waverley Path and for Fabian Way, Staff proposed Option 2. Per the  
5 request of residents, Staff met with over 30 residents to discuss East Meadow Drive. At the  
6 meeting, residents raised concerns regarding the outreach process, the project rationale,  
7 parking supply and convince, Ramos Park access, and increased vehicle and bicycle interactions  
8 if existing conditions are changed. The residents strongly requested that parking be retained on  
9 the south side of Middlefield Road and that there be further community outreach. Based on the  
10 feedback received, Staff broke East Meadow Drive into four different segments. Location one is  
11 located between East Meadow Circle and Fabian Way. Staff proposed to retain parking in the  
12 westbound direction and keep bike lanes on both sides of the street. Location two is located  
13 between Alma Street and Waverley Street. Staff proposed protected bike lanes in both  
14 directions due to the low number of driveways accessing the street. Location three is located  
15 between Waverley Street and Middlefield Road. Staff proposed to install a buffered bike lane  
16 on the residential side of the street in the westbound direction and widen the parking lane  
17 between the bike lane and sidewalk. On the school side of the street, protected bikeways were  
18 proposed. Location four is located between Middlefield Road and East Meadow Circle and both  
19 sides of the street are fronted by residential properties. Staff proposed buffered bike lanes in  
20 both directions and on-street parking would be maintained between the bike lane and sidewalk  
21 in the westbound direction.

22

23 Ms. Chan shared that after the PTC makes its recommendations, Staff will be presenting the  
24 project to Council on August 9<sup>th</sup>, 2021. If Council approves the project, the design phase will  
25 begin in fall 2021 which will include more community engagement, parking studies, and  
26 temporary treatments.

27

28 Chair Hechtman inquired if any of the Commissioners have questions of Staff.

29

30 Commissioner Lauing noted that the purpose of the meeting is for the PTC to determine if the  
31 project should move forward or not. He asked if there is a reason why Staff is asking that when  
32 so much of Staff time has already been invested and there are benefits to making the  
33 improvements.

34

35 Mr. Kamhi explained that Staff brought the item to the PTC at a prior meeting and Staff had  
36 anticipated doing community outreach to determine if the community supports the project. He  
37 noted that VTA is providing the grant funding and VTA is expecting the City to develop what is  
38 listed in the grant which is to provide bicycle paths on all of the roads that have been  
39 mentioned. He shared that the project was originally identified as a potential corridor for these  
40 types of treatments in the 2012 Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Plan. The grant was

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 applied for 4-years ago and Staff is now trying to fulfill the project on a tight timeline to receive  
2 the funding.

3  
4 Ms. Star-Lack acknowledged that Staff knows there is no room in the schedule to stop the  
5 project and change things. If that happens, VTA will pull the funding for the project.  
6

7 Commissioner Lauing understood that there was supposed to be some discussion with VTA  
8 about the grant and its requirements.  
9

10 Ms. Star-Lack confirmed that Staff did speak with VTA about the project scope. VTA is expecting  
11 protected bikeways with a vertical element on East Meadow Drive and Fabian Way. VTA stated  
12 that protected bikeways have to be provided as much as possible and if not, then there needs  
13 to be a buffered bike lane or provide the space of a buffered bike lane. If any segments are left  
14 in existing conditions, the City will lose the grant.  
15

16 Mr. Kamhi stated that the crux of the discussion will be should parking be removed on East  
17 Meadow Drive to accommodate a buffered or protected additional bikeway.  
18

19 Commissioner Lauing asked if Staff has discussed reducing speed limits on the segments.  
20

21 Mr. Kamhi confirmed that Staff is already in the process of reducing speeds around the school  
22 zones.  
23

24 Commissioner Chang restated that this is an all-or-nothing deal. The City cannot remove a  
25 section of East Meadow Drive and receive the funding.  
26

27 Mr. Kamhi said for the grant to be the funding source for the project, that is correct.  
28

29 Commissioner Chang inquired if parents from Fair Meadow Elementary school have voiced that  
30 due to safety concerns, they do not allow their children to bike to school?  
31

32 Ms. Star-Lack noted that the survey done was school district-wide and the survey did not break  
33 it down into school zones.  
34

35 Chair Hechtman see no other Commissioner questions of Staff, he called for public comment.  
36

37 Mr. Vinh Nguyen, Admin Associate III, announced that the first five speakers are Arthur Keller,  
38 Kenneth, Sue F, Peggy, and then Alan.  
39

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 Mr. Arthur Keller quoted the details regarding the scope of the project as written in the Staff  
2 report. He explained that the plan can provide a protected bikeway along Fabian Way along  
3 East Meadow Drive between Alma and Waverley and not change anything between Middlefield  
4 and East Meadow Circle. He noted that the preference of the neighborhood is to have green  
5 stripes painted with bike lane markers between Middlefield and East Meadow Circle. He asked  
6 why is the City trying to fix something that is not broken? He pointed out that between East  
7 Meadow Circle and Fabian Way, the parking should be on the south side of the street. That way  
8 bicyclists have a direct route to the Highway 101 bike bridge. He concluded that the parking is  
9 full at night near Ramos Park and that it should not be removed.

10

11 Mr. Kenneth Fehl, a resident of East Meadow Drive, emphasized that Staff's survey data is  
12 wrong and that many residents along segment four of East Meadow Drive support leaving  
13 conditions as is. The main reason to keep the conditions as is was to retain all the parking  
14 spaces. The residents supported having the bike lane painted green. By removing the parking,  
15 employees and residents would be required to walk long distances. He said that it is a perceived  
16 problem of having bicyclists interacting with car doors and there have never been incidents of  
17 that nature that he's seen. He said that the bike lanes can be improved while retaining the  
18 parking and still receive the funding.

19

20 Ms. Sue F was bothered that decisions have to be made by August 9<sup>th</sup> and that PTC and City  
21 Council are going on summer break. She shared that Staff has not expressed to residents that if  
22 a segment of the project is left as is, the funding will be lost. She supported the previous  
23 speakers' comments that the survey data is wrong and the survey drove folks to provide  
24 answered they didn't necessarily want. She wanted to know who moved the plan forward,  
25 knowing that it was an all-or-nothing plan, and did they think that residents would not speak  
26 up. She emphasized that moving forward concepts, that the residents do not support, only to  
27 receive the funding is not a best practice.

28

29 Ms. Peggy thanked Staff and the Commission for hearing public comments. She urged the  
30 Commissioners to read the emails that were sent by residents that laid out clearly why the  
31 residents do not support removing the parking on segment four of East Meadow Drive. She was  
32 frustrated that the photos shown in Staff's presentation were not an accurate depiction of how  
33 wide the bike lane is. She asked why Staff did not use the absolute number of how many kids  
34 bike to school instead of the percentage. She said that because the base number of students is  
35 decreasing, the percentage would increase, and that does not show truly how many kids bike to  
36 school. She reemphasized that there is no problem with segment four of East Meadow Drive.

37

38 Mr. Nguyen announced the next seven speakers as Alan, Amie, Patricia, Taly, Francine, Karen,  
39 and Chuck.

40

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 Mr. Alan Wachtel announced that he has been a member of the City's Pedestrian and Bicycle  
2 Committee for over 40-years, but he is not speaking for that committee. He stated that the  
3 project should not move forward because the project has not been designed to address the  
4 need. He the need in segment four could be addressed by partial parking removal and lane  
5 reconfiguration which would preserve parking than the current plan. He noted that the many  
6 drawbacks to barrier-separated bikeways have not been presented to the Commission or the  
7 public. He said that roads are not designed to pass right-turning traffic on the right and these  
8 separated bikeways force bicyclists to do just that. He concluded that buffered bike lanes also  
9 have problems, but he is willing to compromise, and barrier-separated bikeways should not be  
10 used.

11  
12 Ms. Amie Ashton affirmed that the public right of way is for everyone and is not a private  
13 parking lot for select residents. She acknowledged that the plan is not perfect but it is a step in  
14 the right direction to making kids feel safe.

15  
16 Ms. Patricia Stayte proclaimed that the community outreach process failed because many of  
17 the residents in segment four of East Meadow Drive were unaware of the project. She  
18 acknowledged that many of the residents are cyclists and the neighborhood is not anti-bicycle  
19 at all. She acknowledged that Staff has explained well the goal of the project, but the project is  
20 flawed because it is tied to the grant that has specific requirements that residents do not want.  
21 She shared that she does not allow her children to bike or walk to school and there are ways to  
22 solve that problem but not by using the grant. She agreed with the previous speaker that the  
23 data provided by the public outreach survey is skewed and using percentages is misleading. She  
24 recommended the Commission deny the project.

25  
26 Ms. Taly Katz agreed with the comments made by the previous speakers. She concurred that  
27 the outreach to the neighbors was not sufficient and the fact that the proposal is an all or  
28 nothing is very disturbing. She said the problematic stretch of East Meadow Drive contains  
29 Ramos Park. The park is used for youth recreational activities and she predicted that there may  
30 be a legal issue if the proposal is to remove parking next to the park. She confirmed that there  
31 are no other alternative parking spaces to use for the park if the parking is eliminated. She  
32 requested further data on accidents that have occurred along the East Meadow corridor.

33  
34 Ms. Francine Fail stated that she has lived in the East Meadow neighborhood and has biked the  
35 roads all her life. She said there has never been a problem, especially between Middlefield  
36 Road and East Meadow Circle. She suggested that Staff hand out a flyer to students suggesting  
37 they use Mayview Avenue and go through the park instead of using East Meadow Drive. She  
38 added that the traffic circle has caused a lot of confusion between pedestrians, bicyclists, and  
39 vehicles. She noted that the traffic circle has caused delays in response times for the fire  
40 department as well. She encouraged the Commission to deny the project as presented. She

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.



1 supported the improvements to Fabian Way and painting the bike lanes green on East Meadow  
2 Drive.

3  
4 Mr. Nguyen called on Karen, but due to technical difficulties, he announced that he would call  
5 again for Karen at the end of the public comment. He called for the next speaker.

6  
7 Mr. Chuck Wilson shared that he has been a resident of East Meadow for 41-years and has  
8 never witnessed problems between bicycles and vehicles. He confirmed that the bike lanes are  
9 very wide and that Ramos Park is one of the biggest safety problems. He said most folks who  
10 use the park are youth recreation groups and their families. Parents park on the south side so  
11 that their young children do not have to cross the street to go to the park. He stated that due to  
12 the City encouraging the development of ADUs, parking on the street has increased. He  
13 encouraged the Commission to read the emails that the residents had sent in.

14  
15 Mr. Robert Stayte agreed that the bike lanes need to be repainted, that the parking should be  
16 maintained on both sides of the street, the bike lanes are already very wide, and that the  
17 community outreach was a failure. He disclosed that a new problem will arise if the parking is  
18 eliminated around Ramos Park, that the roundabout is a nightmare, and he has never  
19 witnessed an accident. He indicated that there is a church on the corner of East Meadow and  
20 Middlefield that has many events. The parking from those events overflows onto the  
21 neighboring streets. He concluded that not only are the residents losing parking, the  
22 community is losing the spaces as well.

23  
24 Ms. Shelley echoed all the comments made by the previous speakers with regards to  
25 community engagement and the lack of data. She agreed that folks will be incentivized to  
26 jaywalk across the street if parking is removed. She suggested speed bumps be installed, that  
27 something be done about the roundabout, and that the City should provide a mail-in survey.  
28 She agreed that the bikes lanes along East Meadow Drive are wide and that the lane should be  
29 painted. She concluded that she does support the improvements for Fabian Way.

30  
31 Mr. Nguyen called again for Karen.

32  
33 Mr. Rich Jew disclosed that he is speaking for Karen and himself. He expressed that he has  
34 never seen an accident between a bicycle and a vehicle long East Meadow Drive. He requested  
35 that the Commission decline the recommendation to move the project forward. He echoed  
36 many of the comments made by the previous speakers regarding parking, jaywalking, that kids  
37 should be encouraged to use Mayveiw instead of East Meadow and that the outreach was not  
38 sufficient.

39  
40 Mr. Nguyen stated that there are no more public speakers for the item.

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

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

Chair Hechtman disclosed that he has read all the emails that were sent and acknowledged that the other Commissioners have as well. He specified that there is a reference in the Staff report that a protected bikeway can be on Fabian Way “or” East Meadow, but later in the Staff report, the two roads are linked together. He requested that Staff clarify that.

Ms. Chan acknowledged that the grant was awarded 4-years ago and needs have changed since then. When the project came before the PTC in January of 2021, Staff was already in discussions with VTA letting them know the original grant may not be needed. VTA indicated that they are willing to work with the City, but they want to be as close as possible with the original grant which contains protected bikeways.

Ms. Star-Lack added that at no point did VTA say it would be ok to leave parts of East Meadow Drive in existing conditions.

Mr. Kamhi noted that the project was initially conceived before the 2012 Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Plan was drafted.

Chair Hechtman summarized that at least one of the roads has to be protected and the one that is not protected, has to be buffered. Both of those options result in a loss of parking on segment four for East Meadow Drive. The City does not have a choice, in the context of the grant, to leave a segment in its existing condition.

Mr. Kamhi confirmed that is correct.

Chair Hechtman suggested the Commissioners provide general comments first and then discuss the six segments individually.

Commissioner Templeton asked if Staff felt comfortable responding to any of the comments and concerns raised by the public.

Mr. Kamhi restated that the purpose of the meeting is to decide whether the community wants the project to move forward. He shared that the reason why school data is shared in percentages is that the school population can change and Staff has the raw data if the Commissioners and the public are interested in having it. He acknowledged that Staff provided a lot of community outreach and distributed the information in many different ways. The meeting that was held at Ramos Park, Staff was unprepared for the large gathering and did not have a presentation to show folks. He appreciated all the public comments that have been voiced and submitted in writing regarding the project.

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson’s presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 Ms. Star-Lack added that as for the PAUSD high schools, over half of the students bike to school  
2 which equated to 1,000 students at each high school.

3  
4 Commissioner Templeton appreciated the different perspectives and points of view related to  
5 the project. She shared there have been incidences where a car has struck a bicycle and that  
6 her daughter was struck by a car on East Meadow Drive in front of Fair Meadow. She predicted  
7 that if the biking facilities are protected, more kids will feel comfortable biking to school. She  
8 concluded that it is exciting that there is an opportunity to use funds from an external source to  
9 fund the project.

10  
11 Commissioner Chang disclosed that initially, she was very excited about the project. After  
12 hearing the public comments and participating in some of the community meetings. She  
13 wanted to make sure that the City is not implementing a project that the community does not  
14 support. She referenced the Ross Road project that was not supported by the community. She  
15 acknowledged that community engagement was rushed because of the project timeline and  
16 complicated because of the COVID-19 pandemic. She expressed concern that parents who have  
17 kids attending JLS and Fair Meadow Elementary were not fully engaged in the community  
18 outreach process due to the timing of the school year and when community engagement took  
19 place. She observed that there is broad consensus on most of the recommendations Staff has  
20 put forward, except segment four on East Meadow Drive. She wanted to see the project move  
21 forward in the areas where there is consensus. She agreed with the concerns raised by the  
22 public regarding Ramos Park and crossing the street if parking is removed.

23  
24 Commissioner Lauing stated that the project is terrific in terms of connecting the school and the  
25 public to new bikeways. He agreed with Commissioner Chang's comment that there is broad  
26 consensus for many of the proposed changes. He supported having the project move forward  
27 to Council and preferred to have policy, not money, drive how the project is implemented. He  
28 acknowledged that Staff does not know how much the total project will cost at this time. He  
29 affirmed that he read all of the letters that the public sent in and that the public comments are  
30 important for the Commission to hear. He asked Staff if they have any comments regarding Mr.  
31 Wachtel's letter that states that the proposed changes will make bicycling more dangerous.

32  
33 Mr. Kamhi acknowledged that there are different types of users of bicycle facilities. One  
34 treatment may appeal stronger to certain users and less appealing to others. He specified that  
35 there is a lot of data that shows that a protected facility can be safer for younger bicyclists.

36  
37 Commissioner Summa was excited about the project and thanked Staff for moving the project  
38 forward. She supported the improvements proposed for Fabian Way and the Waverley Path.  
39 She hoped that there is enough leeway in the VTA process to allow the City to develop a project  
40 that the community will support.

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1  
2 Commissioner Alcheck stated that every residential neighborhood should feel safe to bike  
3 through and that is a goal that is stated throughout the City’s Comprehensive Plan. He believed  
4 that protected bikeways are the superior alternative. He agreed that the proposed  
5 recommendations for the Waverley Path and Fabian Way are the right recommendations. He  
6 shared that there are alternatives for protected bike lanes throughout the City that may work  
7 for the project. He suggested the treatment on California Avenue and Middlefield which has a  
8 protected bike lane with both directions on one side of the road. That solution may provide a  
9 protected bike lane while retaining parking. He strongly recommended that the Commission  
10 review the project outside the constraints of the grant and suggested that the Commission  
11 allow Council to decide how the project will be funded. In terms of the comments about the  
12 loss of parking, he remarked that what may be best for the community may not be best for the  
13 individual. He said the recommendation to remove parking to gain protected bike lanes is the  
14 best concept for the City as a whole. He added that while that statement may be true, that may  
15 not be the recommended choice that Council should make. He suggested that if there is  
16 consensus, the Commission should tell Council that all of the improvements make sense, that  
17 there are some recommendations for East Meadow that are better than others, and to remove  
18 funding from any recommendations the Commission may have. He did not understand why VTA  
19 was making a stand on how the City’s bikeways should be. He noted that there should be more  
20 opportunities to negotiate with VTA, but that should come from Council’s direction. Also, that  
21 Council should decide if the project is an “all or nothing” project. He concluded that the  
22 Commission should decide if treatment improves or doesn’t improve bike safety and the  
23 Commission should not be weighing the consequences of recommending half, all, or none of  
24 the project.

25  
26 Chair Hechtman shared that he is an avid bicyclist, that he has lost two friends to bicycle  
27 accidents, and that safety is very important for bicyclists of all ages. He restated that Staff has  
28 explained that all six segments have to be at least buffered with additional space or protected  
29 by a physical barrier. Staff’s proposed preferred alternatives accomplish those requirements.  
30 He acknowledged that there is community support and Commission support for all the  
31 proposed alternatives except the alternative for segment four; which is the segment on East  
32 Meadow Drive between Middlefield to East Meadow Circle. For segment four, there are  
33 concerns regarding parking and the consequences related to losing those parking spaces. He  
34 stated that anything that improves bicycle safety is good and that residents will experience a  
35 change from what they are accustomed to if the proposal is implemented. He saw that as a  
36 tradeoff that residents have to make to receive the benefits of living in a city. However, he  
37 acknowledged that there are circumstances where particular safety methods may not fit a  
38 particular neighborhood, and segment four falls in that category. When the Commission  
39 discusses segment four, he requested that Staff explain whether there are unique  
40 circumstances for segment four that would make the loss of parking uniquely impactful to the

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson’s presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 neighborhood. He announced that he supports the proposed alternatives for the other five  
2 segments and if the Commission cannot recommend a specific segment to Council. He advised  
3 the Commission to recommend to Council not to continue to pursue the grant. If Council  
4 chooses to not pursue the grant, the City can still implement the proposed alternatives on the  
5 segments that the Commission has endorsed.

6  
7 Mr. Kamhi found Chair Hechtman's suggestion to recommend specific segments for approval to  
8 Council a good approach. He restated that Staff has requested that VTA change the  
9 requirements of the grant and they have firmly stated their opinion on that request. He noted  
10 that the City will be updating the Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Plan soon and these  
11 projects can be incorporated into that plan if Council decides not to pursue the grant funding.

12  
13 Commissioner Templeton inquired what level of design is the project at? She noted that in the  
14 Staff report it is listed as a conceptual plan.

15  
16 Ms. Chan concurred that it is a conceptual plan.

17  
18 Commissioner Templeton restated what does conceptual mean.

19  
20 Ms. Kamhi confirmed that the plans are high-level, conceptual ideas, to determine whether  
21 there is a project or not. Once a ruling has been made to move to the next phase, that is when  
22 Staff will begin drafting more detailed designs.

23  
24 Commissioner Templeton asked if flaws are identified in the conceptual plan, can the plan be  
25 adjusted and continued forward?

26  
27 Mr. Kamhi answered yes.

28  
29 Commissioner Templeton summarized that the Commission could recommend the project to  
30 move forward with direction about incorporating the public's feedback. She asked Staff to what  
31 extent have they considered the parking demand at Ramos Park.

32  
33 Ms. Star-Lack explained that because it is so early in the design phase, the City can decide to  
34 move parking around. She restated that in order to install a buffered bike lane, space has to  
35 come from the parking lane.

36  
37 Commissioner Templeton wondered if the bike path could be routed through the park which  
38 would allow the parking to remain as is. She noted that with further research, the City can  
39 provide a solution that accommodates City priorities, bicycle safety, and retain parking.

40

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 Mr. Kamhi agreed that having the bike path through the park would solve some of the issues,  
2 but the park does not cover the entire block. There would still need to be parking removed  
3 within that segment.

4  
5 Commissioner Templeton asked if the concerns could be resolved with additional design work.

6  
7 Mr. Kamhi clarified that Staff does not have enough geometry to know if parking can be  
8 retained or not.

9  
10 Commissioner Templeton acknowledged that some parking may have to be removed. She  
11 wanted to understand if additional design work can be done to address the loss of parking  
12 concern.

13  
14 Commissioner Lauing summarized that the public and the Commission have indicated to Staff  
15 that there has to be some way to address parking and receive a buffered bike lane. He  
16 suggested that after the break the Commission should start with segment four.

17  
18 Chair Hechtman announced that the Commission will take a 10-minute break.

19  
20 [The Commission took a short break]

21  
22 Chair Hechtman explained that the other segments need separation motions so that the  
23 Council knows that the Commission supports those recommendations. During the discussion  
24 before the break, there was consensus among the Commission that the recommendations for  
25 those segments should move forward. He asked what approach was the Commission  
26 comfortable taking.

27  
28 Commissioner Summa agreed that the recommendations for the Waverly Path and Fabian Way  
29 can move forward. In terms of East Meadow Drive, she was not 100 percent convinced that  
30 segment four could be isolated and treated separately from the rest of the street.

31  
32 Chair Hechtman asked Commissioner Summa if she was comfortable with Staff's  
33 recommendations for segments one and two for East Meadow Drive.

34  
35 Commissioner Summa confirmed that those recommendations seemed more obvious.

36  
37 Commissioner Alcheck supported Chair Hechtman's approach to the discussion. He confirmed  
38 that these are conceptual designs and that the Staff report provides substantial evidence as to  
39 why the recommendations are the right recommendations.

40

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 Commissioner Templeton also supported the approach. Her concern was that by leaving  
2 segment four for East Meadow Drive unresolved, Commissioners may feel held back on  
3 supporting the other recommendations. If that is the case, Commissioners should voice those  
4 concerns, and the motion can be modified.

5

6 MOTION #1

7

8 Commissioner Alcheck moved to recommend Staff's preferred concepts for A, B, C, and D on  
9 Packet Page 8. That included alternative two for the Waverly Path, protected bike lanes on both  
10 sides for Fabian Way as well as East Meadows Drive segments one and two.

11

12 SECOND

13

14 Commissioner Chang seconded the motion.

15

16 Commissioner Alcheck looked forward to seeing the alternatives evolve and he hoped Council  
17 pursues them regardless of the funding source. He emphasized that the improvements are very  
18 worthy of City investment.

19

20 Commissioner Chang echoed Commissioner Alcheck's comments. She disclosed she is  
21 seconding the motion with the understanding that the alternatives are in the concept phase.  
22 She wanted to see more community engagement be conducted to understand the granular  
23 details on how things will be implemented.

24

25 Commissioner Templeton announced she will be supporting the motion. She found the  
26 improvements to be very promising, but they need refinements. She was hopeful that the  
27 benefits of the project will affect other routes throughout the City.

28

29 Chair Hechtman supported the motion as well and hoped that the Council will fund the project  
30 if the grant is not obtained.

31

32 VOTE

33

34 Mr. Nguyen announced that the motion carries 6-0 with one Commissioner absent.

35

36 MOTION #1 PASSED 6(Alcheck, Chang, Hechtman, Lauing, Summa, Templeton) -0 -  
37 1(Roohparvar recused)

38

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 Chair Hechtman recommended that the Commission discuss segment four of East Meadow  
2 Drive. By discussing segment four, the Commission can understand if any issues from segment  
3 four would affect segment three.

4  
5 Mr. Kamhi requested that Mr. Davis provide further explanation regarding the geometry of the  
6 road in segment four.

7  
8 Mr. Davis explained that the blacktop portion of the road from curb edge to curb edge is 44-  
9 feet wide. Then there is 1-foot down the concrete to the bottom of the valley gutter and then 1  
10 ½-feet up the other side of the valley gutter to come to the sidewalk. The maximum total width  
11 that is available for use of transportation is 46-feet between the bottoms of the gutters. If the  
12 design used the absolute minimum standards for the bike lanes, the buffer, the travel lanes,  
13 and the parking lane. It takes 42-feet to accomplish that. With that said, the standard minimum  
14 for a parking lane is 8-feet and so the extra 4-feet is not enough to accommodate an additional  
15 parking lane. Staff explored many different versions before coming to the preferred alternative  
16 that was presented.

17  
18 Commissioner Alcheck asked why a bi-directional, protected bike lane on one side cannot be  
19 installed. He explained that there may be a way to reduce the bi-directional lane and install  
20 additional parking.

21  
22 Mr. Davis mentioned that there aren't any driveways along California Avenue and so the bi-  
23 directional bike lanes work there because there are no crossing conflicts for cyclists. It is very  
24 hazardous for drivers to be backing out of their driveway while watching for cyclists coming  
25 from either direction. For these reasons, bi-directional bike lanes are not recommended in  
26 residential settings. If the Commission decided to recommend a bi-directional bikeway  
27 alternative, a substandard width would be required for the bike lane in order to accommodate  
28 an additional parking lane.

29  
30 Commissioner Alcheck acknowledged that explanation makes sense. He inquired if the parking  
31 that is removed could be gained by using angled parking spaces on the other side.

32  
33 Mr. Davis articulated that there may be some potential for that gain, but due to the driveways,  
34 angled parking doesn't often gain many spaces.

35  
36 Commissioner Alcheck asked how many spaces are estimated to be lost in segment four and  
37 how many spaces exist currently.

38  
39 Ms. Chan answered that currently there are approximately 160 parking spaces and 80 parking  
40 spaces are proposed to be removed with the proposal.

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.



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

Mr. Kamhi clarified that there are approximately 80 spots per side.

Commissioner Alcheck indicated that no matter what side the parking is placed on, half of the spots will be removed.

Commissioner Lauing asked how many feet are needed to accomplish two parking lanes, two bike lanes, two buffers, and two vehicle travel lanes.

