

Complete Streets Commission



REGULAR MEETING AGENDA

Date: 7/10/2019
Time: 7:00 p.m.
City Council Chambers
701 Laurel St., Menlo Park, CA 94025

A. Call To Order

B. Roll Call

C. Reports and Announcements

Under "Reports and Announcements," staff and Commission members may communicate general information of interest regarding matters within the jurisdiction of the Commission. No Commission discussion or action can occur on any of the presented items.

D. Public Comment

Under "Public Comment," the public may address the City Council on any subject not listed on the agenda. Each speaker may address the City Council once under public comment for a limit of three minutes. Please clearly state your name and address or political jurisdiction in which you live. The City Council cannot act on items not listed on the agenda and, therefore, the City Council cannot respond to non-agenda issues brought up under public comment other than to provide general information.

E. Regular Business

- E1. Approve the Complete Streets Commission regular meeting minutes of May 8, 2019 ([Attachment](#))
- E2. Recommend to City Council to select concepts 1 and 3 to advance for the Middle Avenue pedestrian and bicycle rail crossing project ([Staff Report #19-009-CSC](#))
- E3. Recommend to City Council to remove on-street parking on Jefferson Drive and Chrysler Drive for installation of bike lanes ([Staff Report #19-011-CSC](#))
- E4. Evaluate Commission subcommittees

F. Informational Items

- F1. Update on Commission/Committees Policies and Procedures, Roles and Responsibilities ([Staff Report #19-010-CSC](#))
- F2. Update on conflict of interest regulation ([Memorandum](#))
- F3. Update on major project status

G. Committee/Subcommittee Reports

- G1. Update from Active Transportation Network Subcommittee (Kirsch/Weiner)
- G2. Update from Downtown Access and Parking Subcommittee (Behroozi/Goldin/Levin)
- G3. Update from Multimodal Subcommittee (Levin)
- G4. Update from Safe Routes to School Program Subcommittee (Lee/Meyer)
- G5. Update from Transportation Master Plan Subcommittee (Behroozi/Levin)
- G6. Update from Zero Emission Subcommittee (Goldin/Meyer)

H. Adjournment

At every Regular Meeting of the Commission, in addition to the Public Comment period where the public shall have the right to address the Commission on any matters of public interest not listed on the agenda, members of the public have the right to directly address the Commission on any item listed on the agenda at a time designated by the Chair, either before or during the Commission's consideration of the item.

At every Special Meeting of the Commission, members of the public have the right to directly address the Commission on any item listed on the agenda at a time designated by the Chair, either before or during consideration of the item.

For appeal hearings, appellant and applicant shall each have 10 minutes for presentations.

If you challenge any of the items listed on this agenda in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues you or someone else raised at the public hearing described in this notice, or in written correspondence delivered to the City of Menlo Park at, or prior to, the public hearing.

Any writing that is distributed to a majority of the Commission by any person in connection with an agenda item is a public record (subject to any exemption under the Public Records Act) and is available for inspection at the City Clerk's Office, 701 Laurel St., Menlo Park, CA 94025 during regular business hours.

Persons with disabilities, who require auxiliary aids or services in attending or participating in Commission meetings, may call the City Clerk's Office at 650-330-6620.

Agendas are posted in accordance with Government Code §54954.2(a) or §54956. Members of the public can view electronic agendas and staff reports by accessing the City website at menlopark.org/agenda and can receive email notification of agenda and staff report postings by subscribing to the "Notify Me" service at menlopark.org/notifyme. Agendas and staff reports may also be obtained by contacting City Clerk at 650-330-6620. (Posted: 7/3/2019)

Complete Streets Commission



REGULAR MEETING MINUTES - DRAFT

Date: 5/8/2019
Time: 7:00 p.m.
City Council Chambers
701 Laurel St., Menlo Park, CA 94025

A. Call to Order

Chair Kirsch called the meeting to order at 7:03 p.m.

B. Roll Call

Present: Behroozi, Cebrian, Cromie, Goldin, Kirsch, Lee, Levin, Meyer, Weiner
Absent: None
Staff: Assistant Public Works Director Nikki Nagaya, Associate Transportation Engineer Rene Baile, Associate Transportation Engineer Kevin Chen

Chair Kirsch led a round of introduction to welcome the two new Commissioners - Jacquie Cebrian and John Cromie.

C. Reports and Announcements

Staff Chen announced upcoming City events and a summary of City Council actions on transportation related items since the April 10 Commission meeting.

D. Public Comment

- Jordan Smith spoke about the difficulty of getting onto Willow Road from the U.S. 101 freeway using the current off-ramp configuration and asked to speak with City staff with potential solutions.

E. Regular Business

- E1. Approve the Complete Streets Commission regular meeting minutes of April 10, 2019 (Attachment)

ACTION: Motion and second (Behroozi/Levin) to approve the Complete Streets Commission regular meeting minutes of April 10, 2019, passed (5-0-4, Cebrian, Cromie, Lee and Levin abstained).

- E2. Select chair and vice chair

Chair Kirsch provided remarks and asked for nominations.

ACTION: Meyer nominated Behroozi as Chair, by acclamation Behroozi was selected as Chair. Behroozi nominated Levin as Vice Chair, by acclamation Levin was selected as Vice Chair.

- E3. Recommend to City Council to approve the removal of on-street parking on sections of O'Brien Drive

between Willow Road and University Avenue (Staff Report #19-007-CSC)

Staff Baile and Nagaya provided a presentation (Attachment).

- Arturo Aria, representing Eternal Life Church, spoke about the church's need for on-street parking during church events and against the removal of on-street parking.
- Steven Schmidbauer, representing JobTrain, spoke against removal of on-street parking on both sides of the street but would potentially support parking removal on one side.
- Skip Hilton spoke in concurrence with previous speakers on the need for the existing on-street parking to serve existing occupants.
- Matt Todd spoke in support of maintaining wide travel lanes for the existing large trucks traversing on O'Brien Drive and the need for additional analyses to reflect existing pedestrian, bicycle and parking demands.

ACTION: Motion and second (Levin/Kirsch) to recommend to City Council removal of on-street parking on O'Brien Drive per staff recommendation, with the following additions:

- Coordinate with JobTrain and Eternal Life Church to address their existing on-street parking demand, solutions may include: shared parking with adjacent developments, time restricted on-street parking, etc.
- Examine the existing speed and develop cost effective traffic calming opportunities to reduce excessive speeding and safety issue

Motion passed (7-2-0, Cromie and Meyer dissented).

