



## PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

**City Council Chamber**  
200 Old Bernal Avenue, Pleasanton, CA 94566

**APPROVED**

**Wednesday, May 10, 2017**

*(Staff has reviewed the proposed changes against the recorded proceedings and confirms that these Minutes are accurate.)*

### **CALL TO ORDER**

The Planning Commission Meeting of May 10, 2017, was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chair Balch.

### **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Chair Balch.

### **1. ROLL CALL**

Staff Members Present: Adam Weinstein, Planning Manager; Julie Harryman, Assistant City Attorney; Mike Tassano, City Traffic Engineer; Matt Nelson, Associate Traffic Engineer; Eric Luchini, Associate Planner; Natalie Amos, Associate Planner; and Kendall Granucci, Recording Secretary

Commissioners Present: Commissioners Nancy Allen, Justin Brown, Greg O'Connor, Herb Ritter and Chair Jack Balch

Commissioners Absent: Commissioner Nagler

### **2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

There were no minutes for approval.

### **3. MEETING OPEN FOR ANY MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE TO ADDRESS THE PLANNING COMMISSION ON ANY ITEM WHICH IS NOT ALREADY ON THE AGENDA**

There were no speakers.

#### **4. REVISIONS TO THE AGENDA**

There were no revisions to the agenda.

#### **5. CONSENT CALENDAR**

*Consent Calendar items are considered routine and will be enacted, approved, or adopted by one motion unless a request for removal for discussion or explanation is received from the Planning Commission or a member of the public by submitting a speaker card for that item.*

##### **a. P17-0051, Jing Cui, Spring Music Studio**

Application for a Conditional Use Permit to operate a music school at 1024 Serpentine Lane, Suite 112. Zoning for the project site is PUD-I (Planned Unit Development – Industrial) District.

##### **b. P17-0154, Bruce Smith, Dusty Cars**

Application for a Conditional Use Permit to operate an internet-based automobile sales business without servicing of vehicles and with interior vehicle storage located at 3440 Stanley Boulevard, Suites J and K. Zoning for the project site is C-S (Service Commercial) District.

**Commissioner Allen moved to approve the Consent Calendar.**

**Commissioner O'Connor seconded the motion.**

#### **ROLL CALL VOTE:**

**AYES: Commissioners Allen, Brown, O'Connor, and Ritter**

**NOES: None**

**ABSTAIN: None**

**RECUSED: Commissioner Balch**

**ABSENT: Commissioner Nagler**

Resolutions No. PC-2017-16 approving Case P17-0051 and No. PC-2017-17 approving Case P17-0154 were entered and adopted as motioned.

#### **6. PUBLIC HEARING AND OTHER MATTERS**

Continued from April 12, 2017:

##### **a. Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan Update**

Review and comment on the Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan Update.

Matt Nelson presented the Staff Report.

Commissioner Brown: I'll limit it strictly to the staff report versus the actual document. I was just wondering why in Figure 2 in the staff report Corridors 1 and 2 weren't shown,

specifically the West Las Positas corridor wasn't shown in the near term and I think I actually know the answer to number 2 when I did additional reading.

Nelson: The West Las Positas corridor....the draft that you guys have is obviously an older draft so there's been an update. Originally when this was created West Las Positas wasn't one of the corridors on there, but after feedback primarily from the community and the outreach, we had Stoneridge ranked higher but many of the residents and the Bike and Trail Committee said that if there were improvements along West Las Positas, they would feel much safer riding on West Las Positas than they would on Stoneridge and there is more opportunity on West Las Positas, so yes, West Las Positas will be added on that map. It just had not made it into this update.

Commissioner Brown: All right, then the only other question I have and the rest is on the 150-page document, was around the purpose of the Number 5 Stanley Boulevard Corridor. It seemed awful short and sort of went from Stanley and Bernal to...I don't know if that was Ray Street or....and when I was looking in the detail guide, I didn't really see what the compelling reason was.

Tassano: The intent of that Stanley Corridor was to try and feed to the downtown where another corridor would then pick it up, so at some point it becomes a smaller network as you get to the downtown and then another corridor of the downtown core picks up. At some point we have to break it off but it is kind of similar to a couple of other that kind of stop.

Commissioner Brown: Is there a diagram that shows all 16 corridors to show where they connect?

Commissioner Ritter: I didn't see it in the packet.

Commissioner Brown: Yeah, this is the one I was having difficulty with, the Figure 2. Figure 2 is missing and I was specifically looking for a diagram to show the 16 corridors and how they interconnected and I didn't see that.

Tassano: In the full master plan there's a more updated one. It's on approximately page 65. It's not an actually numbered page, but....it shows the near term corridors there in and about 17 different colors.

Commissioner Brown: All right, so basically to answer my question, the Stanley Corridor would connect with the Class II bicycle lane. All right, thank you.

Commissioner Allen: Questions regarding funding. In addition to the Measure BB funding of about \$400,000, how much total additional funding would we expect over the next 5 years for the program?

Tassano: That's really the question that we get most often and when we identify that money—the Measure B and BB, that's guaranteed for ped/bike funding only. There are other funding sources that we have available. We have gas tax money that can come through and can be used for ped/bike improvements. There is also pass-through money. Measure B money that comes for our local streets and roads can be used for all

pedestrians and bicyclists. We do get vehicle registration fee money of about \$100,000. That's not necessarily identified just for ped/bikes, so we really called out just the \$400,000 that's guaranteed.

