

From: [David Coale](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Cc: [Shikada, Ed](#); [Star-Lack, Sylvia](#)
Subject: Bike lanes on El Camino
Date: Wednesday, March 13, 2024 8:52:40 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

Dear Commissioners and Staff,

I support bike lanes on El Camino. As a cyclist, I have been struggling with this for a while now as my concerns are similar to many Commission members – how will this really make El Camino safer? In particular, how does this address the major causes of cycling crashes (80%), the right hook or broadside crash?

By removing parking on El Camino, this will improve visibility and sight lines for cyclist and car drivers. With the addition of protected bike lanes, this will help bring attention to motorist about the presence of cyclist in this corridor. This should help address the major cause of cycling crashes on El Camino.

Reducing the speed of traffic on El Camino will also make this route safer. The easiest way to address this is to reduce the width of the left two travel lanes to 10.5 feet. Reducing lane width has been shown to decrease speeds in these situations. The right most lane would then have more room for the bike lanes and bus stops. As I understand it, VTA has OKed the reduced width of the left two travel lanes, but Caltrain is still using there old guidelines of 11 feet.

Here is where Palo Alto can make El Camino even safer: Approve the removal of parking on El Camino on the condition that the left two travel lanes are 10.5 feet wide. This will reduce the car speed and increase width of the right lane to better accommodate bike lanes and bus stops. This additional reduction in lane width is also called for as 30% of all crashes on El Camino, from San Jose to SF (as I understand it) are in Palo Alto, so this calls for additional road treatments for safety measures in Palo Alto.

Should Palo Alto decide not to support these free safety improvements, that could be completed within a year's time, Palo Alto will be liable for crashes in this corridor.

Please note again, that these improvements are free to Palo Alto and will done in short order. While not perfect, Palo Alto could never come up with other improvements, of any kind, to address safety on El Camino for many years. This is a great start.

Please do not miss this opportunity to make El Camino safer for all road users.

David Coale

From: [Cedric de La Beaujardiere](#)
To: PABACPaloAlto@googlegroups.com; [Planning Commission](#); [Human Relations Commission](#)
Subject: Estimated coverage % by type for ECR Bike Lanes
Date: Thursday, March 14, 2024 1:04:58 AM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

Esteemed Planning & Transportation and Human Relations Commissioners,
CC Pedestrian And Bicycle Advisory Committee (PABAC) Members,

I virtually attended the joint PTC & HRC Study Session on CalTrans draft plans to add bike lanes on El Camino Real. In my public comments I threw out a number, which I meant to preface with the word "approximately", that 80% of the "protected" bike lanes are actually not protected. That was a very rough estimate derived from a quick look at the plans on the walls shown at the community meeting held at Paly. Since in my hasty look at my notes I forgot the word "approximately" and since that number was later quoted by some of the commissioners I thought I should make and share a more accurate estimate. Looking at the [draft 2024.01.22 plans available online](#), at a zoom level on my monitor such that 1" = 100', I measured the lengths of total ECR lengths through Palo Alto (page by page) and the lengths of dashed bike lanes, length of sharrowed area, lengths without any markings nor buffers, and lengths on Stanford paths. From this I calculated percentages of each type of coverage and conclude that, for the length of ECR through Palo Alto:

30% is protected bike lanes

49% is dashed bike lanes (representing conflicts with roads, driveways and right-turn lanes)

4% is sharrowed lanes (sharrows = Share the Road Arrows)

7% is Stanford paths

10% is no lane markings

I welcome you to review my estimates and to let me know if you see any significant errors taking into account the rough nature of this estimate with a ruler on a computer monitor. The table can be found here:

https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/u/2/d/e/2PACX-1vSBgI23vvS9dNsHVsnQ7sTRyDmizfrUmE7rcmGqVGv5LZWqQVwRHFjnMm1x95d2B_cwKspwC-lqvPlj/pubhtml

Regards,
Cedric de La Beaujardiere

(PS PABAC is CC'd because of their interest in this topic, but I don't know what happens if non-members message the PABAC list, they might just bounce. Commissioners are probably discouraged from replying to all anyways due to the Brown Act. I am a member of PABAC but representing only myself.)