Mr. Davis answered 49-feet is needed to fit everything at the minimum standard size.

Commissioner Lauing noted that these exercises are what the Commission is requesting that Staff do to see if any other alternatives can work.

Mr. Davis stated that Staff has done those exercises.

Commissioner Lauing specified that removing the spaces will not only impact the residents but the community who use the area. He acknowledged that removing 80 parking spaces will have a large impact.

Commissioner Chang observed that in the evenings the parking spaces were full of vehicles and she suggested using a small portion of parkland to accommodate some of the parking spaces that will potentially be lost. She reported that there are plans to install a bathroom at Ramos Park. Parks without bathrooms are usually used by folks who live nearby, but parks that have bathrooms draw folks from all over the City. She pointed out that the blocks are very large. If parking is removed, that will force folks to walk to an intersection that is a ways away to cross the street and/or will incentivize jaywalking. She asked Staff if they had any thoughts about what problems may arise if parking is removed.

Mr. Kamhi disclosed that jaywalking currently happens and if the parking is removed, it will cause spill over to other streets. If the concept to remove parkland to accommodate parking is moved forward, that concept is outside the scope of the grant, and would require its own community outreach process. He noted that it is an intriguing idea and could be explored in the future if the segment is not included in the proposed project.

Commissioner Templeton did not support trading parkland for parking spaces. She predicted that if bike infrastructure is improved and parking spaces are eliminated. That may incentivize folks to bike more to Ramos Park and neighboring facilities. Using Google Maps measuring tool, she shared that segment four is roughly .58 of a mile. She wanted to understand if the maximum parking demand warrants having 80 spaces on each side. She indicated that a

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 significant section of segment three does not have driveways and bi-directional bike lanes may  
2 work in that area. She observed that there may be room for parking on the adjacent streets,  
3 but that would involve more community outreach. She concluded that there is less traffic near  
4 Lewis heading towards East Meadow Circle and protected bike lanes may not be needed along  
5 that stretch.

6  
7 Commissioner Chang echoed that the traffic patterns on the southside of Middlefield is  
8 dramatically different from the traffic on East Meadow towards the end. She wondered if a  
9 universal treatment for both sections is appropriate because of the very different traffic  
10 patterns, driveway location, and parking facilities. Based on the survey data, there is less  
11 support for a protected bikeway as the traffics declines.

12  
13 Chair Hechtman observed that Staff is proposing for East Meadow segments one, two, and  
14 three have parking on only one side of the street.

15  
16 Mr. Kamhi confirmed that is correct.

17  
18 Chair Hechtman inquired if currently there is parking on both sides of the street.

19  
20 Ms. Chan answered yes.

21  
22 Chair Hechtman asked how many parking spaces are estimated to be lost in total for segments  
23 one, two, and three for East Meadow Drive if the plan is implemented.

24  
25 Ms. Chan shared that for segment three, the section between Waverley Street and Middlefield  
26 Road, 39 parking spaces will be removed on the south side.

27  
28 Chair Hechtman predicted that 60 to 80 parking spaces may be removed from segments one,  
29 two, and three combined on East Meadow Drive. He mentioned that there have been no  
30 concerns about losing parking in those segments. He predicted that residents on segment four  
31 of East Meadow Drive are voicing parking concerns because many of the homes face East  
32 Meadow Drive versus segments one and two where the homes face the streets that enter East  
33 Meadow Drive. He wanted to understand what makes segment four unique in that many  
34 residents have voiced strong opposition to having the parking be removed.

35  
36 Mr. Kamhi clarified that there will be no removal of parking in segment one. In terms of what is  
37 the difference between segment four and the other three segments is that segment four has  
38 the most housing along it. He acknowledged that the City is fully built out, many of the homes  
39 in this area are older and folks nowadays like to use their garage for storage. This results in

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 moving their cars to their driveways or potentially to the street. He added that the segment  
2 along JLS and Mitchell Park also has no housing and Mitchell Park has its own parking lot.

3  
4 Chair Hechtman inquired if there are houses across from Mitchell Park.

5  
6 Mr. Kamhi answered yes.

7  
8 Commissioner Chang inquired if Staff has talked with JLS and their drop-off location on East  
9 Meadow Drive.

10  
11 Ms. Star-Lack confirmed that the school district knows about the project. She reported that  
12 PAUSD is working on a new school plan that changes where their office is and may change the  
13 traffic circulation at JLS. Staff continues to work with the school district on decongesting JLS's  
14 frontage. The school district has requested that the City install a left turn lane into the Waverley  
15 driveway and if the project moves forward, Staff will be exploring how to include that request  
16 in the project. The proposal does not include protected bike lanes along the school frontage.

17  
18 Commissioner Chang asked Staff to clarify why that section will not be protected.

19  
20 Ms. Star-Lack explained that the proposal is to maintain the parking along the housing portion  
21 of the street, but the bike lane will be a buffered bike lane. In summary, if facing Gunn High  
22 School, there would be a buffered bike lane, a through lane, a left turn lane, and then the  
23 opposite direction vehicle lane. This configuration cannot accommodate another parking lane  
24 as well as a drop-off for the school.

25  
26 Commissioner Chang shared that JLS plans to move their offices closer to East Meadow Drive  
27 which will cause circulation problems for the school to figure out. She remarked that what is  
28 also different about segment four is that the lot sizes are larger than a standard lot and those  
29 lots can accommodate an ADU.

30  
31 Mr. Kamhi added that because of the potential for those lots to hold ADUs, that is an example  
32 of the changing usage and demand for change in parking in the area.

33  
34 Commissioner Templeton noted that based on Google Maps, the lots appear to be large  
35 enough to allow folks to house their cars on their lot. She indicated that what is also different  
36 about segment four is this section of the neighborhood was impacted by the Ross Road  
37 upgrades, which were not supported by the community, and there may be lingering feelings  
38 about that. She agreed that the flow of everything in that neighborhood is affected by the  
39 traffic circle that was installed and the residents do not want to be caught off guard again by  
40 another transportation project. The unique nature of segment four is to come up with a project

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 that improves bike safety but does not compromise the comfort of the neighborhood. She  
2 concluded that as you move further away from the Ross Road/Meadow Drive intersection, the  
3 more accepting folks are to transportation changes.

4  
5 Mr. Kamhi emphasized that that is an important point. One of the main reasons why the project  
6 is before PTC is to have a dialog with the community and not have another upsetting  
7 transportation project be implemented.

8  
9 Commissioner Summa acknowledged that maybe there are no problems along segment four  
10 that need to be fixed and she agreed with Commissioner Templeton that the change to Ross  
11 Road was very upsetting to many of the residents. She commented that with major  
12 transportation changes, it takes a long time for drivers to become accustomed to the change.  
13 She stated that there is just not enough available space in the roadway to keep the parking and  
14 add protected or buffered bike lanes. She concluded that a solution cannot be found right now  
15 because according to the residents, there is no problem on segment four.

16  
17 Chair Hechtman predicted that the City can pitch to VTA to provide a buffered bikeway from  
18 East Meadow Circle to Lewis and do only visual enhancements to the segment between Lewis  
19 and Middlefield. However, he understands that VTA has made a strong stand on the requests  
20 that Staff has already made.

21  
22 Mr. Kamhi emphasized that if the project is modified any further than what is presented, then  
23 the City will have to find another way to fund the project.

24  
25 Chair Hechtman responded that whether it is grant-funded or not, it makes sense to implement  
26 his recommendation to have visual enhancements between Lewis and Middlefield.

27  
28 MOTION #2

29  
30 Commissioner Lauing moved that PTC move the approval of Items E and F in the Staff report  
31 and recommended revised solutions which omits or mitigates the proposed loss of 80 parking  
32 spaces necessary for public parking, ADUs, and other residents. He added that the City should  
33 continue negotiating with VTA to maintain the grant funding with the proposed changes to  
34 segment four. He commented that his motion shows that PTC wants to move the project  
35 forward, grant or not grant.

36  
37 SECOND

38  
39 Commissioner Templeton seconded the motion.  
40

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 Mr. Kamhi requested that the number of parking spaces be removed from the motion because  
2 80 is an approximate number.

3  
4 Commissioner Templeton suggested the motion say “parking” instead of a specific number.

5  
6 Mr. Kamhi answered yes.

7  
8 Commissioner Templeton felt comfortable with that change.

9  
10 Commissioner Lauing explained that 80 is a large number and if the number was less then there  
11 would be no concerns.

12  
13 Mr. Kamhi restated that 80 is an approximation and if the project moves forward, Staff will be  
14 doing a parking study which will provide more definite numbers.

15  
16 Commissioner Lauing suggested the language be changed to estimated.

17  
18 Mr. Kamhi preferred the motion to say the location but was comfortable using the work  
19 estimated.

20  
21 Commissioner Templeton clarified that when a motion includes a specific data point, it can  
22 cause problems for Staff. She suggested that the Staff provide the estimated number of parking  
23 spaces in the notes when the item goes to Council.

24  
25 Commissioner Lauing restated that it is the order of magnitude number that should be focused  
26 on.

27  
28 Commissioner Templeton commented that the City has a significant commitment to biking and  
29 biking infrastructure goes with that. She acknowledged that when funding depletes, biking  
30 infrastructures projects are placed on hold.

31  
32 **FRIENDLY AMENDMENT**

33  
34 Chair Hechtman was concerned that Item E, segment three, is included in the motion. He  
35 mentioned that Commissioner Summa earlier raised a concern that issues that relate to  
36 segment four may bleed into segment three. Throughout the discussion, he noted he has not  
37 heard that that is the case and that segment three is quite different than segment four. For  
38 those reasons, he was not comfortable lumping together segments three and four. He  
39 suggested that they have their own motions.

40

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson’s presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 Commissioner Lauing agreed to separate segment three from his motion.

2

3 Commissioner Templeton agreed.

4

5 Commissioner Lauing clarified that his motion applies only to Item F in the Staff report.

6

7 Mr. Kamhi remarked that if the adoption is adopted, this provides leverage for Staff to use in negotiations with VTA.

8

9  
10 MOTION RESTATED

11

12 Commissioner Lauing moved that PTC move approval of Item F and recommends a revised solution that omits or mitigates the proposed loss of estimated 80 parking spaces necessary for public parking for parks, ADU, and other residents. Also, PTC recommends to continue to negotiate with VTA to maintain the grant funding with these changes in the .58-mile segment of East Meadow Drive.

13

14  
15  
16  
17  
18 VOTE

19

20 Mr. Nguyen announced that the motion carries 6-0 with one Commissioner absent.

21

22 MOTION PASS 6(Alcheck, Chang, Hechtman, Lauing, Summa, Templeton) -0 -1(Roohparvar  
23 recused)

24

25 Chair Hechtman asked if any Commissioner want to comment on segment three or make a motion.

26

27  
28 Commissioner Summa clarified that there is an approximate loss of 39 parking spaces for segment three.

29

30  
31 Chair Hechtman answered yes, that is what Staff said.

32

33 MOTION #3

34

35 Commissioner Chang moved that PTC recommends the Staff proposal for segment E to City Council.

36

37  
38 SECOND

39

40 Commissioner Lauing seconded.

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1  
2 Commissioner Chang acknowledged that there will be a parking reduction in the segment, it is  
3 understood that the segment is typically under parked and there is backup parking at Mitchell  
4 Park. Also, traffic is very heavy on this segment and so a protected bike lane is critical.

5  
6 Commissioner Lauing supported Commissioner Chang's judgment.

7 VOTE

8  
9 Mr. Nguyen announced that the motion carries 6-0 with one Commissioner absent.

10  
11 MOTION #3 PASSED 6(Alcheck, Chang, Hechtman, Lauing, Summa, Templeton) -0 -  
12 1(Roohparvar recused)

13  
14 Commissioner Summa commented that there is a timing disconnect because Staff has noted  
15 that these are conceptual plans and there are many unknowns. The City is constrained though  
16 by the grant and that is a hazardous situation to be in.

17  
18 Chair Hechtman asked if the Commissioners would like to discuss a potential retreat later in the  
19 agenda. If so, then Vice-Chair Roohparvar can rejoin the meeting for that discussion.

20  
21 Commissioner Alcheck stated now is the right time to have that conversation because the PTC  
22 will be going on a break and then will be in the final stretch of the year.

23  
24 **Commission Action:** Motion by Alcheck, seconded by Chang. Pass 6-0 (Roohparvar recused)  
25 **Commission Action:** Motion by Lauing, seconded by Templeton. Pass 6-0 (Roohparvar recused)  
26 **Commission Action:** Motion by Chang, seconded by Lauing. Pass 6-0 (Roohparvar recused)

## 27 **Approval of Minutes**

28 Public Comment is Permitted. Five (5) minutes per speaker.<sup>1,3</sup>

29 4. June 9, 2021 Draft PTC Meeting Minutes

30 MOTION

31  
32 Commissioner Alcheck moved to approve the minutes as revised.

33  
34 SECOND

35  
36 Chair Hechtman announced that Commissioner Summa seconded the motion.

37  
38 VOTE

39

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 Mr. Nguyen announced that the motion carries 6-0 with one Commissioner absent.

2

3 Chair Hechtman believed that Vice-Chair Roohparvar was absent for that meeting.

4

5 Vice-Chair Roohparvar concurred.

6

7 Commissioner Chang stated she was absent as well and would like to abstain from the vote.

8

9 Mr. Nguyen acknowledged that the motion carries 5-0 with Commissioner Chang and Vice-Chair  
10 Roohparvar abstaining.

11

12 **Commission Action:** Motion by Alcheck, seconded by Summa. Pass 5-0 (Chang and Roohparvar  
13 abstain)

#### 14 **Committee Items**

15 Commissioner Lauing reported that the Housing Element working group has been meeting. He  
16 will provide updates as the process moves along.

#### 17 **Commissioner Questions, Comments or Announcements**

18 Chair Hechtman restated that July 28, 2021, and August 11, 2021 meetings have been canceled.  
19 He observed that out of the seven Commissioners, two have not participated in a retreat. He  
20 wanted to understand from the other Commissioners if a retreat is worth having and what  
21 might be accomplished at the retreat.

22

23 Commissioner Templeton voiced that the retreat she attended was in-person and allowed for  
24 the Commissioner to get to know each other better. She said she is open to having a retreat,  
25 but did not find the last retreat beneficial in terms of a working session.

26

27 Commissioner Lauing remarked that retreats can be helpful. He said the value of a retreat  
28 depends on the content of the agenda and he found retreats to be beneficial when they are  
29 held at the beginning of the year. He noted that the PTC Work Plan could be discussed at a  
30 retreat, but it can also be agendized for a regular meeting.

31

32 Commissioner Alcheck disclosed that every retreat he has attended have been different. He  
33 found the last retreat to be really enlightening and helped him understand his fellow  
34 Commissioners better. He didn't feel that a retreat should be at a specific time in the year and  
35 that the work plan should not be part of a retreat. It should be agendized during a regular  
36 meeting. He encouraged the Commission to use the retreat as a time to come together, to get  
37 to know each other better, and spent time doing something other than sharing personal  
38 opinions. He shared that a retreat does not have the same formalities as a meeting does, but it

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.



1 does have to be public. He suggested the retreat be a site visit of a project that the Commission  
2 has discussed or a project that is similar to the items that the PTC discusses. He concluded that  
3 he supported having a retreat.

4  
5 Vice-Chair Roohparvar agreed that the last retreat was informal and was intended for team  
6 building. She stated she could go either way on whether there should be a retreat or not. A lot  
7 of it depended on what the agenda is for the retreat and whether fellow Commissioners find  
8 value in it. She supported the idea of doing a site visit and she wanted to interact with the other  
9 Commissioners in an informal setting.

10  
11 Commissioner Summa believed that because the retreat is considered a City hearing, the  
12 Commission could not do a site visit. She acknowledged that the Commissioners could do that  
13 together outside of a retreat. If the Chair does a retreat, she expressed she will come, but felt  
14 that a retreat should be held at the beginning of the year.

15  
16 Chair Hechtman shared that he has missed in-person, informal, discussions with fellow  
17 Commissioners. He indicated that it may be best to have a retreat at the beginning of the year  
18 to allow for the Commission to get to know the new Commissioner coming in. He commented  
19 that he doesn't have any particular topics he wants to focus on for a retreat, but felt the  
20 Commission together could come up with some.

21  
22 Commissioner Chang agreed it would be great to have an informal discussion with the other  
23 Commissioners. She suggested that a retreat agenda should allow for some work items but also  
24 some team-building items.

25  
26 Commissioner Templeton requested that the retreat be in-person and not virtual.

27  
28 Commissioner Lauing agreed.

29  
30 Mr. Albert Yang, Assistant City Attorney, clarified that Board and Commission retreats have  
31 been noticed to the public because they have been about Commission business. If the retreat is  
32 just a getting to know you session, that does not need to be a noticed public meeting. The  
33 Commission could do a site visit as a retreat, but it has to be noticed to the public.

34  
35 Chair Hechtman appreciated the input and declared the meeting adjourned.

## 36 **Adjournment**

37 10:15 pm

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.



# Planning & Transportation Commission

## Action Agenda: July 14, 2021

Virtual Meeting  
6:00 PM

### Call to Order / Roll Call

Approximately 6:02 pm

Mr. Vinh Nguyen, Admin Associate III: Chair Hechtman?

Chair Hechtman: Present.

Mr. Nguyen: Vice Chair Roohparvar?

Vice-Chair Roohparvar: Present.

Mr. Nguyen: Commissioner Alcheck?

Mr. Nguyen: Present.

Mr. Nguyen: Commissioner Chang?

Commissioner Chang: Present.

Mr. Nguyen: Commissioner Lauing?

Commissioner Lauing: Present.

Mr. Nguyen: Commissioner Summa?

Commissioner Summa: Present.

Mr. Nguyen: Commissioner Templeton?

Commissioner Templeton: Here.

Mr. Nguyen: We have a quorum. Thank you.

Chair Hechtman: We are now moving on to oral communications.

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 **Oral Communications**

2 The public may speak to any item not on the agenda. Three (3) minutes per speaker.<sup>1,2</sup>

3 Chair Hechtman: This section is for the public to speak on items not on the agenda. So, if you  
4 want to talk about bicycles, that is on the agenda. If you want to talk about something else,  
5 now is your time. Please raise your hand if you wish to speak. On the Zoom App, there is a raise  
6 hand button on the bottom of your screen. If you are dialing in from a phone, please press \*9.  
7 Are there any public speakers for oral communications?

8  
9 Mr. Vinh Nguyen, Admin Associate III: Chair Hechtman, we currently do not have any raised  
10 hands.

11  
12 Chair Hechtman: Very well.

13  
14 Mr. Nguyen: I'm sorry, we just had one just raised it right now. Our first and only speaker is  
15 Francine.

16  
17 Ms. Francine Fail: Hi, my name is Francine Fail. I live on East Meadow Drive. I have lived here on  
18 our [unintelligible] around the corner all my life. I have used the East Meadow way to get to  
19 what was then Wilbur and Cubberley without bike lanes, never having a problem. My children  
20 (interrupted)

21  
22 Chair Hechtman: Francis [note – Francine]?

23  
24 Ms. Fail: Same thing and my grand (interrupted)

25  
26 Chair Hechtman: Francis? Francis? Francis [note – Francine] can I interrupt you for just a  
27 second? You can stop her clock please, Mr. Nguyen. Francis [note – Francine], it sounds very  
28 much to me like you are wanting to speak tonight on our Agenda Item Number Two which is  
29 the Bikeways Project. And if I'm correct, then this would not be the right time to talk. When...  
30 after the... after we get through oral communication, we have some Commission business and  
31 then we call that Agenda Item, have a Staff report, and then we take public comment on that.  
32 And at that point, if you raise your hand, you'll get a full 3-minutes. So, am I misunderstanding  
33 your comments, or if not, can I ask you to hold your comments until the Agenda Item?

34  
35 Ms. Fail: So, I will wait until it's time. You are correct.

36  
37 Chair Hechtman: Thank you very much. I look forward to hearing those comments later tonight.  
38 Mr. Nguyen, any other oral communications tonight?

39  
40 Mr. Nguyen: Chair Hechtman, there are no other raised hands.

---

1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.  
2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.  
3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1  
2 Chair Hechtman: Alright, thank you. We will the move to agenda changes, additions and  
3 deletions.

4  
5 **Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions**  
6 The Chair or Commission majority may modify the agenda order to improve meeting management.  
7 Chair Hechtman: I have none. Commissioners, any of you have any? I'm seeing no hands, so we  
8 will move next to City Official reports.

9 **City Official Reports**

10 1. Directors Report, Meeting Schedule and Assignments

11 Chair Hechtman: Mr. Kamhi.

12  
13 Mr. Philip Kamhi, Chief Transportation Official: Thank you very much. Just a brief update, the  
14 Council's summer recess continues and so there are no updates from the City Council for  
15 tonight. The PTC will also take its own recess following this meeting in July and August with the  
16 next two meetings being canceled and this follows a year-to-date in which none of the other  
17 meetings have been canceled. Needless to say, PTC has been very busy and working hard and  
18 next PTC meeting is scheduled for August 25<sup>th</sup>.

19  
20 The Development Center, which is part of Planning and Development Services, and also the  
21 Office of Transportation will both reactive for in-person services on Monday, August 2<sup>nd</sup>. And  
22 we'll be offering in-person services by appointment only and we'll also continue to offer virtual  
23 appointments and online services. Please note that any unvaccinated Staff or customers must  
24 wear face coverings to prevent the spread of COVID-19 and we will look forward to seeing our  
25 customers and co-workers again very soon.

26  
27 And with that, I believe Sylvia Star-Lack has a few updates that she'd like to share.

28  
29 Ms. Sylvia Star-Lack, Transportation Manager: Thanks, Phillip. I have two Safe Routes to School  
30 updates. This week 126 students are participating in summer bike rodeos. Our Staff has  
31 coordinated these for students who missed them this fall due to the COVID pandemic. While all  
32 of last year's 3<sup>rd</sup> graders did receive online or virtually taught bicycle safety instruction. Until  
33 the rodeos this week, there had been no on-bike instruction and we are partnering with the  
34 Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition to provide these rodeos for students this week. So, I just wanted  
35 to let you know that that's happening.

36  
37 The second item is part of our equity efforts. In June, the Safe Routes to School Staff  
38 coordinated an adaptive cycling event for 20 exceptional needs PAUSD students. Our partner,  
39 Bay Area Outreach and Recreation Program, also known as BORP, brought special bicycles for

---

1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.  
2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.  
3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 students of all abilities and fitted them to the students. So, they could experience the joy of  
2 bicycling on the school black top. It was a successful event and we hope to bring more adaptive  
3 cycling to more Palo Alto students and families in the future. Thanks, Phillip.

4

5 Mr. Kamhi: Thank you and with that, that concludes the director's comments, and happy to  
6 take any questions.

7

8 Chair Hechtman: Commission questions of Staff? Commissioner Templeton.

9

10 Commissioner Templeton: Thank you. Just a quick question, what is the targeted age group for  
11 the bike rodeos? Is that the 3<sup>rd</sup> event or?

12

13 Ms. Star-Lack: Yeah, that was... thanks, Commissioner Templeton. That was for the last years 3<sup>rd</sup>  
14 graders, so raising 4<sup>th</sup> graders, and they were... we were... yes, so they were asked to sign up  
15 back in May for those.

16

17 Commissioner Templeton: That's awesome. Do you have anything planned for kids who are  
18 going to be going back to school and haven't been biking for a year or plus? Or are you aware of  
19 any events like that?

20

21 Ms. Star-Lack: No, we don't have anything planned, but we know that this is a concern of many  
22 parents. We do have on our Safe Routes to School webpage, many online safety videos, and  
23 curriculum that you can look at and review with your children.

24

25 Commissioner Templeton: Awesome. Thank you so much for all you do.

26

27 Ms. Star-Lack: Thanks.

28

29 Chair Hechtman: Commissioner Chang.

30

31 Commissioner Chang: Unmute, ok. This might be better directed towards Assistant Director  
32 Tanner who isn't here, but I did have a question regarding the Objective Standards meeting that  
33 we had... that I was absent for. But I did watch the video of it and in it Assistant Director Tanner  
34 had mentioned that she would try and organize a community information session or  
35 community webinar or something like that in order to address the height limit concern. For...  
36 and to explain to the community who's interested more about what's going on there and I  
37 wanted to follow-up, especially because I wasn't at that meeting to ask. Do you know when  
38 that is scheduled for by any chance?

39

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 Mr. Kamhi: Unfortunately, I do not. I'm happy to forward that question to Assistant Director  
2 Tanner though.

3  
4 Chair Hechtman: Other Commission questions of Staff? Seeing none, we will move to our action  
5 item tonight.

6 **Action Items**

7 Public Comment is Permitted. Applicants/Appellant Teams: Fifteen (15) minutes, plus three (3) minutes rebuttal.  
8 All others: Five (5) minutes per speaker.<sup>1,3</sup>

9  
10 2. South Palo Alto Bikeways Phase 1 Community Feedback and Concept Plan  
11 Alternatives

12 Chair Hechtman: The sole action item on the agenda is Agenda Item Number Two, South Palo  
13 Alto Bikeways Phase 1 community feedback and Concept Plan Alternatives. May we have a Staff  
14 report, please?

15  
16 Vice-Chair Roohparvar: Chair Hechtman?

17  
18 Chair Hechtman: Actually, before we do that... yeah, before the Staff report, let me ask for  
19 disclosures by any Commissioners? Contacts, things of that nature. Vice-Chair Roohparvar.

20  
21 Vice-Chair Roohparvar: So, due to the proximity of my house to this project and after consulting  
22 with counsel for the City. I am going to recuse myself from this action item and I will return  
23 once it completes.

24  
25 Chair Hechtman: Thank you Vice-Chair. Commissioner Chang.

26  
27 Commissioner Chang: So, I've been... I just wanted to disclosed that I've been involved in some  
28 of these meetings. I attended them, so I had attended a meeting in May asking for participation  
29 from parents because I am a JLS parent as well as on the JLS PTA and so I attended one of  
30 those. I also attended the engagement summary and I live close to the area but not directly  
31 affected by it. So, I don't feel the need to recuse myself but I did want... and then the final note  
32 is that I had emailed Ms. Chan to ask some questions and she had given me a response. So,  
33 that's information that I don't know if I should share now or when it's more relevant in our  
34 discussion? A question.

35  
36 Chair Hechtman: Mr. Yang?

37  
38 Commissioner Chang: Would it be Mr. Yang?

39  
40 Mr. Albert Yang, Assistant City Attorney: I guess just to be clear, there's not necessarily a need  
41 to do traditional disclosures for this item because the City is the applicant. But yeah so there's

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 no need to do it now. It was important for Vice-Chair Roohparvar to announced her conflict...  
2 potential conflict at the outset but nothing more is necessary. Thank you.

