

<p>1 CITY OF MENLO PARK 2 PLANNING COMMISSION 3 4 EL CAMINO REAL/ ) DOWNTOWN SPECIFIC PLAN ) 5 _____) 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 SPECIAL MEETING 15 16 REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 17 MONDAY, JUNE 6, 2011 18 MENLO PARK CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS 19 701 LAUREL STREET, MENLO PARK, CALIFORNIA 20 21 22 23 24 Reported by: MARK I. BRICKMAN, CSR RPR 25 License No. 5527</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 1</p>	<p>1 2 ATTENDEES 3 THE PLANNING COMMISSION: 4 Vincent Bressler - Chairperson Katie Ferrick - Vice Chairperson 5 Ben Eiref John O'Malley - Not present 6 John Kadvany Henry Riggs 7 Peipei Yu 8 THE CITY STAFF: 9 Arlinda Heineck - Community Development Director Thomas Rogers - Associate Planner 10 Chip Taylor - Transportation Director 11 SUPPORT CONSULTANTS: 12 Reema Mahamood Karl Heisler 13 14 ---o0o--- 15 16 17 BE IT REMEMBERED that, pursuant to Notice 18 of the Meeting, and on June 6, 2011, 7:05 PM at the Menlo 19 Park City Council Chambers, 701 Laurel Street, Menlo 20 Park, California, before me, MARK I. BRICKMAN, CSR No. 21 5527, State of California, there commenced a Planning 22 Commission meeting under the provisions of the City of 23 Menlo Park. 24 ---o0o--- 25</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 2</p>
<p>1 2 MEETING AGENDA 3 Page 4 Presentation by Mr. Thomas Rogers 6 5 Public Comments 39 6 Public Hearing 45 7 Regular Business 101 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 3</p>	<p>1 2 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Item C, Public 3 Hearing, El Camino Downtown Specific Plan Review and 4 Comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Report. No 5 action will be taken on the project at this meeting, and 6 before I hand it off to Thomas, I think your first slide 7 will describe the procedure here, we do have one request 8 for a -- I believe it's a question, a point of 9 clarification from Commissioner Riggs. So I'd like to 10 give him the opportunity to do that. 11 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: Hi, Thomas. I 12 actually was prepared to ask my question after you had 13 given your introduction but before we start going through 14 this. 15 Are you going to start right off with this? 16 MR. ROGERS: Pretty much start right into 17 the presentation. 18 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: This may be jumping 19 ahead of what you'd intended to explain, anyway, but 20 there's a -- here we are looking at this document, this 21 EIR, and yet what not everyone may be following is that 22 at this point, we aren't actually talking about the 23 project. We're talking about an environmental review. 24 So I wanted to just prompt -- is it 25 possible to give a simple -- well, first of all, I'm</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 4</p>

<p>1 correct -- tell me if I'm correct that a Specific Plan, 2 that which we're not talking about tonight, is a 3 framework or a set of rules for development. 4 Can I put it that simply? 5 MR. ROGERS: Indeed. That's even in 6 one of the upcoming slides. 7 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: Okay. And then in 8 layman's terms, which is a challenge in itself, looking 9 at the purpose of the EIR, what's in it for John Q. 10 Resident? How -- how does it serve John Q. Resident to 11 have this environmental review when what most people are 12 thinking about is okay, what's in the plan? 13 MR. ROGERS: Ultimately it is information. 14 So it's one of the data sources that people can use to 15 make up their minds for the actual decisions on the draft 16 plan itself, which is very much in a draft form. 17 So we're touching a little bit on some 18 things I think that we'll deal with a little more 19 comprehensively in a moment. 20 So if -- for questions along this line, I 21 might advise just sort of taking a crack at the 22 presentation and seeing if there were any kind of 23 overarching issues that we didn't address that maybe you 24 want to emphasize or want to clarify after. 25 I don't mean to cut you off if there's any</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 5</p>	<p>1 other issues. 2 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: Okay. 3 MR. ROGERS: In that case, I'll go ahead 4 and get going. I would like to thank the Planning 5 Commission for the opportunity to be here tonight. 6 In addition to the Community Development 7 Director, Arlinda Heineck, who was previously introduced, 8 we are graced by the presence of Chip Taylor, Engineering 9 Division Manager who also oversees Transportation 10 Division, as well as Reema Mahamood from ESA, the primary 11 Environmental Impact Report consultant. 12 And the presentation should be going. 13 There we go. So the purpose of this meeting first and 14 foremost is to provide an overview of the Draft EIR. 15 Secondly, we're looking to receive 16 individual comments from Planning Commissioners and the 17 public on the environmental analysis, although we do want 18 to note that the comments are not required to be made 19 verbally at this time. 20 They can be relayed in writing through June 21 20th, and we do have a court reporter transcribing the 22 proceedings as we go through, but again, if you'd like to 23 take the time and put your own thoughts together in 24 writing after mulling things through, that's absolutely 25 the same in terms of how they're treated.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 6</p>
<p>1 Tonight also we have an opportunity to 2 provide clarifications about the analysis if necessary to 3 inform comments. This is something we'd like to 4 highlight that we're not looking to have too much of a 5 back and forth. That's really what the Draft and Final 6 EIR process is meant to do. 7 If we get into a little bit too much of a 8 responding to a comment in the meeting where it's not 9 actually kind of a technical question that -- that's 10 holding people up, we're actually kind of duplicating the 11 efforts the Final EIR is meant to do. 12 And as we've touched on a little bit right 13 now, what we're doing right now is not a broad policy 14 discussion, but that's absolutely to come. 15 I think we've tried to be clear that this 16 stage of the process is very much a draft plan. We 17 understand there's definitely a lot of range of feelings 18 out there. We're looking to get the plan improved and 19 representative of the overall community's interest. 20 So for tonight what we're going to do is 21 start off with the summary presentation. That's already 22 gotten going, take public comment on the Draft EIR, close 23 the public hearing, provide an opportunity for the 24 Planning Commission to ask those clarification or 25 technical type questions of staff and the consultant as</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 7</p>	<p>1 needed on the Draft EIR, and then lastly to close with 2 the Commission's individual comments on the Draft EIR. 3 Taking one step back and looking at the 4 overall process, the El Camino Real Downtown Specific 5 Plan is really a multi-year process, and the intent was 6 fairly broad to start. Really just asking to establish a 7 clear long-term plan for the El Camino Real corridor and 8 downtown. 9 The -- a key element to the success that 10 we've enjoyed so far is starting out not with digging 11 into a detailed Zoning Ordinance Amendment or Specific 12 Plan right off the bat, but starting with a visioning 13 exercise, and that really was key to getting people to 14 think more broadly, agree on twelve vision plan goals 15 which are discussed a little bit later in the staff 16 report, and throughout all this, we've -- we've tried to 17 do our best with community engagement as well as 18 documenting that process on the project web page. 19 I have a sample here of some of the 20 meetings and walking tours and, you know, graphics that 21 have gone out on this project. 22 We really have enjoyed the best that we've 23 seen in Menlo Park through our consultants and other 24 contacts. We've heard that other cities would be happy 25 to have half of what we've gotten here.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 8</p>

<p>1 That's not to say that we're looking to cut 2 off public comment or that we can't do better, but it 3 does show a solid base from which we can work. 4 In terms of what the specific plan is -- to 5 Commissioner Riggs' point -- it's a clear and action- 6 oriented plan for the next twenty, thirty years. 7 It provides a very detailed framework for 8 public space improvements such as plazas, widened 9 sidewalks, parking garages. It also provides a strong 10 foundation for private development with rules that would 11 guide development on private properties. 12 The other thing to keep in mind, I already 13 emphasized it's a draft document. It's something that 14 can be improved. 15 In terms of what it's not, it's not an 16 individual private development project. Like, for 17 example, the Menlo Gateway project or other things that 18 folks may have seen in our communities as well as other 19 community around here. 20 It's also not a final decision on every 21 public improvement. So it shows conceptual diagrams, it 22 shows, you know, projected phasing plan, but all those 23 decisions with a lot more detail would come later if and 24 when the plan is approved. 25 CEQA is the abbreviation for the California Page 9</p>	<p>1 Environmental Quality Act. The process that we're in 2 right now under CEQA is called the Environmental Impact 3 Report or EIR. I'll use those acronyms fairly liberally 4 from this point forward. 5 CEQA as a process is highly structured by 6 state law, guidelines and court cases. Cities have some 7 flexibility with elements of it, but a lot of it is very 8 regimented, steps you have to follow and certain 9 processes and deadlines and tasks that you have to do. 10 And a key concept here is impacts have to 11 be associated with physical effects on the environment. 12 You can contrast that explicitly with social or economic 13 impacts, but you can also contrast it with just general 14 preferences or other opinions. They need to actually 15 create some sort of physical effect on the environment. 16 Ultimately, this is an informational 17 document. It's disclosing impacts to the public as well 18 as to decision-makers, such as the Planning Commission 19 and City Council. 20 And what it doesn't do necessarily is 21 dictate a particular outcome. Communities have the 22 flexibility to take into account a number of different 23 factors in addition to the environmental effects. 24 Part of the EIR, you have to consider 25 feasible alternatives for projects. Feasible is a key Page 10</p>
<p>1 word there, that they're not things that are pie in the 2 sky or complete deviations from what your project 3 objectives are. They need to address as many of the 4 project goals as possible while lessening or removing 5 impacts. 6 Analysis also can't piecemeal things by 7 looking only at your project. You have to look at the 8 project plus other projects that are pending or likely as 9 well as just regional growth, if that can be accounted 10 for in a quantitative way. 11 And the standard -- and this is a direct 12 quote from -- from the CEQA guidelines. It's not 13 perfection. It's adequacy, completeness and a good faith 14 effort and full disclosure. 15 Another way of phrasing that is that 16 disagreement among experts is not a reason to consider an 17 environmental analysis inadequate, but if there are areas 18 of disagreement, they should be described. 19 For the plan, we're at a different level of 20 analysis than maybe some community members have seen 21 on -- on a project level analysis. It's called a Program 22 Level EIR. 23 It's a little bit higher level. There's 24 additional project level review potentially required in 25 the future as individual private development projects Page 11</p>	<p>1 come forward as well as individual public space 2 improvements. 3 Where we are right now, we've released a 4 Draft EIR and we're looking for comments. All comments 5 received during the EIR review period that are designated 6 as EIR comments are included in the Final EIR, and they 7 are responded to, to the extent that they address the 8 adequacy of the EIR or the City's compliance with CEQA. 9 Those responses can be providing more 10 information. They can actually be changing some elements 11 of the analysis. Depending on certain elements, they can 12 drive different conclusions or different descriptions. 13 Non-environmental comments ultimately can't 14 be responded to in the EIR if they're not -- not related 15 to physical impacts, but they are noted and included for 16 the record. 17 When discussing any particular impact, you 18 find that they typically fall into one of three 19 classifications. 20 The first is called less than significant, 21 meaning that there may be slight impacts, but they do not 22 exceed a relevant threshold or criteria. 23 A second category is when an impact is 24 significant, but becomes less than significant. That 25 means the impacts on initial analysis exceed the relative Page 12</p>

<p>1 threshold or criteria, but through the application of 2 feasible mitigation measures, you can actually reduce the 3 impact to the less than significant level.</p> <p>4 The last category listed here in the 5 summary is significant and unavoidable. That means that 6 there are impacts that exceed the relevant threshold or 7 criteria and there are no feasible mitigation measures 8 that are available to reduce the impact to less than 9 significant.</p> <p>10 There may be feasible mitigation measures 11 that reduce the impact somewhat. If those are feasible, 12 they should be -- still be applied. However, the impacts 13 need to be considered significant and unavoidable.</p> <p>14 CEQA asks that you look at a certain number 15 of environmental topics. Cities are free to add to this 16 list, but this is the standard list that Menlo Park has 17 used. We're going -- going to be going through each one 18 in differing levels of details. This is a summary.</p> <p>19 One thing to highlight is that two areas of 20 analysis, agriculture resources and mineral resources are 21 not analyzed in this EIR at all due to the fact that this 22 is a relatively developed area that does not have any 23 significant agriculture or mineral resources of note.</p> <p>24 In terms of the overall process, we're at 25 the April 29th Draft EIR release followed by the Planning</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 13</p>	<p>1 Commission Public Hearing we're at right now. 2 The Draft EIR comment period ends formally 3 on June 20th at 5:30 PM. As discussed, later we're going 4 to be taking those comments and responding to them. That 5 can drive potential changes to the analysis.</p> <p>6 Looking at fall 2011 for that next step of 7 the process. However, that does depend on what the level 8 of analysis -- what the level of comments are in terms of 9 number and -- and detail.</p> <p>10 So if there -- we get a lot of comments 11 that potentially drive more analysis or review that fall 12 could be later potentially, but it likely will not be 13 sooner.</p> <p>14 And this is a key element to Commissioner 15 Riggs' point. Following close of this comment period, 16 the Planning Commission and City Council will review and 17 provide comprehensive direction on the Draft Specific 18 Plan itself.</p> <p>19 So if I -- I would guess that a lot of the 20 people who are potentially here tonight or watching us on 21 the Internet or on our -- we actually got upgraded to -- 22 to the cable access TV for tonight -- are probably 23 interested in providing a bit more comment on the 24 specific plan itself.</p> <p>25 The EIR is going to feed into that, but I</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 14</p>
<p>1 think that a lot of those comments probably we're going 2 to hear and enjoy at that point that really provide more 3 of the broad comment about the specific plan and what 4 things could be changed over a bit.</p> <p>5 So digging into the actual impact criteria, 6 I note here that again, we're summarizing things at a 7 fairly high level, pulling out key discussions, and the 8 intent here is that if folks really haven't had a chance 9 to read the report or haven't had a chance to read it in 10 detail, this provides kind of an overview of things that 11 you might focus on.</p> <p>12 If you're looking to provide comments, you 13 can maybe identify areas that are of particular interest 14 and maybe rule out some areas that you don't think are of 15 particular interest to you.</p> <p>16 So the first topic is aesthetic resources. 17 We pulled out a little bit of discussion here. The plan 18 would -- would change the heights and the sizes of 19 different buildings for different areas, very specific 20 regulations for different zones.</p> <p>21 That does have the potential to change 22 aspects of individual character and cast new shadows, but 23 under the CEQA type analysis, the development 24 regulations, design guideline this Specific Plan has 25 embedded within them would limit the potential for</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 15</p>	<p>1 negative effects. Again, that's character and shadow. 2 So those are characterized in the draft as less than 3 significant.</p> <p>4 Air quality. There are two significant and 5 unavoidable impacts within this category. First comes 6 from construction vehicles and earth disturbing 7 activities which has the potential to result in a 8 significant air quality violation.</p> <p>9 That's from the emissions from these diesel 10 types of equipment as well as just the kicking up of dirt 11 as you're -- you're grading and doing other site 12 construction activities.</p> <p>13 If you get into the report, there are a 14 number of projects that are exempt from these 15 regulations, which come to the Bay Area Air Quality 16 Management District, which we typically just refer to as 17 Air District.</p> <p>18 However, just given the uncertainty of a 19 plan level analysis, we can't say with certainty that one 20 or more projects would not exceed the threshold. So 21 that's conservatively considered a significant and 22 unavoidable impact.</p> <p>23 The plan would also result in increased 24 pollutant emissions from increased vehicle traffic, and 25 what the Air District guidelines ask you to look at there</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 16</p>

<p>1 is the proposed level of growth of your plan or project 2 in terms of -- in terms of vehicle miles traveled 3 relative to population increase and to look at that 4 relative to the respective projections for your relevant 5 commute area, which in this case is the county in terms 6 of how much vehicle miles is projected and how much 7 population growth is projected over the same period. 8 In this case, the vehicle miles traveled 9 associated with the plan would have increased at a 10 slightly but notable higher rate than the impacts -- or 11 the projected increase in the population, the housing 12 associated with the project. So that's also considered 13 significant and unavoidable. 14 There are a number of analyses, Air 5 15 through 7, that deal with kind of a similar topic, which 16 is locating new residences near areas of existing 17 elevated pollutants. 18 In this case, El Camino Real, the 19 vehicles from El Camino Real as well as from Caltrain 20 that, the current diesel operations of Caltrain. 21 However, additional analysis, depending on 22 the project, and subsequent filtration systems would 23 mitigate that impact. 24 So that's our first example of an impact 25 that starts out as significant, but through application Page 17</p>	<p>1 of relevant mitigation measures that are feasible, 2 brings it down into a less than significant level. 3 Biological resources. That does -- does 4 look at potential impacts. There are special status 5 meaning endangered or otherwise listed birds and bats 6 that do roost in developed areas like this one. 7 However, preconstruction surveys and 8 avoidance procedures would mitigate that. Another impact 9 that starts out significant and becomes less than 10 significant. 11 Similarly, project lighting for any 12 individual development project could affect migratory or 13 breeding special status birds, but application of 14 lighting reductions would mitigate that. 15 Lastly, in terms of this highlight, 16 construction activities could affect special status 17 amphibians and reptiles, but fencing, training and other 18 actions would mitigate that impact. 19 So even though we're in a relatively 20 developed area, there are endangered species that -- that 21 are around, but these mitigation measures would address 22 those and help preserve them. 23 Cultural resources looks at the potential 24 for impacts on historic buildings as well as on 25 archaeological type resources. Page 18</p>
<p>1 So for historic buildings, there is the 2 potential. The existing resources are discussed in some 3 detail. 4 The exact developments aren't proposed at 5 this point, but -- so what we've laid out is a process 6 for site specific evaluations. And here the preservation 7 standards mitigate the impact along the same lines. 8 If construction activities encounter 9 archaeological resources or fossils or human remains, the 10 construction personnel, they've conducted studies, been 11 trained and implemented other procedures that would mitigate 12 the impact. 13 Geology, soils and seismicity is one where 14 it -- essentially for this particular area, they 15 adherence to all standards, building codes and other 16 regulations would result impacts to less than significant 17 levels. 18 So there aren't -- there are no mitigations 19 that need to be applied. The standards would get that 20 down to less than significant level. 21 Greenhouse gases and climate change is a 22 bit of new topic. It's been required for all EIRs I 23 believe since last year. It's been implemented for some 24 other ones in advance of that. 25 For this particular area, we rely on the Page 19</p>	<p>1 Air District's guidelines, which were implemented fairly 2 recently, and what the guidelines say for the first type 3 of analysis is you look at the total greenhouse gases. 4 That's the tailpipe emissions from the cars that people 5 drive to get to the -- the new housing or new office or 6 new retail. 7 You look at the energy use that requires 8 light and heat to maintain those. You look at some other 9 impact criteria. 10 You get a total greenhouse gases as 11 measured in carbon dioxide equivalent, and then you 12 divide that by what's called the service population. So 13 that's the residents or employees who are associated with 14 that particular development. 15 For a specific plan using the Air 16 District's model, you get a measurement of 5.8 metric 17 tons of carbon dioxide equivalent per service population 18 per year. That's in excess of the Air District 19 threshold, which is 4.6. 20 For this one, we identified several 21 feasible mitigation measures which would reduce the rate 22 to 5.5 tons of carbon dioxide equivalent for service 23 population. 24 However, that would still -- still exceed 25 the threshold. So that is another one that's considered Page 20</p>

<p>1 significant and unavoidable.</p> <p>2 The -- the second analysis is really just</p> <p>3 the policy side of the previous analysis, because that</p> <p>4 standard was derived from state legislation. To the</p> <p>5 extent the plan does not address the previous standard,</p> <p>6 GHG-1, we consider GHG-2 to likewise be significant and</p> <p>7 unavoidable. It's kind of the flipside of the same --</p> <p>8 same requirement.</p> <p>9 Hazardous materials and hazards. Again, if</p> <p>10 you're doing construction, there's the potential to</p> <p>11 disturb hazardous materials, potentially leaky tanks from</p> <p>12 previous gas stations or other types of uses.</p> <p>13 But in conducting these environmental site</p> <p>14 reviews, initial site reviews and doing mitigations if</p> <p>15 you need them would mitigate that impact.</p> <p>16 Similarly, any -- any time you're doing</p> <p>17 hazardous -- any time you're doing construction, you're</p> <p>18 using fuels or lubricants or solvents through the act of</p> <p>19 construction.</p> <p>20 If you're handling those improperly, they</p> <p>21 could result in impacts, but implementing best management</p> <p>22 practices would mitigate that.</p> <p>23 Akin to geology, hydrology and water</p> <p>24 quality is an area where there are no impacts. Just</p> <p>25 through the application of standard grading and drainage,</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 21</p>	<p>1 other regulations.</p> <p>2 Land use and planning policy. You need to</p> <p>3 look at whether a plan or project would divide an</p> <p>4 established community.</p> <p>5 In this case, the plan would not and in</p> <p>6 many respects would improve conductivity. So that's</p> <p>7 found to be less than significant without the application</p> <p>8 of any mitigation measures.</p> <p>9 With regard to the second criteria, the</p> <p>10 plan would alter the type and intensity of land uses, but</p> <p>11 not in a manner that would be substantially incompatible</p> <p>12 with surrounding land uses or neighborhood character.</p> <p>13 As noted before, we did conduct a fairly</p> <p>14 detailed community engagement exercises, and so a lot of</p> <p>15 things are coming through numerous workshops or having</p> <p>16 been reviewed again.</p> <p>17 That's not to say they're things that can't</p> <p>18 be improved further, but it's not coming out of being cut</p> <p>19 from whole cloth or -- or coming out of nowhere. So</p> <p>20 those are considered to be different, but not</p> <p>21 incompatible.</p> <p>22 With noise, we've reached another category</p> <p>23 where there is a significant and unavoidable impact. But</p> <p>24 first, there are the potential for impacts from</p> <p>25 construction activities, but doing noise control</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 22</p>
<p>1 activities for pile driving, that would mitigate those</p> <p>2 impacts.</p> <p>3 Similar to the air quality, the act of</p> <p>4 locating new residences near areas that are currently</p> <p>5 noisy is considered to be exposing a sensitive receptor</p> <p>6 to noise and/or vibration, but you can do insulation or</p> <p>7 vibration isolation techniques to mitigate that impact,</p> <p>8 and that would be required as a mitigation measure.</p> <p>9 The category noise 5 that is a significant</p> <p>10 unavoidable impact, that looks at the fact that there are</p> <p>11 already several roadways along portions El Camino Real</p> <p>12 and along Ravenswood Avenue in particular that are in</p> <p>13 excess of relevant General Plan or Municipal Code</p> <p>14 standards.</p> <p>15 In the -- increase of basically any traffic</p> <p>16 from the plan would be considered to exacerbate a</p> <p>17 condition that's already not performing up to standards.</p> <p>18 In cases of noise types -- types of</p> <p>19 impacts, if, you know, you think of freeways and the new</p> <p>20 sound walls are -- are applied as mitigation measures.</p> <p>21 In this case because we're in a relatively</p> <p>22 compact urban type area, you can't put sound walls on the</p> <p>23 edge of a roadway. They just -- it would change the</p> <p>24 character. There's not room necessarily. So that's not</p> <p>25 considered to be a feasible mitigation and the impact is</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 23</p>	<p>1 significant and unavoidable.</p> <p>2 Population and housing. The project is</p> <p>3 a -- a -- again, it's not an individual development</p> <p>4 project. It is a plan that's going to be implemented in</p> <p>5 phases as individual property owners turn over their</p> <p>6 properties as opposed to specific redevelopment.</p> <p>7 So to the extent that any existing housing</p> <p>8 in the planning area is demolished, it would occur over</p> <p>9 time such that the replacement facilities will be</p> <p>10 provided elsewhere within the plan area. So that's not</p> <p>11 considered to be a housing impact.</p> <p>12 And the -- the other criteria for</p> <p>13 population housing is whether it would induce substantial</p> <p>14 population growth, and that's either directly by</p> <p>15 proposing new housing.</p> <p>16 In this case, because the plan area's</p> <p>17 population growth will be both in the overall projections</p> <p>18 for the City, that's not considered to be the impact, and</p> <p>19 in addition, the plan itself in contrast to an</p> <p>20 infrastructure improvement like a free -- new freeway</p> <p>21 interchange where there wasn't a freeway interchange</p> <p>22 before, it would not induce population growth elsewhere</p> <p>23 through that type of inducement.</p> <p>24 With regard to public services and</p> <p>25 utilities, the plan wouldn't require new or physically</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 24</p>

<p>1 altered police or fire facilities.</p> <p>2 The reason that word is highlighted is</p> <p>3 because the -- the CEQA standards do not look at</p> <p>4 potential economic or service impacts. It's really</p> <p>5 limited to whether new fire station, new police station</p> <p>6 is required to serve the area.</p> <p>7 In this case, it is a developed area</p> <p>8 already that has a number of taller buildings as well as</p> <p>9 a number of police needs, so that wouldn't increase the</p> <p>10 need for a new station for either of those services.</p> <p>11 Under Pub 3, the plan would result in some</p> <p>12 school enrollment from new residences. However, again,</p> <p>13 because this is an incremental implementation, that would</p> <p>14 incur currently the tapering of recent growth trends as</p> <p>15 projected within the school district's own analysis,</p> <p>16 which did account for a little bit of plan area</p> <p>17 development.</p> <p>18 In addition, the majority of new housing in</p> <p>19 the plan area would be attached multi-family</p> <p>20 residences which have lower student yield rates, verified</p> <p>21 both in the census as well as the district's own</p> <p>22 projections, and in this case, by the district, I mean</p> <p>23 the Menlo Park City School District primary, elementary</p> <p>24 school district for this particular area.</p> <p>25 Under Pub 4, new residences and employees</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 25</p>	<p>1 would increase the use of parks. However, the ratio of</p> <p>2 park acre per 1,000 persons as established in the General</p> <p>3 Plan would still be exceeded, and in addition, we would</p> <p>4 be providing new plazas and open spaces through the plan</p> <p>5 area implementation.</p> <p>6 With regard to water, the development</p> <p>7 association of the plan would increase the demand for</p> <p>8 water supply. However, the local water supplier would be</p> <p>9 able to serve these demands in normal year conditions.</p> <p>10 It is worth noting that during critical dry</p> <p>11 year events, normal full dry years, water supplies could</p> <p>12 be curtailed systemwide. That is a condition that</p> <p>13 currently applies.</p> <p>14 It's not something where the plan has an</p> <p>15 effect on that condition during dry years, critical dry</p> <p>16 year events or multiple dry years.</p> <p>17 There wouldn't be any impacts for new</p> <p>18 facilities, for water treatment, wastewater agreement,</p> <p>19 landfills or gas and electric supplies. Those could be</p> <p>20 served within the existing demands, and cumulative</p> <p>21 impacts is also less than significant.</p> <p>22 Of particular note I know to a lot of folks</p> <p>23 is transportation, circulation and parking. The primary</p> <p>24 transportation analysis is probably worth taking a little</p> <p>25 bit of a step back and just looking at how Menlo Park</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 26</p>
<p>1 looks at transportation impacts.</p> <p>2 And so what the analysis provides is a</p> <p>3 description of existing conditions, and that's verified</p> <p>4 from data from traffic counts, about impacts, delays at</p> <p>5 certain intersections, about volumes of traffic on</p> <p>6 certain roadways.</p> <p>7 What the analysis then looks at is the</p> <p>8 impact of the project. And so that's the impact of the</p> <p>9 entire Specific Plan Development being added to the</p> <p>10 existing conditions.</p> <p>11 Of note is the fact that this is a</p> <p>12 conservative analysis. It acknowledges the fact that</p> <p>13 this is a -- it's -- the plan area would be developed in</p> <p>14 phases, but however it's hard to pinpoint when certain</p> <p>15 developments would come along for purposes of traffic</p> <p>16 analysis.</p> <p>17 So in this case, we just said what if it</p> <p>18 just appeared tomorrow, what would be the impacts of</p> <p>19 different roadways?</p> <p>20 Then you also have to look at the</p> <p>21 cumulative analysis. So that's the impact of the entire</p> <p>22 plan Specific Plan Development Program over existing</p> <p>23 conditions plus other approved or proposed projects</p> <p>24 within Menlo Park, plus a 25-year regional growth factor.</p> <p>25 So that accounts for projects that are</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 27</p>	<p>1 outside our jurisdiction, but from observance and data</p> <p>2 from the past couple decades, we've found out it's</p> <p>3 basically a one hundred compounding growth. So over</p> <p>4 time, it definitely adds up. Those are the impacts of</p> <p>5 cumulative growth.</p> <p>6 So you take that data and you're looking at</p> <p>7 intersections. So for representative sample of</p> <p>8 intersections, you're saying does the project or the</p> <p>9 cumulative analysis degrade a certain level of service</p> <p>10 category or exceed a particular delay threshold versus</p> <p>11 existing conditions.</p> <p>12 For roadway segments, it's a little bit</p> <p>13 different. You look at the increase in traffic volumes</p> <p>14 and whether a percentage or absolute increase is</p> <p>15 exceeded.</p> <p>16 For both intersections and roadway</p> <p>17 segments, depending on the intersection, you have</p> <p>18 different thresholds.</p> <p>19 So for a state arterial like El Camino</p> <p>20 Real, that has different criteria for when an impact is</p> <p>21 an impact versus a -- a more local or collector type</p> <p>22 intersection.</p> <p>23 So for the short-term project analysis if</p> <p>24 the whole project appeared tomorrow -- and we're going to</p> <p>25 be -- this is an area where we are definitely summarizing</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 28</p>

<p>1 things a little bit, so I would encourage anyone who's</p> <p>2 interested who hasn't had a chance to -- to really dig</p> <p>3 into the report, because it provides all the level of</p> <p>4 detail that you may be looking for, but under the short</p> <p>5 term the traffic.</p> <p>6 But -- so under the short-term, the traffic</p> <p>7 from the plan area development would adversely affect</p> <p>8 operation of four area intersections. We're not going to</p> <p>9 go through them all here.</p> <p>10 We do look at whether any mitigation</p> <p>11 measures -- for example, signaling an intersection</p> <p>12 that's currently just a stop sign or whether adding lanes</p> <p>13 at the intersection, a right turn lane or additional</p> <p>14 through lanes, restriping could eliminate impacts.</p> <p>15 And in this case, there are several</p> <p>16 mitigation measures that would eliminate all of these</p> <p>17 impacts. However, because of phasing, right-of-way,</p> <p>18 acquisition, financing, other issues, that add some</p> <p>19 uncertainty, we're saying that their implementation</p> <p>20 cannot be guaranteed.</p> <p>21 It's probably likely that some would</p> <p>22 actually be implemented, but it's hard to say exactly</p> <p>23 which ones.</p> <p>24 So for a conservative analysis, we're</p> <p>25 calling those significant and unavoidable impacts for</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 29</p>	<p>1 intersections at the short-term level.</p> <p>2 The analysis at the project short-term</p> <p>3 level looks at the roadway segments. There are nine</p> <p>4 roadway segments that would have certain increases that</p> <p>5 are considered impacts.</p> <p>6 When you're looking at roadway segments,</p> <p>7 typically one way to minimize an impact is to widen them,</p> <p>8 but these roadways are not good candidates for widening.</p> <p>9 There are transportation demand programs</p> <p>10 that would provide partial mitigation. However, it's</p> <p>11 hard to quantify that.</p> <p>12 So again, we're considering these</p> <p>13 significant and unavoidable impacts.</p> <p>14 At the long-term level -- so that's the</p> <p>15 project plus other projects plus a regional growth factor</p> <p>16 that accounts for things that we can't get to a certain</p> <p>17 level of detail on -- the number of intersections goes</p> <p>18 up, and we're not going to list each one of them.</p> <p>19 I think there are fourteen -- yeah. I</p> <p>20 think there's fourteen intersections at the long-term</p> <p>21 level that would have adverse operations in terms of</p> <p>22 delays at different times of day and for different</p> <p>23 directions, but those are considered to be impacts under</p> <p>24 our transportation impact analysis guidelines.</p> <p>25 In this case, we again look at mitigation</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 30</p>
<p>1 measures, and again it's not the case that all impacts</p> <p>2 could be eliminated through the -- the application of</p> <p>3 mitigations, but several -- many could and many could</p> <p>4 also be lessened.</p> <p>5 However, once again for those uncertainties</p> <p>6 we talked about earlier, we are considering those to be</p> <p>7 significant and unavoidable impacts.</p> <p>8 Again, at the long-term level, we see more</p> <p>9 traffic because there's more growth; not just from the</p> <p>10 project, but from other projects in our area.</p> <p>11 The number of roadway segments went up.</p> <p>12 The same justification for -- for not mitigating them,</p> <p>13 which is -- that's basically that there's not room or</p> <p>14 desire to widen these segments to add additional lanes to</p> <p>15 roads like Oak Grove or University Drive.</p> <p>16 Those are considered to be impacts. TDM</p> <p>17 would also help, but not in a quantifiable way.</p> <p>18 Transportation also looks at a number of</p> <p>19 other impacts, freeway segments, transit ridership,</p> <p>20 pedestrian/bicycle operations, parking in the downtown.</p> <p>21 All of which would be affected to some degree, but would</p> <p>22 not reach a substantial threshold.</p> <p>23 So as an overview, what we talked about</p> <p>24 being significant and unavoidable project impacts. Those</p> <p>25 are impacts of projects in the short-term scenario.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 31</p>	<p>1 There's the potential for increased</p> <p>2 long-term emissions of pollutants associated with</p> <p>3 construction activities that could contribute</p> <p>4 substantially to an air quality violation.</p> <p>5 There is also the effect of an -- increased</p> <p>6 long-term emissions from vehicle traffic and other onsite</p> <p>7 air resources that would be considered to contribute</p> <p>8 substantially to air quality violation.</p> <p>9 There are impacts from future development</p> <p>10 against the current operation of area intersections as</p> <p>11 well as impacts from future development on the operation</p> <p>12 of roadway segments. So those are all the short-term</p> <p>13 level. Just the project over existing conditions.</p> <p>14 And then at the cumulative level, which is</p> <p>15 the project plus other projects, there's the greenhouse</p> <p>16 gas impact which is considered to be exclusively</p> <p>17 cumulative.</p> <p>18 That's the impact that there would be</p> <p>19 greenhouse gas emissions, both indirectly and directly</p> <p>20 that would have a significant impact on the environment.</p> <p>21 There's the policy related implications of</p> <p>22 that with regard to greenhouse gases. There's the noise</p> <p>23 impact from roadways that are already noisy that would</p> <p>24 have increases to that that cannot be mitigated by sound</p> <p>25 walls or other types of mitigations.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 32</p>



<p>1 And then there were the equivalent 2 transportation mitigi -- impacts that we talked about 3 will have for cumulative developments versus 4 intersections as well as roadway segments. 5 The last thing -- we're getting to the end 6 here of the presentation. CEQA requires that you look at 7 alternatives to the project, and so that's part of the 8 guidelines for that say you have to look at alternatives 9 that attain most of the basic objectives of the project, 10 and avoid significant impacts or lessen them. 11 With regard to this, alternatives have to 12 be feasible. They cannot be unrealistic in terms of the 13 cost or disruption that are going for alternative that 14 would have to be required. 15 One alternative that you have to analyze 16 under CEQA is called the no project alternative, and what 17 this is is the impact of just not adopting the project 18 whatsoever. The current zoning ordinance and current 19 General Plan would remain in effect. 20 So it's worth taking a step back and 21 looking at what are the project objectives if the 22 alternatives have to address the project objectives. 23 Those are considered to be made up of the 24 vision plan goals, so we're not going through these all, 25 but there are things like revitalizing under- utilized</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 33</p>	<p>1 parcels and buildings, protecting and enhancing 2 pedestrian amenities on Santa Cruz Avenue, expanding 3 shopping, dining and neighborhood services, providing 4 plaza and park spaces. 5 Those are all considered to be the 6 objectives of the plan in conjunction with the Specific 7 Plan's guiding principles. There are five of those. 8 They are to generate vibrancy, strengthen the public 9 realm, sustain Menlo Park's village character, enhance 10 connectivity and promote healthy living and 11 sustainability. 12 So the way we determined the alternatives, 13 the project is considered to be the hundred percent 14 maximum that could -- could be a result of the -- the 15 process that we've gone through so far. 16 The no project alternative, we compared to 17 current densities and intensities of the existing zoning 18 ordinance in connection with the Draft Specific Plan, and 19 we found that basically the current zoning ordinance, if 20 you keep it in effect, certain properties are going to be 21 redeveloped at lower intensities in certain cases. 22 That can be considered to represent 47 23 percent of the Specific Plan's residential component and 24 66 percent of its retail, commercial and hotel component. 25 So that establishes what the no</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 34</p>
<p>1 alternative -- sorry -- the no project alternative looks 2 at. 3 Then we looked at a -- worked on an 4 alternative two for this project, which is really just 5 splitting the difference between the Specific Plan and 6 alternative one, no project, saying, you know, maybe the 7 intensities we hit from the draft aren't right. Let's 8 downgrade everything across the board. 9 That gives you a 74 percent comparison to 10 the specific plan with regard to residential and 83 11 percent with regard to the commercial components. 12 And then for alternatives three and four, 13 they're kind of hybrids of alternative two and the 14 project, because we have heard comments from different 15 community members about, you know, maybe -- maybe the 16 residential is something you want to look at in 17 reducing -- maybe the retail's something you want to look 18 at reducing. There are different priorities out there. 19 And so alternative three is looking at 20 keeping the project as the project, but reducing the 21 retail commercial space so the -- the residential stays 22 at a hundred percent. 23 And then alternative four is kind of the 24 flipside of that where the commercial stays at a hundred 25 percent, but residential reduced down to the</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 35</p>	<p>1 alternative two levels. 2 The key findings here, none of the 3 alternatives -- and this includes the no project 4 alternative -- fully eliminates any significant and 5 unavoidable impact. 6 So the no project alternative would lessen 7 air quality, noise and transportation impacts due to the 8 fact that there would be fewer auto trips. 9 However, it performs the same or worse 10 regarding greenhouse gases and climate change, and the 11 key thing to keep in mind here is that because the 12 greenhouse gas standard is a ratio of emissions to 13 service population, it would have at a minimum the same 14 ratio as the specific plan does because there would be -- 15 still be people and trips associated with it, and if 16 anything, it could be considered to have a greater 17 greenhouse gas or climate change impact. 18 I'm talking about the no project 19 alternative here in that a lot of the more sustainable 20 elements of the plan would not be implemented with the no 21 project alternative. 22 And probably as important if not more 23 important is the fact that the no project alternative 24 addresses the fewest number of project objectives. 25 So that includes vibrancy, pedestrian</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 36</p>