From: [Aram James](#)
To: michael.gennaco@oirgroup.com; [Anjie, Palo Alto Renters Association](#); [Braden Cartwright](#); [Cecilia Taylor](#); [Cindy Chavez](#); [Council, City](#); [D Martell](#); [Dave Price](#); [Dennis Upton](#); [EPA Today](#); [Ed Lauing](#); [Emily Mibach](#); [Friends of Cubberley](#); [Greer Stone](#); [Greg Tanaka](#); [Human Relations Commission](#); [Jeff Moore](#); [Joe Simitian](#); [Julie Lythcott-Haims](#); [Kaloma Smith](#); [Karen Holman](#); [Lewis James](#); [Lotus Fong](#); [Zelkha, Mila](#); [Van Der Zwaag, Minka](#); [ParkRec Commission](#); [Planning Commission](#); [Raymond Goins](#); [Roberta Ahlquist](#); [Rose Lynn](#); [Sean Allen](#); [Shikada, Ed](#); [Supervisor Otto Lee](#); [Supervisor Susan Ellenberg](#); [Vara Ramakrishnan](#); [WILPF Peninsula Palo Alto](#); [Perron, Zachary](#); [dennis burns](#); district1@bos.sccgov.org; [ladoris cordell](#); [walter wilson](#)
Subject: Valley Water Board Censures Director Eisenberg for Abusive Comments By Barry Holtzclaw / 7 hours ago
Date: Thursday, March 14, 2024 11:11:17 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

Valley Water Board Censures Director Eisenberg for Abusive Comments

By Barry Holtzclaw / 7 hours ago

<https://www.sanjoseinside.com/news/valley-water-board-censures-director-eisenberg-for-abusive-comments/>

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Council, City](#)
Cc: [Planning Commission](#); pabacpaloalto@googlegroups.com
Subject: San Antonio Road -- Managing Existing and Future Traffic Impacts
Date: Monday, March 18, 2024 11:22:28 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

Honorable City Council Members,

Re: San Antonio Road -- Managing Existing and Future Traffic Impacts

Here is Mountain View's North Bayshore Precise Plan (P39—Nov. 25, 2014) and its gateway plan (referencing San Antonio Road in Palo Alto as a gateway). This document is worth briefly perusing if you have not already seen it before tonight.

<https://www.mountainview.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/4406/638214110650830000>

Please note the gateway connectivity is mapped on p. 151 and gateway concepts for MV gateways follow that. Portions of this plan are helpful to Palo Altans who are trying to understand what's happening with regional bike/transit connectivity. Here are all of the materials related to this process for those who are interested. <https://www.mountainview.gov/our-city/departments/community-development/planning/regulations/precise-plans/north-bayshore-precise-plan>

From some reading this weekend, I learned that when City Council approved plans for the 788 San Antonio TOD housing project on November 16, 2020, they also approved a Comp Plan change, and certified a Final EIR that also applies to future TOD housing projects on the block of San Antonio between Charleston and Middlefield which are now moving into and through the planning/approval pipeline. While I support creating new housing at this location, I am very concerned about what appears to be a failure to incorporate requirements for ROW for future San Antonio Road bicycle facilities and bus transit in these TOD projects. The traffic study for 788 San Antonio allowed continued use of sharrows on San Antonio—a contraindicated bicycle facility for a multi-lane road with these auto volumes and speeds. Also, it is important to consider that San Antonio is, and will continue to be, a truck route. **Question I have asked staff:** Will all of the projects on that corridor also get only sharrows? Did any of this ever come to PABAC for review? When?

According to Action Minutes, at the time of the 788 San Antonio Project approval in 2020, Council voted to direct staff to “return with the parameters for a San Antonio Corridor transportation study.” I searched for a transportation study and could not find one. If TOD projects continue to be approved on San Antonio with sharrows and street parking, the city will have to fight future building occupants for street parking removal to get ROW to create room for appropriate bike/ped/transit facilities in a TOD area. (If we have learned nothing else from the recent El Camino Real debacle, I hope we have learned that bike/ped transit facilities need to be built at the SAME time new development and parking decisions are underway.) A very high density San Antonio Area streetscape that preserves no ROW for future bike facilities or bus transit stops along and across San Antonio Road (as well as connectors like Middlefield which also lacks bike lanes on the San Antonio approach) is not sensible planning. It cannot deliver trip reduction that one would expect and the city needs from TOD.

When I asked staff why no bike facilities (or ROW for bike facilities and bus transit) were incorporated in these TOD Area projects, I was told that “it was impossible to plan bike facilities piecemeal.” However, it appears, **from the 11/16/ 2020 Council Meeting Action Minutes that planning staff was directed not to plan piecemeal for the Charleston to Middlefield portion of San Antonio. They were directed to “return with the parameters for a San Antonio Corridor transportation study.” Did staff follow up on this direction? When? Where can interested citizens find it?**

Our city should be thinking about this corridor in context of Mountain View’s aforementioned Precise Plans as well.