As an example, local streets and roads--should we fund all of our pass through local streets and roads as ped/bike instead of asphalt overlay. It's about \$2.5 million so if we don't fix any of our roads then we can fix all of our bike lanes, but it's kind of a balance between those and that's why we try to incorporate bicycle improvements in all of our local streets and roads overlay projects.

Chair Balch: I just wanted to ask, you know, out by Pacific Pearl, El Charro, Stoneridge and all that, we've got the green and I think I saw it there first and now it's kind of moving a bit. Is that...I think we've actually talked about this at one point, but is that the new way the state is going or are cities choosing to?

Nelson: That's the direction we're going. It depends on the location and the volume and the amount of pedestrians, but I think in general it's going to that and maybe state-wide but it's kind of a city-by-city in how you want to implement it and best practices which is where we're looking to follow as we go through here. But, where you use it and where you don't is kind of a case by case basis.

Chair Balch: And maybe that's hinting of what I'm thinking. I know it's not a question, but the inconsistency is almost as devilish as the consistency I'm assuming you're grappling with.

Commissioner Ritter: First of all, great job Matt and thanks Mike for all you're doing on this process which actually started a long time ago. I think I was on the first committee for this. What about community outreach when you get going through this. I know the Bicycle, Pedestrian, Trails Committee (BPTC) has been having meetings, but have you got much feedback from the community on this? And, specifically, Hart Middle School with taking away a loading zone lane. Is anybody concerned with that, as I do see a lot of cars parked along there if you put a bike trail in there.

Nelson: As far as community outreach, we held three community outreach sessions outside of the BPTC and we had pretty good attendance in those outreaches. We were also at Parks and Rec, Economic Vitality Committee, so we've got a lot of feedback from the community in different areas and aspects which has helped mold the direction we went with this and some of the changes that were made. As far as removing the loading zone lane, that was one example shown up there. It's not necessarily what would be done at that location, but there are areas along West Las Positas that currently only operate with two lanes of travel and it doesn't seem to be an operational issue, so it could be to reduce the lane where feasible, and obviously we have a parking problem at Hart Middle, so that would be looked at in more detail.

Commissioner Ritter: Or a loading zone problem.

Tassano: I think you bring up a good point, is that the projects and programs that are identified in here. It's a master plan. It's a guide, but when it comes down to detailed design and West Las Positas is a perfect example, it says from Foothill from Santa Rita Road you should install separated, protected bike lanes. Some locations of what Matt

showed work very well and there are some location where it does not. But on any of those locations, they will come back to City Council to show what's going on after we do outreach. We're not a non-outreach focused City so we would definitely hold a meeting at the very least at the Hart Middle School. I don't envision necessarily taking away parking there but there are ways to potentially protect bicyclists by putting the parking lane away from the curb so it's almost as though they're parking in the middle of the lane and the bicycle lanes are actually between the parked vehicles and the curb, right? So you have a fully protected bike lane but the parking is still there. We didn't really want to show that because the next question that comes out is, oh, we're going to allow parking on all of the projects, and it's easier to just show something basic and we'll get into the section by section detail in moving forward.

Commissioner Brown: When you get into the implementation phases what is going to be your outreach strategy, because obviously you want to avoid a situation like what happened around the BART station where we made a logical change to the road design for that project that went in there because of trying to expedite people coming in and out and narrowed the amount of vehicle thru traffic, but we want to avoid backlash from the community when we make significant road structures to accommodate sort of the 21<sup>st</sup> century bike and pedestrian facilities and so on and so forth. Any general comment on that?

Tassano: I think every time we do another project we learn a lesson. I think the lesson from the 2011 approval and then implementation in 2016 is that 5 years is a long time to go without reminding people of what is going to take place. For us as staff, once it's approved, you know it's approved but it's probably a good opportunity to make sure there's outreach. Another thing I think is important is that you actually show things on the roadway. Matt was just saying, you know, even if our recommendation is to put in protected bike lanes along all of West Las Positas, it's a lot easier to put it down in paint, right? Or even cone it so the public can see what's going on. We're also working on an improved public outreach campaign. One request was to put up a little QR code so we can scan it. When we did that project initially on Owens in 2012 and QR readers were not something everyone had on their phones, so I think that will be important and something we want to make sure they're very involved. Our community has been very involved in this plan and I hope to have them to continue to be involved as we move forward into the project.

Commissioner Brown: I'm personally not a fan of QR codes.

Chair Balch: Okay, any other questions?

## **THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS OPENED.**

Steve McGinnis: I'm a member of the BPTC and also a ride leader for the Pleasanton Peddlers of 285 fellow citizens of this town who ride their bicycles on a more than regular basis, and really I'm just here to thank in particular the staff of the City for putting together this report. This required a lot of hours, a lot of time and effort and they did a remarkably fine job. We're proud of what came out of that report. So again, Matt, Mike, thank you.