<p>1 improvements, housing opportunities and such.</p> <p>2 Alternative three, the reduced commercial</p> <p>3 retail space, that would result in fewer daily trips than</p> <p>4 the alternative four, reduced residential.</p> <p>5 So another way of looking at that is if</p> <p>6 you -- if decreasing auto trips is the goal, alternative</p> <p>7 three where you reduce the commercial space does a better</p> <p>8 job at that than the reduced residential space.</p> <p>9 And under CEQA, you're -- you're supposed</p> <p>10 to look at what is the environmentally superior</p> <p>11 alternative. In this case, it's just the across the</p> <p>12 board reduction alternative two. It's designated as the</p> <p>13 environmentally superior alternative.</p> <p>14 And thankfully for my voice, it's bringing</p> <p>15 us to the end of the presentation.</p> <p>16 A couple of things we want to emphasize is</p> <p>17 the process for this meeting does involve public comment</p> <p>18 on the Draft EIR coming up. Closing the public hearing,</p> <p>19 providing opportunity for the Commission to ask those</p> <p>20 technical clarifying type questions of staff or the</p> <p>21 consultant if needed on the Draft EIR.</p> <p>22 Again, what we're -- we're trying to look</p> <p>23 for is things where there's a -- maybe a misunderstanding</p> <p>24 or just a lack of information about something that you</p> <p>25 need to understand in order to make a comment.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 37</p>	<p>1 It's not meant to be actually making a</p> <p>2 comment and expecting us to respond on the spot, because</p> <p>3 the Final EIR process is what that's meant for.</p> <p>4 Then we're getting the Commission comments</p> <p>5 on the Draft EIR after there's any questions, and then</p> <p>6 closing the public meeting in this case.</p> <p>7 So the Draft EIR comment deadline, Monday</p> <p>8 June 20th, 5:30 PM. You can submit those comments in</p> <p>9 writing to me through e-mail, letter or fax. Our project</p> <p>10 page describes a lot more information on it.</p> <p>11 And just in closing, to highlight again</p> <p>12 that the focus of this meeting is the Draft EIR, the</p> <p>13 quality of the environmental analysis and the City's</p> <p>14 compliance with CEQA.</p> <p>15 It's not a broad policy discussion about</p> <p>16 the Specific Plan itself. However, that is coming and</p> <p>17 we're going to welcome everyone's comments from the</p> <p>18 public, from the Commission, from the broader community.</p> <p>19 So with that, I'm going to head over to the</p> <p>20 other staff table, and if there's any questions before</p> <p>21 public comments necessary to the process, we can take</p> <p>22 those. But if not, I would recommend we just open the</p> <p>23 public hearing.</p> <p>24 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Okay. Thank you,</p> <p>25 Thomas.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 38</p>
<p>1 Does anyone up here have any questions that</p> <p>2 they would like to address before public comments?</p> <p>3 Okay. I don't have any cards right now, so if</p> <p>4 you want to make a public comment, please submit a card</p> <p>5 after you do so or before.</p> <p>6 If no one approaches the podium, I'm going</p> <p>7 to close public comment pretty soon. Okay. We have</p> <p>8 someone.</p> <p>9 CHIEF SCHAPELHOUMAN: The Fire District</p> <p>10 has a couple comments. Do you want the card?</p> <p>11 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Yes.</p> <p>12 CHIEF SCHAPELHOUMAN: So members of the</p> <p>13 Planning Commission and to the staff, the District -- the</p> <p>14 Fire District did look at this and did provide initial</p> <p>15 comments, and I was looking at the comments that were</p> <p>16 made tonight in the document.</p> <p>17 My name is Harold Schapelhouman. I'm the</p> <p>18 fire chief.</p> <p>19 And so the District doesn't necessarily</p> <p>20 agree with some of the comments, but we'll put that in</p> <p>21 writing. Obviously it's an extensive document, very well</p> <p>22 done.</p> <p>23 Whether we agree or disagree is really</p> <p>24 immaterial to some of these things. It's really up to</p> <p>25 the community.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 39</p>	<p>1 But we do have concerns on traffic</p> <p>2 circulation obviously, because it affects our response.</p> <p>3 We have specific concerns related to the comments on Fire</p> <p>4 Station 6, which was built in the -- in the 1950s, and as</p> <p>5 it mentions in one of the slides, it talks about public</p> <p>6 services and utilities and the nexus was the plan would</p> <p>7 not require new or physically altered police or fire</p> <p>8 facilities.</p> <p>9 I would differ with that. The Fire</p> <p>10 District realizes that its facility is outdated. It was</p> <p>11 built, as I mentioned, in the '50s. It's not capable of</p> <p>12 holding anything beyond a single engine company.</p> <p>13 If it were to be rebuilt on the lot today,</p> <p>14 it could not be built the way that it was built. It</p> <p>15 doesn't even have adequate parking with the standards</p> <p>16 that are there. It wouldn't meet ADA requirements and so</p> <p>17 forth.</p> <p>18 So the District in the last several years</p> <p>19 has purchased the residential lot behind that facility.</p> <p>20 We had some extensive plans prior to the economic</p> <p>21 downturn that we're all living through, and unfortunately</p> <p>22 we're in a phased plan right now.</p> <p>23 So I know this document references that the</p> <p>24 facility is adequate. I would disagree with that.</p> <p>25 We know the facility's inadequate. We know</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 40</p>

<p>1 the facility's old. I would equate it to an old pair of 2 tennis shoes. Sooner or later, it's going to wear out. 3 You can keep wearing 'em, but there's problems with 'em. 4 So at this point with what's processed 5 here, we have some concerns. 6 We also have some concerns, which we'll 7 have to talk to staff about, which is from the 8 environmental standpoint, we're obviously in favor of 9 wider sidewalks. We're in favor of trees. We're in 10 favor of everything that's going to make the community 11 look more beautiful. Going to make it more advantageous 12 for the public to use, Santa Cruz Avenue or other streets 13 and so forth. 14 We are concerned about closing streets down 15 from a response point. We are concerned about offsets to 16 streets like Santa Cruz Avenue and our ability to have 17 good access on that street, specifically if you 18 understand that two-thirds of all the structures in 19 downtown are not sprinklered structures. 20 So I understand with the improvements, with 21 multi-story and we have some concerns about those, as 22 well, although less because they'll be sprinklered, but 23 if we add more trees and move the sidewalks out, the Fire 24 District has equipment that works in the configuration 25 that's there now.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 41</p>	<p>1 I'm not opposed to it. I'm just concerned 2 about it. What we don't want to end up is with a 3 situation where we have trees and a density format where 4 we can't use something like the aerial ladder truck or 5 we're forced to go back to using ground ladders or we 6 can't use it on one side of the building, but can use it 7 on the other. 8 So that will eliminate or reduce or 9 complicate our tactical objectives, and I know people 10 don't like to think about those things, but -- and again, 11 from an environmental standpoint, I'm sure it's going to 12 be much more beautiful than it was before, but there's 13 also practical things that need to be looked at when you 14 look at these projects. 15 So we've offered a number of comments, and 16 again, I think the group has done a pretty nice job of 17 including a number of those. With the exception of the 18 fire station. 19 Again, we feel is inadequate right now and 20 needs to be replaced at some point. So that's my 21 comments. 22 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Thank you. 23 I have a card for Don Brawner. Don 24 Brawner. 25 MR. BRAWNER: I'd like to wait until you</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 42</p>
<p>1 all have made comments. 2 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: We have to do the 3 public comment right now. I can't reopen it. I mean, 4 this is the public comments period right now. Bear in 5 mind, this is simply the EIR. 6 MR. BRAWNER: Well, keep it simple. This 7 has got to be another travesty brought forward by 8 consultants who apparently haven't driven in the streets 9 of Menlo Park for a long, long time. Or they just close 10 their eyes when they see problems. 11 Redwood City went through the same process 12 about three or four or five years ago. I don't remember 13 when, and unfortunately, they spent about fifty million 14 dollars on their projects and built this huge garage and 15 made all these fancy meters for parking, et cetera, et 16 cetera, et cetera. 17 Well, guess what happened? An attorney 18 with an office downtown sued and said, "This thing is 19 ridiculous." He went to court, the court tossed the 20 Specific Plan out the window. 21 Well, gee whiz, what are we going to do 22 now? Well, we're going to draw up another plan. 23 So last summer, they had this full page 24 advertisement in the paper. Oh, guess what we're going 25 to do now? We're not going to limit retail on the ground</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 43</p>	<p>1 floor. We're going to open -- we're going to allow 2 anything on the ground floor of all these wonderful 3 buildings we've built where they were built for retail, 4 but they couldn't get any retailers in there because 5 customers couldn't get there because of the congestion. 6 So now they have quote modified zoning on 7 the first floor in the business district. 8 I think two things we need to understand. 9 A, the most successful quote Town and Country Village 10 Shopping Center, if you want to call it that, on the 11 Peninsula is next door at Stanford, and I don't think the 12 partnership -- the real estate partnership that bought 13 that property and has redeveloped it into a very 14 successful operation is going to be building housing. 15 They're not going to be building three- and four- and 16 five- story office buildings, either. 17 Interestingly, the same consultant that was 18 used to try and brainstorm us into this program is 19 working for Stanford. I don't think -- if they're 20 working over at Stanford, I'd be surprised if they are 21 going to bring something like that to the Stanford 22 Shopping Center. Very surprised. 23 One of the other very classic examples, of, 24 shall we say a non-successful enterprise is Sunnyvale, 25 the Town and Country Center down there. You ought to</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 44</p>

<p>1 drop by there some day and see what's going on.</p> <p>2 It's resulted in the bankruptcy of a couple</p> <p>3 of the developers, but, you know, things happen, and when</p> <p>4 you go up to San Francisco next time, if you're familiar</p> <p>5 with the Tenderloin District in San Francisco, that's the</p> <p>6 perfect example of what happens to mixed use after ten,</p> <p>7 fifteen, twenty years. Junk.</p> <p>8 Thank you.</p> <p>9 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Thank you.</p> <p>10 Do we have anybody else that wants to make</p> <p>11 a public comment? This is your only chance.</p> <p>12 Okay. I'm going to close the public</p> <p>13 comment with that.</p> <p>14 And I'm going to bring it back up here.</p> <p>15 We're going to address questions to staff about the EIR</p> <p>16 report, about the presentation, and after that, we'll</p> <p>17 have an opportunity to comment on this.</p> <p>18 Who would like to start? I see Ben, do you</p> <p>19 have your light on? It just looks like it's on. Okay.</p> <p>20 Peipei.</p> <p>21 COMMISSIONER YU: I do have a question.</p> <p>22 Under the Transportation and Air Quality section, I was</p> <p>23 wondering if the ER -- EIR takes into account the</p> <p>24 cumulative impact of potential future projects like high</p> <p>25 speed rail or other changes that might be in the</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 45</p>	<p>1 pipeline.</p> <p>2 MR. ROGERS: The cumulative analysis</p> <p>3 definitely takes into account the cumulative effect of</p> <p>4 other development projects, specifically as noted in the</p> <p>5 summary. There are other projects within Menlo Park that</p> <p>6 are proposed or likely. There's also a regional growth</p> <p>7 factor.</p> <p>8 We did analyze and discuss some of the</p> <p>9 impacts from high speed rail; not as a development trip</p> <p>10 generator, but as a potential modifier to the</p> <p>11 intersection design and operations.</p> <p>12 Ultimately that wouldn't be considered to</p> <p>13 have a -- a significant effect. I'm just seeing if I can</p> <p>14 locate the exact reference, but the gist of it was that</p> <p>15 because the rail project would be grade separated, some</p> <p>16 of the intersections that are currently at-grade would</p> <p>17 actually improve operations, and again, this is really</p> <p>18 just looking at traffic impact.</p> <p>19 So there were potential other aesthetic</p> <p>20 effects or just community preferences, but in terms of</p> <p>21 traffic operations, those were considered, but not</p> <p>22 considered to have a significant effect under this</p> <p>23 analysis.</p> <p>24 But again, as with anything we're talking</p> <p>25 about here, that could be the source of a comment.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 46</p>
<p>1 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Henry.</p> <p>2 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: Thank you.</p> <p>3 I guess this is probably directed to</p> <p>4 Thomas. One of the points you made in your presentation</p> <p>5 was that although this is a higher level or program EIR,</p> <p>6 project level review may be required in the future, and</p> <p>7 by that, you meant project level EIR?</p> <p>8 MR. ROGERS: It really does run the range.</p> <p>9 So what the -- the plan assumed was a certain amount of</p> <p>10 development under the Specific Plans Development</p> <p>11 Regulations on a certain number of opportunity sites,</p> <p>12 sites that look like they're good candidates for</p> <p>13 redevelopment.</p> <p>14 However, the plan acknowledges, the EIR</p> <p>15 also echoes that we essentially know that the actual</p> <p>16 development will vary from those conditions.</p> <p>17 And so the -- the way the process works is</p> <p>18 that if the plan is adopted, if the EIR's certified, and</p> <p>19 then the next year, another project -- a project comes</p> <p>20 in, a specific project.</p> <p>21 The first step is basically to look at</p> <p>22 whether that project is covered under the analysis of the</p> <p>23 Draft Specific Plan EIR, and in a lot of cases, the</p> <p>24 intent is definitely that it will be in terms of those</p> <p>25 uses in that general location, no further analysis will</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 47</p>	<p>1 be required.</p> <p>2 We do acknowledge there's the potential for</p> <p>3 in any number of cases analysis to find that you know</p> <p>4 what? We didn't look at development or this type of</p> <p>5 development of this particular intensity at this</p> <p>6 particular site and there is the potential for impact.</p> <p>7 There may be an intersection delay that wasn't forecast</p> <p>8 or a shadow impact that could have some sort of impact.</p> <p>9 Then that project will have to do its own</p> <p>10 supplemental analysis, and that can either take the form</p> <p>11 of an EIR, full EIR, which is what we're looking at here</p> <p>12 and which has been kind of the norm for Menlo Park</p> <p>13 projects over the last few years, or it could be</p> <p>14 something that's called a Mitigated Declaration, and</p> <p>15 that's a terms of art under CEQA where impacts are found</p> <p>16 for that particular project that weren't analyzed in the</p> <p>17 program level EIR. However, they can be mitigated under</p> <p>18 a certain level.</p> <p>19 And so it requires less review, but it's</p> <p>20 also -- it's very similar in its structure in terms of</p> <p>21 what -- what an impact is, how it's mitigated and how</p> <p>22 those mitigations are enforced.</p> <p>23 I think the overall hope is that few</p> <p>24 projects would need to do their own project level EIRs.</p> <p>25 However, in the absence of actual specific development</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 48</p>

<p>1 proposals, it's hard to say with certainty whether they 2 would or wouldn't.</p> <p>3 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: All right. I just -- 4 I really wanted to address the majority of it because one 5 of the -- I mean, in balancing restrictions or 6 requirements or mandates with some levels of 7 encouragement to renew our El Camino or parts of our 8 downtown maybe there's some advantage gained out of this, 9 and certainly if the majority don't have to go through 10 the EIR process, then that -- advantages would be I'm 11 sure appreciated.</p> <p>12 Now I wanted to ask about the greenhouse 13 gases under GHG1 is where I made my note, although it may 14 be applies -- I guess that's it.</p> <p>15 The -- the Air District's threshold is 4.6 16 metric tons of CO2, and what is evaluated under this 17 Specific Plan, which already assumes the higher level of 18 modern codes, is 5.5.</p> <p>19 So that leads me to ask: What would be the 20 Air District's evaluation of our current buildings in 21 town?</p> <p>22 MR. ROGERS: It -- it's a fair question. 23 Ultimately CEQA's not looking, you know, at the impacts 24 of, you know, what's the energy use of buildings that are 25 built today that are maybe not very efficient or which</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 49</p>	<p>1 are, you know, more auto -- maybe slightly more auto 2 dependent than current new buildings could be.</p> <p>3 It's really looking at what's the impact of 4 your project versus the impact of not -- not doing 5 anything.</p> <p>6 So if I read you correctly, one -- one 7 comment could be something along the lines of the fact 8 that if new buildings were built under the plan, those 9 would have improved energy, more efficient energy 10 consumption than the existing buildings.</p> <p>11 However, CEQA does not look at it typically 12 at that level of granularity, but that could be a comment 13 that's worth exploring further.</p> <p>14 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: CEQA looks at growth, 15 and therefore the status quo is not about that.</p> <p>16 MR. ROGERS: In kind of general terms, I 17 would say that's accurate. There are always nuances, 18 but, for example, the -- the -- some people have made the 19 case that the no project alternatives, if they push 20 growth to other parts of the area, the Bay Area, that 21 should be considered an impact, but under CEQA, it's 22 really just kind of that it's not there. If it's not in 23 your city, it just doesn't exist.</p> <p>24 So there's -- there's some different things 25 that could be considered maybe more broadly when the</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 50</p>
<p>1 Planning Commission and City Council gets to the more 2 broad policy type discussions, but under CEQA, at least 3 as we've analyzed it currently in the Draft EIR which 4 can't be commented on, it looks at the impact of this 5 growth and then, yeah, the absence of that.</p> <p>6 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: Well, actually, I'm 7 going to pick up on that. I've made a couple of notes in 8 here, and by the way, I really appreciate the way you 9 distilled the key issues. It looks a lot better than the 10 orange tab method.</p> <p>11 Given that we're looking at an 12 environmental document and that it provides required 13 alternatives -- and, for example, one of those 14 alternatives is no growth -- is no project -- it does 15 frame the question about where growth goes -- or 16 partially frames it.</p> <p>17 And I would frame it with another aspect. 18 I know from past experience as an architect that 19 generally whether it's an individual building or whether 20 it's a -- an expansive project, no one is going to fund 21 that project until a demand -- a market demand is already 22 demonstrated.</p> <p>23 So if there's a market demand for -- and we 24 could pick one, retail, housing, commercial -- and it's 25 in this area and we say, "Well, you can't build here," I</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 51</p>	<p>1 would have to presume that the alternatives are -- well, 2 actually I know someone who was not able to find a piece 3 of land in Menlo Park and ended up finding a piece of 4 land in Redwood City.</p> <p>5 So it seems that if there's a demand and 6 there's someone capable of filling it, that they will 7 probably do so.</p> <p>8 So I don't -- a couple of weeks ago, I sort 9 of wrote this prompt to myself, and coming back in the 10 last few days, I couldn't help but see it again.</p> <p>11 If -- just -- just for a wild example, if 12 we limit the amount of housing to be built here and it's 13 built in Redwood City and we limit the amount of 14 commercial and it's built in Palo Alto, would that be a 15 net improvement of either traffic or air pollution in 16 Menlo Park?</p> <p>17 Maybe I'll present that as a question and 18 it will be answered in the Final EIR.</p> <p>19 MR. ROGERS: Right, yeah. In terms of the 20 purpose of this meeting, we're not intending to get into 21 a dialogue. So that would be noted, and it will be 22 responded to the extent applicable, most likely under the 23 consideration of alternatives and particularly the no 24 project alternative, so --</p> <p>25 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: Again, I would think</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 52</p>

<p>1 of a certain massive housing project in Redwood City that 2 we maybe don't really want. 3 So -- and then I think you pretty much 4 answered my main other question which had to do with flow 5 in terms of traffic. 6 I mean, the recurring aspect of this that 7 seems to be unavoidable quote unquote is the traffic 8 issue, and yet we saw the traffic -- we actually improved 9 traffic, as I've heard and I think I've observed myself 10 on Sand Hill Road out near 280 in spite of having 11 approved a rather large project out there, and we did so 12 by improving the intersections and the traffic lights. 13 As Chip notes, I'm -- I could probably 14 recommend a few traffic lights that could function 15 better, but I get the point that since we cannot assume 16 that will happen, the EIR does not want to address it. 17 Just on the side, I guess I will be one of 18 those who will urge City Council to start funding that. 19 All right. Thank you. 20 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Peipei. 21 COMMISSIONER YU: I still have two 22 specific traffic questions. One is I'm wondering if the 23 Draft EIR took into consideration the Willows traffic 24 study if it's implemented. 25 I know that the City Council is deciding</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 53</p>	<p>1 whether or not to let that study progress to a committee 2 vote, and if it does, I see some of the intersections you 3 have on the list would -- the character of those 4 intersections would change. 5 So I'm wondering whether that's been 6 considered in this EIR. 7 MR. ROGERS: Response from our Engineering 8 Division Manager, Chip Taylor. 9 MR. TAYLOR: The EIR does not include 10 implementation of the Willows traffic study. As you 11 indicated, there still are several things that would need 12 to occur before that would actually happen. 13 City Council still has to decide whether 14 they're going to survey the community, and then it would 15 have to do the survey and see if it even gets any sort of 16 support to move forward through the process. 17 So it wasn't included to be implemented. 18 The amount of changes of volume that might 19 occur in some of the intersections that were analyzed 20 probably wouldn't change their character significantly 21 regardless. At least the analysis that we do for the 22 peak hour analysis. 23 So I don't think it would change 24 dramatically regardless. Most of those are indicated to 25 be impacted in some way or another regardless.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 54</p>
<p>1 COMMISSIONER YU: Okay. Well, I think 2 that if it does get past the community vote and is approved, 3 I -- I personally think that the character of the streets 4 would be impacted quite negatively. 5 And so if the Willows traffic study does go 6 through, I would suggest it would be incorporated in the 7 EIR so that the people who are living on those streets, 8 you know, would have -- would have a fair chance of 9 having their impact be evaluated given the impact of the 10 downtown plan plus the Willows traffic study. 11 So -- and it may not be neg -- as 12 negatively impactful as I think it would be, but I think 13 it's worth studying it and evaluating whether or not it 14 is. 15 Okay. And my other questions kind of 16 related to a similar theme. If the Specific Plan is 17 approved and is, you know, in process, obviously it will 18 take years and years for it to be executed. 19 So I wonder during that time if pieces of 20 the plan are implemented but projects arise that are 21 separate from this plan, when they go through the EIR 22 process, would they have to include the impact of the 23 Specific Plan in their EIR even if it's not implemented 24 yet? 25 MR. ROGERS: They typically would. So the</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 55</p>	<p>1 process of a Specific Plan looked at in terms of what 2 else was proposed or approved or likely. 3 For example, when we started the Menlo 4 Gateway project, had not been approved. It's since been 5 approved, but at the point we started the analysis, we 6 had to say because it's been proposed, we need to 7 consider it in the background in terms of traffic 8 analysis. 9 And so that would hold for a Specific Plan 10 if it's approved and other projects come along, they need 11 to basically account for the Specific Plan as part of 12 their background, traffic, noise, or other types of 13 background analysis. 14 COMMISSIONER YU: And actually I 15 remembered something as you were talking. I should also 16 note that I live in the Willows, so back to the other 17 conversation. But for the record, I live there. 18 And my other question is: If you can 19 explain why mixed use housing would result in lower 20 school enrollment. I just -- I'm not sure I understand 21 how that logic flows. 22 MR. ROGERS: It goes more for the 23 character of attached multi-family housing. It's 24 typically smaller in terms of its size. It typically 25 offers less outdoor space, offers fewer amenities that I</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 56</p>

<p>1 think the families who typically gravitate toward single 2 family residential find less appealing.</p> <p>3 So the -- the statistical analysis doesn't 4 necessarily look at some of those qualitative factors, 5 but to our understanding, those are some of the things 6 that drive those -- the fact there's a different yield 7 rates for multi-family housing versus single family 8 housing.</p> <p>9 The size, any amenities that are offered 10 and the appeal of those to families with children versus 11 not.</p> <p>12 COMMISSIONER YU: Okay. 13 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Katie. 14 COMMISSIONER FERRICK: Thank you. 15 Thomas, I think this one's for you. Does 16 the greenhouse gas emission impacts use auto emission 17 averages only of today or are there any future increase 18 in fuel efficiencies taken into account?</p> <p>19 MR. ROGERS: The -- the model that's used 20 is a computer model that is prepared -- has been prepared 21 by the Air Quality District and embedded within that are 22 essentially discounts over time that reflect the 23 improvement of fleet emissions.</p> <p>24 That -- that's recognition of the fact that 25 there are Federal Government and other state standards</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 57</p>	<p>1 about emissions, and as cars get replaced, they get 2 better over time.</p> <p>3 So those are embedded in it already. So 4 those are not candidates for additional reductions under 5 the current -- current analysis in the Draft EIR.</p> <p>6 COMMISSIONER FERRICK: Great. Thank you. 7 And regarding traffic and circulation, 8 since that appears to be the area of greatest 9 environmental impact, does the plan itself -- and I know 10 this isn't a question you can answer today -- propose any 11 mitigations that could be increased or improved in order 12 to further mitigate some of the impacts like shuttle 13 capacity and things like that?</p> <p>14 MR. ROGERS: There are -- there are some 15 mitigations. I think maybe to avoid getting too deep 16 into a response, I would say that an EIR -- a Draft EIR 17 comment doesn't have to just address whether -- you know, 18 typically a Draft EIR comment is indicating that the 19 analysis is not conservative enough.</p> <p>20 Impacts are bigger, and a Draft EIR comment 21 can also be the mitigation was ignored or if there are 22 additional opportunities for refining analysis to find 23 lesser impacts.</p> <p>24 So with regard to other improvements that 25 maybe haven't been included that might be considered</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 58</p>
<p>1 feasible alternatives that would reduce transportation, 2 those are certainly valid being made as Draft EIR 3 comments and could drive changes to the Final EIR or at 4 least applicable responses to some of the assumptions.</p> <p>5 COMMISSIONER FERRICK: Great. Thank you. 6 And I wondered if the EIR question also 7 might be the -- so on the alternative projects, the 8 different percentages of commercial and then the 9 different percentage of residential as a percent of the 10 proposed project, is there a percent of the proposed 11 project with respect to either residential or commercial 12 that would result in traffic impacts being less than 13 significant?</p> <p>14 MR. ROGERS: No. The no project 15 alternative, which is the application of existing zoning, 16 does reduce I believe three of the four near-term 17 intersection impacts.</p> <p>18 There would still be one, and then in the 19 long-term, I believe all of the impacts would still be 20 there with regard to intersections.</p> <p>21 But it's worth diving into a little more 22 detail in the report if you -- if you look at that.</p> <p>23 But the upshot is there was no alternative 24 as analyzed that would fully eliminate any significant 25 unavoidable impact, and that includes transportation.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 59</p>	<p>1 COMMISSIONER FERRICK: All right. And 2 then the other question I have for EIR, is there any 3 particular specific intersections that could be 4 identified for some improvements that could mitigate 5 circulation at both that intersection and other 6 intersections that traffic flows to that are also right 7 now categorized as significantly impacted?</p> <p>8 So like along Middlefield and Oak Grove and 9 then the next one down, you know, there's -- like the 10 Glenwood is also listed as a significant impact.</p> <p>11 So, you know, is there any that we know if 12 that were improved, it would also include others?</p> <p>13 MR. TAYLOR: In this case, I think we'd 14 have look at that.</p> <p>15 I think in this case -- in the past, we 16 have looked at -- there was one project -- I believe it 17 was 1300 El Camino where if we signalized Encinal and 18 Middlefield, it also solved the problem at Glenwood and 19 Middlefield based on the traffic volumes at that time for 20 those intersections because it created gaps in the 21 network and what not.</p> <p>22 And so there is potential for that, but I 23 think with the amount of trips generated for this 24 project, I'm not sure if that same logic would apply, and 25 in the EIR, we did indicate that a traffic signal would</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 60</p>

<p>1 be necessary at the intersection of Glenwood and 2 Middlefield if the traffic warrants meet that at some 3 point in the future. 4 So I think it's a valid comment that could 5 be looked at. 6 COMMISSIONER FERRICK: All right. Thank 7 you. That's all I have. 8 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Okay. Ben. 9 COMMISSIONER EIREF: A few quick 10 questions. I had a tough time finding the document what 11 is the -- what is a trip? Is a trip defined as a vehicle 12 coming in from outside downtown into? Does it include 13 trips inside downtown? So if somebody drives from 14 Draeger's to the train station, is that a trip? 15 MR. TAYLOR: Yeah. It includes -- it 16 includes any time a person gets in their vehicle to go 17 from one point to another point. And it's really -- it's 18 not new vehicles that are coming downtown, it's new 19 trips. 20 If somebody is coming to their office in 21 the morning, that's one trip. And when they go home, 22 that's a second trip so both of those trips are counted. 23 So any time they would move their vehicle to some point, 24 that would be considered a trip. 25 COMMISSIONER EIREF: So whether it's</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 61</p>	<p>1 inside the downtown or coming in from the outside or 2 leaving -- 3 MR. TAYLOR: That's correct. 4 COMMISSIONER EIREF: The 13,385 trips. 5 This sounds like a big number, but what is the baseline 6 today for all trips in this area? 7 MR. TAYLOR: We don't have -- we don't 8 have the number. It's very difficult to get the number. 9 When you have a specific development, you can say that 10 amount of square footage is going to generate this many 11 trips, but in order to count the number of trips like in 12 a specific region or area, you have all the traffic 13 volumes for all those various streets, but to actually 14 calculate the trips -- because some of those ones, let's 15 say on Ravenswood would also go into El Camino. So it 16 will be double counted. 17 So you have to actually do a full analysis, 18 a kind of license plate survey of every vehicle to really 19 understand how many of those are trips versus just that 20 same vehicle that's gone from one roadway to another 21 roadway. 22 There's no easy way to get just a baseline 23 number of trips downtown or a specific area. 24 COMMISSIONER EIREF: Okay. Because to me, 25 that seems like -- it's like trying to evaluate a number,</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 62</p>
<p>1 but not having a comparison. 2 I mean -- because it is a big number and I 3 think people are going to react pretty strongly to that, 4 but -- but who knows whether we're comparing 100,000 or 5 200,000 trips or what that -- what the comparison is for 6 the -- 7 MR. TAYLOR: Yes. 8 COMMISSIONER EIREF: -- existing community 9 that we have here today. 10 MR. TAYLOR: It would be nice to easily 11 just compare that quickly given that order or magnitude. 12 COMMISSIONER EIREF: Yeah. 13 MR. TAYLOR: But one of the things that 14 does help is in -- in the analysis, there are traffic 15 volume tables that are related that show each one of the 16 roadway segments, how much traffic is on there today and 17 how much this Specific Plan will add to those roadways. 18 So from those tables, you can get an idea 19 of what kind of increase you're going to see on the 20 various roadways. 21 COMMISSIONER EIREF: I started trying to 22 add those up, but it just -- 23 MR. TAYLOR: There's so many of them, but 24 at least it will give you some idea. 25 COMMISSIONER EIREF: Okay. The other one</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 63</p>	<p>1 I had, you talk about the model, that there was a study 2 done in Florida I think or something like that that 3 created a model that was used to generate these numbers. 4 Is that correct? 5 MR. ROGERS: Well, the trip generation 6 numbers come from the Institute of Transportation 7 Engineer's manual. 8 Those were considered for reductions to 9 account for the fact that Menlo Park is a mixed use 10 downtown that does enjoy some transit service. 11 So there were some studies that looked at 12 the reductions that could be applied for those intrinsic 13 aspects, and there was a ten percent reduction. 14 But ultimately there -- all of the trip 15 generation rates come from the Institute of 16 Transportation Engineers, which is a standard source for 17 this type of thing. 18 Unless there's a specific reference to a 19 different thing that you were looking for more 20 information on. 21 COMMISSIONER EIREF: That's all right. 22 This is a model used. It's used in many locations for 23 similar types -- 24 MR. ROGERS: It is. It's the same kind of 25 numbers that are -- you've seen in the 1300 El Camino</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 64</p>



<p>1 Real EIR, the Menlo Gateway EIR.</p> <p>2 COMMISSIONER EIREF: Okay.</p> <p>3 MR. ROGERS: It is the -- the standard for</p> <p>4 this type of transportation analysis.</p> <p>5 COMMISSIONER EIREF: Okay. One of the</p> <p>6 questions I had was there are some -- there may be into</p> <p>7 more of the actual plan itself and not the EIR plan, but</p> <p>8 there's some discussion about sequencing of projects in</p> <p>9 here.</p> <p>10 So there's discussion about, for example,</p> <p>11 trying out like widening sidewalks downtown and doing</p> <p>12 some sort of easy, you know, base hit, so to speak, sort</p> <p>13 short quick to try things out.</p> <p>14 Does -- does the -- does an EIR process</p> <p>15 have a notion built into it of phasing of things to try</p> <p>16 them out and make sure, you know, there's feedback loops,</p> <p>17 and if traffic gets really bad, we cut back and not do</p> <p>18 much more of that or -- I didn't see that in here, but</p> <p>19 yet there's -- it seems logical that one would want to</p> <p>20 sequence things a little bit.</p> <p>21 MR. ROGERS: The topic of potential</p> <p>22 temporary trials is something that's described in the</p> <p>23 EIR, but it's actually embedded within the Draft Specific</p> <p>24 Plan itself. It's mentioned as -- as one of the options</p> <p>25 within the Chapter G, Implementation Chapter.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 65</p>	<p>1 As a way potentially for cost reasons,</p> <p>2 potentially for public support reasons, you could apply</p> <p>3 some of these public improvements such as sidewalk</p> <p>4 widening or street closures on a temporary basis to see</p> <p>5 how they work.</p> <p>6 With regard to the EIR component of that,</p> <p>7 what we've found is there weren't, at least -- again,</p> <p>8 this is for the Draft EIR analysis describing what's in</p> <p>9 the Draft EIR, that does include a comment that could</p> <p>10 drive more analysis in the final, but what we found in</p> <p>11 the Draft EIR is that the phasing of those relatively</p> <p>12 small scale public improvements that would be eligible</p> <p>13 for trial implementation consideration, there wouldn't be</p> <p>14 an environmental impact that would essentially be tripped</p> <p>15 by starting it out on a trial level or not.</p> <p>16 But there -- there could again be a comment</p> <p>17 that justifies a little bit more analysis or description</p> <p>18 that we would respond to in the final, but that -- that</p> <p>19 is something that's in the Specific Plan. It's not a new</p> <p>20 EIR thing that a mitigation or anything like that.</p> <p>21 COMMISSIONER EIREF: Because I could</p> <p>22 imagine that in the Specific Plan itself, one could bake</p> <p>23 in feedback loops that say if you get a certain threshold</p> <p>24 of traffic or you're unable to fund traffic light</p> <p>25 improvements or whatever, you simply stop developing</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 66</p>
<p>1 Maybe that's more a topic for the plan</p> <p>2 itself and not the EIR.</p> <p>3 MR. ROGERS: It's worth considering at</p> <p>4 this stage. Certainly with regards to any public</p> <p>5 improvements, the City Council would need to be funding</p> <p>6 and prioritizing, authorizing certain improvements.</p> <p>7 And so certainly if there were impacts</p> <p>8 that, you know, would widen a sidewalk or a street</p> <p>9 closure would exacerbate to some level, it's likely --</p> <p>10 it's not guaranteed. It's likely the City Council would</p> <p>11 just not fund it or look for a different way to achieve</p> <p>12 that goal.</p> <p>13 With regard to private development, the cap</p> <p>14 as set up by the Specific Plan in the EIR is the overall</p> <p>15 development program, so there's a projection of 680</p> <p>16 dwelling units, a number of square feet of retail,</p> <p>17 commercial, et cetera, space.</p> <p>18 Up until the point those are exceeded, that</p> <p>19 development could happen as long as the projects are</p> <p>20 within the sort of overall scope of the EIR as discussed</p> <p>21 further.</p> <p>22 The public improvements can always be</p> <p>23 throttled back by virtue of, you know, the democratic</p> <p>24 process, but private development, at least under the</p> <p>25 development program, if it meets what's projected here</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 67</p>	<p>1 would be considered to be permitted subject to the</p> <p>2 architectural review and other standards depending on the</p> <p>3 use.</p> <p>4 COMMISSIONER EIREF: Okay. And one last</p> <p>5 question, which is it seemed to me that there might</p> <p>6 actually be one other alternative scenario here.</p> <p>7 I would imagine a lot of people in town --</p> <p>8 not everyone, but a lot of people would like -- like some</p> <p>9 of the things like widening -- looking at sidewalk</p> <p>10 improvements and -- and pocket parks, and there's some</p> <p>11 nice things in there that have nothing to do with</p> <p>12 development per se.</p> <p>13 Is there not a scenario that says that one</p> <p>14 would do those things that are considered to be public</p> <p>15 improvements, but without all the commercial development</p> <p>16 and, you know, mixed use housing, all that kind of stuff?</p> <p>17 Is that a scenario or is that actually</p> <p>18 considered to be not realistic because it doesn't provide</p> <p>19 funding sources for itself built in?</p> <p>20 MR. ROGERS: It's not appropriate</p> <p>21 necessarily at this time to get into a -- a detailed</p> <p>22 off-the-cuff response about whether it's feasible,</p> <p>23 whether it addresses project goals.</p> <p>24 So that can certainly be made as a comment</p> <p>25 if there's any alternative, that or any other one that</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 68</p>