Council also is talking about staff’s Work Plan tonight. If the Transportation Study that Council directed staff to do in 2020 was never done, what action might be taken now to preserve San Antonio Road ROW and plan bike and bus transit facilities before it is too late?

It saddens me to see that Mountain View has been much more forward-thinking than my own city on this matter.

I realize there may be pieces I am missing here. Please do fill me in if that is so.

Thank you in advance for giving my comments your usual thoughtful attention.

Penny Ellson

(speaking as an individual, though I cc my PABAC colleagues and PTC here informationally)



Virus-free www.avg.com

From: [Annette Glanckopf](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: Fw: Bike lanes on El Camino - vote no
Date: Friday, March 22, 2024 1:42:59 PM
Attachments: [Letter on Bike lanes on ECR.docx](#)

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

Here is the letter I sent to Council on the folly of putting bike lanes on ECR.
Annette Glanckopf

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Annette Glanckopf <[REDACTED]>
To: City Council <city.council@cityofpaloalto.org>
Cc: city.clerk@cityofpaloalto.org <city.clerk@cityofpaloalto.org>; Ed Shikada <ed.shikada@cityofpaloalto.org>; Jonathan Lait <jonathan.lait@cityofpaloalto.org>
Sent: Friday, March 22, 2024 at 01:34:43 PM PDT
Subject: Bike lanes on El Camino - vote no

Dear Mayor Stone and Council members,

Please see my attached letter with my full details on why bike lanes on EL Camino Real should be rejected. Menlo Park isn't going to do this, why should we waste this time and money? Use (or enhance) what is already established - a safer faster bike route on Park Blvd.

Annette Glanckopf

PS: I do not agree with consultant's report on the over-de\$\$\$\$ign needed to make this work safely for bikers.

March 22, 2024

Dear Mayor Stone and City Council members.

I want to weigh in on the topic of bike lanes on El Camino. **VOTE NO ON THIS FOLLY.** It is a disaster waiting to happen.

The logic behind creating bikes lanes from Mt. View to Redwood City on El Camino is faulty for many reasons.

1) **Menlo Park** has no plans to do so

2) **Alternative routes:** Little consideration has been given for the optimum alternative route on Park Blvd, just a few blocks off of ECR or even Bryant Street (Palo Alto's official bike boulevard).

3) **Parking:** Small businesses will suffer - just at a time when the city is trying to encourage more retail, especially small independently owned businesses. Yes, some of these businesses do have parking, but is it sufficient? I think not, especially for those customers (elderly, disabled) who want to park in front of the door on ECR. Taking out a huge number of parking spaces in a major mistake. Caltrans counts 600 vehicle parking spots on ECR, but hasn't identified where these vehicles should/could go. I understand that at least about 41 serve as dwellings for some of our neighbors.

4) **Safety:** With the numerous curb cuts, driveways, and streets on ECR, bike lanes are a recipe for disaster, especially with distracted drivers, speeders in a hurry, buses and trucks as well as numerous traffic lights. Note that on Park Blvd, there are only a handful of lights and fewer driveways, streets, etc. to hamper bikers. This Park Blvd alternative route already has bollards (Ventura and near Mollie Stones) for bike safety. This route is much safer and **FASTER** as well. ECR accident reports show that a large majority of serious and fatal accidents between cars and bikes are broadsides, indicating that these accidents occurred when bikes were crossing ECR. This plan does not at all address this real and known fact.

5) **No Answers:** There are numerous unanswered questions that need to be decided/discussed; the answers are uncertain. How do bikes and buses work together at bus stops? Will buses cross bike lanes at each bus stop; this will be a significant safety issue. What portions of the bike lanes will be Class 2? No bike user data, current or projected, has been gathered. I ask how many bikers will actually use ECR, when they realize that a faster, safer route is Park Blvd.?

Finally let's consider the **greater good**. The daily car, bus, and truck traffic is significant on ECR--in the high thousands--while bike traffic would be in the hundreds at best. ECR parking is also used as dwelling spaces. Should we inconvenience the far greater number, when there is an alternative route that is faster and safer.

Please take a strong stand against Caltrans and refuse bike lanes on El Camino.

