



TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY
Bicycle, Pedestrian and Traffic Safety
Committee Meeting
Wednesday April 5
8:15 am

Edward Holland, Chair
Angela Hay, Secretary
Patricia Baenen, Member
Gary Hanes, Member
Kevin Welch, Member

SPECIAL HYBRID MEETING
HISTORIC SCHOOLHOUSE – 765 PORTOLA ROAD - PORTOLA VALLEY, CA

REMOTE MEETING COVID-19 MEETING ADVISORY: On September 16, 2021, the Governor signed AB 361, amending the Ralph M. Brown Act (Brown Act) to allow legislative bodies to continue to meet virtually during the present public health emergency. AB 361 is an urgency bill which goes into effect on October 1, 2021. The bill extends the teleconference procedures authorized in Executive Order N-29-20, which expired on September 30, 2021, during the current COVID-19 pandemic and allows future teleconference procedures under limited circumstances defined in the bill.

ASSISTANCE FOR PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the Town Clerk at (650) 851-1700 or by email at mthurman@portolavalley.net 48 hours prior to the meeting start time. Notification 48 hours prior to the meeting will enable the Town to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting.

VIRTUAL PARTICIPATION VIA ZOOM

To access the meeting by computer:

<https://us06web.zoom.us/j/87102524246?pwd=R1ZQdWJGdlJUd2pVMzBCc21Oa05CQT09>

Webinar ID: 871 0252 4246

Passcode: 360206

To access the meeting by phone:

1-669-900-6833 or 1-888-788-0099 (toll-free)

*Mute/Unmute – Press *6 / Raise Hand – Press *9*

- 1. CALL TO ORDER & ROLL CALL**
- 2. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA**
Speakers' time is limited to three minutes.
- 3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**
 - a. Motion to approve the minutes from the March 1st Meeting
- 4. SHERIFF'S REPORT:**
 - a. Review of Citations
 - b. Request for Officer coverage/attention
- 5. PUBLIC WORKS UPDATE:**
 - a. General update
 - b. Request for update on Parking signage At Portola Rd in the Vicinity of Windy Hill access
- 6. DISCUSSION OF COMMITTEE BUDGET NEEDS**
 - a. Outline budget for Outreach, events, Public Notices.
- 7. ONGOING COMMITTEE BUSINESS:**

- a. Request to the town for information on plans to review/update the Circulation Element of the General Plan.
- b. Update From Subcommittee on Alternative Transport and Infrastructure
- c. Committee Structure Review
 - i. Update from Meeting of Chairs (14th March)
 - ii. Discussion and request for input.

8. EVENTS:

- a. Request for notification of and event ideas for the 2023 Calendar
 - i. Bike to/From Work Day
 - ii. Earth Day
 - iii. Town Picnic/Zots to tots

9. MATTERS ARISING:

10. ADJOURNMENT

- a. The next regularly scheduled meeting date is May 3rd 2023

Land Acknowledgement:

The Town of Portola Valley acknowledges the colonial history of this land we dwell upon—the unceded territory of the Ramaytush (rah-my-toosh) Ohlone, Tamien Nation, and Muwekma (mah-WEK-mah) Ohlone, who endured a human and cultural genocide that included removal from their lands and their sacred relationship to the land. Portola Valley recognizes that we profit from the commodification of land seized from indigenous peoples and now bear the ecological consequences. We seek to understand the impact of these legacies on all beings and to find ways to make repair.

TOWN OF PORTOLA VALLEY



Bicycle, Pedestrian and Traffic Safety Community Meeting

Wednesday 1st March 2023 8:15 am

At the Schoolhouse and on Zoom

Bicycle, Pedestrian and Traffic Safety (BPTS) Community Meeting

1 Call to Order and Roll Call

Ed Holland (chair) started the meeting at 8:15 am. In attendance were Ed Holland, Kevin Welch and Angela Hey. Gary Hanes resigned from the committee and Patt Baenen was absent. In addition, Howard Young (public works director) was present in person. Dale Kane and family, residing at 3 Hillbrook Drive, attended in person. Architect Carter Warr also attended in person.