<p>1 wasn't addressed in the EIR or the Planning Commission or</p> <p>2 a member of the public should -- believes should be</p> <p>3 analyzed. That can be a comment.</p> <p>4 However, just in broad terms, the things</p> <p>5 that are analyzed as alternatives are feasibility. So if</p> <p>6 items like development in lieu of impact fees are</p> <p>7 considered to be a significant funding source for those</p> <p>8 public improvements, it may not be as realistic to</p> <p>9 consider something that authorizes parks and plazas and</p> <p>10 widens sidewalks but didn't generate funding for them.</p> <p>11 That may not be as feasible, or it may if</p> <p>12 other funding sources can be addressed.</p> <p>13 The other thing is whether project</p> <p>14 objectives are addressed. And so there may be -- there</p> <p>15 is one vision plan goal about providing parks in public</p> <p>16 spaces.</p> <p>17 However, there's also ones about providing</p> <p>18 housing opportunities and revitalizing underutilized</p> <p>19 parcels and buildings.</p> <p>20 So it's kind of a balance -- it would be a</p> <p>21 balancing act to review a suggestion about a new</p> <p>22 alternative.</p> <p>23 Depending on the specifics, it could be</p> <p>24 incorporated in this analysis or it could be described as</p> <p>25 to why it's not described further.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 69</p>	<p>1 But no one should hold back from making a</p> <p>2 comment if they see a viable alternative.</p> <p>3 COMMISSIONER EIREF: Okay. Thanks.</p> <p>4 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: John.</p> <p>5 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: Thank you.</p> <p>6 I have a set of questions here. I'll try</p> <p>7 to move in -- through them in kind of a logical way.</p> <p>8 I wanted to ask about this -- or raise this</p> <p>9 assumption of the one percent growth factor. In the</p> <p>10 present -- I'd assume that this is for the cumulative</p> <p>11 analysis going up to 2035.</p> <p>12 I think I understood you to say in the</p> <p>13 presentation that that's sort of a general area growth</p> <p>14 analysis, and then we -- but I see that my understanding</p> <p>15 is that in the EIR, we use that really for traffic only.</p> <p>16 So do we have data that confirms that</p> <p>17 assumption -- largely confirms that assumption in our</p> <p>18 approximate way for like the last fifteen years or</p> <p>19 something that that is adequately characterizing traffic</p> <p>20 growth in Menlo Park?</p> <p>21 MR. TAYLOR: The one percent is a pretty</p> <p>22 standard rate that's used in the industry for traffic</p> <p>23 growth.</p> <p>24 Within Menlo Park, we have a lot of data.</p> <p>25 Depending on you look at it, which years you look at it,</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 70</p>
<p>1 you get a lot of different variation throughout the</p> <p>2 community.</p> <p>3 In general, if you just look from ten years</p> <p>4 ago to today, in a lot of areas, you have actually</p> <p>5 negative numbers. Some have actually gone down, whereas</p> <p>6 others have gone up.</p> <p>7 And so in order to balance that, we</p> <p>8 historically used the one percent, which is a pretty</p> <p>9 reasonable factor.</p> <p>10 But it's probably if anything a little bit</p> <p>11 conservative more than anything.</p> <p>12 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: Okay. Well, my</p> <p>13 concern is that if you go out 25 years and compound it,</p> <p>14 you get -- you get these huge -- you get these huge</p> <p>15 numbers, and I think either these numbers could -- could</p> <p>16 be misleading because people get over -- they will</p> <p>17 perceive them as being, you know, just terrible or it</p> <p>18 means well, I don't really believe this. What is this</p> <p>19 model telling me?</p> <p>20 So I think if we could better characterize</p> <p>21 in the document, you know, what the status of that</p> <p>22 assumption is, you know, empirically and give some</p> <p>23 guidance on interpreting, it would help. Otherwise, to</p> <p>24 me the model is -- it's -- it's awfully rough.</p> <p>25 I mean, maybe there can be something like</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 71</p>	<p>1 you say well, here's what happens at eight percent.</p> <p>2 Here's what happens at twelve percent or something,</p> <p>3 breaking it up a little bit and characterizing that with</p> <p>4 respect to what we know empirically.</p> <p>5 One -- one thing about that -- the</p> <p>6 cumulative analysis also, that's where all existing</p> <p>7 projects on the books also get wrapped in. That's right?</p> <p>8 Okay.</p> <p>9 Is that -- now, if you look at the no</p> <p>10 project alternative, is that a way of kind of picking out</p> <p>11 projects on the books only without the one percent growth</p> <p>12 factor? Is that true or is that --</p> <p>13 MR. ROGERS: The no project alternative</p> <p>14 accounts -- includes the regional growth as well as the</p> <p>15 projects -- other projects on the books.</p> <p>16 It only subtracts out the Specific Plan.</p> <p>17 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: Oh, okay. Well,</p> <p>18 again, so that would be help -- you know, since -- if the</p> <p>19 one percent, especially over 25 years, is a number that</p> <p>20 compounds, we're never going to get there, but it might</p> <p>21 be nonetheless be useful to know, you know, what the</p> <p>22 existing project piece is, if that -- you know, if that</p> <p>23 could be calculated easily.</p> <p>24 You know, generally speaking on the EIR, I</p> <p>25 think it's -- I agree with what the fire chief said. In</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 72</p>

<p>1 general, it's a well done document. There's lots of 2 information here.</p> <p>3 I don't think there's any -- I'm not sure 4 there's really anything fundamental that's missing from 5 my perspective, but I think a bunch could be done to 6 improv -- just improve basic intelligibility by doing 7 more graphical summaries.</p> <p>8 For example, this mitigation data I'd like 9 to have on one page using some kind of graphical legends 10 to see affected roadway segments and intersections so you 11 don't have to go paging through and, you know, looking up 12 what the intersection is and look at a map and stuff.</p> <p>13 I think in the -- in the appendix, there's 14 some much better graphical presentations where things get 15 summarized really well using the -- you know, using the 16 map format and bring -- so bringing some of that in and 17 maybe just some codification graphically I think would 18 help.</p> <p>19 Because I think there's a lot here that 20 will be useful and guiding this forward, you know, so 21 that we don't have to do the work in the future. That 22 would help a lot.</p> <p>23 So segment changes, changes at crossings 24 like the bumpouts on the roadways, those are -- those are 25 hard to see, and definitely the mitigation.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 73</p>	<p>1 You know, they're kind of like all the 2 scenarios of these various mitigations, where they're 3 occurring and what -- kind of what level, that -- 4 bringing that all together in one -- one page would 5 probably be possible or two pages.</p> <p>6 And I know the information is there. It's 7 just a matter of grasping it.</p> <p>8 I agree with what Ben said about vehicle 9 trip generation, that that's sort of a -- it's hard to 10 know what to do with that metric because -- and if there 11 really isn't a baseline or some kind of expository 12 information on that, just sort of clarifying that so 13 people don't get all wondering what it means. That 14 could -- that could be helpful.</p> <p>15 One -- one detail -- this is kind of a -- 16 this might seem kind of nitpicky, but it stood out when I 17 read it.</p> <p>18 In Chapter 4 -- actually, the background of 19 this is -- I found that there's lots of really good kind 20 of more expository information here than even in the 21 Specific Plan that I found really useful in terms of 22 explaining, you know, what the function of wider 23 sidewalks is and these types of buildings and all this 24 kind of stuff.</p> <p>25 It kind of moves beyond the EIR proper,</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 74</p>
<p>1 which is fine to me. I don't think there's anything 2 against that. It helps -- it's all good stuff, but in 3 Chapter -- it is Chapter 4, I saw repeated I think five 4 times, and maybe six times about what the workshop groups 5 endorsed, and this is specifically about workshops 6 endorsing five-story buildings.</p> <p>7 And it wasn't like there were other things 8 mentioned that were endorsed or not endorsed like this 9 density or that density or these setbacks or not.</p> <p>10 It just kind of jumped out at me as sort of 11 being repetitive and sort of looking like -- it was like 12 it reminded me of MacBeth where, you know, somebody says, 13 "And we thinks the lady does protest too much."</p> <p>14 It was sort of like yeah, everybody says 15 this is okay. I think dialing that down would be helpful 16 to something that's kind of much more neutral.</p> <p>17 You know, I just don't think it's possible 18 to be so precise about what's endorsed or not. It starts 19 to become questionable well what do you include about 20 what was endorsed, how specifically and how these things 21 are related. I don't know.</p> <p>22 I think it's sort of bothersome, but it's 23 keeping it at sort of a strength level there now.</p> <p>24 I've got some other questions, but I just 25 wanted to just -- I'll stop for a while.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 75</p>	<p>1 I just want to say in general, you know, 2 there's -- some people say, you know, well, you know, 3 forget the -- forget this. What is all this money for? 4 What do we get out of this?</p> <p>5 This -- for one thing, this thing is just a 6 big envelope that we've got here in front of us and we 7 can -- there are things about this that we see, impacts 8 we don't like. We can dial down densities, setbacks, 9 heights, building heights, whatever we want until we get 10 the impacts we want.</p> <p>11 This -- the Specific Plan is not all or 12 nothing. From what I hear out in the public discourse, 13 it sounds like -- it seems like some people are assuming 14 that that's true.</p> <p>15 There may be things that are wrong with it, 16 things that go in the wrong direction, but what we've 17 paid for with all this consultant money is in part is 18 this very precisely designed tool kit where we've got 19 dozen -- literally dozens of knobs and dials that we can 20 adjust based on what we see in the Environmental Impact 21 Report, or just other kinds of data and then you can a 22 adjust it down to something in the middle, one-quarter of 23 three-quarters or something. But it's certainly not all 24 -- you know, all or nothing.</p> <p>25 So -- and that's partly the reason I</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 76</p>

<p>1 emphasized kind of tuning that cumulative scenario, 2 because it's -- well, we have four scenarios. It's one 3 of the major pieces of information. 4 If it's too coarse an analysis, it's not 5 going to help us do that. So that's about it for now. 6 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: I have a few 7 questions. 8 I would agree with John's comments about 9 this being a report that goes well beyond, the EIR gets 10 very specific and brings up a lot of interesting points. 11 My first question is going to be about one 12 of these. 13 You refer to private open space on page 14 3-26, and there are various analysis of private open 15 space associated with various areas. It's not clear to 16 me what this means. 17 The private open space is greater for the 18 higher density development areas, but can you just give 19 me a definition of what that means, though? What is a 20 private open space? 21 MR. ROGERS: Sure. So we're in project 22 description, Chapter 3 of the EIR, which is really a 23 recapitulation enhancement in some regards of the content 24 of the Specific Plan itself. 25 It's not new analysis, but it can be</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 77</p>	<p>1 necessary to -- to form opinions on the elements of the 2 analysis. 3 So the requirements for private open space 4 that the Draft Specific Plan puts up would require 5 certain square footages per dwelling unit or actually 6 per -- for parcel size that's distributed to dwelling 7 units if housing is developed. 8 That can take the form of private 9 balconies, private patios. It can also take the form of 10 communal open space, shared terraces or ground level type 11 things. 12 And so they're fairly common in -- in more 13 multiple-family developments now. You often see 14 balconies. They're the most obvious, but there can also 15 be other shared type areas, rooftop decks, et cetera. 16 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Okay. In light of 17 that, and given that it can be private space, as 18 indicated by the name and just what you said, they're 19 requiring more of this kind of space for higher density 20 development, but this doesn't sound like it's any kind of 21 public benefit necessarily. 22 MR. ROGERS: We might be straying a little 23 bit into some future discussions about the Draft Specific 24 Plan itself, but certainly as presented in the EIR 25 summary as well as in the -- the Specific Plan itself,</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 78</p>
<p>1 private -- most private open space, with the exception of 2 I think a few unique view corridors on the larger El 3 Camino Real southeast properties, with the exception of 4 those private open spaces could be considered largely for 5 the benefit of the residents of the development. 6 However, there are a few of those view 7 corridors that would line up with the streets that apply 8 to the larger parcels that are currently vacant along 9 southeast El Camino Real. 10 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Okay. That's fine. 11 Okay. I looked through this report for 12 indications of one of the main items that was in the 13 bullet points of our -- our view, and that was improved 14 east/west conductivity, and the only thing that I could 15 really find was these bulbouts and maybe a couple of bike 16 paths. 17 Am I missing anything? 18 MR. ROGERS: There are also the -- the 19 pedestrian bicycle tunnels -- not tunnels, or grade 20 separated crossings of the train tracks. 21 One is proposed in the vicinity of Middle 22 Avenue. The other one is proposed in the train station 23 area. So both El Camino Real and the train tracks 24 function as barriers to that east/west conductivity. 25 The sidewalks, expanded sidewalks along El</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 79</p>	<p>1 Camino Real, even though those run north/south can also 2 be interpreted to enhance east/west conductivity in the 3 sense that they lead in more of a pleasing way to an 4 intersection that has buildout. So it's all inter- 5 related. 6 But there certainly are tradeoffs with 7 regard to improving access across El Camino Real in a way 8 that doesn't then constrain vehicle flow. 9 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Just to be clear, 10 some of this is contention on what happens with high 11 speed rail. I mean, specifically at Ravenswood. 12 It's a little unclear from the language 13 here, but that's completely dependent on what happens 14 with the high speed rail, isn't it? With pedestrian 15 access here. 16 MR. ROGERS: There were actually fairly 17 detailed set of meetings that the Transportation Division 18 understood about a undercrossing of the current Caltrain 19 tracks. 20 I think we even got to a level of not a 21 full design, but fairly detailed schematic where the 22 train -- Caltrain tracks are at their current level and 23 will remain at their current level. 24 However, an undercrossing would be 25 approved, and we did see, some of us saw one example of</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 80</p>

<p>1 this at the Homer Avenue crossing in Palo Alto when we 2 went on a tour. 3 So those particular crossings would not -- 4 of the train tracks would not depend on the rail tracks, 5 whether that's Caltrain or Caltrain and high speed rail 6 being elevated. 7 There are ways to cross those in a safe 8 grade separated way that doesn't involve changing the 9 level. 10 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: I want to get into 11 more details on that, but I do think it's -- it's a good 12 thing to get a little clarity on at this time. 13 There's a point in the report where you -- 14 it was actually in the presentation, as well -- where you 15 show that for the no project option, there is an 16 additional 420 housing units, and for the full project 17 option, there was an additional 680 housing units. 18 I'm assuming that the 320 comes from what 19 could actually be built under current zoning. 20 Is that correct? 21 MR. ROGERS: It is. We looked at what the 22 current zoning districts allow, and their -- the project 23 area encompasses a number of zoning districts. 24 So it's a little bit of an estimation 25 because you don't know exactly where things could get</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 81</p>	<p>1 redeveloped. 2 But we compared the proposed zoning 3 intensities, dwelling units to the acre versus what the 4 various zoning districts currently allow. 5 An estimated that as 47 percent of what the 6 projects would. 7 So if this isn't improved, the existing 8 zoning remains in effect. Those could foreseeably 9 develop at 320 versus 680. 10 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: It seems to me that 11 it's unlikely that the 320 would be built. I mean, 12 especially given the project that we have on the Cadillac 13 property where they specifically decided not to. 14 Are there -- are there financial 15 inducements in the plan that specifically facilitate 16 housing or -- I'm just trying to get a handle on these 17 numbers. 18 MR. ROGERS: For the Specific Plan or the 19 no project alternative? 20 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: For the no project. 21 I'm making a statement that I don't think that 320 is 22 necessarily real given our recent experience, at least. 23 So I'm wondering is the 680 is real. 24 MR. ROGERS: I think both of those are 25 good comments that are worth exploring in more detail in</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 82</p>
<p>1 the Final EIR comments. 2 So it's not an in-meeting thing, but I 3 think that is a good comment that can be the source of 4 more background information or changes to the -- 5 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Okay. 6 MR. ROGERS: What's planned, essentially. 7 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: On page 3-30, you 8 give a table that shows basically a reduction of parking 9 requirements across the board for different uses, and 10 there are some footnotes here that describe where -- what 11 the basis of these changes are. 12 I'm not quite sure. If you could be -- 13 provide a little clarity on how it's decided to change 14 these numbers. 15 MR. ROGERS: Sure. Again, we're in the 16 project description section of the Draft Specific Plan, 17 which is largely summarizing -- specific in some levels, 18 but mostly summarizing the Draft Specific Plan. 19 So I'm actually backing up a little bit 20 into the Draft Specific Plan which provides some more 21 detail on the page F-21 as well as some dialogue that 22 went into that. 23 And the short answer is in looking at what 24 current accurate industry standards would require for 25 certain types of uses versus what the current zoning</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 83</p>	<p>1 ordinance allows. 2 With regards to the EIR, we'd need to maybe 3 question if there's particular impact or element of the 4 analysis that could be questioned, because it's mostly 5 what we're doing right here is just summarizing what's in 6 the Specific Plan. 7 Or to the extent that there's anything 8 about this reduction that you believe has an impact 9 that's not analyzed or affects other elements, you can 10 just make that as a comment. 11 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: This isn't based on 12 a parking study; right, in particular, is it? 13 MR. ROGERS: It's not based on a parking 14 study for Menlo Park. It's looking at what the most 15 relevant and up-to-date industry analyses are with regard 16 to what developments of this type would generate -- 17 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Okay. 18 MR. ROGERS: -- in terms of parking demand 19 for an area like this. 20 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: That's what I 21 thought. I just wanted us to be clear on that. 22 Okay. There's an interesting little 23 section on page 3-33 about something called a Public 24 Benefit Bonus Negotiated Agreement, and could you tell us 25 a little bit about what you have in mind with that?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 84</p>

<p>1 MR. ROGERS: Once again, most of these  2 Chapter 3 project description things are a little bit  3 closer to what we're going to be talking about in the  4 next phase of the Planning Commission's review, but I'm  5 happy to give an overview at this point.  6 The Public Benefits Bonus is an  7 acknowledgement that there are certain benefits that the  8 community would like to be considered and returned for  9 certain levels of density, and so there are changes to  10 the current densities that facilitate the actual  11 redevelopment of properties that have their own intrinsic  12 benefits, but there's a second level of densities and  13 intensities -- and when I speak of those, I mean mostly  14 dwelling to the acre standard maximums as well as floor  15 area ratio maximums, which are the size of the building  16 relative to the size of the lot.  17 So the Public Benefit Bonus would set up a  18 more formalized process where a developer/landowner could  19 apply for the highest level of densities or intensities,  20 but only through the provision of a public benefit to the  21 City.  22 And as we talked about a little bit more in  23 the Draft Specific Plan itself, there are so many  24 variables that are unknown at any particular moment in  25 time, a lot of things affect the cost or develop-ability</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 85</p>	<p>1 of certain lot.  2 So it's not set up as a specific formula  3 that would result in payment of a certain dollar amount.  4 It would be a project by project negotiation.  5 But overall, it's a recognition that the  6 highest level of densities deserve the provision of  7 certain benefits to the City.  8 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Okay. Following up  9 on something that Ben talked about, and that's the idea  10 of what we're potentially doing with some of the  11 improvements and being able to pick and choose among  12 the -- as a development, what we want to do.  13 Are we going to see a cost breakout of what  14 some of these upgrades to the City would actually cost at  15 some point and let us think about that?  16 MR. ROGERS: The Specific Plan, Draft  17 Specific Plan includes a little bit of analysis of  18 potentially parking structure cost. It does not provide  19 estimates for the other potential public improvements.  20 Of that, again, there's a lot of variables  21 of when you do them and the level of design.  22 With regard to the EIR, I don't see a clear  23 effect with regard to whether an impact's an impact or  24 not.  25 At this point, I don't believe that we have</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 86</p>
<p>1 a -- anything in the scope that would -- that would  2 analyze that. That could be something that the  3 Commission or individual Commissioners could propose to  4 the Council for consideration if it's relevant to the  5 particular decision.  6 But for most plans, it's -- there is a  7 little bit of flexibility or, you know, holistic kind of  8 view of it that we have to take on, 'cause it's not  9 possible to design something out to the construction  10 detail drawings to a point our true cost is known, but to  11 the extent that additional information could be  12 necessary, that -- that might be added in the process,  13 but it's not currently scoped.  14 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Okay. I just -- I  15 have one other question. I'm sorry that so many of my  16 questions are not directly related to the EIR, but I do  17 want to get these things out.  18 Mr. Brawner brought up a series of projects  19 that by some definition have not been successful,  20 redevelopment efforts in our area, but I don't see a lot  21 of information here that lets us see how what we're doing  22 is different than those particular situations, and I'm  23 sure that some of this relates to not necessarily things  24 that -- how we fix this.  25 Specifically not how we have implemented</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 87</p>	<p>1 this plan, but choices that we made along the way and how  2 development would be phased, and I think that it would be  3 useful for us to be able to see some of that information.  4 MR. ROGERS: We'll note that and discuss  5 it maybe in a little more detail about whether it's  6 information that we can at least provide in some summary  7 form for when the Planning Commission has its more  8 general discussions about the Draft Specific Plan  9 relative to other projects and maybe what some  10 differences are with this Specific Plan and lessons  11 learned. Could be.  12 As we were listening, there were some  13 obvious differences between, you know, a sort of  14 comprehensive redevelopment project like the Sunnyvale  15 project where it was one landowner, one developer working  16 with the City to basically raze a whole neighborhood and  17 redevelop it versus an incremental plan like this, but  18 there -- there could be other elements of the project  19 that we can learn from.  20 So we'll discuss that in a more bit more  21 detail as it relates to the Planning Commission's general  22 review of the Draft Specific Plan.  23 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: There's -- there's  24 one final point I'd like to make, and this has -- this  25 has already come out, but I don't think it had proper</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 88</p>

<p>1 emphasis.</p> <p>2 And that is that -- when -- when this is</p> <p>3 approved -- assuming that this is approved in some form,</p> <p>4 whatever the zoning changes are for the area approved,</p> <p>5 those are by right.</p> <p>6 And so at that point, based on the way this</p> <p>7 is structured, those land owners can expect to -- as long</p> <p>8 as they stay within certain parameters, the housing and</p> <p>9 things as noted, they are entitled to those -- those</p> <p>10 upzoning amenities, so we need to keep that in mind.</p> <p>11 That's all I have to say.</p> <p>12 John.</p> <p>13 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: Thank you.</p> <p>14 So I just have a few more thoughts to bring</p> <p>15 up. One is I noticed in the long list of acronyms in the</p> <p>16 EIR, one that was not in there is TOD for Transit</p> <p>17 Oriented Development, and I think that probably should be</p> <p>18 in there as an acronym, although as it turns out, it's</p> <p>19 not clear that it's used all that much in the EIR.</p> <p>20 I think I did a -- tried to do a search on</p> <p>21 PDF, and those are not always accurate, but the -- the</p> <p>22 area that I'm particularly interested in -- there is</p> <p>23 discussion in there about -- primarily about the station</p> <p>24 area being -- obviously because it's at the station</p> <p>25 providing lots of opportunities for transit oriented</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 89</p>	<p>1 development set -- because of proximity, but I don't see</p> <p>2 anything and -- especially in terms of the analysis of</p> <p>3 alternatives, of different roles for parking, different</p> <p>4 parking -- parking limits, maximums.</p> <p>5 We have -- and real and specifically</p> <p>6 residential parking that looks like the standard</p> <p>7 assumption for residential parking is something like 1.85</p> <p>8 spaces per dwelling unit, but I think in the -- even in</p> <p>9 the Specific Plan itself, there's some alternatives like</p> <p>10 from -- it might be the Metropolitan Transportation</p> <p>11 Commission recommendation, whatever -- for whatever</p> <p>12 that's worth is like one -- one parking -- one parking</p> <p>13 spot.</p> <p>14 So given that transportation and traffic</p> <p>15 impacts are a big concern here, what matters is not</p> <p>16 people, but their cars.</p> <p>17 And so in the analysis that's here, that's</p> <p>18 all confounded. We just -- because, for example, we just</p> <p>19 dial down residential generally.</p> <p>20 We can just dial down the parking as</p> <p>21 suggested implicitly only in the -- in the Specific Plan.</p> <p>22 So I would certainly find it useful if we</p> <p>23 could tease -- you know, tease that out and know what</p> <p>24 kind of other benefit -- benefits that, you know, we</p> <p>25 would be able to quantify those.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 90</p>
<p>1 Even if it's just estimated, I would hope</p> <p>2 that some of these things that are being</p> <p>3 calculated -- if it's a direct function of a number of</p> <p>4 parking spaces, then you go, "Oh, well. Yeah. It's</p> <p>5 linear function or something like that."</p> <p>6 So knowing something like that would be</p> <p>7 good, and it does seem to be consistent with release of</p> <p>8 the information in the current Specific Plan. Maybe that</p> <p>9 would tell us something also about greenhouse gas</p> <p>10 reduction, a point that Henry brought up.</p> <p>11 Continuing on parking, parking downtown.</p> <p>12 There's an important issue. I -- as far as I can tell --</p> <p>13 I mean, everything's pretty much at the aggregate level</p> <p>14 in terms of total number of spaces available.</p> <p>15 Is that -- is that right? We don't -- I'm</p> <p>16 not saying you should be able to analyze parking lots --</p> <p>17 parking plaza six vs. seven or whatever, but just to</p> <p>18 confirm that it's pretty much total number of spaces.</p> <p>19 MR. ROGERS: There -- there certainly is</p> <p>20 information either -- just in this Draft Specific Plan,</p> <p>21 but I think it's included in the EIR, as well, that does</p> <p>22 breakdowns by parking plaza as well as on-street parking</p> <p>23 that shows what currently exists, what could be affected</p> <p>24 and then what's ultimately supplied.</p> <p>25 It is totally up for the district but could</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 91</p>	<p>1 look at it on a plaza by plaza basis.</p> <p>2 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: Okay. Well, I</p> <p>3 mean -- like for example, this idea of the sale</p> <p>4 construction and -- so that's on Chestnut, and the -- at</p> <p>5 least some of the changes to parallel parking on Santa</p> <p>6 Cruz to make -- put in -- make the plaza possible.</p> <p>7 And that's discussed in this in particular</p> <p>8 as an early -- like an early phase option and maybe on a</p> <p>9 pilot basis.</p> <p>10 So I think it would be use -- that will</p> <p>11 have some kind of local effects. People look at that and</p> <p>12 they think well, where are the people who park in plaza</p> <p>13 seven going to go? Do you think they're going to go to</p> <p>14 plaza five? There's a bunch of permits and they're going</p> <p>15 to disappear.</p> <p>16 It's just a general estimated statement to</p> <p>17 give -- you know, give some sort of sense of the</p> <p>18 consequences there.</p> <p>19 That's not at the aggregate level. That's</p> <p>20 why I asked about the aggregation, and people don't have</p> <p>21 to screw up their eyes and work hard to figure -- infer</p> <p>22 it from the data. That would be helpful about why --</p> <p>23 basically why that's a feasible plan.</p> <p>24 There's another parking detail. The bike</p> <p>25 lane is proposed on Oak Grove, so that be -- that would</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 92</p>

<p>1 take out the parking on Oak Grove toward El Camino. I'm 2 not sure where it starts.</p> <p>3 MR. ROGERS: On -- it would be parking on 4 one side of the street.</p> <p>5 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: One side of the 6 street. Of course.</p> <p>7 And just -- I just want to note there. I 8 think when I read it, you know, it was a discussion of 9 like where is alternative parking. Well, some, of 10 course, would be behind in the plazas, but I think there 11 was some mention on -- like on Laurel or something across 12 El Camino.</p> <p>13 That seemed not particularly plausible. so 14 that -- that might be adjusted a little bit just to know 15 where that is, but my main concern there is simply the 16 post office is there with its fifteen-minute green zone. 17 Typically post offices have some kind of, you know, easy 18 drop-off function.</p> <p>19 So I think thinking about that in some way 20 would be helpful. Is there something possible? Can you 21 have a break? Can you have a bump-out, bump-in? The 22 post office is special with respect to parking. So 23 that's the only thing.</p> <p>24 On conductivity, also I agree with Vince's 25 raising this issue about conductivity. We're not -- that</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 93</p>	<p>1 is a huge goal of a Specific Plan.</p> <p>2 We don't get -- our metrics are kind of 3 vague there. You know, my sense is that maybe there's 4 my belief is that actually what's proposed in the 5 Specific Plan is probably like all the stuff that you can 6 do without just getting a big fat N-O from Caltrans.</p> <p>7 I mean, I think that's -- everything that 8 is actually in there is everything that is really feas -- 9 realistically feasible.</p> <p>10 However, you know, it may not be everything 11 we hoped for, and -- I mean, take something simple like 12 some of our sidewalks on the west side of El Camino. 13 Take like, for example, the corner of Cambridge and El 14 Camino, that's the last light before you hit Sand Hill 15 Road.</p> <p>16 It's got to be one of the narrowest side -- 17 legal sidewalks in the United States. I mean, it's just 18 horrible, and it's never -- you know, we're not going to 19 be able to do anything about it.</p> <p>20 So that's just -- that's an extreme case, 21 sort of where are we in terms of achieving our goals in 22 the Specific Plan?</p> <p>23 I don't -- a lot of that you can't get it. 24 The EIR is about negative impacts, so maybe you can't 25 you can't exactly get at it, but I'm afraid that there's</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 94</p>
<p>1 going to be this gap between knowing what we can -- you 2 know, knowing, you know, what we're trying to do, but 3 what's the stuff that we might do and then the stuff we 4 can't really do or the stuff that's not really, you know, 5 plausible, this kind of just gray area?</p> <p>6 I think we need to -- to kind of nail that 7 down a little bit better. Definitely east/west 8 conductivity is one.</p> <p>9 For example, I don't think we proposed new 10 any four-way crossings on El Camino Real, yeah. So I 11 mean that would -- I mean, if you could do that, wow, 12 that would be really great, but we're not going to be 13 able to do that.</p> <p>14 So that -- kind of getting a sense -- and I 15 think there anything to be afraid of there. It's just 16 being honest, and it would help if we kind of know what's 17 laid out in front of us and like what -- you know, what 18 all these mechanisms are.</p> <p>19 That may help to prioritize, especially 20 over the years in terms of we have to do this first 21 because that's the best, and, you know, these can come 22 later, that kind of thing.</p> <p>23 So anyway, a little more provision on 24 conductivity and detailing it out.</p> <p>25 High speed rail. Again, I, you know, agree</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 95</p>	<p>1 that this is a little -- my sense -- I don't see that 2 there's a problem there.</p> <p>3 I believe what I read in the document about 4 well, you know, this -- everything has been thought 5 through such that it shouldn't be a problem.</p> <p>6 You know, it's sort of like okay. I'm not 7 going to -- but I think filling that out in some detail 8 like knowing that you've done some studies, just some 9 bullet points. Maybe it's just three-quarters of the 10 page, 200 words or something just to fill that out and 11 just to get more of a warm and fuzzy feeling. Again, 12 it's just guidance for the future.</p> <p>13 A lot of these things I'm saying is like I 14 feel like it's stuff -- maybe they're more in the sense 15 of like sidebars or just extra expository material and it 16 could be done in a certain way -- you don't need to know 17 this for the EIR analysis, but it -- it's helpful to 18 understand what's going on.</p> <p>19 This point -- Henry's point I agree with, 20 this business on greenhouse gases, like it would be nice 21 to have a sense of like well, are we doing something good 22 here at the margin in terms of greenhouse gases, even if 23 overall because of the nature of our city and our 24 baseline practices, we're not going to get that, you 25 know, ratio down as much as we'd like.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 96</p>



<p>1 Just sort of what's baked -- kind of what's 2 baked in there, and I know there may be a problem about 3 estimating the baseline, but just, you know, any kind of 4 warm and fuzzy words.</p> <p>5 Oh, here's something that's always -- 6 that's bugged me probably for years. It's just going all 7 the way from the vision plan with the EIR.</p> <p>8 There's a Lot of good summary here going 9 back to the vision plan, but I'm not -- I think a few 10 more words trying to disambiguate what -- and clarify 11 what is meant by village character and vibrancy could be 12 helpful, because this is probably our last chance to get 13 it, you know, sort of where parts of the town we're 14 thinking of, what features.</p> <p>15 There's probably a little bit of that, but 16 a little bit more there sort of -- instead of just sort 17 of like assuming we know about all that. It's not very 18 important, but it will help.</p> <p>19 Just in -- one last comment on this 20 successes and failures, business around, you know, where 21 we live.</p> <p>22 I don't know what's happened in Sunnyvale 23 and Redwood City that -- that well, but I do spend a lot 24 of time for various reasons both in Mountain View and 25 Santa Cruz both as communities which -- both of which</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 97</p>	<p>1 have implemented lots of things that we're looking at, 2 parking changes, different types of buildings, changes to 3 their Main Street downtown parking to accommodate -- you 4 know, all that kind of stuff.</p> <p>5 It's all confounded with their local 6 issues, but I think there -- you know, I don't really 7 know really what -- whether they're successes or failures 8 or not except that I go there and I see people in 9 restaurants and at least some of these things seem to be 10 working well and people are happy.</p> <p>11 So I think there are plenty -- maybe this 12 will come up in the next set of discussions, but I think 13 there are lots -- I think there are lots of examples to 14 draw on from the -- you know, the Peninsula -- from San 15 Francisco down through the Peninsula and Santa Cruz of 16 these types of -- of changes, and maybe we can use those 17 to help come up with some kind of empirical analysis.</p> <p>18 It's beyond the EIR, but I think -- I think 19 it is important to kind of look at that kind of stuff and 20 useful.</p> <p>21 That's all I have to say. Thank you.</p> <p>22 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Okay. Peipei.</p> <p>23 COMMISSIONER YU: On the topic of learning 24 from other cities, I was thinking that one possible thing 25 to do in the EIR is look at the estimates you had used</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 98</p>
<p>1 for traffic or population growth and enrollment in 2 schools and see whether or not those estimates were close 3 to what actually happened.</p> <p>4 That information might not be readily 5 available, but I do think that if other cities had done 6 that, to see the difference between the actual and 7 estimated numbers, I think that might help us say hey, 8 you know, we should add a plus or minus, you know, 9 whatever margin of error based on what other cities have 10 done.</p> <p>11 And I got to thinking about that because of 12 the Vince's comment about housing and Ben's comment about 13 also measuring traffic. And I'd imagine it's extremely 14 difficult to quantify that.</p> <p>15 And so I just wonder if using a margin of 16 error based on what our neighbors have done would be 17 helpful.</p> <p>18 MR. ROGERS: Thanks. That's certainly 19 worthy of consideration. We'll address it to the extent 20 possible.</p> <p>21 I just wanted to highlight -- just because 22 we hadn't mentioned it before -- is that part of the 23 Draft EIR review process does involve public review, 24 Planning Commission review, but you also do have to send 25 it to any potential affected agencies.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 99</p>	<p>1 So we saw a representative from the Fire 2 District earlier. That's one example, but just to 3 highlight on the schools topic, the Menlo Park City 4 Schools District as well as the Sequoia Union Secondary 5 School District were given copies of the report, and to 6 the extent that there's anything about our assumptions 7 that they believe as the most affected parties that that 8 is not accurate and deserves additional clarification, we 9 are expecting and hoping to receive those as comments, as 10 well.</p> <p>11 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Henry.</p> <p>12 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: Thank you.</p> <p>13 I get a sense we're coming to a close and I 14 don't want to -- sometime soon and I don't want to miss 15 the chance to say that with all the EIRs that we see or 16 have seen, including on our main corridors, it's great to 17 be collecting -- although it's an awfully big volume with 18 a lot of information -- for us to actually address the 19 downtown and El Camino collectively is something that 20 many have commented was overdue, and here we actually 21 have it.</p> <p>22 And I also -- I agree with a previous 23 comment that this seems to be complete, and maybe a proof 24 of that -- of -- of the completeness and value of this 25 EIR is the number of comments on -- jumping ahead to the</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 100</p>