E4. Recommend to City Council updates to the City's rail policy to consider the Dumbarton transportation project and Caltrain business plan efforts (Staff Report #19-008-CSC)

Staff Nagaya provided a presentation (Attachment).

- Maria Amundson shared suggested edits with the Commission (Attachment).
- Camille Pataki spoke in support of adding one more Dumbarton Rail station near the Onetta Harris Community Center.
- Matt Todd spoke in support of the rail project but shared concern about noise level. He also spoke in support of grade separating Caltrain rail crossings for all crossings and recommended connecting Willow Road to El Camino Real.

ACTION: Motion and second (Levin/Cromie) to recommend to City Council the proposed staff recommendations with the following additions:

- Increase ridership and maximize traffic benefit
- Modify service patterns for weekday off-peak and weekend hours
- Provide feeder service for first and last miles
- Consider feasibility of a second Dumbarton Rail station in the Belle Haven Neighborhood
- Encourage moderate fares for both high ridership and accessibility for people across the income spectrum

Motion passed (9-0-0).

F. Informational Items

F1. Update on City Council work plan and capital improvement program

Kirsch received no additional feedback from the Commission.

F2. Update on major project status

Staff Chen provided updates on the neighborhood traffic management program projects, transportation master plan, Middle Avenue pedestrian and bicycle rail crossing, Willow Road and U.S. highway 101 interchange construction, Oak Grove/University/Crane Bicycle improvement project construction and the safe routes to school program.

G. Committee/Subcommittee Reports

G1. Update from Active Transportation Network Subcommittee

None.

G2. Update from Downtown Access and Parking Subcommittee

None.

G3. Update from Multimodal Subcommittee

None.

G4. Update from Safe Routes to School Program Subcommittee

Lee reiterated the importance of soliciting comments on the draft walk and roll maps and other relevant program documents on the City webpage.

G5. Update from Transportation Master Plan Subcommittee

None.

G6. Update from Zero Emission Subcommittee

None.

H. Adjournment

Kirsch adjourned the meeting at 10:01 p.m.



STAFF REPORT

Complete Streets Commission

Meeting Date: 7/10/2019
Staff Report Number: 19-009-CSC

Regular Business: **Recommend to City Council to select concepts 1 and 3 to advance for the Middle Avenue pedestrian and bicycle rail crossing project**

Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Complete Streets Commission recommend to City Council to select concepts 1 and 3 to advance for the Middle Avenue pedestrian and bicycle rail crossing project.

Policy Issues

The City Council identified the Middle Avenue pedestrian and bicycle rail crossing project (project) as a high priority project in their 2019 work plan March 12, 2019. The project is consistent with policies stated in the 2016 General Plan Circulation Element, the El Camino Real and Downtown Specific Plan and is included in the City's capital improvement program (CIP). These policies seek to maintain a safe, efficient, attractive, user-friendly circulation system that promotes a healthy, safe and active community and quality of life throughout Menlo Park.

Background

Staff provided an informational update on the project to City Council on April 9, 2019. Since that time, staff has been coordinating closely with Caltrain staff on the design and construction options.

The City Council Rail Subcommittee received a project update on April 22, 2019. At the meeting, community members asked questions regarding how the various Ravenswood Avenue railroad crossing study alternatives, including a Caltrain tunnel and a fully elevated rail option, would impact concepts for the Middle Avenue crossing.

The second project community meeting was held on May 13, 2019 and a summary of that meeting and a copy of the presentation are available on the project webpage (Attachment A).

Staff provided another update on the project to City Council June 4, 2019 (Attachment B). A brief summary of the community meeting was included in the analysis section of the June 4 staff report. The analysis section of that staff report also included a discussion of the Ravenswood Avenue railroad crossing study tunnel and fully elevated rail options as requested by the Rail Subcommittee, as well as updates on the construction approach and overall project progress.

Analysis

The current study is evaluating benefits and challenges of three undercrossing concepts near Middle Avenue, included as Attachment C.

Concept 1 proposes to utilize a trenching method to install the tunnel portion of the crossing. This would require the rail tracks to be removed temporarily while the tunnel is installed, putting the rail out of service during the tunnel construction (approximately 2-4 days), but allowing the tunnel to be shallower (approximately 10-11 feet below existing elevations at Alma Street and proposed Middle Plaza). This location of the crossing would coincide with existing crossover tracks, tracks used by Caltrain to move trains from one set of tracks to the other for operational purposes such as single tracking during an incident or mechanical failure that blocks one set of tracks. Some of the main benefits of this concept are the shorter tunnel length, shallower tunnel depth, more efficient and easy to use ramp alignments on both sides of the tunnel and lower construction cost estimate. Caltrain staff has expressed concerns with this concept in that there is possible ground settlement that could cause problems with the connection points of the crossover tracks.

Concept 2 tunnel location also coincides with the existing crossover tracks. This concept proposes to install the tunnel with a directional jack and boring method. This would allow the rail tracks to remain in place during installation of the tunnel, however would require the tunnel to be deeper (approximately 20 feet below existing elevations at Alma Street and proposed Middle Plaza). Concept 2 has many benefits to Caltrain operations as well as more flexibility in tunnel construction time periods and durations since the crossover tracks would not need to be removed.

Concept 3 also proposes to install the tunnel portion using a trenching method. The location of this crossing tunnel is approximately 200 feet north of concepts 1 and 2, allowing the construction to occur outside of the crossover track area and enabling additional flexibility in Caltrain operations during construction over concept 1. For example, the tunnel could potentially be constructed in two phases, allowing one set of rail tracks to remain operational and the trains to single track. The benefits of concept 3 are similar to concept 1 in that it includes a shorter tunnel length, shallower tunnel depth and a construction cost estimate lower than concept 2. There are benefits for the Caltrain rail operations and construction staging as well. Due to the more northern crossing location, this concept will have longer ramps, although they can be less steep than the other two concepts, and the tunnel opening will not be directly visible from the Middle Plaza area. Caltrain staff has preliminarily shown support for this concept since it avoids the crossover track areas.

All three concepts will require a partial property acquisition on the west side of the tracks. There is a 52-foot wide rectangular portion of the 700 El Camino Real property (currently shopping center including Big 5 and BevMo) that extends south between the Stanford-owned property and the Caltrain property that must be utilized for the stairs and ramps into the crossing tunnel. The yellow shading in Attachment C illustrates the portion necessary for each of the three concepts. Currently this portion of the property is an underutilized parking lot. Staff is having on-going discussions with the affected property owner about the project and staff will return to City Council for authorization to negotiate with property owner as this project progresses.