Sharon Pikarsky: I'm a 33 year resident of Pleasanton and I also ride with Pleasanton Peddlers and also am a member of several bike groups and bike East Bay. The City of Pleasanton was built for cars with little thought to alternative modes of transportation. Over the last year as the Bicycle Pedestrian Master Plan was being developed, I've been to a number of meetings where citizens young and old have talked about their desire to safely ride their bikes for errands and especially to school. Currently, bike lanes start and then stop, stranding cyclists in the middle of streets, often with high volumes of fast-moving traffic. The mini-split lanes throughout the City which allow cars to turn right without stopping are a serious hazard for pedestrians and bicyclists alike. Safety is a huge issue. Accident statistics show that over a three year period, there was a bicyclist or pedestrian in a collision with a car on average every 9 days in our City with 2/3 of them being the fault of the drivers. Nearly a third of the victims were children. There is a dire need for a safer, comprehensive bicycle and pedestrian transportation network. Those choosing to ride or walk would be safer and healthier. Those who still drive will also benefit with fewer cars on the road, cleaner air and more free parking spaces.

I'd like to give you a personal example of current challenges. I live in Pleasanton Meadows. The only exit for a bicycle is West Las Positas at Santa Rita, one of the busiest intersections in the City. The most direct route to downtown is Santa Rita Road. I ride a bike lane up to Santa Rita, but I don't dare ride on Santa Rita due to the fast-moving heavy traffic and a lack of bike lanes. As a result, I cross Santa Rita. To cross, I have to merge into moving traffic to avoid a pork chop directly in my path. I then have to merge into a lane of traffic that uses the slip lane. There is no crosswalk. In a block I have to merge left again as the slip lane becomes a right turn only lane. There are no bike lanes through here. This by the way is the route that Hart Middle School students or BART riders from my neighborhood of 1700 homes has to navigate.

After this nightmare, I need to zigzag my way to downtown through residential streets that adds mileage and time. As a result, I often get in my car and drive instead, adding pollution, traffic and parking congestion. This example is by no means the only one. We have scary streets and intersections throughout our City. As a result, many who would otherwise ride bikes or walk choose not to. Is there any wonder that we have such frustration with traffic and parking? Implementation of the Bicycle Pedestrian Master Plan will greatly improve safety and provide a more convenience user-friendly transportation network for those of us who want to get somewhere without getting into our cars. I urge you to approve the plan. Let's make our streets safe and attractive not just for experienced bicyclists but also for casual cyclists and our kids. We will all benefit. Thank you.

Chair Balch: Thank you very much. Seeing no additional speaker cards, I will close the public comment period and bring it back before the Commission.

## **THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS CLOSED.**

Commissioner Brown: Just a general comment in echoing what Steve said. This is probably one of the most exhaustive and complete reports I've ever read. I don't think there's any stone left unturned, so my compliments to staff on that, as well.

Chair Balch: All right, so with that:

1. Does the updated Master Plan provide the necessary/desired elements to address the two new goals established in the update process?
  - a. Create a “Low Stress” bicycle and pedestrian network; and
  - b. Complete corridors

Commissioner Ritter: Like I said earlier in 2010 we were on the committee where Fehr and Peers helped create this. Back then a lot of the talk was just inter-connectivity between the trails. That was all we kind of focused on, and over the years I started hearing more that you can connect all the trails you want but if they're not safe no one's going to get on them. So, go back to the category rankings and this is what I feel might be the only flaw in this program is to look at how we're ranking the priorities and it seems to me that the safety one—I think they made that....in the staff report, there it is—you had safety as 4 points the same as connectivity where I almost think safety should be 8 points and connectivity be 4 because to connect everything, great but if people aren't going to ride on them because of safety, they're not going to use them. So, it's just a comment. I love the concept, but as you go around and you hear peddlers talking, it's all about safety and they can't even get to the half-way point safe, they're not going to even start the process. That's just my thought on it and also I think the schools are a priority, having the route closest to the schools be the number one fix as far as the priority. So even to put safety, safe routes to schools next and connectivity, just because demand will come when you fix those. That's just a general concept for this, but that's just my two cents on that first topic.

Chair Balch: If I may, I'm going to just pick up with you. I was actually on the BPTC and our rep had that conversation—that exact one, about how to rank these points and I remember it because I also thought exactly like you. How are we not having safe routes for our children to school be number one. I know the committee grappled pretty hard with it. I was a “newbie” but I'll just say, if the group had their way, everything would be high priority and something had to fall out. I remember that conversation and it took a fair bit and I think they exhausted the conversation in much more depth than the level we're getting at this staff presentation. I don't know if you guys want to go into it, but I remember the conversation was lengthy.

Tassano: I'll just add one quick thing about this because we did spend several meetings on this and I think to your point Herb, is we want to make sure we focus on safety and thankfully, we have a bicycle collision pattern that doesn't necessarily reflect where people feel the least unsafe, right? When you look at our collision pattern—and that's really where safety goes—its like, hey, if there's a collision here you get extra points. But that doesn't necessarily reflect where we can make the best safety improvements, so there's kind of a disconnect there. I think that's where we landed with safety and then we added in the safe routes to school, that actually elevated the combination of the two and I think it better represents where the corridors played out, they're all on routes to several schools. I think ultimately it played out and the 1 through 16 was really focused around that.

Commissioner Ritter: Those bottom two, okay.

Chair Balch: And as I recall, West Las Positas raised up because of that element, right? Because I thought there was an alternative path as I recall that you guys were debating at the time. Maybe it was Stoneridge as I recall, whether it be that or West Las Positas, I think the committee ultimately favored West Las Positas because of a variety of reasons.