<p>1 Specific Plan that has prompted tonight. So I'm quite 2 appreciative of the document.</p> <p>3 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Ben. 4 COMMISSIONER EIREF: I'll second that, as 5 well.</p> <p>6 I think I was involved in the Oversight 7 Committee, I think Henry, you were, as well, and I felt 8 really hungry for data, for information about -- because 9 it seemed like for several years, we were kind of talking 10 about big picture concepts, and there was very little 11 hard information to put your finger on at all, and all of 12 a sudden, we have 500 pages. I'm not sure how long this 13 document is; it takes a long time to read, but a 14 tremendous amount of information, and we can all 15 interpret it the way we want to think about it, but it 16 does give us a tremendous amount of kind of additional -- 17 it just makes this project feel much more doable and real 18 in a sense than -- than it was before when we were pretty 19 much talking about general concepts.</p> <p>20 So -- so I thought thanks to the team that 21 wrote it for all the work they put into it to help us 22 move forward.</p> <p>23 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Okay. Well, I 24 certainly concur with that. Thank you very much, Arlinda 25 and Thomas and Chip, and since I don't see any more</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 101</p>	<p>1 lights up here, I think we're going to move on to Regular 2 Business, which is El Camino Real Downtown Specific Plan 3 Tentative Scheduling for Planning Commission review of 4 Draft Specific Plan.</p> <p>5 MR. ROGERS: Thank you. So this is 6 really, this is really more of a housekeeping type item, 7 so as described in the presentation as well as in this 8 memo.</p> <p>9 With the pending close of the EIR process, 10 it does run another -- another two weeks, so to the 11 extent we got some positive feedback tonight, there -- 12 there is -- is always potential for other feedback, and 13 we welcome that as a natural part of the EIR process.</p> <p>14 To the extent we finish that up, close it 15 out on the 20th, the next step would be doing the 16 Planning Commission's actual full review of the Draft 17 Specific Plan, which again has full latitude to think 18 about what are elements of the plan that need to be 19 changed, what are some things that, you know, need to be 20 tweaked or -- or modified in any sort of way.</p> <p>21 And so what we've included here as a 22 reminder is the approved process the Planning Commission 23 approved back in November, I think, enhancing the 24 original one planned meeting on the Draft Specific Plan 25 to a set of four and potentially five meetings starting</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 102</p>
<p>1 out with an overview of the process, kind of laying out 2 the background as well as setting up the framework for 3 the discussion, and then doing three geographically 4 focused meetings starting with the station area, then 5 looking at downtown and then closing with El Camino Real, 6 and then focusing -- closing everything with a wrap-up.</p> <p>7 And so then intent here is really to 8 provide the City Council with a very set -- very detailed 9 and comprehensive set of recommendations.</p> <p>10 To the extent that the Commission is 11 unanimous on things, that's great. To the extent that 12 there's differing opinions, those will be summarized, as 13 well, depending on the level of disagreement or different 14 opinions.</p> <p>15 So what we really need to look at right now 16 is just what are our parameters for scheduling these 17 meetings.</p> <p>18 Per our original agreement, the thought was 19 these four or five meetings would ideally be able to take 20 on a Special Meeting basis within an approximate two- to 21 three-week period in order to maintain some momentum, in 22 order to not drag it out too far and have to recap too 23 much at the beginning of the next meeting.</p> <p>24 And so on the third page, what we've laid 25 out here are what we believe are likely eligible dates</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 103</p>	<p>1 for these meetings, and what we're going to hopefully 2 leave here tonight with is just an understanding of how 3 many commissioners are available on various dates, and we 4 do have -- an expected absence here tonight, so we'll 5 follow up with Commissioner O'Malley separately.</p> <p>6 But unless commissioners have any sort of 7 better idea, we were thinking that we would go through 8 each of the open dates, meaning non-shaded in gray or 9 dark gray, maybe just see a raised set of hands of how 10 many Commissioners can make a meeting on that date, and 11 then coupled with other factors of when other documents 12 could be produced, we would then schedule meetings at a 13 later date.</p> <p>14 So we just wanted to get you guys all here 15 together and -- and figure out what dates work and which 16 ones definitely didn't.</p> <p>17 We probably -- probably should have done 18 this at the beginning of the meeting when you guys had 19 energy and thought of meetings as something enjoyable.</p> <p>20 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: One thing, I mean, 21 just working back from this, this is a really bad time to 22 try and get everyone here, obviously, because, I mean, 23 the school break is very -- the summer break is short, 24 and this is falling right in the heart of it.</p> <p>25 Is there something that's driving -- really</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 104</p>

<p>1 I was hoping that we would be able to do this before 2 summer, and obviously we're here now, so I'm not going to 3 spend a lot of time on that. 4 But I'm assuming that what's -- what's 5 driving this schedule is that this is the earliest date 6 that we can start looking at time based on how much time 7 it takes to notice right now. 8 MR. ROGERS: Correct. 9 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Yeah. And 10 obviously we already need to be close to this one. 11 But are we constrained from moving this out 12 at all by what's going on with the City Council? 13 MR. ROGERS: It's a little bit driven by 14 the City Council's desire. They -- as much as you guys 15 want to sink your teeth into this, I think that they have 16 been waiting a while, too. 17 There's a desire for the overall project 18 not to extend the potential overall approval out too far. 19 Any -- I would say any change that extended 20 it past these dates, we would need to take to our Council 21 Subcommittee as a first step to say the Planning 22 Commission or individual members of the Planning 23 Commission are expressing an interest in -- in 24 rescheduling this, pushing it out to avoid a summer date, 25 what are the pros and cons? We might have to come back.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 105</p>	<p>1 To the extent that we can get answers on 2 these, if you have a -- on these dates, whether they work 3 or not on just a functional level, we could couple that 4 with some -- some additional dialogue, but I do know that 5 the City Council is feeling the same pressures with 6 regard to the overall project timeline, something that we 7 were supposed to be finished with essentially a year ago 8 this summer. 9 But -- but that's not to say there can't -- 10 aren't other concerns that could drive a positive 11 outcome. 12 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Based on what I see 13 here, it almost seems like the City Council would be 14 voting on this in August. I don't know. 15 MR. ROGERS: The City Council's intent is 16 to review the Planning Commission's recommendation at 17 the -- either the last meeting of August -- they have a 18 meeting after they return from their own summer break or 19 maybe the week prior -- potentially extending into 20 September. 21 But that -- that's at least their intent is 22 that the City Council would be having their review. 23 That is another way to look at it. It's 24 not necessarily the most satisfying way, but just to say 25 that anyone who can't make the Planning Commission's</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 106</p>
<p>1 review can -- because of summer vacation conflicts or 2 other summer conflicts could still attend and participate 3 in the City Council's end of summer review. 4 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: So just to be 5 clear, the -- the City Council's review of -- of our 6 conclusions, would that be the occasion on which they 7 would actually make a vote on this? 8 MR. ROGERS: The -- whether it's a vote as 9 a group or direction, I think depending on the elements, 10 we probably have to have a talk about the best process, 11 but the intent of their meetings as tentatively scheduled 12 for August/September would be they would provide clear 13 direction for revisions to the Draft Specific Plan using 14 the Planning Commission's recommendations. 15 So if there's, you know, a height standard 16 that should be changed or a particular public 17 improvement, garages, marketplace that needs to be 18 altered or -- or deleted, that would be the marching 19 order to change the Specific Plan. 20 The Final Specific Plan would still need to 21 come forward to the Planning Commission and City Council 22 and additional changes could be made then, but the intent 23 would be the City Council provide the overall substance 24 of any changes and improvements -- 25 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Okay.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 107</p>	<p>1 MR. ROGERS: -- in August/September. 2 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: I'm going to let 3 other people talk now. John? 4 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: Just one thought 5 had. I don't know. It may be not possible with this -- 6 you know, the dates we have here, but one -- maybe one 7 possibility is if we could get in like two or even three 8 meetings and be able to schedule those and be able to 9 defer completion of them and scheduling the other two or 10 three, whatever it is, for sometime from now. 11 I'm concerned Jack isn't here, also. I'd 12 like to -- you know, I'd like to know about his 13 availability. So not just -- whether that can work or 14 not, I'm thinking off the top of my head. 15 I am concerned about the idea that the City 16 Council would begin their review before La -- before 17 Labor Day, really, the end of the summer, like that. 18 I'm not sure that's going to allow us and 19 the public to participate with them and certainly I think 20 after -- so there's an awful lot to look at here. I 21 think we owe it to the City to make it as available as 22 possible. 23 So those are my thoughts. 24 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Okay. Ben. 25 COMMISSIONER EIREF: One other option is</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 108</p>

<p>1 to spread it out a little bit. So start it early, and  2 I'm thinking back to the original vision meetings that we  3 had. I don't think we crammed them all, because we did a  4 whole series of them. We did -- I'm trying to remember  5 how we did.  6 We did five or six meetings in each phase,  7 but they were spread out, you know, one each month or one  8 every -- does anyone remember?  9 MR. ROGERS: With all the workshops or  10 oversight and outreach committee meetings, those were  11 always separated by a month at least at a minimum.  12 COMMISSIONER EIREF: So start -- you know,  13 start it early.  14 And the other thing is I understand the  15 idea of trying to cram it all down and get this kind of  16 piled up, but getting -- you know, if you do one of these  17 every week for four weeks and they're done, very little  18 time for the community to kind of absorb, think, react on  19 the information, whereas if it's kind of one a month,  20 people -- there's more time to spread the word. There's  21 more time to think about the results. There's more time  22 to kind of gel for the next meeting, and frankly it's  23 more doable.  24 Because I don't think you're going to find  25 too many committee members every night and every week for</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 109</p>	<p>1 a month in the middle of -- you know, I definitely hear  2 your comment about this being the middle of the summer.  3 July 4th week is -- gosh. I mean, not too  4 many people are going to want to be here on July 5th, you  5 know, talking about this.  6 So I would say maybe spreading it out.  7 MR. ROGERS: The -- I mean, the logic, as  8 we talked about it last November, was to essentially keep  9 the momentum, keep the potential for implications for the  10 Planning Commission's other obligations to a minimum.  11 And so that -- that keeps like the  12 possibility of, you know, occupying a whole other meeting  13 that's normally scheduled for this meeting to -- to a  14 minimum.  15 I mean, there's pros and cons certainly to  16 either way --  17 COMMISSIONER EIREF: Yeah.  18 MR. ROGERS: -- but it -- at least as we  19 talked about last -- last November, that was a deliberate  20 feeling from the group, and at some level, enough's  21 enough and we just need a recommendation.  22 And so there's always going to be a  23 balancing act with that, but dragging things too long has  24 its own negative effect, and so it's a decision on where  25 to draw that line.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 110</p>
<p>1 COMMISSIONER EIREF: But I could very  2 easily see the complete opposite reaction from the  3 community if you do this in June and July where you're  4 going to make a lot of people very angry that, you know,  5 we spent three or four years getting to this point and  6 then we just jammed this thing in in the space of one  7 month.  8 So there's -- there's a balancing act,  9 obviously, that we have to weigh up.  10 MR. ROGERS: Yeah. Just always personally  11 jealous of people that get to take entire months off, but  12 certainly it is a -- a balancing act, but I say anyone  13 who doesn't make the Planning Commission meetings, it's  14 not -- that's not their only chance to have input.  15 You can write. You can come to the City  16 Council meetings that are after the summer.  17 I know at least in previous years, the  18 discussion about Labor Day, before or after, a lot of it  19 was driven from people who have schoolchildren who say  20 essentially as long as the school year's started, pretty  21 much those families are back and maybe you travel for  22 Labor Day, but it's really looking at the school calendar  23 which I think typically kicks up the second to last  24 weekend of August.  25 So that was part of decision, at least part</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 111</p>	<p>1 of decision from the City Council's side about when they  2 wanted to start doing it.  3 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Okay. Just --  4 before I move on up here, I wanted to see -- hey, Thomas,  5 would it be appropriate to have public comment on this if  6 anyone's out there?  7 MR. ROGERS: Oh, certainly. Planning  8 Commission standard process is to --  9 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Okay.  10 MR. ROGERS: -- include public comment.  11 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Now just up here, I  12 can wait until we're finished commenting on this or I can  13 give them a chance to talk now if you feel like you'd  14 benefit from public comment at this time.  15 Katie, you'd be next.  16 COMMISSIONER FERRICK: Well, I'm not going  17 to say --  18 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Okay.  19 COMMISSIONER FERRICK: -- I don't want  20 public comment, but it's not -- my comment wasn't really  21 relevant. I was just going to make observations about  22 the dates.  23 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Why don't we just  24 finish up and I'll see if there's interest for public  25 comment.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 112</p>

<p>1 COMMISSIONER FERRICK: Okay. Thanks.</p> <p>2 I was going to say that yes indeed, the</p> <p>3 Menlo Park public schools start back August 22nd this</p> <p>4 next summer, and the June dates of course ideally, like</p> <p>5 Thomas said, we would have loved to have this -- I'm on</p> <p>6 the subcommittee that planned this -- that helped kind of</p> <p>7 come up with the idea of having a rather compact meeting</p> <p>8 series in the sense that for a few reasons.</p> <p>9 However, the whole caveat was that you're</p> <p>10 right. We had wanted it, you know, in the spring or even</p> <p>11 last winter, but obviously some factors brought us to</p> <p>12 today and the reality.</p> <p>13 The reason that we wanted them relatively</p> <p>14 compact -- it didn't necessarily have to happen within</p> <p>15 a very, very short period of time, but -- is to allow</p> <p>16 people to learn from the lot, like the idea is you attend</p> <p>17 a series, and then when you go to meeting two, meeting</p> <p>18 three, meeting four, we're not starting back again with a</p> <p>19 brand new introduction to square one at every single</p> <p>20 meeting. You kind of build on the knowledge.</p> <p>21 That said, since -- since it is summer, I</p> <p>22 also concur with Thomas. I really don't think the</p> <p>23 majority of Menlo Park leaves town, but what my concern</p> <p>24 is is that on any given week, there will be more</p> <p>25 volatility or whatever, more likely attendance that -</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 113</p>	<p>1 that may be lower, but I think -- but I also don't think</p> <p>2 that we should not have them starting in the summer,</p> <p>3 either.</p> <p>4 So I was going to suggest we have one in</p> <p>5 June, the late June week that they have here, maybe one</p> <p>6 or two in July and then wait for third and/or fourth one</p> <p>7 for post 8-22 when most -- the preponderance of the</p> <p>8 population would be not on vacation breaks anymore.</p> <p>9 But frankly, I feel like the -- the greater</p> <p>10 attending public that has been to our previous workshops</p> <p>11 aren't necessarily the school parents -- as the giant</p> <p>12 proportion of the population. I say that as a school</p> <p>13 parent and someone that did attend.</p> <p>14 I just noted that there's quite a range of</p> <p>15 people that attend. It's not -- I don't think we should</p> <p>16 focus everything on -- on one segment.</p> <p>17 I think there's a number of seniors that</p> <p>18 are interested and business owners that are interested,</p> <p>19 et cetera, and they -- they aren't necessarily always</p> <p>20 gone on the school calendar.</p> <p>21 So I don't know that we can find a date</p> <p>22 that everyone that's interested could come. It's really</p> <p>23 where I'm going to.</p> <p>24 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Henry.</p> <p>25 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: Yeah. Thank you.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 114</p>
<p>1 I'm inclined to agree with Thomas, and the</p> <p>2 way that I see it, frankly there have been countless</p> <p>3 reasons to delay getting this project wrapped up, and if</p> <p>4 there are in the neighborhood of six meetings left on</p> <p>5 this process and four to five of them are ours, and I --</p> <p>6 I think I know where the action either is or isn't.</p> <p>7 I agree that we should stay away from the</p> <p>8 week of July 4th, probably the week leading up to it and</p> <p>9 the week thereafter, but other than that, the idea that</p> <p>10 summer, everyone's on vacation, that doesn't fly with me,</p> <p>11 either, and maybe that was true back when everyone worked</p> <p>12 in cubicles and factories, but it doesn't apply even</p> <p>13 in -- even weekends don't apply as such anymore.</p> <p>14 And as for availability, my neighbors, once</p> <p>15 the school year starts, they don't have time for</p> <p>16 anything. They're making commitments left and right, but</p> <p>17 they're not showing up.</p> <p>18 And then when there are breaks during the</p> <p>19 school hol -- during the school, those holidays are so</p> <p>20 constricted, that's where all their -- their plans are.</p> <p>21 I think summer is absolutely as good a time</p> <p>22 as any as long as we avoid July 4th and Labor Day.</p> <p>23 And as for spreading them out, I think it</p> <p>24 does make sense to try to keep them a couple of weeks</p> <p>25 apart, if we can do that -- three weeks may be ideal --</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 115</p>	<p>1 but I do agree with the momentum concept.</p> <p>2 One of the more successful series that I</p> <p>3 went to was Redwood City's -- call it urban planning at</p> <p>4 the Little Fox that went on for a couple of years, and</p> <p>5 getting those even once a month, I think you lost a</p> <p>6 little bit of momentum.</p> <p>7 But certainly with this one focus, I say</p> <p>8 let's get on this thing.</p> <p>9 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Okay. I don't see</p> <p>10 more lights, so I'm going to see if there's interest in</p> <p>11 anyone commenting.</p> <p>12 Okay. I don't see anyone coming forth, so</p> <p>13 I'll close the public comment, and I don't know if we</p> <p>14 need to come up with some kind of consensus here.</p> <p>15 You're looking at me right now, John.</p> <p>16 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: Well, I just want</p> <p>17 to comment. It's a little bit open-ended, because we</p> <p>18 don't have -- we may -- we may get through this much more</p> <p>19 efficiently than we imagined a year ago, say, because</p> <p>20 we've read the EIR and so on.</p> <p>21 But we may end up deciding we need another</p> <p>22 meeting, things kind of bleed over or whatever.</p> <p>23 So I'm not sure we're perfectly sure of the</p> <p>24 total number of meetings, but I -- you know, I guess --</p> <p>25 you know, if I had to choose, choose some weeks and</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 116</p>

<p>1 dates, I guess just to get started, I would -- I would 2 propose something like two meetings the last week of 3 June, and then two meetings in the week following July 4 4th.</p> <p>5 So skip the July 4th week, have a couple 6 meetings before, and then you have a week publicity that 7 people digest it. Maybe it's a busy week, and then the 8 next week.</p> <p>9 And then we've got four meetings done and 10 then we see if we need -- we may decide maybe then, maybe 11 around meeting two slash three we could schedule the last 12 meeting or the last two meetings, but not do that.</p> <p>13 Is that plausible to leave those last one 14 or two kind of hanging?</p> <p>15 MR. ROGERS: I think to the extent that it 16 doesn't affect the City Council's intended objective to 17 start their review at the beginning of August or 18 beginning of September, there can definitely be some 19 flexibility in the Planning Commission's process.</p> <p>20 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: So Thomas, when you 21 say start their review, what do you envision there? Do 22 you they could -- they just need one evening, maybe two 23 evenings, don't know? What would you recommend for --</p> <p>24 MR. ROGERS: For the City --</p> <p>25 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: -- from your</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 117</p>	<p>1 personal perspective?</p> <p>2 MR. ROGERS: For the City Council, I think 3 it's probably at least two meetings, and --</p> <p>4 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: Okay.</p> <p>5 MR. ROGERS: -- we might do the same 6 thing. I'm kind of playing it by ear, but I think we'll 7 have a better sense to be honest after the Planning 8 Commission completes its review, because if they're 9 looking at a number of, you know, seven-oh, six -- you 10 know, six-one, five-two kind of clear recommendations, I 11 think they'll have an easier time of it than if it's a 12 four-three split in different directions on -- you know 13 very kind of muddy - some of that we might have to wait 14 and see.</p> <p>15 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: So is there also 16 any issue of staff's need to kind of regroup and do some 17 analysis, collect data, clarify -- you know, clarify this 18 or that, legal issues, the whole -- you know, before 19 going to Council, you want to have kind of a clean 20 package.</p> <p>21 MR. ROGERS: No. That's a good 22 consideration. It -- it does vary on the good comments 23 again, as well, to the extent that things are pretty 24 clear, but to the extent a recommendation is coupled with 25 a need to kind of filter in, interpret, it can take a</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 118</p>
<p>1 little longer.</p> <p>2 But yeah, typically we need I would say 3 three weeks between the Planning Commission meeting and 4 the City Council meeting.</p> <p>5 We could do two, but it's getting kind of 6 rough at that point.</p> <p>7 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: Well, if we did 8 what I -- suppose we took those two weeks -- suppose we 9 took four meetings in some two weeks and -- could we hold 10 off on the final couple meetings until meeting one or 11 two? Would that be -- that would work and there'd still 12 be enough flexibility there? I mean, that would still 13 give them a lot of lead time.</p> <p>14 I mean, certainly if they were in that 15 June, early July. I mean, you know --</p> <p>16 MR. ROGERS: Yeah. If the Planning 17 Commission wraps up its work in any of these end of July 18 meetings, that gives us enough time to get the City 19 Council's staff report together, again depending on 20 comments being relatively straightforward.</p> <p>21 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: Yeah. I guess it's 22 the tail event I'm concerned about, and maybe it's 23 unnecessary. I don't, know. I can -- I can see blocking 24 out two days in those two weeks myself, so I'm just going 25 to throw those out there as a start to see maybe what</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 119</p>	<p>1 others have to say.</p> <p>2 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Peipei.</p> <p>3 COMMISSIONER YU: So I don't know if it's 4 appropriate for -- for us to do like an e-mail survey, 5 because I'd have to check my calendar, and I typically 6 don't like to announce publicly when I've planned to go 7 on vacation.</p> <p>8 MR. THOMAS: Okay.</p> <p>9 COMMISSIONER YU: So I know it'll be in 10 the minutes and I know everybody reads them every week, 11 but -- and also Jack's not here.</p> <p>12 So I just wonder if it's appropriate to say 13 I'm happy to send out an e-mail survey where I send out 14 dates and people can, you know, click whether or not they 15 are definitely available, you know, not available or 16 whatever and I can report back to you what people 17 responded.</p> <p>18 Is that okay?</p> <p>19 MR. ROGERS: Well, we would probably do -- 20 we would be the source, and so you would provide us the 21 information and we would poll the rest of the Planning 22 Commission, and we did -- out of an abundance of caution, 23 we did check with the City Attorney on whether that had 24 any Brown Act implications, and to the extent it just 25 relates to the actual meeting availability on -- that</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 120</p>

<p>1 doesn't require any noticing.  2 But the kind of more general discussion  3 we're having here about ideally focus momentum versus,  4 you know, having a longer process, that's something that  5 has to happen at a public meeting, but just clearing  6 individual dates can happen via e-mail.  7 COMMISSIONER YU: I see. And I agree, I  8 think we should get this done, and I would support us  9 doing some kind of an e-mail survey using, I work for  10 Google and I very much like Google forms, so I think if  11 you use Google forms and just e-mail us and provide us  12 dates and we can click on the radio buttons to tell you  13 our availability.  14 I think that could feedback the dates that  15 people are most available. So I would support that  16 process.  17 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Thank you.  18 COMMISSIONER EIREF: I'm curious to know.  19 When we did the original visioning process, do you know  20 -- do you recall how far apart each of the meetings was?  21 Because that was a good cadence, people  22 came and we had a lot of attendance.  23 MR. ROGERS: Was it -- are you talking  24 about the workshops that we had over in the Rec Center  25 where we put stuff up on --</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 121</p>	<p>1 COMMISSIONER EIREF: Yeah. In both  2 phases. We had workshops in both phases.  3 MR. ROGERS: We did. On the Specific  4 Plan, they were a little more spread out. I think in  5 2009, we had a February workshop, a June workshop and  6 then a September workshop.  7 In the vision plan, that was more compact.  8 I think we had maybe one a month or maybe a little  9 longer, but that was like -- that total process was  10 basically half a year.  11 So yeah, the workshop portion couldn't have  12 been more than once a month.  13 COMMISSIONER EIREF: Yeah. The vision one  14 went longer.  15 MR. ROGERS: Yeah. Those are -- those  16 meetings, those kind of workshops are a little bit  17 different in focus in terms of broader community input.  18 The Planning Commission, I think the hope  19 would be that we could be a little bit more efficient,  20 just given your expertise and your comfort level with  21 some of these topics.  22 So you would be getting input, it would be  23 a very important part of the process, but it wouldn't --  24 it wouldn't necessarily require the same kind of pace and  25 deliberation that the workshops and the visioning or the</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 122</p>
<p>1 Specific Plan did, if the Planning Commission is in  2 agreement.  3 So it sounds like there is some, but I --  4 we were looking for you guys to kind of wrap things up  5 and summarize for us.  6 COMMISSIONER EIREF: Okay. I will still  7 stick with my recommendation that we not cram in too  8 much, but I'm thinking every three weeks or something  9 like that might be reasonable.  10 So are we not envisioning, then, that  11 there's going to be a lot of public -- I just have a  12 feeling that there's going to be a lot of public input on  13 this. A lot more than we saw this evening, actually.  14 MR. ROGERS: I think we as staff certainly  15 expect input, but it's what the Planning Commission does  16 with that. If you're able to distill and synthesize  17 fairly quickly and come to an agreement amongst  18 yourselves, then the timing can happen relatively  19 quickly.  20 But if it's something that --  21 COMMISSIONER EIREF: Yeah.  22 MR. ROGERS: -- the Commission needs  23 more -- itself needs more time, then that's maybe what  24 should be driving the decision as opposed to a perception  25 of the public.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 123</p>	<p>1 Because the act of getting into it actually  2 doesn't take, you know, more than three minutes as an  3 individual, but again, it's at the Commission's  4 discretion.  5 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Okay. Katie.  6 COMMISSIONER FERRICK: Thank you.  7 I was just going to suggest maybe some sort  8 of a compromise with Ben's suggestion, but by adding --  9 if -- you know, if you sent out like Peipei said some  10 sort of a survey or form so we can kind of figure out  11 which dates out of the ones you have here, but adding  12 another week or two on so that there's a potential to  13 maybe have two to two and a half weeks in between each  14 meeting.  15 Like, for example, June 28th, July 13th,  16 July 28th and then something in August. So that way it's  17 still hopefully achieving some momentum as well as having  18 a little bit of time to kind of distill the information.  19 As Ben was pointing out, hopefully it would be a  20 compromise between them.  21 But then I also wanted to just circle back  22 with what Henry said. I completely agree. I'm far more  23 as a parent of children available to concentrate on this  24 in the summer than I will be the first two weeks of  25 school.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 124</p>

<p>1 And so this is -- the summer to me is like,  2 oh, good, I can actually think about it more and spend  3 some more time on it than I could in late August or  4 September.  5 Thank you.  6 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: John.  7 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: This is something I  8 just wanted to clarify. It has to do with the timing.  9 It's important to me.  10 So it looks like in each meeting, we're  11 planning on formulating some preliminary recommendations?  12 Those will be in written form and maybe they have like a  13 straw vote or something associated with them -- indicates  14 some kind of strength of preference.  15 Informal way. Nothing binding, but fairly  16 precise and written down and maybe showing where people  17 stand on various issues and that kind of thing.  18 MR. ROGERS: That was the intent. So the  19 wrap-up meeting is really -- it's not kind of  20 re-inventing stuff. It's really validating and --  21 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: Right. And giving  22 very clear interim feedback to --  23 MR. ROGERS: Mm-hmm.  24 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: I think that's  25 great. That's fine as long as we can follow that</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 125</p>	<p>1 flexively. Maybe we'd like issues to be resolved or  2 something like that. That's also part of it. That's  3 great. I think that's a very important part of this.  4 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Henry.  5 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: I first have a  6 question of staff, if I may. Do we know -- we have  7 Commission meetings three of the next five Mondays.  8 Do we have them pretty much booked at this  9 point?  10 MR. ROGERS: For the regular meetings?  11 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: Yes.  12 MR. ROGERS: I know through 6-27, the  13 regular meeting of 6-27, that's effectively full. I  14 don't believe we have necessarily been charting out  15 what's going on July 11th or July 25th, but I think we  16 have enough things that are kind of pending or close to  17 pending.  18 But certainly not -- both of those meetings  19 will be eligible for consideration as one of these  20 Specific Plan meetings. It's possible that one of them  21 might be.  22 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: I just wanted to ask  23 that for background. I'm perfectly willing to reassign,  24 say, my Thursdays for June and July, but -- I mean, for  25 context, I'd like to point out that the workshops that we</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 126</p>
<p>1 had were typically repetitive and they were different  2 locations and different months.  3 So that people who didn't get to one could  4 get to the other. They didn't build, whereas what we've  5 set ourselves the task to do here is not repetitive at  6 all.  7 We have to do our assigned portions of the  8 task in the four separate meetings, and so I -- I don't  9 think spacing is particularly relevant except that it  10 would disadvantage someone out there if we had them all  11 in a week's time, because that would be the week that  12 their company sent them to Dubai or something.  13 I would like to suggest that we simply  14 space them at two weeks, and so we might have them  15 starting with June 30th and then go 14th, 28th and then  16 early August.  17 Then that would just give the three weeks  18 to staff to prepare for the first City Council meeting.  19 So, you know, I'll throw that out.  20 And I'd also like to point out that if  21 someone were sent to Dubai and really, really wanted to  22 see the second meeting, it's streaming live.  23 I would like to think it's important enough  24 for people to watch, but it is a lot more available than  25 it used to be.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 127</p>	<p>1 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Okay. It sounds  2 like we're getting pretty close to a consensus.  3 One thing I'm hearing we're going to send  4 out the form for people to indicate which days they're  5 available which should also probably cover August and  6 that we want to try at least two weeks between the  7 meetings.  8 It sounds like people are interested in  9 excluding the July 4th week. That's what I've heard.  10 I am a little concerned. Ben expressed the  11 same concern that we're going to come into some  12 criticism.  13 The original idea here was that we were  14 going to have a lot of input and this was going to be the  15 primary mechanism by which people could specifically have  16 an opportunity to address their concerns about one  17 particular aspect of the plan.  18 My concern is that it's going to end up  19 being -- maybe this isn't just because it's in the  20 summer, but my concern is it's going to end up becoming  21 our opportunity to refine this, and I don't know.  22 I just -- I hope that as Commissioners --  23 what we're going to do as Commissioners, we can try and  24 get the word out about these meetings to people that will  25 be interested in doing that.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 128</p>



<p>1 So I think -- yeah. Katie.</p> <p>2 COMMISSIONER FERRICK: Thank you. Sorry</p> <p>3 to interrupt.</p> <p>4 I just wanted to mention that one great</p> <p>5 opportunity for that would be the Downtown Block Party on</p> <p>6 June 22nd.</p> <p>7 I have a question for the staff. Like last</p> <p>8 year, will you have an information table out and the year</p> <p>9 before and I think the year before that, you did, too.</p> <p>10 But this time, it could be to tout these</p> <p>11 upcoming series of meetings?</p> <p>12 MR. ROGERS: Absolutely. We're already</p> <p>13 planning on it. That would be a -- a great outreach</p> <p>14 opportunity, as you know.</p> <p>15 COMMISSIONER FERRICK: Great. Thank you.</p> <p>16 You're welcome, Fran.</p> <p>17 COMMISSIONER YU: I think along those</p> <p>18 lines, obviously it would be great to have the dates and</p> <p>19 the topics associated with those dates as concise as</p> <p>20 possible and put it on the website.</p> <p>21 I don't know if it's possible to make a</p> <p>22 flyer kind of like what we did with the Charette so that</p> <p>23 we can pass them out for our neighbors and whatever.</p> <p>24 I think that most likely people want to</p> <p>25 make a comment about some particular issue; they might</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 129</p>	<p>1 not want to come to every single meeting, but if they can</p> <p>2 reserve that time and at least know it's coming, with an</p> <p>3 e-mail or letter, whatever they can do, that's great.</p> <p>4 I always think that the most effective way</p> <p>5 to communicate with people is kind of the grass roots</p> <p>6 flyers, neighbors talk to neighbors.</p> <p>7 If staff can provide that kind of thing, it</p> <p>8 would be very helpful to us to be able to publicize it,</p> <p>9 as well.</p> <p>10 MR. ROGERS: Thank you. That's a good</p> <p>11 suggestion. I think we'll definitely be able to provide</p> <p>12 something along those lines.</p> <p>13 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: So do we need to</p> <p>14 take a vote on this, a motion or is this discussion</p> <p>15 adequate?</p> <p>16 MR. ROGERS: I believe the consensus</p> <p>17 that's been relayed is sufficient.</p> <p>18 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Okay. That's the</p> <p>19 end of regular business, and we have nothing else, so I'm</p> <p>20 going to adjourn the meeting.</p> <p>21 (The meeting concluded at 9:40 PM).</p> <p>22 ---o0o---</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p> <p>25</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 130</p>
<p>1</p> <p>2 STATE OF CALIFORNIA )</p> <p>3 COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO )</p> <p>4</p> <p>5 I, the undersigned, hereby certify that the</p> <p>6 discussion in the foregoing meeting was taken at the</p> <p>7 time and place therein stated; that the foregoing is a</p> <p>8 full, true and complete record of said matter.</p> <p>9 I further certify that I am not of counsel or</p> <p>10 attorney for either or any of the parties in the</p> <p>11 foregoing meeting and caption named, or in any way</p> <p>12 interested in the outcome of the cause named in said</p> <p>13 action.</p> <p>14</p> <p>15 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have</p> <p>16 hereunto set my hand this</p> <p>17 _____ day of _____,</p> <p>18 2011.</p> <p>19 _____</p> <p>20 MARK I. BRICKMAN CSR 5527</p> <p>21</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Page 131</p>	

