



CITY COUNCIL AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AGENCY MINUTES

Regular Meeting
Tuesday, June 4, 2002
7:30 p.m.

Menlo Park Council Chamber
801 Laurel Street, Menlo Park

6:00 p.m. CLOSED SESSION - in the Administration Conference Room located on the first floor at City Hall, 701 Laurel Street, Menlo Park. (Members of the public may speak to the Closed Session item at this time; three minutes per speaker.)

ADJOURN TO CLOSED SESSION

1. Closed Session pursuant to Government Code Section §54956.8 regarding property negotiations for: 507 Hamilton, APN 055-341-080; Rear of 507 Hamilton, APN 055-341-020; 511 Hamilton, APN 055-341-090; 525 Hamilton, 055-341-120; 547 Hamilton, APN 055-341-160; vacant lot, APN 055-341-190; vacant lot, APN 055-341-200

Negotiating Parties: David Boesch, City Manager/Executive Director, Bill McClure, City Attorney, and Don de la Pena, Housing and Redevelopment Director.

RECONVENE IN OPEN SESSION – 7:25 p.m.

REPORT ON AFOREMENTIONED CLOSED SESSION – No reportable actions at this time.

REGULAR MEETING – Held in the Council Chambers.

ROLL CALL – Mayor Schmidt called the meeting to order at 7:35 p.m. Mayor Pro Tem Kinney and Councilmembers Borak and Jellins were present. Councilmember Collacchi was absent.

A. PRESENTATIONS AND PROCLAMATIONS

1. A Proclamation to honor the Menlo Park Chamber of Commerce.

The proclamation was read by Mayor Pro Tem Kinney and presented by Mayor Schmidt to Al Filice, president of the Chamber of Commerce. Mayor Pro Tem Kinney announced that the City received an award for its 75th Anniversary from the Chamber of Commerce during the Chamber's Golden Acorn Awards event.

B. ANNOUNCEMENTS, APPOINTMENTS AND REPORTS

1. Arts Commission (one vacancy) with an application deadline of June 4, 2002 and the Housing Commission (one vacancy) with an application deadline of July 2, 2002 – Mayor Schmidt announced the current vacancies.

2. Councilmember Reports: Schmidt, Kinney, Borak, Collacchi, Jellins.

Mayor Pro Tem Kinney reported on Phase 2 of the El Camino Real tree-planting project.

Councilmember Jellins thanked the public for walking Santa Cruz Avenue with the Mayor on June 1, 2002. He announced the special meeting of June 19, 2002 at 7:00 p.m. to discuss the striping plan for Santa Cruz Avenue and that another walk is scheduled on June 15, 2002 at 9 a.m. to begin in Fremont Park.

C. PUBLIC COMMENT #

Tom Harrison, Menlo Park, requested pulling the Bayfront Park contract from the consent calendar for further discussion and urged the Council to reconsider playfields at that location. He suggested returning the matter to the Parks and Recreation Commission or the Planning Commission for further exploration before finalizing the contract.

Chris Golde, Menlo Park, urged the Council to emphasize open space use for Bayfront Park and to consider separating the landfill mitigation funds from other park maintenance funds.

Pat White, Menlo Park, commented about the funding sources for the Santa Cruz Avenue improvements and questioned the total money spent to date for this project.

Staff provided clarification about the Santa Cruz project costs.

D. CONSENT CALENDAR

Mayor Schmidt read the consent calendar items. Councilmember Jellins pulled items 2 and 3.

M/S Kinney/Schmidt to approve consent calendar items 1 and 4 as presented. Motion passed 4-0, with Councilmember Collacchi absent.

1. Approval of audited bills for period 48 ending May 24, 2002.
4. Approval of minutes for the City Council meeting of May 7, 2002.

Pulled item

2. Approval of an Agreement with Brown, Vence and Associates, Inc. in the amount of \$29,743 to perform a Bayfront Park/Marsh Road Landfill funding analysis to identify and assess possible alternatives to fund costs associated with the site and approval of a total budget in an amount not to exceed \$32,743.