Commissioner O'Connor: I think it addresses it fine. I agree with Herb on the safety issue but I do think connectivity is about equal because once you make the routes safe, if it's not continuous to a destination, especially schools, then we're going to have kind of a disconnected safety route, right? It will be safe for a while and then the connectivity falls apart. So I do think they go hand in hand and I think if we make things safer and people are more confident other than those who are just avid bikers, then we will get more people on the streets.

Commissioner Brown: When you read the report, Santa Rita has the most accidents, pedestrian and cars. I think 57% of the collisions are where cars are not yielding to pedestrians or bikes and you heard the speaker tonight describe her trip down Santa Rita. Santa Rita is always coming up from a safety perspective. I was pleased to see number 2 on the list but I was not pleased to see it will just be a study by 2021 when you've clearly got gaps on Santa Rita and it's not a pain point and I wanted a comment on that one.

Nelson: The Santa Rita corridor—when we brought it to City Council, so part 1 of their items and their feedback to us was to not only make it a study but a clean project. With the revisions that are going on that corridor will include projects depending on what the study shows. It's the study and the project.

Commissioner Brown: That will be probably one of the 5 prioritized corridors most likely with projects before 2021?

Nelson: Yes.

Commissioner Brown: Okay, that's encouraging to hear. The other general comment I have is when I finally got to Table 7-2 which is on page one hundred something, the cost of the pedestrian improvements was \$1.27 million and the cost of the bike improvements was \$66 million and notwithstanding the audience representing the bike community, the other thing I noted in Section 3 when it talks about the current state of walking and bicycling in Pleasanton today, on page 20 it said pedestrians was about 7.7% of the commute versus .8% for bikes and then by 2040 you were saying if you made these improvements, you could get to 14.2% for ped and 1.1% for bikes on page 130. So you can get 6.5% improvement on pedestrians by spending \$1.27 million and you get a .3% improvement in commutes spending \$66 million. So, I hate to point out the obvious, but I'm just wondering why when we're looking at prioritization, why we wouldn't go for the biggest impact of the aggregate of pedestrian and bicycles and prioritize the pedestrian projects over some of the bike projects if you're going to get that much more bang for the buck. Any comments?

Tassano: Yeah, we were almost not going to put those numbers in so we wouldn't get that question. (haha) That's not true, but I think you do bring up a good point and I don't



completely agree that if we make these improvements we're only going to have a .3% increase in bicyclists. I think some of it is true with the pedestrian improvements. You'll double the number of pedestrians if you want to look at it the other way; twice as many pedestrians, but I think it's important to balance those. That's really one of the troubles we had with the original, with the 2010 version; that you didn't have a way to prioritize so you make a valid point and the cyclist makes a valid point about where they want to go and how they want to get there, and so we constantly struggled with how we allocate those funds, and we still struggle a little bit with the battle between bicycle improvements and pedestrian improvements and how we break those down, and that's something we'll continue to bring back to the committee. Maybe that's with our next update, is how we break those percentages out.

Commissioner Brown: I would just keep that in mind. It sounds like you already are. It just jumped out at me on the page and I thought well, more bang for the buck. I guess I'm putting my business hat on and where would you spend your money first. The other comment I had was on page 43 regarding the bicycle boulevards. The comment on page 43 was that because the bicycle boulevards don't just use the chevrons and don't have a delineation that the middle school riders don't feel safe and they're not using them, and I was just questioning the relative value of putting in more bicycle boulevards versus prioritizing the other classes of bike lanes.

Tassano: We put in the priority numbers or the ranking numbers and I was a little disappointed that things like Greenwood and some of the ones that go through the core, the kind of center of the City didn't come out higher. Those are actually some of the projects I would really like to see because I think there's a great opportunity if we direct the entire core through the Greenwood area. Here's a location where bicyclists are first. They're primary and cars, you should actually move out of the way. I think that would encourage a cycling community and right through the core of our neighborhoods. I think it would be a big challenge and would look much different than where it's at today, but I would find that as one of the better projects to do because it provides a real notification as you're riding through the community, as you're riding through Greenwood that you should actually move your car out of the way. I mean, almost that sort of approach and that's where I think we need to go moving forward on plans like this. If you have the choice of riding down Greenwood or riding down Santa Rita, we already heard from Sharon and we heard from the community. You know, give us a path. Give us a place where we feel comfortable and safe and if it's riding through a 25 mph residential street where there are big pavement legends that say "bikes get to be here" and there's a constant reminder, I think that's one of the most valuable things we can do. I may still try and push for those things. It's not the highest on the priority list, but it's one of those things I find very encouraging and something I'd like us to move forward with.

2. Are the prioritized corridors in locations that are reasonable and provide access to existing and new developments?

Commissioner Brown: Okay, interesting comment. Since we're still on....we're kind of merging 1 and 2, my apologies to the Chair, I was a little disappointed to see that the downtown corridor was I think number 9 just because of investments in the downtown corridor for pedestrians I think would rank fairly high from a connectivity and safety perspective, and its good investment in terms of tying it to the DSP work that we're

doing and making investments in the downtown because it drives commerce and economy and so on.

Commissioner Allen: So I have one question regarding page 130 and the bicycling mode share for road trips that was brought up a little bit earlier of 1.1% as being envisioned in 2040. How does that compare to what other cities—I don't know if Davis is a good example—but other cities that are very bicycle friendly would have as a percentage number. It feels low, but I don't know.