There are multiple elements still being reviewed by and coordinated with Caltrain related to construction methods and scheduling. City staff and Caltrain staff are currently coordinating on the construction method of the tunnel and the construction requirements within an electrified rail corridor. City staff's current preferred construction method for the crossing is an open cut-and-trench construction method that would require temporary removal of all existing railroad infrastructure and relocation of utilities at the crossing location. This is currently preferred due to the shallower tunnel requiring shorter ramps and stairs and preferred user experience. In this method, a trench is dug, undercrossing supports are placed, material to cover the trench is restored and train tracks are replaced.

One of the benefits of Concept 3 is the flexibility in construction staging that could minimize the construction duration and impacts on service and maintaining operations of service during the trenching, using methods

such as keeping one track operational during construction and building the trench in two phases or bussing Caltrain passengers (a “bus bridge”) between the Menlo Park and Palo Alto stations during the construction. Staff will continue to work with Caltrain to minimize impacts to the system while advancing and expediting construction as much as feasible.

Next steps

City staff anticipates bringing forward the options to City Council along with a summary of the Complete Streets Commission’s feedback and recommendation to select a preferred crossing concept(s) tentatively on August 27, 2019. Negotiations to acquire necessary right-of-way for the project will be brought before City Council for discussion and authorizations in summer 2019.

Upon selection of a preferred crossing location and direction on overall layout, the project team will proceed with completion of the 30 percent design plans and environmental documentation. Staff is also exploring a design-build approach to the next phases of the project to help expedite project delivery. Staff is currently evaluating this possible approach and continues to meet with Caltrain to coordinate and determine the best delivery options. Staff will return to the Rail Subcommittee and City Council with a more detailed update and delivery plan as more information becomes available.

The San Mateo County Transportation Authority (SMCTA) grant was initially identified to expire in July 2018, and has received two time extensions to February 2020. It is critical to keep this schedule on track to ensure the project progresses, and in accordance with the funding agreement that the City is reimbursed the awarded funds from SMCTA. The key milestones for the next steps of the project are summarized below:

Table 1: Key project milestones	
Coordination with Caltrain	On-going
Complete Streets Commission meeting	July 10, 2019
City Council Rail Subcommittee update	July 16, 2019
City Council selects preferred crossing tunnel alignment and layout	August 27, 2019
City Council authorize negotiations to acquire right-of-way	Summer 2019
Completion of environmental documents and 30% design plans (grant scope)	By February 2020
Construction	2021-2022
Goal for undercrossing opening	Concurrent with Middle Plaza occupation, mid-2022

Impact on City Resources

The project was included in the CIP for fiscal year 2016-17, with a total budget in the amount of \$700,000. Through the Measure A pedestrian and bicycle program grant awarded for this project, the SMCTA will reimburse the City up to \$490,000.

Environmental Review

The project will require a complete review under the California Environmental Quality Act. The environmental documentation for this project is expected be completed as an addendum to the El Camino Real and Downtown Specific Plan. More information about the environmental review will be provided in the August 2019 report to City Council.

Public Notice

Public notification was achieved by posting the agenda, with the agenda items being listed, at least 72 hours prior to the meeting. Additionally, an email notification was sent to the Public Works projects interest list to notify the public about this agenda item.

Attachments

- A. Hyperlink – Middle Avenue pedestrian/bicycle crossing:
menlopark.org/middlecrossing
- B. Hyperlink – City Council staff report, June 4, 2019:
menlopark.org/DocumentCenter/View/21719/F5-20190604-Middle-Ave-ped-bike-cross-CC
- C. Three crossing concepts

Report prepared by:

Angela R. Obeso, Senior Transportation Engineer

Report reviewed by:

Nicole H. Nagaya, Assistant Public Works Director



STAFF REPORT

City Council

Meeting Date:

7/10/2019

Staff Report Number:

19-011-CSC

Regular Business:

Recommend to the City Council to approve the installation of a No Stopping zone on Chrysler Drive between Constitution Drive and Commonwealth Drive and on Jefferson Drive between Chrysler Drive and Constitution Drive and to install bicycle lanes

Recommendation

Recommend to City Council to approve the installation of a No Stopping zone on Chrysler Drive between Constitution Drive and Commonwealth Drive and on Jefferson Drive between Chrysler Drive and Constitution Drive and to install bicycle lanes.

Policy Issues

The installation of Class II bicycle lanes on Chrysler Drive and Jefferson Drive is proposed in the draft Transportation Master Plan. The project is also consistent with policies stated in the 2016 General Plan Circulation Element. This policy seeks to maintain a safe, efficient, attractive, user-friendly circulation system that promotes a healthy, safe and active community and quality of life throughout Menlo Park.

Per the City's municipal code (Section 11.24.009), City Council has the authority to establish parking and stopping restrictions or prohibitions. The Complete Streets Commission is authorized (Section 11.24.026) to designate no parking zones adjacent to driveways, intersections and crosswalks at up to five (5) spaces per location or up to three (3) within of the "Downtown/Station Area", if the commission determines that parked vehicles are obstructing visibility, interfering with reasonable ingress and egress or obstructing safe bike lane travel. The transportation manager is authorized (Section 11.24.025) to designate a no parking zone and to paint the curbs red within six (6) feet of a driveway if determined that cars parked are causing an obstruction of the driveway or are interfering with reasonable ingress and egress.

Background

General Plan and Transportation Master Plan (TMP)

In 2016, the City Council approved the ConnectMenlo General Plan Land Use and Circulation Elements. The General Plan serves as the City's comprehensive and long range guide to land use and infrastructure development in the City and provided a vision for potential land use changes.

Transportation challenges, including multi-modal safety, traffic congestion, neighborhood quality of life and regional coordination are significant concerns to the City of Menlo Park. The Circulation Element includes a number of forthcoming transportation-related programs, including those to encourage multi-modal transportation, provide opportunities for active transportation to encourage health and wellness, minimize cut-through traffic on residential streets and consider changes to the transportation impact metrics the City uses to evaluate development proposals. High priority transportation-related programs are the development

of a Transportation Master Plan and updates to the Transportation Impact Fee (TIF). Chrysler Drive and Jefferson Drive are listed in the Transportation Master Plan as roadways where the installation of Class II bicycle lanes would enhance the bicycle network in the area.