Councilmember Jellins noted that he had discussed this item with staff to fully understand the implications of this decision with respect to segregating the expense of park maintenance from the expense of landfill remediation. He believes the segregation of funds should occur both historically and on an ongoing basis. He said that he received assurance from staff that it will conduct a research on the funding sources and expenditures for Council information. With this understanding, he said he would support staff's recommendation.

Staff reiterated it would look into the funding sources and how they are used over time and provide that information to Council.

M/S Jellins/Schmidt to approve item number 2 as presented.

Mayor Pro Tem Kinney said that the agreement would provide a process to explore other funding sources, ideas and methodologies and it would not preclude open space for playfields.

Councilmember Borak concurred with Councilmember Kinney and favored continuing to look at recreational uses for the Park such as play and practice fields and a driving range, in addition to seeking funding sources.

Councilmember Jellins noted the change in Council's sentiment about uses for Bayfront Park, compared to the meeting in May, and asked staff when this matter would be brought back to the Council to discuss more active recreational uses.

Staff suggested addressing the issues of landfill costs and recreational uses sequentially because regardless of the decision to consider recreational uses on the Park, there would still be the landfill cost issue and it would help Council to have a full understanding of how that cost would be met before considering additional development and maintenance costs on the site. Staff said it would have to confer with the Community Services Department to coordinate a feasible timeline.

Councilmember Jellins asked for Council clarification on its direction to staff.

Councilmember Kinney noted that his position tonight is the same as it was in May. Mayor Schmidt suggested putting the request for Council reconsideration in writing and bringing it back to the Council, rather than reversing Council's previous direction to staff tonight. He recalled that the Council's position in May was to pursue passive recreational uses based on the fact that none of the revenue-generating uses presented at that time met the needs of the residents or the Council. He agreed with staff's suggestion to first address the issue of evaluating non-land use revenue-generating funding sources for the Park before revisiting the issue of considering active recreational uses.

Councilmember Jellins asked Councilmember Borak for a clarification of her position.

Councilmember Borak clarified that her understanding of Council's direction in May was to address revenue-generating options in order to pay for the landfill related costs. She added that the City has about a year or two left in funds to cover the leachate costs and it is important to move forward with the process of exploring and studying that issue first.

Councilmember Jellins stated he is not suggesting ceasing the study process. He said that he wanted to clarify Council's position with respect to non-passive uses. He said that if there is a willingness among the Council to look at other uses, it should be considered promptly and Council could direct staff to bring back a timeline and a procedure to consider them.

Motion passed 4-0, with Councilmember Collacchi absent.

Pulled item

3. Ratification of the appointments of Mayor Steve Schmidt to the Policy Advisory Committee and Jamal Rahimi to the Technical Advisory Committee as requested by C/CAG relative to the 2020 Peninsula Gateway Corridor Study.

Councilmember Jellins said he would abstain on this item.

M/S Kinney/Borak to approve item number 3. Motion passed 3-0, with Councilmember Jellins abstaining and Councilmember Collacchi absent.

E. PUBLIC HEARING

1. Fiscal Year 2002-03 Budgets for the City of Menlo Park, Capital Improvement Projects, and Community Redevelopment Agency.

City Manager Boesch presented the staff report.

Councilmember Kinney requested an additional \$3,000 for the City's contribution to the San Francisquito Creek Joint Powers Authority.

Council concurred.

Mayor Schmidt opened the public hearing.

Tom Harrison, Menlo Park, commented about the railway and the City's plan for the streets that cross the railroad tracks.

Jamal Rahimi, Transportation Manager, provided an update to Council about the grade separation crossings.

Mayor Schmidt closed the public hearing at 8:32 p.m.

Staff responded to questions regarding potential state takeaways, the various funds, measuring results, charting the rate of growth/reduction of expenditures, fund reserves, police services and staffing,

City Manager Boesch clarified that there is no action required by the Council tonight. He said that the budget is scheduled to come back for adoption on June 18 with an amendment to include the \$3,000 for the San Francisquito Creek Joint Powers Authority as requested by Councilmember Kinney.