Tassano: It is low. We don't have the kind of centralized destinations that kind of are short trip. And then we also don't really have a lot of facilities. As an example, we opened the Iron Horse Trail and from the time we opened it, it is solid with pedestrians and bicyclists, so that 1.1% or .8% or whatever it is and whatever it's going to be, that number is correct on the .8%. You look through our traffic counts—we do annual traffic counts, and I just went through them today and the peak hour at Hopyard or Stoneridge or even Hopyard and West Las Positas is 7. That's 7 bicyclists and 4 of them are on sidewalk. So I think we can improve that. Other locations—I don't know Davis because it's a college town. They're already going to have bicyclists anyway or other locations where parking isn't very convenient. They're going to have higher percentages. Ours is really low. When we apply for grants and we have to say we're under 1% for bicycling percentage, that's never looked at favorably.

Weinstein: Could I just add to it. Even really fantastic bike cities like Portland only have mode splits of like 5% or so for bicycling, so I mean, we're less than 1% right now, but even cities with amazing bike networks and a strong bike culture are going to have several times more than we do, but the percentages are relatively low.

Commissioner Allen: First of all, very fine job pulling this together. I agree with what you commented about—this being one of the most comprehensive plans I've ever seen and the level of specificity is amazing. And I was also pleased to see 40, 50, 60 people at community meetings that were very, very engaged. So, great work in community outreach as well.

My comments revolve around primarily funding because we have constraints that will probably never allow us to be at a 5% level, but I think we can be much better than 1%, I mean even if it's 2%. And so it causes me to ask if there's anything we could do, even going to the Council possibly, to tee up the potential for additional money on top of the \$400,000 that's from Measure BB. I don't know if it's feasible, but potentially adding a page that gives the Council 2 to 3 options of funding potential. One could be baseline of current funding that we have here. A second could be to allocate "x" percent of the road transportation maintenance money to bicycling on top of what's being done today and maybe there's a third option as well because I just think about if all we have is \$400,000 over 5 years, that's less than \$100,000 a year and that feels like 2 to 3 consultant studies or 1 to 2 consultant studies which doesn't feel like a lot to make much progress. So therefore, it's not a surprise we're getting a lot of traction.

Now, I agree with what you said about return on the buck, but I still think....it would be helpful to see if we could get some energy around a little bit more funding to do some important things because there's a lot to be done if we're going to make a dent in this,

and I think we should. So that was my major comment. Mike, on your discussion about Greenwood and I think of Greenwood and Kolln as two side streets to Santa Rita and I do think at the end of the day, given the amount of funding we're going to have, that it's not practical to think that Santa Rita will be improved in the short term significantly. I mean, it's a busy street. There's not a lot of extra space to do a lot of widening there that I can see. If anything, we need to add more lanes for traffic. So therefore, people are just not going to ride there even if we invest in bike lanes. People rarely ride on the street on Valley even where there are lanes. I'm a cyclist and I rarely ride on Valley because it's just too scary. So, I do like your idea about some kind of minor amount of money, maybe in the pool of 20% non-priority things being used to pick a few corridors and help think about other corridors with some of the chevrons. That's it for me.

Chair Balch: I don't know if I have the same comments or not. I mean, I agree with the plan and I appreciate staff's work and the committee's work on it. Like I said, I had the opportunity to pop in and probably tried to hijack it off course a few times, but they did a good job in staying the course and it's pretty amazing actually. I do agree.

I was there when the rankings were discussed. I was there when there were conversations about safe transits or corridors to schools were discussed. I lent my support to that because as Commissioner Ritter said, it's essential. If we can empower the youth to feel that a bicycle is an equal mode of transportation as a vehicle, we might have this situation resolved a lot faster frankly. So, I think the committee did great on all those conversations I got to witness, and I didn't have many comments on the report. I did notice some quick grammatical things and maybe you could look them up later. On page 69 just seems to be in another language or something. Page 161, which I didn't notice earlier, but there are some dollar amounts that say "put them out in here." 7.4 by the way—that section.

So if I may, why don't we try to...now that we've all kind of voiced our comments unless there are additional comments you want to make, why don't we revisit their elements here and see if there's anything else they want to talk through on this.

Commissioner Brown: I was just going to add, page 76 also has that same inverted picture that makes it look Russian.

Tassano: I think we've got good input on 1 and 2 but I really do want to hear about 3 because I wrote that one specifically for you guys.

3. Are the new design concepts the type of improvements that could be supported by the Planning Commission in future development projects?

Commissioner Balch: It ties in well. I'll also start off by reminding the Commission that we have discussed a few times, as Adam will attest to, the street standards especially with sidewalks a few times before on projects that have come before us, including Valley Trails, right? So with that, we'll start on this side, Commissioner Brown.

Commissioner Brown: So one of the things as I was reading through the report you convinced me on was the slip lanes not just because of the plans that you had at Stanley and Bernal anyway, but just going through the need to eliminate and change

the slip lanes to make it safer for bikes was pretty compelling, and there's so much better designs out there. I was thinking about the slip lane you proposed at Sunol Boulevard and Bernal was an example and one you highlighted and people in the room as well. I thought that was pretty key. And you listed, and I'm trying to remember what page it was, you listed the priorities on one of the sections and I agreed with all of the priorities including the production and slip lanes or they increase with the radii to slow traffic down and it affects pedestrians and so forth. I thought the design considerations in the updates were pretty good and that the new crossing with the two reds and the yellow as an option or design consideration was interesting. I think you're calling it...the crosswalk with PHD...I glanced at the map and I thought maybe it might need to be something like that; either the R or P on First Street. I thought that maybe you were missing one there, but I think it might be Abbie that might need one, but I thought all of the design considerations were good. Thank you.