3  
4 Chair Hechtman: Thank you, Mr. Yang. Alright, seeing no further Commission hands, I will ask  
5 for a Staff report. Ms. Chan, are you going to lead us?

6  
7 Mr. Phillip Kamhi, Chief Transportation Official: Well, thanks, I'll just briefly introduce Joanna  
8 Chan our Senior Planner. And I have to sadly note that this is going to be her last meeting  
9 because she's, unfortunately, leaving the City of Palo Alto. So, everybody is going to get to see  
10 how fantastic she is and then we'll have to bit her farewell, but this will be her final meeting  
11 and her final week here with the City. But that said, Joanna Chan our Senior Planner, we also  
12 have consultant here to assist with the presentation and also Sylvia Star-Lack.

13  
14 Ms. Joanna Chan, Senior Transportation Planner: Steve, can you please pull up the  
15 presentation, please? Thank you. So good evening Commissioners and members of the public.  
16 So, it is my pleasure to be here this evening being my last week. So, I am Joanna, I'm the Senior  
17 Transportation Planner with the City, and joining me tonight in this presentation is Steve Davis  
18 from our consultant team from Fehr & Peers. Next, please.

19  
20 So, this evening we will provide an overview of the project background, potential  
21 improvements we shared with the community during the first phase of engagement as well as  
22 feedback we have received through our online survey and previous events. We will also present  
23 the Preferred Concept Plan that was developed from this phase of community feedback and  
24 briefly outline the immediate next steps of the project at the end.

25  
26 So tonight, we are looking for PTC's direction on whether Staff should proceed with this project  
27 as a whole and if PTC recommends to further pursue this project. Staff request PTC to  
28 recommend the Preferred Concept Plan in its entirety to Council. Next, please. One more.

29  
30 The project was awarded to improve bicycle facilities on three corridors. The Waverley Multi-  
31 Use Path, East Meadow Drive between Alma Street and Fabian Way, and Fabian Way between  
32 East Meadow Drive and East Charleston Road. The City must deliver a protected bikeway along  
33 Fabian Way or East Meadow Drive as close as possible to a protected bikeway along the  
34 corridor without a continuous protected bikeway. Meaning that parts of the corridor could  
35 potentially be a buffered bikeway without the vertical separation and the grant stipulations do  
36 not allow the City to remove segments of these routes from the project without losing the  
37 funding. The project must also receive all Caltrans approval to initiate the construction phase by  
38 January 2023.

39

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 Here is a project map showing the project corridors in green. These corridors serve as key  
2 routes for students traveling to multiple schools as well as connections to various community  
3 facilities. Such as Mitchell Park Library and the Community Center, JCC, Robles Park and the  
4 Highway 101 pedestrian bike bridge project, and Adobe Reach Trail that is currently under  
5 construction which you can see in orange on the map.

6  
7 Here are two charts displaying data on the students bicycling to school. And these were  
8 collected by counting the number of parked bikes at a school and administered by  
9 parent/teacher association volunteers. And relevant to the project, the graph on the left shows  
10 in blue that JLS students biking increase from 48 percent in 2009 to 70 percent in 2019. The  
11 graph on the right shows in the red that Gunn students biking increase from 33 percent in 2009  
12 to 50 percent in 2019. For this coming school year, earlier start times for JLS and Gunn could  
13 result in even higher rates of biking and walking as parent work schedules may not long align  
14 with a morning school drop-off. And additionally, according to a fall 2020 survey of PAUSD  
15 parents, the lack of protected bikeway is the main reason site by elementary school parents  
16 who do not allow their children to bike to school.

17  
18 Analysis from the City's current Sustainability and Climate Action Plan effort shows that the  
19 transportation sector in red is the largest source of greenhouse gas emission in the state at 65  
20 percent. So, projects such as this one support mode shift from vehicle trips to active  
21 transportation modes and it is a relatively low-cost and efficient strategy to help reduce  
22 greenhouse gas emissions and reduce the barriers to bicycling identified by local parents.

23  
24 With that in mind, let's take a quick look at the three project corridors and what they look like  
25 now. The existing Waverly Multi-Use Path is pretty bumpy with uneven surfaces in places in due  
26 to cracking and tree root intrusion. There are also obstacles such as overgrown vegetation as  
27 you can see in this photo. Additionally, the path is directly adjacent to a chain-link fence that  
28 can interfere with bicycle handle bars. These issues combined with high demand during school  
29 peak periods have leads to falls and collisions for student cycling. And on Fabian Way, we have  
30 heard parents indicate that the existing bicycle facility make it a difficult school commute. This  
31 is likely due to the large crossing distance, traffic volumes and speed, and the lack of separation  
32 from vehicle traffic. As you can see in the photo on the right, this is Fabian Way looking towards  
33 West Bay Shore Road. The shared bicycle and parking lane leave little room for bicyclists and  
34 presents dooring exposure. And on East Meadow Drive, which is a popular school commute  
35 corridor, it currently has one vehicle travel lane, one bike lane, and one non-standard width  
36 parking lane in each direction. The rolled curbs, large parked vehicles, and lack of space  
37 between the bike lane and parking lane can result in challenges for bicyclists. Exposing them to  
38 dooring risks by parked cars or causing them to use the sidewalk when bike lanes are obstruct.

39

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.



1 Now I would like to turn the presentation over to Steve who will speak in more detail about  
2 potential improvements and share a summary of feedback we have received so far.

3  
4 Mr. Steve Davis: Thanks Joanna and thank you to the Commission for allowing me to join you  
5 today. We'll begin by flipping through some examples of different types of potential  
6 improvements that we've shared with the community and that many of you are probably  
7 familiar with. The first set of treatments that are the most common form of bike lane, which is  
8 either the standard bike lanes you see on the left or the buffered bike lanes that you see on the  
9 right. These are treatments that provide a clearly delineated space for one-way bike travel on a  
10 roadway. Standard bike lanes like the ones on the left are the existing condition on East  
11 Meadow and Fabian today. And buffered bike lanes like the ones on the right, are generally the  
12 same, but provide additional striping to create that clear space that you're seeing between  
13 bicyclist and moving vehicles. This also creates additional space for bicyclists to move into in the  
14 event that a car door is opened into the bike lane from a parked vehicle. Both of these  
15 treatments, I think as you all know, are used in many locations throughout Palo Alto.

16  
17 The next potential treatment is a protected bike lane, sometimes referred to as a cycle track.  
18 This provides a space for bicycles that is separated from vehicle traffic by some kind of a  
19 physical barrier such as bollards, concrete curbs, or other vertical elements. For example,  
20 bollards are used in front of Green Middle School at Middle Field Road and North California  
21 Avenue for that protected bikeway. This essentially creates a separate right of way for bicyclists  
22 within the roadway to minimize interactions between the vehicles and bicycles and can be  
23 implemented quickly using plastic bollards, delineators, other such materials; which is similar to  
24 what's on California Avenue and Middlefield Road there by green. Also, you see it on the left  
25 here on Blossom Hill Road in Los Gatos. One specific version of protected bike lane is referred  
26 to as a parking-protected bike lane and this utilizes parking... parked vehicles as part of that  
27 physical protection between the bike lane and moving vehicle traffic. So, this also creates a  
28 separate right of way for bicyclists in the roadway and it still allows parking to occur on the  
29 roadway without having interactions between bicyclists and parked vehicles or vehicles creating  
30 parking maneuvers. This allows a space to be put in between parked vehicles and the bicycle  
31 way to avoid the vehicle doors from the passenger side of cars intruding onto bicyclist's path.  
32 And just like protected bikeways, this can also be implemented more quickly using plastic  
33 bollards. And again, the same spot in Los Gatos, just another section of the road, you can see  
34 how that's s generally done.

35  
36 For the Waverly Path, the barrier between the path and the school parking circulation could  
37 potentially be modified to eliminate some of the constraints caused by the existing chain link  
38 fence. A shorter barrier in particular would not catch the handle bars of bicyclists like the fence  
39 can and would allow bicyclists to ride closer to that barrier and effectively make the path fee  
40 wider even if it's not actually wider. A wide variety of materials can serve this purpose,

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 including bollards, delineators, curbs, or a variety of other separators. These types of devices  
2 have been used throughout the Bay Area, including in Palo Alto, and adjacent communities  
3 such as Menlo Park, Mountain View, and Redwood City.

4  
5 Additionally, a variety of other decorative or artistic treatments could be considered to replace  
6 or enhance the existing fence. These treatments could provide a more substantial separation  
7 between the vehicle circulation route and the path, similar to the existing fence, but would  
8 improve the aesthetics. Depending on the treatment selected, the overall height may still be  
9 reduced to address interference with cyclist's handle bars. Some treatments, such as the  
10 decorative bollards and guard rails shown on the far right, can also be implemented and  
11 adjusted more quickly.

12  
13 So, with this background, let's go ahead and jump into an overall summary of the engagement  
14 activities and feedback that we received to date on the South Palo Alto Bikeways Project. As a  
15 start, just walking through the methods that were used and the events that were held. This  
16 shows the overall set of engagement methods for this project. Including the launching of the  
17 project webpage, communication through the City's social media channels, physical distribution  
18 of materials, focused meetings, and other methods used to advertise the project engagement.  
19 Additionally, this table shows the online survey and various events that were conducted. Along  
20 with the level of participation that was observed for each of these event throughout the  
21 process.

22  
23 The goal of this first phase of engagement was to assess community support for protected  
24 bicycle facilities. There were considerations that may have impacted the evaluation of the  
25 project. For example, we had to rely on digital engagement tools which sometimes had low  
26 participation and the engagement timeframe was limited or limited school-based opportunities  
27 because it was at the end of the school year. Overall, given the constrained product timeline  
28 and pandemic situation, there were limited resources and ability to pivot.

29  
30 This identifies a few of the key pieces of feedback we received for each of the project corridors  
31 during the webinars. For the Waverly Path, many attendees expressed a preference for keeping  
32 ridge delineation between the path and adjacent vehicle circulation to encourage safer  
33 behavior with a lower fence seen as a desirable option. Participants generally agreed with the  
34 project's goal to avoid tree removals along the path. Two key themes that developed were  
35 concerns about parking reductions as well as concerns about visibility for cyclists if parking-  
36 protected bike lanes were implemented on East Meadow Drive or Fabian Way. Participants  
37 sought more information pertaining to the makeup of people using the project corridors and  
38 noted that biking is particularly difficult at school arrival and dismissal times along East Meadow  
39 Drive.

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 As you can see here, a total of 258 unique participants provided feedback via the projects  
2 online survey. About 95 percent of those who participated live in Palo Alto and the responses  
3 indicated that approximately 80 percent of those who completed the survey were familiar with  
4 the corridors as a bicyclist and/or driver. Approximately 2/3s of the participants represented  
5 households with a student under the age of 18 who bikes to and from school.

6  
7 The next few slides will speak directly to the feedback provided for each of the project corridors  
8 using the web map, which is assessable through the online survey. A total of 17 comments were  
9 received on the Waverly Path via the project web map with 12 of those expressing a desire for  
10 the path to be widened. Respondents expressed a desire to maintain some kind of continuous  
11 physical barrier between the path and the adjacent vehicle circulation at the schools out of  
12 concern for safe interactions between students biking and drivers. Several participants noted  
13 that wayfinding and connectivity between the path and nearby facilities, such as Mitchell Park,  
14 and existing bikeways on East Charleston Road could be improved. A total of 11 comments  
15 were placed along Fabian Way using the web map, with more than half indicating that a  
16 protected bikeways was needed. No respondents indicated that the existing bikeways were  
17 adequate. Written comments indicated that biking is difficult and feels unsafe here. Especially  
18 for children and expressed concern for movements at the Fabian and East Charleston signalized  
19 intersection. Finally, a total of 50 comments were placed along East Meadow Drive using the  
20 web map. 13 of those comments indicated a preference for protected or buffered bikeways,  
21 and all of those were pins that were placed between Alma Street and Middlefield Road. 22  
22 comments were placed indicating that the existing bikeways were adequate. Written  
23 comments indicated that there were concerns about placements of bollards and in some cases  
24 noting specific locations in the concepts where bollards wouldn't be feasible for bikeway  
25 protection. It was noted that biking is particularly difficult during school arrival and dismissal  
26 times and that East Meadow Drive is used heavily as a biking routes by Gunn High School  
27 students.

28  
29 So, as part of the survey, participants were directly asked to vote for their preferred option on  
30 each project corridor. Two options were provided for each location on the Waverly Path and  
31 participants additionally could choose to express no preference. Or select other and enter  
32 written explanation and that was for all of the corridors that this was done.

33  
34 For the Waverly Multi-Use Path, the two options proposed different approaches to modifying  
35 the path to provide an improved and more consistent user experience. Option One consisted of  
36 widening the path toward the grassy strip away from the school buildings where feasible to  
37 accommodate larger flows. At pinch points, like this fire hydrant that you see here on the left,  
38 widening the path would allow more space for bicyclists. Option Two consisted of not only  
39 widening the path toward the grassy strip, similar to Option One but additionally widen the  
40 path towards the school buildings where feasible to allow additional space adjacent to trees

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 and vegetation. Any modification of the path that would require coordination... would require  
2 coordination with the fire department and school district. Both options were noted to  
3 potentially include removal or modification to the existing chain link fence and replace it with a  
4 different type of separation. As previously mentioned, a wide variety of materials could be used  
5 to delineate separation between the multi-use path and the adjacent vehicle [unintelligible].  
6 Approximately 2/3s of the survey participants expressed support for Option Two, which  
7 includes widening the path on either side where feasible.

8  
9 For Fabian Way, Option One consisted of eliminating the existing on-street parking to allow  
10 four vehicle travel lanes to be maintained while adding buffers for the existing bike lanes.  
11 Option Two consisted of maintaining on-street parking, adding a center turn lane, and  
12 implementing protected bike lanes while removing one thru travel lane in each direction. As  
13 can be seen here, 58 percent of the survey participants indicated a preference for protected  
14 bike lanes along Fabian Way while 26 percent preferred buffered bike lanes. A total of 16  
15 percent either didn't express a preference or indicated a preference for a different option, with  
16 those preferred to maintain the existing condition on Fabian Way representing 3.5 percent of  
17 the responses.

18  
19 On East Meadow Drive, both options to improve the existing bikeway would require moving  
20 parking on one side of the street. The parking retained could be on either side of the street and  
21 could potentially be different in different segments. Option One generally consisted of  
22 providing buffered bike lanes on both sides of the street to improve visibility and separation of  
23 bicyclists. Parking would be retained between the bike lane and sidewalk on side of the street.  
24 Option Two consisted of providing protected bike lanes on both sides of the street. In this  
25 option, parking would be between the moving vehicles and bikeways to provide additional  
26 physical separation. On East Meadow, 53 percent of the survey participants indicated a  
27 preference for protected bike lanes while 24 percent preferred buffered bike lanes. A total of  
28 23 percent either didn't express a preference or indicated a preference for a different option;  
29 with those who preferred to maintain the existing conditions representing 9 percent of the  
30 responses. Consistent with the feedback received during the engagement events, several  
31 responses reflected a desire to better understand how parking would be affected prior to  
32 selecting an alternative.

33  
34 As part of the survey, participants were directly asked to indicate on which sections of East  
35 Meadow Drive and Fabian Way they would prefer to see protected bikeways. Participants were  
36 allowed to select more than one segment, could select all segments if desired. As can be seen  
37 here, support for protected bikeways was strongest on East Meadow Drive between Alma  
38 Street and Middlefield Road as well as on Fabian Way. Respondents generally showed less  
39 preference for protected bikeways on East Meadow Drive east of Middlefield Road.

40

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 Based on the feedback received through the events, survey, web map, and emails to the Office  
2 of Transportation. We then went ahead with developing a preferred alternative for  
3 consideration.

4  
5 The preferred alternative for the Waverly Path was identified as widening to either side of the  
6 path where feasible. This design has the potential to provide the greatest enhancement to the  
7 users experience while minimizing the effect on trees. Based on the feedback, it is anticipated  
8 that the continuous ridged barrier would be investigated to replace the existing chain link  
9 fence. In order to best control interactions between students on the path and vehicles in the  
10 adjacent circulation isles. As previously mentioned, any widening toward the school would  
11 coordinated with the school district and the fire department.

12  
13 Given the support for protected bikeways on Fabian Way, we plan to present to PTC and  
14 Council Option Two. Which includes a reduction in travel lanes and maintains on-street parking  
15 as part of the protected bikeway in the east bound direction toward US 101. East bound in this  
16 aerial is off to your left towards 101. Improvements for this segment would be coordinated  
17 with other improvement programs in the area as part of the Charleston/Arastradero Project.  
18 Including lane configuration changes at the East Charleston Road intersection.

19  
20 Before we share the preferred alternative for East Meadow Drive, we would like to note that  
21 number of concerns related to improvements on East Meadow Drive were identified through  
22 the engagement process. A number of concerns related to the survey not explicitly providing an  
23 option to retain existing conditions, which supports an overall community preference to  
24 preserve parking as much as possible on the residential side. With that in mind, surveyor  
25 responses indicated general support for protected bikeways on East Meadow south or west of  
26 Middlefield Road with the greatest desire to add protected facilities adjacent to the schools  
27 between Waverly Street and Middlefield Road. Given that East Meadow Drive is not wide  
28 enough to allow additions of buffers or protection for bike lanes while keeping parking on both  
29 sides of the street. The preferred alternative reflects the solution with parking preserved on the  
30 residential side. Additionally, last Friday, over 30 residents met with City Staff as Ramos Park. A  
31 variety of concerns were raised about the project including concerns about the outreach  
32 process, the project rationale, and the reduction in parking supply inconvenience. The results of  
33 location-specific feedback about the change in parking availability along the Ramos Park  
34 frontage. And the potential for increased vehicle and bicycle interaction during the tightly  
35 clustered morning commute if the parking were retained on the north side of the street. As  
36 reducing these interactions is a goal of the project, the next project phase will include  
37 conducting outreach to consider retention of parking on the south of East Meadow Drive, east  
38 of Middlefield Road. For the purpose of tonight's action item, PTC could recommend a parking  
39 lane removal and leave open the question of where parking should be retained or express a  
40 preference for which side should retain parking.

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

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

Based upon the feedback, East Meadow Drive have been broken into four different segments for the identification of the preferred alternative. Location Number One is between East Meadow Circle and Fabian Way and would retain parking in the westbound direction traveling away from Fabian Way while keeping bike lanes on both sides.

Location Number Two is at the other end of East Meadow Drive between Alma Street and Waverly Street. Compared to the rest of the corridor, relatively few properties have driveways directly accessing East Meadow as most properties in this segment front the cross streets. Because of this, a preferred design of protected bike lines in both directions with parking maintained on one side has been identified. Access to all driveways would be maintained.

Location Number Three is between Waverly Street and Middlefield Road. Including the frontage of JLS and Fair Meadow Schools as well as Mitchell Park on the south side of the street. Along this section, a majority of the north side of the street consists of residential frontage. Because of the context, a preferred designed was identified as a hybrid of the original two options. On the residential side of the street, a buffered bike lane would be introduced in the westbound direction while the one street parking lane would be widened between the bike lane and sidewalk. The buffer would increase bicyclist comfort and provide additional space to navigate the door zone. Alternatives to provide a buffer between bicyclists and parked vehicles could also be considered. On the school side of the street, a protected bikeway would be provided by including physical separation in the proposed painted buffer. Access to all existing driveways would be maintained.

One unique location in this segment is where angled parking is provided with direction access from East Meadow Drive adjacent to the Fair Meadow Elementary School site. The same general cross-section as described in the last slide would be maintained here but the bike lane would be striped with dash marking to identify the mixing zone between bicycles and vehicles completing parking maneuvers. This is similar to the existing treatment on Stanford Avenue at the dish parking.

The final segment of East Meadow Drive is between Middlefield Road and East Meadow Circle where both sides of the street are generally fronted by residential properties. Based upon feedback received, the preferred design here consists of buffered bike lanes in both directions. On-street parking would be maintained between the bike lane and sidewalk in one direction which is currently proposed to be westbound. At locations where there are not driveways and parking is not proposed such as adjacent to Ramos Park. Physical separators such as bollards could be added to the buffered bike lane to enhance protection of bicyclists.

So, with that, I'm going to turn it back over to Joanna to explain the next steps for the project.

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1  
2 Ms. Chan: Thanks, so much Steve. So, after tonight's meeting... oh, next slide, please? So, after  
3 tonight's meeting, we anticipate presenting the project along with PTC's feedback and  
4 recommendation to City Council on August the 9<sup>th</sup>. And if City Council directs the project to  
5 move forward, the design phase will likely begin in the fall which will include more community  
6 engagement, parking studies as well as temporary treatments. And with that, it concludes our  
7 presentation tonight and we welcome any questions.

8  
9 Chair Hechtman: Thank you, Staff. Questions of Staff Commissioners before we take public  
10 comment? Alright, I'm seeing no hands so... oh, Commissioner Lauing.

11  
12 Commissioner Lauing: Yes, thanks. These are just questions to Staff, correct?

13  
14 Chair Hechtman: Yes.

15  
16 Commissioner Lauing: So, first of all, the original premise of this meeting is whether or not the  
17 product should be continued and I'm just a little bit confused from the start on that. Can you  
18 give that... some context? I mean are there pluses and minuses as to why it should move  
19 forward or not or is this relative to the VTA Grant? Why are we being asked that question  
20 because there's so much invested in it and, you know, it's got benefits? Why is it even a  
21 question as to whether it should move forward with some recommendation?

22  
23 Mr. Kamhi: I'll start on that and then perhaps Sylvia or Joanna or Steve even might want to  
24 jump in. But just to note that this was originally brought to PTC and Council a little while back  
25 as... it's a little bit complicated. But we laid out originally the outreach plan and this was  
26 intended to be a check point on that outreach plan. That outreach plan was determined to...  
27 was set to determine if we have a project. And what we mean by that is we've got a potential  
28 grant funding source if we have a project. And that is because VTA in giving us this grant has  
29 required us to do what we said we would do in the grant which is to provide bike paths in all  
30 the segments that have been mentioned. So, that's the premise for the grant so what we need  
31 to decide at this point is if this is going to be a project that we are going to feel comfortable  
32 moving forward with. Noting that the history of this project is that it was originally identified as  
33 a potential corridor for this type of treatment in the 2012 Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation  
34 Plan. This grant was applied for approximately 4-years ago and now we're trying to fulfill this  
35 project on a very, very tight timeline in order to receive that grant funding if we are going to  
36 move forward on the project. So, nothing that we're already spending money on doing the  
37 community outreach to determine whether we'll be able to move forward with this project. So,  
38 that's where we're at and I'm not sure if Sylvia or Joanna or Steve, do you want to provide any  
39 more context on that?

40

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 Ms. Star-Lack: Sure, I'll say a couple things. I think we realized that once we get going with this  
2 project, once we decide to move forward and commit to it. That we won't... there's no wiggle  
3 room in the schedule to stop and change things and pause it or we will lose the money. And so,  
4 we wanted to make sure that the community understood what this project was. We wanted to  
5 get a check-in to move forward so that's the main thrust of that.

6  
7 Commissioner Lauing: So, then it is specifically relative to if there is a project as funded by VTA?  
8 I think that's what I heard Phillip say.

9  
10 Ms. Star-Lack: Yeah.

11  
12 Commissioner Lauing: I mean that clarifies the question for me, but the next question is that I  
13 understood that there was suppose to be some negotiations with VTA and could we get a  
14 status on that?

15  
16 Ms. Star-Lack: We did speak with VTA about the project scope. They're... they were expecting  
17 protected bikeways with a vertical element on all of the project segments. I mean not on the  
18 Waverly Path but because that's all obviously separated... going to be separated anyway but on  
19 East Meadow and on Fabian. And they said well if you... they said you have to provide it as  
20 much as possible, as much protection as possible, and if not. If you can't get protection in, then  
21 there needs to be some kind of separation. A buffered bike lane and so leaving any segments  
22 out, where we leave things in existing conditions, would not be ok. We would lose the grant for  
23 that and they note that other... we competed with other people for this money and other  
24 communities might not take it kindly if we change the promised scope. So, they're willing to  
25 move a little bit and meet us in the middle to remove the protected bike lanes from both  
26 streets, but we have to put in at least buffered bike lanes where we can.

27  
28 Mr. Kamhi: I just wanted to note that this is really critical because the crux of the discussion  
29 that I'm sure that we're going to hear from public comments tonight and as well from PTC  
30 Commissioners who might have the same question is really the question about removing  
31 parking. So just to note that in order to gain the space necessary to do buffered or protected,  
32 any type of additional bike lane in order to fulfill the need of this grant, we will have to remove  
33 parking. So, I just want to note that in advance because that is the difficult discussion that will  
34 be before you tonight.

35  
36 Commissioner Lauing: Yeah, we should have that on the table. So, your understanding of VTA,  
37 the narrowest definition of... can't remember that indirect phrase of almost where it was or  
38 something like that, is that there has to be some kind of physical buffer?  
39

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.



1 Mr. Kamhi: It's really the space more so than the physical. So, the allowance that VTA is giving  
2 us is that we do not have to have the physical barrier as a protected bikeway would. But we do  
3 need to have the space at a minimum of a buffered bike lane. If that makes sense to you on all  
4 of the segments. So, we can't say this really works great in segment one, three, and four but we  
5 don't want to do it in segment two. It just... VTA will say thank you, let's move this money to  
6 another agency.

7  
8 Commissioner Lauing: Ok, well maybe you can go into more detail on that when we get to the  
9 alternatives but that's very good about answering the question. Really quick question was  
10 there... is there any consideration a possibility of also reducing speed limits because taking the  
11 speeds down 5 miles per hours reduced collisions by half. I know there's a state law that  
12 addresses that as well so is that also an enhancement in this project of dropping speeds?

13  
14 Mr. Kamhi: I don't have the exact boundaries immediately in front of me but we are already in  
15 the process of reducing speeds around the school zones. So, the speeds are going to be... are...  
16 this was approved back by Council in 2016. We're currently in the process of installing new  
17 speed zone signs. So, we are already reducing speeds in school areas.

18  
19 Commissioner Lauing: Ok thanks, that's all the question for now.

20  
21 Chair Hechtman: Commissioner Chang.

22  
23 Chair Hechtman: Just to ask one more time, my understanding this is an all-or-nothing deal. We  
24 cannot lop off a section of East Meadow and receive a proportionate amount of funding. Is that  
25 correct?

26  
27 Mr. Kamhi: Yes, in order to fulfill or to have the grant be our funding source for this project.

28  
29 Commissioner Chang: Then a second question which is Ms. Chan I think cited some survey of  
30 parents saying that the lack of protected bike lanes is the reason why many elementary school  
31 children do not bike. And so, I was wondering if that was also the case for specifically Fair  
32 Meadow Elementary School children since that is primarily the elementary school in question in  
33 this area? And the reason I ask that question is because I want to make sure that we're... this is  
34 solving for an actual problem according to that neighborhood and people who use that area.