Annette Glanckopf, Midtown resident

From: [Robert Neff](#)
To: [Council, City; Planning Commission](#)
Subject: El Camino Real Parking Occupancy Survey
Date: Tuesday, March 26, 2024 1:15:02 AM
Attachments: [2024 El Camino Real Parking Occupancy Survey 1p1.pdf](#)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

Dear City Council Members and Planning & Transportation Commissioners,

Attached is a parking occupancy survey completed in February and March, 2024, for El Camino Real. I think you should find this as a complimentary addition to the staff report for the El Camino bike lane improvements proposed by CalTrans, item 11 on April 1 for city council. It includes results from 10 parking occupancy surveys in all, done at night, on weekend days, and on work days, and descriptions of the parking occupancy observed.

I hope this can help inform your decisions.

Thank you for your service to our city of Palo Alto.

--

-- Robert Neff
[REDACTED] ear Loma Verde in Palo Alto.

2024 El Camino Real Parking Occupancy Survey

Robert Neff¹

3/25/2024

Version 1.1

Background

Since early 2023, when CalTrans presented the city of Palo Alto with a proposal to implement bicycle lanes and infrastructure for bicycle and pedestrian safety on El Camino Real, the city has not formally analyzed the use of street parking on El Camino Real. The author is not aware of any systematic approach to parking on ECR, especially with the myriad different restrictions that exist along the street, from completely unrestricted sections, except for the city 72 hour rule, to time of day rules, no parking in some blocks, and 2 hour parking during the day in others. At the same time, the author is not aware of any plan or survey of current street parking use. Who or what is parked on El Camino Real, and what is the hardship if this parking is removed to make way for transportation infrastructure like bicycle lanes.

Parking appears to be a resource that the city gives away freely to any user, even if the use is simply for long term parking of storage trailers, or a permanently parked vehicle with a sign mounted on top for advertising.

In January 2024, the Pedestrian Bicycle Advisory Committee (PABAC) asked the city to conduct a parking survey to support decision making for the CalTrans proposal. This was done in Los Altos when that city developed its plans for removing parking in favor of bicycle lanes. With such a survey it is easier to understand how and when the street parking is used.

This volunteer effort began when no substantial work in this area was proposed by city staff before mid-February. The current city report developed for the April 1, 2024 council meeting has only a weekend and early morning survey. The data here includes multiple surveys done in the daytime on both work days and weekends, as well as late evening surveys. It gives information about daytime parking occupancy, especially on a work day or school day that is a complimentary addition to the parking occupancy reported in the city report.

Note that this survey indicates current use, but does not try to assess parking alternatives. For example, several businesses near Charleston have large private parking lots, yet encourage workers, or customers to park for free on the street. Near California Avenue, there is an abundance of parking available in the new city parking lot. The city report has more detail about on-site parking and limited parking parcels which give a fuller understanding.

¹ Frank Viggiano also helped with data gathering. The author is a longtime resident, member of PABAC, and representative for Palo Alto to the VTA Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory Committee.
Email: [REDACTED]

This survey covers from the city border at Los Altos Avenue north to the PAMF traffic signal beyond Embarcadero Road.

Methodology

The parking survey methodology consisted of:

1. Gathering estimates of parking capacity along El Camino Real. CalTrans had some preliminary street survey data. This was augmented by observational data. In a few blocks more parking was observed than computed by CalTrans.
2. Driving the corridor with a dashcam on, and counting the parked cars observed. A total of 10 surveys were done. 3 in the late evening, 2 during workdays, and 5 on weekend days. The survey drives took approximately 1 hour to make, plus additional time to tabulate.
3. Data was tabulated by looking at average occupancy for each type of survey, and compared to available parking. Parking occupancy was computed by block, though there is a wide range of block sizes along the corridor, with from 1 to 60 parking spaces, but most blocks have fewer than 8 parking spaces.
4. Notes about parking restrictions were added to the data. Some blocks near major intersections are marked with no parking, while an ongoing utility project impacted parking availability on some parts of the corridor, particularly on the Northbound side from Portage to Page Mill during daytime surveys.
5. The data was highlighted with color for blocks which experienced higher total occupancy, and colors (Green-Red) for percentage occupancy, to help.

Discussion

Data Survey and Limitations

Ideally sampled data, as done in a survey like this should be done with enough frequency and repetition that one time events and happenstance may be averaged out. The Los Altos survey had surveys over 4 days, and multiple times of day, to obtain a more complete picture. In the case of this survey there are only 2 surveys done during regular weekday business hours, so this is a severe limitation to the data here. Also, the blocks with no parking due to utility construction have incomplete data.