TIDE Academy

The TIDE Academy, located at 150 Jefferson Drive as shown in Attachment A, is under construction and expected to be open in August 2019. It is a small high school with capacity for 400 students and 35 faculty and staff. Due to the school's location near Facebook and other technology company campuses, the school's curriculum will include career technical education (CTE) classes. The new school will be open to all Sequoia Union High School District (SUHSD) students; however, the SUHSD anticipates the school will primarily serve students from Redwood City, Menlo Park and East Palo Alto. Much of this area is within a five-mile bicycle commute distance. The initial enrollment in the 2019-2020 school year is anticipated to be approximately 100 students in its freshman class, with the school reaching full capacity by the 2022-2023 school year. Attachment B provides an illustration of the frontage of the school including the proposed bus pullout area on Jefferson Drive.

Bayfront Area Projects Overview

ConnectMenlo identified a vision for a live/work/play environment that fosters economic growth, increased sustainability, housing opportunities and improved transportation and mobility options in the City of Menlo Park. ConnectMenlo was a long-range planning process that culminated in the adoption of an update to the general plan, which was intended to guide development through 2040. ConnectMenlo affirmed an amount of remaining development potential throughout the city and added new development potential in the Bayfront area (former M-2 zone). With the adoption of the general plan in 2016, the City expanded development potential in the Bayfront area and created three new zoning districts - office (O), life science (LS) and residential mixed use (R- MU). The Bayfront area zoning map illustrating these new districts is included as Attachment C.

Since the adoption of the general plan, multiple projects have been proposed in the Bayfront area and are either completed, in construction, or in the approval pipeline. Recent City Council discussions have presented possible changes in the zoning or proposed development in the future, therefore this staff report focuses on summarizing the current proposals and potential projects that may impact travel patterns and modes on Chrysler and Jefferson drives.

Completed and currently in construction projects in the Bayfront area are shown in Attachment D. Attachment E shows locations of the currently proposed projects in the Bayfront area adjacent to Chrysler and Jefferson drives. The table below summarizes these projects.

Table 1A: Completed Projects						
#	Address/Project	Project Description	Status	Office SF	Residential Units	Hotel Rooms
1	3639 Haven Ave	Residential	Complete		394	
2	3645 Haven Ave	Residential	Complete		146	
3	Menlo Gateway	Office/Hotel	Complete	241,251		250
4	162-164 Jefferson Dr	Office	Complete	259,920		
5	777 Hamilton Ave	Residential	Complete		195	
6	1200 Willow Rd	Residential	Complete		90	

Table 1B: Proposed Projects - Western

#	Address/Project	Project Description	Status	Office SF	Commercial SF	Residential Units	Hotel Rooms
1	3723 Haven Ave	Hotel	Study Session				167
2	105-155 Constitution Dr	Office	Under Construction	495,052			
3	111 Independence Dr	Residential	Design Review			106	
4	104-110 Constitution 115 Independence Dr	Office Residential Commercial	Design Review	34,700	1,600	330	
5	141 Jefferson Dr 180-186 Constitution Dr	Residential Commercial	Study Session		2,000	483	
6	162-164 Jefferson Dr	Office	Design Review	249,500			

There are additional proposed projects on the Facebook campus that are not immediately adjacent to the TIDE Academy. These are summarized in the table below. Additional exhibits of proposed projects in the Bayfront area can be found on the City's website linked as Attachment F.

Table 1C: Proposed Projects - Facebook Building 20-23

#	Address/Project	Project Description	Status	Office SF	Commercial SF	Residential Units	Hotel Rooms
4A	Facebook	Hotel	Study Session				240
4B	Facebook	Office	Completed	180,108			
4C	Facebook	Office Hotel	Under Construction	1,137,200		106	200
4D	Facebook	Office Hotel	Completed	433,555	1,600	330	

Facebook Transit Hub

On August 17, 2018, Facebook submitted plans to the City of Menlo Park Planning Department for a Chilco Campus Bus Stop/Transit Hub. The transit hub would be located in the parking lot of 180, 190 and 200 Jefferson Drive. This hub along with the bus stop located in the parking lot of 105-155 Constitution Drive would serve as the main stops for the Facebook buses. Jefferson Drive, Chrysler Drive, Constitution Drive and Chilco Street are proposed to be used as the primary bus routes for this area. Currently there are approximately 290 buses a day using Chrysler Drive and Jefferson Drive to transport Facebook employees to the campus. The currently proposed transit hub location and bus routes are shown in Attachment G.

Facebook Employee Bicycle Routes and Bicycle Corrals

Attachment H shows the current primary bicycle routes and existing and proposed bicycle corrals also submitted to the City in August 2018. Currently Facebook campuses in the area have the capacity for over 1000 bicycles. Facebook buildings 62 and 63 are scheduled to be completed in September of 2019 and are to have two additional bicycle corrals. Although the primary routes shown in Attachment H do not include Jefferson Drive, it is expected that increased locations of Facebook occupied buildings and bicycle corrals

will increase the overall bicycle usage in the Bayfront area. For example, the bicyclists traveling between future Facebook buildings 62 and 63 and the proposed transit hub could likely utilize a Constitution Drive - Chrysler Drive - Jefferson Drive route. This exhibit illustrates the various possible origins and destinations of bicycles throughout the day.

Analysis

The Transportation Master Plan (TMP) provides a bridge between the policy framework adopted within the Circulation Element and project-level efforts to modify the transportation network within Menlo Park. Broadly, it provides the ability to identify appropriate projects to enhance the transportation network, conduct community engagement to ensure such projects meet the communities' goals and values and prioritize projects based on need for implementation.

Chrysler Drive and Jefferson Drive are listed in the Transportation Master Plan as roadways where the installation of Class II bicycle lanes would enhance the bicycle network in the area (Attachment I). The planned opening of TIDE Academy in August 2019 will generate additional bicycling traffic, especially between local neighborhoods and the campus. The current uses in the Bayfront area generate bicycle traffic throughout the day and proposed future uses will increase those volumes. These occurrences therefore justify consideration of installing Transportation Master Plan identified bicycle facilities at this time.

The consideration of installing these bicycle facilities included evaluation of a number of factors. A discussion of these factors is included below.