F. REGULAR BUSINESS

Mayor Schmidt changed the order of the agenda and moved up item F3 to this part of the agenda.

- F3. Adoption of an Ordinance by the City Council of the City of Menlo Park amending Title 16 (Zoning) of the Menlo Park Municipal Code by adding Chapter 16.69 thereto relating to public artwork, which would assess a percentage of building fees to install public art in commercial, industrial and municipal buildings; and, approval of an appropriation of the amount of \$8,500 from the General Fund Operating Reserves to hire a consultant to develop a Policies and Procedures Handbook.
- a. Waive the reading of the Ordinance
 - b. Adopt the Ordinance

Curtis Brown, Director of Community Services, presented the staff report.

Nancy Chillag, Arts Commission Chair, provided additional background and commented about the results of the cultural needs assessment and the annual survey noting a strong support for public art.

Michael Lambert, Menlo Park, noted that the annual survey shows a four percent response, which means that people are ambivalent about public art, and questioned the validity of public support for public art in general and whether there is support for public art through private development or through the City.

M/S Kinney/Schmidt to waive the reading of the ordinance. Motion passed 4-0, with Councilmember Collacchi absent.

M/S Kinney/Schmidt to adopt the ordinance as presented. Motion passed 3-1, with Councilmember Borak dissenting and Councilmember Collacchi absent.

Councilmember Borak expressed her opposition because she does not believe that this is the right approach to take to encourage public art. She felt that many of the supporters for public art will be disappointed that the one percent will go to a piece of art outside a commercial building.

1. Review of proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendments and Design Guidelines pertaining to single-family residential development.

Tracy Cramer, Senior Planner, presented the staff report with overhead slides and noted the additional letters that were received.

Earl Shelton, Menlo Park, asked that Council engage input from the community in its review process and noted the importance of addressing privacy issues. He also commented about the 15-day overlay response time.

Sam Sinnott, Menlo Park, noted letters to Council containing his comments about the two-story development permit process, regulations and guidelines. He suggested that in the two-story development permit process, the City could require only homes with a fifty percent or more improvement, to submit, which matches the current requirements for use permits. He also suggested requiring a group of concerned individuals to file appeals on projects rather than a single individual. He stated that the roof dormer intrusions into the daylight plane ought to be allowed under the proposed regulations. Under the design guidelines, he suggested changing the standards for access to sunlight.

Elliott Jones, Menlo Park, was not present.

Edwin Brink, Menlo Park, does not support the involvement of the Council and the Planning Commission in the administrative review process. He said that his neighborhood in Lorelei Manor would support a zoning overlay.

Susan Shoening, Menlo Park, supports the proposed amendments and would recommend an overlay zoning for Lorelei Manor.

Tom Harrison, Menlo Park, stated that 97 percent of residents in Suburban Park signed a petition opposing the proposed permit process because the neighborhood supports two-story development. He said that since Menlo Park is made up of neighborhoods, the City should address development for each neighborhood separately based on its character and nature.

Davena Gentry, Menlo Park, deferred her comments to a later time.

Mark Louie, Menlo Park, said that the current zoning regulations are restrictive and make it difficult to build or expand on existing properties. He likes the user-friendly approach of the guidelines. He said that some of the other proposed changes would make the process more restrictive for certain categories of development such as for two-story development. He concurred with previous suggestion to require a group versus a single individual with respect to appeals. He encouraged Council to seek some balance.

Sue Kayton, Menlo Park, said it is important to find a balance between the needs of the builder and the neighbor. She suggested that instead of having overlay districts where people can opt out of the ordinance, let people opt in.

Cindy Marty, Menlo Park, expressed opposition to the proposed changes because they would take away property owner rights. She referred to last year's petition from Suburban Park and Lorelei Manor opposing these restrictions. She suggested that rather than changing the current regulations, why not ask those neighborhoods with concerns to present documented proof that a majority of their neighbors object to the current regulations and that they desire to opt in to restrictive changes.

