



CITY COUNCIL SUMMARY MINUTES

Regular Meeting
April 1, 2024

The City Council of the City of Palo Alto met on this date in the Council Chambers and by virtual teleconference at 5:30 P.M.

Present In Person: Burt, Kou, Lauing, Lythcott-Haims, Stone, Tanaka, Veenker

Present Remotely:

Absent:

Call to Order

Mayor Stone called the meeting to order. The clerk called roll with all present.

Special Orders of the Day

1. Presentation from Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District (Midpen) to City Council

NO ACTION

Karen Holman, Board Member Midpeninsula Region Open Space District, provided a slide overview of the 2024 Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District update outlining Midpen's missions, Midpen's lands, facts about Midpen, Rancho San Antonio Open Space Preserve, Ravenswood Open Space Preserve, Russian Ridge Open Space Preserve and Windy Hill Open Space Preserve.

Yoriko Kishimoto, Board Member Midpeninsula Region Open Space District, gave a slide presentation discussing project updates, Wildland Fire Resiliency Program Implementation, vegetation management locations, Hawthorns Area plan, Alpine Road Regional Trail Improvement Project, Purisima-to-the-Sea Trail, Highway 17 Crossings and Measure AA 10th anniversary – 2024.

2. Review List of Applicants for Board and Commission Openings and Select Candidates to Interview. CEQA Status - Not a project.

NO ACTION TAKEN

Vinh Nguyen, Assistant City Clerk, provided a slide presentation summarizing the vote results on the Boards and Commissions recruitment including the applicants for the Architectural

SUMMARY MINUTES

Review Board, the Human Relations Commission, Public Art Commission, Planning and Transportation Commission, Stormwater Management Oversight Committee and Utilities Advisory Committee Commission. The Historic Resources Board had an insufficient number of applicants so the City Clerk's Office will be conducting a special extended recruitment to fill the remaining vacancies and hope to bring it back to Council within the next couple of months.

Ed Shikada, City Manager, noted that securing sufficient applications for the HRB has been a perennial issue. Staff would like to bring forward a recommendation to reduce the size of the HRB to a five-member board and potentially make additional changes that would make the load on this board more manageable and will bring that as a separate recommendation.

Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

City Manager Shikada announced Item 11 would be heard before Item 10.

Public Comment

Mayor Stone provided ground rules for public comment. He discussed a controversial rally held in Palo Alto recently.

1. Anabelle, speaking on behalf of (8): Mika, Elinor, Tal, Andi, Rick, Rebecca, Michal, Ilana, spoke about antisemitism, terrorism and the Israel-Hamas war. She urged Council to do everything possible to keep the City safe, inclusive, open and welcoming as it was before the war.
2. Sarit S., speaking on behalf of (8): Rotem, Jennifer, Giora, Avner, Estee, Allyson, Eric, David, spoke about the experience of a woman being taken and held hostage in Gaza. She declared that the war would end and a ceasefire would be attained when the hostages were released and Hamas surrenders.
3. Jerry U. thought it was a good decision to permit the Rail Committee to speak about the viaduct.
4. Alan C. expressed his shock in seeing Palestinian flags on the flag poles at City Hall above and anti-Israel protest. He believed there should be a strong condemnation by the City of the actions at the protest.
5. Lisa M. announced an opportunity, employment and service fair to be held April 2 at the Opportunity Center.
6. Yazan provided information on the number of population that has been killed in Gaza for scale.