Collision history

Over the period of January 2016 through December 2018, a total of 40 collisions were reported on the City streets in the Bayfront area, three involving bicycles, nine involving a collision with a fixed object or parked vehicle and no fatalities. A total of 19 of these collisions occurred on Chrysler Drive, six on Jefferson Drive and one at the intersection of Chrysler and Jefferson drives. The table below lists the collisions with locations and collision type. Bayfront Expressway is a Caltrans owned facility intended for large volumes and high speeds of regional traffic and is therefore not included in this evaluation.

Table 2: Collision Type History				
Location	Bicycle	Moving Vehicle	Fixed Object or Parked Vehicle	Total
Jefferson Drive	1	3	3	7
Chrysler Drive	2	15	2	19
Commonwealth Drive*	0	0	0	0
Constitution Drive	0	6	3	9
Independence Drive	0	4	1	5
Total	3	28	9	40
* = One collision reported under Chrysler Drive was located at the intersection at Commonwealth Drive.				

Many of these collisions were reported with the primary collision factors of speeding or unsafe lane change. These could be related to limited sight distance due to vehicles parked on both sides of the streets.

With the introduction of additional bicycles on these streets, the addition of bicycle facilities would clarify right-of-way for the various transportation modes, thereby increasing safety of all roadway users.

On-Street Parking

There is existing on-street parking on both sides of Chrysler and Jefferson drives. The spaces are not marked, but based on City standard stall dimensions, Chrysler Drive has approximately 37 parking spaces and Jefferson Drive has approximately 128.

The existing width of both streets cannot accommodate bicycle lanes and maintain the existing on-street parking. To install bicycle lanes along Chrysler Drive and Jefferson Drive, on-street parking would need to be removed on both sides of the road. Staff conducted site studies on three separate occasions and observed the number of vehicles parked for each roadway. The parking observations are shown in the table below.

Table 3: Number of parked vehicles				
Roadway section	11:00 am Thursday, June 20, 2019	2:45 pm Tuesday, June 25, 2019	1:00 pm Thursday, June 27, 2019	Total number of spaces
Jefferson Drive	125 (98%)	73 (57%)	112 (88%)	128
Chrysler Drive	35 (95%)	19 (51%)	26 (70%)	37

From the field observations, it is noted that mornings and midday have the highest utilization of on-street parking and after 2:30 p.m., the demand drops considerably. Presently there are multiple projects under construction in the nearby vicinity, most notably TIDE Academy. It is presumed that many of the vehicles parking on the street are construction employees who will no longer be parking here after the high school construction is complete.

In order to outreach to the on-street parking users and confirm if parking removal will have impacts after completion of construction, on two of the site visits, staff placed postcards on parked vehicles notifying the recipients of the project and the requirement for parking removal. The postcard also notified the recipients that the project would be brought before the Complete Streets Commission on July 10, 2019, and the City Council on August 20, 2019, and invited attendance and public comment. As of noon on Wednesday, July 3, 2019, staff has received no comments.

Staff Recommendation

With the various new land uses, additional origins and destinations for bicyclists and the existing high demand for bicycling facilities in this area, it is anticipated that bicycle volumes will continue to increase. The policies set in the ConnectMenlo effort and the draft Transportation Management Plan seek to accommodate these additional future demands with an expanded bicycle network. Therefore, staff is recommending the installation of a No Stopping zone on both sides of Chrysler Drive between Constitution Drive and Commonwealth Drive and on both sides of Jefferson Drive between Chrysler Drive and Constitution Drive and to install class II bicycle lanes in these same areas, based upon the following:

- TIDE Academy is anticipated to generate student bicycling volumes from East Palo Alto, Menlo Park and Redwood City;
- Completed and proposed projects have and will continue to increase bicycle usage between offices,

- commercial buildings, hotels and residential buildings;
- Facebook employees are currently and will continue to be commuting between campus buildings via bicycle; and
- Current and future volumes of buses transporting TIDE Academy students and Facebook employees to the area create narrow travel lanes and reduced sight distance if on-street parking remains

Impact on City Resources

Measure A funds to complete this project are available in the adopted FY2019-20 operating budget.

Environmental Review

This action is not a project within the meaning of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines §§ 15378 and 15061(b)(3) as it will not result in any direct or indirect physical change in the environment.

Public Notice

Public Notification was achieved by posting the agenda, with the agenda items being listed, at least 72 hours prior to the meeting. Staff also sent out postcards to the businesses in the area as well as placing postcards on vehicles parked along both streets on June 25 and June 27, 2019.

Attachments

- A. Location map of TIDE Academy
- B. Illustration of TIDE Academy frontage on Jefferson Drive
- C. Bayfront area zoning map
- D. Bayfront area completed and in construction projects exhibit
- E. Bayfront area proposed projects exhibits
- F. Hyperlink - Bayfront Area Projects Overview:
menlopark.org/1396/Bayfront-Area-projects-overview
- G. Proposed Facebook Transit Hub
- H. Proposed Facebook employee bicycle routes
- I. Transportation Master Plan, Citywide Bicycle Facilities Map and Project Area

Report prepared by:
Richard F. Angulo, Assistant Engineer

Reviewed by:
Nicole H. Nagaya, Assistant Public Works Director



STAFF REPORT

Complete Streets Commission

Meeting Date: 7/10/2019
Staff Report Number: 19-010-CSC

Informational Item: Update on Commission/Committees Policies and Procedures, Roles and Responsibilities

Recommendation

This is an information item and does not require Complete Streets Commission action.

Policy Issues

The City Council has established policies and procedures, roles and responsibilities that govern commission/committee activities. On occasion, the City Council updates the policy and procedures to bring the existing policy up to date. This item is to inform the Complete Streets Commission on updates made to the Commission/Committees Policies and Procedures, Roles and Responsibilities (Policy.)

Background

The previous City Council Policy (#CC-01-004) was adopted in 1991 and subsequently edited in 2001, 2011, 2013, and 2017.

On January 29, staff recommended several changes to the Policy that reflect either direction from the City Council, formal request by the commission/committee, or procedural updates to streamline the commission/committee process. After reviewing the recommended changes, the City Council directed staff to return with additional edits.

On March 5, staff returned to the City Council with a revised Policy. Ultimately, the City Council adopted a resolution (No. 6477) to update the Policy (#CC-19-004), but without dissolving and merging of the Belle Haven Neighborhood Library Advisory Committee. After its adoption, the updated Policy was then incorporated into the commission handbook (Attachment A.)