The town planning director, Laura Russell, Jamie Bourne & Jacob (Jake) Garcia (assistant city planners for the Town of Portola Valley under contract from Good City Company), Jay Radke (civil engineer contracted to the Town of Portola Valley public works department from NV5), Caroline Vertongen (resident), Kristi Corley (resident) and Jacquelyn Davis (Trails and Paths Committee member) joined online. Sheriff's Officer Patrick Taylor arrived later online.

A video recording of this meeting is on YouTube at <https://youtu.be/FKLuhhVQiPY>.

2 Oral Communications for Items not on The Agenda

2.1 Report from the Trails and Paths Committee

Jacquelyn Davis, a member of the town Trails and Paths Committee, reported that the committee has been working on a new town trail map as well as a new Safe Routes to School map. The latter shows trails near schools as well as routes to locations of interest – Alpine Hill Tennis and Swimming Club as well as the Town Center. The committee has walked the trails and confirmed easements. She expects to update the community on the maps and Safe Routes to School in the summer. She asked Howard whether the flashing signs at crosswalks, in particular those on Alpine Road, near Alpine Hills & at Triangle Park, and on Portola Road, near Woodside Priory, would be implemented in the summer. Ed noted that the flashing signs at crosswalks project is included for later in the agenda.

She asked for comments from the committee. Angela noted that signage is inadequate. She has frequently observed mountain bikers using trails with signs that forbid cycling. The signs do not face the cyclists, so cyclists do not read them. Signs need to be rotated so they face the cyclists as nobody looks sideways on a bicycle. Jacquelyn said she would note the comment.

2.2 Resident Comments

Caroline Vertongen had sent Ed an email as she believed the February 1st minutes were incomplete. She hoped there would be access to a recording (ed: a video of the meeting is on <https://youtu.be/pKQq0lYVbjw>). She would like to see close captioning of the meeting. (ed: Users can turn this on - see <https://support.zoom.us/hc/en-us/articles/4403492514829>). She suggested close captioning be used to create the minutes.

(ed: On YouTube by clicking 3 dots at the bottom left of the video, a transcript can be seen to the right of the video). Ed suggested she share her ideas with town clerk.

3 Approval of the minutes of February 1st 2023

3.1 February 1st 2023 Minutes

Ed noted there were some inaccuracies in the February minutes and that approval would be postponed until the next BPTS committee meeting.

3.2 Motion to approve a minor change to the minutes from the November 2nd meeting

Ed also noted that the recorded time of adjournment - 9 am, not 9 pm as written in the November minutes – needed correcting – Angela said she had updated them already.

4 Review of Planning Applications

4.1 Request to Retain an Existing Double-Access Driveway for a New Single-Family Residence and Site Development at 3 Hillbrook Drive

Laura Russell, planning and building director, gave some background information on process. The municipal code gives the BPTS committee the authority to decide on double access or loop driveways. The recommendation is then reviewed by the ASCC (Architectural & Site Control Commission).

Jake Garcia explained that the request is to retain a double access driveway at 3 Hillbrook Drive when the site is redeveloped. The existing house will be demolished and a 5041 sq. ft. house with 800 sq. ft. ADU (accessory dwelling unit) is proposed to replace it. The town’s municipal code Section 15.12.300 states “Double-access, or ‘loop,’ driveways with two entrances to a road or street shall not be permitted unless determined necessary for reasons of safety by the traffic committee”.

Homeowner, Dale Kane, said he had lived in Portola Valley for 10 years. The top entrance of the current driveway is close to a curve on Hillbrook and the bottom is close to a Stop sign. The conservation committee was in favor of keeping the existing 1969 driveway as it preserves redwood trees and other native plants. Dale addressed safety. The project’s safety memo points out (a) that a car turning left into the lower driveway entrance near the Stop sign could get rear-ended, presenting a minor safety risk and (b) a car leaving the property by the upper entrance has to contend with a curve and steep hill, meaning that vehicles coming down Hillbrook and the exiting car have limited sight lines. Visitors to a neighboring property also park near the upper driveway entrance.