Teri O'Neel, Menlo Park, said that much of the proposed changes relate to the same issues that the Suburban Park neighborhood communicated to the Council a couple of years ago. She reiterated that Suburban Park likes two story homes because they allow the homeowners to stay and invest in their property. She urged the Council to leave the current regulations as they are. She reiterated Mayor Pro Tem Kinney and Councilmember Collacchi's support of two years ago regarding two-story development in Suburban Park.

Terry Thygesen, Menlo Park, expressed concern about the proposed new daylight plane and the 35 percent second story regulations because of aesthetics and that it would encourage a flat roof style of architecture. She suggested considering a case-by-case approach to the neighborhoods.

Maria Hilton, Menlo Park, provided background about the Residential Review Task Force process noting that at the first meeting an agenda was already in place as opposed to opening the discussion with general comments and ideas from the participants. She questioned where the mandate is to change the current regulations and suggested that if these changes were to occur, to put it to a vote. She noted that most of the houses are built within the law and are built to the maximum. She suggested changing the maximum so that people will build to the new maximum. She asked what is going to happen with the work put forth by the task force.

Jose Fernandez, Menlo Park, commented that the proposed regulations would subject two story homes to a discretionary review, which allows for a disregard of the established laws and could become political. He expressed concern about Section 16.8.2 A and B regarding the provisions for building or modifying a second story and exceptions to that. He expressed opposition to the proposed ordinance and suggested eliminating Section 16.82 regarding discretionary review.

David Alfano, Menlo Park, said that the design guidelines are subjective and would invite controversy. He said that the changing membership in the Planning Commission would result in inconsistent implementation. He feels it will spawn controversy among neighbors and throughout the city. He supports the intent of preventing monster homes but feels that the proposed ordinance is inadequate and should be rewritten and voted on by the people.

Eric Johnson, Menlo Park, expressed opposition to the proposed ordinance. He questioned the 2/3 opt out feature and suggested a simple majority to opt out or instead to allow neighborhoods to opt in. Furthermore, he suggested the ordinance be the subject of a vote of the people.

Al Filice, Menlo Park, concurred with the concerns and opposition expressed. He questioned the definition of a basement and how it applies to the floor area ratio.

Staff provided clarification about the basement provisions.

Marian Kremer, Menlo Park, concurred with the concerns raised by others and is concerned about the restrictions for additions or expansions. She urged Council to listen to the majority, focus on the issue about the monster homes and not to change what is not broken.

Davena Gentry, did not speak.

Eric Gilbertson, Menlo Park, noted there is a benefit to setting guidelines that address the whole city. He suggested including quantitative measures that have distinctive exemptions for a reasonable second story development.

Jeff McColloch, Menlo Park, concurred with the concerns raised and questioned the warrant for changing the current regulations. He commented about the impact of the proposed changes particularly to small lots.

Anita Depry, Menlo Park, felt that there is a better way to approach the issue of monster homes than one standard for all. She noted that it is important to communicate with the builder or developer to design a home that will complement the existing neighborhood.

Joseph MacMahon, Menlo Park, expressed concern about the proposed changes because they would make it difficult to build on or expand properties especially on small lots. He said that the architectural review process is nebulous.

Mayor Schmidt commented that it is clear to him that one set of standards will not work for all. He commented about the pros and cons of two story houses. He liked the suggestion of allowing neighborhoods to opt in to the regulations, and changing the language to require a group of individuals rather than a single individual to file an appeal. He thought that the foundation of the proposed ordinance may be more than some neighborhoods would like. He supports setting provisions to protect solar access separate from daylight plane. He suggested maximizing pervious surfaces on all properties.