35  
36 Ms. Star-Lack: I can speak to that and so that was a survey that was done that was school  
37 district-wide. So, it was parents across the district who report... parents from across the district  
38 who do not normally... who don't let their kids walk or bike to school site that the lack of  
39 protected bike lanes was the number one reason why or yeah. The number one reason why  
40 they weren't biking to school.

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

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

Commissioner Chang: Ok, so we don't have the cross tabs on that (interrupted)

Ms. Star-Lack: No.

Commissioner Chang: Knowing how many Fair Meadow parents said that? Ok. That's it for me for now.

Chair Hechtman: Alright, thank you. Any other Commission questions of Staff before we go to public comment? Seeing no hands, we will now open the floor for public comment. Please raise your hand if you wish to speak. On the Zoon App, there is a raise hand button on the bottom of your screen. If you're dialing in from a phone, please press \*9 and I know we have speakers tonight. Before we get to that, you'll have 3-minutes as indicated on the clock and I do expect that... in fact, I can see that we have seven hands up already, 25 attendees. I'm expecting more of you to raise your hand. So, what I would encourage you to do is we're looking forward to hearing what you have to say. To the extent you're going to say something that you heard another speaker say, just if you can find a short way to tell us you agree with that earlier speaker, you actually preserve more of your time to make original points. Which would... both that would be helpful to hear the original points and to know you agree with a prior speaker. So, with that, it looks like Mr. Nguyen, you want to start the public speakers for this item?

Mr. Vinh Nguyen, Admin Associate III: Yes, thank you. Let's wait a quick moment for the speaker timer. Oh, there it is, sorry. Our first... so currently we have 10 speakers. Our first five speakers will be Arthur Keller, followed by Kenneth, followed by Sue F, followed by Peggy, and then followed by Alan. So, our first speaker is Arthur.

Mr. Arthur Keller: Good evening Commissioners and Staff. I quote from Staff report Page 2 with an emphasis added. The original grant scope committed the City to delivery of protected bikeways along Fabian Way and East Meadow Drive. After conversations with VTA, the City must deliver at a minimum a protected bikeway along Fabian Drive... Fabian Way or East Meadow Drive must deliver a scope as close as possible to protected bikeways along any corridor without a continuous protected bike lane.

Now, the plan can provide a protected bikeway along Fabian Way, along East Meadow Drive within Alma and Middlefield and Waverly, and not change anything between Middlefield and East Meadow Circle, [unintelligible] four. The plan is the preference to the neighbor. It desired a green stripe that is going to be painted with a bike lane marker between Middlefield and East Meadow Circle along East Meadow Drive. Now, why spend money to fix something that is not broken?

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 I also point out that the along East Meadow Circle, that between East Meadow Circle and East...  
2 and Fabian Way, that parking should be on the south side of the street. So, the... rather than  
3 the north side because in that direction is where the bike bridge is going to be placed in the  
4 interest of bikeway... the bike bridge. So, it would be a problem if there's bike... where there's  
5 parking on that side of the street. And not only that but there also is parking all along there  
6 because of... excessive parking because of this two housing complexes in the neighborhood and  
7 those complexes cost considerable street parking that can be seen at night. So, I would just ask  
8 you [unintelligible] people to look at night and then you'll see all the parking on the street. I'm  
9 done.

10

11 Mr. Nguyen: Thank you Arthur for your comments. Our next speaker is Kenneth.

12

13 Mr. Kenneth Fehl: Good evening, can you hear me?

14

15 Mr. Nguyen: Yes, we can hear you. There seems to be an echo. If you're listening to the meeting  
16 on a different device (interrupted)

17

18 Mr. Fehl: Ok can you hear... is the echo gone now?

19

20 Mr. Nguyen: Yes, perfect, thank you.

21

22 Mr. Fehl: Thank you. My name is Kenneth Fehl. I've lived here on East Meadow for over 40-  
23 years. And I want to address one comment that Mr. Davis made that only 9 percent of the  
24 people wanted to retain the situation as is based upon the meeting that we had, the  
25 impromptu meeting we had on Friday with over 35 attendees addressing segment four of East  
26 Meadow by the way. The area east of Middlefield down to East Meadow Circle. It was not 9  
27 percent that wanted to keep it, it was 100 percent of the residents here wanted to keep it as is  
28 with respect to the issue of maintaining the parking on the streets.

29

30 We were all agreeable to having bike lane painted greed to emphasize it, but no one wants to  
31 have a parking removed. It would be a tremendous inconvenience to everybody. I personally  
32 have a business here. I'm a law practice. I have an assistant who's handicapped who would be  
33 forced to walk quite a bit of distance away from her office if she was not allowed to park here. I  
34 have a number of clients who are elderly in their 80s and 90s. It would be a horrible  
35 inconvenience for them as well.

36

37 And so, the proposal to remove the parking is overkill in that we have never... there's no  
38 empirical evidence that there is any kind of accident or a collision or any interference by cars  
39 opening their doors with respect with interfering with the bike lane. It's a perceived problem

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 that does... is not an actual problem and yes, we can improve the biking but we do not have to  
2 remove the parking.

3  
4 And as far as the contention that it's an all or nothing deal or you lose the money. That is  
5 incorrect. You can still improve the parking... improve the bike lanes but you do not need to  
6 remove the parking. That would be a major inconvenience and a major loss of a financial  
7 interest as well. Thank you very much.

8  
9 Mr. Nguyen: Thank you Kenneth for joining us tonight. Our next speaker is Sue. Sue  
10 [unintelligible – audio disturbance] (interrupted)

11  
12 Ms. Sue F: Hi, can you hear me?

13  
14 Mr. Nguyen: Yes, we can. Thank you.

15  
16 Ms. Sue F: So, I'm kind of bothered very much here by the timeline that decisions have to be  
17 made by August 9<sup>th</sup>, and the Planning Commission and City Council are going on vacation. So, I  
18 don't see how anything's going to get done between now and then very much without just  
19 barreling through with the all-or-nothing idea. Like we got to get this money, let's do it.  
20 Damned with what everyone says which is a very, unfortunately, thing I think.

21  
22 I think that the City... Joanna Chan mentioned that she said the City, according to the proposal,  
23 is not allowed to remove segments of the plan. In the park on July 9<sup>th</sup> and I believe on a phone  
24 call previously with Sylvia. I do not believe we were told that that was 100 percent definite. I  
25 thought we could change segments of the plan. My understanding was we could so I thought  
26 we're trying to get all these comments from neighbors and residents to understand that better  
27 and make our voice be heard.

28  
29 I also go to what Arthur spoke of, of the 9... there was a notation of the survey results. 9  
30 percent of East Meadow area residents said don't change the portion of East Meadow. I think  
31 that the results of the survey drove people to put answers that they didn't necessarily want. I  
32 know that I, on several questions, looked at it and I said I don't want any of these, and I can't  
33 get a good answer for what I want in our neighborhood. So, I do believe that the survey, like  
34 many surveys ever done in the world, are skewed to get the results that you want which is get  
35 everybody to say ok and move ahead with the plan. Because like Arthur said, 100 percent of  
36 approximately 35 people at the park on Friday, who are residents of the area and closely  
37 affected by this, said we don't want this. So, that information and the results of that survey are  
38 not accurate at all.

39

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 So, I also really wonder about who agreed to this plan of take this proposal and like Sylvia said.  
2 Let's take it away from other Cities who want the money because Palo Alto can use it, knowing  
3 it was pretty much an all-or-nothing plan and did you really think Palo Alto people weren't  
4 going to speak up? And if you lived in this neighborhood or took the time to be down here. I  
5 think that you would really not want this in your neighborhood. I mean I don't mean to say  
6 don't put it in my backyard, but that's exactly what's happening and we have a ton of stuff on  
7 this road. And we need to have cars and parking and we need to be listened to most of all. And I  
8 don't think that's being done if you just want to ram down our throats to get the money which I  
9 think is your goal and I'm sorry about that.

10

11 Mr. Nguyen: Thank you for your comments. Our next speaker is Peggy.

12

13 Ms. Peggy: Hi, can you hear me?

14

15 Mr. Nguyen: Yes, we can, thank you.

16

17 Ms. Peggy: Ok thank you. Thank you for having this meeting and listening to us and also thank  
18 you, thanks Sylvia for meeting us at the park last Friday. After the meeting at the park, we... a  
19 lot of residents sent emails to the Planning Commission and also the City Council. Please, please  
20 read those emails. There are tons of reasons that why this plan is not a good plan. It's actually...  
21 I wouldn't use the words in the email but please read them.

22

23 And when I look at the presentation today, I almost laughed loud because when I saw the  
24 picture of East Meadow. It's very, very, very deceptive. It's a picture taken... I couldn't even  
25 believe that there's an angle to take a picture of East Meadow showing that the bike lane is not  
26 generous. But actually, I took a photo a few days ago and sent the photo with an email and I  
27 just now sent another email to the Planning Commission. Please look at the email. Please look  
28 at the photo that I take. The bike lane is very generous. It's almost as wide as the car lane and  
29 yeah, there's... I don't know why we still need to widen that already very generous bike lane.  
30 And also, I'm very concerned about the deceptive photo in the presentation.

31

32 There's another slide talking about the percentage of students going to school and the  
33 percentage is rising every year. Why did they use percentage? Why do not... why don't use just  
34 the real number? The absolute number? There's one reason using the percentage because  
35 maybe the absolute number is decreasing but because of the base number of students is  
36 decreasing then the percentage is increasing. Then they chose to show the percentage instead  
37 of the absolute value. So, from these slides, I think we have a reason to question the data in the  
38 presentation. Whether they are engineered so that it's favored to a decision that they want to  
39 push.

40

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 As a summary, as many neighbors... fellow neighbors already stated in their emails. There is no  
2 problem with this East Meadow stretch of the street and please do not create problems when  
3 there is no problem. Thank you.

4  
5 Mr. Nguyen: Thank you for your comments. Our next and last five speakers are Alan, followed  
6 by Amie, followed by Patricia, followed by Taly, followed by Francine, followed by Karen, and  
7 then followed by Chuck. Ok, our next speaker is Alan. Alan, if you're there, can (interrupted)

8  
9 Mr. Alan Wachtel: Yes, I've unmuted. Can you hear me?

10  
11 Mr. Nguyen: Yes, we can, thank you.

12  
13 Mr. Wachtel: Alright, I've been a member of the City's Pedestrian and Bicycle Committee for  
14 over 40-years without... with one interruption but I'm not speaking for that Committee. Only  
15 for myself. I believe this project should not move forward. There's a need in this corridor but  
16 the project has not been designed to address the need. You've heard very clearly that it was  
17 designed to chase certain funding and to conform to the requirements of that funding. Not to  
18 the need in the corridor. It would be possible for the City to spend half a million dollars of its  
19 own funding and a million dollars of the grant while making things more dangerous for  
20 bicyclists and pedestrians. The need in this corridor could be addressed first of all by some  
21 combination of partial parking removal and lane re-configuration; which would preserve more  
22 parking than the current plan which is clearly important to the neighborhood.

23  
24 But what's been presented to you here as a necessity is barriers separated bikeways which have  
25 been described to you as protected. That's also how they were described during outreach and  
26 naturally when people were told that bikeways are protected. That's what they want. It sounds  
27 like there's no interaction with cars, but that's an illusion. It's not the engineering term for  
28 these facilities and the many drawbacks were not presented either to you or during public  
29 outreach.

30  
31 If you're driving a car, you would not think of passing right-turning traffic on the right. Roads  
32 wouldn't even be designed that way, but these separated bikeways force bicyclists to pass  
33 right-turning traffic at every driveway and minor intersection on the right, in the right rear blind  
34 spot of the driver. While expecting to be protected while the driver is unable to merge toward  
35 the curb as you would normally do because of the barrier. In addition, sight lines may be  
36 obstructed by parked cars which has been mentioned.

37  
38 There are additional drawbacks to be trapped in the separated bikeway but I don't have time to  
39 go into those. You might say, well you don't have to use them if you don't want to. But the  
40 remaining traffic lane will be too narrow to share side by side and will also create hostility and

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 antagonism between bicyclist who ought to use it and motorists who are delayed. Buffer bike  
2 lanes also have problems but I could work with them if I had to. These barrier separated so-  
3 called protected bikeways, no you should not approve the project.

4  
5 Mr. Nguyen: Thank you for your comments. Our next speaker is Amie. Ok, I'm sorry Amie, it  
6 looks like you're using an older version of Zoom. So, I actually can't unmute you but I can  
7 temporarily promote you to panelist so you can give us your comments. So, your Zoom app is  
8 going to close and reopen shortly. Amie, you're muted.

9  
10 Ms. Amie Ashton: Good evening. Once again, hello. Ok, my names Amie Ashton and I am here  
11 to speak for those who aren't here with us tonight and those are the kids. Hundreds of which  
12 who use and would this bike lane if they felt safe.

13  
14 Public right of way is for all us. It's not a private parking lot for use of those who are out there.  
15 This is transportation space, it's space that contributes to our sense of community and our  
16 overall public health. I'm just kind of sad that potentially parking spaces might be the reason  
17 this plan is being squashed and I admit no plan is perfect. This plan might not be perfect, but it's  
18 a step in the right direction towards making these kids feel safe. And I think that's what our  
19 community is about and what we need to value. So, thank you so much, and good luck with  
20 this.

21  
22 Mr. Nguyen: Thank you Amie for your comments. Our next speaker is Patricia.

23  
24 Ms. Patricia Stayte: Hi, I would like to say that I think that there's several problems with this  
25 plan. I'm asking the Commissioners to... oh, can you hear me?

26  
27 Mr. Nguyen: Yes, we can, thank you.

28  
29 Ms. Stayte: Oh ok, can you restart me by any chance? I just didn't know if you could hear me.  
30 Hello?

31  
32 Mr. Nguyen: Yeah, we can (interrupted)

33  
34 Chair Hechtman: Go ahead and restart... Mr. Nguyen, go ahead and restart her.

35  
36 Ms. Stayte: Thank you so much. Alright, so there're a number of problems with this project and  
37 specifically with community engagement and outreach which I think was quite failed. Because  
38 as we discovered in the park last Friday or whenever that was, last Monday, that many of us  
39 were completely unaware of this project. You should also know Commissioners that we are not  
40 just motorists. We are cyclists and motorists, many of us, and so we are not anti-bicycle at all.

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

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

This programs has created a real illusion, this project, and Commissioners I'd like you to pay attention to like Alan was saying. The grant is really forcing the conditions and you've really put the cart before the horse. It looks like you've done a great job of explaining what you're doing but the basic premise is flawed because you're jamming the location into the grant and that creates a lot of problems.

I'd like to say as a parent, I would not allow my child, K to four grade, to bike, walk or otherwise go to school on their own. Regardless of whether you paved the roads with gold and put them in some kind of protected bubble because they're really too vulnerable and they lack maturity because they're little kids. And so, I think there's lots of great things we can do to solve these problems. They're just not in that grant.

Next, the... your data is skewed like Peggy was saying. The cost of housing in Palo Alto coupled with the declining birth rates will lead to less of a PAUSD population going forward. So, using percentages is completely misleading and then saying that those are increasing. Maybe the percentage has increased but not the gross number. Not the raw number. There are solutions, just not with this grant.

Commissioners, please vote no, and please also, like Peggy was saying, take some time if you can to read the emails that we're sending. A lot of us are really, really upset about this because we feel like we've been blindsided and if you vote no... if you vote yes on this. You will increase danger to both cyclists, motorists, and pedestrians and there will be accidents. There are lots of great things that could be done that probably would require less money and some imagination but this is not the right way to do it. I thank you guys so much for your public service Commissioners and everyone who's come here tonight to give up their time to figure this problem out. We all love the kids, we all love cycling, and we want to have a safe community but this grant is not it. Thank you so much again for your time.

Mr. Nguyen: Thank you for your comments. Our next speaker is Taly.

Ms. Taly Katz: Hi. Hi, thank you. I've been living on Ortega Court for 35-years now and I thank you guys all for being here and for taking the time with the grant. I agree with most of the speakers so far that because this is an all-or-nothing kind of a deal which I didn't understand until just right now. With all your outreach and put all in quotations because the first time I heard about this project was the meeting that was on Friday. Even know I'm on Facebook and I'm on Next Door Neighbor, etc. So, the outreach was not sufficient to start with.

So, the fact that this is an all-or-nothing kind of a deal is very disturbing because the part of the project that is problematic is, in my opinion, the stretch of East Meadow Drive from Middlefield

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.



1 to East Meadow Circle. And the problematic... the very problematic part of that is Ramos Park.  
2 That park is accessed by people who come there for soccer and dog walking, etc. and I think  
3 there might even be a legal problem to eliminate parking on that side of the street. You would  
4 be eliminating the handicap parking and you would be forcing people to jay-walk, which is  
5 illegal because they would have to go either all the way to Ross Road or to Lewis Road in order  
6 to cross and that is not practical. So, I contend that there might even be a legal problem to  
7 eliminate parking next to Ramos Park. It's not like Mitchell Park where there's other parking  
8 there. There's parking lots at Mitchell Park. There is no alternative parking there.

9  
10 So, this is... I'd also like to hear some status about the accidents that have been along the  
11 corridor. Mostly the East Meadow corridor because I think that's the problematic part of this  
12 proposal because again, it's all or nothing. And I'm wondering if it's really not a problem there  
13 but it just was inserted into this whole plan and now we can't eliminate it. So, that's the part of  
14 the plan that is not, in my opinion, this whole shouldn't go through because of that part. Yeah, I  
15 guess that's it. Thank you.

16  
17 Mr. Nguyen: Thank you for joining us. Our next speaker is Francine.

18  
19 Ms. Francine Fail: Hi, you can hear me?

20  
21 Mr. Nguyen: Yes, we can, thank you.

22  
23 Ms. Fail: Great. So, as I was saying in the beginning, I have lived here all my life in this  
24 neighborhood. I grew up here as a kid, I biked East Meadow, went to Wilbur, went to  
25 Cubberley. My children did and my grandchild and there has never been a problem that I know  
26 of. Especially, between Middlefield Road and was its East Meadow Circle? There's never been  
27 an issue with cars and bicycles.

28  
29 I think that the... I agree with basically what everybody said. The only thing I want to add to this  
30 are two things. One, there's no reason... because I know that they did this for the other  
31 elementary schools that you passed out saying... you passed out a flyer to all the parents saying  
32 this is how the kids should ride and where. And I don't understand why we can't do that to say  
33 go to Mayfield... Mayfield?

34  
35 [note – unknown male speaker:] Mayview.

36  
37 Ms. Fail: Mayview, go through the park because that's where they're bike places are that they  
38 have to place their bikes to go to school and that's a may much quieter street. They don't have  
39 any issues with that.

40

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 I don't get that and then not to add insult to injury but having that turnabout that you'd put in.  
2 You got rid of the bike lanes and now you're going to have children mixed in with this  
3 roundabout where they had to put back two of the stop signs. And it's going to be an issue for  
4 pedestrians, I've already seen it for cars, and for bicyclists who all have to converge in this  
5 roundabout.

6  
7 [note – unknown male speaker:] Fire department.

8  
9 Ms. Fail: Oh yeah and the fire department goes down East Meadow quite a bit and they literally  
10 have to slow down, stop, go around the thing and who knows, somebody having a heart attack  
11 how long... how much longer they have to wait because of that.

12  
13 So, I really don't think that this should continue. I think you need to end it. If you have to give  
14 back the money because it's all or nothing. Give back the money. I did see in Section Two where  
15 it said Fabian Way or East Meadow you could do something and I do see on Fabian Way it  
16 makes sense because it's a much larger street. Wider street and most of the places are  
17 businesses that already have parking lots for their employees. So, I could understand doing  
18 something there for the bicycles and I can understand on East Meadow putting in the green  
19 color things so that people can see the bike paths better. But the road is just not that wide as  
20 Charleston and Arastradero and I really don't think there's been a problem here. I also have  
21 asked to see where they've had an issue and nobody has shown that to me. Thank you.

22  
23 Mr. Nguyen: Thank you for your comments. Our next speaker is Karen. Hi, Karen, if you're  
24 there, can you please unmute yourself? Last call for Karen. Ok, in the interest of time we'll  
25 come back to Karen at the end. Our next three speakers will be Chuck, followed by Robert, and  
26 then Shelley. Chuck, if you're there, you can speak now.

27  
28 Mr. Chuck Wilson: My name is Chuck Wilson. I'm a resident of East Meadow for 41-years. In the  
29 41-years I've been here, I've never seen a problem with biking safety. My three children all  
30 biked to and from school. To Fair Meadow, JLS, and Gunn. The bike lanes are probably the  
31 widest in the City. There are lines already between the bike lanes and the traffic and the bike  
32 lanes and parking.

33  
34 Another problem... one of the biggest safety problems is Ramos Park which has already been  
35 gone over. But I want to point out that Ramos Park, first of all, does not have its own parking  
36 unlike Mitchell Park what was pointed out, so most of the use is by young children. In the  
37 evening there's tee-ball, youth soccer. These parents park on the south side so their kids do not  
38 have to run across the road. Forcing... removing the parking from the south side is going to  
39 mean that every... all these kids that are going to Don Ramos Park every evening during school  
40 or are going to be running across the road. Four lanes; two bike lanes, two traffic lanes, to and

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 from and these are the young kids. These are not older teenagers. These are our youngest  
2 children who are using Ramos Park and then the parents, the adults, would be carrying their  
3 athletic equipment, picnic tables for picnics on weekends.

4  
5 Another problem is that there isn't enough space for the two... all the parking right now to go  
6 to one side. The City's has been encouraging the addition of the ADU units to provide low-cost  
7 housing and this has increased the amount of parking on the street. You might go down the  
8 middle of the day and it looks like there's a lot of parking. But in the evening when everyone is  
9 home, you find that right now where I live. The south side is the overflowed parking for the  
10 north side because there just aren't enough spaces. And the problem of leaving the parking on  
11 the northside is that in the morning, that you're doubling the number of cars on the northside.  
12 All the kids are biking to school on the northside and they're in a rush to go to school. It's  
13 different from in the afternoon when they're coming... leisurely going and the after-school  
14 actives are spaced out. But in the morning, you've got the rush of traffic and they're all rushing,  
15 and then at the same time you have twice as many car doors opening, people backing out,  
16 driving over the bike lane. So, for that reason, it's a bad idea.

17  
18 Let's see, I'm [unintelligible] aren't going to have enough time to speak everything. Just be...  
19 read our emails. I think in our emails we did a good job. The circle right now if you look at the  
20 picture I sent in the email. You'll see how the lines of bike path direct the bikers right into the  
21 traffic before they go around the circle. That's just an accident waiting to happen. Thank you.

22  
23 Mr. Nguyen: Thank you for your comments. Our next speaker is Robert.

24  
25 Mr. Robert Stayte: Can you hear me now?

26  
27 Mr. Nguyen: Yes, we can.

28  
29 Mr. Stayte: Great. First, I'll follow your format and I'll [unintelligible] one all the people I agree  
30 with. So [unintelligible] and at least who I remember. Painting the lanes and stenciling is  
31 something that we need. I live... also first I live between Meadow and between [unintelligible]  
32 roundabout. So, that's where I live one Meadow, have for 16-years, family of five, all bicyclists  
33 for commuting, work, everything. So, a lot of bicycles going on in my house. So, I agree with  
34 painting the lanes and stenciling. I agree with maintaining all the parking on both sides of the  
35 street for some of the reasons that have been given. The generous... the bike lanes are very  
36 generous as are... as they are presently. There was quite a bit of lacking of the community  
37 engagement and outreach because everyone at the meeting last Friday did not receive a door  
38 hanger or any kind of communication about this. So, there's no problem, don't create one.

39

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 Ramos Park, eliminate the parking down would be a nightmare. The roundabout is a nightmare  
2 and reducing that or reducing the bike lanes around it presently. I walk my dogs through there  
3 every day. Trying to walk the dogs around, if there's bicyclists around and cars around. It's  
4 everybody kind of pauses and doesn't really know what to do and the kids in the morning time  
5 have the same issue. So, that needs to be rethought. No accidents that I've seen living in where  
6 I live in my street anywhere coming and going at all times of day.

7  
8 I do have an ADU. I built an ADU and losing parking... we were encouraged by the City and given  
9 money by the City to build an ADU. We built an ADU to provide more housing for the  
10 community and now we're saying ok, now we want to take away the parking that's on your  
11 street for another reason. But you know thanks for that, so that's not very good.

12  
13 So, I want to add a few things, new ones. There's a church on the corner of Middlefield and East  
14 meadow that has a lot of services going on. They require parking that always overflows on our  
15 street. For Ramos Park has lot of things going on. There's the baseball, there's the church at the  
16 corner, there's the community center, there's the chili cook-off. Any time there's events, our  
17 street is always used for overflow parking. So, this is not parking just that being a resident on  
18 the street that I'm losing. It's also the community parking is they're losing the space as well  
19 because when the parking's full. They go everywhere around the neighborhood and try to find.  
20 So, the farther they have to walk, the farther the strollers have to go, the farther everyone has  
21 to make the event that's in the park. So, they use this street for events and I think everything's  
22 ok with that because it doesn't happen every single day, all the time.

23  
24 And lastly, I just want to thank you for your time and also, we have two bus stops on this street  
25 on this side too as well. So, a lot of coming and going with adding in things for that. So, thanks  
26 for your time, appreciate it.

27  
28 Mr. Nguyen: Thank you for your comments. Our next speaker is Shelley.

29  
30 Ms. Shelley: Hi, thank you so much for the time that you guys have dedicated to this. I want to  
31 say that I completely agree with Francine and Ken. With everything that Peggy and Patricia and  
32 Taly have said with regards to the amount of community engagement on this and the... just the  
33 amount of information and the data that has gone out or the lack of data.

34  
35 I agree with if people have to park across the street and then walk across the street. They're  
36 going to go jay-walk which is going to make things very dangerous. Some alternatives that I  
37 would like to suggest would be speed bumps because we have big trucks going up and down  
38 that corridor. We have lots of cars going up and down and it would be great just to kind of force  
39 people to slow down.

40

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 The next item is that roundabout. I completely agree, it is so dangerous. Some people stop,  
2 some people don't stop, some people go super-fast, and I have seen so many people almost get  
3 into accidents or almost run into people because there's the assumption that it's a roundabout.  
4 It's just... if it's not going to be used as a roundabout, it should be removed, and there should  
5 just be a four-stop sign sort of thing there to make sure that everybody stops, everybody is  
6 aware of what the rules are. But the way it is right now with half of the street being just driving  
7 and then half the people stopping and then people are confused. It's really dangerous.