The town engineer agreed with some of the safety concerns with some caveats, e.g. the chances of a car stopping before turning left into the driveway are slim because it would only stop on the rare occasion a car would simultaneously be descending Hillbrook. Dale agreed with this observation. The town engineer sees existing at the top driveway as “safe enough” – not good enough for Dale. Dale was not as concerned about his own safety. Rather he is concerned that when his children, who were present, become new drivers that they exit and entry the driveway safely.

Ed asked Dale what his Plan B would be if only one driveway was approved. Dale said it would probably be in the middle of the property and require removal of native plantings and redwood trees, resulting in pushback from the Conservation Committee.

Carter Warr, architect, reread the ordinance. He noted that the town has had design reviews since 1967, hence the driveway had been permitted by the town. He does not think it right to revoke permission for a double access driveway because someone builds a new house, unless there are serious safety concerns or there are public works requirements. Laura mentioned that plans that were permitted under old regulations, but are not now

permitted by the municipal code are called “legal nonconforming”. New construction requires sites to be brought up to code when they are redeveloped. Staff have to follow the municipal code, Howard added. He said there were no plans to expand Hillbrook.

Caroline Vertongen supports the residents. She doesn’t agree with the planning department’s interpretation of the municipal code, but agrees with the architect. Ed agreed with the owner. Angela didn’t believe that one driveway entrance would be safer than two, given the terrain. Kevin believed that access for the main home and the ADU would be well-served by the current driveway.

Ed proposed that the BPTS committee accept the proposal for a double-access driveway as presented by the homeowner, seconded by Angela. The proposition was unanimously passed by the committee.

4.2 Request to Retain an Existing Double-Access Driveway for a New Single-Family Residence and Site Development at 127 Ramoso Road

Jamie Bourne presented the case for 127 Ramoso Road where a homeowner wants to retain a double-access driveway for a single-family residence. The applicant plans to demolish the current house, pool and guest house and replace it with a 4592 sq. ft. house with 1396 sq. ft. detached garage, media room, bathroom and pool equipment room, as well as an 800 sq. ft. ADU and a 1200 sq. ft. SB9 unit (accessed through a separate driveway that is not part of this review for the BPTS committee). The applicant wants to move one entrance of the driveway 30ft north.

Town engineering consultant has performed an engineering review of the driveway in consultation with Portola Valley’s public works director, Howard. It looks at the safety of the current driveway. Town staff recommend that the BPTS deny the request for a double access driveway for reasons of safety.

Carter Warr provided a brief presentation with a site plan. The proposed change to the driveway was to keep it double access, but move the south-eastern end of the driveway 30ft closer to the other end. The driveway would be wider and the moved driveway entrance more perpendicular to Ramoso Road. It would come down at a steeper angle to the street than the current driveway. The driveway is designed for safety of people on the site, primarily so they have clear lines of sight. Ed noted that the BPTS was primarily concerned with street safety.

Ed asked Carter to describe the ingress and egress for the main house. He indicated that the geometry and topography of the site mean a double access driveway appears safer than a single access driveway because there is less maneuvering. Carter also noted that when guests visit the property, if they have to back up and turn around on a single driveway that is less safe than if they use a double access driveway, along which they usually park.

Carter said a reason that the proposed driveway was wider than the existing one and shorter was so that the amount of impervious surface did not exceed limits for the site.

Kevin asked for the distance between ingress and egress – Carter answered about 75ft. Neighbors have been notified. In this meeting there were no comments from the public. Ed asked whether a turning circle could be put in place instead of a double access driveway – Carter said it would need tree removal and additional grading. The Conservation Committee noted that there were scrub oaks in the area, not commonly found in Portola Valley. Conservation Committee members prefer that the existing driveway be kept.

Jay Radke recommended that there be a single entrance at the northern end of the driveway with a parking area, not a turning circle, as it had better line of sight.