SUMMARY MINUTES

7. Michael B. did not speak.
8. Deborah G. expressed disappointment in the Council's reaction and lack of law enforcement to the recent protest.
9. Elan L. discussed harassment she has experienced as a Jew for speaking out against genocide. She asked for full City divestment and boycott of companies profiting from Israeli apartheid.
10. Talha B. (Zoom) wanted to shed light on the peaceful protest that occurred on Saturday. He was amazed that the residents of the City were more concerned about flags than actual genocide occurring. He called for an immediate ceasefire.
11. Aram J. (Zoom) claimed Mayor Stone exhibited Zionist sympathy calling the first speaker courageous. He declared genocide is going on in Palestine. He urged Vice Mayor Lauing to stand with Israel as a Jew.
12. Karen H. discussed how qualified HRB applicants were difficult to find. She opined the HRB was swept up in the term limits for boards and commissions. She stated the fact that the HRB recommends to the ARB diminishes the influence and worthiness of the HRB members. She strongly urged Council to send Ramona Street to the HRB for recommendations on the design acumen.
13. Deborahlise M. (Zoom) talked about acts of terrorism committed by the IDF. She questioned who the City Council represents and asked for a ceasefire.
14. Barry G. (Zoom) spoke using racial slurs.
15. Amir R. (Zoom) wanted the City to not be in favor of a ceasefire because he believed the Palestinians should be martyrs.
16. Molly C. (Zoom) wanted to bring awareness that April is Sexual Assault Awareness Month. She thought steps needed to be taken to prevent sexual assault. She then spoke with racial slurs.
17. Michelle H. spoke about being the grassroots of moral leadership in the country.

Council Member Questions, Comments and Announcements

Council Member Kou announced Adult Mental Health First Aid training being offered by Momentum for Health. She brought attention to the Fire Department's 2023 Annual Performance Report in the Informational Staff Report in the packet. She asked that the Department continue to make an effort to reduce response times.

SUMMARY MINUTES

Council Member Lythcott-Haims stated that the City and the Palo Alto Unified School District reported significant strides having been made toward finalizing an agreement enabling a permanently secured portion of Cubberley for the development of a community center.

Mayor Stone announced he was elected as the Vice Chair of the SFCJPA and hoped to bring additional Valley Water representation to Palo Alto.

Study Session

3. Study Session: Palo Alto Link One-Year Service Evaluation and Report; CEQA status – not a project.

NO ACTION TAKEN

Philip Kamhi, Chief Transportation Official, gave a slide presentation on the Study Session of the Palo Alto Link One-Year Service Evaluation and Report. He provided an outline of the presentation and a discussion of the background.

Nathan Baird, Transportation Planning Manager, discussed slides detailing the On-Demand Transit, a performance snapshot, ridership, wait times, rider demographics and insights, funding and fare recovery and potential funding scenarios for FY25.

Vice Mayor Lauing wondered if there was any anecdotal evidence on why there was not more dispersion of unique riders per month. He wanted to know if there has been any concern in terms of the way it is purchased.

Mr. Baird believed that number was the first month so all those riders were new. He felt they could do more visual advertisement for visitors. He described the options for payment.

Mr. Kamhi thought that was potentially a question for a future survey. He added they could expand the marketing more. He had not heard any specific concerns for the way it is purchased.

Council Member Lythcott-Haims wondered if any survey had been done about how the youth would utilize the service and what it would take to extend the hours further. She wanted to hear about why weekend service had not been contemplated. She asked why such a small increment would require such a vast outlay of dollars as described in Scenario A. She queried what the average trip duration is and who took the survey.

Sophia Witte, Contractor, discussed the survey results about the hours to expand to and said the short-term priority expansion is the three-hour expansion. She provided the average ride duration statistic to be about 12 minutes.

Mr. Baird said the survey was of the existing users and there is currently a survey out to the youth working with Community Services and the school district. He added that average trip

SUMMARY MINUTES

length is a little over three miles. He explained that weekend service was beyond the scope at the time.

Mr. Kamhi noted that ridership typically dips on weekends, evenings and early mornings.

Council Member Burt asked how much additional capacity they have in the system and what is the incremental cost if they have additional riders.

Mr. Kamhi answered they have additional capacity in the system. How much capacity is hard to measure because it depends on the time of day. He said they rebalance to make sure the operators are available when they have the most service demand. The question becomes what happens to the capacity as ridership increases and what happens to wait times. If they have more riders, they could have more labor.