8  
9 I would like to see more data again from everybody who lives around there. Maybe some sort  
10 of mail-in survey. I feel like having this on Zoom makes it so that only people who have access  
11 to electronic devices are on this or who are computer savvy or getting on to this or people who  
12 have email addresses. So, maybe some sort of mail-in survey would be great and to top it off. I  
13 bike with my kids to school. I've never had an issue but my kids are smaller. I have a  
14 kindergartener and I have a second grader and I would never let them bike by themselves.  
15 Although my son has... he does tend to think he's a teenager and bike far ahead of me and I'm  
16 like ah you know but he's learning and they're doing bike safety at school. He's... it's definitely  
17 something that they're getting more comfortable with. And I have not felt like East Meadow is  
18 dangerous because it is pretty wide and there is a huge bike lane right there and painting it  
19 green would be great. It's a visual reminder but I feel like getting rid of the parking or forcing  
20 people to part across the street. You're just creating more problems.

21  
22 I would like to see more things like speed bumps or something. So, and also lastly, I agree with  
23 Fabian Way. It is so dangerous. I use to live over there. All the kids would drive up and then go  
24 down East Meadow. That's how they felt. Thank you.

25  
26 Mr. Nguyen: Thank you for your comments. We will not go back to Karen. Karen, if you're there,  
27 can you please unmute yourself?

28  
29 Mr. Rich Jew: Good evening. This is actually Rick and Karen [unintelligible]. I'll be speaking for  
30 both of us. We are also longtime residents of East Meadow. Like Ken, I have a presence on this  
31 street since I have since the early 80s and I usually... I actually can see East Meadow from my  
32 window and my door is barely open. [unintelligible] remember an event where a car and a bike  
33 had a problem. I also was born and raised in Palo Alto. I've lived here virtually all my life. I went  
34 to Wilbur, Ross Road, De Anza, [unintelligible], and Cubberley riding my bike or walking. I didn't  
35 see any people [unintelligible] going to school or any [unintelligible] with cars of any kind.

36  
37 So, I want to actually quickly ask the Commission... the Planning Commission to decline the  
38 positive recommendations for this project and just to reemphasize some of the things people  
39 said. Arthur says it's not an all or nothing, it's an either-or between East Meadow and Fabian  
40 Way. For Kenneth pointing out that we elderly people that move around the street. I've

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 included my practice my clients are in their 80s and 90s and so having them to come across  
2 my... across East Meadow would be a real problem. With Peggy, I would say absolutely,  
3 [unintelligible] with statistics. When I was young and using my bike to go to school. There were  
4 way more children going to school, nobody died, and to Sue and Alan. Thank you for what you  
5 said and to Amie who was the one dissenting voicing. There are alternatives that are free or  
6 have a very low cost which would be going and using Mayview as opposed to East Meadow. It is  
7 the stress-free bike path for you are all looking for and [unintelligible] thank you for your  
8 comments. I believe with Taly, there was not sufficient outreach. I'm here 24/7. I don't  
9 remember the outreach and to Francine and Chuck and to Robert and Shelley.

10  
11 I think in conclusion the neighborhood doesn't want this. We've all written emails regarding  
12 and expressing our ideas as to why this is a bad. This should be integrated into the statistic  
13 [unintelligible] tonight is not ignored. So, again, I want to thank the Commission for hearing us. I  
14 hope that you turn down and do not recommend this to the City Council. Thank you.

15  
16 Mr. Nguyen: Thank you for your comments. Can you please restate your name for the record?

17  
18 Mr. Jew: Rich and Carri Jew. We're [unintelligible] residents of East Meadow.

19  
20 Mr. Nguyen: Thank you. Chair Hechtman, that concludes public comments for this item.

21  
22 Chair Hechtman: Alright, I want to thank the many members of the public who spoke tonight  
23 and also thank members of the public who submitted written comments which I have read all  
24 of. I suspect my fellow Commissioners have. I was at 5:45 tonight I was reading the batch that  
25 came in this afternoon and so those are important for us too. And we appreciate the time you  
26 took to share your thoughts and concerns with us.

27  
28 I'm going to bring it back to the Commission for our deliberation now, but I'd like to actually  
29 start with a question of Staff. In the Staff... because I heard in the... from at least three our  
30 commenters. In the Staff report, fairly early in the report, there's a reference to Fabian Way or  
31 East Meadow. Later on, in the Staff report, it's conjunctive, Fabian Way and East Meadow, and  
32 clearly, at least three of our speakers are under the impression from that first reference that we  
33 have some choices that we can make here. Although, that's not my impression from the overall  
34 Staff report. So, I'd like a member of Staff to clarify that reference and really what the deal is  
35 with this VTA grant.

36  
37 Ms. Chan: I mean I can start answering that and if Sylvia and Phil, if you guys would like to add  
38 feel free. So, first of all, I also want to thank you. All of the members of the public and  
39 Commissioners setting aside this time to discuss the project with us tonight.

40

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 So, I guess just a little background, so this grant was envisioned and awarded 4-years ago. So, I  
2 mean the strategies and perspectives have definitely changed since. So, it has... I guess this  
3 project has been dormant for some years so when we reengaged Council as well as PTC earlier  
4 this year in January 2021. We're also in conversations with VTA already letting them know that  
5 this original grant which is to deliver protected bike lanes with the vertical separations on both  
6 corridors. We let them know that this may not be something that could happen in the City. So,  
7 we started that discussion early on and we let them know and they were like well this is still  
8 what the grant requires. We will continue working with the City and we did also let them know  
9 that we're going for the first of community engagement. So, pretty much we left it opened  
10 ended. We would say we'll continue discussing and come back to us when we have more data  
11 from community. So, as we were having our community conversations. We continuously went  
12 back to VTA and what they said. Ok, it seems like we could have the protected bikeway on  
13 Fabian. So, it sort of becomes like ok, we could deliver the protected bikeway on Fabian but the  
14 other one. We will continue discussing but they still wanted to be as close as possible to the  
15 original grant which is the protect bicycle facility. So, that's why it sounds like the original grant  
16 is to deliver protected bikeways but after discussion, they're willing to work with us. And that's  
17 already after some community engagement and them knowing support that we have protected  
18 or we have support from the community that it could happen on Fabian Way. I don't know if  
19 Sylvia or Philip, you guys have any other notes to add?  
20

21 Ms. Star-Lack: I just want to add that at no point did VTA say it would be ok to leave parts of  
22 East Meadow as they are in existing conditions.  
23

24 Mr. Kamhi: Thanks, and I also want to just note that although the grant was 4-years ago. This  
25 project was I guess initially conceived back prior to 2012 when the 2012 Bike and Pedestrian...  
26 Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Plan was originally drafted.  
27

28 Chair Hechtman: Alright, that's helpful, so I'm understanding now that or and actually when  
29 you read it in the context of the sentence, it's basically saying one of these roads... at least one  
30 of these roads has to be protected and the one that's not protected, which means the physical  
31 barrier, has to be buffered which is widened. Or have the wider path and both of those on  
32 segment four and East Meadow would result in a loss of parking. So, we don't really have a  
33 choice within the context of the grant (interrupted)  
34

35 Mr. Kamhi: Yes.  
36

37 Chair Hechtman: To say we'll do protected or buffered here but neither protected or buffered  
38 there. Is that right?  
39

40 Mr. Kamhi: Yeah, that's correct in the terms of the grant.

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1  
2 Chair Hechtman: Yeah, ok, alright, thank you for that clarification and I hope that helped some  
3 of our members of the public understand that language from the Staff report. So, I'd like to...  
4 my thought regarding the Commission discussion here was that we would start with a round of  
5 general comments by the Commissioners up to 5-minutes. Sort of an overview of thoughts that  
6 any of the Commissioners may have and then we can dive into each of what I'm counting as six  
7 segments. If you look at the East Meadow as four discrete segments which one of the Staff  
8 maps shows us. So, if that sounds right with the Commission, I would invite Commissioner  
9 hands and I'm seeing Commissioner Templeton's hand.

10  
11 Commissioner Templeton: Thank you, Chair. I was wondering if before we get started we  
12 wanted to... if Staff wanted to respond to anything from the public comments. There was  
13 definitely a lot of concerns and allegations that were included in that commentary.

14  
15 Mr. Kamhi: Yeah, thank you. Yes, very much would like to address some of those things. I just  
16 want to note again, really the purpose of this meeting and the reason this item is before you is  
17 because we want to decide whether this is a project that members of the community want to  
18 see move forward. And so, I just want to first say thank you to everyone that's shown up here.  
19 You know to provide their thoughts and noting that Staff developed this process in particular  
20 because we don't want to force anything down. So, we didn't just say, we've got this project  
21 we're moving forward. This entire part of this process has really been determined whether we  
22 have people's desires and interests in this project. So, I just want to note that.

23  
24 I also want to note that I... apologizes, my dog just scared herself with a cardboard box. Startled  
25 me a little bit, but I want to note that we have all of the raw data for all of our Safe Routes to  
26 School. And the reason why typically when you share school data you share percentages is  
27 because the school population can change over time. And actually, in our case, the school  
28 population has actually increased I believe over time since when that slide started. So, we'd be  
29 happy to share the raw data for that which actually shows that we have a lot more people  
30 bicycling now. Students bicycling now than we did in the past. We have slides with that data on  
31 it.

32  
33 Also want to note that this project was on a really tight timeline for a lot of community  
34 outreach and a lot of community outreach happened. You know, noting that we had door  
35 hangers, mailings to residents within 500-feet of the project, social media, we had flyers posted  
36 at the grocery stores, we had multiple webinars, we have a website, we sent emails to  
37 individuals and local neighborhood associations and the school communities. So, I want to note  
38 that the meeting that occurred last Friday was, at least as far as our Staff knew, just a meeting  
39 with a few concerned residents that wanted to discuss the project. And ended up being quite a  
40 large meeting that our Staff was not really prepared to handle or didn't have a presentation or

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.



1 anything that with I believe I around 37 residents. But so, noting that their comments and  
2 concerns didn't really make our report or presentation which has printed earlier. But you heard  
3 many of their comments and concerns tonight and I'll say better late than never. So, very glad  
4 to have their input on this project.

5  
6 With that, did I miss anything Sylvia, Joanna, that we wanted to talk about beforehand? No. Oh,  
7 Sylvia has one.

8  
9 Chair Hechtman: You're muted, Sylvia.

10  
11 Mr. Kamhi: Still muted.

12  
13 Ms. Star-Lack: Sorry, sorry, it's a slippery mute button. I just wanted to mention that at our high  
14 schools now over half of the student's bike to school. So, that's approximately 1,000 students at  
15 each high school are arriving by bike in a non-pandemic year. So, just want to give you the  
16 context around that. Thank you.

17  
18 Commissioner Templeton: Thank you all. Chair, may I do my comments now?

19  
20 Chair Hechtman: Please.

21  
22 Commissioner Templeton: Thank you. First, I just wanted to say thank you so much for the  
23 presentation. I also watched the webinar video and felt very excited about this project. It's  
24 definitely interesting hear the different perspectives and that there are definitely different  
25 angles and points of view that we need to consider.

26  
27 I will share some of you on the Commission already know but maybe for our public. I was biking  
28 on Meadow in front of Fair Meadow when my daughter was struck by a car that was pulling out  
29 of the parking lane. She was fine. You know no lasting injuries but just to say that does happen  
30 and I've seen it happen and I've also been a participant in that kind of collision. And we don't  
31 want to have that, especially with very young children. I would also say that now that my  
32 children are going to a school along the Arastradero corridor rather than requiring the use of  
33 Meadow. They're biking more. So, I... these are anecdotes but just to let you know that I feel  
34 that we do have some expectation that more children will be able to bike independently when  
35 the biking facilities are more protected and safer.

36  
37 So, I think it's really exciting that we have this opportunity to use funds from an external source  
38 to improve our City streets for bikers. I'm going to leave it there for my initial comments but  
39 just to say thank you for presenting this opportunity and allow us to discuss it.

40

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 Chair Hechtman: Thank you, Commissioner Templeton. Other Commissioners? Commissioner  
2 Chang.

3  
4 Commissioner Chang: Sure, so I was initially really, really excited about this project also because  
5 I live in the area. My kids bike to JLS and to Hoover. They... we're big users of the Waverly Bike  
6 Path and again, I should say that I can attest to the dangers of the Waverly Bike Path because  
7 my own child went over his handle bars and we had to stop at JLS to [unintelligible].

8  
9 All that said, I am... and I want to thank Staff for their really hard work and to also thank  
10 everybody who gave up part of their precious evening to give public comment or write emails.  
11 I'm... it's wonderful to hear all of those perspectives which I also share and understand.  
12 Because I also bike down East Meadow and I see the difference in the traffic pattern on the  
13 Alma side of Middlefield versus the 101 side of Middlefield along East Meadow.

14  
15 And so, what I really want to make sure we do here, you know as I was going through this and  
16 participating in the community meetings with the Staff team, is to avoid another Ross Road  
17 process. Where... because I think it just unminds the confidence of our citizenry in our process  
18 and I know that the community engagement was rushed. And hard... rushed because of the  
19 project timeline so you guys did admirable job given what time you had. But nevertheless,  
20 rushed and also immeasurably complicated because of the pandemic. So, the timing was really  
21 less than ideal because most of the outreach started in May and anybody with a school-aged  
22 child can't read anything. Has no bandwidth for anything in May and as a member of the PTA  
23 and working with our principal on communication plans. I actually really tried to push that  
24 survey but it's very, very hard and our PTA and principle teams were very careful about  
25 metering out communications. Knowing the chances are parents aren't going to get the  
26 message for things that are immediately related to school, much less something that's a larger  
27 community. And so, it's just real challenge and so I do have concerns about the community  
28 engagement since kids who are going to JLS and Fair Meadow generally live near JLS and Fair  
29 Meadow and would be impacted heavily by this.

30  
31 I actually... I really think that most of the... there's seems to be pretty broad consensus on most  
32 of the recommendations with the acceptance of one... of that section from Middlefield to East  
33 Meadow Circle. And so, it's a real shame that it is an all-or-nothing decision based on the grant.  
34 What I would like to do and that's not... where I'm leaning on this is I'd really like to see a lot of  
35 these changes implemented. I think there seems to be tremendous consensus on the Waverly  
36 Path as well as on Fabian and actually a good portion of East Meadow. And yet, I see that the  
37 concerns that are raised are really valid ones.

38  
39 I'm very concerned about crossing... the need... you know with parking for Ramos Park being a  
40 really big concern because our public areas, as one speaker who was in favor of the path said,

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 are for everybody. But we have a park there and we need to make sure that that park is useable  
2 and safe also. So, I'll leave it at that for now.

3

4 Chair Hechtman: Commissioner Lauing followed by Commissioner Summa.

5

6 Commissioner Lauing: Just briefly to start off to answer the initial two questions in the Staff  
7 report. I really that this project is terrific in terms of the connection of making this all happen  
8 for the schools, for the public, for the great new bridge above Bart's [note -Chair Hechtman]  
9 head there. You know all of this is phenomenal and I actually agreed with substantially with  
10 what a lot of Commissioner Chang said. That we haven't talked about it yet tonight but I'm  
11 betting that there's probably a lot of consensus that this is mostly good with this one draw back  
12 at least in this one section.

13

14 I also think that this should definitely go to Council and I understand the difference between  
15 how transportation department is positioned the project meaning the project with the grant. I  
16 think of it a little bit more broadly as the project that can go forward and I really would prefer  
17 that we have policy, not money, drive how we get that project done. \$919,000 is not zero, it's  
18 also not \$9 million and we don't even know what the total project costs are. So, we don't really  
19 know as a percentage of the total what that's about.

20

21 So, I want to hear what folks have to say about each of the pieces but as a general overview,  
22 that's what I'd like to say. I also would like to tag on with Commissioner Templeton and just ask  
23 one question of Staff. Particularly, with respect to on Mr. Wachtel's letter which was... all of the  
24 public comment, I read every one of the letters that you sent twice, at least, and your  
25 comments tonight at just so important for our deliberations and for us to hear. So, thank you  
26 for that. I would expect that the Staff would have... would probably say that they don't agree  
27 with Mr. Wachtel but with his experience for example, for 30-years on the City's Pedestrian and  
28 bicycle Advisory Commission. He's not making this stuff up. So, when he says things like this is  
29 going to be more dangerous, not less. That's striking to me and you know should be considered.  
30 So, I don't know if you have anything specific, you don't have to, but you'd like to comment on  
31 any of these things in the letter. You can do that but then I'll stop there.

32

33 Mr. Kamhi: Well, I don't know that we want to necessary air an argument about what type of  
34 bicycle facility is the best. I think there are different types of users of bicycle facilities so I think  
35 that's really important to note. Some bicyclists might feel comfortable acting as vehicles so  
36 typically call those type of cyclists' vehicular cyclists. So, vehicular cyclists feel more  
37 comfortable taking the lane and using the lane. Often children, especially student-age bicyclists,  
38 feel more comfortable in protected facilities but that's not always the case. Sometimes there  
39 might be an experience cyclist who prefers to ride in protected facilities or vice versa. There  
40 might be a student that feels comfortable taking the lane. So, I think that's something that you

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 could argue. I do think that there is data... quite a lot of data that does show that a protected  
2 facility where there's not an existing facility can be safer for younger cyclists.

3

4 Commissioner Lauing: Ok, thank you.

5

6 Chair Hechtman: Commissioner Summa.

7

8 Commissioner Summa: Thank you, Chair. I think this is an exciting project and I want to thank  
9 Staff given the tight timeline for moving it forward and I guess I would associate myself with a  
10 lot of the concerns that were brought up. It sounds like there's some leeway in... by the  
11 members of the public and I want to thank them for all their emails. They really got on board  
12 and were very informative and speaking tonight.

13

14 I do think that others have mentioned this, Fabian Way being seriously scary street for people  
15 to bike down. And the improvements to the Waverly Bike Path are definitely no brainers and  
16 really, really needed. And then there's just this question about are we... is overkill that's going  
17 to do more harm than good on East Meadow. Particularly, the portion of it that people have  
18 identified. So, I guess that's we're going to get down to and I hope there's enough leeway in the  
19 VTA process... sorry, there's a little bug... that we can really craft something that's really good  
20 for the community. Specifically, for this community and for everyone in the City that uses those  
21 streets and those parks. Thank you.

22

23 Chair Hechtman: Commissioner Alcheck.

24

25 Commissioner Alcheck: Thank you to the Staff and to the public who commented. I will start by  
26 saying that I think every residential neighborhood should feel safe to bike through. That's I  
27 think a goal that is well articulated in a number of different statements in our Comp Plan. The  
28 notion that this Safe Routes to School, pedestrian and bicycle-friendly throughways, and I  
29 would suggest that a protected bike path is superior bike lane.

30

31 And I think that improvements like this will have costs and I think that I'm approaching this  
32 from sort of two perspectives. The first is that... well, if I'm looking at the six items. The Waverly  
33 expansion seems like a no-brainer. I think we could spend less than 15-minutes probably talking  
34 about that. What I mean by that is I think that the recommendation that Staff is making for  
35 improving the Waverly Pathway is the right way. You've done the work, you've done the  
36 research, you've proposed a good solution, funds should be invested in that. I feel the same  
37 way about Fabian Way. It's necessarily wide. The three-lane model with a turn lane makes  
38 sense.

39

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 I would suggest to you that there are alternatives to protected bike lanes in our City that came  
2 to mind while I was reviewing this project. Including the one-off California Avenue and  
3 Middlefield which is a protected bike lane with both directions on one side of the road. If our  
4 Staff members are familiar with that, they could just like nod. That seems like a solution that  
5 would give you some feet back on the road and could potentially provide you with protected  
6 bikeway options and potentially not eliminating parking on both sides of any given roadway.  
7 For example, on Fabian and I mention this because it's 6- to 8-feet maybe? The one that's next  
8 to Cal Ave and Middlefield Road that goes around that school that goes in both directions the  
9 bike traffic. It's short but I just think that if you're getting into the weeds with the VTA and City  
10 Council. It could be slightly different. There could be variations that preserve parking.

11  
12 I don't know but I'll go one step further which is to say take the funding out of this. Everything  
13 you presented tonight makes sense. If Council doesn't want to eliminate some parking in East  
14 Meadow because there's too much political will against it. Then let me pay for the change on  
15 Fabian and Waverly and I don't think we should even really get involved in that. I think we have  
16 to... first of all, I don't... I imagine that there isn't very many residents in any community  
17 anywhere in the world who would be thrilled about losing parking on their street.

18  
19 And so, I have to... there's some skepticism I have to approach the comments about the loss of  
20 parking with because I have to appreciate that what may be best for the community may not be  
21 best for the individual. And I think I could still stand behind a recommendation that eliminating  
22 parking on side of East Meadow and providing protected park... protected bicycle ways is  
23 superior for Palo Alto as a whole than maintaining parking on one side of Meadow. And so,  
24 what I would suggest to you is that while that statement could be true, it doesn't necessarily  
25 mean that that's the choice City Council should make.

26  
27 And I think we have to step away from this idea that's its all or nothing or whatnot and say to  
28 City Council. Here are improvements to transportation that were presented to us and all of  
29 them make sense. All of them improve transportation if that's how we feel and we could even  
30 say look, the East Meadow ones there are four segment right? There are some that are better  
31 than the others and we think funds should be invested. Whether those funds are going to be  
32 given to you by another entity or whether you're going to come up with them yourself or really  
33 your burden to berry. And if, at the end of the day, VTA and the City Council who ultimately  
34 have to decide how to negotiate this compact. If they... if the VTA's like you know what, we said  
35 we were going to give you this but only if you did this and I'm not even... I can't make sense  
36 why the VTA is so invested in whether or not something looks like way or that way. So, like I  
37 said, I think those are conversations that have to happen between the VTA and City Council or  
38 maybe Staff and I really hope we can stay away from those. I think it would be a success tonight  
39 if we could just basically communicate whether we felt that a protected bikeway on East  
40 Meadow was an improvement. And if it is... and not just an improvement, if a protected bike...

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 because the other ones, I'm just saying are feel like givens. So, a protected bikeway on the four  
2 segments that appear to be controversial based on the feedback we got tonight. If those  
3 remain improvements and drastically reduce concerns we have about safety and access to the  
4 schools for children which aren't the only members of our community that use the space. Then  
5 I say we give that feedback and say we think this should take place and maybe you have to  
6 combine the protected bikeways in both directions on one side of the road. And maybe that  
7 gives you 4 ½-feet more and you do the parking perpendicular to the road as opposed to  
8 parallel to the road or at some 45-degree angle to the road.

9  
10 I know this sounds like a ridiculous, off-the-cuff creative thinking here, but my... the point here  
11 is that it doesn't matter in my opinion where the funding comes from. And there should be  
12 more opportunities to negotiate with the VTA if that's something that has to happen but that  
13 should come from the Council's direction. I think it's kind of a mistake for us to weigh these  
14 options from the perspective of take it or leave it. That's a decision the Council has to make,  
15 take it or leave it. We should be able to tell them improve, doesn't improve and we recommend  
16 improve. I don't think we should be weighing the consequences of only recommending half or  
17 recommend all or recommending none. I think we should avoid that and let that conversation  
18 happen at Council.

19  
20 Chair Hechtman: Thank you, Commissioner Alcheck. So, I think it's pretty well known that I ride  
21 my bike almost every day. I love bicycling. It's not as commonly known that I've lost two  
22 friends, different times, to biking accidents. Both on the side of the road, not riding in the road,  
23 on the side where they were supposed to be. So, I'm keenly aware of the importance of safety  
24 for bicyclists of all ages.

25  
26 The issue tonight I think is pretty straightforward. Our... will this Commission recommend a  
27 series of changes to get a grant or not? As Staff has explained, all six segments have to be at  
28 least buffered with additional space but mostly protected with some kind of physical barrier  
29 and the preferred plan presented by Staff would accomplish that. It appears to me from a  
30 review of the Staff report and the resident letters and their comments tonight that there  
31 appears to be citizen support and from what I'm hearing from the Commission, Commission  
32 support for each of the six segments except East Meadow segment number four which is the  
33 segment from Middlefield... and most... actually most of the comments talk about Middlefield  
34 to Lewis. But actually, segment four goes a little bit farther to I think it's called the East  
35 Meadow Circle. In that... for that segment, there seems to be a common issue with the loss of  
36 parking and the consequences of losing that parking.

37  
38 Generally, I think that anything that improves bike safety is good and that adjacent residents  
39 may experience some change from what they're accustomed to. But that's a tradeoff that  
40 residents have to make for all the benefits you get from living in a City. From having that park,

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 from being close to the grade school, from having a road that is not full of pot holes. However, I  
2 acknowledge that there can be circumstances where particular safety methods may not fit a  
3 particular area. And from the letters we've received and these public comments tonight, I'm  
4 concerned that segment four may be such case and so when we get to our discussion of  
5 segment four, I really want to understand from Staff whether there are unique circumstances  
6 between Middlefield and Lewis or Middlefield and East Meadow Circle on East Meadow that  
7 would make the loss of parking here uniquely impactful to that neighborhood. Because that's  
8 certainly the impression I get from the public comments.

9  
10 I'm supportive of the other five segments. If the Commission cannot recommend segment four,  
11 or another individual segment, then our overall recommendation to the City Council is that we  
12 should not continue to pursue the grant. But as many of my fellow Commissioners have said  
13 tonight, that doesn't mean that we cannot improve bike safety in this corridor. It just means  
14 that we won't have VTA funds to do it. But over time the Council could budget the  
15 improvements contemplated in the concept plan for the other five segments and look to what  
16 improvements could be made in segment four. So, I'm looking forward to that discussion  
17 particularly on segment four.

18  
19 Mr. Kamhi: Thank you and I think that'd be really helpful way to approach this if ultimately if I  
20 just want to note that this grant... we've already tried to get VTA to make changes what the  
21 grant was initially applied for. And we do not feel that we're going to be able to do so in a  
22 meaningful enough way that we could break out a certain segment and not do something in a  
23 certain segment. So, just noting that it would be really helpful if we decide that we're not going  
24 to move forward with this grant funding. If other segments or any other particular  
25 improvements in the area are found to be desirable. Those are things that we could potentially  
26 slate for future funding, future projects, and noting that we're going to be doing our Bicycle and  
27 Pedestrian Transportation Plan update in this coming year. And those could be things that are  
28 looked at in more depth.

29  
30 Chair Hechtman: Thank you. So, eventually, we'll get to discussions of individual segments but  
31 for now, we can continue the more general discussion if that's the Commissions' will. I see  
32 Commissioner Templeton and Commissioner Lauing's hands. Commissioner Templeton.

33  
34 Commissioner Templeton: Thank you. I just had a couple more questions that I wanted to ask of  
35 Staff. Having worked with you guys on a few projects before, I thought it might be helpful to  
36 clarify what level of "design" we're at, at this point? I see in the Staff report it says conceptual  
37 plan and I also heard from members of the public that there was a perception that perhaps this  
38 was a design. Can you clarify exactly where we are on that and then I have another question  
39 after that?