Councilmember Jellins concurred with most of the comments of Mayor Schmidt, however, he suggested the process go slow in terms of how the proposed changes will be implemented. He thought that an alternative procedure of opting in, as suggested, is a different approach to a neighborhood-zoning overlay. He said that there are neighborhoods that do not want changes and there are those that do and the City should make those changes available to them. He would support a change in the ordinance that addresses neighborhood desires. He said that there are certain details in the proposal pertaining to design aspects such as solar access and daylight plane that need further discussion. He suggested eliminating the substandard lot classification and establishing a fair, equitable and objective review process for development. He said that if the mandate from the community is to make the review process smoother for all involved, then that is how the City should proceed. He does not feel that the proposed ordinance will serve the interest of the community as a whole.

Councilmember Borak said that she agrees that there is a problem with large out of scale houses in some neighborhoods. She is happy that some neighborhoods are content with the large and two story homes in their neighborhoods, but many people have expressed serious concerns about new construction and second story additions that are out of character with their neighborhoods. She cited other cities in the area that have revised their ordinances to address these issues. She supports a majority of the changes stated in the proposed ordinance and guidelines. She agrees that the 15-day overlay response time is too short and that counting basements that start more than 30" above grade as a story should be modified. She is concerned about wedding cake-looking houses. She supports the proposed plan in concept and most of the details in the plan. She concurred with Ms. Fergusson's suggestion about story poles and Mr. Sinnott's comment that eliminating dormers would not be a good thing. She recommended moving forward with the proposal and thought it would help review projects on conforming and nonconforming lots.

Councilmember Kinney provided background of how this issue evolved. He said that the proposed ordinance will create a review process for substandard or nonconforming lots. He does not see anything wrong with two story buildings particularly if they have a good design. He likes the administrative review process and would prefer applications not going through the Planning Commission unless they are appealed. He believes compatibility is an essential component. He suggests that projects at 85 percent FAL not have to go to the Planning Commission. He clarified that the intent of the guidelines is to address large and bulky two-story projects. He expressed concern about wedding cake-looking designs. He thought that the attic and ceiling heights requires additional review with staff. He supports the daylight plane provisions. He thought that it would be all right if certain neighborhoods had specific changes to fit their needs. He does not agree with requiring a group of individuals to appeal a project rather than a single individual. He would support aesthetic design characteristics for second stories. He said that the guidelines are good but lengthy and should be streamlined.

In response to Mayor Schmidt, City Attorney McClure clarified that the Council can adopt an ordinance that would apply citywide with the exception of some neighborhoods that will be subject to either the current or modified set of regulations. He suggested continuing the matter to another Council meeting and staff will bring back a set of questions for Council direction. He noted that staff has taken notes of the comments and concerns that have been expressed by the public and Council and will be taking them into consideration.

The Council concurred to bring the matter back on July 16 for further consideration.

Mayor Schmidt declared a ten minute recess.

2. City Council Approval of: 1) Improvement Measures in the Phase I Traffic Safety and Management Plan for the Middle Avenue and Oak Knoll School Area, and 2) An Allocation of \$89,000 from the Current Traffic Impact Fee Account to Fund the Implementation of Certain Phase I Improvements.

City Manager Boesch suggested a substitute recommendation to continue this item to another date, after receiving tonight's presentation and public comments. He clarified that the reasons for this suggested change are because of the numerous emails and feedback that have been received by staff, a West Bay Sanitary District project that might complicate the implementation of this project, and an incomplete Council.

Jamal Rahimi, Transportation Manager, presented the staff report and introduced Jim West, Consultant.

Jim West, Consultant, provided an overhead presentation about the study area and plan.

Staff responded to questions regarding stop signs, speed reduction measures, patrolling, parking, sidewalks, and parking notices.

Dan Finlay, Menlo Park, commented about the bureaucratic process. He said he does not oppose stop signs but does not like the speed bumps. He commented about enforcing the speed limit and increasing and posting the speed fines. He provided Council with his written comments.

Martin Beurger, Menlo Park, noted the shoulder area near Brandon Way is deteriorated and should be fixed. He suggested eliminating the speed bumps from the plan. He questioned taking a slow approach in implementing the recommendations since school starts in September and hopes that some of the measures would be implemented by then.