Mr. Baird discussed their busiest hours and the recommended expanded hours.

City Manager Shikada advised that the Finance Committee would have the opportunity to dive more deeply into the details as a part of the proposed budget deliberations.

Council Member Veenker asked for comment on when a user may encounter a location they think is in Palo Alto and cannot get a pickup. She recommended it would be nice to have service in East Palo Alto.

Mr. Kamhi stated that was a perfect instance to call rather than use the app. He clarified because of the terms of the grant agreement they can only stay within the city limits of Palo Alto.

Council Member Kou thought they should explore increasing the fare for adults and look at different areas where they should test it and compare with other services. She wanted an understanding of how Paratransit comes into play. She suggested being prepared for what they will do if the funding becomes no longer available. She thought it would be interesting to see the data on age groups for the regular riders.

Mr. Kamhi answered that is the kind of feedback they would like to have from Council and the Finance Committee. He expressed an interest in looking into whether Paratransit use has declined. He believed their service to be complimentary to Paratransit.

Council Member Tanaka opined compared to Uber or Lyft, it made no economic sense as the wait times are longer and it is more expensive. He thought they should leverage the existing rideshare programs.

Mr. Kamhi discussed how Uber or Lyft are not always more efficient. He added they are trying to make sure they have pooled rides in order to have less vehicles driving around. The hope is to transition the whole fleet to electric.

SUMMARY MINUTES

Mayor Stone was curious to learn more about how the free fares for youth seeking teen services was being marketed to the community. He asked if they had looked into what opportunities exist with PAUSD.

Mr. Kamhi said CSD would need to respond to that. He stated they are researching additional partnerships and looking at some of the larger destinations to see if they are interested in having a similar partnership to the one with Stanford Research Park. They are trying to see if VTA will allow them to apply for a VTA Grant again. They have had initial data sharing with PAUSD but not the full conversation.

Consent Calendar

Council Member Kou registered a no vote on Agenda Item Number 5.

Council Member Tanaka registered a no vote on Agenda Item Number 5 & 9.

MOTION: Vice Mayor Lauing moved, seconded by Council Member Lythcott-Haims to approve Agenda Item Numbers 4-9.

MOTION PASSED ITEMS 4, 6-8: 7-0

MOTION PASSED ITEM 5: 5-2, Kou, Tanaka no

MOTION PASSED ITEM 9: 6-1, Tanaka no

Council Member Kou explained she had an issue with the way the staff report title was written on Item Number 5.

Council Member Tanaka did not think the amount of \$82,200 on Item Number 5 was justified. On Item Number 9, he did not think a 60 percent pay raise was justified.

4. Approval of Minutes from March 11, 2024 Meeting
5. Approval of Contract Amendment Number 1 to Contract Number S24190818 with Integrated Design 360 in the Amount of \$82,200 for a total not to exceed \$132,200 and Extension of the Contract Term through December 30, 2024 for development of a "One Margin" Reach Code. CEQA Status: Exempt Under CEQA Guidelines Section 15308
6. Approval of Amendments with Professional Account Management LLC, dba Duncan Solutions for Contracts C17164727 and C19171363A for a Combined Additional Amount

SUMMARY MINUTES

of \$60,000 (Total not to exceed of \$860,000 and \$767,000 respectively) and to Extend the Contract Terms to December 31, 2024 (total term of eight and five years respectively), for Parking Permitting and Citation Management Services; CEQA Status – Not a Project.