40

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 Ms. Chan: We are currently on concept plans. It's just conceptual.

2

3 Commissioner Templeton: Yes, I get that, but I was hoping you could clarify for the public what  
4 does that mean and how fully designed are they? For example, what you have here is an idea or  
5 is what they're going to construct for example? Somewhere on that grading, can you explain  
6 what that means to the public?

7

8 Ms. Kamhi: So, I'll take that. Yeah, these are really high-level conceptual ideas intended for this  
9 phase of the project which is determining whether we have a project. So, we're still at the very  
10 early phase and this entire process right now is to determine whether we move forward with  
11 the project. That's when we start going to design. So, you could maybe say this is like a 15 to 20  
12 percent design or something like that. But this is really early conceptual design where we're  
13 trying to figure out... we don't even necessarily have all... you know we don't have geometry or  
14 any of those things completely worked out. This is a very high-level design at this point.

15

16 Commissioner Templeton: And so just following up on that, if members of the public identify a  
17 flaw in the conceptual plan. Will we then have opportunity to adjust and continue forward?

18

19 Mr. Kamhi: Yeah and noting that even if PTC and Council ultimately were to recommend this  
20 project to move forward. There's still additional outreach and work that needs to be done. You  
21 know coordinating and potentially could find that maybe the bike lane needs to move to one  
22 side of the street in a certain area as opposed to another side of the street or any other number  
23 of changes that might occur. Including other additional or improvements or other changes that  
24 could happen. This is a very, very early in the process and this is really just determining whether  
25 we have a project that we want to use the grant funding for.

26

27 Commissioner Templeton: That is super helpful and just to close this loop on this conversation.  
28 So, that means that we could then recommend to go forward as a Commission with some  
29 direction about incorporating some of the feedback that we've heard. So, you can do both  
30 right?

31

32 Mr. Kamhi: Yes, that's correct.

33

34 Commissioner Templeton: Alright, thank you for clarifying that, and then my other question is  
35 because I do think it's going to dominate the rest of the conversation. Have you considered... to  
36 what extent have you considered the parking in Ramos Park as part of this proposal?

37

38 Ms. Star-Lack: To what extent we considered the parking, do you mean the parking demand at  
39 Ramos Park?

40

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.



1 Commissioner Templeton: Right, so we've heard some comments that as a public park we  
2 expect there to be some parking facility there. If we eliminate it along Meadow there's no  
3 other. Just help us in a where ever we are in the conceptual phase, kind of understand what  
4 you had in mind. Was it completely eliminating it or doing something else? I know I'm... I know  
5 it's a bit repetitive but I want to just really nail this so we're all clear and on the same page.  
6 Thank you.

7  
8 Ms. Star-Lack: Right so as was stated by Steve in the presentation, we are at the stage of  
9 conceptual... of this conceptual plan where we can decide to switch the parking. So, if for  
10 example, the community wants the parking to remain east of Middlefield on the south side so  
11 that there is parking available for Ramos Park. And so that in the west direction in the morning  
12 that the bike lane is potentially not experiencing interactions from people getting in and out of  
13 the parked cars on the north side. We can switch the parking to the southside. I mean these are  
14 just drawings right now. The main thing here though to understand is that in order to put in a  
15 buffered bike lane, we have to take the space from something and that something is a parking  
16 lane.

17  
18 Commissioner Templeton: Is it possible to do something... I'm going to go like this is a wild and  
19 crazy out-on-the-limb situation, but is it possible to then curve the bike path through the park  
20 and leave the parking where it is? Does it have to be on the road because that would count as  
21 protection?

22  
23 Ms. Star-Lack: I'm just thinking about how that (interrupted)

24  
25 Commissioner Templeton: I'm not going to even... don't even worry about answering it. What  
26 I'm getting at is that is public land and if we need to figure out a way to prioritize. That's an area  
27 we can flex and we don't have to commit to anything and I don't want to put you on the spot.  
28 But just to say I don't think the situation is dire or insoluble. I think this is something we can  
29 work out based on City prioritizes and figuring out how to get people safely up and down  
30 Meadow on bikes. Thank you.

31  
32 Mr. Kamhi: If I can just quickly respond to the comment about the park. I think that would help  
33 to put the path through the park. Just noting that it would only help... apologize for my dog is  
34 just having a field day tonight. But noting that doesn't even... you know the park doesn't even  
35 cover the whole block. So, it would still... there would still need to be parking removal in that  
36 very block. So, it would not... you know even if we did flex the path into the edge of that park  
37 and just noting that I'm not really familiar with what's right there in the park. But if that was a  
38 possibility, that would not completely solve all the issues that you're hearing tonight.

39

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 Commissioner Templeton: Do you think that it's something that we can solve with additional  
2 design work?

3  
4 Mr. Kamhi: So, if the question that you're asking is can we solve the elimination of any parking  
5 in that block with additional design? I would say the answer is no. We don't have enough  
6 geometry to do so. It's not my opinion that we have enough additional geometry to not have  
7 parking elimination. You might be able to not eliminate in a small area which looks like it's  
8 about four to five house lengths in that small area if we were able to gain park land. Now,  
9 noting that that might be another challenge but that is a possibility. So, I'm just... I just want to  
10 note that that's not a huge... that's not necessarily a huge change in that area where the  
11 parking is really along the street. And noting that the other sides where there's... where we  
12 wouldn't have the park land there're houses.

13  
14 Commissioner Templeton: Right so well maybe we can come back to this when we get to that  
15 segment but the question is, is this a plan we can work with, with additional design or not? And  
16 I understand that you know some parking may have to go but the question is can we still have  
17 some parking? So, we... in other words, we need to understand is the concern that we've heard  
18 from the public something that we address with further design work or not? So, and you can  
19 hold that thought until we get to that segment. Thank you.

20  
21 Chair Hechtman: Commissioner Lauing, I see your hand up. Would it be acceptable to you for us  
22 to take a 10-minute break and come back? Or are you wanting to follow something that you've  
23 just heard and now it would be better for you to chime in before the break? Your choice.

24  
25 Commissioner Lauing: Thank you. This will only take 30-seconds. I think what folks are hearing  
26 from Commissioners and from the public is that we must be able to do something in that spot.  
27 And my... the thing I wrote down as a lead into that how many inches do you really need there  
28 and are rolling curbs or whatever they're called is really so bad? I mean in other words, we're  
29 saying can we get creative around those? So, I think we're all on the same track there that we  
30 think we maybe can get close as Commissioner Templeton and Commissioner Alcheck said.

31  
32 I was going to suggest procedurally though that when we come back from the break. We might  
33 want to start with number four or if it's number four? With this particular issue which is the  
34 more difficult one. If we can get that solved, maybe we can get through the rest of them pretty  
35 quickly. Thank you.

36  
37 Chair Hechtman: Alright thank you, Commissioner. We will take a 10-minute break. I have 8:17  
38 so we'll come back at 8:27.

39  
40 [The Commission took a short break]

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1  
2 Chair Hechtman: Alright Commissioner Lauing and Alcheck, when you can turn on your cameras  
3 and I know you are present we will resume. All the Commissioners are back and so we will  
4 continue our discussion of Agenda Item Number Two. Commissioner Lauing, just before the  
5 break you had made a recommendation to tackle segment four first. I actually had the opposite  
6 idea and let me just explain that briefly. Whatever we do on segment four we're going to have  
7 to deal with the other five segments because even if we were to say no to segment four which  
8 means our recommendation is no to the grant, Council might not agree with that and so they're  
9 going to need our recommendation on the other five items. In the first round of Commission  
10 discussion, I actually didn't hear any concerns from any Commissioners about any of the other  
11 five segments. Now, it was general conversation and maybe there are some concerns. But if  
12 there are not, then I'm wondering if the most efficient path would be a motion to recommend  
13 those five segments. Get that under our belt and then we know really what's at stake with  
14 segment four because we will at that point know that the... that we're... there's at least a  
15 majority of the Commission supportive of the other five segments. And then I agree with  
16 Commissioner Templeton and I think Commissioner Lauing that we're going to spend a lot of  
17 time talking about segment four perhaps.

18  
19 So, let me just ask the Commission what you... we got two different approaches. We can start  
20 with segment four, we can start with the other five possibly taken as one motion. Any  
21 Commissioners have any thoughts on that? Commissioner Summa.

22  
23 Commissioner Summa: Thank you. I would think that we could get the other two... the  
24 Waverly... the bike route and Fabian Way out of the way and then I'm not sure if we won't find  
25 in our discussion of East Meadow Drive. That it's just segment four because I'm not sure three  
26 and four can be treated differently. We may find that there's some sort of correlations between  
27 the segments even though we're more sure about the two outlining segments. So, I'm fine with  
28 doing it in either direction. But I just wanted to say that I'm not 100 percent convinced we can  
29 just isolate segment four and treat it differently than the rest of the street.

30  
31 Chair Hechtman: What about segments one and two Commissioner Summa? Those are the two  
32 end pieces. Are you comfortable with those?

33  
34 Commissioner Summa: Those seem more obvious to me. Especially given that the... especially  
35 up near Alma it's the sides of lots. It's not driveways and people are parking on their side  
36 streets.

37  
38 Chair Hechtman: Other Commissioner thoughts? I'm not seeing any. Well, then... Commissioner  
39 Alcheck.

40

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 Commissioner Alcheck: I think that's a great suggestion. I think we should... I mean look, we've  
2 already heard that this is preliminary. This is the beginning of the formulation stage of including  
3 feedback and extrapolating into a more specific designs. These are at the very initial stages and  
4 I think the report does a really good job of identifying why the recommendations are the right  
5 recommendations. So, unless we have some sort of tension for spending lots of time on things  
6 we agree on or I should be even more specific, things the majority of us agree on. I think it  
7 would make a lot of sense to push all of the ideas that are non-controversial to the side.

8  
9 I would then suggest to you that I hope we focus not on the controversial-ness of the item's...  
10 my hope is that we then focus on the actual questions on the other items. You know the safety  
11 and improvements and trade-offs I guess as opposed to... I don't even like... what my point was  
12 I don't even like calling them controversial. It's not that... it's just that we didn't get negative  
13 feedback about them and so for that reason alone. I feel very comfortable recommending them  
14 but anyways, so I would treat... I would love to put that motion forward or second that motion.  
15 And move that path... move that way and the com back to items I guess its three and four and  
16 then understand what Commissioners are specifically concerned about there. And then maybe  
17 we'll be able to patch a motion there together that will make sense.

18  
19 Chair Hechtman: Commissioner Templeton.

20  
21 Commissioner Templeton: I also like Commissioner Summa's approach. My concern with, and I  
22 think this... I assume that Commissioner Laung also had this concern, is we wouldn't want  
23 number four being unresolved to hold anyone back on other items and that's why he was  
24 thinking about putting it first. So, if Commissioner Summa does make that motion I'd be happy  
25 to support it. And what I would suggest is if any Commissioners are being held back by concerns  
26 about four and that's holding them back on other segments of the path. Just say so, maybe we  
27 can modify the motion and understand what are the areas of concern. So, anyway, we slice it, I  
28 think we'll get through the stuff where we agree. But I do want to make sure that people feel  
29 comfortable to say if they find it's tied to something that we don't deprive folks of the  
30 opportunity to discuss it. Thanks.

31  
32 Chair Hechtman: Commissioner Summa, are you interested in making a motion regarding  
33 Fabian, Waverly and East Meadow segments one and two?

34  
35 Commissioner Summa: I had... I wasn't indicating that earlier but so anybody can make a  
36 motion. I haven't written one down so maybe if someone has one prepared.

37  
38 Chair Hechtman: Commissioner Alcheck, I'm not sure if your hand is up a new or (interrupted)

39  
40 MOTION #1

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1  
2 Commissioner Alcheck: I can... I move that we recommend Staff's preferred concepts for A, B,  
3 C, and D on Page... Packet Page 8. That's the Waverly Multi-Use Alternative Two widening  
4 towards either side and Fabian Way, protected bicycle lanes on both sides, and then East  
5 Meadows Drive segment one and two and that's my motion.

6  
7 Chair Hechtman: Alright, thank you Commissioner Alcheck. We have a motion, do we have a  
8 second for A, B, C, and D which are Waverly, Fabian, East Meadow segment one, and segment  
9 two.

10  
11 SECOND

12  
13 Commissioner Chang: I second.

14  
15 Chair Hechtman: I'm sorry, I didn't... where did that come from?

16  
17 Commissioner Chang: I (interrupted)

18  
19 Chair Hechtman: Oh, Commissioner Chang, thank you. I didn't see your mouth move. Second by  
20 Commissioner Chang. Commissioner Alcheck, any comments on your motion?

21  
22 Commissioner Alcheck: Yeah, no, I'll just say that I look forward to seeing how these ideas  
23 evolve. I hope that City Council pursues them regardless of the funding source. And I would  
24 actually lymphatically suggest that they are very worthy of City investment in both the time  
25 Staff has taken so far and that the time that Staff will ultimately need to invest in it  
26 [unintelligible] of the funds. And I hope that it won't be tremendously long regardless of  
27 funding between now and the time when these improvements could be implemented.

28  
29 Chair Hechtman: Commissioner Chang, any comments on your second?

30  
31 Commissioner Chang: So, everything that Commissioner Alcheck just said, but I'd like to add  
32 that I'm seconding this with the understanding that this is in concept phase. Because I know  
33 that I feel strongly that a lot more community engagement has to be done to understand the  
34 nitty-gritty of exactly how things are implemented. For example, I said this before and will say it  
35 again, that the Waverly Bike Path I personally believe needs to be a solid barrier not easily  
36 crossed by children but I think that that will come out through... I have faith in the process.

37  
38 Chair Hechtman: Other Commission discussion on the motion? Commissioner Templeton.

39

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 Commissioner Templeton: Yes, I'm going to support this motion. I think I for many years  
2 commuted when the underpass was open down this path to work and think it could be... the  
3 safety could be improved there. I also biked to school with my kids when I stopped working. So,  
4 I have some substantial experience here and I feel like this... these improvements are very  
5 promising. And like Commissioner Chang mentioned, I do think that it's important to keep in  
6 mind that we need to iterate on this. This is a great concept but it needs refinement, it's needs  
7 refinement that involves getting the feedback and addressing the concerns of folks like those  
8 who wrote and spoke about this topic.

9  
10 So, regarding the other comment, you know it's off-topic for this evening but I do hope that we  
11 will see the benefits of this project affect other routes within the City. So, I think this is a great  
12 next step towards implementing our bike and pedestrian vision. Thank you.

13  
14 Chair Hechtman: Other Commission comments on the motion? I'll be supporting the motion. I  
15 think these are four great and worthwhile improvements. I'm hoping that they'll be partially  
16 funded by VTA but even if they're not, I'm hoping that the Council will find budget in the  
17 relatively near term to accomplish them anyway. I'm not seeing any further Commission hands  
18 so Mr. Nguyen, will you conduct a roll call vote?

19  
20 Mr. Nguyen: Commissioner Alcheck?

21  
22 Commissioner Alcheck: Aye.

23  
24 Mr. Nguyen: Commissioner Chang?

25  
26 Commissioner Chang: Yes.

27  
28 Mr. Nguyen: Chair Hechtman? Chair Hechtman?

29  
30 Chair Hechtman: Yes.

31  
32 Mr. Nguyen: Commissioner Lauing?

33  
34 Commissioner Lauing: Yes.

35  
36 Mr. Nguyen: Vice-Chair Roohparvar is absent. Commissioner Summa?

37  
38 Commissioner Summa: Yes.

39  
40 Mr. Nguyen: Commissioner Templeton?

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

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

Commissioner Templeton: Yes.

Mr. Nguyen: The motion carries 6-0 with one Commissioner absent.

MOTION #1 PASSED 6(Alcheck, Chang, Hechtman, Lauing, Summa, Templeton) -0 -  
1(Roohparvar recused)

Chair Hechtman: Excellent, thank you. So, I'm going to suggest that now we tackle segment four because I think through the fullness of that discussion, we may get an understanding of whether some of those issues bleed over into segment three which is the concern that Commissioner Summa had expressed.

So, for this segment, I think it might be helpful for us to put up on the screen the area of segment four and help us understand... help us see graphically where the residences are, the park in the vicinity. We've heard that there are churches, how far away are the schools? We've heard about overflow parking. Maybe we could start by an understanding... a better understanding of the geography.

Mr. Kamhi: Thank you and while we're pulling that up I wanted to provide a chance for our consultant Steve Davis to provide a little bit of context about the width of the... the geometry that we're working within. I think it would be helpful for everyone to hear a bit about that.

Mr. Davis: Yeah, thanks Philip and hopefully my audio will hold out ok. So, just for way of background, you know we've been out there obviously physically in the street taking measurements and everything. And in most portions of segments three and four, in particular, the physical black top pavement, the part that is colored black from curb to curb edge, is 44-foot wide in total. And then there's usually a little over a foot down the concert to the bottom of that valley gutter and then you'll get a foot half or so back up the other side of the valley gutter till you get to the sidewalk. So, in general, the maximum total width we would say is available for use for transportation would be down to the bottom of the valley gutter on each side. So, that's 46-foot total between the bottoms of the gutters on either side of the street.

So, for reference, if we were to take everything that we want to serve and using what is in the preferred alternative. If you were to say we did everything to absolute minimums, made the bike lanes the narrowest that would meet standards which is actually narrower than it is today. Made the buffer the narrowest that it would meet standards, made the travel lanes the narrowest that would meet standards, and made the parking lane... the one parking lane the narrowest that would meet standards. That takes 42-total feet of width, so if you assume that

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 we have 46-feet total. Then we only have 4-extra feet which leaves us generally speaking about  
2 4-feet shy of having enough space for an additional parking lane.

3  
4 So, that's essentially... we looked at a lot of different configurations for this before we landed  
5 on the versions that were shared and then ultimately the preferred alternative. But the reason  
6 the conclusion has been reached to say that there isn't physical space in the existing street as it  
7 is currently out there today. To include parking in both directions while providing all those  
8 other facilities is that it... there's just not the extra on top of that then 46-foot width. And part  
9 of the reason it actually seems wider than it is today is because the parking lanes that are out  
10 there are quite narrow. So, most places the edge of the stripe on the road to where the  
11 concrete starts. The actual black top part of the parking lane is about 5-feet and then you would  
12 have about a foot down the valley gutter to where you would normally consider it ok to have  
13 cars. So, that's 6-feet and the typical standard minimum for a parking lane is 8-feet to provide  
14 enough space for people to be able to get in there and leave their cars. So, it feels like there's a  
15 little bit more space to us, you know when I'm out there in the middle of the road because  
16 we're also considerably squeeze again from a transportation perspective to the space that's on  
17 the parking area on the sides. So, I just wanted to provide that background.

18

19 Commissioner Templeton: Excuse me, Chair?

20

21 Chair Hechtman: Yeah?

22

23 Commissioner Templeton: Could we ask Mr. Davis to put up the slide that shows all those  
24 numbers? It might be hard for the Commissioners to place all that... to follow that description  
25 without the illustration. I think it's on the slide deck, number 45 perhaps?

26

27 Mr. Davis: One moment, finding it. So, this is the slide in question and what I was suggesting is  
28 that you could actually make this a little bit narrower if you were take space away from the bike  
29 lane and make it narrower than it is today.

30

31 Chair Hechtman: Commissioner Alcheck, I see your hand.

32

33 Commissioner Alcheck: So, can you explain to me why we couldn't institute a bi-directional  
34 protected bike path on one side of the road like on Cal Avenue near Middlefield? North Cal  
35 Avenue and so that would eliminate presumably one section of protection which appears on  
36 this image as 3-feet wide. And then... I mean I'm assuming that protected bike lane that I'm  
37 referring to is not 10-feet wide. So that implies also that maybe the bi-directional bike lane  
38 doesn't necessarily have to be 12-feet in total. It could be 9-feet in total which is another 3-feet.  
39 And so... ok, let me clear because I'm seeing some crossed eyes here. Imagine for a minute that  
40 you move the bike lane on the left side of this image to the right side. Then that 3-foot

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.



1 protection zone on the left side between the orange car and the parking wouldn't need to be  
2 there. We don't need a protection area between cars and cars. So, you've now come back with  
3 3-feet and then imagine for a minute that the combined bike lanes, which represents 12-feet in  
4 this image, were not 12-feet wide. That's an obscene amount of bike space compared to what  
5 he have on Cal Avenue which is next to a school and is designed for students to use. I'm just  
6 curious, do people... are people familiar with that bi-directional bike lane next to Cal Ave... on  
7 Cal Avenue next to Middlefield? Ok, so then you know what I'm talking about. That's not a 10-  
8 foot wide combined bike lane.

9  
10 And I don't know, maybe that standard was too narrow. Maybe they want... I think that  
11 probably is somewhere between 6- and 8-feet. Maybe that's too narrow and so it needs to be a  
12 little bigger. But if it was 10-feet as opposed to 12, then you've just bought yourself another  
13 few feet and for sure that bike lane's protection zone... well, it's not clear. But I don't think that  
14 bike lane's protection zone is 3-feet wide either. So, the question is, could you, for example,  
15 find parking on both sides of the street if you combined the bike paths on one side. Made them  
16 slightly narrower and eliminated the need for protection zone on both sides which would be  
17 redundant?

18  
19 Mr. Davis: I can take the first answer at that. So, first I do want to specify that the existing path  
20 that's on Middlefield next to Green. The pathway is 10-feet wide and the buffer is 3-feet wide.  
21 So, that is the same dimensions that you're talking about there. So, if we were to do  
22 (interrupted)

23  
24 Commissioner Alcheck: That's not 12-feet wide? That's not 12-feet wide?

25  
26 Mr. Davis: Correct, so if we were to go with that exact same dimension we would gain 5-fete  
27 back. So, that leaves us still short of enough width for parking in general. The other piece is that  
28 the design, and I wasn't involved in the design, but as a general... just as a practitioner. The  
29 reason that I would have chosen the design the way it is for the location along Cal Ave and  
30 Middlefield Road is that there aren't any driveways there. So, there's no crossing conflicts at all  
31 for the bicyclists.

32  
33 In general, at intersection crossings and at driveways, it is considered to be quite a bit more of a  
34 hazard for drivers to be backing out to need to look for people coming from both directions in  
35 the space immediately closest to their driveway on one side of the street. It's also considerably  
36 more difficult to handle intersections with both directions of bicyclists on one side because  
37 people turning right, for example, would need to look for both someone coming behind them  
38 to the right and oncoming to the right. In addition to then pedestrians beside that. So, in  
39 settings with a lot of driveways and residential settings like this. We typically would not  
40 recommend that kind of treatment, but I would say that in general if were to do that. We still...

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 we would have to go to a significantly substandard width. I shouldn't use significantly in  
2 California. A definitely substandard width bikeway to be able to buy enough additional space to  
3 fit additional parking on the other side of the street.

4  
5 Commissioner Alcheck: Ok, thank you for that illuminating answer. That makes perfect sense to  
6 my other meager transportation knowledge. But let me just ask one other question which is I  
7 think you said that there are 4-feet to play somewhere in this design. Is there a scenario where  
8 the parking on one side of the street could be angled and allow for a greater density of cars  
9 parked as opposed to be parallel? That would... my theory is that when you're doing this,  
10 eventually you will say this is how many spaces we're going to lose. And my question is, is there  
11 a scenario where the design could evolve and the spots are lost on one side but spots are  
12 gained on the other?

13  
14 Mr. Davis: From a design standpoint, there may be some potential for that but in a residential  
15 setting because of the closely spaced driveways. That often doesn't gain very much just  
16 because you're not... if you think... if you're looking at about a 4-foot extra play room and again,  
17 that's with everyone... every other space really shrunk down to the bare minimum. So, lower  
18 dimensions than what you're seeing here on the drawing. The angle that you're getting is going  
19 to be less than 30 degrees usually. So, you're not getting... unless you're getting more than 30  
20 degrees, you're not normally gaining enough angle to actually really increase your parking  
21 density a lot over small spaces. And so, if you picture that you have in some cases driveways  
22 that are two car lengths apart. Some of those you might be able to get three cars into instead of  
23 two but in many cases, you're probably talking very small amounts. But there... I mean that's  
24 something that potentially could be looked at in the future if there was the opportunity to do  
25 so.

26  
27 Commissioner Alcheck: Is... and so last question, is there any... do you have any... I know it's  
28 really initial so well maybe you do. Do you have any sense where how many spaces are lost on  
29 this segment four? And you know that it would also help to appreciate how many spaces total.  
30 So, do we have an idea of that? And it seems absurd to be talking about this as such an early of  
31 the design but maybe that's something you've looked into.

32  
33 Ms. Chan: So, we do have an approximate number, this is Joanna, for location for between East  
34 Meadow and east... sorry, Middlefield and East Meadow Circle will be approximately 80 spots  
35 on both sides. I mean yeah, 80 spots on both sides.

36  
37 Commissioner Alcheck: I'm sorry, on... 80 spots...

38  
39 Ms. Chan: Each side so each.

40

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 Commissioner Alcheck: How many spots are there right now and how many would be lost?

2

3 Ms. Chan: If we're doing a complete removal of one side, it will be 80 spots.

4

5 Commissioner Alcheck: 80 spots (interrupted)

6

7 Ms. Chan: Approximately 80 spots.

8

9 Mr. Kamhi: Just to clarify, it's approximately 80 spots per side approximately space. So, 160  
10 spaces, 80 of those would be potentially lost.

11

12 Commissioner Alcheck: Ok, so it's very, very roughly half. I wasn't sure if maybe there were  
13 more spots because of the number of cut-away. Or less spots because of the number of... I  
14 wondered for example if choosing sides would have impacted the numbers of spots lost based  
15 off the number of double-wide driveways or not or whatnot.

16

17 Chair Hechtman: Alcheck, can we... ok, great. Commissioner Lauing followed by Commissioner  
18 Chang.

19

20 Commissioner Lauing: Yes, I mean I just want to follow up on what our consultant said because  
21 I didn't take notes fast enough on the math. I know you show a 46-foot there and Mr. Alcheck  
22 said we could take out three and we're at 43. What number are we actually trying to solve for  
23 to squeeze it in because you said we are 4-feet short?

24

25 Mr. Davis: So, we have 46 in general. Usually, we would need four more than that. We would  
26 need 50-feet is what we would need to fit everything at the minimum. So, in theory, you would  
27 be if you could remove 3-feet here and 5-feet, or I'm sorry.

28

29 Commissioner Lauing: 1-foot.

30

31 Mr. Davis: Now, I'm confusing myself.

32

33 Commissioner Lauing: 1-foot.

34

35 Mr. Davis: One moment.

36

37 Commissioner Lauing: If I was following that, if you take Mr. Alcheck's 3-feet, I think you only  
38 need 1-foot but that's what I'm trying to clarify.