Kevin wanted to take a look at the site. Ed didn’t want to incur any delay in the process. Angela thought the curves aren’t that steep and there is little traffic and no evidence of crashes on the curve. She believed that the

decision was between the proposed driveway and the existing one – both double access driveways. Carter emphasized that the original plan was well thought out and the driveway’s location regarded safety, given the topography. Retaining the existing driveway would protect more trees. Angela asked Carter if the proposed driveway was steeper coming into Ramoso Road than the existing driveway – he said it was and that a critical design consideration was to have safe parking for guests and family that are not using the garage.

Ed asked for the date of the original driveway – Carter didn’t know but he said that he thought it dated from the 50s and 60s in which case the Westridge Homeowners Association would have approved it. Carter said that the homeowners association has been notified of the plans and they were concerned about the 2nd ADU, but other site features were acceptable to them.

An informal poll of committee members was taken to see which of the double-access driveways was preferred Ed and Angela wanted to retain the existing driveway. Kevin still wanted to see the site.

Ed proposed that the committee recommend retaining a double-access driveway that keeps the current access points. Angela seconded this proposal and Kevin agreed. So the proposal passed unanimously.

5 Public Works Update

5.1 General Update

Parking – no reported issues on Golden Oak, Portola Road or other popular parking spots. Heavy rain had deterred hikers at Windy Hill and outdoor diners at the Alpine Inn so fewer people have been parking recently. Storm-related work is being carried out – clearing roads and trails.

5.2 Request for update on Tree Removal at Brookside/Portola

The public works department is going into contract with a contractor to remove the tree, most likely in mid-March when the weather is better.

5.3 Request for update on Parking signage At Portola Rd in the Vicinity of Windy Hill access

The public works department is working on signage, as well on the rapid flashing beacons at crosswalks in other parts of the town.

5.4 Resident Comments

Kristi Corley said there was a tree on Golden Oak leaning on a power pole, she would like someone from PG&E to look at it. Howard said that PVConnect was the way to report problems. Howard had sent a crew out to look at the tree which is on private property. Kristi said that we should support single older adults who may need help with their trees.

6 Sheriff’s Report

Kristi Corley wanted access to the Sheriff’s report so that the public can comment on it – she said she’s asked for this for every meeting. She says it is the largest contract in Portola Valley and we need the report for citizen safety. She claimed that the appropriate paperwork for the state has not been filled out in a timely fashion which delayed their use of lidar to identify speeders.

Patrick Taylor gave the report.

6.1 Review of Citations

In January there were 2 accidents, compared with 4 in 2022. Both were on Alpine Road, one was a major injury collision with a bicycle. The committee has been sent a copy of the report. Kristi asked where the Alpine Road accident with a cyclist occurred. Patrick replied at Alpine and Arastradero.

Patrick also reformatted the annual report for 2022, which separates bicycle citations and accidents.

Ed would like the town to include the police reports on the BPTS committee page on the town website. Patrick said the San Mateo County Sheriff's office plans to include accident information on their website. It should be searchable in the next month, or so.

Kristi also asked how the public could get a copy of the report – she thought it would be best added to the agenda. Ed said he believed he would get it in time to add it to the agenda.

7 **Adjournment and Next Meeting**

Ed adjourned the meeting at 9:35 am. The next regularly scheduled meeting date is April 5, 2023 at 8:15 a.m.

DRAFT: Proposal For Simplifying and Clarifying Committee Operations

Goal

The goal of this initiative is to strengthen our volunteer community and improve overall operational efficiency for both volunteers and staff. Brown-Act rules, that generally assume more political governing bodies, can be cumbersome for our volunteer committee members and staff. Below are ideas for alternative committee structures that allow more flexible committee organization. This initiative is part of the 2022-2023 Council Priorities.

Process

Review the current operating procedures for committees (eg, Brown Act requirements, in-person vs remote participation) by the Committee of Committees (committee chairs or their representative, and the council subcommittee (Sarah and Craig)). The committee representatives would collect feedback from their respective committees to be incorporated into a working draft to be reviewed by the Committee of Committees and submitted to the Council.