7. Policy and Services Recommendation Regarding Use of Board and Commissions Demographic Data
8. SECOND READING: Adopt a Revised Interim Ordinance to Extend the Interim Parklet Program to July 31, 2024 (from March 31, 2024) and Phase-in Enforcement of the Ongoing Parklet Program through November 1, 2024; and Extend Parking Lot Eating/Drinking Uses to December 31, 2024; CEQA Status- Categorically Exempt (Sections 15301 and 15304(e)) (FIRST READING: March 11, 2024 PASSED 7-0)
9. SECOND READING: Adopt an Ordinance Increasing Council Member Salary From \$1,000/Month to \$1,600/Month, Effective January 1, 2025, as authorized by State law (FIRST READING: March 11, 2024 PASSED 6-1, Tanaka no)

City Manager Comments

City Manager Ed Shikada presented slides outlining El Camino Real Construction, events scheduled throughout April for Earth Month, updates on grade separation upcoming discussions, Fire Station No. 4 community meeting, Palo Alto Link offers free rideshare service to teens and notable tentative upcoming Council items.

Action Items

ACTION ITEMS HEARD OUT OF ORDER

10. SECOND READING: Ordinance of the Council of the City of Palo Alto Amending Chapter 8.04 (Street, Trees, Shrubs, and Plants) and Chapter 8.10 (Tree Preservation and Management Regulations) (FIRST READING: January 16, 2024 PASSED 5-2, Lythcott-Haims, Tanaka no)

MOTION: Council Member Veenker moved, seconded by Mayor Stone to approve the amended ordinance of the Council of the City of Palo Alto Amending Chapter 8.04 (Street, Trees, Shrubs, and Plants) and Chapter 8.10 (Tree Preservation and Management Regulations), and further amend by moving the language of new subsection 8.10.050(b)(4) into subsection b after "unless" and follow it with "or it is" to read:

“a protected tree shall not be removed unless the tree is proposed for removal to accommodate an ADU constructed pursuant to Section 18.09.030, or because removal is necessary to allow an ADU constructed pursuant to Section 18.09.040 to achieve the minimum standards set forth in state law, or it is determined by the urban forester, on

SUMMARY MINUTES

the basis of a tree report prepared by a designated arborist and other relevant information, that any of the following apply:"

MOTION PASSED: 7-0

Peter Gollinger, Urban Forester, discussed 2024 Title 8 update – second reading change to 8.10.050 State Standards ADU exemption.

Public Comment:

1. Winter D. urged Council to approve the second reading so the other changes can take effect. She opined more education of the public and an improved update in tree ordinance were the vital tools to get Palo Alto back on track.
 2. JP R., Executive Director of Canopy, discussed creating incentives for planting trees. He asked Council to support this ordinance.
 3. Jeff G. (Zoom) associated himself with the comments of the other two public commenters. He urged Council to support their trees, Urban Forester and Staff, the Canopy S/CAP effort, community tree rebates and please approve the ordinance.
-
11. Discussion of Caltrans' Repaving Project of El Camino Real, Including Replacing Existing Parking with Bicycle Lanes, and Potential Approval of a Resolution to Support this Project; CEQA status – categorically exempt.

MOTION: Council Member Burt moved, seconded by Council Member Kou to:

1. Request Caltrans return with additional safety measures in conjunction with bike lanes on El Camino for biking on El Camino Real based on the Safe System Approach Design and applicable Caltrans Design Information Bulletins (DIB) as well as a complete street network approach, and;
2. Create a Council Ad Hoc Committee to consult with City staff, VTA staff, biking advocate stakeholders, including Chamber of Commerce, and;
 - a. Prioritize a plan for safety improvements at intersections and conflict areas, and outreach to our small business community and neighborhood community to identify parking alternatives including modifications to our RPP program, Palo Alto Transportation Management Association and coordinate efforts to accommodate our RV dwellers on El Camino Real.

MOTION PASSED: 6-1, Tanaka no

SUMMARY MINUTES

SUBSTITUTE MOTION: Council Member Veenker, seconded by Council Member Tanaka to implement the bike lanes with the repaving effort in accordance with Option B:

- Adopt a phased approach that implements the Caltrans proposed bicycle lanes now and acknowledges additional analysis is needed to both incorporate a Safe System Approach to the design and establish bike facilities that take into account future housing development on El Camino Real.