Analysis

Information pertaining to the Complete Streets Commission, and relevant page numbers in the commission handbook, are summarized below:

Complete Streets Commission:

- Establishes the Commission as a 9-member body and defines the Commission's roles and responsibilities as follows. Pages 27-28 of 96.
 - Coordination of multi-modal (motor vehicle, bicycle, transit and pedestrian) transportation facilities
 - Advising City Council on ways to encourage vehicle, multi-modal, pedestrian and bicycle safety and accessibility for the City supporting the goals of the general plan
 - Coordination on providing a citywide safe routes to school plan

- Coordination with regional transportation systems
- Establishing parking restrictions and requirements according to Municipal Code sections 11.24.026 through 11.24.028
- Summarizes meeting code of conduct and Commission scope of authority as advisory to the City Council. Pages 10-11 of 96.

Commission work plan:

- Requires establishing an annual work plan that aligns with the City Council adopted work plan. Page 21 of 96.
- Establishes a timeline for the City Council to approve the commission work plan (no later than September 30) and receive updates from a commission representative (at least twice a year.) Page 21 of 96. The two fiscal years 2018-19, City Council quarterly updates occurred December 4, 2018, and May 21, 2019.

Commission meeting:

- Establishes policies and procedures for off-premises meeting participation (e.g., participate in meeting via technology from a location other than the regular meeting location.) Page 25 of 96. In summary, off-premises participation is discouraged given the logistics required to ensure compliance with the Brown Act and experience with technological failures disrupting the meeting. A set of requirements have been identified if off-premise meeting is deemed essential.

Commission members:

- Establishes the procedure for City Council direction if commission/committee members' requests require one hour or more staff time to complete. Page 22 of 96.
- Removes the requirement to be a registered voter to serve on a commission/committee. Page 27 of 96.
- Requires mandatory training every two years on Brown Act and parliamentary procedures, anti-harassment training, ethics training, and other training required by the City Council or State Law. Page 22 of 96.

Commission staff liaisons:

- Establishes the roles of the City Council commission/committee liaison. Page 22 of 96. In summary, the purpose of the City Council commission liaison is to facilitate communication between the City Council and the Commission, on behalf of the City Council. This liaison is to reflect the views of the City Council to the Commission and to help increase the City Council's familiarity with the Commission membership, programs and issues.
- Establishes the roles of the City staff liaison. Pages 22 and 23 of 96. In summary, the purpose of the City staff liaison is to serve as a conduit between the commission and the City Council, on behalf of the City. This liaison is to:
 - Assist with commission members and meeting logistics
 - Advise the commission of the City Council priorities and direction
 - Inform the commission of events, activities, policies, programs, project updates, etc. occurring within the scope of the commission's function

On May 21, the City Council approved the Complete Streets Commission 2019-2020 annual work plan (Attachment B.) With the adoption of the new Policy, staff anticipates the best time for the Commission to annually review the work plan would be in the summer, following publication of the proposed City budget for the upcoming fiscal year. This would align the work plan with the City Council's annual budget adoption in

June and meet the newly established approval deadline of September 30 of each year.

Impact on City Resources

Resources expended for staff support of the City's Commissions is considered part of baseline operations.

Environmental Review

This action is not a project within the meaning of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines §§ 15378 and 15061(b)(3) as it will not result in any direct or indirect physical change in the environment.

Public Notice

Public notification was achieved by posting the agenda, with the agenda items being listed, at least 72 hours prior to the meeting.

Attachments

- A. Hyperlink – City of Menlo Park commission handbook:
menlopark.org/DocumentCenter/View/15204/Commission-Handbook-2019?bidId=
- B. Complete Streets Commission 2019-2020 work plan

Report prepared by:
Kevin Chen, Associate Transportation Engineer

Report reviewed by:
Nikki Nagaya, Assistant Public Works Director

MEMORANDUM

To: Mayor and Members of the Menlo Park City Council and Boards and Commissions

CC: Starla Jerome-Robinson, City Manager
Nick Pegueros, Assistant City Manager
Justin Murphy, Deputy City Manager
Mark Muenzer, Director Community Development

From: William McClure, City Attorney
Cara Silver, Assistant City Attorney

Date: May 13, 2019

Re: New Real Property Conflict of Interest Regulation

The Fair Political Practices Commission (FPPC) recently updated the real property conflict of interest regulation. The new regulation went into effect on March 22, 2019 and applies to all public officials involved in the decision making process. The changes primarily affect ownership of real property interests and establish different criteria depending on whether the official's parcel ("Official's Parcel") is located within 500 feet, 500-1000 feet or 1000 feet or more of the property involved in the government decision.

This particular regulation has undergone several different changes in the past few years. Prior to 2015, Regulation 18702.2 contained a bright-line rule which presumed if the Official's Parcel was more than 500 feet from the property subject of the decision, the impact was not material unless there were specific circumstances indicating an effect on the property. In 2015, however, the FPPC eliminated the bright-line rule in favor of a more comprehensive analysis of all potential effects on real property interests. Under this approach, the official was required to conduct a comprehensive examination of all potential effects on the Official's Parcel, even when the parcel was a considerable distance from the property subject of the decision. Many criticized this approach as being overly complicated and subjective. The current amendments to Regulation 18702.2 restore the bright-line rule by allowing an official to participate in a decision if the Official's Parcel is a sufficient distance from the property subject to the decision. Most significantly, if the Official's Parcel is more than 1,000 feet from the property subject of the decision, the official would be allowed to participate in the decision unless there is clear and convincing evidence the decision will have a measurable impact on the Official's Parcel.

This memo summarizes the new regulation which is also attached for reference.

Background

Under the Political Reform Act, public officials may not make, participate in making, or attempt to use their official positions to influence a governmental decision in which they know or have reason to know that they have a disqualifying interest. A public official has a disqualifying interest if the governmental decision at issue will have a reasonably foreseeable, material effect on the official's financial interests. (Government Code 87103; FPPC Regulation 18700(a).) To determine whether a financial interest is "material" depends on the type of financial interest involved. Recently, the FPPC amended the standard for determining whether a decision will have a *material* effect on a public official's interest in real property.

Interests in real property are divided into ownership and leasehold interests. The most significant change amends the materiality standard for decisions that affect ownership interests in real property.