Alternative Committee Structures For Discussion

How do we continue to support and enhance our volunteer culture of involvement and inclusiveness? Use both the volunteer and staff resources wisely? Possible committee structures are listed below for discussion and refinement. A Council subcommittee is called out in the table. This subcommittee is different from the Council Liaison. The purpose of the subcommittee is to ensure that there is coordination across all committees with respect to charter and membership without violating the Brown Act. For Brown Act Committees this role is fulfilled by the entire Council.

CRITERIA	Brown Act Committee	Non-Brown Act Committee	Group
Description	Current structure.	Closer to the original PV committee intent.	Supports key Town events, projects and initiatives.
Member Appointment	By Council	By Council subcommittee	Open membership
Meeting Requirement for Members	In person	In person or hybrid	In person or hybrid
Public Participation	In person or hybrid	In person or hybrid	In person or hybrid
Charter	Formal defined by the Council	Defined by the Non-Brown Act Committee, approved by Council subcommittee	
Noticing	Yes, per Brown (72 hrs)	Yes, TBD on exact timing	Yes, in Town calendar
Agenda Setting	Yes, per Brown Act, with review by Council liaison and Town Manager	Yes, with review by Council liaison (possibly self-serve in the future).	TBD

DRAFT: Proposal For Simplifying and Clarifying Committee Operations

Minutes	Yes, per Brown Act	Yes, non-Brown Act*	TBD
Council Access	Direct	Direct	Direct
Council liaison	Assigned	Assigned	Assigned
Staff member	Assigned	As needed	As needed
Issue resolution	As needed, Chair to Council liaison to Town Manager (to Council if needed)	As needed, Chair to Council liaison to Town Manager (to Council if needed)	As needed, Chair to Council liaison to Town Manager (to Council if needed)
PROS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maximum oversight 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flexibility for committee members* • Hybrid meetings • Lower impact on staff/resources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maximum flexibility for group members* • Hybrid meetings • Lowest impact on staffing/resources

* To be determined: Examples: simplify agenda setting and meeting noticing, provide flexibility on in-person requirements, determine quorum requirement, video recording, action vs detailed minutes, etc.

Questions for Committees to Consider:

1. Does the “Alternative Committee Structures” above seem like a step in the right direction?
2. Is your committee open to changing to an alternative non-Brown Act body? If so, is Alt 1 or Alt 2 appealing, or is there another alternative that would work better for your committee?
3. How should we handle hybrid meeting (zoom) participation for committee members and residents under the different alternative structures? Examples: full remote participation, limited participation, viewing only, no remote. Should it be uniform by committee type or at the discretion of each committee?
4. Type of minutes: action, summary or verbatim minutes?
5. Thoughts on reducing required staff time given we have 17 committees?
6. Do you have ideas for increasing volunteer participation?
7. How can we make it easier to volunteer?

DRAFT: Proposal For Simplifying and Clarifying Committee Operations

Current Committee List (for reference)

Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Traffic Safety
Cable and Utilities Undergrounding
Conservation
Cultural Arts
Emergency Preparedness
Finance and Audit
Geologic Safety
Historic Resources
Nature and Science
Open Space
Parks and Recreation
Public Works
Race and Equity
Sustainability
Trails and Paths
Wildfire Preparedness
Woodside Highlands Road Maintenance

DRAFT: Proposal For Simplifying and Clarifying Committee Operations

Minutes From Committee of Committee Meeting 3/14/2023

Committee: Proposal for simplifying and clarifying committee operations

Tuesday, March 14, 2023

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** 4:40 PM
2. **PUBLIC COMMENTS:** None

Attending:

Town Council: Craig Taylor, Sarah Wernikoff

Judith Murphy (Moderator)

Bicycle Pedestrian and Traffic Safety: Ed Holland

Conservation: Catherine McGill (Zoom)