SUBSTITUTE MOTION FAILED: 3-4, Lauing, Burt, Kou, Stone no

Nick Salay, Caltrans District Division Chief Santa Clara County, presented slides discussing the proposed bikeway implementation in Palo Alto and the Caltrans SR 82 Paving Project.

Sergio R., Caltrans Office Chief Bike & Pedestrian, presented slides talking about the policies, plans and Caltrans guidance that helped shape the scope of the projects, the four core principles at Caltrans at the state level that provide the framework for the Complete Streets Policy, planning, improving mobility for bicyclists on El Camino Road and El Camino Real Bikeways in development.

Lester Lee, Caltrans Office Chief of Traffic Engineering, discussed slides about the Bicyclist Safety Improvement Monitoring Program, bike related crash history review along, crash types, primary collision factors, location of collisions and bike-related crash patterns/mitigation.

Mr. Salay covered design considerations and challenges of the proposed bikeway and right of way along SR 82, the proposed bikeway and on-street parking along SR 82, the proposed bikeway and conflict zones along SR 82, the proposed bikeway and typical cross-section (before and after), engagement and outreach, additional considerations based on feedback and implementation.

Mr. Kamhi presented a slide presentation orienting to the project and the staff report to include Caltrans El Camino Real removal of parking for bike lanes project, key considerations, requests to Caltrans and City concerns and options for Council consideration.

Public Comment:

1. Deborah G. read a poem that expressed her disapproval of the parking lanes.
2. Emil A. was in support of adding bike lanes and removing parking on El Camino.
3. Dylan F. was confident in the safety of the proposed lanes and supported removal of parking on El Camino.
4. Giuliano C. requested Council pass a resolution to remove parking and add bike lanes.

SUMMARY MINUTES

5. Robert N. supported Staff Option B.
6. Scott M. supported replacing parking with bike lanes for El Camino.
7. Arthur L. agreed with the Fehr and Peers report that the Caltrans' Bikeway Proposal would not provide an adequate level of safety. He wondered if Caltrans has incorporated the suggestions from DIB89.
8. Mark S. believed this plan to be a start in fulfilling a need for an efficient inner city bike highway. He asked for Council to approve the plan.
9. Patrick K. supported allowing Caltrans to remove parking lanes from El Camino Real and adding bike lanes. He discussed the economic benefits to that course.
10. Eleni J. described Option B as a rebalancing of the use of space.
11. Paul B. spoke about safety issues of bicycling on El Camino. He implored Council to pass this resolution.
12. Eric N. brought up research that concluded improving bicycle infrastructure with more protected separated bike facilities is significantly associated with fewer fatalities and better safety outcomes for all road users. He asked Council to pass Option B.
13. Tim O. opined the Caltrans project would make El Camino safer for bicyclists, pedestrians and motorists and worth approving the removal of car parking on El Camino.
14. Zafarali A. supported Option B.
15. Frank V. urged Council to adopt Staff Option B.
16. Katherine D. asked Council to pass a resolution to remove parking on El Camino Real so bike lanes can be installed.
17. Patrick F. strongly supported the proposal of building bike lanes on El Camino.
18. Maria R. was very supportive of removing parking and adding bike lanes on El Camino.
19. Caroline H. expressed support for Caltrans' bike lanes on El Camino.
20. Jake C. supported bike lanes on El Camino and removing parking.
21. Diana A. expressed support for bike lanes on El Camino.
22. Carol M. remarked adding more bike lanes to the high visibility thoroughfare is aligned with Palo Alto's interests and goals in sustainability and climate action as well as safety.