<b>A</b>				
<b>abbreviation</b> 9:25	<b>action</b> 4:5 9:5 115:6 131:12	<b>adopting</b> 33:17	<b>allows</b> 84:1	66:10,17 69:24
<b>ability</b> 41:16	<b>actions</b> 18:18	<b>advance</b> 19:24	<b>alter</b> 22:10	70:11,14 72:6
<b>able</b> 26:9 52:2 86:11 88:3 90:25 91:16 94:19 95:13 103:19 105:1 108:8,8 123:16 130:8,11	<b>activities</b> 16:7,12 18:16 19:8 22:25 23:1 32:3	<b>advantage</b> 49:8	<b>altered</b> 25:1 40:7 107:18	77:4,14,25 78:2 84:4 86:17 90:2 90:17 96:17 98:17 118:17
<b>absence</b> 48:25 51:5 104:4	<b>actual</b> 5:15 15:5 47:15 48:25 65:7 85:10 99:6 102:16 120:25	<b>advantageous</b> 41:11	<b>alternative</b> 33:13 33:15,16 34:16 35:1,1,4,6,13,19 35:23 36:1,4,6,19 36:21,23 37:2,4,6 37:11,12,13 52:24 59:7,15,23 68:6 68:25 69:22 70:2 72:10,13 82:19 93:9	<b>analyze</b> 33:15 46:8 87:2 91:16
<b>absolute</b> 28:14	<b>ada</b> 40:16	<b>adverse</b> 30:21	<b>alternatives</b> 10:25 33:7,8,11,22 34:12 35:12 36:3 50:19 51:13,14 52:1,23 59:1 69:5 90:3,9	<b>analyzed</b> 13:21 48:16 51:3 54:19 59:24 69:3,5 84:9
<b>absolutely</b> 6:24 7:14 115:21 129:12	<b>add</b> 13:15 29:18 31:14 41:23 63:17 63:22 99:8	<b>adversely</b> 29:7	<b>amendment</b> 8:11	<b>angry</b> 111:4
<b>absorb</b> 109:18	<b>added</b> 27:9 87:12	<b>advertisement</b> 43:24	<b>amenities</b> 34:2 56:25 57:9 89:10	<b>announce</b> 120:6
<b>abundance</b> 120:22	<b>adding</b> 29:12 124:8 124:11	<b>advise</b> 5:21	<b>amount</b> 47:9 52:12 52:13 54:18 60:23 62:10 86:3 101:14 101:16	<b>answer</b> 58:10 83:23
<b>access</b> 14:22 41:17 80:7,15	<b>addition</b> 6:6 10:23 24:19 25:18 26:3	<b>aerial</b> 42:4	<b>alto</b> 52:14 81:1	<b>answered</b> 52:18 53:4
<b>accommodate</b> 98:3	<b>additional</b> 11:24 17:21 29:13 31:14 58:4,22 81:16,17 87:11 100:8 101:16 106:4 107:22	<b>aggregate</b> 91:13 92:19	<b>amphibians</b> 18:17	<b>answers</b> 106:1
<b>account</b> 10:22 25:16 45:23 46:3 56:11 57:18 64:9	<b>address</b> 5:23 11:3 12:7 18:21 21:5 33:22 39:2 45:15 49:4 53:16 58:17 99:19 100:18 128:16	<b>aggregation</b> 92:20	<b>analyses</b> 17:14 84:15	<b>anybody</b> 45:10
<b>accounted</b> 11:9	<b>addressed</b> 69:1,12 69:14	<b>ago</b> 43:12 52:8 71:4 106:7 116:19	<b>analysis</b> 6:17 7:2 11:6,17,20,21 12:11,25 13:20 14:5,8,11 15:23 16:19 17:21 20:3 21:2,3 25:15 26:24 27:2,7,12 27:16,21 28:9,23 29:24 30:2,24 38:13 46:2,23 47:22,25 48:3,10 54:21,22 56:5,8 56:13 57:3 58:5 58:19,22 62:17 63:14 65:4 66:8	<b>anymore</b> 114:8 115:13
<b>accounts</b> 27:25 30:16 72:14	<b>addresses</b> 36:24 68:23	<b>agree</b> 8:14 39:20,23 72:25 74:8 77:8 93:24 95:25 96:19 100:22 115:1,7 116:1 121:7 124:22	<b>amplified</b> 17:14 84:15	<b>anyones</b> 112:6
<b>accurate</b> 50:17 83:24 89:21 100:8	<b>adds</b> 28:4	<b>agreement</b> 26:18 84:24 103:18 123:2,17	<b>amount</b> 47:9 52:12 52:13 54:18 60:23 62:10 86:3 101:14 101:16	<b>anyway</b> 4:19 95:23
<b>achieve</b> 67:11	<b>adequacy</b> 11:13 12:8	<b>agriculture</b> 13:20 13:23	<b>amphibians</b> 18:17	<b>apart</b> 115:25 121:20
<b>achieving</b> 94:21 124:17	<b>adequate</b> 40:15,24 130:15	<b>ahead</b> 4:19 6:3 100:25	<b>analyses</b> 17:14 84:15	<b>apparently</b> 43:8
<b>acknowledge</b> 48:2	<b>adequately</b> 70:19	<b>air</b> 16:4,8,15,17,25 17:14 20:1,15,18 23:3 32:4,7,8 36:7 45:22 49:15,20 52:15 57:21	<b>analysis</b> 6:17 7:2 11:6,17,20,21 12:11,25 13:20 14:5,8,11 15:23 16:19 17:21 20:3 21:2,3 25:15 26:24 27:2,7,12 27:16,21 28:9,23 29:24 30:2,24 38:13 46:2,23 47:22,25 48:3,10 54:21,22 56:5,8 56:13 57:3 58:5 58:19,22 62:17 63:14 65:4 66:8	<b>appeal</b> 57:10
<b>acknowledgement</b> 85:7	<b>adherence</b> 19:15	<b>akin</b> 21:23	<b>amphibians</b> 18:17	<b>appealing</b> 57:2
<b>acknowledges</b> 27:12 47:14	<b>adjourn</b> 130:20	<b>allow</b> 44:1 81:22 82:4 108:18 113:15	<b>analyses</b> 17:14 84:15	<b>appeared</b> 27:18 28:24
<b>acquisition</b> 29:18	<b>adjust</b> 76:20,22		<b>analysis</b> 6:17 7:2 11:6,17,20,21 12:11,25 13:20 14:5,8,11 15:23 16:19 17:21 20:3 21:2,3 25:15 26:24 27:2,7,12 27:16,21 28:9,23 29:24 30:2,24 38:13 46:2,23 47:22,25 48:3,10 54:21,22 56:5,8 56:13 57:3 58:5 58:19,22 62:17 63:14 65:4 66:8	<b>appears</b> 58:8
<b>acre</b> 26:2 82:3 85:14	<b>adjusted</b> 93:14		<b>amount</b> 47:9 52:12 52:13 54:18 60:23 62:10 86:3 101:14 101:16	<b>appendix</b> 73:13
<b>acronym</b> 89:18	<b>adopted</b> 47:18		<b>amphibians</b> 18:17	<b>applicable</b> 52:22 59:4
<b>acronyms</b> 10:3 89:15			<b>analyses</b> 17:14 84:15	<b>application</b> 13:1 17:25 18:13 21:25 22:7 31:2 59:15
<b>act</b> 10:1 21:18 23:3 69:21 110:23 111:8,12 120:24 124:1			<b>analysis</b> 6:17 7:2 11:6,17,20,21 12:11,25 13:20 14:5,8,11 15:23 16:19 17:21 20:3 21:2,3 25:15 26:24 27:2,7,12 27:16,21 28:9,23 29:24 30:2,24 38:13 46:2,23 47:22,25 48:3,10 54:21,22 56:5,8 56:13 57:3 58:5 58:19,22 62:17 63:14 65:4 66:8	<b>applied</b> 13:12 19:19 23:20 64:12
			<b>analysis</b> 6:17 7:2 11:6,17,20,21 12:11,25 13:20 14:5,8,11 15:23 16:19 17:21 20:3 21:2,3 25:15 26:24 27:2,7,12 27:16,21 28:9,23 29:24 30:2,24 38:13 46:2,23 47:22,25 48:3,10 54:21,22 56:5,8 56:13 57:3 58:5 58:19,22 62:17 63:14 65:4 66:8	<b>applies</b> 26:13 49:14
			<b>analysis</b> 6:17 7:2 11:6,17,20,21 12:11,25 13:20 14:5,8,11 15:23 16:19 17:21 20:3 21:2,3 25:15 26:24 27:2,7,12 27:16,21 28:9,23 29:24 30:2,24 38:13 46:2,23 47:22,25 48:3,10 54:21,22 56:5,8 56:13 57:3 58:5 58:19,22 62:17 63:14 65:4 66:8	<b>apply</b> 60:24 66:2 79:7 85:19 115:12 115:13
			<b>analysis</b> 6:17 7:2 11:6,17,20,21 12:11,25 13:20 14:5,8,11 15:23 16:19 17:21 20:3 21:2,3 25:15 26:24 27:2,7,12 27:16,21 28:9,23 29:24 30:2,24 38:13 46:2,23 47:22,25 48:3,10 54:21,22 56:5,8 56:13 57:3 58:5 58:19,22 62:17 63:14 65:4 66:8	<b>appreciate</b> 51:8
			<b>analysis</b> 6:17 7:2 11:6,17,20,21 12:11,25 13:20 14:5,8,11 15:23 16:19 17:21 20:3 21:2,3 25:15 26:24 27:2,7,12 27:16,21 28:9,23 29:24 30:2,24 38:13 46:2,23 47:22,25 48:3,10 54:21,22 56:5,8 56:13 57:3 58:5 58:19,22 62:17 63:14 65:4 66:8	<b>appreciated</b> 49:11
			<b>analysis</b> 6:17 7:2 11:6,17,20,21 12:11,25 13:20 14:5,8,11 15:23 16:19 17:21 20:3 21:2,3 25:15 26:24 27:2,7,12 27:16,21 28:9,23 29:24 30:2,24 38:13 46:2,23 47:22,25 48:3,10 54:21,22 56:5,8 56:13 57:3 58:5 58:19,22 62:17 63:14 65:4 66:8	<b>appreciative</b> 101:2
			<b>analysis</b> 6:17 7:2 11:6,17,20,21 12:11,25 13:20 14:5,8,11 15:23 16:19 17:21 20:3 21:2,3 25:15 26:24 27:2,7,12 27:16,21 28:9,23 29:24 30:2,24 38:13 46:2,23 47:22,25 48:3,10 54:21,22 56:5,8 56:13 57:3 58:5 58:19,22 62:17 63:14 65:4 66:8	<b>approaches</b> 39:6

<b>appropriate</b> 68:20 112:5 120:4,12 <b>approval</b> 105:18 <b>approved</b> 9:24 27:23 53:11 55:2 55:17 56:2,4,5,10 80:25 89:3,3,4 102:22,23 <b>approximate</b> 70:18 103:20 <b>april</b> 13:25 <b>archaeological</b> 18:25 19:9 <b>architect</b> 51:18 <b>architectural</b> 68:2 <b>area</b> 13:22 16:15 17:5 18:20 19:14 19:25 21:24 23:22 24:8,10 25:6,7,16 25:19,24 26:5 27:13 28:25 29:7 29:8 31:10 32:10 50:20,20 51:25 58:8 62:6,12,23 70:13 79:23 81:23 84:19 85:15 87:20 89:4,22,24 95:5 103:4 <b>areas</b> 11:17 13:19 15:13,14,19 17:16 18:6 23:4 24:16 71:4 77:15,18 78:15 <b>arent</b> 4:22 19:4,18 35:7 106:10 114:11,19 <b>arlinda</b> 2:9 6:7 101:24 <b>art</b> 48:15 <b>arterial</b> 28:19 <b>asked</b> 92:20 <b>asking</b> 8:6 <b>asks</b> 13:14 <b>aspect</b> 51:17 53:6 128:17 <b>aspects</b> 15:22 64:13	<b>assigned</b> 127:7 <b>associate</b> 2:9 <b>associated</b> 10:11 17:9,12 20:13 32:2 36:15 77:15 125:13 129:19 <b>association</b> 26:7 <b>assume</b> 53:15 70:10 <b>assumed</b> 47:9 <b>assumes</b> 49:17 <b>assuming</b> 76:13 81:18 89:3 97:17 105:4 <b>assumption</b> 70:9 70:17,17 71:22 90:7 <b>assumptions</b> 59:4 100:6 <b>atgrade</b> 46:16 <b>attached</b> 25:19 56:23 <b>attain</b> 33:9 <b>attend</b> 107:2 113:16 114:13,15 <b>attendance</b> 113:25 121:22 <b>attendees</b> 2:2 <b>attending</b> 114:10 <b>attorney</b> 43:17 120:23 131:9 <b>august</b> 106:14,17 107:12 108:1 111:24 113:3 117:17 124:16 125:3 127:16 128:5 <b>authorizes</b> 69:9 <b>authorizing</b> 67:6 <b>auto</b> 36:8 37:6 50:1 50:1 57:16 <b>availability</b> 108:13 115:14 120:25 121:13 <b>available</b> 13:8 91:14 99:5 104:3	108:21 120:15,15 121:15 124:23 127:24 128:5 <b>avenue</b> 23:12 34:2 41:12,16 79:22 81:1 <b>averages</b> 57:17 <b>avoid</b> 33:10 58:15 105:24 115:22 <b>avoidance</b> 18:8 <b>awful</b> 108:20 <b>awfully</b> 71:24 100:17	<b>basically</b> 23:15 28:3 31:13 34:19 47:21 56:11 83:8 88:16 92:23 122:10 <b>basis</b> 66:4 83:11 92:1,9 103:20 <b>bat</b> 8:12 <b>bats</b> 18:5 <b>bay</b> 16:15 50:20 <b>bear</b> 43:4 <b>beautiful</b> 41:11 42:12 <b>becoming</b> 128:20 <b>beginning</b> 103:23 104:18 117:17,18 <b>belief</b> 94:4 <b>believe</b> 4:8 19:23 59:16,19 60:16 71:18 84:8 86:25 96:3 100:7 103:25 126:14 130:16 <b>believes</b> 69:2 <b>ben</b> 2:5 45:18 61:8 74:8 86:9 101:3 108:24 124:19 128:10 <b>benefit</b> 78:21 79:5 84:24 85:17,20 90:24 112:14 <b>benefits</b> 85:6,7,12 86:7 90:24 <b>bens</b> 99:12 124:8 <b>best</b> 8:17,22 21:21 95:21 107:10 <b>better</b> 9:2 37:7 51:9 53:15 58:2 71:20 73:14 95:7 104:7 118:7 <b>beyond</b> 40:12 74:25 77:9 98:18 <b>bicycle</b> 31:20 79:19 <b>big</b> 62:5 63:2 76:6 90:15 94:6 100:17 101:10 <b>bigger</b> 58:20	<b>bike</b> 79:15 92:24 <b>binding</b> 125:15 <b>biological</b> 18:3 <b>birds</b> 18:5,13 <b>bit</b> 5:17 7:7,12 8:15 11:23 14:23 15:4 15:17 19:22 25:16 26:25 28:12 29:1 65:20 66:17 71:10 72:3 78:23 81:24 83:19 84:25 85:2 85:22 86:17 87:7 88:20 93:14 95:7 97:15,16 105:13 109:1 116:6,17 122:16,19 124:18 <b>bleed</b> 116:22 <b>block</b> 129:5 <b>blocking</b> 119:23 <b>board</b> 35:8 37:12 83:9 <b>bonus</b> 84:24 85:6 85:17 <b>booked</b> 126:8 <b>books</b> 72:7,11,15 <b>bothersome</b> 75:22 <b>bought</b> 44:12 <b>brainstorm</b> 44:18 <b>brand</b> 113:19 <b>brawner</b> 42:23,24 42:25 43:6 87:18 <b>break</b> 93:21 104:23 104:23 106:18 <b>breakdowns</b> 91:22 <b>breaking</b> 72:3 <b>breakout</b> 86:13 <b>breaks</b> 114:8 115:18 <b>breeding</b> 18:13 <b>bressler</b> 2:4 4:2 38:24 39:11 42:22 43:2 45:9 47:1 53:20 57:13 61:8 70:4 77:6 78:16 79:10 80:9 81:10 82:10,20 83:5,7
---	---	---	---	---

84:11,17,20 86:8 87:14 88:23 98:22 100:11 101:3,23 104:20 105:9 106:12 107:4,25 108:2,24 112:3,9 112:11,18,23 114:24 116:9 120:2 121:17 124:5 125:6 126:4 128:1 130:13,18	<b>bumpin</b> 93:21 <b>bumpout</b> 93:21 <b>bumpouts</b> 73:24 <b>bunch</b> 73:5 92:14 <b>business</b> 3:7 44:7 96:20 97:20 102:2 114:18 130:19 <b>busy</b> 117:7 <b>buttons</b> 121:12	94:25 95:4 106:9 106:25 <b>cap</b> 67:13 <b>capable</b> 40:11 52:6 <b>capacity</b> 58:13 <b>caption</b> 131:10 <b>carbon</b> 20:11,17,22 <b>card</b> 39:4,10 42:23 <b>cards</b> 39:3 <b>cars</b> 20:4 58:1 90:16 <b>case</b> 6:3 17:5,8,18 22:5 23:21 24:16 25:7,22 27:17 29:15 30:25 31:1 37:11 38:6 50:19 60:13,15 94:20 <b>cases</b> 10:6 23:18 34:21 47:23 48:3 <b>cast</b> 15:22 <b>categorized</b> 60:7 <b>category</b> 12:23 13:4 16:5 22:22 23:9 28:10 <b>cause</b> 87:8 131:11 <b>caution</b> 120:22 <b>caveat</b> 113:9 <b>census</b> 25:21 <b>center</b> 44:10,22,25 121:24 <b>ceqa</b> 9:25 10:2,5 11:12 12:8 13:14 15:23 25:3 33:6 33:16 37:9 38:14 48:15 50:11,14,21 51:2 <b>ceqas</b> 49:23 <b>certain</b> 10:8 12:11 13:14 27:5,6,14 28:9 30:4,16 34:20,21 47:9,11 48:18 53:1 66:23 67:6 78:5 83:25 85:7,9 86:1,3,7 89:8 96:16 <b>certainly</b> 49:9 59:2	67:4,7 68:24 76:23 78:24 80:6 90:22 91:19 99:18 101:24 108:19 110:15 111:12 112:7 116:7 119:14 123:14 126:18 <b>certainty</b> 16:19 49:1 <b>certified</b> 47:18 <b>certify</b> 131:4,8 <b>cetera</b> 43:15,16,16 67:17 78:15 114:19 <b>chairperson</b> 2:4,4 4:2 38:24 39:11 42:22 43:2 45:9 47:1 53:20 57:13 61:8 70:4 77:6 78:16 79:10 80:9 81:10 82:10,20 83:5,7 84:11,17 84:20 86:8 87:14 88:23 98:22 100:11 101:3,23 104:20 105:9 106:12 107:4,25 108:2,24 112:3,9 112:11,18,23 114:24 116:9 120:2 121:17 124:5 125:6 126:4 128:1 130:13,18 <b>challenge</b> 5:8 <b>chambers</b> 1:18 2:19 <b>chance</b> 15:8,9 29:2 45:11 55:8 97:12 100:15 111:14 112:13 <b>change</b> 15:18,21 19:21 23:23 36:10 36:17 54:4,20,23 83:13 105:19 107:19	<b>changed</b> 15:4 102:19 107:16 <b>changes</b> 14:5 45:25 54:18 59:3 73:23 73:23 83:4,11 85:9 89:4 92:5 98:2,2,16 107:22 107:24 <b>changing</b> 12:10 81:8 <b>chapter</b> 65:25,25 74:18 75:3,3 77:22 85:2 <b>character</b> 15:22 16:1 22:12 23:24 34:9 54:3,20 55:3 56:23 97:11 <b>characterize</b> 71:20 <b>characterized</b> 16:2 <b>characterizing</b> 70:19 72:3 <b>charette</b> 129:22 <b>charting</b> 126:14 <b>check</b> 120:5,23 <b>chestnut</b> 92:4 <b>chief</b> 39:9,12,18 72:25 <b>children</b> 57:10 124:23 <b>chip</b> 2:10 6:8 53:13 54:8 101:25 <b>choices</b> 88:1 <b>choose</b> 86:11 116:25,25 <b>circle</b> 124:21 <b>circulation</b> 26:23 40:2 58:7 60:5 <b>cities</b> 8:24 10:6 13:15 98:24 99:5 99:9 <b>city</b> 1:1,18 2:8,19 2:22 10:19 14:16 24:18 25:23 43:11 50:23 51:1 52:4 52:13 53:1,18,25 54:13 67:5,10
---	---	--	--	--

85:21 86:7,14 88:16 96:23 97:23 100:3 103:8 105:12,14 106:5 106:13,15,22 107:3,5,21,23 108:15,21 111:15 112:1 117:16,24 118:2 119:4,18 120:23 127:18 <b>citys</b> 12:8 38:13 116:3 <b>clarification</b> 4:9 7:24 100:8 <b>clarifications</b> 7:2 <b>clarify</b> 5:24 97:10 118:17,17 125:8 <b>clarifying</b> 37:20 74:12 <b>clarity</b> 81:12 83:13 <b>classic</b> 44:23 <b>classifications</b> 12:19 <b>clean</b> 118:19 <b>clear</b> 7:15 8:7 9:5 77:15 80:9 84:21 86:22 89:19 107:5 107:12 118:10,24 125:22 <b>clearing</b> 121:5 <b>click</b> 120:14 121:12 <b>climate</b> 19:21 36:10,17 <b>close</b> 7:22 8:1 14:15 39:7 43:9 45:12 99:2 100:13 102:9 102:14 105:10 116:13 126:16 128:2 <b>closer</b> 85:3 <b>closing</b> 37:18 38:6 38:11 41:14 103:5 103:6 <b>closure</b> 67:9 <b>closures</b> 66:4 <b>cloth</b> 22:19	<b>co2</b> 49:16 <b>coarse</b> 77:4 <b>code</b> 23:13 <b>codes</b> 19:15 49:18 <b>codification</b> 73:17 <b>collect</b> 118:17 <b>collecting</b> 100:17 <b>collectively</b> 100:19 <b>collector</b> 28:21 <b>come</b> 7:14 9:23 12:1 16:15 27:15 56:10 64:6,15 88:25 95:21 98:12 98:17 105:25 107:21 111:15 113:7 114:22 116:14 123:17 128:11 130:1 <b>comes</b> 16:5 47:19 81:18 <b>comfort</b> 122:20 <b>coming</b> 22:15,18,19 37:18 38:16 52:9 61:12,18,20 62:1 100:13 116:12 130:2 <b>commenced</b> 2:21 <b>comment</b> 4:4 7:8 7:22 9:2 14:2,15 14:23 15:3 37:17 37:25 38:2,7 39:4 39:7 43:3 45:11 45:13,17 46:25 50:7,12 58:17,18 58:20 61:4 66:9 66:16 68:24 69:3 70:2 83:3 84:10 97:19 99:12,12 100:23 110:2 112:5,10,14,20,20 112:25 116:13,17 129:25 <b>commented</b> 51:4 100:20 <b>commenting</b> 112:12 116:11	<b>comments</b> 3:5 6:16 6:18 7:3 8:2 12:4 12:4,6,13 14:4,8 14:10 15:1,12 35:14 38:4,8,17 38:21 39:2,10,15 39:15,20 40:3 42:15,21 43:1,4 59:3 77:8 82:25 83:1 100:9,25 118:22 119:20 <b>commercial</b> 34:24 35:11,21,24 37:2 37:7 51:24 52:14 59:8,11 67:17 68:15 <b>commission</b> 1:2 2:3 2:22 6:5 7:24 10:18 14:1,16 37:19 38:4,18 39:13 51:1 69:1 87:3 88:7 90:11 99:24 102:3,22 103:10 105:22,23 107:21 111:13 112:8 118:8 119:3 119:17 120:22 122:18 123:1,15 123:22 126:7 <b>commissioner</b> 4:9 4:11,18 5:7 6:2 9:5 14:14 45:21 47:2 49:3 50:14 51:6 52:25 53:21 55:1 56:14 57:12 57:14 58:6 59:5 60:1 61:6,9,25 62:4,24 63:8,12 63:21,25 64:21 65:2,5 66:21 68:4 70:3,5 71:12 72:17 89:13 92:2 93:5 98:23 100:12 101:4 104:5 108:4 108:25 109:12 110:17 111:1	112:16,19 113:1 114:25 116:16 117:20,25 118:4 118:15 119:7,21 120:3,9 121:7,18 122:1,13 123:6,21 124:6 125:7,21,24 126:5,11,22 129:2 129:15,17 <b>commissioners</b> 6:16 87:3 104:3,6 104:10 128:22,23 <b>commissions</b> 8:2 85:4 88:21 102:16 106:16,25 107:14 110:10 117:19 124:3 <b>commitments</b> 115:16 <b>committee</b> 54:1 101:7 109:10,25 <b>common</b> 78:12 <b>communal</b> 78:10 <b>communicate</b> 130:5 <b>communities</b> 9:18 10:21 97:25 <b>community</b> 2:9 6:6 8:17 9:19 11:20 22:4,14 35:15 38:18 39:25 41:10 46:20 54:14 55:2 63:8 71:2 85:8 109:18 111:3 122:17 <b>communitys</b> 7:19 <b>commute</b> 17:5 <b>compact</b> 23:22 113:7,14 122:7 <b>company</b> 40:12 127:12 <b>compare</b> 63:11 <b>compared</b> 34:16 82:2 <b>comparing</b> 63:4 <b>comparison</b> 35:9	63:1,5 <b>complete</b> 11:2 100:23 111:2 131:7 <b>completely</b> 80:13 124:22 <b>completeness</b> 11:13 100:24 <b>completes</b> 118:8 <b>completion</b> 108:9 <b>compliance</b> 12:8 38:14 <b>complicate</b> 42:9 <b>component</b> 34:23 34:24 66:6 <b>components</b> 35:11 <b>compound</b> 71:13 <b>compounding</b> 28:3 <b>compounds</b> 72:20 <b>comprehensive</b> 14:17 88:14 103:9 <b>comprehensively</b> 5:19 <b>compromise</b> 124:8 124:20 <b>computer</b> 57:20 <b>concentrate</b> 124:23 <b>concept</b> 10:10 116:1 <b>concepts</b> 101:10,19 <b>conceptual</b> 9:21 <b>concern</b> 71:13 90:15 93:15 113:23 128:11,18 128:20 <b>concerned</b> 41:14 41:15 42:1 108:11 108:15 119:22 128:10 <b>concerns</b> 40:1,3 41:5,6,21 106:10 128:16 <b>concise</b> 129:19 <b>concluded</b> 130:21 <b>conclusions</b> 12:12 107:6
---	---	---	---	--

<b>concur</b> 101:24 113:22	36:16 46:12,21,22 50:21,25 54:6	10:19 14:16 51:1 53:18,25 54:13	79:20 81:3 95:10	108:17 111:18,22
<b>condition</b> 23:17 26:12,15	58:25 61:24 64:8 68:1,14,18 69:7	67:5,10 87:4	<b>cruz</b> 34:2 41:12,16	115:22 131:17
<b>conditions</b> 26:9 27:3,10,23 28:11	79:4 85:8	103:8 105:12,20	92:6 97:25 98:15	<b>days</b> 52:10 119:24
32:13 47:16	<b>considering</b> 30:12	106:5,13,22	<b>csr</b> 1:24 2:20	128:4
<b>conduct</b> 22:13	31:6 67:3	107:21,23 108:16	131:20	<b>deadline</b> 38:7
<b>conducted</b> 19:10	<b>consistent</b> 91:7	111:16 118:2,19	<b>cubicles</b> 115:12	<b>deadlines</b> 10:9
<b>conducting</b> 21:13	<b>constrain</b> 80:8	119:4 127:18	<b>cultural</b> 18:23	<b>deal</b> 5:18 17:15
<b>conductivity</b> 22:6	<b>constrained</b> 105:11	<b>councils</b> 105:14	<b>cumulative</b> 26:20	<b>decades</b> 28:2
79:14,24 80:2	<b>constricted</b> 115:20	106:15 107:3,5	27:21 28:5,9	<b>decide</b> 54:13
93:24,25 95:8,24	<b>construction</b> 16:6	112:1 117:16	32:14,17 33:3	117:10
<b>configuration</b>	16:12 18:16 19:8	119:19	45:24 46:2,3	<b>decided</b> 82:13
41:24	19:10 21:10,17,19	<b>counsel</b> 131:8	70:10 72:6 77:1	83:13
<b>confirm</b> 91:18	22:25 32:3 87:9	<b>count</b> 62:11	<b>curious</b> 121:18	<b>deciding</b> 53:25
<b>confirms</b> 70:16,17	92:4	<b>counted</b> 61:22	<b>current</b> 17:20	116:21
<b>conflicts</b> 107:1,2	<b>consultant</b> 6:11	62:16	32:10 33:18,18	<b>decision</b> 9:20 87:5
<b>confounded</b> 90:18	7:25 37:21 44:17	<b>countless</b> 115:2	34:17,19 49:20	110:24 111:25
98:5	76:17	<b>country</b> 44:9,25	50:2 58:5,5 80:18	112:1 123:24
<b>congestion</b> 44:5	<b>consultants</b> 2:11	<b>counts</b> 27:4	80:22,23 81:19,22	<b>decisionmakers</b>
<b>conjunction</b> 34:6	8:23 43:8	<b>county</b> 17:5 131:3	83:24,25 85:10	10:18
<b>connection</b> 34:18	<b>consumption</b> 50:10	<b>couple</b> 28:2 37:16	91:8	<b>decisions</b> 5:15 9:23
<b>connectivity</b> 34:10	<b>contacts</b> 8:24	39:10 45:2 51:7	<b>currently</b> 23:4	<b>decks</b> 78:15
<b>cons</b> 105:25 110:15	<b>content</b> 77:23	52:8 79:15 106:3	25:14 26:13 29:12	<b>declaration</b> 48:14
<b>consensus</b> 116:14	<b>contention</b> 80:10	115:24 116:4	46:16 51:3 79:8	<b>decreasing</b> 37:6
128:2 130:16	<b>context</b> 126:25	117:5 119:10	82:4 87:13 91:23	<b>deep</b> 58:15
<b>consequences</b>	<b>continuing</b> 91:11	<b>coupled</b> 104:11	<b>curtailed</b> 26:12	<b>defer</b> 108:9
92:18	<b>contrast</b> 10:12,13	118:24	<b>customers</b> 44:5	<b>defined</b> 61:11
<b>conservative</b> 27:12	24:19	<b>course</b> 93:6,10	<b>cut</b> 5:25 9:1 22:18	<b>definitely</b> 7:17 28:4
29:24 58:19 71:11	<b>contribute</b> 32:3,7	113:4	65:17	28:25 46:3 47:24
<b>conservatively</b>	<b>control</b> 22:25	<b>court</b> 6:21 10:6	<b>D</b>	73:25 95:7 104:16
16:21	<b>conversation</b> 56:17	43:19,19	<b>daily</b> 37:3	110:1 117:18
<b>consider</b> 10:24	<b>copies</b> 100:5	<b>cover</b> 128:5	<b>dark</b> 104:9	120:15 130:11
11:16 21:6 56:7	<b>corner</b> 94:13	<b>covered</b> 47:22	<b>data</b> 5:14 27:4 28:1	<b>definition</b> 77:19
69:9	<b>correct</b> 5:1,1 62:3	<b>crack</b> 5:21	28:6 70:16,24	87:19
<b>consideration</b>	64:4 81:20 105:8	<b>cram</b> 109:15 123:7	73:8 76:21 92:22	<b>degrade</b> 28:9
52:23 53:23 66:13	<b>correctly</b> 50:6	<b>crammed</b> 109:3	101:8 118:17	<b>degree</b> 31:21
87:4 99:19 118:22	<b>corridor</b> 8:7	<b>create</b> 10:15	<b>date</b> 104:10,13	<b>delay</b> 28:10 48:7
126:19	<b>corridors</b> 79:2,7	<b>created</b> 60:20 64:3	105:5,24 114:21	115:3
<b>considered</b> 13:13	100:16	<b>criteria</b> 12:22 13:1	<b>dates</b> 103:25 104:3	<b>delays</b> 27:4 30:22
16:21 17:12 20:25	<b>cost</b> 33:13 66:1	13:7 15:5 20:9	104:8,15 105:20	<b>deleted</b> 107:18
22:20 23:5,16,25	85:25 86:13,14,18	22:9 24:12 28:20	106:2 108:6	<b>deliberate</b> 110:19
24:11,18 30:5,23	87:10	<b>critical</b> 26:10,15	112:22 113:4	<b>deliberation</b>
31:16 32:7,16	<b>couldnt</b> 44:4,5	<b>criticism</b> 128:12	117:1 120:14	122:25
33:23 34:5,13,22	52:10 122:11	<b>cross</b> 81:7	121:6,12,14	<b>demand</b> 26:7 30:9
	<b>council</b> 1:18 2:19	<b>crossing</b> 81:1	124:11 129:18,19	51:21,21,23 52:5
		<b>crossings</b> 73:23	<b>day</b> 30:22 45:1	84:18
				<b>demands</b> 26:9,20

<b>democratic</b> 67:23 <b>demolished</b> 24:8 <b>demonstrated</b> 51:22 <b>densities</b> 34:17 76:8 85:10,12,19 86:6 <b>density</b> 42:3 75:9,9 77:18 78:19 85:9 <b>depend</b> 14:7 81:4 <b>dependent</b> 50:2 80:13 <b>depending</b> 12:11 17:21 28:17 68:2 69:23 70:25 103:13 107:9 119:19 <b>derived</b> 21:4 <b>describe</b> 4:7 83:10 <b>described</b> 11:18 65:22 69:24,25 102:7 <b>describes</b> 38:10 <b>describing</b> 66:8 <b>description</b> 27:3 66:17 77:22 83:16 85:2 <b>descriptions</b> 12:12 <b>deserve</b> 86:6 <b>deserves</b> 100:8 <b>design</b> 15:24 46:11 80:21 86:21 87:9 <b>designated</b> 12:5 37:12 <b>designed</b> 76:18 <b>desire</b> 31:14 105:14 105:17 <b>detail</b> 9:23 14:9 15:10 19:3 29:4 30:17 59:22 74:15 82:25 83:21 87:10 88:5,21 92:24 96:7 <b>detailed</b> 8:11 9:7 22:14 68:21 80:17 80:21 103:8	<b>detailing</b> 95:24 <b>details</b> 13:18 81:11 <b>determined</b> 34:12 <b>develop</b> 82:9 <b>developability</b> 85:25 <b>developed</b> 13:22 18:6,20 25:7 27:13 78:7 <b>developer</b> 85:18 88:15 <b>developers</b> 45:3 <b>developing</b> 66:25 <b>development</b> 2:9 5:3 6:6 9:10,11,16 11:25 15:23 18:12 20:14 24:3 25:17 26:6 27:9,22 29:7 32:9,11 46:4,9 47:10,10,16 48:4 48:5,25 62:9 67:13,15,19,24,25 68:12,15 69:6 77:18 78:20 79:5 86:12 88:2 89:17 90:1 <b>developments</b> 19:4 27:15 33:3 78:13 84:16 <b>deviations</b> 11:2 <b>diagrams</b> 9:21 <b>dial</b> 76:8 90:19,20 <b>dialing</b> 75:15 <b>dialogue</b> 52:21 83:21 106:4 <b>dials</b> 76:19 <b>dictate</b> 10:21 <b>didnt</b> 5:23 48:4 65:18 69:10 104:16 113:14 127:3,4 <b>diesel</b> 16:9 17:20 <b>differ</b> 40:9 <b>difference</b> 35:5 99:6 <b>differences</b> 88:10	88:13 <b>different</b> 10:22 11:19 12:12,12 15:19,19,20 22:20 27:19 28:13,18,20 30:22,22 35:14,18 50:24 57:6 59:8,9 64:19 67:11 71:1 83:9 87:22 90:3,3 98:2 103:13 118:12 122:17 127:1,2 <b>differing</b> 13:18 103:12 <b>difficult</b> 62:8 99:14 <b>dig</b> 29:2 <b>digest</b> 117:7 <b>digging</b> 8:10 15:5 <b>dining</b> 34:3 <b>dioxide</b> 20:11,17,22 <b>direct</b> 11:11 91:3 <b>directed</b> 47:3 <b>direction</b> 14:17 76:16 107:9,13 <b>directions</b> 30:23 118:12 <b>directly</b> 24:14 32:19 87:16 <b>director</b> 2:9,10 6:7 <b>dirt</b> 16:10 <b>disadvantage</b> 127:10 <b>disagree</b> 39:23 40:24 <b>disagreement</b> 11:16,18 103:13 <b>disambiguate</b> 97:10 <b>disappear</b> 92:15 <b>disclosing</b> 10:17 <b>disclosure</b> 11:14 <b>discounts</b> 57:22 <b>discourse</b> 76:12 <b>discretion</b> 124:4 <b>discuss</b> 46:8 88:4 88:20	<b>discussed</b> 8:15 14:3 19:2 67:20 92:7 <b>discussing</b> 12:17 <b>discussion</b> 7:14 15:17 38:15 65:8 65:10 89:23 93:8 103:3 111:18 121:2 130:14 131:5 <b>discussions</b> 15:7 51:2 78:23 88:8 98:12 <b>disruption</b> 33:13 <b>distill</b> 123:16 124:18 <b>distilled</b> 51:9 <b>distributed</b> 78:6 <b>district</b> 16:16,17,25 20:18 25:22,23,24 39:9,13,14,19 40:10,18 41:24 44:7 45:5 57:21 91:25 100:2,4,5 <b>districts</b> 20:1,16 25:15,21 49:15,20 81:22,23 82:4 <b>disturb</b> 21:11 <b>disturbing</b> 16:6 <b>divide</b> 20:12 22:3 <b>diving</b> 59:21 <b>division</b> 6:9,10 54:8 80:17 <b>doable</b> 101:17 109:23 <b>document</b> 4:20 9:13 10:17 39:16 39:21 40:23 51:12 61:10 71:21 73:1 96:3 101:2,13 <b>documenting</b> 8:18 <b>documents</b> 104:11 <b>doesnt</b> 10:20 39:19 40:15 50:23 57:3 58:17 68:18 78:20 80:8 81:8 111:13 115:10,12 117:16	121:1 124:2 <b>doing</b> 7:13 16:11 21:10,14,16,17 22:25 50:4 65:11 73:6 84:5 86:10 87:21 96:21 102:15 103:3 112:2 121:9 128:25 <b>dollar</b> 86:3 <b>dollars</b> 43:14 <b>don</b> 42:23,23 <b>dont</b> 5:25 15:14 39:3 42:2,10 43:12 44:11,19 49:9 52:8 53:2 54:23 62:7,7 71:18 73:3,11,21 74:13 75:1,17,21 76:8 81:25 82:21 86:22,25 87:20 88:25 90:1 91:15 92:20 94:2,23 95:9 96:1,16 97:22 98:6 100:14 100:14 101:25 106:14 108:5 109:3,24 112:19 112:23 113:22 114:1,15,21 115:13,15 116:9 116:12,13,18 117:23 119:23 120:3,6 126:14 127:8 128:21 129:21 <b>door</b> 44:11 <b>double</b> 62:16 <b>downgrade</b> 35:8 <b>downtown</b> 1:4 4:3 8:4,8 31:20 41:19 43:18 49:8 55:10 61:12,13,18 62:1 62:23 64:10 65:11 91:11 98:3 100:19 102:2 103:5 129:5
---	---	---	--	--