Commissioner Allen: All right, I also thought they were good. I especially like the protected bike lane and I also thought you did a good job of explaining the slip lane and potential options. There is one implication and request that I have going forward related to design, especially on new projects, is in some ways I like the bike/ped team or maybe a representative from the bike/ped team to be engaged, looking at the detailed design of the bike access for new developments where there is a high risk area, and I'm specifically thinking of a project like Auf de Maur. You have changed the name, but the project on Stanley...or Bernal and Stanley, because I remember being part of that project and when we looked at it, at the stage we're looking at it, we're not seeing the bike design and the safety mechanisms and I remember us talking about that being a critical area and let's be sure there's good visibility and there's not trees blocking the roadways and the ingress and egress. But, who knows what really happened and in some way when that detail design is done that looks at the situation from a bicyclist's perspective, I'm wondering how that can be vetted or usability tested you might say with folks like Steve or others, either one representative if it's too unwieldy to bring it to the whole bike/ped team or a sub-team that looks in detail there. Because only bicyclists could start to ask certain questions, you know, that the average person wouldn't know to even think about. So that would be a request and maybe when we bring projects up, we test and say is this one that we want to spin off for special review of the bike situation or ped situation.

Commissioner Ritter: Yeah, I agree. I think it should be done with at least that review. I agree with you Nancy that it should be done before it gets to actual motion time and workshop stage. But, also I really, really, really like the protected bike lane examples. My question might be is what's the minimum width of a car lane that you could...as the lane gets narrower, cars slow down. As it gets wider they speed up. Is there some minimum standard? Let's say Peters. If we were going to put a protected bike lane down Peters what's the minimum width of a lane. Is there one of those Mike in certain areas or is it based on the speed limit?

Tassano: My standard is 11 feet. The bicycle community will tell you that you can do it at 9 feet, but we're not doing it at 9 feet.

Commissioner Ritter: Would you go to 10 feet?

Tassano: No, we'll do it at 11 feet until there's some sort of documentation that actually shows either the benefit of a 10-foot travel lane on a 45 mph roadway or 35 mph roadway, when you get to a lower than 25 mph roadway, we don't normally then stripe in a bike lane necessarily next to one and 11 feet is normally when you're trying to put a bike lane on a 25 mph roadway, your biggest consideration is how close you can get to the park, the theater, and that's why Black Avenue has sharrows because you can't really go parking lane, bike lane, and then have anything really left over. So that's why we put the sharrows in on Black Avenue. It doesn't fit in what our normal roadway width is. So if there's a study that comes out that convinces me that a 10-foot lane is safer and actually slows down traffic and doesn't increase side swipes and collisions, then I would consider that, but until that occurs, I'm going to go off of what my engineering judgement says is a reasonable width.

Commissioner Ritter: Okay, and then I guess if it's an option to have a parked car, a bike lane and a curb, I really do like that because it creates its own barrier. I just keep thinking of going down Peters to get to the downtown if you're going to go around if we ever set that up, but, and I would love to eliminate the slip lanes. From a pedestrian/bike standpoint it seems like they just create more ways for cars to be distracted and cause more injuries the way I see it, but yeah, I like your design concepts. I do think that Stanley and Bernal, we've got to get something set there as we all agree on. Thank you for introducing the examples to us.

Commissioner O'Connor: So I have a question on your question. At the end here you say are the design concepts the type we could support in the future for development projects. Are you talking about that we would support that the developer would be responsible for funding those improvements in their developments? Was that part of the question?

Tassano: Support, condition, whatever you feel is appropriate for putting in some of these features. Does that answer the question?

O'Connor: Yeah, and I don't think anybody's addressed that yet and that brings us back to, we don't usually look at the finances of some of these things, but we know that when we require a lot of extras that prices of homes generally go up. I don't know if this is Citywide that we're going to start to drive pricing up, but I know you can't sell a house for more than what's on the market, so in concept, yeah, I would support these.

I think a lot of the examples I looked at were really nice, but I've got to tell you, I was just down in San Diego and I've also been in streets in Fremont. They're doing something different with the striping. San Diego has a lot of the green striping where you come into some of these intersections where there's so much of it, it's almost like it's overwhelming without being used to it. It's like, where am I supposed to go, what am I supposed to do, whose got the right-of-way. Fremont's got some strange striping in the middle of some of their lanes where I thought, is this lane going away, has it been marked out? I couldn't tell what it was even for and they like split the lane and had an island in the middle of the road that no one was driving in. I still don't know what they were doing. I think or I would hope over time at least the people who live here can get used to it. I'm sure that people I was following in San Diego knew what they were doing but I was caught off guard from being out of town. But yeah, I think anything that

provides for more safety to anyone who is not in the vehicle and protected by all the metal in a car I think is a good thing.