Summary of New Ownership Standard

The new regulation divides ownership interests into three separate categories: (1) governmental decisions involving property within 500 feet of the Official's Parcel; (2) decisions involving property within 500 to 1,000 feet of the Official's Parcel and (3) decisions involving property more than 1,000 feet from the Official's Parcel.

For decisions involving property within 500 feet of the Official's Parcel, there is now a presumption that the decision will have a material impact on the official's interest. This presumption can be rebutted by "clear and convincing evidence" that the decision will not have any measurable impact on the Official's Parcel.¹

For decisions involving property located between 500 and 1,000 feet from the Official's Parcel, whether the decision creates a conflict now depends on a number of factors. Under the revised regulation, a decision will have a material impact on the Official's Parcel if it would change the parcel's development potential, income-producing potential, highest and best use, market value, or, if it would change the parcel's "character by substantially altering traffic levels, intensity of use, parking, view, privacy, noise levels, or air quality." (FPPC Regulation 18702.2 (a).)

Finally, there is now a presumption that a decision involving property 1,000 feet or more from the Official's Parcel will not have a material impact on the official's interest. Like the first category, this presumption can be rebutted with clear and convincing

¹ The old regulation divided ownership interests into two categories. If the Official's Parcel was located within 500 feet of the property involved in the decision, the official could not participate in the decision unless they received a clearance letter from the FPPC. If the Official's Parcel was located more than 500 feet, the official was required to apply six criteria to determine whether the real property interest was material enough to warrant recusal. As some of the criteria were subjective, oftentimes the old regulation was difficult for officials to implement without legal guidance.

evidence that the decision would in fact have a substantial impact on the Official's Parcel.

Other materiality factors governing ownership interests

The new regulation does not impact the other materiality factors relating to real property ownership interests. Thus, a local official would still meet the materiality standard if the decision directly involves property owned by the official in the following ways:

- Involves adoption or amendment of a development plan applicable to the parcel;
- Affects the parcel's zoning (other than a zoning decision applicable to all properties designated in that category);
- Imposes, repeals or modifies taxes, fees or assessments applicable to the parcel;
- Authorizes the sale, purchase, or lease of the parcel
- Involves the issuance, denial or revocation of a license, permit or other land use entitlement authorizing a specific use of or improvement to the parcel; or
- Involves construction of, or improvements to, streets, utilities or similar facilities and the parcel will receive new or improved services that provide a benefit or detriment disproportionate to other properties receiving the services

(FPPC Regulation 18702.2 (a).)

Leasehold Standard

Leasehold interests in real property are analyzed differently than ownership interests. As a threshold matter, month-to-month leaseholds (or shorter) are not considered real property interests for purposes of the Political Reform Act.² (FPPC Regulation 18233.) For leasehold interests, the regulation does not contain a buffer rule. Instead, officials who lease property must apply several criteria to determine whether their particular leasehold interest is material relative to the government decision. The leasehold interest will be deemed material if any of the following criteria apply:

1. Changes the termination date of lease;
2. Increases or decreases the potential rental value of the property
3. Changes the official's actual or legally allowable use of the property
4. Impacts the officials' use and enjoyment of the property.

(FPPC Regulation 18702.2 (c).)

Exceptions to Recusal

Like the old regulation, the new regulation specifies that an official's financial interest is not material (allowing the official to participate) under the following circumstances:

- The decision solely concerns repairs, replacements or maintenance of existing streets, water, sewer storm drainage or similar facilities;

² An official who has a month-to-month tenancy may still be precluded from participating in a decision if the official or the official's immediate family members (i.e. spouse, domestic partner or dependent children) would receive a measurable gain or loss to their personal finances. (FPPC Regulation 18702.5.)

- The decision solely concerns the adoption or amendment of a general plan and the decision only relates to policy and further action is needed to implement such policy;
- The decision does not concern an identifiable parcel or development project; or
- The decision does not concern the agency's prior, concurrent, or subsequent action on a permit, license, zoning action or land use ordinance or specific plan.

Public Generally Exception

In addition, officials who may have a conflict under either the ownership or leasehold rules, may be able to participate in the decision under the "public generally" exception. Under this exception, disqualification will not be required if the effect on the public official's financial interest is indistinguishable from the decision's effect on the financial interests of the public generally. (FPPC Regulation 18703.) In order to use this exception, the official must be able to demonstrate two core elements. First, the governmental decision must affect a "significant segment" of the public in the jurisdiction of the public agency.³ Second, the governmental decision's effect on the official's financial interest must not be unique as compared to the effect on the significant segment.

Implementation

To implement the new regulation, staff would create maps indicating both a 500 foot and a 1,000 foot radius around each parcel owned by a public official to help them identify when a public official might have a disqualifying conflict of interest.

As always, our office is available to discuss particular issues. The FPPC advice line is also available as a resource at 800-ASK-FPPC.

³ A significant segment of the public is "at least 25 percent of" any of the following:

- All businesses or non-profit entities within the official's jurisdiction;
- All real property, commercial real property, or residential real property within the official's jurisdiction; or
- All individuals within the official's jurisdiction. (Regulation 18703(b)).

Amend 2 Cal. Code Regs., Section 18702.2 to read:

§ 18702.2. Materiality Standard: Financial Interest in Real Property.

(a) ~~Except as provided in subdivision (c) below, the~~ The reasonably foreseeable financial effect of a governmental decision ~~(listed below in (a)(1) through (a)(12))~~ on a parcel of real property in which an official has a financial interest, other than a leasehold interest, is material whenever the governmental decision:

(1) Involves the adoption of or amendment to a development plan or criteria applying to general ~~(except as provided below) or specific plan, and the parcel is located within the proposed boundaries of the plan;~~

(2) Determines the parcel's zoning or rezoning, ~~(other than a zoning decision applicable to all properties designated in that category);~~ annexation or de-annexation, ~~or;~~ inclusion in or exclusion from any city, county, district, or ~~other~~ local government subdivision; or other boundaries, other than elective district boundaries ~~as determined by the California Citizen's Redistricting Commission or any other agency where the governmental decision is to determine boundaries for elective purposes;~~

(3) Would impose, repeal, or modify any taxes, fees, or assessments that apply to the parcel;

(4) Authorizes the sale, purchase, or lease of the parcel;

(5) Involves the issuance, denial or revocation of a license, permit or other land use entitlement authorizing a specific use of or improvement to the parcel or any variance that changes the permitted use of, or restrictions placed on, ~~that real~~ the property. ~~For purposes of this paragraph, any financial effect resulting from a governmental decision regarding permits or licenses issued to the official's business entity when operating on the official's real property shall~~