<b>downturn</b> 40:21 <b>dozen</b> 76:19 <b>dozens</b> 76:19 <b>draegers</b> 61:14 <b>draft</b> 4:4 5:15,16 6:14 7:5,16,22 8:1 8:2 9:13 12:4 13:25 14:2,17 16:2 34:18 35:7 37:18,21 38:5,7 38:12 47:23 51:3 53:23 58:5,16,18 58:20 59:2 65:23 66:8,9,11 78:4,23 83:16,18,20 85:23 86:16 88:8,22 91:20 99:23 102:4 102:16,24 107:13 <b>drag</b> 103:22 <b>dragging</b> 110:23 <b>drainage</b> 21:25 <b>dramatically</b> 54:24 <b>draw</b> 43:22 98:14 110:25 <b>drawings</b> 87:10 <b>drive</b> 12:12 14:5,11 20:5 31:15 57:6 59:3 66:10 106:10 <b>driven</b> 43:8 105:13 111:19 <b>drives</b> 61:13 <b>driving</b> 23:1 104:25 105:5 123:24 <b>drop</b> 45:1 <b>dropoff</b> 93:18 <b>dry</b> 26:10,11,15,15 26:16 <b>dubai</b> 127:12,21 <b>due</b> 13:21 36:7 <b>duplicating</b> 7:10 <b>dwelling</b> 67:16 78:5,6 82:3 85:14 90:8 <hr/> <div style="text-align: center;"><b>E</b></div> <hr/>	<b>ear</b> 118:6 <b>earlier</b> 31:6 100:2 <b>earliest</b> 105:5 <b>early</b> 92:8,8 109:1 109:13 119:15 127:16 <b>earth</b> 16:6 <b>easier</b> 118:11 <b>easily</b> 63:10 72:23 111:2 <b>east</b> 79:14,24 80:2 95:7 <b>easy</b> 62:22 65:12 93:17 <b>echoes</b> 47:15 <b>economic</b> 10:12 25:4 40:20 <b>edge</b> 23:23 <b>effect</b> 10:15 26:15 32:5 33:19 34:20 46:3,13,22 82:8 86:23 110:24 <b>effective</b> 130:4 <b>effectively</b> 126:13 <b>effects</b> 10:11,23 16:1 46:20 92:11 <b>efficiencies</b> 57:18 <b>efficient</b> 49:25 50:9 122:19 <b>efficiently</b> 116:19 <b>effort</b> 11:14 <b>efforts</b> 7:11 87:20 <b>eight</b> 72:1 <b>eir</b> 4:21 5:9 6:14 7:6,11,22 8:1,2 10:3,24 11:22 12:4,5,6,6,8,14 13:21,25 14:2,25 37:18,21 38:3,5,7 38:12 43:5 45:15 45:23 47:5,7,14 47:23 48:11,11,17 49:10 51:3 52:18 53:16,23 54:6,9 55:7,21,23 58:5 58:16,16,18,20 59:2,3,6 60:2,25 65:1,1,7,14,23 66:6,8,9,11,20 67:2,14,20 69:1 70:15 72:24 74:25 77:9,22 78:24 83:1 84:2 86:22 87:16 89:16,19 91:21 94:24 96:17 97:7 98:18,25 99:23 100:25 102:9,13 116:20 <b>eiref</b> 2:5 61:9,25 62:4,24 63:8,12 63:21,25 64:21 65:2,5 66:21 68:4 70:3 101:4 108:25 109:12 110:17 111:1 121:18 122:1,13 123:6,21 <b>eirs</b> 19:22 47:18 48:24 100:15 <b>either</b> 24:14 25:10 44:16 48:10 52:15 59:11 71:15 91:20 106:17 110:16 114:3 115:6,11 131:9 <b>el</b> 1:4 4:3 8:4,7 17:18,19 23:11 28:19 49:7 60:17 62:15 64:25 79:2 79:9,23,25 80:7 93:1,12 94:12,13 95:10 100:19 102:2 103:5 <b>electric</b> 26:19 <b>element</b> 8:9 14:14 84:3 <b>elementary</b> 25:23 <b>elements</b> 10:7 12:10,11 36:20 78:1 84:9 88:18 102:18 107:9 <b>elevated</b> 17:17 81:6 <b>eligible</b> 66:12 103:25 126:19 <b>eliminate</b> 29:14,16 42:8 59:24 <b>eliminated</b> 31:2 <b>eliminates</b> 36:4 <b>em</b> 41:3,3 <b>email</b> 38:9 120:4,13 121:6,9,11 130:3 <b>embedded</b> 15:25 57:21 58:3 65:23 <b>emission</b> 57:16,16 <b>emissions</b> 16:9,24 20:4 32:2,6,19 36:12 57:23 58:1 <b>emphasis</b> 89:1 <b>emphasize</b> 5:24 37:16 <b>emphasized</b> 9:13 77:1 <b>empirical</b> 98:17 <b>empirically</b> 71:22 72:4 <b>employees</b> 20:13 25:25 <b>encinal</b> 60:17 <b>encompasses</b> 81:23 <b>encounter</b> 19:8 <b>encourage</b> 29:1 <b>encouragement</b> 49:7 <b>endangered</b> 18:5 18:20 <b>ended</b> 52:3 <b>endorsed</b> 75:5,8,8 75:18,20 <b>endorsing</b> 75:6 <b>ends</b> 14:2 <b>energy</b> 20:7 49:24 50:9,9 104:19 <b>enforced</b> 48:22 <b>engagement</b> 8:17 22:14 <b>engine</b> 40:12 <b>engineering</b> 6:8 54:7 <b>engineers</b> 64:7,16 <b>enhance</b> 34:9 80:2 <b>enhancement</b> 77:23 <b>enhancing</b> 34:1 102:23 <b>enjoy</b> 15:2 64:10 <b>enjoyable</b> 104:19 <b>enjoyed</b> 8:10,22 <b>enoughs</b> 110:20 <b>enrollment</b> 25:12 56:20 99:1 <b>enterprise</b> 44:24 <b>entire</b> 27:9,21 111:11 <b>entitled</b> 89:9 <b>envelope</b> 76:6 <b>environment</b> 10:11 10:15 32:20 <b>environmental</b> 4:4 4:23 5:11 6:11,17 10:1,2,23 11:17 13:15 21:13 38:13 41:8 42:11 51:12 58:9 66:14 76:20 <b>environmentally</b> 37:10,13 <b>envision</b> 117:21 <b>envisioning</b> 123:10 <b>equate</b> 41:1 <b>equipment</b> 16:10 41:24 <b>equivalent</b> 20:11 20:17,22 33:1 <b>er</b> 45:23 <b>error</b> 99:9,16 <b>esa</b> 6:10 <b>especially</b> 72:19 82:12 90:2 95:19 <b>essentially</b> 19:14 47:15 57:22 66:14 83:6 106:7 110:8 111:20 <b>establish</b> 8:6 <b>established</b> 22:4 26:2 <b>establishes</b> 34:25
---	--



<b>estate</b> 44:12 <b>estimated</b> 82:5 91:1 92:16 99:7 <b>estimates</b> 86:19 98:25 99:2 <b>estimating</b> 97:3 <b>estimation</b> 81:24 <b>et</b> 43:15,15,16 67:17 78:15 114:19 <b>evaluate</b> 62:25 <b>evaluated</b> 49:16 55:9 <b>evaluating</b> 55:13 <b>evaluation</b> 49:20 <b>evaluations</b> 19:6 <b>evening</b> 117:22 123:13 <b>evenings</b> 117:23 <b>event</b> 119:22 <b>events</b> 26:11,16 <b>everybody</b> 75:14 120:10 <b>everyones</b> 38:17 115:10 <b>everything</b> 91:13 <b>exacerbate</b> 23:16 67:9 <b>exact</b> 19:4 46:14 <b>exactly</b> 29:22 81:25 94:25 <b>example</b> 9:17 17:24 29:11 45:6 50:18 51:13 52:11 56:3 65:10 73:8 80:25 90:18 92:3 94:13 95:9 100:2 124:15 <b>examples</b> 44:23 98:13 <b>exceed</b> 12:22,25 13:6 16:20 20:24 28:10 <b>exceeded</b> 26:3 28:15 67:18 <b>exception</b> 42:17 79:1,3	<b>excess</b> 20:18 23:13 <b>excluding</b> 128:9 <b>exclusively</b> 32:16 <b>executed</b> 55:18 <b>exempt</b> 16:14 <b>exercise</b> 8:13 <b>exercises</b> 22:14 <b>exist</b> 50:23 <b>existing</b> 17:16 19:2 24:7 26:20 27:3 27:10,22 28:11 32:13 34:17 50:10 59:15 63:8 72:6 72:22 82:7 <b>exists</b> 91:23 <b>expanded</b> 79:25 <b>expanding</b> 34:2 <b>expansive</b> 51:20 <b>expect</b> 89:7 123:15 <b>expected</b> 104:4 <b>expecting</b> 38:2 100:9 <b>experience</b> 51:18 82:22 <b>expertise</b> 122:20 <b>experts</b> 11:16 <b>explain</b> 4:19 56:19 <b>explaining</b> 74:22 <b>explicitly</b> 10:12 <b>exploring</b> 50:13 82:25 <b>exposing</b> 23:5 <b>expository</b> 74:11 74:20 96:15 <b>expressed</b> 128:10 <b>expressing</b> 105:23 <b>extend</b> 105:18 <b>extended</b> 105:19 <b>extending</b> 106:19 <b>extensive</b> 39:21 40:20 <b>extent</b> 12:7 21:5 24:7 52:22 84:7 87:11 99:19 100:6 102:11,14 103:10 103:11 106:1	117:15 118:23,24 120:24 <b>extra</b> 96:15 <b>extreme</b> 94:20 <b>extremely</b> 99:13 <b>eyes</b> 43:10 92:21 <hr/> <b>F</b> <hr/> <b>f21</b> 83:21 <b>facilitate</b> 82:15 85:10 <b>facilities</b> 24:9 25:1 26:18 40:8 <b>facility</b> 40:10,19,24 <b>facilitys</b> 40:25 41:1 <b>fact</b> 13:21 23:10 27:11,12 36:8,23 50:7 57:6,24 64:9 <b>factor</b> 27:24 30:15 46:7 70:9 71:9 72:12 <b>factories</b> 115:12 <b>factors</b> 10:23 57:4 104:11 113:11 <b>failures</b> 97:20 98:7 <b>fair</b> 49:22 55:8 <b>fairly</b> 8:6 10:3 15:7 20:1 22:13 78:12 80:16,21 123:17 125:15 <b>faith</b> 11:13 <b>fall</b> 12:18 14:6,11 <b>falling</b> 104:24 <b>familiar</b> 45:4 <b>families</b> 57:1,10 111:21 <b>family</b> 57:2,7 <b>fancy</b> 43:15 <b>far</b> 8:10 34:15 91:12 103:22 105:18 121:20 124:22 <b>fat</b> 94:6 <b>favor</b> 41:8,9,10 <b>fax</b> 38:9 <b>feas</b> 94:8	<b>feasibility</b> 69:5 <b>feasible</b> 10:25,25 13:2,7,10,11 18:1 20:21 23:25 33:12 59:1 68:22 69:11 92:23 94:9 <b>features</b> 97:14 <b>february</b> 122:5 <b>federal</b> 57:25 <b>feed</b> 14:25 <b>feedback</b> 65:16 66:23 102:11,12 121:14 125:22 <b>feel</b> 42:19 96:14 101:17 112:13 114:9 <b>feeling</b> 96:11 106:5 110:20 123:12 <b>feelings</b> 7:17 <b>fees</b> 69:6 <b>feet</b> 67:16 <b>felt</b> 101:7 <b>fencing</b> 18:17 <b>ferrick</b> 2:4 57:14 58:6 59:5 60:1 61:6 112:16,19 113:1 124:6 129:2 129:15 <b>fewer</b> 36:8 37:3 56:25 <b>fewest</b> 36:24 <b>fifteen</b> 45:7 70:18 <b>fifteenminute</b> 93:16 <b>fifty</b> 43:13 <b>figure</b> 92:21 104:15 124:10 <b>fill</b> 96:10 <b>filling</b> 52:6 96:7 <b>filter</b> 118:25 <b>filtration</b> 17:22 <b>final</b> 7:5,11 9:20 12:6 38:3 52:18 59:3 66:10,18 83:1 88:24 107:20 119:10	<b>financial</b> 82:14 <b>financing</b> 29:18 <b>find</b> 12:18 48:3 52:2 57:2 58:22 79:15 90:22 109:24 114:21 <b>finding</b> 52:3 61:10 <b>findings</b> 36:2 <b>fine</b> 75:1 79:10 125:25 <b>finger</b> 101:11 <b>finish</b> 102:14 112:24 <b>finished</b> 106:7 112:12 <b>fire</b> 25:1,5 39:9,14 39:18 40:3,7,9 41:23 42:18 72:25 100:1 <b>first</b> 4:6,25 6:13 12:20 15:16 16:5 17:24 20:2 22:24 44:7 47:21 77:11 95:20 105:21 124:24 126:5 127:18 <b>five</b> 34:7 43:12 44:16 75:3 92:14 102:25 103:19 109:6 115:5 126:7 <b>fivestory</b> 75:6 <b>fivetwo</b> 118:10 <b>fix</b> 87:24 <b>fleet</b> 57:23 <b>flexibility</b> 10:7,22 87:7 117:19 119:12 <b>flexively</b> 126:1 <b>flipside</b> 21:7 35:24 <b>floor</b> 44:1,2,7 85:14 <b>florida</b> 64:2 <b>flow</b> 53:4 80:8 <b>flows</b> 56:21 60:6 <b>fly</b> 115:10 <b>flyer</b> 129:22 <b>flyers</b> 130:6
--	--	--	---	---

<b>focus</b> 15:11 38:12 114:16 116:7 121:3 122:17	111:5 113:18 115:5 117:9 119:9 127:8	<b>fuzzy</b> 96:11 97:4	<b>giant</b> 114:11	95:1,12 96:7,18 96:24 97:6,8 102:1 104:1 105:2 105:12 108:2,18 109:24 110:4,22 111:4 112:16,21 113:2 114:4,23 116:10 118:19 119:24 123:11,12 124:7 126:15 128:3,11,14,14,18 128:20,23 130:20
<b>focused</b> 103:4	<b>fourteen</b> 30:19,20	<b>G</b>	<b>gist</b> 46:14	<b>good</b> 11:13 30:8 41:17 47:12 74:19 75:2 81:11 82:25 83:3 91:7 96:21 97:8 115:21 118:21,22 121:21 125:2 130:10
<b>focusing</b> 103:6	<b>fourth</b> 114:6	<b>g</b> 65:25	<b>give</b> 4:10,25 63:24 71:22 77:18 83:8 85:5 92:17,17 101:16 112:13 119:13 127:17	<b>google</b> 121:10,10 121:11
<b>folks</b> 9:18 15:8 26:22	<b>fourthree</b> 118:12	<b>gained</b> 49:8	<b>given</b> 4:13 16:18 51:11 55:9 63:11 78:17 82:12,22 90:14 100:5 113:24 122:20	<b>gosh</b> 110:3
<b>follow</b> 10:8 104:5 125:25	<b>fox</b> 116:4	<b>gap</b> 95:1	<b>gives</b> 35:9 119:18	<b>gotten</b> 7:22 8:25
<b>followed</b> 13:25	<b>frame</b> 51:15,17	<b>gaps</b> 60:20	<b>giving</b> 125:21	<b>government</b> 57:25
<b>following</b> 4:21 14:15 86:8 117:3	<b>framework</b> 5:3 9:7 103:2	<b>garage</b> 43:14	<b>glenwood</b> 60:10,18 61:1	<b>graced</b> 6:8
<b>footage</b> 62:10	<b>frankly</b> 109:22 114:9 115:2	<b>garages</b> 9:9 107:17	<b>go</b> 6:3,13,22 29:9 42:5 45:4 49:9 55:5,21 61:16,21 62:15 71:13 73:11 76:16 91:4 92:13 92:13 98:8 104:7 113:17 120:6 127:15	<b>grade</b> 46:15 79:19 81:8
<b>footages</b> 78:5	<b>free</b> 13:15 24:20	<b>gas</b> 21:12 26:19 32:16,19 36:12,17 57:16 91:9	<b>goal</b> 37:6 67:12 69:15 94:1	<b>grading</b> 16:11 21:25
<b>footnotes</b> 83:10	<b>freeway</b> 24:20,21 31:19	<b>gateway</b> 9:17 56:4 65:1	<b>goals</b> 8:14 11:4 33:24 68:23 94:21	<b>granularity</b> 50:12
<b>forced</b> 42:5	<b>freeways</b> 23:19	<b>gee</b> 43:21	<b>goes</b> 30:17 51:15 56:22 77:9	<b>granularity</b> 50:12
<b>forecast</b> 48:7	<b>front</b> 76:6 95:17	<b>gel</b> 109:22	<b>going</b> 4:13,15 6:4 6:12 7:20,22 13:17,17,17 14:3 14:25 15:1 24:4 28:24 29:8 30:18 33:13,24 34:20 38:17,19 39:6 41:2,10,11 42:11 43:21,22,24,25 44:1,1,14,15,21 45:1,12,14,15 51:7,20 54:14 62:10 63:3,19 70:11 72:20 77:5 77:11 85:3 86:13 92:13,13,14 94:18	<b>graphical</b> 73:7,9,14 <b>graphically</b> 73:17 <b>graphics</b> 8:20 <b>grasping</b> 74:7 <b>grass</b> 130:5 <b>gravitate</b> 57:1 <b>gray</b> 95:5 104:8,9 <b>great</b> 58:6 59:5 95:12 100:16 103:11 125:25 126:3 129:4,13,15 129:18 130:3
<b>foregoing</b> 131:5,6 131:10	<b>fuel</b> 57:18	<b>general</b> 10:13 23:13 26:2 33:19 47:25 50:16 70:13 71:3 73:1 76:1 88:8,21 92:16 101:19 121:2	<b>goal</b> 37:6 67:12 69:15 94:1	<b>greater</b> 36:16 77:17 114:9
<b>foremost</b> 6:14	<b>fuels</b> 21:18	<b>generally</b> 51:19 72:24 90:19	<b>goals</b> 8:14 11:4 33:24 68:23 94:21	<b>greatest</b> 58:8
<b>foreseeably</b> 82:8	<b>full</b> 11:14 26:11 43:23 48:11 62:17 80:21 81:16 102:16,17 126:13 131:7	<b>generate</b> 34:8 62:10 64:3 69:10 84:16	<b>goes</b> 30:17 51:15 56:22 77:9	<b>green</b> 93:16
<b>forget</b> 76:3,3	<b>function</b> 53:14 74:22 79:24 91:3 91:5 93:18	<b>generated</b> 60:23	<b>going</b> 4:13,15 6:4 6:12 7:20,22 13:17,17,17 14:3 14:25 15:1 24:4 28:24 29:8 30:18 33:13,24 34:20 38:17,19 39:6 41:2,10,11 42:11 43:21,22,24,25 44:1,1,14,15,21 45:1,12,14,15 51:7,20 54:14 62:10 63:3,19 70:11 72:20 77:5 77:11 85:3 86:13 92:13,13,14 94:18	
<b>form</b> 5:16 48:10 78:1,8,9 88:7 89:3 124:10 125:12 128:4	<b>functional</b> 106:3	<b>generation</b> 64:5,15 74:9		
<b>formalized</b> 85:18	<b>fund</b> 51:20 66:24 67:11	<b>generator</b> 46:10		
<b>formally</b> 14:2	<b>fundamental</b> 73:4	<b>geographically</b> 103:3		
<b>format</b> 42:3 73:16	<b>funding</b> 53:18 67:5 68:19 69:7,10,12	<b>geology</b> 19:13 21:23		
<b>forms</b> 121:10,11	<b>further</b> 22:18 47:25 50:13 58:12 67:21 69:25 131:8	<b>getting</b> 8:13 33:5 38:4 58:15 94:6 95:14 109:16 111:5 115:3 116:5 119:5 122:22 124:1 128:2		
<b>formula</b> 86:2	<b>future</b> 11:25 32:9 32:11 45:24 47:6 57:17 61:3 73:21 78:23 96:12	<b>ghg1</b> 21:6 49:13 <b>ghg2</b> 21:6		
<b>formulating</b> 125:11				
<b>forth</b> 7:5 40:17 41:13 116:12				
<b>forward</b> 10:4 12:1 43:7 54:16 73:20 101:22 107:21				
<b>fossils</b> 19:9				
<b>found</b> 22:7 28:2 34:19 48:15 66:7 66:10 74:19,21				
<b>foundation</b> 9:10				
<b>four</b> 29:8 35:12,23 37:4 43:12 44:15 59:16 77:2 102:25 103:19 109:17				

<b>greenhouse</b> 19:21 20:3,10 32:15,19 32:22 36:10,12,17 49:12 57:16 91:9 96:20,22	<b>happen</b> 45:3 53:16 54:12 67:19 113:14 121:5,6 123:18	<b>helps</b> 75:2	102:6	82:21,23 83:12,19 85:4 87:15,22 89:22 91:15 93:1 94:25 96:6,13 97:9 101:1,12 105:2,4 108:2,11 108:14,18 109:2,4 112:16 113:5 114:23 115:1 116:10,23 118:6 119:22,24 120:13 121:18 123:8 124:22 126:23 128:3 130:19
<b>ground</b> 42:5 43:25 44:2 78:10	<b>happened</b> 43:17 97:22 99:3	<b>henry</b> 2:6 47:1 91:10 100:11 101:7 114:24 124:22 126:4	<b>housing</b> 17:11 20:5 24:2,7,11,13,15 25:18 37:1 44:14 51:24 52:12 53:1 56:19,23 57:7,8 68:16 69:18 78:7 81:16,17 82:16 89:8 99:12	<b>imagine</b> 66:22 68:7 99:13
<b>group</b> 42:16 107:9 110:20	<b>happens</b> 45:6 72:1 72:2 80:10,13	<b>henrys</b> 96:19	<b>huge</b> 43:14 71:14 71:14 94:1	<b>imagined</b> 116:19
<b>groups</b> 75:4	<b>happy</b> 8:24 85:5 98:10 120:13	<b>heres</b> 72:1,2 97:5	<b>human</b> 19:9	<b>immaterial</b> 39:24
<b>grove</b> 31:15 60:8 92:25 93:1	<b>hard</b> 27:14 29:22 30:11 49:1 73:25 74:9 92:21 101:11	<b>hereunto</b> 131:16	<b>hundred</b> 28:3 34:13 35:22,24	<b>impact</b> 4:4 6:11 10:2 12:17,23 13:3,8,11 15:5 16:22 17:23,24 18:8,18 19:7,12 20:9 21:15 22:23 23:7,10,25 24:11 24:18 27:8,8,21 28:20,21 30:7,24 32:16,18,20,23 33:17 36:5,17 45:24 46:18 48:6 48:8,8,21 50:3,4 50:21 51:4 55:9,9 55:22 58:9 59:25 60:10 66:14 69:6 76:20 84:3,8 86:23
<b>growth</b> 11:9 17:1,7 24:14,17,22 25:14 27:24 28:3,5 30:15 31:9 46:6 50:14,20 51:5,14 51:15 70:9,13,20 70:23 72:11,14 99:1	<b>harold</b> 39:17	<b>hey</b> 99:7 112:4	<b>hungry</b> 101:8	<b>impacted</b> 54:25 55:4 60:7
<b>guaranteed</b> 29:20 67:10	<b>hasnt</b> 29:2	<b>hi</b> 4:11	<b>hybrids</b> 35:13	<b>impactful</b> 55:12
<b>guess</b> 14:19 43:17 43:24 47:3 49:14 53:17 116:24 117:1 119:21	<b>havent</b> 15:8,9 43:8 58:25	<b>highlight</b> 7:4 13:19 18:15 38:11 99:21 100:3	<b>hydrology</b> 21:23	<b>impacts</b> 10:10,13 10:17 11:5 12:15 12:21,25 13:6,12 16:5 17:10 18:4 18:24 19:16 21:21 21:24 22:24 23:2 23:19 25:4 26:17
<b>guidance</b> 71:23 96:12	<b>hazardous</b> 21:9,11 21:17	<b>highest</b> 85:19 86:6	<b>I</b>	
<b>guide</b> 9:11	<b>hazards</b> 21:9	<b>highlighted</b> 25:2	<b>id</b> 4:9 42:25 44:20 70:10 73:8 88:24 99:13 108:11,12 120:5 126:25 127:20	
<b>guideline</b> 15:24	<b>head</b> 38:19 108:14	<b>highly</b> 10:5	<b>idea</b> 63:18,24 86:9 92:3 104:7 108:15 109:15 113:7,16 115:9 128:13	
<b>guidelines</b> 10:6 11:12 16:25 20:1 20:2 30:24 33:8	<b>healthy</b> 34:10	<b>hill</b> 53:10 94:14	<b>ideal</b> 115:25	
<b>guiding</b> 34:7 73:20	<b>hear</b> 15:2 76:12 110:1	<b>historic</b> 18:24 19:1	<b>ideally</b> 103:19 113:4 121:3	
<b>guys</b> 104:14,18 105:14 123:4	<b>heard</b> 8:24 35:14 53:9 128:9	<b>historically</b> 71:8	<b>identified</b> 20:20 60:4	
	<b>hearing</b> 3:6 4:3 7:23 14:1 37:18 38:23 128:3	<b>hit</b> 35:7 65:12 94:14	<b>identify</b> 15:13	
	<b>heart</b> 104:24	<b>hol</b> 115:19	<b>ignored</b> 58:21	
	<b>heat</b> 20:8	<b>hold</b> 56:9 70:1 119:9	<b>ill</b> 6:3 10:3 52:17 70:6 75:25 101:4 112:24 116:13 127:19	
	<b>height</b> 107:15	<b>holding</b> 7:10 40:12	<b>im</b> 4:25 5:1 36:18 38:19 39:6,17 42:1,1,11 45:12 45:14 46:13 49:10 51:6 53:13,22 54:5 56:20 60:24 73:3 81:18 82:16	
	<b>heights</b> 15:18 76:9 76:9	<b>holidays</b> 115:19		
	<b>heineck</b> 2:9 6:7	<b>holistic</b> 87:7		
	<b>heisler</b> 2:12	<b>home</b> 61:21		
	<b>help</b> 18:22 31:17 52:10 63:14 71:23 72:18 73:18,22 77:5 95:16,19 97:18 98:17 99:7 101:21	<b>homer</b> 81:1		
	<b>helped</b> 113:6	<b>honest</b> 95:16 118:7		
	<b>helpful</b> 74:14 75:15 92:22 93:20 96:17 97:12 99:17 130:8	<b>hope</b> 48:23 91:1 122:18 128:22		
		<b>hoped</b> 94:11		
		<b>hopefully</b> 104:1 124:17,19		
		<b>hoping</b> 100:9 105:1		
		<b>horrible</b> 94:18		
		<b>hotel</b> 34:24		
		<b>hour</b> 54:22		
		<b>housekeeping</b>		

26:21 27:1,4,18 28:4 29:14,17,25 30:5,13,23 31:1,7 31:16,19,24,25 32:9,11 33:2,10 36:7 46:9 48:15 49:23 57:16 58:12 58:20,23 59:12,17 59:19 67:7 76:7 76:10 86:23 90:15 94:24 <b>implementation</b> 25:13 26:5 29:19 54:10 65:25 66:13 <b>implemented</b> 19:11 19:23 20:1 24:4 29:22 36:20 53:24 54:17 55:20,23 87:25 98:1 <b>implementing</b> 21:21 <b>implications</b> 32:21 110:9 120:24 <b>implicitly</b> 90:21 <b>important</b> 36:22,23 91:12 97:18 98:19 122:23 125:9 126:3 127:23 <b>improperly</b> 21:20 <b>improv</b> 73:6 <b>improve</b> 22:6 46:17 73:6 <b>improved</b> 7:18 9:14 22:18 50:9 53:8 58:11 60:12 79:13 82:7 <b>improvement</b> 9:21 24:20 52:15 57:23 107:17 <b>improvements</b> 9:8 12:2 37:1 41:20 58:24 60:4 66:3 66:12,25 67:5,6 67:22 68:10,15 69:8 86:11,19 107:24	<b>improving</b> 53:12 80:7 <b>inadequate</b> 11:17 40:25 42:19 <b>inclined</b> 115:1 <b>include</b> 54:9 55:22 60:12 61:12 66:9 75:19 112:10 <b>included</b> 12:6,15 54:17 58:25 91:21 102:21 <b>includes</b> 36:3,25 59:25 61:15,16 72:14 86:17 <b>including</b> 42:17 100:16 <b>incompatible</b> 22:11 22:21 <b>incorporated</b> 55:6 69:24 <b>increase</b> 17:3,11 23:15 25:9 26:1,7 28:13,14 57:17 63:19 <b>increased</b> 16:23,24 17:9 32:1,5 58:11 <b>increases</b> 30:4 32:24 <b>incremental</b> 25:13 88:17 <b>incur</b> 25:14 <b>indicate</b> 60:25 128:4 <b>indicated</b> 54:11,24 78:18 <b>indicates</b> 125:13 <b>indicating</b> 58:18 <b>indications</b> 79:12 <b>indirectly</b> 32:19 <b>individual</b> 6:16 8:2 9:16 11:25 12:1 15:22 18:12 24:3 24:5 51:19 87:3 105:22 121:6 <b>induce</b> 24:13,22 <b>inducement</b> 24:23	<b>inducements</b> 82:15 <b>industry</b> 70:22 83:24 84:15 <b>infer</b> 92:21 <b>inform</b> 7:3 <b>informal</b> 125:15 <b>information</b> 5:13 12:10 37:24 38:10 64:20 73:2 74:6 74:12,20 77:3 83:4 87:11,21 88:3,6 91:8,20 99:4 100:18 101:8 101:11,14 109:19 120:21 124:18 129:8 <b>informational</b> 10:16 <b>infrastructure</b> 24:20 <b>individual</b> 124:3 <b>initial</b> 12:25 21:14 39:14 <b>inmeeting</b> 83:2 <b>input</b> 111:14 122:17,22 123:12 123:15 128:14 <b>inside</b> 61:13 62:1 <b>institute</b> 64:6,15 <b>insulation</b> 23:6 <b>intelligibility</b> 73:6 <b>intended</b> 4:19 117:16 <b>intending</b> 52:20 <b>intensities</b> 34:17,21 35:7 82:3 85:13 85:19 <b>intensity</b> 22:10 48:5 <b>intent</b> 8:5 15:8 47:24 103:7 106:15,21 107:11 107:22 125:18 <b>inter</b> 80:4 <b>interchange</b> 24:21 24:21	<b>interest</b> 7:19 15:13 15:15 105:23 112:24 116:10 <b>interested</b> 14:23 29:2 89:22 114:18 114:18,22 128:8 128:25 131:11 <b>interesting</b> 77:10 84:22 <b>interestingly</b> 44:17 <b>interim</b> 125:22 <b>internet</b> 14:21 <b>interpret</b> 101:15 118:25 <b>interpreted</b> 80:2 <b>interpreting</b> 71:23 <b>interrupt</b> 129:3 <b>intersection</b> 28:17 28:22 29:11,13 46:11 48:7 59:17 60:5 61:1 73:12 80:4 <b>intersections</b> 27:5 28:7,8,16 29:8 30:1,17,20 32:10 33:4 46:16 53:12 54:2,4,19 59:20 60:3,6,20 73:10 <b>intrinsic</b> 64:12 85:11 <b>introduced</b> 6:7 <b>introduction</b> 4:13 113:19 <b>involve</b> 37:17 81:8 99:23 <b>involved</b> 101:6 <b>isnt</b> 58:10 74:11 80:14 82:7 84:11 108:11 115:6 128:19 <b>isolation</b> 23:7 <b>issue</b> 53:8 91:12 93:25 118:16 129:25 <b>issues</b> 5:23 6:1 29:18 51:9 98:6	118:18 125:17 126:1 <b>item</b> 4:2 102:6 <b>items</b> 69:6 79:12 <b>itll</b> 120:9 <b>ive</b> 51:7 53:9,9 75:24 120:6 128:9 <hr/> <b>J</b> <hr/> <b>jack</b> 108:11 <b>jacks</b> 120:11 <b>jammed</b> 111:6 <b>jealous</b> 111:11 <b>job</b> 37:8 42:16 <b>john</b> 2:5,6 5:9,10 70:4 89:12 108:3 116:15 125:6 <b>johns</b> 77:8 <b>july</b> 110:3,4 111:3 114:6 115:8,22 117:3,5 119:15,17 124:15,16 126:15 126:15,24 128:9 <b>jumped</b> 75:10 <b>jumping</b> 4:18 100:25 <b>june</b> 1:17 2:18 6:20 14:3 38:8 111:3 113:4 114:5,5 117:3 119:15 122:5 124:15 126:24 127:15 129:6 <b>junk</b> 45:7 <b>jurisdiction</b> 28:1 <b>justification</b> 31:12 <b>justifies</b> 66:17 <hr/> <b>K</b> <hr/> <b>kadvany</b> 2:6 70:5 71:12 72:17 89:13 92:2 93:5 108:4 116:16 117:20,25 118:4,15 119:7,21 125:7,21,24 <b>karl</b> 2:12
---	---	---	---	---

<b>katie</b> 2:4 57:13 112:15 124:5 129:1	42:9 45:3 47:15 48:3 49:23,24 50:1 51:18 52:2 53:25 55:8,17 58:9,17 60:9,11 60:11 65:12,16 67:8,23 68:16 71:17,21,22 72:4 72:18,21,21,22,24 73:11,15,20 74:1 74:6,10,22 75:12 75:17,21 76:1,2,2 76:24 81:25 87:7 88:13 90:23,23,24 92:17 93:8,14,17 94:3,10,18 95:2,2 95:4,16,17,21,25 96:4,6,16,25 97:2 97:3,13,17,20,22 98:4,6,7,14 99:8,8 102:19 106:4,14 107:15 108:5,6,12 108:12 109:7,12 109:16 110:1,5,12 111:4,17 113:10 114:21 115:6 116:13,24,25 117:23 118:9,10 118:12,17,18 119:15,23 120:3,9 120:10,14,15 121:4,18,19 124:2 124:9 126:6,12 127:19 128:21 129:14,21 130:2	<b>ladder</b> 42:4 <b>ladders</b> 42:5 <b>lady</b> 75:13 <b>laid</b> 19:5 95:17 103:24 <b>land</b> 22:2,10,12 52:3,4 89:7 <b>landfills</b> 26:19 <b>landowner</b> 85:18 88:15 <b>lane</b> 29:13 92:25 <b>lanes</b> 29:12,14 31:14 <b>language</b> 80:12 <b>large</b> 53:11 <b>largely</b> 70:17 79:4 83:17 <b>larger</b> 79:2,8 <b>lastly</b> 8:1 18:15 <b>late</b> 114:5 125:3 <b>latitude</b> 102:17 <b>laurel</b> 1:19 2:19 93:11 <b>law</b> 10:6 <b>laying</b> 103:1 <b>laymans</b> 5:8 <b>lead</b> 80:3 119:13 <b>leading</b> 115:8 <b>leads</b> 49:19 <b>leaky</b> 21:11 <b>learn</b> 88:19 113:16 <b>learned</b> 88:11 <b>learning</b> 98:23 <b>leave</b> 104:2 117:13 <b>leaves</b> 113:23 <b>leaving</b> 62:2 <b>left</b> 115:4,16 <b>legal</b> 94:17 118:18 <b>legends</b> 73:9 <b>legislation</b> 21:4 <b>lessen</b> 33:10 36:6 <b>lessened</b> 31:4 <b>lessening</b> 11:4 <b>lesser</b> 58:23 <b>lessons</b> 88:10 <b>letter</b> 38:9 130:3	<b>level</b> 11:19,21,22 11:23,24 13:3 14:7,8 15:7 16:19 17:1 18:2 19:20 28:9 29:3 30:1,3 30:14,17,21 31:8 32:13,14 47:5,6,7 48:17,18,24 49:17 50:12 66:15 67:9 74:3 75:23 78:10 80:20,22,23 81:9 85:12,19 86:6,21 91:13 92:19 103:13 106:3 110:20 122:20 <b>levels</b> 13:18 19:17 36:1 49:6 83:17 85:9 <b>liberally</b> 10:3 <b>license</b> 1:25 62:18 <b>lieu</b> 69:6 <b>light</b> 20:8 45:19 66:24 78:16 94:14 <b>lighting</b> 18:11,14 <b>lights</b> 53:12,14 102:1 116:10 <b>likewise</b> 21:6 <b>limit</b> 15:25 43:25 52:12,13 <b>limited</b> 25:5 <b>limits</b> 90:4 <b>line</b> 5:20 79:7 110:25 <b>linear</b> 91:5 <b>lines</b> 19:7 50:7 129:18 130:12 <b>list</b> 13:16,16 30:18 54:3 89:15 <b>listed</b> 13:4 18:5 60:10 <b>listening</b> 88:12 <b>literally</b> 76:19 <b>little</b> 5:17,18 7:7,12 8:15 11:23 15:17 25:16 26:24 28:12 29:1 59:21 65:20	66:17 71:10 72:3 78:22 80:12 81:12 81:24 83:13,19 84:22,25 85:2,22 86:17 87:7 88:5 93:14 95:7,23 96:1 97:15,16 101:10 105:13 109:1,17 116:4,6 116:17 119:1 122:4,8,16,19 124:18 128:10 <b>live</b> 56:16,17 97:21 127:22 <b>living</b> 34:10 40:21 55:7 <b>local</b> 26:8 28:21 92:11 98:5 <b>locate</b> 46:14 <b>locating</b> 17:16 23:4 <b>location</b> 47:25 <b>locations</b> 64:22 127:2 <b>logic</b> 56:21 60:24 110:7 <b>logical</b> 65:19 70:7 <b>long</b> 43:9,9 67:19 89:7,15 101:12,13 110:23 111:20 115:22 125:25 <b>longer</b> 119:1 121:4 122:9,14 <b>longterm</b> 8:7 30:14 30:20 31:8 32:2,6 59:19 <b>look</b> 11:7 13:14 16:25 17:3 18:4 20:3,7,8 22:3 25:3 27:20 28:13 29:10 30:25 33:6,8 35:16,17 37:10,22 39:14 41:11 42:14 47:12,21 48:4 50:11 57:4 59:22 60:14 67:11 70:25 70:25 71:3 72:9
---	---	--	---	--