Commissioner Brown: I was just going to say to Greg, I think an example of what Mike is saying it will be Johnson Drive EDZ as an example. I think this type of design with sort of planning would work. It's a lot about the road network that would go in place of that large area being proposed to be developed. So that's just an example.

Chair Balch: I mentioned the green earlier because I too was in San Diego a few weeks ago and noticed the exact same thing and I think the difficulty I have and not necessarily with our example here in the City, but unfortunately, because it's not necessarily a state standard or something, even in northern California or southern California, it's creating confusion frankly I think. I was going slower to try and understand this intersection or the coloring. I know Mountain View led us off it seemed like in the Bay Area and that whole area with some of this. So, you know, use it to your discretion and I'll go with your dedication on that.

I wanted to mention on the slip lanes, I was part of the Parks and Recreation Commission when the Iron Horse Trail funding came through to re-design the intersection at Santa Rita and Stoneridge and I remember the conversations where we were talking about it wasn't traversing the line of the Iron Horse, we have to cross these two major streets, how to design this exact intersection and slip lane. In fact, I think there was a slip lane, right, and then we kept changing that out. I think the improvements are better and I think eliminating the slip is important because I see it at Owens where it dead-ends and then it's Las Positas, right? There's a lot of children traffic at exactly 3:00 or so coming across the new 7-Eleven we approved and they hit that first bollard and they can't all fit on that and people are not stopping for them to make the full cross to dry land, for lack of a better word. You know these little islands can't support more than 8 people and with bikes, so I think this is essential.

But I could see us supporting a lot of this. We're approaching build-out with the east side as probably as our next undeveloped land and who knows when that will come around. So the City's not necessarily designing or building new streets that I see per se, so I think how much can the Commission support when we're doing things like Valley Trails and it's the 9 acres and its....interior-wise, yes. As Commissioner Allen said, I'd like to see Santa Rita tackled in some way that would slow traffic down.

And then my last comment and question, I don't know if I asked it or it was addressed in the report, as we look at our design elements and call it autonomous vehicle driving, are we thinking about what the cars can read? You know, as Commissioner Ritter said, where you've got the parked car and the protected bike lane and then the sidewalk, you know, will cars be smart enough to read that and know to stay in their lane. I don't know. That's an interesting conversation I guess for motorists out there.

Commissioner Brown: On Item 3, one other comment. I still struggle with the two-stage left turn just because I worry about drivers trying to interpret green paint in the middle of the intersection to the same point that Commissioner O'Connor and the Chair were mentioning. That's why I like the picture you have up there. I keep looking back at it because all the green paint is in the corridor and it's extremely clear and not in the

middle of the intersection. I know it's proposed that the two-stage box be part of the design considerations in Figure 8 in the staff report, but I still struggle with that one a little bit because I think until drivers become educated it would confuse a lot of people. I still see people struggling with roundabouts on Valley.

Chair Balch: As you can tell by the tire tread across the middle of it, right? (hahaha) No offense, those are a great idea but they're just arson! (Hahaha)

Commissioner Brown: Okay, final question. I noticed on pages 13 and 14, actions 3.1.a and 4.2.a; I just had a couple of minor questions. Action 3.1.a: "Consider creating a City sponsored self-service bicycle sharing program." I hope "City sponsored" means we would partner with somebody else and they would be paying for it versus the City. I don't mind sponsoring it in terms of allocating space to set up their bike racks and re-allocate parking spaces, but we've seen too many bicycle ride-sharing programs not very profitable and they're still finding the niche. That's sort of a comment.

And then Action 4.2.a: "Provide a Citywide bicycle rack request program." I was just wondering if you could clarify that. Is that some way of collecting public feedback as to where they'd like to see a bicycle rack?

Tassano: Yeah, I think part of that is there's a deficiency specifically in the downtown. There's a need and it's something we heard from the public. How do we do this, and we don't actually have a procedure beyond calling us and then we try and find an appropriate location. It seemed like the combination between....you know, even at our City facilities there's opportunity to have a comprehensive robust program.

Commissioner Brown: Yeah, I think I've seen some designs you can almost fit like 8 bikes in a stamped parking space, right, an 8 to 1 return. Okay, those were my only comments.

Chair Balch: Let me pick up on that actually. One of the last things...I think it was my last meeting with the Parks and Rec, was that why Wayside got a bike rack and I don't even know if it's there yet. I haven't located it. I mentioned it to Ms. Andrade-Wax, but I do think we need to make sure we include a bike rack at every park. It came up out of the Park and Rec Master plan, I'll say that. So I remember it came up but I just don't know where it went. I'll just mention it here and maybe it can get traction again.

Okay, anything else for our team? Okay, I would like to echo or re-mention the support I think everybody heard from the Planning Commission to staff and the committee for doing this extensive work. I know a lot of you guys are here. If you can carry our appreciation back to them and just, you know, as I said, I got to stop in a few times myself, but I really appreciate this. I think you guys have done a great job and I'll say on behalf of the Commission we really appreciate it. Thank you. Do you guys need a motion to accept the plan, or is it just comments at this time? Just comments, okay, great! All right, so we will complete that item. Thank you very much you guys. We really appreciate seeing you guys as always.

## **7. MATTERS INITIATED BY COMMISSION MEMBERS**

No discussion was held or action taken.

## **8. MATTERS FOR COMMISSION'S REVIEW/ACTION/INFORMATION**

### **a. Reports from Meetings Attended (e.g., Committee, Task Force, etc.)**

No discussion was held or action taken.