SUMMARY MINUTES

23. Albert H. hoped Council would consider the Caltrans' Mission Statement as they vote.
24. Natalie G. urged Council to pass Option B.
25. Nick B. asked Council to remove parking and add bike lanes on El Camino to be an examples to the other 16 cities.
26. Amie A. was in favor of the bike lanes.
27. Richard H. spoke on behalf of Palo Alto Chamber of Commerce who asked that additional analysis be completed on the proposal to understand the full impact of any proposed parking changes before they are finalized.
28. Galen F. expressed concerns as a business owner on El Camino regarding the proposal of removing parking.
29. Eduardo L. supported the removal of parking for the bike lanes.
30. Reid K. urged Council and the City to approve the replacement parking along El Camino with bike lanes.
31. Elaine U. spoke in support of Option B and suggested working with the businesses to assist in the transition and the Palo Alto TMA program to find solutions.
32. Gregory (Zoom)
33. April W. (Zoom) strongly supported removing parking and installing protected bike lanes on ECR.
34. Alan W. (Zoom) hoped Council would look at the comments he had submitted in writing because he could not summarize them in one minute. He described why the promise of bikeways completely separated and protected from automobile traffic was not possible. He urged Council to look at other equally applicable design guidance such as DIB89.
35. Sharlene L. (Zoom) supported Option B.
36. Jeff G. (Zoom) agreed with the comments of Arthur L. He stated Park Boulevard would be an existing viable biking alternative. He advised that it was important to move forward cautiously.
37. Sandhya L. did not find it safe to ride on the El Camino Real corridor. She felt this project would be an opportunity for Palo Alto to shine as the pioneer of bike infrastructure.
38. Neil S.

SUMMARY MINUTES

39. Jennifer M. did not find it reasonable to presume that nonvehicle drivers would use other paths of travel because El Camino is a source of resources, goods and services for residents and commerce.
40. Cedric B. (Zoom) supported bike lanes but suggested using the time before striping to make modifications to decrease conflict points and risks.
41. Evelyn K (Zoom) opined that removing the parking spaces would displace many RV dwellers.
42. Ren F (Zoom) asked council to install bike lanes on El Camino.
43. Nicole R. (Zoom) supported removing parking on El Camino Real and adding bike lanes. She encouraged the City to find alternatives for parking on El Camino including for RVs.
44. Stephen R. (Zoom) informed the bike/ped community about upcoming rail grade separation decisions that would have a significant effect on bicycle transportation in the City. He mentioned upcoming meetings of the Rail Committee and urged people to be informed by looking at connectingpaloalto.com.
45. Katie B. (Zoom) supported bike lanes on El Camino. She noted as more housing was added, there would be more people who want to get to and from places on El Camino.
46. Ken K. supported the safest possible bike lanes on El Camino Real and asked Council to pass a resolution to continue close collaboration with Caltrans to remove parking and install bike lanes.

Council Member Kou asked if CEQA analysis or looking at environmental impacts come into play. She asked if they intend to implement the proposed bicycle lanes without Palo Alto's Council vote of support. She discussed safety issues that need to be focused on.

Mr. Kamhi believed Caltrans determined that this project has CEQA exemption and NEPA exclusion.

Mr. Salay answered that this is the first level of environmental clearance. He said Caltrans intends to work in collaboration with the City but had an obligation to do something because of the 33 crashes. He discussed adjustments they made in terms of safety issues.

Ang M., Caltrans District Division Chief Office of Safety, clarified it would still apply because they are just removing parking.

Council Member Veenker wondered how many crossings are made by school children on an average weekday across ECR. She asked if she was correct that most of the failure to yield incidents happened at intersections. She asked how effective the potential mitigations have been in other settings. She wanted to know if there was a sense of how many of the parking

SUMMARY MINUTES

spots potentially being lost are regularly used for business. She asked if losing parking on Park Boulevard could be expected.

Mr. Kamhi answered they do not have exact numbers for that but could safely say hundreds. He could not say how many of the parking spots were regularly used for business without a more in-depth parking study. He discussed the amount of permits sold in the RPP District to employees. He added people that are visiting the business can park on other streets and many businesses have their own lots. He did not believe there would be loss of parking on Park Boulevard as a result of the proposal.