73:12 92:1,11 98:19,25 103:15 106:23 108:20 <b>looked</b> 35:3 42:13 56:1 60:16 61:5 64:11 79:11 81:21 <b>looking</b> 4:20 5:8 6:15 7:4,18 8:3 9:1 11:7 12:4 14:6 15:12 26:25 28:6 29:4 30:6 33:21 35:19 37:5 39:15 46:18 48:11 49:23 50:3 51:11 64:19 68:9 73:11 75:11 83:23 84:14 98:1 103:5 105:6 111:22 116:15 118:9 123:4 <b>looks</b> 18:23 23:10 27:1,7 30:3 31:18 35:1 45:19 50:14 51:4,9 90:6 125:10 <b>loops</b> 65:16 66:23 <b>lost</b> 116:5 <b>lot</b> 7:17 9:23 10:7 14:10,19 15:1 22:14 26:22 36:19 38:10 40:13,19 47:23 51:9 68:7,8 70:24 71:1,4 73:19,22 77:10 85:16,25 86:1,20 87:20 94:23 96:13 97:8,23 100:18 105:3 108:20 111:4,18 113:16 119:13 121:22 123:11,12,13 127:24 128:14 <b>lots</b> 73:1 74:19 89:25 91:16 98:1 98:13,13 <b>loved</b> 113:5 <b>lower</b> 25:20 34:21	56:19 114:1 <b>lubricants</b> 21:18 <hr/> <b>M</b> <b>macbeth</b> 75:12 <b>magnitude</b> 63:11 <b>mahamood</b> 2:12 6:10 <b>main</b> 53:4 79:12 93:15 98:3 100:16 <b>maintain</b> 20:8 103:21 <b>major</b> 77:3 <b>majority</b> 25:18 49:4,9 113:23 <b>making</b> 38:1 70:1 82:21 115:16 <b>management</b> 16:16 21:21 <b>manager</b> 6:9 54:8 <b>mandates</b> 49:6 <b>manner</b> 22:11 <b>manual</b> 64:7 <b>map</b> 73:12,16 <b>marching</b> 107:18 <b>margin</b> 96:22 99:9 99:15 <b>mark</b> 1:24 2:20 131:20 <b>market</b> 51:21,23 <b>marketplace</b> 107:17 <b>massive</b> 53:1 <b>material</b> 96:15 <b>materials</b> 21:9,11 <b>matter</b> 74:7 131:7 <b>matters</b> 90:15 <b>maximum</b> 34:14 <b>maximums</b> 85:14 85:15 90:4 <b>mean</b> 5:25 25:22 43:3 49:5 53:6 63:2 71:25 80:11 82:11 85:13 91:13 92:3 94:7,11,17 95:11,11 104:20	104:22 110:3,7,15 119:12,14,15 126:24 <b>meaning</b> 12:21 18:5 104:8 <b>means</b> 12:25 13:5 71:18 74:13 77:16 77:19 <b>meant</b> 7:6,11 38:1 38:3 47:7 97:11 <b>measure</b> 23:8 <b>measured</b> 20:11 <b>measurement</b> 20:16 <b>measures</b> 13:2,7,10 18:1,21 20:21 22:8 23:20 29:11 29:16 31:1 <b>measuring</b> 99:13 <b>mechanism</b> 128:15 <b>mechanisms</b> 95:18 <b>meet</b> 40:16 61:2 <b>meeting</b> 1:14 2:18 2:22 3:2 4:5 6:13 7:8 37:17 38:6,12 52:20 102:24 103:20,23 104:10 104:18 106:17,18 109:22 110:12,13 113:7,17,17,18,20 116:22 117:11,12 119:3,4,10 120:25 121:5 124:14 125:10,19 126:13 127:18,22 130:1 130:20,21 131:5 131:10 <b>meetings</b> 8:20 80:17 102:25 103:4,17,19 104:1 104:12,19 107:11 108:8 109:2,6,10 111:13,16 115:4 116:24 117:2,3,6 117:9,12 118:3 119:9,10,18	121:20 122:16 126:7,10,18,20 127:8 128:7,24 129:11 <b>meets</b> 67:25 <b>member</b> 69:2 <b>members</b> 11:20 35:15 39:12 105:22 109:25 <b>memo</b> 102:8 <b>menlo</b> 1:1,18,19 2:18,19,23 8:23 9:17 13:16 25:23 26:25 27:24 34:9 43:9 46:5 48:12 52:3,16 56:3 64:9 65:1 70:20,24 84:14 100:3 113:3 113:23 <b>mention</b> 93:11 129:4 <b>mentioned</b> 40:11 65:24 75:8 99:22 <b>mentions</b> 40:5 <b>meters</b> 43:15 <b>method</b> 51:10 <b>metric</b> 20:16 49:16 74:10 <b>metrics</b> 94:2 <b>metropolitan</b> 90:10 <b>middle</b> 76:22 79:21 110:1,2 <b>middlefield</b> 60:8,18 60:19 61:2 <b>migratory</b> 18:12 <b>miles</b> 17:2,6,8 <b>million</b> 43:13 <b>mind</b> 9:12 36:11 43:5 84:25 89:10 <b>minds</b> 5:15 <b>mineral</b> 13:20,23 <b>minimize</b> 30:7 <b>minimum</b> 36:13 109:11 110:10,14 <b>minus</b> 99:8 <b>minutes</b> 120:10	124:2 <b>misleading</b> 71:16 <b>missing</b> 73:4 79:17 <b>misunderstanding</b> 37:23 <b>mitigate</b> 17:23 18:8 18:14,18 19:7,11 21:15,22 23:1,7 58:12 60:4 <b>mitigated</b> 32:24 48:14,17,21 <b>mitigating</b> 31:12 <b>mitigation</b> 13:2,7 13:10 18:1,21 20:21 22:8 23:8 23:20,25 29:10,16 30:10,25 58:21 66:20 73:8,25 <b>mitigations</b> 19:18 21:14 31:3 32:25 48:22 58:11,15 74:2 <b>mitigi</b> 33:2 <b>mixed</b> 45:6 56:19 64:9 68:16 <b>mmhmm</b> 125:23 <b>model</b> 20:16 57:19 57:20 64:1,3,22 71:19,24 <b>modern</b> 49:18 <b>modified</b> 44:6 102:20 <b>modifier</b> 46:10 <b>moment</b> 5:19 85:24 <b>momentum</b> 103:21 110:9 116:1,6 121:3 124:17 <b>monday</b> 1:17 38:7 <b>mondays</b> 126:7 <b>money</b> 76:3,17 <b>month</b> 109:7,11,19 110:1 111:7 116:5 122:8,12 <b>months</b> 111:11 127:2 <b>morning</b> 61:21
---	--	---	---	---

<b>motion</b> 130:14 <b>mountain</b> 97:24 <b>move</b> 41:23 54:16 61:23 70:7 101:22 102:1 112:4 <b>moves</b> 74:25 <b>moving</b> 105:11 <b>muddy</b> 118:13 <b>mulling</b> 6:24 <b>multifamily</b> 25:19 56:23 57:7 <b>multiple</b> 26:16 <b>multiplefamily</b> 78:13 <b>multistory</b> 41:21 <b>multiyear</b> 8:5 <b>municipal</b> 23:13	110:21 116:14,21 117:10,22 118:16 118:25 119:2 130:13 <b>needed</b> 8:1 37:21 <b>needs</b> 25:9 42:20 107:17 123:22,23 <b>neg</b> 55:11 <b>negative</b> 16:1 71:5 94:24 110:24 <b>negatively</b> 55:4,12 <b>negotiated</b> 84:24 <b>negotiation</b> 86:4 <b>neighborhood</b> 22:12 34:3 88:16 115:4 <b>neighbors</b> 99:16 115:14 129:23 130:6,6 <b>net</b> 52:15 <b>network</b> 60:21 <b>neutral</b> 75:16 <b>never</b> 72:20 94:18 <b>new</b> 15:22 17:16 19:22 20:5,5,6 23:4,19 24:15,20 24:25 25:5,5,10 25:12,18,25 26:4 26:17 40:7 50:2,8 61:18,18 66:19 69:21 77:25 95:9 113:19 <b>nexus</b> 40:6 <b>nice</b> 42:16 63:10 68:11 96:20 <b>night</b> 109:25 <b>nine</b> 30:3 <b>nitpicky</b> 74:16 <b>noise</b> 22:22,25 23:6 23:9,18 32:22 36:7 56:12 <b>noisy</b> 23:5 32:23 <b>nonenvironmental</b> 12:13 <b>nonshaded</b> 104:8 <b>nonsuccessful</b>	44:24 <b>norm</b> 48:12 <b>normal</b> 26:9,11 <b>normally</b> 110:13 <b>north</b> 80:1 <b>notable</b> 17:10 <b>note</b> 6:18 13:23 15:6 26:22 27:11 49:13 56:16 88:4 93:7 <b>noted</b> 12:15 22:13 46:4 52:21 89:9 114:14 <b>notes</b> 51:7 53:13 <b>notice</b> 2:17 105:7 <b>noticed</b> 89:15 <b>noticing</b> 121:1 <b>noting</b> 26:10 <b>notion</b> 65:15 <b>november</b> 102:23 110:8,19 <b>nuances</b> 50:17 <b>number</b> 10:22 13:14 14:9 16:14 17:14 25:8,9 30:17 31:11,18 36:24 42:15,17 47:11 48:3 62:5,8 62:8,11,23,25 63:2 67:16 72:19 81:23 91:3,14,18 100:25 114:17 116:24 118:9 <b>numbers</b> 64:3,6,25 71:5,15,15 82:17 83:14 99:7 <b>numerous</b> 22:15	<b>obligations</b> 110:10 <b>observance</b> 28:1 <b>observations</b> 112:21 <b>observed</b> 53:9 <b>obvious</b> 78:14 88:13 <b>obviously</b> 39:21 40:2 41:8 55:17 89:24 104:22 105:2,10 111:9 113:11 129:18 <b>occasion</b> 107:6 <b>occupying</b> 110:12 <b>occur</b> 24:8 54:12 54:19 <b>occurring</b> 74:3 <b>offered</b> 42:15 57:9 <b>offers</b> 56:25,25 <b>office</b> 20:5 43:18 44:16 61:20 93:16 93:22 <b>offices</b> 93:17 <b>offsets</b> 41:15 <b>offthecuff</b> 68:22 <b>oh</b> 43:24 72:17 91:4 97:5 112:7 125:2 <b>okay</b> 5:7,12 6:2 38:24 39:3,7 45:12,19 55:1,15 57:12 61:8 62:24 63:25 65:2,5 68:4 70:3 71:12 72:8 72:17 75:15 78:16 79:10,11 83:5 84:17,22 86:8 87:14 92:2 96:6 98:22 101:23 107:25 108:24 112:3,9,18 113:1 116:9,12 118:4 120:8,18 123:6 124:5 128:1 130:18 <b>old</b> 41:1,1 <b>omalley</b> 2:5 104:5	<b>once</b> 31:5 85:1 115:14 116:5 122:12 <b>onequarter</b> 76:22 <b>ones</b> 19:24 29:23 57:15 62:14 69:17 104:16 124:11 <b>onsite</b> 32:6 <b>onstreet</b> 91:22 <b>open</b> 26:4 38:22 44:1 77:13,14,17 77:20 78:3,10 79:1,4 104:8 <b>openended</b> 116:17 <b>operation</b> 29:8 32:10,11 44:14 <b>operations</b> 17:20 30:21 31:20 46:11 46:17,21 <b>opinions</b> 10:14 78:1 103:12,14 <b>opportunities</b> 37:1 58:22 69:18 89:25 <b>opportunity</b> 4:10 6:5 7:1,23 37:19 45:17 47:11 128:16,21 129:5 129:14 <b>opposed</b> 24:6 42:1 123:24 <b>opposite</b> 111:2 <b>option</b> 81:15,17 92:8 108:25 <b>options</b> 65:24 <b>orange</b> 51:10 <b>order</b> 37:25 58:11 62:11 63:11 71:7 103:21,22 107:19 <b>ordinance</b> 8:11 33:18 34:18,19 84:1 <b>oriented</b> 9:6 89:17 89:25 <b>original</b> 102:24 103:18 109:2 121:19 128:13
--	---	--	---	--

<b>ought</b> 44:25	<b>parent</b> 114:13	97:13	<b>perfectly</b> 116:23	14:24 15:3,17,24
<b>outcome</b> 10:21	124:23	<b>party</b> 129:5	126:23	16:19,23 17:1,9
106:11 131:11	<b>parents</b> 114:11	<b>pass</b> 129:23	<b>performing</b> 23:17	20:15 21:5 22:3,5
<b>outdated</b> 40:10	<b>park</b> 1:1,18,19 2:19	<b>paths</b> 79:16	<b>performs</b> 36:9	22:10 23:13,16
<b>outdoor</b> 56:25	2:20,23 8:23	<b>patios</b> 78:9	<b>period</b> 12:5 14:2,15	24:4,10,16,19,25
<b>outreach</b> 109:10	13:16 25:23 26:2	<b>payment</b> 86:3	17:7 43:4 103:21	25:11,16,19 26:3
129:13	26:25 27:24 34:4	<b>pdf</b> 89:21	113:15	26:4,7,14 27:9,13
<b>outside</b> 28:1 61:12	43:9 46:5 48:12	<b>peak</b> 54:22	<b>permits</b> 92:14	27:22,22 29:7
62:1	52:3,16 64:9	<b>pedestrian</b> 31:20	<b>permitted</b> 68:1	33:19,24 34:6,18
<b>overall</b> 7:19 8:4	70:20,24 84:14	34:2 36:25 79:19	<b>person</b> 61:16	35:5,10 36:14,20
13:24 24:17 48:23	92:12 100:3 113:3	80:14	<b>personal</b> 118:1	38:16 40:6,22
67:14,20 86:5	113:23	<b>pei</b> 2:7 45:20	<b>personally</b> 55:3	43:20,22 47:9,14
96:23 105:17,18	<b>parking</b> 9:9 26:23	53:20 98:22 120:2	111:10	47:18,23 49:17
106:6 107:23	31:20 40:15 43:15	124:9	<b>personnel</b> 19:10	50:8 55:10,16,20
<b>overarching</b> 5:23	83:8 84:12,13,18	<b>pending</b> 11:8 102:9	<b>persons</b> 26:2	55:21,23 56:1,9
<b>overdue</b> 100:20	86:18 90:3,4,4,6,7	126:16,17	<b>perspective</b> 73:5	56:11 58:9 63:17
<b>oversees</b> 6:9	90:12,12,20 91:4	<b>peninsula</b> 44:11	118:1	65:7,7,24 66:19
<b>oversight</b> 101:6	91:11,11,16,17,22	98:14,15	<b>phase</b> 85:4 92:8	66:22 67:1,14
109:10	91:22 92:5,24	<b>people</b> 5:11,14 7:10	109:6	69:15 72:16 74:21
<b>overview</b> 6:14	93:1,3,9,22 98:2,3	8:13 14:20 20:4	<b>phased</b> 40:22 88:2	76:11 77:24 78:4
15:10 31:23 85:5	<b>parks</b> 26:1 34:9	36:15 42:9 50:18	<b>phases</b> 24:5 27:14	78:24,25 82:15,18
103:1	68:10 69:9,15	55:7 63:3 68:7,8	122:2,2	83:16,18,20 84:6
<b>owe</b> 108:21	<b>part</b> 10:24 33:7	71:16 74:13 76:2	<b>phasing</b> 9:22 29:17	85:23 86:16,17
<b>owners</b> 24:5 89:7	56:11 76:17 99:22	76:13 90:16 92:11	65:15 66:11	88:1,8,10,17,22
114:18	102:13 111:25,25	92:12,20 98:8,10	<b>phrasing</b> 11:15	90:9,21 91:8,20
	122:23 126:2,3	108:3 109:20	<b>physical</b> 10:11,15	92:23 94:1,5,22
<b>P</b>	<b>partial</b> 30:10	110:4 111:4,11,19	12:15	97:7,9 101:1
<b>pace</b> 122:24	<b>partially</b> 51:16	113:16 114:15	<b>physically</b> 24:25	102:2,4,17,18,24
<b>package</b> 118:20	<b>participate</b> 107:2	117:7 120:14,16	40:7	107:13,19,20
<b>page</b> 3:3 8:18 38:10	108:19	121:15,21 125:16	<b>pick</b> 51:7,24 86:11	122:4,7 123:1
43:23 73:9 74:4	<b>particular</b> 10:21	127:3,24 128:4,8	<b>picking</b> 72:10	126:20 128:17
77:13 83:7,21	12:17 15:13,15	128:15,24 129:24	<b>picture</b> 101:10	<b>planned</b> 83:6
84:23 96:10	19:14,25 20:14	130:5	<b>pie</b> 11:1	102:24 113:6
103:24	23:12 25:24 26:22	<b>perceive</b> 71:17	<b>piece</b> 52:2,3 72:22	120:6
<b>pages</b> 74:5 101:12	28:10 48:5,6,16	<b>percent</b> 34:13,23	<b>piecemeal</b> 11:6	<b>planner</b> 2:9
<b>paging</b> 73:11	60:3 81:3 84:3,12	34:24 35:9,11,22	<b>pieces</b> 55:19 77:3	<b>planning</b> 1:2 2:3,21
<b>paid</b> 76:17	85:24 87:5,22	35:25 59:9,10	<b>pile</b> 23:1	6:4,16 7:24 10:18
<b>pair</b> 41:1	92:7 107:16	64:13 70:9,21	<b>piled</b> 109:16	13:25 14:16 22:2
<b>palo</b> 52:14 81:1	128:17 129:25	71:8 72:1,2,11,19	<b>pilot</b> 92:9	24:8 39:13 51:1
<b>paper</b> 43:24	<b>particularly</b> 52:23	82:5	<b>pinpoint</b> 27:14	69:1 85:4 88:7,21
<b>parallel</b> 92:5	89:22 93:13 127:9	<b>percentage</b> 28:14	<b>pipeline</b> 46:1	99:24 102:3,16,22
<b>parameters</b> 89:8	<b>parties</b> 100:7 131:9	59:9	<b>place</b> 131:6	105:21,22 106:16
103:16	<b>partly</b> 76:25	<b>percentages</b> 59:8	<b>plan</b> 1:4 4:3 5:1,12	106:25 107:14,21
<b>parcel</b> 78:6	<b>partnership</b> 44:12	<b>perception</b> 123:24	5:16 7:16,18 8:5,7	110:10 111:13
<b>parcels</b> 34:1 69:19	44:12	<b>perfect</b> 45:6	8:12,14 9:4,6,22	112:7 116:3
79:8	<b>parts</b> 49:7 50:20	<b>perfection</b> 11:13	9:24 11:19 14:18	117:19 118:7



119:3,16 120:21 122:18 123:1,15 125:11 129:13 <b>plans</b> 34:7,23 40:20 47:10 87:6 115:20 <b>plate</b> 62:18 <b>plausible</b> 93:13 95:5 117:13 <b>playing</b> 118:6 <b>plaza</b> 34:4 91:17,22 92:1,1,6,12,14 <b>plazas</b> 9:8 26:4 69:9 93:10 <b>please</b> 39:4 <b>pleasing</b> 80:3 <b>plenty</b> 98:11 <b>plus</b> 11:8 27:23,24 30:15,15 32:15 55:10 99:8 <b>pm</b> 2:18 14:3 38:8 130:21 <b>pocket</b> 68:10 <b>podium</b> 39:6 <b>point</b> 4:8,22 9:5 10:4 14:15 15:2 19:5 41:4,15 42:20 53:15 56:5 61:3,17,17,23 67:18 81:13 85:5 86:15,25 87:10 88:24 89:6 91:10 96:19,19 111:5 119:6 126:9,25 127:20 <b>pointing</b> 124:19 <b>points</b> 47:4 77:10 79:13 96:9 <b>police</b> 25:1,5,9 40:7 <b>policy</b> 7:13 21:3 22:2 32:21 38:15 51:2 <b>poll</b> 120:21 <b>pollutant</b> 16:24 <b>pollutants</b> 17:17 32:2 <b>pollution</b> 52:15	<b>population</b> 17:3,7 17:11 20:12,17,23 24:2,13,14,17,22 36:13 99:1 114:8 114:12 <b>portion</b> 122:11 <b>portions</b> 23:11 127:7 <b>positive</b> 102:11 106:10 <b>possibility</b> 108:7 110:12 <b>possible</b> 4:25 11:4 74:5 75:17 87:9 92:6 93:20 98:24 99:20 108:5,22 126:20 129:20,21 <b>post</b> 93:16,17,22 114:7 <b>potential</b> 14:5 15:21,25 16:7 18:4,23 19:2 21:10 22:24 25:4 32:1 45:24 46:10 46:19 48:2,6 60:22 65:21 86:19 99:25 102:12 105:18 110:9 124:12 <b>potentially</b> 11:24 14:11,12,20 21:11 66:1,2 86:10,18 102:25 106:19 <b>practical</b> 42:13 <b>practices</b> 21:22 96:24 <b>precise</b> 75:18 125:16 <b>precisely</b> 76:18 <b>preconstruction</b> 18:7 <b>preference</b> 125:14 <b>preferences</b> 10:14 46:20 <b>preliminary</b> 125:11 <b>prepare</b> 127:18	<b>prepared</b> 4:12 57:20,20 <b>preponderance</b> 114:7 <b>presence</b> 6:8 <b>present</b> 2:5 52:17 70:10 <b>presentation</b> 3:4 4:17 5:22 6:12 7:21 33:6 37:15 45:16 47:4 70:13 81:14 102:7 <b>presentations</b> 73:14 <b>presented</b> 78:24 <b>preservation</b> 19:6 <b>preserve</b> 18:22 <b>pressures</b> 106:5 <b>presume</b> 52:1 <b>pretty</b> 4:16 39:7 42:16 53:3 63:3 70:21 71:8 91:13 91:18 101:18 111:20 118:23 126:8 128:2 <b>previous</b> 21:3,5,12 100:22 111:17 114:10 <b>previously</b> 6:7 <b>primarily</b> 89:23 <b>primary</b> 6:10 25:23 26:23 128:15 <b>principles</b> 34:7 <b>prior</b> 40:20 106:19 <b>priorities</b> 35:18 <b>prioritize</b> 95:19 <b>prioritizing</b> 67:6 <b>private</b> 9:10,11,16 11:25 67:13,24 77:13,14,17,20 78:3,8,9,17 79:1,1 79:4 <b>probably</b> 14:22 15:1 26:24 29:21 36:22 47:3 52:7 53:13 54:20 71:10	74:5 89:17 94:5 97:6,12,15 104:17 104:17 107:10 115:8 118:3 120:19 128:5 <b>problem</b> 60:18 96:2,5 97:2 <b>problems</b> 41:3 43:10 <b>procedure</b> 4:7 <b>procedures</b> 18:8 19:11 <b>proceedings</b> 1:16 6:22 <b>process</b> 7:6,16 8:4 8:5,18 10:1,5 13:24 14:7 19:5 34:15 37:17 38:3 38:21 43:11 47:17 49:10 54:16 55:17 55:22 56:1 65:14 67:24 85:18 87:12 99:23 102:9,13,22 103:1 107:10 112:8 115:5 117:19 121:4,16 121:19 122:9,23 <b>processed</b> 41:4 <b>processes</b> 10:9 <b>produced</b> 104:12 <b>program</b> 11:21 27:22 44:18 47:5 48:17 67:15,25 <b>programs</b> 30:9 <b>progress</b> 54:1 <b>project</b> 4:5,23 8:18 8:21 9:16,17 11:2 11:4,7,8,21,24 17:1,12,22 18:11 18:12 22:3 24:2,4 27:8 28:8,23,24 30:2,15 31:10,24 32:13,15 33:7,9 33:16,17,21,22 34:13,16 35:1,4,6 35:14,20,20 36:3	36:6,18,21,23,24 38:9 46:15 47:6,7 47:19,19,20,22 48:9,16,24 50:4 50:19 51:14,20,21 52:24 53:1,11 56:4 59:10,11,14 60:16,24 68:23 69:13 72:10,13,22 77:21 81:15,16,22 82:12,19,20 83:16 85:2 86:4,4 88:14 88:15,18 101:17 105:17 106:6 115:3 <b>projected</b> 9:22 17:6 17:7,11 25:15 67:25 <b>projection</b> 67:15 <b>projections</b> 17:4 24:17 25:22 <b>projects</b> 10:25 11:8 11:25 16:14,20 27:23,25 30:15 31:10,25 32:15 42:14 43:14 45:24 46:4,5 48:13,24 55:20 56:10 59:7 65:8 67:19 72:7 72:11,15,15 82:6 87:18 88:9 <b>promote</b> 34:10 <b>prompt</b> 4:24 52:9 <b>prompted</b> 101:1 <b>proof</b> 100:23 <b>proper</b> 74:25 88:25 <b>properties</b> 9:11 24:6 34:20 79:3 85:11 <b>property</b> 24:5 44:13 82:13 <b>proportion</b> 114:12 <b>proposals</b> 49:1 <b>propose</b> 58:10 87:3 117:2 <b>proposed</b> 17:1 19:4
--	--	--	---	---

<p>27:23 46:6 56:2,6 59:10,10 79:21,22 82:2 92:25 94:4 95:9</p> <p><b>proposing</b> 24:15 <b>pros</b> 105:25 110:15 <b>protecting</b> 34:1 <b>protest</b> 75:13 <b>provide</b> 6:14 7:2,23 14:17 15:2,12 30:10 39:14 68:18 83:13 86:18 88:6 103:8 107:12,23 120:20 121:11 130:7,11 <b>provided</b> 24:10 <b>provides</b> 9:7,9 15:10 27:2 29:3 51:12 83:20 <b>providing</b> 12:9 14:23 26:4 34:3 37:19 69:15,17 89:25 <b>provision</b> 85:20 86:6 95:23 <b>provisions</b> 2:22 <b>proximity</b> 90:1 <b>pub</b> 25:11,25 <b>public</b> 3:5,6 4:2 6:17 7:22,23 9:2,8 9:21 10:17 12:1 14:1 24:24 34:8 37:17,18 38:6,18 38:21,23 39:2,4,7 40:5 41:12 43:3,4 45:11,12 66:2,3 66:12 67:4,22 68:14 69:2,8,15 76:12 78:21 84:23 85:6,17,20 86:19 99:23 107:16 108:19 112:5,10 112:14,20,24 113:3 114:10 116:13 121:5 123:11,12,25</p>	<p><b>publicity</b> 117:6 <b>publicize</b> 130:8 <b>publicly</b> 120:6 <b>pulled</b> 15:17 <b>pulling</b> 15:7 <b>purchased</b> 40:19 <b>purpose</b> 5:9 6:13 52:20 <b>purposes</b> 27:15 <b>pursuant</b> 2:17 <b>push</b> 50:19 <b>pushing</b> 105:24 <b>put</b> 5:4 6:23 23:22 39:20 92:6 101:11 101:21 121:25 129:20 <b>puts</b> 78:4</p> <hr/> <p><b>Q</b></p> <p><b>qualitative</b> 57:4 <b>quality</b> 10:1 16:4,8 16:15 21:24 23:3 32:4,8 36:7 38:13 45:22 57:21 <b>quantifiable</b> 31:17 <b>quantify</b> 30:11 90:25 99:14 <b>quantitative</b> 11:10 <b>question</b> 4:8,12 7:9 45:21 49:22 51:15 52:17 53:4 56:18 58:10 59:6 60:2 68:5 77:11 84:3 87:15 126:6 129:7 <b>questionable</b> 75:19 <b>questioned</b> 84:4 <b>questions</b> 5:20 7:25 37:20 38:5,20 39:1 45:15 53:22 55:15 61:10 65:6 70:6 75:24 77:7 87:16 <b>quick</b> 61:9 65:13 <b>quickly</b> 63:11 123:17,19 <b>quite</b> 55:4 83:12</p>	<p>101:1 114:14 <b>quo</b> 50:15 <b>quote</b> 11:12 44:6,9 53:7</p> <hr/> <p><b>R</b></p> <p><b>radio</b> 121:12 <b>rail</b> 45:25 46:9,15 80:11,14 81:4,5 95:25 <b>raise</b> 70:8 <b>raised</b> 104:9 <b>raising</b> 93:25 <b>range</b> 7:17 47:8 114:14 <b>rate</b> 17:10 20:21 70:22 <b>rates</b> 25:20 57:7 64:15 <b>ratio</b> 26:1 36:12,14 85:15 96:25 <b>ravenswood</b> 23:12 62:15 80:11 <b>raze</b> 88:16 <b>reach</b> 31:22 <b>reached</b> 22:22 <b>react</b> 63:3 109:18 <b>reaction</b> 111:2 <b>read</b> 15:9,9 50:6 74:17 93:8 96:3 101:13 116:20 <b>readily</b> 99:4 <b>reads</b> 120:10 <b>real</b> 1:4 8:4,7 17:18 17:19 23:11 28:20 44:12 65:1 79:3,9 79:23 80:1,7 82:22,23 90:5 95:10 101:17 102:2 103:5 <b>realistic</b> 68:18 69:8 <b>realistically</b> 94:9 <b>reality</b> 113:12 <b>realizes</b> 40:10 <b>really</b> 7:5 8:5,6,13 8:22 15:2,8 21:2</p>	<p>25:4 29:2 35:4 39:23,24 46:17 47:8 49:4 50:3,22 51:8 53:2 61:17 62:18 65:17 70:15 71:18 73:4,15 74:11,19,21 77:22 79:15 94:8 95:4,4 95:12 98:6,7 101:8 102:6,6 103:7,15 104:21 104:25 108:17 111:22 112:20 113:22 114:22 125:19,20 127:21 127:21 <b>realm</b> 34:9 <b>reason</b> 11:16 25:2 76:25 113:13 <b>reasonable</b> 71:9 123:9 <b>reasons</b> 66:1,2 97:24 113:8 115:3 <b>reassign</b> 126:23 <b>rebuilt</b> 40:13 <b>rec</b> 121:24 <b>recall</b> 121:20 <b>recap</b> 103:22 <b>recapitulation</b> 77:23 <b>receive</b> 6:15 100:9 <b>received</b> 12:5 <b>receptor</b> 23:5 <b>recognition</b> 57:24 86:5 <b>recommend</b> 38:22 53:14 117:23 <b>recommendation</b> 90:11 106:16 110:21 118:24 123:7 <b>recommendations</b> 103:9 107:14 118:10 125:11 <b>record</b> 12:16 56:17 131:7</p>	<p><b>recurring</b> 53:6 <b>redevelo</b> 88:17 <b>redeveloped</b> 34:21 44:13 82:1 <b>redevelopment</b> 24:6 47:13 85:11 87:20 88:14 <b>reduce</b> 13:2,8,11 20:21 37:7 42:8 59:1,16 <b>reduced</b> 35:25 37:2 37:4,8 <b>reducing</b> 35:17,18 35:20 <b>reduction</b> 37:12 64:13 83:8 84:8 91:10 <b>reductions</b> 18:14 58:4 64:8,12 <b>redwood</b> 43:11 52:4,13 53:1 97:23 116:3 <b>reema</b> 2:12 6:10 <b>refer</b> 16:16 77:13 <b>reference</b> 46:14 64:18 <b>references</b> 40:23 <b>refine</b> 128:21 <b>refining</b> 58:22 <b>reflect</b> 57:22 <b>regard</b> 22:9 24:24 26:6 32:22 33:11 35:10,11 58:24 59:20 66:6 67:13 80:7 84:15 86:22 86:23 106:6 <b>regarding</b> 36:10 58:7 <b>regardless</b> 54:21 54:24,25 <b>regards</b> 67:4 77:23 84:2 <b>regimented</b> 10:8 <b>region</b> 62:12 <b>regional</b> 11:9 27:24 30:15 46:6 72:14</p>
--	--	---	--	---

<b>regroup</b> 118:16 <b>regular</b> 3:7 102:1 126:10,13 130:19 <b>regulations</b> 15:20 15:24 16:15 19:16 22:1 47:11 <b>reinventing</b> 125:20 <b>related</b> 12:14 32:21 40:3 55:16 63:15 75:21 80:5 87:16 <b>relates</b> 87:23 88:21 120:25 <b>relative</b> 12:25 17:3 17:4 85:16 88:9 <b>relatively</b> 13:22 18:19 23:21 66:11 113:13 119:20 123:18 <b>relayed</b> 6:20 130:17 <b>release</b> 13:25 91:7 <b>released</b> 12:3 <b>relevant</b> 12:22 13:6 17:4 18:1 23:13 84:15 87:4 112:21 127:9 <b>rely</b> 19:25 <b>remain</b> 33:19 80:23 <b>remains</b> 19:9 82:8 <b>remember</b> 43:12 109:4,8 <b>remembered</b> 2:17 56:15 <b>reminded</b> 75:12 <b>reminder</b> 102:22 <b>removing</b> 11:4 <b>renew</b> 49:7 <b>reopen</b> 43:3 <b>repeated</b> 75:3 <b>repetitive</b> 75:11 127:1,5 <b>replaced</b> 42:20 58:1 <b>replacement</b> 24:9 <b>report</b> 4:4 6:11 8:16 10:3 15:9	16:13 29:3 45:16 59:22 76:21 77:9 79:11 81:13 100:5 119:19 120:16 <b>reported</b> 1:24 <b>reporter</b> 6:21 <b>reporters</b> 1:16 <b>represent</b> 34:22 <b>representative</b> 7:19 28:7 100:1 <b>reptiles</b> 18:17 <b>request</b> 4:7 <b>require</b> 24:25 40:7 78:4 83:24 121:1 122:24 <b>required</b> 6:18 11:24 19:22 23:8 25:6 33:14 47:6 48:1 51:12 <b>requirement</b> 21:8 <b>requirements</b> 40:16 49:6 78:3 83:9 <b>requires</b> 20:7 33:6 48:19 <b>requiring</b> 78:19 <b>rescheduling</b> 105:24 <b>reserve</b> 130:2 <b>residences</b> 17:16 23:4 25:12,20,25 <b>resident</b> 5:10,10 <b>residential</b> 34:23 35:10,16,21 37:4 37:8 40:19 57:2 59:9,11 90:6,7,19 <b>residential</b> 35:25 <b>residents</b> 20:13 79:5 <b>resolved</b> 126:1 <b>resources</b> 13:20,20 13:23 15:16 18:3 18:23,25 19:2,9 32:7 <b>respect</b> 59:11 72:4 93:22	<b>respective</b> 17:4 <b>respects</b> 22:6 <b>respond</b> 38:2 66:18 <b>responded</b> 12:7,14 52:22 120:17 <b>responding</b> 7:8 14:4 <b>response</b> 40:2 41:15 54:7 58:16 68:22 <b>responses</b> 12:9 59:4 <b>rest</b> 120:21 <b>restaurants</b> 98:9 <b>restrictions</b> 49:5 <b>restriping</b> 29:14 <b>result</b> 16:7,23 19:16 21:21 25:11 34:14 37:3 56:19 59:12 86:3 <b>resulted</b> 45:2 <b>results</b> 109:21 <b>retail</b> 20:6 34:24 35:21 37:3 43:25 44:3 51:24 67:16 <b>retailers</b> 44:4 <b>retails</b> 35:17 <b>return</b> 106:18 <b>returned</b> 85:8 <b>review</b> 4:3,23 5:11 11:24 12:5 14:11 14:16 47:6 48:19 68:2 69:21 85:4 88:22 99:23,23,24 102:3,16 106:16 106:22 107:1,3,5 108:16 117:17,21 118:8 <b>reviewed</b> 22:16 <b>reviews</b> 21:14,14 <b>revisions</b> 107:13 <b>revitalizing</b> 33:25 69:18 <b>ridership</b> 31:19 <b>ridiculous</b> 43:19 <b>riggs</b> 2:6 4:9,11,18	5:7 6:2 9:5 14:15 47:2 49:3 50:14 51:6 52:25 100:12 114:25 126:5,11 126:22 <b>right</b> 4:15,16 7:12 7:13 8:12 10:2 12:3 14:1 29:13 35:7 39:3 40:22 42:19 43:3,4 49:3 52:19 53:19 60:1 60:6 61:6 64:21 72:7 84:5,12 89:5 91:15 103:15 104:24 105:7 113:10 115:16 116:15 125:21 <b>rightofway</b> 29:17 <b>road</b> 53:10 94:15 <b>roads</b> 31:15 <b>roadway</b> 23:23 28:12,16 30:3,4,6 31:11 32:12 33:4 62:20,21 63:16 73:10 <b>roadways</b> 23:11 27:6,19 30:8 32:23 63:17,20 73:24 <b>rogers</b> 2:9 3:4 4:16 5:5,13 6:3 46:2 47:8 49:22 50:16 52:19 54:7 55:25 56:22 57:19 58:14 59:14 64:5,24 65:3,21 67:3 68:20 72:13 77:21 78:22 79:18 80:16 81:21 82:18,24 83:6,15 84:13,18 85:1 86:16 88:4 91:19 93:3 99:18 102:5 105:8,13 106:15 107:8 108:1 109:9 110:7 110:18 111:10	112:7,10 117:15 117:24 118:2,5,21 119:16 120:19 121:23 122:3,15 123:14,22 125:18 125:23 126:10,12 129:12 130:10,16 <b>roles</b> 90:3 <b>rooftop</b> 78:15 <b>room</b> 23:24 31:13 <b>roost</b> 18:6 <b>roots</b> 130:5 <b>rough</b> 71:24 119:6 <b>rpr</b> 1:24 <b>rule</b> 15:14 <b>rules</b> 5:3 9:10 <b>run</b> 47:8 80:1 102:10
<b>S</b>				
<b>safe</b> 81:7 <b>sale</b> 92:3 <b>sample</b> 8:19 28:7 <b>san</b> 45:4,5 98:14 131:3 <b>sand</b> 53:10 94:14 <b>santa</b> 34:2 41:12,16 92:5 97:25 98:15 <b>satisfying</b> 106:24 <b>saw</b> 53:8 75:3 80:25 100:1 123:13 <b>saying</b> 28:8 29:19 35:6 91:16 96:13 <b>says</b> 68:13 75:12,14 <b>scale</b> 66:12 <b>scenario</b> 31:25 68:6 68:13,17 77:1 <b>scenarios</b> 74:2 77:2 <b>schapelhouman</b> 39:9,12,17 <b>schedule</b> 104:12 105:5 108:8 117:11 <b>scheduled</b> 107:11 110:13				