Emergency Preparedness: Dale Pfau (Zoom), Jerry Shefren

Finance and Audit: George Savage

Geologic Safety: Nan Shostak, Gary Ernst, Chet and Bob Wrucke

Historic Resources: Nancy Lund

Open Space: Betsy Morgenthaler

Parks and Recreation: Patty Dewes

Public Works: Alex Doherty

Sustainability: Scott Elrod, Rebecca Flynn

Trails and Paths: Gary Hanning

Wildfire Preparedness: Jennifer Hammer

Public: Anne Kopf-Sill, Dave Cardinal, Rita Comes, Kristi Corley

3. DISCUSSION ITEMS

a. Discuss “Proposal For Simplifying and Clarifying Committee Operations” Craig opened the meeting by welcoming and thanking all who were attending, particularly given the weather conditions. The purpose of the meeting was to convene the Towns’ Committee Chairs to get their input on a framework for improving the overall operational efficiency for both volunteers and staff. This initiative originated as part of the Town Council’s 2022-23 Council Priorities. He stressed that this was NOT a decision-making meeting, but an introduction and invitation for discussion.

The meeting outcomes were to:

- Review the DRAFT of the alternative committee structures
- Gather initial POV, concerns, questions, etc.
- Incorporate the input and update the DRAFT
- Ask the Chairs to take the DRAFT to their Committees for discussion
- Reconvene, at some future date, to reiterate the proposal

The goal would be to take the proposal to the Town Council for approval, hopefully by the end of the fiscal year and then incorporate the changes in an overall update of the Committee Handbook.

DRAFT: Proposal For Simplifying and Clarifying Committee Operations

Sarah provided some background – we have about 400 volunteers in a town w/ ~3600 adults for a participation rate of 11%. This is great but there is feedback from the Committees and staff that:

- It is becoming increasingly challenging to accommodate and comply w/ Brown Act requirements
- There are opportunities to improve alignment between Town Council and Committee priorities
- Not all committee policies and procedures are being implemented consistently
- Aspects of the Committee Handbook are ambiguous and outdated
- All or some of these factors “may” affect our ability to attract more volunteers

Comments regarding the framework:

Point of Clarification: ANY committee appointed by the full Town Council (permanent or ad hoc) is subject to the Brown Act.

Point of Clarification: ALL our Committees are “advisory.” This means they might not have been subject to Brown Act requirements given that all decisions need to be reviewed by the Town Council before implementation. Only the Planning Commission and the ASCC can make decisions which can then be appealed to the Town Council, if needed.

Overall:

- Can the framework ID the committees that are “required” by the General Plan (Conservation, Trails, BPTS) and why? This would “help” the other committees have some clarification about what is squarely in column #1.
- Can the framework ID what actions committees in columns #2 and #3 can engage in. . . What types of decisions can they make, documents they can review?
- Charter – very important and must be defined clearly for all 3 columns
- Description – supportive of strong volunteer participation is true for all 3 columns
- Member appointment: Town Council subcommittee to approve member appointments is all they do; the committee’s primary relationship is still w/ their Council liaisons for all other business.
- Agenda setting: Would like clarity on this for Columns 2 & 3, sometimes staff input is helpful and/or needed.
- Council Liaison: A goal of this structure would be to strengthen the relationship between the Council liaison and the committees
- Issue resolution, does not need to go through all levels unless necessary
- Transparency is STILL very important; we will get judged on how well this is handled. Somewhere in the process, the public must have transparency, through budget review, Town Council review, some other method. . . ?

Overall comments:

- There is general support for the approach, outline, opening the discussion
- There is general agreement that committees would LOVE to have some flexibility and/or be released from Brown Act requirements.
- There is concern about transparency and communication, especially if it involves issues critical to our residents, i.e. safety

DRAFT: Proposal For Simplifying and Clarifying Committee Operations

- Concerned about enforcement. This will potentially put more work on the council liaisons to be gatekeepers
- Residents still want to participate; how do we ensure this will happen?
- Elephant in the room, do we have too many committees that spread our limited volunteerism too thin?
- Chairs should bring back examples from their committee discussions.
- Chairs should be **more specific about what is meant by transparency.** . .

Actions:

- Dewes to provide notes to Craig/Sarah
- DRAFT to be updated and distributed to all Chairs
- Chairs take DRAFT to Committees for review and discussion
- Chairs to provide feedback to Craig/Sarah (Dewes to consolidate)
- Next meeting TBD

3b. Council priorities rollout - Deferred

4. **ADJOURNMENT:** 6:20 PM