Mr. Lee stated the largest percentage of failure to yield accidents was bikes going against traffic at about 40 percent. Drivers failing to yield was 30 percent.

Ang M. explained having the dedicated right of way for the bicycles helped make a lot more visible and drivers more compliant on yielding the bicycles. He offered to provide statistical information on that at a later date.

Council Member Burt queried if it was correct that 79% of the collisions are at conflict locations of intersections. He wanted to know if the mid-block included conflict locations where commercial driveways are located. He opined the primary safety problem was at intersections plus commercial driveways. He thought it was important to zero in on the real safety risks and how the plan addresses them. He questioned if there was a projection of the increase in number of bikes that would take El Camino as a result of these measures. He believed linking the two measures was important in order to improve the safety on El Camino rather than just drive more people into a circumstance with inherent safety risk.

Ang M. confirmed it was correct that 79% of the collisions are at conflict locations of intersections. He stated the conflict locations were part of the mid-block. He explained the challenges. He said there was no current projection of the increase in number of bikes that would take El Camino as a result of these measures. That was something that would need to be analyzed.

Sergio R. added there were no good models to determine how many bicyclists would use a certain kind of facility. They recognize there are a lot of different types of bicyclists with varying levels of comfort or stress on certain facilities. They realize there are other routes available in Palo Alto that people would continue to use. He discussed proven safety measures.

Council Member Lythcott-Haims wanted to better understand how it is that bike lanes create a safer experience when vehicles are still going to be turning in and out of El Camino's intersections, driveways and the bus stops. She asked for comment about the suggestion of putting the bike lanes to the left or help her understand the alternative why this bike lane would protect the cyclists from the turns into the numerous driveways and intersections. She asked what would be done to mitigate the impact of lost parking on the local businesses in the area north of Cambridge. She queried if PATMA would help to solve the problem.

SUMMARY MINUTES

Sergio R. commented that the biggest benefit they will get with the bike lane is the sight distance. The placement of the bike lane is constrained by geometrics. The team will be looking into the options.

Mr. Salay assured everyone that the bike lane proposal is still open book. They welcome all feedback.

Mr. Kamhi outlined the options for parking if El Camino is not available. He confirmed PATMA was a potential option, as well.

Council Member Tanaka wanted to know how much of the money for the proposal would come from the City. He questioned if Staff has surveyed why more people do not bike. He had found that another reason people do not bike is because sometimes there is no direct route. He wondered if business owners have been surveyed for their opinion on the loss of potential parking on El Camino and, if so, what were the results.

Mr. Kamhi explained this project is being offered completely free of cost by Caltrans. He said they do not have a specific data measuring why more people do not bike. He thought additional bicycle facilities would make people feel safer to bike.

Mr. Salay stated they had not surveyed the businesses.

Male said he and his colleague canvassed the businesses along El Camino and discovered there are about 210 parking spaces in front of businesses and about 1600 off street available. He added speed was the number one concern of businesses. Half a dozen of the businesses shared that they use the on-street parking for their employees.

Mayor Stone asked if Staff has identified what will happen to the many RV dwellers located along El Camino Real. He asked about the average count of RV dwellers. He wanted to know how long the county waitlist is. He was curious why bike lanes would prevent cyclists from riding against traffic. He asked if the Economic Development Manager had a chance to review the impacts on local businesses by the removal of parking. He was curious if the loss of parking and loss of some customers due to parking issues would be offset by new customers due to the ease of access of bicyclists. On Option B, he asked what kind of guarantee they have from Caltrans to have the partnership moving forward.

Melissa McDonough, Assistant to the City Manager, stated they are looking at options for the RV dwellers and that there is a waiting list in the county for locations for RVs and safe parking. They hope Caltrans can notify people of when to anticipate the parking removal so people can adequately prepare and organizations that are willing to help can. The average count of RV dwellers varies. She did not have a ballpark on the length of the county waitlist.