39

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 Mr. Davis: That, let's see here, so if you were to take out and made this cross-section of 8-feet  
2 parking with a 3-foot buffer... well, two, 10-foot travel lanes and then a 10-foot path that has a  
3 3-foot buffer. The total width of that is 41-feet and so we would need 49-feet. We need 8-more  
4 feet in order to get a parking lane in addition to that and we would only have five more. So, we  
5 come up 4-feet short.

6  
7 Commissioner Lauing: Ok, yeah, I mean this is the kind of exercise I think we're asking Staff to  
8 do. To see what the other alternatives are as opposed to saying this is it, these are the  
9 numbers. That's why we're kind of working with you on this but I know that we're not going to  
10 solve this tonight.

11  
12 Mr. Davis: Understood and to be fair, I mean that is the exercise we have done as well  
13 (interrupted)

14  
15 Commissioner Lauing: Sure.

16  
17 Mr. Davis: Which is a variety of what we did but obviously understand from a transparency  
18 standpoint.

19  
20 Commissioner Lauing: Right, right and to be more radical. I mean I know this isn't possible but  
21 could you... so [unintelligible] something that isn't going to work. Take 4-feet of the park a way.  
22 I mean, we can't do that but you know some of these things need to be looked at in real detail  
23 to see what we could squeak out here. And again, I just want to underscore, the reason this is a  
24 concern is that this is really public parking spacings. This is not just residents. I mean there's  
25 obviously resident parking and as some person said. You know you're backing your... you have a  
26 single car garage and driveway you're backing out and you're during a lot of traffic there. But  
27 you've got, as has been pointed out, a lot of parked traffic that we have to address. It's a public  
28 facility and they need parking. We have supported and do serious support ADUs and there's not  
29 parking there. So, that has to spill on the street. So, wiping out 80 units [note – parking spaces]  
30 there is a big deal in terms of overall public benefit. It's not just a benefit for residents so that's  
31 kind of the emphasis. Thank you.

32  
33 Chair Hechtman: Commissioner Chang.

34  
35 Commissioner Chang: So, along the brainstorming front because we're talking about removing  
36 50 percent of the parking there and to... I do drive down there or bike down there all the time.  
37 In fact, was there every night this week, and when I took a quick look at about 6:00 pm, 6:30  
38 pm. Ramos Park was filled with people. There was sort of game there or something and the  
39 other side... and so I kind of did a quick eyeball and I'm thinking these cars can't all fit here. I  
40 don't know where they're going to go. If I took both sides of the road and tried to smash them

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 into one, it wouldn't work, and I know that that's a study for phase 2 if we were to advance. But  
2 brainstorming, I was noodling on this with someone else and they said. Well, can we do a little  
3 bit more parking in front of Ramos Park the way Fair Meadow has? So, eat up a little bit of the  
4 park. I know that Commissioner Templeton had talked about routing the bike path through the  
5 park but another idea would be what if we had 90-degree parking in along Ramos Park. That at  
6 least helps alleviate some the situation caused by removed 80 parking spaces. I don't think we  
7 could get 80 parking spaces in there but it might help. The other thought... the other question...  
8 so that's just an idea and I know nobody here can answer it.

9  
10 The other concern I had as I was talking to folks about this is and I had confirmed with Ms. Chan  
11 is that Ramos Park is going to be putting in a bathroom next year. So, usually, parks without  
12 bathrooms are kind of considered neighborhood parks. Just drawing from the houses that are  
13 there but once they put in a bathroom. It really starts drawing from a larger area and I do know  
14 that many of the soccer games that happen at Ramos Park are club teams that come from  
15 outside that area again. And so regardless of which side we put parking on, these are large  
16 blocks. If you look at the map and compare, they're kind of two deep... two... they're the length  
17 of two normal blocks. So, if you compare down by the circles versus in the sections that we're  
18 talking about. These are large blocks and so it's hard for people to walk to an intersection and I  
19 foresee jay walking regardless of which side we put parking on. And so, I wanted to ask Staff if  
20 you have thought about how that might be addressed? Because that seems to me... you know  
21 we might be trading one problem for a more dangerous problem because right now it's maybe  
22 commute hours that we see the most danger for bikes. But the parking issue, that's going to  
23 be... jay walking, that's all day. So, I wanted to hear your thoughts on that because that must  
24 have been something that you thought about? Staff?

25  
26 Mr. Kamhi: Well, I would just say yeah, it's... so jay walking occurs now. Just noting that it's  
27 really just people crossing the street and there are other examples as much as there are  
28 examples of parks with parking right in front of there or parks with parking at it. There are  
29 examples of parks that don't really have parking right at them that really does cause a little bit  
30 more spill over and that's frankly what would happen. If we remove the parking either across  
31 the street or at the park. Probably when there's sporting events, the parking spills across the  
32 street currently I would guess, and so what would happen is that distance would be spread out  
33 further. So, walking distances would become greater for people going to the park. I currently...  
34 you know I coached a little league team that my son's on and there's not parking at the park  
35 where we go to. And certainly, not nearly enough parking to support all the teams that happen  
36 to be there on a Saturday morning. So, when I go there, we walk a few blocks. I'm not saying it's  
37 perfect or ideal situation but just noting that's the reality.

38  
39 Also, I want to point out that, and I think you probably knew this as you were saying it, but the  
40 concept of taking some of the park and turning it into a parking lot. Well, not necessarily a bad

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 idea is well without... outside the grant scope for this project and would actually take a  
2 significant... its own significant outreach process but it is a really intriguing idea as well. Perhaps  
3 if this segment is not moved forward in this project, that could be something that's considered  
4 in the future.

5

6 Chair Hechtman: Commissioner Templeton.

7

8 Commissioner Templeton: Thank you. Yes, I just want to clarify, I don't think that's what we  
9 should do. It was just an example of trying to get creative and how far one might be willing to  
10 go.

11

12 Personally, I don't think that we should trade park land for parking spaces, but I do think that if  
13 we had less parking spaces... fewer parking spaces. That we would... and better bike  
14 infrastructure, we might see an increase in people going to that park on their bikes. So, that's  
15 something to think about. It's not exactly necessarily a one for one with that parking situation.  
16 We may be encouraging people to use their bike more if they're locals.

17

18 The other thing is I measured with the Google Maps measuring tool, I measured the length of  
19 segment four. It looks like it's about 3,048-feet which is approximately .58 of a mile. So, just to  
20 give it context. It's not a huge length of stretch of road. With that said, 80 parking spaces is  
21 considerable so we do need to think about that. And I'm curious, I don't think I've ever seen it  
22 full up but I understand Commissioner Chang did to see if all those 80 spaces are ever in use. In  
23 other words, what our maximum demand may not be 80, even though our maximum spaces  
24 might be.

25

26 Also, just throw back to another project that Mr. Kamhi and I worked on. As part of that project  
27 we discovered that a very significant amount of section three is not... doesn't have driveways  
28 on the side of the road that Mitchell Park and the schools are on. So, if we did to the bi-  
29 directional bike lanes. Somehow miraculously we worked out the math for that. You might  
30 consider that for segment three as well because that goes with the least disruption for those  
31 sides of the road with the driveways. So, that's just something... and easier... just like with  
32 Green. It would be easier for the students to get in and out of those bikes lanes without having  
33 to cross Meadow. So, just something to think about that just this discussion around segment  
34 three may also be something to consider for the whole stretch up to Alma and then other  
35 thoughts about the parking.

36

37 I do think that there's significant room for parking in adjacent streets where you could fill in  
38 here and there those parking. But I don't know that the... that's a bigger question we want to  
39 involve more people.

40

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 And then finally, this stretch here, at least part of it, as you get down towards Lewis and headed  
2 towards East Meadow Circle. It's less and less traffic-iky and I think that's part of what the point  
3 some of the callers were making is do we need protected bike lanes in this specific area as the  
4 traffic from Middlefield starts to taper off. So, I don't know what options we have with the  
5 grant constraints and I'm not going to even think about that but if we had to move forward  
6 with these improvements without those constraints. You know we might want to... we might  
7 have more options in this area because it's just not as traffic-iky or especially past Lewis. So,  
8 something to think about, thank you.

9

10 Chair Hechtman: Sorry, muted. Commissioner Chang.

11

12 Commissioner Chang: So, yeah, I actually had forgot to mention that last point that  
13 Commissioner Templeton mentioned about the traffic patterns. And so, if you look at Packet  
14 Page 40 and I know that these are pandemic counts, but I can imagine that they might increase  
15 proportionately. So, if you look at Packet Page 40, the traffic on the east or south side of  
16 Middlefield is dramatically different than from the traffic on East Meadow as you get towards  
17 the end. And it's dramatically different and I think that's why... and also my personal experience  
18 biking there it's the same thing. I get to the other side of Middlefield and I'm wow, there's no  
19 cars and it's so wide and this is the safest I've ever felt. I mean really, it really feels safer than  
20 even bike boulevard just because there's really very few cars there relative to the other side  
21 and the bike... it feels roomy. So, I do wondering about whether the same treatment is  
22 appropriate given the very different characteristics and traffic patter, as well as where  
23 driveways are, as well as where driveways are, as well as where the parking is for the public  
24 facilities for the parks. Because Mitchell Park again has a bunch of parking and the schools have  
25 parking to meeting their needs. So, I do really question whether a universal solution is the most  
26 appropriate. Particularly given that a lot of the speakers who also avid bicyclists.

27

28 And then relatedly, if you look at Package Page 27 and sort of what people were saying. People  
29 who know the area were saying, Packet Page 27 has a series of green bars that kind of shows  
30 decreasing support for various areas and again, it's just communicating the same thing. That  
31 the data with the vehicle volume shows which is that there's less of a perceived need for  
32 protected bikeway as the traffic declines. So, that's just my observation in the Packet data as  
33 well as matches with my observation in real life.

34

35 Chair Hechtman: Thank you. I have a few questions for Staff on this segment four. So, when I  
36 look at Packet Page 19 which shows the preferred concept plan for the lane layout for segments  
37 one, two, and three, it looks like for all three of those segments, what is proposed would be to  
38 have parking on only one side of the street. Am I seeing that correctly? So, I see (interrupted)

39

40 Mr. Kamhi: Yes.

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

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

Chair Hechtman: Ok and today on all three of those segments is there parking on both sides of the street? Yes, ok. So, segments one, two, and three together look like they're about the same or yeah, about the same length as segment four. Maybe slightly longer. Do we know how many parking spaces we'd be losing on segments one, two, and three if we implement the plan for those segments?

Ms. Chan: Sorry, I do not have a rough number for segments one and two. I do have some rough numbers for segment three, which is Waverly to Middlefield. Sorry, excuse me, so if we decide to remove parking on the school side which is the south side. It's approximately 39 parking spaces.

Chair Hechtman: Alright and then we don't have information for one and two but there's no reason to believe that we're not losing some number of parking spaces. And those two segments are roughly the size of segment three. So, it's conceivable that with one, two, and three we could be losing 60 to 80 spaces. So, one of the things I'm finding interesting is that I haven't heard any neighborhood comments about losing those parking spaces, however many there are, on one, two, and three. And so, it brings me back to this question I raised earlier trying to understand what's unique about section four, the segment four, where the neighbors are feeling there will be a significant impact. And perhaps part of that we've talked about is I think along segment four the houses frequently are facing East Meadow. They have an East Meadow address where I think at least for segment two maybe they're mostly facing the side... the streets that enter East Meadow. So, you're really getting the side yard where there's not much parking. I don't know if that's true in segment three, but again I'm interested in knowing why this seems to be... this seems, at least based on the residents' response, that the impact seems to be unique to them. The lost parking... the concern about loss of parking and I'm wondering if Staff can help me understand why that might be.

Mr. Kamhi: I just want to clarify really quickly that segment one does not have a lose in parking. Just wanted to note that. Coming back to the larger question which is what is different? The primarily thing that's different is segment four has the most housing and that's really why we're hearing from the residents that are... would be feeling the loss. The residents and park users at etc. that would feeling the loss of that parking. Noting that one thing I always want to say is the City is fully built out right? So, we don't have enough room to... we haven't... we're not building a new road here through corn field. We've got these houses that were built in the 50s and 60s. That were built with driveways and garages and typically when the houses were built. People parked their car in the garage but now a lot of people like to use their garage for storage and cars are bigger now and you don't necessarily want to park two cars side by side in your driveway. You might not have room for that and so it ends up being a tandem situation if you're... you can't park on the street. So, just noting some of the changes have or some of the

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.



1 changes that have occurred over time when probably initially these streets were designed.  
2 There weren't a lot of cars that actually parked on the streets.

3  
4 The segment along Mitchell Park and JLS has no housing. Just want to note that. Mitchell Park  
5 has its own parking lot as well.

6  
7 Chair Hechtman: Across from Mitchell Park, there are some houses, right?

8  
9 Mr. Kamhi: Yeah, no... yes. No, at Mitchell Park so the portion along the park.

10  
11 Chair Hechtman: The frontage of the schools and the park, right? That dominates (interrupted)

12  
13 Mr. Kamhi: That's right.

14  
15 Chair Hechtman: That side, the southeastern side of the segment three.

16  
17 Mr. Kamhi: Yep.

18  
19 Chair Hechtman: Ok. Alright, thank you. Commissioner Chang followed by Commissioner  
20 Templeton.

21  
22 Commissioner Chang: I had a question of Staff. Have you heard anything from JLS about the  
23 elimination of parking in front of or what... actually, it's not so much the parking I'm necessarily  
24 concerned about there. It's the drop-off. I think currently, parents are dropping off on East  
25 Meadow in front of JLS and I know that for Meadow. That parking and that area is going to be  
26 preserved so it's probably a little less of a concern to them. But I'm wondering what PAUSD has  
27 said about all this?

28  
29 Ms. Star-Lack: So, I don't know Joanna want to add anything about this. We have been talking...  
30 JLS and PAUSD know about this project because the Waverly Path is actually their land. And so,  
31 we have been coordinating with them on this. They are working on a new school plan that will  
32 change where their office is and may have changes to their drive... not the driveway. But just  
33 kind of that circulation that is there and they have... so they're working on that. I have not  
34 spoken to them about this, what would happen on East Meadow about drop off, but as you  
35 know, there are 600, 700 kids who bike to this school and we... and it keeps growing. We are  
36 working with them to help decongest that school frontage. One of the requests that they've  
37 had is for us to work on seeing when we can put in a left turn lane into the Waverley driveway  
38 there because what is happening now is that cars are using the bike lane which is not protected  
39 there. Nor are we proposing that it be protected but that cars are using it to get around folks  
40 who are waiting in line to turn into the school. So, if... so we are trying to figure out if we are

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 able to move this project, how we can also add that bike lane... I'm sorry that left turn lane in  
2 there. So, that at least... so that it's safer for students who are biking let's say towards Gunn to  
3 get through there because it's a little bit fraught.

4  
5 Commissioner Chang: I'm sorry, can I just as a clarifying question. You were saying that you're  
6 not proposing that it be protected there.

7  
8 Ms. Star-Lack: Not on... so the proposal right now is to maintain the parking along the housing.

9  
10 Commissioner Chang: Yeah, ok. Well, but wasn't it... maybe I'm confusing sections now. I  
11 thought that it was potentially a parking-protected bike lane there. Segment three. On no, it's  
12 not. Ok (interrupted)

13  
14 Ms. Star-Lack: No, it's not.

15  
16 Commissioner Chang: But it would be buffered, it would be buffered.

17  
18 Ms. Star-Lack: It would be buffered. It would be buffered (interrupted)

19  
20 Commissioner Chang: Which would help.

21  
22 Ms. Star-Lack: Yes.

23  
24 Commissioner Chang: Ok.

25  
26 Ms. Star-Lack: Right and so if we... so if you think about what that cross-section would be at  
27 that intersection. Then you would have a buffered bike lane if you're facing Gunn let's say. You  
28 would have a buffered bike lane, a through lane, a left turn lane, and then the opposite  
29 direction lane there would not be space for then parking and drop off. There's just not enough.

30  
31 Commissioner Chang: Right. Ok, I am concerned because I've also seen the JLS, and they're  
32 moving the office closer to East Meadow which means they have their own circulation  
33 problems that are pretty complex actually.

34  
35 So, then my follow-on comment is that this is kind of in response to one of the public  
36 comments about again parking removal in section four and also in response to Commissioner  
37 Hechtman's [note – Chair Hechtman] question about what's different. What's different is that  
38 there's also large lots in that area if I understand correctly because of the size of... some of the  
39 largest lots with ADU potential I think are in that area as you get down towards East Meadow

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 Circle. And I'd have to look at a parcel map to really understand it but that is... there's like flag  
2 lots there because of the depth of the block. There's flag lots and some large lots back there.

3  
4 Mr. Kamhi: That ADU situation is exactly one of the examples that I would give for the changing  
5 usage in parking and all of that or demand for change in parking in that area.

6  
7 Chair Hechtman: Commissioner Templeton.

8  
9 Commissioner Templeton: Thank you. Even... just to Commissioner Chang's point, even without  
10 a parcel map you can still the outlines of the structures and the lot lines on Google Maps if you  
11 zoom in. Some of them are angled unusually but there does appear to be potential for lots of  
12 parking on people's property in those types of situations.

13  
14 That aside, I wanted to address the Chair's question about what's different down here? I think  
15 this is... it's super awkward to bring up but one of the major differences is this neighborhood  
16 was very recently affect by a major transportation project. And they... there's probably some  
17 lingering emotional feelings about that and a commitment perhaps among the neighbors to  
18 make sure that they're never caught by surprise again. So, think this might be some proactive  
19 outreach in making sure that this neighbor's voices are heard as early as possible and as  
20 strongly as possible. And that's absolutely appropriate way to channel that energy, but the flow  
21 of everything in that particular neighborhood is very affected by the traffic circle that was  
22 implemented. And you know, if you've driven through there or biked through there it's  
23 perplexing. And I think there's a sense of nostalgia for the peaceful predictability of how things  
24 were before. That's not to say that these improvements, I'm sure they brought additional  
25 safety, or else they wouldn't have been implemented. But you know it's still a real concern is  
26 are we going to make this even more complex. We just went through this. It's been a challenge  
27 and so it's really important to engage and to get creative. So that we can have the bike safety  
28 and this be a really pleasant bike thorough fair while also still being a pleasant place to live. So, I  
29 think that's the unique nature. The further you get away from the Ross Meadow intersection,  
30 the calmer people are about this particular issue. So, just throwing that out there and  
31 acknowledging our neighbors who are speaking up.

32  
33 Mr. Kamhi: I think that's a really important point. Oh, that's not my dog this time but I think  
34 that's a really important point. Because I just want to note that that's really the reason why  
35 we're before you tonight asking whether we want to even consider moving forward is in  
36 reflection. And this community outreach process where we are going through this process of  
37 determining whether we want to move forward with the project really in reflection of the  
38 project that occurred on Ross Road. In the area that does definitely affect people in this area. I  
39 think we even heard comments tonight that referenced the Ross Road traffic circle.

40

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 Chair Hechtman: Commissioner Summa. Sorry for the dog.

2

3 Commissioner Summa: Thank you. Yeah so in listening to everybody, I think what we're looking  
4 at here is trying to find a way. Segment four maybe doesn't problems that need to be fixed like  
5 the other segments and so maybe it gets left. And I think Commissioner Templeton is right,  
6 people... the Ross Road was not a resounding happy situation and I live right on at at-  
7 intersection. One of the first traffic circles in our College Terrace traffic calming and I would tell  
8 you, it takes drivers like anecdotally a decade to get use to a new thing like that in the street.  
9 There were so many accidents on mine, it was kind of crazy. People just don't see new things if  
10 they've lived a long place somewhere. It's really true. I mean it was kind of like the wild west  
11 out there, but I think over time that will go away to a certain extent. And you know I back  
12 basically out of my driveway into it so it was kind of not maybe good for me but it was definitely  
13 what was considered to be good for the neighborhood.

14

15 So, but I just think maybe if we can move forward and I know that the VTA doesn't want to hear  
16 this but I'm not finding a way... we just can't find more feet in the roadway. You can't make  
17 them. The only way you could find it was take... get rid of the sidewalks and that's crazy. So, I'm  
18 just feeling like we can't find a solution to a problem on segment four. That according to the  
19 people that live and use this street a lot, which is not me, doesn't exist right now. So, that's kind  
20 of where I am on segment four.

21

22 Chair Hechtman: Thank you. I think where I am looking is big picture on segment four and  
23 again, trying to be mindful of the public comments and what I read and where they were  
24 talking about the impacts. I think that the primary objections don't seem to be from East  
25 Meadow Circle to Lewis but rather from Lewis over to Middlefield. And so, I'm... you know VTA  
26 has given us a kind of taken it or leave it and I'm kind of wondering about a take it or leave it  
27 approach back where maybe we can provide buffered from East Meadow Circle to Lewis, and  
28 then just whatever we can do with the existing traffic bicycle lane. For example, I don't  
29 remember that it's been painted. I can't remember the look of it but maybe there are some  
30 visual enhancements that we could make to that segment from Lewis to Middlefield that would  
31 not meet this VTA criteria but maybe we can... maybe they'll get even softer. I don't... I mean  
32 Staff has made clear and I think they've done a great job of softening them already and I have  
33 no reason to believe that they'll further soften.

34

35 Mr. Kamhi: I just want to say that I think typically when you write a grant application. There's  
36 not a lot of leeway. They expect that you deliver the project that you said you were going to  
37 deliver. And there might be something where you say hey this is infeasible in this area because  
38 we ran into a utility conflict or something like that. I just think at this point, if we're going to try  
39 and modify the project any further. I don't think we're going to get anywhere in the discussion  
40 because we've been having this discussion with them for quite a while now. And we let them

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 know... we anticipated that this was going to be a concern frankly, this parking issue, and that's  
2 why we brought up this conversation. So, I just... I don't want to give anybody any false hope to  
3 think that we're going to get them any further because quite frankly we're not. They're going to  
4 take this money and give it to another community that wants to do something similar to this  
5 and has potentially the support to do so. So, I appreciate your comments. I do wish that we  
6 could actually make this into a project where we can get grant funding for it but I think without  
7 being able to provide the buffered and protected bike path throughout. I don't think we're  
8 going to have a project. Grant-funded project I should say.

9  
10 Chair Hechtman: Understood, understood, but whether or not it's grant-funded, from  
11 everything I've heard, to me that makes the... well, if it's not going to be grant-funded, it still  
12 makes the most sense to me to provide that buffer and lose a few parking spaces where we're  
13 really... we're not hearing as much about... from the neighborhood. Because we're going to  
14 buffer protect segment one and then if we can get the first part of four and then just visually  
15 enhance something with the rest of four. Again, if these are just Council City projects, not VTA  
16 projects, I would still like the Council to know I'd like those enhancements on that segment  
17 four. And if... and Mr. Kamhi, I take you at your word that you have already done extraordinary  
18 lifting to get VTA where you got them too. And if we can't meet their demands, so be it. Alright,  
19 I see Commissioner Lauing followed by Commissioner Summa.

20  
21 MOTION #2

22  
23 Commissioner Lauing: Yes, I think we've had a very good discussion on this and all of us are  
24 coming back to the point that we think that substantially we want to do this project in all  
25 segments and we've got a problem with the grant. So, I would like to make a specific motion  
26 that would address this in the context of ultimately City Council has to make a decision if  
27 they're willing to risk this without a grant and as I said before, we don't know what the total  
28 cost are.

29  
30 So, the motion that I would make is that the PTC moves the approval of Items E and F in the  
31 Staff report and recommends revise solution which omits or mitigates the proposed loss of 80  
32 parking spaces necessary for public parking for parks, ADU, and other residents. Secondly,  
33 continue to negotiate with VTA to maintain the grant funding with these changes in this what  
34 Commissioner Templeton calculated as I think a .58-mile segment.

35  
36 So, that's the motion and I can speak to it if I get a second. The point being that we think we  
37 want to go through with this whole project. As you just said, Chair Hechtman, if it can't be done  
38 with a grant, we still want to get it done. And so, we want to get completely behind this bike  
39 safety and transport. So, that does it and points out that we understand that there's at risk here  
40 a grant and Council needs to address that in the context of this potential loss in these sections.

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

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

Chair Hechtman: Alright, we have a motion. Commissioner Summa, your hand was actually up before the motion was made. After the motion was made, I saw Commissioner Templeton's hand going up. So, I'm interested in first getting a second and ultimately hearing from both of you. So, Commissioner Summa, let me ask you since your hand was already up. Are you... your hand is down, ok. So, let me call on Commissioner Templeton and I can come back to you Commissioner Summa if you want.

SECOND

Commissioner Templeton: I second Commissioner Lauing's motion.

Mr. Kamhi: Before we go too far, if I may? Can we omit the specific parking spaces from the motion? The specific number of parking motion... parking numbers... parking spaces from the motion if possible?

Commissioner Templeton: Just say parking instead of a number of parking?

Mr. Kamhi: Yeah in the area.

Commissioner Templeton: I feel more comfortable with that as well. Let's see what Commissioner Lauing saying.

Mr. Kamhi: Yeah, just noting that all of our parking spaces are approximated and could be (interrupted)

Commissioner Lauing: I just... the reason I thought it was... you know I read it in the Packet originally and it's a material number. So, that's why I wanted to mention it. If it was five, we wouldn't be having all these discussions.

Mr. Kamhi: Yeah but I'm just noting that these are preliminary (interrupted)

Commissioner Lauing: [unintelligible]

Mr. Kamhi: These are preliminary numbers and we would do a parking study in the next phase of the project if this project moves forward which would give us more definite numbers.

Commissioner Lauing: Would you be comfortable in the middle calling estimated.

Mr. Kamhi: Yeah, that would be better. I mean (interrupted)

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

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

Commissioner Lauing: Ok.

Mr. Kamhi: I suppose and my preference would be if you just say the location. So, spaces between Middlefield and Lewis be retained or whatever.

Commissioner Lauing: Since it's... I mean Philip since it's just an order of magnitude number and you've already fairly that it's concept. I'm just trying to point out is it 200, is it 80, or is 5 and that's all I'm trying to get in there. You can say 80 plus or minus, something like that.

Mr. Kamhi: I'm going to look at Staff and see if they feel ok saying approximate or estimated. If they shake their head yes or no. Yes?

Commissioner Lauing: Commissioner Lauing, I think that the reason is that sometimes these numbers trip up how they execute and we can just ask Staff to make sure to upfront those numbers or their estimate when they send it to Council. Would you feel comfortable with that?

Commissioner Lauing: I didn't understand the first part of what you said there.

Commissioner Templeton: That when we're specific in motions in this way it sometimes trips up Staff because if it's incorrect it causes problems downstream. So, if we just say parking and ask... include in our motion to make sure Staff up front puts the number... estimated number of spaces in front of Council in the notes with this motion. I think that would still accomplish your goal potentially.