### **b. Future Planning Calendar**

Commissioner Ritter: There have been some questions on the update of the EDZ and I know Adam has kept us posted on where we're at with that. Is it coming close? Months? Weeks? Days away?

Adam Weinstein: I know you've been thinking about the EDZ for a long time. I was thinking about the timeline today and we set the Notice of Preparation on the EIR out at the end of 2014 and prior to that the Council adopted the idea of pursuing an Economic Development Zone as a City initiative so it's been around for a really long time and a lot of our written work is done. The EIR is about complete. It still needs to get certified. A lot of the traffic analysis has already been completed. The analysis that compared the EDZ to the initiative project was complete and that provides a lot of useful information. So there's fiscal analyses, traffic analyses and everything else under the sun.

You know from reading and understanding the EIR a really critical piece of making the EDZ happen that's the City Council's decision is figuring out a way to finance the transportation improvements which are very, very expensive. And so, the next step in the process is having a City Council Workshop on the funding options for the EDZ transportation improvements and figuring out an equitable distribution of funding responsibility for those traffic improvements. Staff is currently working on identifying a couple of options that will be presented to the City Council, and the workshop on financing is going to happen sometime in June. We're thinking the last City Council meeting in June is the more likely one, so that's June 20<sup>th</sup>.

So, besides looking at different financing options, the City Council at that meeting will also be looking at how and whether to phase development in the EDZ before all the transportation improvements are complete, perhaps allowing the hotels to be built in the EDZ before all of the transportation improvements are complete, as the hotels would only generate a relatively small fraction of the overall traffic in an EDZ. So financing phasing of development will be looked at on June 20<sup>th</sup> by the City Council and then in July, we'll bring the EDZ to the Economic Vitality Committee. Then, shortly thereafter, you will be looking at the EDZ as well and making a recommendation to City Council. So, probably in the August timeframe you'll see the EDZ come before you again and we're thinking September/October for City Council for the first hearing on the project. So, does that answer your question?

Commissioner Ritter: Yeah, it's amazing it takes so long. I understand the vote to process slowed that process.



Weinstein: It's a really big project and the traffic improvements are pretty substantial.

Commissioner Brown: Is there another joint City Council/Planning Commission planning session planned anytime soon?

Weinstein: There aren't any planned.

Chair Balch: Okay, while we're still on Future Planning Calendar, I'd like to know when do things drop off the Future Planning Calendar, specifically, Chabad of the Tri-Valley.

Weinstein: Kendall asks this question all the time and she is a bigger proponent than me of getting rid of some items and maybe we should be more aggressive in trimming the Future Planning Calendar. It's not a scientific algorithm we use to figure out which projects should stay on the Future Planning Calendar so really ones on that that could be alive like the Chabad project, we actually do hear from that applicant every several weeks and he gives us the impression that the real application for that will be submitted soon, so point taken and we'll be critical of keeping items on the Future Planning Calendar.

So the next meeting which is on the 24<sup>th</sup>, it's actually a work session on the....right when you enter Ruby Hill on Ruby Hill Drive there's a big house to your right. We got an application to convert that into a bed and breakfast and build a very large event center and so that would require a major modification to the PUD for that site and so we'll be bringing you a work session on that project.

Commissioner O'Connor: You say a large house, you're talking about the original sales center?

Weinstein: Yes, that's right. That's the next PC meeting and that's the only item scheduled for that one. Then the calendar is a little bit fluid from then on.

### **c. Actions of the City Council**

Commissioner Allen: I was curious on Valley Trails at our last PC meeting the PC requested the developer pay for an increased amount of long-term maintenance for the bathroom. I was wondering what staff recommended to the Council and what amount of additional maintenance.

Weinstein: Yes, that's right. Our initial recommendation was \$200,000 which was about half of the 30 year cost of maintenance and custodial services and so forth because we looked at the overall cost of the restroom. We sort of split the baby initially and brought the City Council in the form of a condition a request that the applicant pay \$200,000 towards long term maintenance costs of the restroom. After talking with the applicant and having additional discussions, we reduced the recommendation to \$70,000 and that's what was ultimately adopted by the City Council.

Commissioner Allen: Okay, so staff reduced the recommendation prior to it going.

Weinstein: Yes, basically it was part of our verbal presentation.

Commissioner Allen: Okay, because I read the staff report and saw the \$200,000 so I was thrown by the....

Weinstein: Yes, it was a last-minute adjustment to our recommendation, again, based on internal conversations and discussions with the applicant and just a sense of what was right for the project based on other public amenities provided by the applicant.

Commissioner Allen: So that covers about 15% of the long-term maintenance and taxpayers are picking up 85%. Okay, thank you.

**d. Actions of the Zoning Administrator**

No discussion was held or action taken.

**e. Matters for Commission's Information**

Weinstein: I'll mention one thing. Every year there's an APA conference that's run by the State chapter which has a lot of great planning-related sessions as you can imagine for an organization like APA that's happening this October in Sacramento. It's not a super local meeting location but it's relatively close by and what we'll do is send out the website link to that conference. We have funds if anybody wants to attend. We'll send out the link and you should let us know if you're interested in attending for a day or a couple of days.

**9. ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Balch adjourned the meeting at 8:26 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kendall Granucci  
Recording Secretary