Council Member Lythcott-Haims last heard that the status of MOVE Mountain View waitlist was 150 days last she checked.

SUMMARY MINUTES

Sergio R. stated that a bike lane creates a dedicated right of way for bicycles to ride on and makes the bicycles more visible.

Mr. Kamhi did not believe the Economic Development Manager had a chance to review the impacts on local businesses by the removal of parking. If Option B were chosen, it would need to be put in the motion that it is being supported with the understanding that Caltrans is going to do that.

Vice Mayor Lauing summarized that it is an incomplete solution but is a step in the right direction. He had concern that the presented project would bring more bikes to a high traffic, high speed thoroughfare. He thought a mitigation program was needed that varies by a block. He said 93 percent of the comments received were in favor of the proposal but that is not the mail that had been received so other segments need to be addressed. He said time to work on changes was needed.

Council Member Kou expressed concern because a lot of the business owners said they talked to somebody representing the bicycle coalition and felt intimidated and worried about retaliation for their business. She wanted to see how they could incorporate DIB89 into this. She asked if CHP would manage speed enforcement. She discussed the poor shape of El Camino and wanted to know if it would be repaired and repaved or if they have to wait until they know if the bike lane is going forward.

Sergio R. answered for the whole corridor, the plan was to work with CHP and the local PD to see what kind of effort and additional enhancement could be done for speed management. He stated paving work would proceed.

Mr. Salay there is another Palo Alto project being worked on but the repaving will proceed when that is completed.

Council Member Tanaka opined that this proposal was not for the avid bikers but for the people who do not feel safe to bike.

Council Member Lythcott-Haims had a hard time voting for removal of parking in favor of bike lanes without greater confidence that the community members who live in their vehicles will have somewhere to go.

Council Member Burt asked if an ad-hoc would need to be Brown Acted.

Molly Stump, City Attorney advised the default under the Brown Act when the body creates a subsidiary body is that it is a Brown Act body itself. The exception is a less than a quorum of Council Members only that is established for a singular limited purpose and disbands after that.

Mr. Kamhi believed they would need to ask Caltrans about the feasibility of creating an ad-hoc within the timeline. Regarding the RV dwellers, City Staff is committed to finding solutions but

SUMMARY MINUTES

they are asking and would like Council potentially ask for is more advance notice for the RV dwellers.

Mr. Salay was not sure about the ad-hoc and other commitment assigning Caltrans to go outside their jurisdiction but they will support the City or anybody else to take the lead because most of the work will be done within the City's jurisdiction.

City Manager Shikada commented the likely implications would be perhaps needing to consider the feasibility of completed this work within the timeframe of Caltrans repaving project. He was not sure about the potential to separate the repaving work from the safety improvements that would be embodied with the bike lanes such that the repaving could proceed immediately on its direct course while the additional work were to be evaluated and completed. He noted that it is a significant body of work and if Caltrans is not going to lead it, presumably it would be the Transportation Staff that would need to lead that effort and he noted that is in conflict with the items already in the City's priorities.

Council Member Burt asked if they could engage Fehr & Peers to work with them as an extension of their staff on these efforts.

City Manager Shikada answered even if they had Fehr & Peers working on the BPTP, it would require a significant management by their own staff.

Mr. Kamhi stated that ties back to asking for more clarity on the schedule from Caltrans. His understanding is the revision to the current plans would take them a few months to complete. He wanted to understand where that leaves the repaving schedule. He said they do not have any more resources for a consultant so would have to go out bid which would be another timeline. He said they could potentially amend the existing on-call consulting contract but he would have to look into that.

Council Member Burt was interested in how they would align the two objectives.

Mr. Salay outlined the timeline of the proposal.

Sergio R. advised Council that with the current project's environmentally approved scope, they look at the DIB94 but they will not be able to implement all of the DIB94 practices because they are limited to curb to curb. They cannot make modification to lane configuration which is why the phased approach makes sense.

Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 11:41 P.M.