Commissioner Lauing: But he's already said that it's an estimate and it's conceptual. It's this order of magnitude number that I want some focus on. Is that we're not just giving up a few spaces. If we're going to not approve the entire thing, I think we should tell Council why.

Mr. Kamhi: Yeah, I think estimated would... if you put word estimated or approximate that would be appropriate I believe.

Commissioner Lauing: Alright, thanks.

Chair Hechtman: Commissioner Lauing, did you speak to your motion?

Commissioner Lauing: In advance so I could explain it, but I think that we're saying is that we substantially agree with the Staff proposal. We understand that from their perspective and probably from all our perspectives it's grant dependent at this point. But there's some substantial issues with this one particular segment or actually two subsegments that would

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 have to be addressed to really make this thing kind of stand hold... stand whole. And if Council  
2 chooses not to do that, that's ok, and they can take the grant. If they decide to make a change  
3 and we don't win the negotiations. Then we have to find that, plus the rest of the construction.  
4

5 Chair Hechtman: Commissioner Templeton, any comments on your second?  
6

7 Commissioner Templeton: Yes, I think that our City has a significant commitment to biking, and  
8 biking infrastructure goes with that. And we have often found that when funding dries up, that  
9 our biking infrastructure has been put on hold, and I think the idea of being able to take  
10 advantage of a unique opportunity that comes before us with prioritizing biking infrastructure is  
11 really important to work with. So, I would like to recommend this to Council for that reason.  
12 Thank you.  
13

14 FRIENDLY AMENDMENT  
15

16 Chair Hechtman: Not seeing any hands so let me just register concern about the inclusion of  
17 item E, segment three in your motion. I know early in our discussion Commissioner Summa  
18 expressed some wonder if whether the parking issues that we heard from the neighborhood,  
19 that seemed pretty... I thought were focused from Middlefield over to segment four, might  
20 bleed over into segment three. And I haven't heard anything in the discussion since that  
21 indicates that they do bleed over and in fact, what I understand now is segment three is  
22 actually quite different. You've got essentially public facilities on one side of the street for all of  
23 segment three. It's very different and so the reason I'm bring that up is it concerns me about  
24 lumping segment three or E in with F, segment four. I would be more comfortable breaking that  
25 out and just have a motion to recommend E. The 80 parking... the estimated 80 parking spaces  
26 or however many are lost, those are all in section... segment four.  
27

28 So, I think that's cleaner and that will... if it happened that way and should the Commission go  
29 that way, then the Council gets a pretty clear message from us, very clear, that on five of these  
30 segments we are all in.  
31

32 Commissioner Lauing: I'm perfectly happy with that because I don't think the outcome is any  
33 different. If that helps with clarity, I'm all in. So (interrupted)  
34

35 Commissioner Templeton: That's fine with me as well.  
36

37 Commissioner Lauing: So, my motion then would just apply at this point to item F.  
38

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.



1 Mr. Kamhi: And if I can add and maybe this is some optimism but if this is actually the motion  
2 that is adopted. This potentially gives us ammunition to talk with VTA in the interim with fingers  
3 crossed.

4  
5 Commissioner Lauing: Yeah, yeah. So, I'm readjusting my motion and I can send the new text to  
6 the Chair and we have a second. So, we're ready to go and then we can come back to E, Chair  
7 Hechtman.

8  
9 Chair Hechtman: Alright, so let me first ask the Commissioners if there's any further discussion  
10 on the motion? Commissioner Summa.

11  
12 Commissioner Summa: Could I just ask for the motion to be restated? Thanks.

13  
14 MOTION RESTATED

15  
16 Commissioner Lauing: PTC moves approval of Item F and recommends a revised solution which  
17 omits or mitigates the proposed loss of estimated 80 parking spaces necessary for public  
18 parking for parks, ADU, and other residents. Also, recommends to continue to negotiate with  
19 VTA to maintain the grant funding with these changes in the .58-mile segment if that's what  
20 Commissioner Templeton calculated.

21  
22 Commissioner Summa: So, your motion does anticipate an outcome where F is included as  
23 described in the preferred alternative?

24  
25 Commissioner Lauing: Right.

26  
27 Commissioner Summa: So, you're just saying there has be another solution but you  
28 (interrupted)

29  
30 Commissioner Lauing: That's right.

31  
32 Commissioner Templeton: We're saying to work on that segment and further iterate because  
33 the current proposal, high level though it is, has some glaring flaws.

34  
35 Commissioner Lauing: Right.

36  
37 Commissioner Summa: Ok.

38  
39 Chair Hechtman: Alright, any more questions or comments on the motion? I'm not seeing any  
40 hands. Mr. Nguyen, will conduct a roll call vote?

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1  
2 Mr. Nguyen: Yes. Commissioner Alcheck?  
3  
4 Commissioner Alcheck: Aye.  
5  
6 Mr. Nguyen: Commissioner Chang?  
7  
8 Commissioner Chang: Yes.  
9  
10 Mr. Nguyen: Chair Hechtman?  
11  
12 Chair Hechtman: Yes.  
13  
14 Mr. Nguyen: Commissioner Lauing?  
15  
16 Commissioner Lauing: Yes.  
17  
18 Mr. Nguyen: Commissioner Summa?  
19  
20 Commissioner Summa: Yes.  
21  
22 Mr. Nguyen: Commissioner Templeton?  
23  
24 Commissioner Templeton: Yes.  
25  
26 Mr. Nguyen: Ok the motion carries 6-0 with one Commissioner absent.  
27  
28 MOTION PASS 6(Alcheck, Chang, Hechtman, Lauing, Summa, Templeton) -0 -1(Roohparvar  
29 recused)  
30  
31 Chair Hechtman: That leaves only segment three, which is Item Two E, undecided. Any  
32 Commissioners want to comment on that or make a motion?  
33  
34 Commissioner Summa: I do have a question on that. I think Chair Hechtman, you were asking  
35 some questions and clarified it's an expected loss of approximately 39 spaces in segment three  
36 or E?  
37  
38 Chair Hechtman: That was the Staff information, right. Well, what's the pleasure of the  
39 Commission on segment three? Commissioner Chang.  
40

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 MOTION #3

2

3 Commissioner Chang: I can make a motion and see if it works. So, I move that PTC recommends  
4 the Staff proposal for segment E to City Council.

5

6 SECOND

7

8 Commissioner Lauing: Second.

9

10 Chair Hechtman: Second by Commissioner Lauing. Commissioner Chang, any elaboration on  
11 your motion?

12

13 Commissioner Chang: Sure. While there is some parking reduction in this section, my  
14 understanding is that it's... and I mean a parking study will tell us when we get to detailed  
15 design. But my understanding is that this section is typically under parked most of the week and  
16 there's also backup parking in Mitchell Park. Furthermore, the traffic in this section is pretty  
17 intense as demonstrated by the traffic study and so I really think that this is... this is kind of like  
18 where the funnel funnels everybody. Cars and students and so this section is really critical  
19 because it's the most congested section for our students and so I feel very strongly that we  
20 protect... do our best to protect bicyclists through this section.

21

22 Chair Hechtman: Thank you and Commissioner Lauing, comments on your second?

23

24 Commissioner Lauing: Yes, Commissioner Chang is very familiar with that neighborhood at a  
25 very helpful level of detail. Has been very attentive in prior meetings to the issue, so I  
26 completely support her judgment on this.

27

28 Chair Hechtman: Other Commission comments on the motion regarding Item Two E which is  
29 East Meadow Drive segment three? Seeing none, Mr. Nguyen, please conduct a roll call vote.

30

31 Mr. Nguyen: Commissioner Alcheck?

32

33 Commissioner Alcheck: Aye.

34

35 Mr. Nguyen: Commissioner Chang?

36

37 Commissioner Chang: Yes.

38

39 Mr. Nguyen: Chair Hechtman?

40

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 Chair Hechtman: Yes.

2

3 Mr. Nguyen: Commissioner Lauing?

4

5 Commissioner Lauing: Yes.

6

7 Mr. Nguyen: Commissioner Summa?

8

9 Commissioner Summa: Yes.

10

11 Mr. Nguyen: Commissioner Templeton?

12

13 Commissioner Templeton: Yes.

14

15 Mr. Nguyen: The motion carries 6-0 with one Commissioner absent.

16

17 MOTION #3 PASSED 6(Alcheck, Chang, Hechtman, Lauing, Summa, Templeton) -0 -  
18 1(Roohparvar recused)

19

20 Chair Hechtman: Excellent. That concludes Action Item Two. Oh, yes, Commissioner Summa, I  
21 see your hand?

22

23 Commissioner Summa: Thank you. I just... earlier I was going to make a comment that I didn't  
24 get a chance to make because we got caught up in our motion making. And that was there's  
25 sort of a timing disconnect here because Staff tells us we're very early on in the design process.  
26 So, there's still a lot of unknowns but we get kind of locked in even before we've contemplated  
27 really what we want to do by the folks giving the grant. And I think that's sort of dangerous and  
28 so I hope for the best outcome but that is kind of a funny process if you ask me. So, I just  
29 wanted to mention that.

30

31 Chair Hechtman: Alright, thank you. So, I want to thank the members of the public who  
32 participated either orally or in writing. Many of whom I see are still with us. I also want to thank  
33 our Staff and Mr. Davis. Thank you for attending. Ms. Chan, thank you for the presentation and  
34 good luck on your future position, and Mr. Kamhi, thank you for that.

35

36 We will move now to... actually before we move to the approval of minutes. It's 10 till 10:00.  
37 We have the approval of minutes and then we have the potential to discuss the retreat. And  
38 the reason I'm bringing it up now before we approve the minutes is if we're going to do that. I'd  
39 like to let the Vice-Chair know that she can rejoin the meeting. But if we don't have an appetite  
40 for that tonight, then I don't want to bother her to rejoin just to approve minutes. So,

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 Commissioners, if there an appetite to discuss the possibility of retreat tonight, or are we ready  
2 to call it an evening at the rare early hour of 10:00?

3  
4 Commissioner Alcheck: Considering that we're not going to see each other for a month and  
5 then you're entering the final stretch of the year. Maybe it would be a good time just have that  
6 conversation so we understand what's expected or what is intended.

7  
8 Chair Hechtman: Anyone else have an objection to having a fairly limited, I'm not anticipating  
9 this is going to go on and on. I just never had a chance to take the temperature of the  
10 Commission on this issue. It's always too late. Anybody have any issues talking about it? Ok,  
11 then I will see if we can get our seventh back and let's move to approval of minutes.

12  
13 **Commission Action:** Motion by Alcheck, seconded by Chang. Pass 6-0 (Roohparvar recused)  
14 **Commission Action:** Motion by Lauing, seconded by Templeton. Pass 6-0 (Roohparvar recused)  
15 **Commission Action:** Motion by Chang, seconded by Lauing. Pass 6-0 (Roohparvar recused)

## 16 **Approval of Minutes**

17 Public Comment is Permitted. Five (5) minutes per speaker.<sup>1,3</sup>

18 4. June 9, 2021 Draft PTC Meeting Minutes

19 Chair Hechtman: So, we have some (interrupted)

20  
21 MOTION

22  
23 Commissioner Alcheck: So, moved.

24  
25 Chair Hechtman: Thank you. As revised?

26  
27 Commissioner Alcheck: Yes.

28  
29 Chair Hechtman: Thank you. Do we have... that's... Commissioner Alcheck motion, a second,  
30 please?

31  
32 SECOND

33  
34 Chair Hechtman: Second by Commissioner Summa. May we have a roll call vote, please?

35  
36 Mr. Vinh Nguyen, Admin Associate III: Commissioner Alcheck?

37  
38 Commissioner Alcheck: Aye.

39

---

1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.  
2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.  
3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 Mr. Nguyen: Commissioner Chang?  
2

3 Commissioner Chang: Sorry, can you restate the motion because I was listening to something  
4 else in the background.  
5

6 Chair Hechtman: The motion is to approve the June 9<sup>th</sup>, 2021 minutes as revised.  
7

8 Commissioner Chang: Yes.  
9

10 Mr. Nguyen: Chair Hechtman?  
11

12 Chair Hechtman: Yes.  
13

14 Mr. Nguyen: Commissioner Lauing?  
15

16 Commissioner Lauing: Yes, I was just checking to see who was not here but yes, I approve.  
17

18 Mr. Nguyen: Commissioner Summa?  
19

20 Commissioner Summa: Yes.  
21

22 Mr. Nguyen: Commissioner Templeton?  
23

24 Commissioner Templeton: Yes.  
25

26 Mr. Nguyen: The motion carries 6-0 with one Commissioner absent.  
27

28 Chair Hechtman: I believe Commissioner Lauing that Vice-Chair Roohparvar was absent for that  
29 meeting.  
30

31 Vice-Chair Roohparvar: That's right.  
32

33 Chair Hechtman: Oh, was it Commissioner Chang?  
34

35 Commissioner Chang: I was absent.  
36

37 Vice-Chair Roohparvar: No, no, it was me. Vice-Chair Roohparvar.  
38

39 Commissioner Chang: I was absent as well so I should actually abstain from that I just realized.  
40

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 Vice-Chair Roohparvar: Oh.

2

3 Chair Hechtman: Do you have that Mr. Nguyen? Vice Chang... Commissioner Chang's  
4 abstention?

5

6 Mr. Nguyen: Yes, thank you.

7

8 Chair Hechtman: Alright and welcome back Vice-Chair. We will move now to committee items.

9 **Commission Action**: Motion by Alcheck, seconded by Summa. Pass 5-0 (Chang and Roohparvar  
10 abstain)

## 11 **Committee Items**

12 Chair Hechtman: Are there any committee items that any of the Commissioners would like to  
13 [unintelligible] with the Commission? Commissioner Lauing.

14

15 Commissioner Lauing: Yes, I'd just like to state briefly that the Housing Element working group  
16 is working and the Co-Chairs are working beyond that to try to make this thing work smoothly.  
17 Still extraordinarily early and I just... the group members are amazingly enthusiastic and  
18 interested and participatory. And they come as you know, by intent from various walks of life so  
19 to speak and various levels of understanding about the City process and that's all good because  
20 that's exactly what you want is all those perspectives. Nothing sort of concrete yet to really  
21 report out but it's basically getting teed up to bring here to PTC. So, I'll keep you updated every  
22 so often.

23

24 Chair Hechtman: Thank you. Any other Committee items, Commissioners? Seeing none we will  
25 move to Commissioner questions, comments, announcements or future agenda items.

## 26 **Commissioner Questions, Comments or Announcements**

27 Chair Hechtman: We'll have our retreat discussion in this item but before we get to that, any  
28 other Commissioners have other items or Staff that they want to introduce here? I will  
29 mention, as I think it's been mentioned a couple of times, we don't have future agenda items  
30 for July 28<sup>th</sup> or August 11<sup>th</sup>. We decided to cancel those meetings so we will reconvene on  
31 August 25<sup>th</sup> and I think it remains to be seen whether that will be in person or a hybrid. We'll  
32 learn as we get closer to that date.

33

34 Alright, let's have a discussion about the possibility of a PTC retreat, and let me start by pointing  
35 out that there are seven Commissioners and I think two of us, myself and Commissioner Chang,  
36 have not participated in a PTC retreat. I think the other five of you have participated in at least  
37 one but I'm not sure. And so, I'd like to... I'm interested in the impressions of the five of you  
38 that have as to whether they're worthwhile, what we might accomplish, whether you think it's

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 a good idea, or whether it's something that maybe we don't need to do for and we can talk  
2 about it in another year? Commissioner Templeton.

3  
4 Commissioner Templeton: It's hard to say. When we were meeting in person the last time we  
5 had a retreat it was a nice way to open up the flow of dialog and get to know each other better.  
6 But I'm not sure it had particularly beneficial outcome that I could point to. I'm open to the idea  
7 but I don't know even in scope what we're talking about. Are we talking a half-day? A whole  
8 day? A couple hours? Something like that but as and when we start meeting in person again. I  
9 could see that it would be a nice way to kind of break the ice and establish that rapport.

10  
11 Chair Hechtman: Commissioner Lauing.

12  
13 Commissioner Lauing: I think it can be very helpful. That comment is based on PTC retreats and  
14 also Parks [note – Parks and Recreation Commission] retreats. Things are potentially going to be  
15 different now with this work plan idea in terms of getting our work plan ready. I think that the  
16 value depends on the content of the agenda and in the context of working the agenda. You do  
17 pick up the team building, the communication, and things like that. I think we're sort of  
18 compromised right now because we only have about six meetings left in the year. And I also felt  
19 it was great to have this, a retreat, as soon as possible in the new year. In our case, after  
20 Council comes out with their objectives and then generally there's also at least a new  
21 Commissioner that can be integrated, oriented, get to know folks as Commissioner Templeton  
22 said. So, I think they're of value I think in the first month of the year as opposed to the eighth  
23 month of the year. And the only footnote I'd put on that is that if we have to address the... an  
24 actual PTC work plan in any more detail than we have. That might be a reason to try to squeeze  
25 something in but that could potentially also an agenda item for one of our meetings so.

26  
27 Chair Hechtman Thank you. Commissioner Alcheck.

28  
29 Commissioner Alcheck: I'm just going touch on diverse points here. I've been to a few, none  
30 have been the same, they've been a lot of unique approaches to the retreat. I... Commissioner  
31 Templeton knows the high esteem I hold her but I disagree on her view that the last retreat was  
32 not particularly effective. Because at the time we had an interesting makeup on the  
33 Commission, a lot of diverse opinions, and the goal of that retreat... that retreat kicked off with  
34 a management specialist who was brought in to do team-building exercises from a business  
35 school up in San Francisco. It was really interesting and I didn't only take away a lot of insight  
36 in... I'll give you an example. We did an exercise where we worked on how do you get the best  
37 from me and what can you do... and how to do I get the best from you? Very interesting  
38 insights into the personality approach of the Commissioners. I honestly took that... I took notes  
39 on that meeting and brought it back to so many different things that I'm involved in but the

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.



1 extent to which I think I understood my fellow Commissioners better was vastly improved  
2 because of that exercise.

3  
4 I would also suggest that I don't think timing is a big deal. We shouldn't... I mean listen, I'm at  
5 the conclusion of my length involvement on the Planning Commission. But I would encourage  
6 you all to consider your retreats not as the... this work... first of all, I've said this already. The  
7 work plan thing is like I'm not particularly impressed with that concept. I don't think it's going  
8 to be a particularly useful... that's not what I would devote a retreat to. Devote a meeting early  
9 on in the year to talk about your work plan. Add it to the agenda of your regular meeting. It  
10 should not be a part of your retreat, it's just a waste. Particularly, because it's unclear yet the  
11 value of that tool but aside from that.

12  
13 I would encourage the Commissioners to not consider the retreat as some uniquely, Chair-led  
14 envisions opportunity. I would encourage you to consider it as an opportunity to come together  
15 and to get to know each other better and to spend time doing something other than sharing  
16 your opinions. And I'll give you a few examples of things that I think could be really valuable.  
17 Imagine a retreat that involved a site visit to a low-income housing project. I mean you have a  
18 lot of flexibility here on how you organize the retreat. It has to be public, but it doesn't have  
19 sort of the same formalities, and imagine if you explored a topic to the work we do together on-  
20 site, in a more casual setting. Maybe it involved a hosted coffee and muffins or something  
21 afterward. It gave you a chance to connect with your fellow Commissioners and understand  
22 them better. Get to hear about their families, get to hear about some of their interests in a  
23 more informal setting after you've maybe walked a site together and hear from a professional  
24 in the industry talk about their work on a project that hey, we talk about all the time.

25  
26 I just think that the tool should be used regularly because there isn't... there is transition but  
27 there's not that much transition and you guys maybe together for 4-years and coming together  
28 in person formally is very different than coming together in person informally and learning  
29 together.

30  
31 My biggest takeaway was out of all the retreats, the last one I learned something alongside my  
32 fellow Commissioners. There was another professional in the room that had something to offer  
33 and maybe it wasn't a topic that impressed every single Commissioner. But at least I got to  
34 learn alongside and I thought that was very illuminating and I think there's some value to that.

35  
36 And so, I'd love to have a retreat and not to... I don't want to be the person that papood a... and  
37 if the idea was we would get together in some park and talk about priorities. I would be... I'd be  
38 excited to do that too, but I think that there's a lot of flexibility and room here and maybe you  
39 could really think outside the box. And it takes planning but hey, it could be exciting and I think I  
40 would... I sometimes think that the Chair sort of a lot of leeway there to decide how to invest

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 the time and I don't I'll ever forget the Billy Riggs, the retreat. I thought... he leveraged his  
2 network, his professional network, to bring a very interesting person in and I will be grateful of  
3 him for that.

4

5 Chair Hechtman Thank you. Vice-Chair Roohparvar.

6

7 Vice-Chair Roohparvar: So, I guess retreat that I've participated in was the Billy Riggs retreat  
8 and it was informal and intend for team building. I could go either way on whether or not we  
9 have a retreat. I think a lot of it depends on what our agenda is for the retreat and whether  
10 fellow Commissioners find value in it. I do personally like the idea of doing a site visit or being  
11 able to see... I mean we spend a lot of time deciding on projects but going out maybe together  
12 and seeing the results of something we've decided on. Or a topic that we're interested in could  
13 be really cool and a way to bring people closer together. Because I personally would love to  
14 interact with my fellow Commissioners in a more informal setting and really get to know them  
15 as a person beyond just the work. I think it brings people closer together and leads to greater  
16 consensus. Thank you.

17

18 Chair Hechtman: Commissioner Summa, you don't have to say anything but if you want to you  
19 could. Yeah, if you want to... you don't have to chime in.

20

21 Commissioner Summa: I think... I don't think we can do a site visit because it's actually a City  
22 hearing and it has to be open to the public and stuff. So, but you know, we can do that kind of  
23 thing with each other if want to anyway but I don't think the retreat can be that. I think it has to  
24 be accessible to the public, it's a hearing. But I mean to me I sort of... if the Chair and Vice-Chair  
25 really want to have a retreat, of course, I will come, but I can't say that it's terribly important to  
26 me. And I think that's because I sort of agree with Commissioner Lauing that it's kind of thing  
27 you do at the beginning of your year, not at the end. That being said, everything was a bit  
28 wacky this year so I would just... if you give a retreat, I will come.

29

30 Chair Hechtman: Well, let me share a couple of my thoughts. So, I joined the Commission in  
31 December of 2019 and we had a number of canceled meetings. We didn't have business to do  
32 and I think I either had two or three meetings before the lockdown and we went virtual. And  
33 one of the things that I've really missed since we went virtual and that Commissioner Chang has  
34 never even experienced yet is that in the minutes before our meetings when we were live, we  
35 actually got to chat and find out about Billy Rigg's diet and find out that somebody had children  
36 or how old they were and you had a few minutes to talk about that. And I mean I love the work  
37 part of this but I was also really enjoying getting to know my fellow workers and so I miss that.  
38 You know, I'm looking forward to getting back to that later this year but you know, we should  
39 hear from a number of you Commissioners that have experienced it. That was one of the  
40 benefits is just that informality of the setting, where ever it needs to occur so that it's public.

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 So, that we can get to know each other as people a little bit and because Commissioner Alcheck  
2 is going to be terming out at the end of this year, we know we're going to have a new  
3 Commissioner at the beginning of next year and so I'm sort of interested in the idea of pursuing  
4 something that could happen in the early part of next year. It seems like that would requiring  
5 some planning this year which I'd be happy to be a part of. We'll have a new Chair next year  
6 and so that would be... they would run that retreat which is fine but I'm open to it as well. I  
7 don't have any particular topics right now that I want to focus on but I think those kinds of  
8 things we could dialog and come up with together, rather than having the Chair impose  
9 something or if that was the dialog is Chair impose something, I'm sure I could figure something  
10 out. So, those are my thought. I'm open to it and would relish the opportunity to spend a little  
11 more relaxed time with my Commissioners which I think that would offer. Commissioner Chang,  
12 do you have any thoughts?

13  
14 Commissioner Chang: Not much other than it would be lovely to get to know you all. I do think  
15 that it can probably be a little bit of the best of both worlds in terms of content like  
16 Commissioner Lauing was talking about as well as kind of on a more personal, getting to know  
17 each other. Because I do think that the discussion of content is fairly limited when we are... at  
18 least thus far. It's fairly regimented I should say when we're in this formal and so if it really  
19 could be a little bit more relaxed even though public. So, maybe we don't have some of those  
20 same formality constraints. It could be a little bit more fluid and I could see that being useful.  
21 Particularly, with something that it's a little bit more long rant or strategic like the work plan.

22  
23 Chair Hechtman: Thank you. Commissioner Templeton.

24  
25 Commissioner Templeton: I just wanted to clarify, because there was remarks about. I didn't  
26 have a problem with the last retreat. I just didn't tie it back to anything other than getting to  
27 know how work with each other. You know, specific on the Commission work. That said, there  
28 is value in getting to know each other. I just pray that it's not going to be another Zoom  
29 meeting. Like it, if we do it, it needs to be in person. I just can't add more Zoom meetings to my  
30 life right now.

31  
32 Chair Hechtman: Commissioner Lauing.

33  
34 Commissioner Lauing: Perfect segue to exactly what I was going to say which is that we're  
35 almost done with Zoom meetings. So, every 2-weeks we're going to get to see each other and  
36 you left out the free dinners too, Chair Hechtman. So, that's another give, so you know, getting  
37 their 20-minutes before and staying 20-minutes after. I think we're going to feel better about  
38 that in terms of the not just to getting to know you but enjoying each other with or without a  
39 retreat. I'm not arguing for one or the other. I'm just saying I think there's hope at the end of  
40 the tunnel in that regard.

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

Chair Hechtman: Alright, well this has been helpful to me and gives me some things to think about, and I will cogitate on it a little bit. I don't think that... unless any of you have more to add, I think we've sufficiently talked about it and I appreciate the context. Mr. Yang, I can see you.

Mr. Albert Yang, Assistant City Attorney: I just have a couple quick thoughts if you don't mind. It is... PTC, Board, and Commission retreats have typically been noticed public meetings because they have been about Commission business. So, agenda, work plan sort of setting things, but if it's truly just a getting to know you sort of session. That doesn't need to be a noticed public meeting.

Something like a site visit would have to be noticed because that concerns the Commission's work. You could do that. I think the HRB does that quite often. They'll go and visit a historic site as a Board and their agenda will just say if you want to attend this part of the meeting. Come meet us at the site and you can walk around it with us. But yeah, so if you were going to do a site visit, that would be... we'd have a formal meeting for that but if it were just everyone getting together for coffee. Then that type of thing doesn't need to be noticed or open to the public.

Chair Hechtman: Alright, thank you.

Commissioner Templeton: Excellent point.

Chair Hechtman: Alright, well appreciate all of the input and so I'm... think we can move on and I will declare this meeting adjourned. Thank you all.

## **Adjournment**

10:15 pm

- 
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
  2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
  3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.