<b>scheduling</b> 102:3 103:16 108:9	<b>segment</b> 73:23 114:16	<b>setbacks</b> 75:9 76:8	31:7,24 32:20	<b>soon</b> 39:7 100:14
<b>schematic</b> 80:21	<b>segments</b> 28:12,17	<b>setting</b> 103:2	33:10 36:4 46:13	<b>sooner</b> 14:13 41:2
<b>school</b> 25:12,15,23	30:3,4,6 31:11,14	<b>seven</b> 91:17 92:13	46:22 59:13,24	<b>sorry</b> 35:1 87:15
25:24 56:20 100:5	31:19 32:12 33:4	<b>sevenoh</b> 118:9	60:10 69:7	129:2
104:23 111:20,22	63:16 73:10	<b>shadow</b> 16:1 48:8	<b>significantly</b> 54:20	<b>sort</b> 5:21 10:15
114:11,12,20	<b>seismicity</b> 19:13	<b>shadows</b> 15:22	60:7	48:8 52:8 54:15
115:15,19,19	<b>send</b> 99:24 120:13	<b>shared</b> 78:10,15	<b>similar</b> 17:15 23:3	65:12,12 67:20
124:25	120:13 128:3	<b>shoes</b> 41:2	48:20 55:16 64:23	70:13 74:9,12
<b>schoolchildren</b>	<b>seniors</b> 114:17	<b>shopping</b> 34:3	<b>similarly</b> 18:11	75:10,11,14,22,23
111:19	<b>sense</b> 80:3 92:17	44:10,22	21:16	88:13 92:17 94:21
<b>schools</b> 99:2 100:3	94:3 95:14 96:1	<b>short</b> 29:4 65:13	<b>simple</b> 4:25 43:6	96:6 97:1,13,16
100:4 113:3	96:14,21 100:13	83:23 104:23	94:11	97:16 102:20
<b>scope</b> 67:20 87:1	101:18 113:8	113:15	<b>simply</b> 5:4 43:5	104:6 124:7,10
<b>scoped</b> 87:13	115:24 118:7	<b>shortterm</b> 28:23	66:25 93:15	<b>sound</b> 23:20,22
<b>screw</b> 92:21	<b>sensitive</b> 23:5	29:6 30:1,2 31:25	127:13	32:24 78:20
<b>se</b> 68:12	<b>sent</b> 124:9 127:12	32:12	<b>single</b> 40:12 57:1,7	<b>sounds</b> 62:5 76:13
<b>search</b> 89:20	127:21	<b>shouldnt</b> 96:5	113:19 130:1	123:3 128:1,8
<b>second</b> 12:23 21:2	<b>separate</b> 55:21	<b>show</b> 9:3 63:15	<b>sink</b> 105:15	<b>source</b> 46:25 64:16
22:9 61:22 85:12	127:8	81:15	<b>site</b> 16:11 19:6	69:7 83:3 120:20
101:4 111:23	<b>separated</b> 46:15	<b>showing</b> 115:17	21:13,14 48:6	<b>sources</b> 5:14 68:19
127:22	79:20 81:8 109:11	125:16	<b>sites</b> 47:11,12	69:12
<b>secondarily</b> 6:15	<b>separately</b> 104:5	<b>shows</b> 9:21,22 83:8	<b>situation</b> 42:3	<b>south</b> 80:1
<b>secondary</b> 100:4	<b>september</b> 106:20	91:23	<b>situations</b> 87:22	<b>southeast</b> 79:3,9
<b>section</b> 45:22 83:16	107:12 108:1	<b>shuttle</b> 58:12	<b>six</b> 75:4 91:17	<b>space</b> 9:8 12:1
84:23	117:18 122:6	<b>side</b> 21:3 42:6	109:6 115:4 118:9	35:21 37:3,7,8
<b>see</b> 31:8 43:10 45:1	125:4	53:17 93:4,5	<b>sixone</b> 118:10	56:25 67:17 77:13
45:18 52:10 54:2	<b>sequence</b> 65:20	94:12,16 112:1	<b>size</b> 56:24 57:9 78:6	77:15,17,20 78:3
54:15 63:19 65:18	<b>sequencing</b> 65:8	<b>sidebars</b> 96:15	85:15,16	78:10,17,19 79:1
66:4 70:2,14	<b>sequoia</b> 100:4	<b>sidewalk</b> 66:3 67:8	<b>sizes</b> 15:18	111:6 127:14
73:10,25 76:7,20	<b>series</b> 87:18 109:4	68:9	<b>skip</b> 117:5	<b>spaces</b> 26:4 34:4
78:13 80:25 86:13	113:8,17 116:2	<b>sidewalks</b> 9:9 41:9	<b>sky</b> 11:2	69:16 79:4 90:8
86:22 87:20,21	129:11	41:23 65:11 69:10	<b>slash</b> 117:11	91:4,14,18
88:3 90:1 96:1	<b>serve</b> 5:10 25:6	74:23 79:25,25	<b>slide</b> 4:6	<b>spacing</b> 127:9
98:8 99:2,6	26:9	94:12,17	<b>slides</b> 5:6 40:5	<b>speak</b> 65:12 85:13
100:15 101:25	<b>served</b> 26:20	<b>sign</b> 29:12	<b>slight</b> 12:21	<b>speaking</b> 72:24
104:9 106:12	<b>service</b> 20:12,17,22	<b>signal</b> 60:25	<b>slightly</b> 17:10 50:1	<b>special</b> 1:14 18:4
111:2 112:4,24	25:4 28:9 36:13	<b>signalized</b> 60:17	<b>small</b> 66:12	18:13,16 93:22
115:2 116:9,10,12	64:10	<b>signalizing</b> 29:11	<b>smaller</b> 56:24	103:20
117:10 118:14	<b>services</b> 24:24	<b>significant</b> 12:20	<b>social</b> 10:12	<b>species</b> 18:20
119:23,25 121:7	25:10 34:3 40:6	12:24,24 13:3,5,9	<b>soils</b> 19:13	<b>specific</b> 1:4 4:3 5:1
127:22	<b>set</b> 5:3 67:14 70:6	13:13,23 16:3,4,8	<b>solid</b> 9:3	8:4,11 9:4 14:17
<b>seeing</b> 5:22 46:13	80:17 85:17 86:2	16:21 17:13,25	<b>solved</b> 60:18	14:24 15:3,19,24
<b>seen</b> 8:23 9:18	90:1 98:12 102:25	18:2,9,10 19:16	<b>solvents</b> 21:18	19:6 20:15 24:6
11:20 64:25	103:8,9 104:9	19:20 21:1,6 22:7	<b>somebody</b> 61:13,20	27:9,22 34:6,18
100:16	127:5 131:16	22:23 23:9 24:1	75:12	34:23 35:5,10
		26:21 29:25 30:13	<b>somewhat</b> 13:11	36:14 38:16 40:3

43:20 47:10,20,23 48:25 49:17 53:22 55:16,23 56:1,9 56:11 60:3 62:9 62:12,23 63:17 64:18 65:23 66:19 66:22 67:14 72:16 74:21 76:11 77:10 77:24 78:4,23,25 82:18 83:16,17,18 83:20 84:6 85:23 86:2,16,17 88:8 88:10,22 90:9,21 91:8,20 94:1,5,22 101:1 102:2,4,17 102:24 107:13,19 107:20 122:3 123:1 126:20 <b>specifically</b> 41:17 46:4 75:5,20 80:11 82:13,15 87:25 90:5 128:15 <b>specifics</b> 69:23 <b>speed</b> 45:25 46:9 80:11,14 81:5 95:25 <b>spend</b> 97:23 105:3 125:2 <b>spent</b> 43:13 111:5 <b>spite</b> 53:10 <b>split</b> 118:12 <b>splitting</b> 35:5 <b>spot</b> 38:2 90:13 <b>spread</b> 109:1,7,20 122:4 <b>spreading</b> 110:6 115:23 <b>spring</b> 113:10 <b>sprinklered</b> 41:19 41:22 <b>square</b> 62:10 67:16 78:5 113:19 <b>staff</b> 2:8 7:25 8:15 37:20 38:20 39:13 41:7 45:15 119:19 123:14 126:6	127:18 129:7 130:7 <b>staffs</b> 118:16 <b>stage</b> 7:16 67:4 <b>stand</b> 125:17 <b>standard</b> 11:11 13:16 21:4,5,25 36:12 64:16 65:3 70:22 85:14 90:6 107:15 112:8 <b>standards</b> 19:7,15 19:19 23:14,17 25:3 40:15 57:25 68:2 83:24 <b>standpoint</b> 41:8 42:11 <b>stanford</b> 44:11,19 44:20,21 <b>start</b> 4:13,15,16 7:21 8:6 45:18 53:18 105:6 109:1 109:12,13 112:2 113:3 117:17,21 119:25 <b>started</b> 56:3,5 63:21 111:20 117:1 <b>starting</b> 8:10,12 66:15 102:25 103:4 113:18 114:2 127:15 <b>starts</b> 17:25 18:9 75:18 93:2 115:15 <b>state</b> 2:21 10:6 21:4 28:19 57:25 131:2 <b>stated</b> 131:6 <b>statement</b> 82:21 92:16 <b>states</b> 94:17 <b>station</b> 25:5,5,10 40:4 42:18 61:14 79:22 89:23,24 103:4 <b>stations</b> 21:12 <b>statistical</b> 57:3 <b>status</b> 18:4,13,16	50:15 71:21 <b>stay</b> 89:8 115:7 <b>stays</b> 35:21,24 <b>step</b> 8:3 14:6 26:25 33:20 47:21 102:15 105:21 <b>steps</b> 10:8 <b>stick</b> 123:7 <b>stood</b> 74:16 <b>stop</b> 29:12 66:25 75:25 <b>story</b> 44:16 <b>straightforward</b> 119:20 <b>straw</b> 125:13 <b>straying</b> 78:22 <b>streaming</b> 127:22 <b>street</b> 1:19 2:19 41:17 66:4 67:8 93:4,6 98:3 <b>streets</b> 41:12,14,16 43:8 55:3,7 62:13 79:7 <b>strength</b> 75:23 125:14 <b>strengthen</b> 34:8 <b>strong</b> 9:9 <b>strongly</b> 63:3 <b>structure</b> 48:20 86:18 <b>structured</b> 10:5 89:7 <b>structures</b> 41:18,19 <b>student</b> 25:20 <b>studies</b> 19:10 64:11 96:8 <b>study</b> 53:24 54:1,10 55:5,10 64:1 84:12,14 <b>studying</b> 55:13 <b>stuff</b> 68:16 73:12 74:24 75:2 94:5 95:3,3,4 96:14 98:4,19 121:25 125:20 <b>subcommittee</b>	105:21 113:6 <b>subject</b> 68:1 <b>submit</b> 38:8 39:4 <b>subsequent</b> 17:22 <b>substance</b> 107:23 <b>substantial</b> 24:13 31:22 <b>substantially</b> 22:11 32:4,8 <b>subtracts</b> 72:16 <b>success</b> 8:9 <b>successes</b> 97:20 98:7 <b>successful</b> 44:9,14 87:19 116:2 <b>sudden</b> 101:12 <b>sued</b> 43:18 <b>sufficient</b> 130:17 <b>suggest</b> 55:6 114:4 124:7 127:13 <b>suggested</b> 90:21 <b>suggestion</b> 69:21 124:8 130:11 <b>summaries</b> 73:7 <b>summarize</b> 123:5 <b>summarized</b> 73:15 103:12 <b>summarizing</b> 15:6 28:25 83:17,18 84:5 <b>summary</b> 7:21 13:5 13:18 46:5 78:25 88:6 97:8 <b>summer</b> 43:23 104:23 105:2,24 106:8,18 107:1,2 107:3 108:17 110:2 111:16 113:4,21 114:2 115:10,21 124:24 125:1 128:20 <b>sunnyvale</b> 44:24 88:14 97:22 <b>superior</b> 37:10,13 <b>supplemental</b> 48:10	<b>supplied</b> 91:24 <b>supplier</b> 26:8 <b>supplies</b> 26:11,19 <b>supply</b> 26:8 <b>support</b> 2:11 54:16 66:2 121:8,15 <b>suppose</b> 119:8,8 <b>supposed</b> 37:9 106:7 <b>sure</b> 42:11 49:11 56:20 60:24 65:16 73:3 77:21 83:12 83:15 87:23 93:2 101:12 108:18 116:23,23 <b>surprised</b> 44:20,22 <b>surrounding</b> 22:12 <b>survey</b> 54:14,15 62:18 120:4,13 121:9 124:10 <b>surveys</b> 18:7 <b>sustain</b> 34:9 <b>sustainability</b> 34:11 <b>sustainable</b> 36:19 <b>synthesize</b> 123:16 <b>systems</b> 17:22 <b>systemwide</b> 26:12
<b>T</b>				
<b>tab</b> 51:10 <b>table</b> 38:20 83:8 129:8 <b>tables</b> 63:15,18 <b>tactical</b> 42:9 <b>tail</b> 119:22 <b>tailpipe</b> 20:4 <b>take</b> 6:23 7:22 10:22 28:6 38:21 48:10 55:18 78:8 78:9 87:8 93:1 94:11,13 103:19 105:20 111:11 118:25 124:2 130:14 <b>taken</b> 4:5 57:18				

131:5 <b>takes</b> 45:23 46:3 101:13 105:7 <b>talk</b> 41:7 64:1 107:10 108:3 112:13 130:6 <b>talked</b> 31:6,23 33:2 85:22 86:9 110:8 110:19 <b>talking</b> 4:22,23 5:2 36:18 46:24 56:15 85:3 101:9,19 110:5 121:23 <b>talks</b> 40:5 <b>taller</b> 25:8 <b>tanks</b> 21:11 <b>tapering</b> 25:14 <b>task</b> 127:5,8 <b>tasks</b> 10:9 <b>taylor</b> 2:10 6:8 54:8 54:9 60:13 61:15 62:3,7 63:7,10,13 63:23 70:21 <b>tdm</b> 31:16 <b>team</b> 101:20 <b>tease</b> 90:23,23 <b>technical</b> 7:9,25 37:20 <b>techniques</b> 23:7 <b>teeth</b> 105:15 <b>tell</b> 5:1 84:24 91:9 91:12 121:12 <b>telling</b> 71:19 <b>temporary</b> 65:22 66:4 <b>ten</b> 45:6 64:13 71:3 <b>tenderloin</b> 45:5 <b>tennis</b> 41:2 <b>tentative</b> 102:3 <b>tentatively</b> 107:11 <b>term</b> 29:5 <b>terms</b> 5:8 6:25 9:4 9:15 13:24 14:8 17:2,2,5 18:15 30:21 33:12 46:20 47:24 48:15,20	50:16 52:19 53:5 56:1,7,24 69:4 74:21 84:18 90:2 91:14 94:21 95:20 96:22 122:17 <b>terraces</b> 78:10 <b>terrible</b> 71:17 <b>thank</b> 6:4 38:24 42:22 45:8,9 47:2 53:19 57:14 58:6 59:5 61:6 70:5 89:13 98:21 100:12 101:24 102:5 114:25 121:17 124:6 125:5 129:2,15 130:10 <b>thankfully</b> 37:14 <b>thanks</b> 70:3 99:18 101:20 113:1 <b>thats</b> 5:5 6:24 7:5,9 7:14,21 9:1 16:1,9 16:21 17:12,24 20:4,13,18,25 22:6,17 23:17,24 24:4,10,14,18 27:3,8,21 29:12 30:14 31:13 32:18 33:7 38:3 41:10 41:25 42:20 45:5 48:14,15 49:14 50:13,17 54:5 57:19,24 61:7,21 61:22 62:3,20 64:21 65:22 66:19 67:1 70:13,22 72:6,7 73:4 74:9 75:16 76:14,25 77:5 78:6 79:10 80:13 81:5 84:9 84:20 86:9 89:11 90:12,17,17 92:4 92:7,19,19,23 93:23 94:7,14,20 94:20 95:4,21 97:5,6 98:21	99:18 100:2 103:11 104:25 106:9,21 108:18 110:13 111:14 114:22 115:20 118:21 121:4 123:23 125:24,25 126:2,2,3,13 128:9 130:3,10,17 130:18 <b>theme</b> 55:16 <b>thered</b> 119:11 <b>theres</b> 4:20 5:25 7:17 11:23 21:10 23:24 30:20 31:9 31:13 32:1,15,21 32:22 37:23 38:5 38:20 41:3 42:12 46:6 48:2 49:8 50:24,24 51:23 52:5,6 57:6 60:9 62:22 63:23 64:18 65:8,10,16,19 67:15 68:10,25 69:17 73:1,3,4,13 73:19 74:19 75:1 76:2 81:13 84:3,7 84:22 85:12 86:20 88:23,23 90:9 91:12 92:14,24 94:3,25 96:2 97:8 97:15 100:6 103:12 105:17 107:15 108:20 109:20,20,21 110:15,22 111:8,8 112:24 114:14,17 116:10 123:11,12 124:12 <b>theyll</b> 41:22 118:11 <b>theyre</b> 6:25 11:1 12:14 22:17 35:13 44:15,19 47:12 54:14 74:1,2 78:12,14,18 92:13 92:14 96:14 98:7	109:17 115:16,17 118:8 128:4 <b>theyve</b> 19:10 <b>thing</b> 9:12 13:19 33:5 36:11 43:18 64:17,19 66:20 69:13 72:5 76:5,5 79:14 81:12 83:2 93:23 95:22 98:24 104:20 109:14 111:6 116:8 118:6 125:17 128:3 130:7 <b>things</b> 5:18 6:24 9:17 11:1,6 15:4,6 15:10 22:15,17 29:1 30:16 33:25 37:16,23 39:24 42:10,13 44:8 45:3 50:24 54:11 57:5 58:13 63:13 65:13,15,20 68:9 68:11,14 69:4 73:14 75:7,20 76:7,15,16 78:11 81:25 85:2,25 87:17,23 89:9 91:2 96:13 98:1,9 102:19 103:11 110:23 116:22 118:23 123:4 126:16 <b>think</b> 4:6 5:18 7:15 8:14 15:1,14 23:19 30:19,20 42:10,16 44:8,11 44:19 48:23 52:25 53:3,9 54:23 55:1 55:3,12,12 57:1 57:15 58:15 60:13 60:15,23 61:4 63:3 64:2 70:12 71:15,20 72:25 73:3,5,13,17,19 75:1,3,15,17,22 79:2 80:20 81:11	82:21,24 83:3 86:15 88:2,25 89:17,20 90:8 91:21 92:10,12,13 93:8,10,19 94:7 95:6,9,15 96:7 97:9 98:6,11,12 98:13,18,18 99:5 99:7 101:6,7,15 102:1,17,23 105:15 107:9 108:19,21 109:3 109:18,21,24 111:23 113:22 114:1,1,15,17 115:6,21,23 116:5 117:15 118:2,6,11 121:8,10,14 122:4 122:8,18 123:14 125:2,24 126:3,15 127:9,23 129:1,9 129:17,24 130:4 130:11 <b>thinking</b> 5:12 93:19 97:14 98:24 99:11 104:7 108:14 109:2 123:8 <b>thinks</b> 75:13 <b>third</b> 103:24 114:6 <b>thirty</b> 9:6 <b>thomas</b> 2:9 3:4 4:6 4:11 38:25 47:4 57:15 101:25 112:4 113:5,22 115:1 117:20 120:8 <b>thought</b> 84:21 96:4 101:20 103:18 104:19 108:4 <b>thoughts</b> 6:23 89:14 108:23 <b>three</b> 12:18 35:12 35:19 37:2,7 43:12 44:15 59:16 103:3 108:7,10
--	---	---	---	---

111:5 113:18 115:25 117:11 119:3 123:8 124:2 126:7 127:17 <b>threequarters</b> 76:23 96:9 <b>threeweek</b> 103:21 <b>threshold</b> 12:22 13:1,6 16:20 20:19,25 28:10 31:22 49:15 66:23 <b>thresholds</b> 28:18 <b>throttled</b> 67:23 <b>throw</b> 119:25 127:19 <b>thursdays</b> 126:24 <b>time</b> 6:19,23 21:16 21:17 24:9 28:4 43:9 45:4 55:19 57:22 58:2 60:19 61:10,16,23 68:21 81:12 85:25 97:24 101:13 104:21 105:3,6,6 109:18 109:20,21,21 112:14 113:15 115:15,21 118:11 119:13,18 123:23 124:18 125:3 127:11 129:10 130:2 131:6 <b>timeline</b> 106:6 <b>times</b> 30:22 75:4,4 <b>timing</b> 123:18 125:8 <b>tod</b> 89:16 <b>today</b> 40:13 49:25 57:17 58:10 62:6 63:9,16 71:4 113:12 <b>tomorrow</b> 27:18 28:24 <b>tonight</b> 5:2 6:5 7:1 7:20 14:20,22 39:16 101:1 102:11 104:2,4	<b>tons</b> 20:17,22 49:16 <b>tool</b> 76:18 <b>top</b> 108:14 <b>topic</b> 15:16 17:15 19:22 65:21 67:1 98:23 100:3 <b>topics</b> 13:15 122:21 129:19 <b>tossed</b> 43:19 <b>total</b> 20:3,10 91:14 91:18 116:24 122:9 <b>totally</b> 91:25 <b>touched</b> 7:12 <b>touching</b> 5:17 <b>tough</b> 61:10 <b>tour</b> 81:2 <b>tours</b> 8:20 <b>tout</b> 129:10 <b>town</b> 44:9,25 49:21 68:7 97:13 113:23 <b>tracks</b> 79:20,23 80:19,22 81:4,4 <b>tradeoffs</b> 80:6 <b>traffic</b> 16:24 23:15 27:4,5,15 28:13 29:5,6 31:9 32:6 40:1 46:18,21 52:15 53:5,7,8,9 53:12,14,22,23 54:10 55:5,10 56:7,12 58:7 59:12 60:6,19,25 61:2 62:12 63:14 63:16 65:17 66:24 66:24 70:15,19,22 90:14 99:1,13 <b>train</b> 61:14 79:20 79:22,23 80:22 81:4 <b>trained</b> 19:11 <b>training</b> 18:17 <b>transcribing</b> 6:21 <b>transcript</b> 1:16 <b>transit</b> 31:19 64:10 89:16,25	<b>transportation</b> 2:10 6:9 26:23,24 27:1 30:9,24 31:18 33:2 36:7 45:22 59:1,25 64:6,16 65:4 80:17 90:10,14 <b>travel</b> 111:21 <b>traveled</b> 17:2,8 <b>travesty</b> 43:7 <b>treated</b> 6:25 <b>treatment</b> 26:18 <b>trees</b> 41:9,23 42:3 <b>tremendous</b> 101:14 101:16 <b>trends</b> 25:14 <b>trial</b> 66:13,15 <b>trials</b> 65:22 <b>tried</b> 7:15 8:16 89:20 <b>trip</b> 46:9 61:11,11 61:14,21,22,24 64:5,14 74:9 <b>tripped</b> 66:14 <b>trips</b> 36:8,15 37:3,6 60:23 61:13,19,22 62:4,6,11,11,14 62:19,23 63:5 <b>truck</b> 42:4 <b>true</b> 72:12 76:14 87:10 115:11 131:7 <b>try</b> 44:18 65:13,15 70:6 104:22 115:24 128:6,23 <b>trying</b> 37:22 62:25 63:21 65:11 82:16 95:2 97:10 109:4 109:15 <b>tuning</b> 77:1 <b>tunnels</b> 79:19,19 <b>turn</b> 24:5 29:13 <b>turns</b> 89:18 <b>tv</b> 14:22 <b>tweaked</b> 102:20 <b>twelve</b> 8:14 72:2	<b>twenty</b> 9:6 45:7 <b>two</b> 13:19 16:4 35:4 35:13 36:1 37:12 44:8 53:21 74:5 102:10 103:20 108:7,9 113:17 114:6 117:2,3,11 117:12,14,22 118:3 119:5,8,9 119:11,24,24 124:12,13,13,24 127:14 128:6 <b>twothirds</b> 41:18 <b>type</b> 7:25 15:23 18:25 20:2 22:10 23:22 24:23 28:21 37:20 48:4 51:2 64:17 65:4 78:10 78:15 84:16 102:6 <b>types</b> 16:10 21:12 23:18,18 32:25 56:12 64:23 74:23 83:25 98:2,16 <b>typically</b> 12:18 16:16 30:7 50:11 55:25 56:24,24 57:1 58:18 93:17 111:23 119:2 120:5 127:1	<b>unclear</b> 80:12 <b>undercrossing</b> 80:18,24 <b>undersigned</b> 131:4 <b>understand</b> 7:17 37:25 41:18,20 44:8 56:20 62:19 96:18 109:14 <b>understanding</b> 57:5 70:14 104:2 <b>understood</b> 70:12 80:18 <b>underutilized</b> 69:18 <b>unfortunately</b> 40:21 43:13 <b>union</b> 100:4 <b>unique</b> 79:2 <b>unit</b> 78:5 90:8 <b>united</b> 94:17 <b>units</b> 67:16 78:7 81:16,17 82:3 <b>university</b> 31:15 <b>unknown</b> 85:24 <b>unnecessary</b> 119:23 <b>unquote</b> 53:7 <b>unrealistic</b> 33:12 <b>upcoming</b> 5:6 129:11 <b>upgraded</b> 14:21 <b>upgrades</b> 86:14 <b>upshot</b> 59:23 <b>uptodate</b> 84:15 <b>upzoning</b> 89:10 <b>urban</b> 23:22 116:3 <b>urge</b> 53:18 <b>use</b> 5:14 10:3 20:7 22:2 26:1 41:12 42:4,6,6 45:6 49:24 56:19 57:16 64:9 68:3,16 70:15 92:10 98:16 121:11 <b>useful</b> 72:21 73:20 74:21 88:3 90:22
---	--	---	--	---

98:20 <b>uses</b> 21:12 22:10,12 47:25 83:9,25 <b>utilities</b> 24:25 40:6 <b>utilized</b> 33:25	<b>vinces</b> 93:24 99:12 <b>violation</b> 16:8 32:4 32:8 <b>virtue</b> 67:23 <b>vision</b> 8:14 33:24 69:15 97:7,9 109:2 122:7,13 <b>visioning</b> 8:12 121:19 122:25 <b>voice</b> 37:14 <b>volatility</b> 113:25 <b>volume</b> 54:18 63:15 100:17 <b>volumes</b> 27:5 28:13 60:19 62:13 <b>vote</b> 54:2 55:2 107:7,8 125:13 130:14 <b>voting</b> 106:14 <b>vs</b> 91:17	127:21 129:4 <b>wants</b> 45:10 <b>warm</b> 96:11 97:4 <b>warrants</b> 61:2 <b>wasnt</b> 24:21 48:7 54:17 69:1 75:7 112:20 <b>wastewater</b> 26:18 <b>watch</b> 127:24 <b>watching</b> 14:20 <b>water</b> 21:23 26:6,8 26:8,11,18 <b>way</b> 11:10,15 30:7 31:17 34:12 37:5 40:14 47:17 51:8 51:8 54:25 62:22 66:1 67:11 70:7 70:18 72:10 80:3 80:7 81:8 88:1 89:6 93:19 96:16 97:7 101:15 102:20 106:23,24 110:16 115:2 124:16 125:15 130:4 131:10 <b>ways</b> 81:7 <b>wear</b> 41:2 <b>wearing</b> 41:3 <b>web</b> 8:18 <b>website</b> 129:20 <b>wed</b> 7:3 60:13 84:2 96:25 126:1 <b>week</b> 106:19 109:17,25 110:3 113:24 114:5 115:8,8,9 117:2,3 117:5,6,7,8 120:10 124:12 127:11 128:9 <b>weekend</b> 111:24 <b>weekends</b> 115:13 <b>weeks</b> 52:8 102:10 109:17 115:24,25 116:25 119:3,8,9 119:24 123:8 124:13,24 127:11	127:14,17 128:6 <b>weigh</b> 111:9 <b>welcome</b> 38:17 102:13 129:16 <b>went</b> 31:11 43:11 43:19 81:2 83:22 116:3,4 122:14 <b>west</b> 79:14,24 80:2 94:12 95:7 <b>weve</b> 7:12,15 8:10 8:16,16,22,24,25 12:3 19:5 22:22 28:2 34:15 42:15 44:3 51:3 66:7 76:6,16,18 102:21 103:24 116:20 117:9 127:4 <b>whats</b> 5:9,12 20:12 41:4 45:1 49:24 50:3 66:8 67:25 75:18 83:6 84:5 91:24 94:4 95:3 95:16 96:18 97:1 97:1,22 105:4,4 105:12 126:15 <b>whatsoever</b> 33:18 <b>whereof</b> 131:15 <b>whiz</b> 43:21 <b>whos</b> 29:1 <b>widen</b> 30:7 31:14 67:8 <b>widened</b> 9:8 <b>widening</b> 30:8 65:11 66:4 68:9 <b>widens</b> 69:10 <b>wider</b> 41:9 74:22 <b>wild</b> 52:11 <b>willing</b> 126:23 <b>willows</b> 53:23 54:10 55:5,10 56:16 <b>window</b> 43:20 <b>winter</b> 113:11 <b>witness</b> 131:15 <b>wonder</b> 55:19 99:15 120:12	<b>wondered</b> 59:6 <b>wonderful</b> 44:2 <b>wondering</b> 45:23 53:22 54:5 74:13 82:23 <b>word</b> 11:1 25:2 109:20 128:24 <b>words</b> 96:10 97:4 97:10 <b>work</b> 9:3 66:5 73:21 92:21 101:21 104:15 106:2 108:13 119:11,17 121:9 <b>worked</b> 35:3 115:11 <b>working</b> 44:19,20 88:15 98:10 104:21 <b>works</b> 41:24 47:17 <b>workshop</b> 75:4 122:5,5,6,11 <b>workshops</b> 22:15 75:5 109:9 114:10 121:24 122:2,16 122:25 126:25 <b>worse</b> 36:9 <b>worth</b> 26:10,24 33:20 50:13 55:13 59:21 67:3 82:25 90:12 <b>worthy</b> 99:19 <b>wouldnt</b> 24:25 25:9 26:17 40:16 46:12 49:2 54:20 66:13 122:23,24 <b>wow</b> 95:11 <b>wrap</b> 123:4 <b>wrapped</b> 72:7 115:3 <b>wraps</b> 119:17 <b>wrapup</b> 103:6 125:19 <b>write</b> 111:15 <b>writing</b> 6:20,24 38:9 39:21
<b>V</b> <b>vacant</b> 79:8 <b>vacation</b> 107:1 114:8 115:10 120:7 <b>vague</b> 94:3 <b>valid</b> 59:2 61:4 <b>validating</b> 125:20 <b>value</b> 100:24 <b>variables</b> 85:24 86:20 <b>variation</b> 71:1 <b>various</b> 62:13 63:20 74:2 77:14 77:15 82:4 97:24 104:3 125:17 <b>vary</b> 47:16 118:22 <b>vehicle</b> 16:24 17:2 17:6,8 32:6 61:11 61:16,23 62:18,20 74:8 80:8 <b>vehicles</b> 16:6 17:19 61:18 <b>verbally</b> 6:19 <b>verified</b> 25:20 27:3 <b>versus</b> 28:10,21 33:3 50:4 57:7,10 62:19 82:3,9 83:25 88:17 121:3 <b>viable</b> 70:2 <b>vibrancy</b> 34:8 36:25 97:11 <b>vibration</b> 23:6,7 <b>vice</b> 2:4 <b>vicinity</b> 79:21 <b>view</b> 79:2,6,13 87:8 97:24 <b>village</b> 34:9 44:9 97:11 <b>vincent</b> 2:4	<b>W</b> <b>wait</b> 42:25 112:12 114:6 118:13 <b>waiting</b> 105:16 <b>walking</b> 8:20 <b>walls</b> 23:20,22 32:25 <b>want</b> 5:24,24 6:17 35:16,17 37:16 39:4,10 42:2 44:10 53:2,16 65:19 76:1,9,10 81:10 86:12 87:17 93:7 100:14,14 101:15 105:15 110:4 112:19 116:16 118:19 128:6 129:24 130:1 <b>wanted</b> 4:24 49:4 49:12 70:8 75:25 84:21 99:21 104:14 112:2,4 113:10,13 124:21 125:8 126:22			



<b>written</b> 125:12,16	<b>zoning</b> 8:11 33:18	<b>385</b> 62:4		
<b>wrong</b> 76:15,16	34:17,19 44:6	<b>39</b> 3:5		
<b>wrote</b> 52:9 101:21	59:15 81:19,22,23			
<hr/> <b>X</b> <hr/>	82:2,4,8 83:25	<hr/> <b>4</b> <hr/>		
	89:4	<b>4</b> 20:19 25:25 49:15		
<hr/> <b>Y</b> <hr/>	<hr/> <b>0</b> <hr/>	74:18 75:3		
<b>yeah</b> 30:19 51:5	<b>000</b> 26:2 63:4,5	<b>40</b> 130:21		
52:19 61:15 63:12	<b>05</b> 2:18	<b>420</b> 81:16		
75:14 91:4 95:10	<hr/> <b>1</b> <hr/>	<b>45</b> 3:6		
105:9 110:17	<b>1</b> 26:2 90:7	<b>47</b> 34:22 82:5		
111:10 114:25	<b>100</b> 63:4	<b>4th</b> 110:3 115:8,22		
119:2,16,21 122:1	<b>101</b> 3:7	117:4,5 128:9		
122:11,13,15	<b>11th</b> 126:15	<hr/> <b>5</b> <hr/>		
123:21 129:1	<b>13</b> 62:4	<b>5</b> 14:3 17:14 20:16		
<b>year</b> 19:23 20:18	<b>1300</b> 60:17 64:25	20:22,22 23:9		
26:9,11,16 47:19	<b>13th</b> 124:15	38:8 49:18,18		
106:7 115:15	<b>14th</b> 127:15	<b>500</b> 101:12		
116:19 122:10	<b>1950s</b> 40:4	<b>50s</b> 40:11		
129:8,8,9	<hr/> <b>2</b> <hr/>	<b>5527</b> 1:25 2:21		
<b>years</b> 9:6 26:11,15	<b>200</b> 63:5 96:10	131:20		
26:16 40:18 43:12	<b>2009</b> 122:5	<b>5th</b> 110:4		
45:7 48:13 55:18	<b>2011</b> 1:17 2:18 14:6	<hr/> <b>6</b> <hr/>		
55:18 70:18,25	131:18	<b>6</b> 1:17 2:18 3:4		
71:3,13 72:19	<b>2035</b> 70:11	20:19 40:4 49:15		
95:20 97:6 101:9	<b>20th</b> 6:21 14:3 38:8	<b>627</b> 126:12,13		
111:5,17,20 116:4	102:15	<b>66</b> 34:24		
<b>yield</b> 25:20 57:6	<b>22nd</b> 113:3 129:6	<b>680</b> 67:15 81:17		
<b>youd</b> 4:19 6:22	<b>25</b> 71:13 72:19	82:9,23		
112:13,15	<b>25th</b> 126:15	<hr/> <b>7</b> <hr/>		
<b>youre</b> 15:12 16:11	<b>25year</b> 27:24	<b>7</b> 2:18 17:15		
16:11 21:10,16,17	<b>280</b> 53:10	<b>701</b> 1:19 2:19		
21:17,20 28:6,8	<b>28th</b> 124:15,16	<b>74</b> 35:9		
30:6 37:9,9 45:4	127:15	<hr/> <b>8</b> <hr/>		
63:19 66:24	<b>29th</b> 13:25	<b>8</b> 20:16		
109:24 111:3	<hr/> <b>3</b> <hr/>	<b>822</b> 114:7		
113:9 116:15	<b>3</b> 25:11 77:22 85:2	<b>83</b> 35:10		
123:16 129:16	<b>30</b> 14:3 38:8	<b>85</b> 90:7		
<b>youve</b> 64:25 96:8	<b>30th</b> 127:15	<hr/> <b>9</b> <hr/>		
<b>yu</b> 2:7 45:21 53:21	<b>320</b> 81:18 82:9,11	<b>9</b> 130:21		
55:1 56:14 57:12	82:21			
98:23 120:3,9	<b>326</b> 77:14			
121:7 129:17	<b>330</b> 83:7			
<hr/> <b>Z</b> <hr/>	<b>333</b> 84:23			
<b>zone</b> 93:16				
<b>zones</b> 15:20				