1 ~~be conclusively analyzed under Regulation 18702.1, rather than this paragraph, without any~~
2 ~~separate consideration for any material financial effects on the official's real property as a result~~
3 ~~of the decision;~~

4 (6) Involves construction of, or improvements to, streets, water, sewer, storm drainage or
5 similar facilities, and the parcel ~~in which the official has an interest~~ will receive new or improved
6 services that provide a benefit or detriment disproportionate to other properties receiving the
7 services ~~are distinguishable from improvements and services that are provided to or received by~~
8 ~~other similarly situated properties in the official's jurisdiction or where the official will otherwise~~
9 ~~receive a disproportionate benefit or detriment by the decision;~~

10 (7) Involves property located 500 feet or less from the property line of the parcel unless
11 there is clear and convincing evidence that the decision will not have any measurable impact on
12 the official's property; or

13 (8) Involves property located more than 500 feet but less than 1,000 feet from the
14 property line of the parcel, and the decision would change the parcel's:

15 (7) (A) ~~Would change the development~~ Development ~~potential of the parcel of real~~
16 ~~property;~~

17 (8) (B) ~~Would change the income~~ Income ~~producing potential of the parcel of real~~
18 ~~property. However, if the real property contains a business entity, including rental property, and~~
19 ~~the nature of the business entity remains unchanged, the materiality standards under Regulation~~
20 ~~18702.1 applicable to business entities would apply instead;~~

21 (9) (C) ~~Would change the highest~~ Highest ~~and best use of the parcel of real property in~~
22 ~~which the official has a financial interest;~~

1 ~~(10) (D) Would change the character~~ Character ~~of the parcel of real property by~~
2 substantially altering traffic levels, ~~or intensity of use, including parking, of property surrounding~~
3 ~~the official's real property parcel, the view, privacy, noise levels, or air quality, including odors,~~
4 ~~or any other factors that would affect the market value of the real property parcel in which the~~
5 ~~official has a financial interest; or~~

6 ~~(11) Would consider any decision affecting real property value located within 500 feet of~~
7 ~~the property line of the official's real property, other than commercial property containing a~~
8 ~~business entity where the materiality standards are analyzed under Regulation 18702.1.~~
9 ~~Notwithstanding this prohibition, the Commission may provide written advice allowing an~~
10 ~~official to participate under these circumstances if the Commission determines that there are~~
11 ~~sufficient facts to indicate that there will be no reasonably foreseeable measurable impact on the~~
12 ~~official's property; or~~

13 ~~(12) (E) Would cause a reasonably prudent person, using due care and consideration~~
14 ~~under the circumstances, to believe that the governmental decision was of such a nature that its~~
15 ~~reasonably foreseeable effect would influence the market~~ Market ~~value of the official's property.~~

16 (b) The financial effect of a governmental decision on a parcel of real property in which
17 an official has a financial interest involving property 1,000 feet or more from the property line of
18 the official's property is presumed not to be material. This presumption may be rebutted with
19 clear and convincing evidence the governmental decision would have a substantial effect on the
20 official's property.

21 ~~(b) (c) Leasehold Interests. Except as provided in subdivision (e) below, the~~ The
22 reasonably foreseeable financial effects of a governmental decision on any real property in which

1 a governmental official has a leasehold interest as the lessee of the property is material only if
2 the ~~whenever~~ governmental decision will:

3 (1) Change the termination date of the lease;

4 (2) Increase or decrease the potential rental value of the property;

5 ~~(3) Increase or decrease the rental value of the property, and the official has a right to~~
6 ~~sublease the property;~~

7 ~~(4) (3) Change the official's actual or legally allowable use of the real property; or~~

8 ~~(5) (4) Impact the official's use and enjoyment of the real property.~~

9 ~~(e) (d) Exceptions. The financial effect of a governmental decision on a parcel of real~~
10 ~~property in which an official has a financial interest is not material if: Exceptions:~~

11 (1) The decision solely concerns repairs, replacement or maintenance of existing streets,
12 water, sewer, storm drainage or similar facilities.

13 (2) The decision solely concerns the adoption or amendment of a general plan and all of
14 the following apply:

15 (A) The decision only identifies planning objectives or is otherwise exclusively one of
16 policy. A decision will not qualify under this subdivision if the decision is initiated by the public
17 official, by a person that is a financial interest to the public official, or by a person representing
18 either the public official or a financial interest to the public official.

19 (B) The decision requires a further decision or decisions by the public official's agency
20 before implementing the planning or policy objectives, such as permitting, licensing, rezoning, or
21 the approval of or change to a zoning variance, land use ordinance, or specific plan or its
22 equivalent.

1 (C) The decision does not concern an identifiable parcel or parcels or development
2 project. A decision does not “concern an identifiable parcel or parcels” solely because, in the
3 proceeding before the agency in which the decision is made, the parcel or parcels are merely
4 included in an area depicted on a map or diagram offered in connection with the decision,
5 provided that the map or diagram depicts all parcels located within the agency's jurisdiction and
6 economic interests of the official are not singled out.

7 (D) The decision does not concern the agency's prior, concurrent, or subsequent approval
8 of, or change to, a permit, license, zoning designation, zoning variance, land use ordinance, or
9 specific plan or its equivalent.

10 ~~(d)~~ (e) Definitions. The definitions below apply to this regulation:

11 (1) A decision “solely concerns the adoption or amendment of a general plan” when the
12 decision, in the manner described in Sections 65301 and 65301.5, grants approval of, substitutes
13 for, or modifies any component of, a general plan, including elements, a statement of
14 development policies, maps, diagrams, and texts, or any other component setting forth
15 objectives, principles, standards, and plan proposals, as described in Sections 65302 and 65303.

16 (2) “General plan” means “general plan” as used in Sections 65300, et seq.

17 (3) “Specific plan” or its equivalent means a plan adopted by the jurisdiction to meet the
18 purposes described in Sections 65450, et seq.

19 (4) Real property in which an official has a financial interest does not include any
20 common area as part of the official's ownership interest in a common interest development as
21 defined in the Davis-Stirling Common Interest Development Act (Civil Code Sections 4000
22 et seq.)

- 1 Note: Authority cited: Section 83112, Government Code. Reference: Sections 87100, 87102.5,
- 2 87102.6, 87102.8 and 87103, Government Code.