Janet Gilmore, Menlo Park, said that she is happy to see sidewalks being considered but questioned why sidewalks end in certain areas. She also questioned the use of speed bumps on Oak Avenue and suggested putting a bike lane and narrowing the car lane and noted the problems about student pick up. She suggested police patrol at Middle Avenue.

Elias Blawie, Menlo Park, supported staff's recommendation to defer this item. He noted shortcomings in the process and the inadequate information in the public notice. He said that the negative comments received tonight should convey a message to the Council. He questioned the consultant's comments about traffic. He supports many of the objectives and recommendations but not the process.

Carel VeenHuyzen, Menlo Park, did not know about the stop sign on San Mateo Drive until recently. He said that although the intent is safety, that is not going to be the case. He said that the other recommendations are useful like the striping and parking restrictions.

Clark Bloom, Menlo Park, expressed support for the recommendations and referred to a petition of support with 21 signatures. He said that he would opt for safety even if it meant noise from cars stopping at the speed bumps.

Mr. & Mrs. Finkle, Menlo Park, expressed concerns about backed up traffic in front of their driveway and suggested a stoplight instead. There was also concern about the children's safety, overdone street markings. She suggested enforcing the speed limit on Middle Avenue.

Mark Louie, Menlo Park, favored a stop sign at San Mateo and Middle Avenue because it protects the intersection and provides safety for school children crossing. He said there is a speeding problem on Middle and suggested extending the sidewalks on Middle Avenue. He would support parking restrictions on Middle Avenue and opposed the curb extensions for Phase 2.

Heidi Welch, Menlo Park, opposed striping of any kind on White Oak Drive for safety reasons. She supports the comments of the Oak Knoll School Traffic Committee in Attachment A. She suggested making the proposed No Left Turn sign from White Oak onto Oak Knoll Lane during peak commute hours sign a temporary sign to determine the impact to traffic flow. She also expressed concern about the overnight parking in the multi family residential area when those residents are out of town.

Adrienne Fioretti, Menlo Park, would support making Middle Avenue safer for children and bicyclists. She would support the added signage, painted crosswalks and limited parking hours. She expressed concerns about the proposed stop sign due to the traffic congestion, noise and pollution that could result from slowing traffic down. She suggested speed bumps on Middle Avenue and signage for pedestrian crossing and bicyclists.

Mary Kay Kroeger, Menlo Park, support the measures with the recent comments incorporated and urged the new police chief to make traffic enforcement a priority. She reported about traffic statistics in the area and urged the implementation of the proposed measures in time for the start of school.

Mary Gilles, Menlo Park, expressed safety concerns for pedestrians and bicyclists because of speeders and a high volume of traffic at peak time. She expressed frustration about the time and process for these measures and urged the Council to consider them even as temporary measures and implement them before the start of school. She questioned the lack of traffic enforcement by the police.

Peter Hart, Menlo Park, provided a presentation with photos showing the curvature of curbs and bicyclists at Oak and Sand Hill intersection. He recommended removing the right hand curb and putting the original one back.

Tamara Suden, Menlo Park, favored the stop sign on Middle Avenue. She provided data about traffic speed in that area. She suggested enforcing speed on Middle Avenue and referred to a petition, which was submitted to the City supporting the stop sign on Middle and San Mateo, enforcing speed and lowering the speed limit to 25 mph. She stated that the last major study conducted on Middle Avenue in 1993 recommended the installation of a stop sign on Middle and San Mateo and a 25 mph speed limit and urged the Council to not waste any more time on this matter.

Terry Thygesen, Menlo Park, urged the Council to move ahead expeditiously in time for the start of school in the fall. She expressed support slowing the traffic on Middle Avenue and questioned whether diverting traffic to San Mateo is a good idea.

Carol Orton, Menlo Park, urged the Council to do something before school starts. She noted several measures on Attachment A and the suggested revisions from Oak Knoll School that can be implemented including the parking restriction on Oakfield and Oak Knoll Lane, a crosswalk at Oakfield and White Oak and increase traffic enforcement in that area.

Spomenka Djorbjevic, Menlo Park, was not present.

Susan Young, Menlo Park, recommended enforcing the speed limits, upgrading existing crosswalks, updating crosswalk signs and adding a new one at Oakfield and White Oak Lane, completing sidewalks on Middle, repairing Oak Avenue, and restricting parking on Oak between Lemon and Oak Knoll Lane and on White Oak between Oakfield and Oak Knoll Lane.

Dan Hilberman, Menlo Park, suggested placing temporary No Parking signs and temporary striping for a trial period.

Eric Olson, expressed support for many of the proposed measures but is opposed to the proposed stop sign because he feels the information supporting it is incomplete, especially regarding the back up traffic that he believes will result from it. He said that the start of school would be a good time to test the proposed measures.

Eric Gilbertson, Menlo Park, agreed with some of the recommendations. He opposed the stop sign on Middle Avenue and thought that a stop sign just on San Mateo might be safer. He suggested speed humps on Middle Avenue. He does not support shoulder striping on local streets and suggested tightening the curves at Oak and Oak Knoll.

Joe Fantuzzi, Menlo Park, Bicycle Commission, commented about the Commission meetings held for this matter. He felt that the San Mateo stop sign is a localized issue and should be dealt with separately. He said that the people have provided comments and thought that there is enough information to make a decision tonight on the general issues.

Councilmember Borak expressed support for the proposed recommendations with some modifications. She said she is reluctant in moving forward tonight without additional noticing to the public for more input.

Councilmember Kinney believes that certain elements of the plan can move forward such as crosswalks, with signage, sidewalks at Cotton and Hermosa, and speed enforcement. He felt that the stop sign may warrant further investigation.

M/S Jellins/Kinney to approve the following measures for implementation:

- **Construct sidewalk extension on Middle Avenue between Hermosa and Cotton; repair sidewalk on Oak between Pembroke and Brandon**
- **No parking on the north side of White Oak between Oakfield and Oak Knoll**
- **No left turns from White Oak onto Oak Knoll at 8:00 a.m. to 8:30 a.m. as recommended by the school safety committee**
- **Install crosswalks at Oakfield and White Oak and at Oakdell and Oak Knoll**
- **Improve signage at crosswalks at Olive and Oakdell**
- **Investigate a button stop at San Mateo Drive but not include a stop sign or crosswalks on Middle and not include any striping on any local streets or Middle Avenue at this time;**
- **Repair a section of pavement at Olive and Oak**
- **Enforce speed on Middle and San Mateo**
- **Explore feasible alternatives for Middle Avenue and conduct outreach efforts to property owners and tenants about the proposed plan and solicit input**

Mayor Schmidt commented about bike lanes on Middle Avenue.

City Attorney McClure suggested bringing back the element of re-striping and crosswalks on Middle Avenue, Olive and Oak Dell and Oak Knoll and Oak Dell, Oak and Oak Knoll, because of the current sewer work in that area which is scheduled to be completed in October. In the meantime, staff can provide additional outreach to the community for additional input.

Staff noted that some of the elements would require additional engineering and scheduling.

City Manager Boesch suggested bringing this list back with a plan to include timelines and funding.

Councilmember Borak expressed concern about the parking restrictions in terms of the notification process.

Councilmember Jellins and Mayor Pro Tem Kinney approved an amendment to the motion to include additional direction to staff to explore feasible alternatives for Middle Avenue and conduct outreach efforts to property owners and tenants about the proposed plan and solicit input.

Motion and amendment to the motion passed 4-0, with Councilmember Collacchi absent.

3. Consideration of legislative items listed in the League of California Cities Bulletin(s), or items referred to in Written Communications or Information Items, including decisions to support or oppose any such legislative, communication or information item – None.

G. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS - None

H. INFORMATION ITEMS - None

I. PUBLIC COMMENT #2 – None

J. ADJOURNMENT – 1:15 a.m.

Susan A. Ramos, CMC, City Clerk
Approved by City Council on July 16, 2002