Some events that occupy parking on ECR are one-time. For example, a survey done on a Saturday morning showed 100% occupied parking in the 3 blocks near the Ananda Church between College and Oxford. No other day showed that level of parking occupancy there.

If parking occupancy was not found where a reader knows there is regular use, or infrequent high use, then the survey may not have captured all parking use on the corridor.

Survey Times

Surveys were done on these dates and times:²

2/11/2024	2/19/2024	2/20/2024	2/21/2024	2/22/2024	2/24/2024	2/25/2024	2/28/2024	3/18/2024	3/23/2024
Sunday	Monday (Hol)	Tues	Wed	Thu	Sat	Sun	Wed	Monday	Saturday
3:25 PM	5:31 PM	10:11 PM	10:10 PM	10:22 PM	9:14 AM	5:21 PM	5:06 PM	9:30 AM	3:25 PM

2/19/24 is President's day, so is grouped with weekend day data.

² Survey time is the end of the survey. Start is ~ 25 minutes earlier.

Tabulated Results

The full spreadsheet with parking availability and occupancy survey data is linked in the references. This is color coded showing:

1. Green to Red for percentage occupancy. Green below 25%, reddish above 50%. A 100% occupancy may not be significant if is only one space, adjacent to a lightly used block.
2. Note the column headers. The 2nd pair is maximum occupancy in **any** survey
3. Reduced Parking note indicates blocks impacted by construction, during at least one of the surveys. No parking indicates permanent no parking.

Block Start	Block End	Capacity	All Surveys Avg Occupancy		All Survey Peak Occupancy		Night Avg Occupancy		Weekday Day Avg Occupancy.		Weekend Day Avg Occupancy		
			Simple Average of all 10.		All - Max of any survey.		3 surveys		2 surveys		5 surveys		
			Average Number	Average Pct	Peak Number	Peak Pct	Avg	Pct	Avg	Pct	Avg	Pct	No Parking?
Northbound													
Country Inn	Cesano	2	0.38	18.75%	2.00	100.00%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	0.60	30.00%	
Cesano	Monroe	3	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	
Monroe	Dinahs Ct.	9	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	
Dinahs Ct.	Deodar St	15	3.88	25.83%	7.00	46.67%	4.33	28.89%	3.00	20.00%	3.00	20.00%	
Deodar St	Rickeys	0											No Parking
Rickeys	Char/Aras.	0											No Parking
W. Charleston/ Arastra.	EC Way	10	1.70	17.00%	3.00	30.00%	2.00	20.00%	2.50	25.00%	1.00	10.00%	
EC Way	Vista Crosswalk	22	4.20	19.09%	13.00	59.09%	1.00	4.55%	5.00	22.73%	4.83	21.97%	
Vista crosswalk	EC Way/Los Robles	20	9.60	48.00%	20.00	100.00%	3.00	15.00%	16.50	82.50%	9.00	45.00%	

EC Way/Los Robles	Ventura	11	1.56	14.14%	5.00	45.45%	0.33	3.03%	3.00	27.27%	1.67	15.15%	
Ventura	Curtner	7	2.00	28.57%	4.00	57.14%	1.67	23.81%	3.00	42.86%	1.50	21.43%	
Curtner	Wilton	7	1.33	19.05%	3.00	42.86%	0.67	9.52%	2.00	28.57%	1.33	19.05%	
Wilton	Matadero	6	1.30	21.67%	4.00	66.67%	1.00	16.67%	2.00	33.33%	1.00	16.67%	
Matadero	Margarita	1	0.20	20.00%	1.00	100.00%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	0.33	33.33%	
Margarita	Fernando	7	1.30	18.57%	3.00	42.86%	2.00	28.57%	0.00	0.00%	1.17	16.67%	
Fernando	Lambert	12	0.60	5.00%	2.00	16.67%		0.00%	0.00	0.00%	0.60	5.00%	Reduced parking
Lambert	Portage	7	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%		0.00%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	Reduced parking
Portage	Acacia	8	4.67	58.33%	8.00	100.00%	7.00	87.50%		0.00%	1.75	21.88%	Reduced parking
Acacia	Olive	8	1.50	18.75%	4.00	50.00%	0.50	6.25%		0.00%	1.67	20.83%	Reduced parking
Olive	Pepper	0											No Parking
Pepper	Page Mill/Oregon	0											No Parking
Page Mill/Oregon	Sheridan	0											No Parking
Sheridan	Grant	9	0.13	1.39%	1.00	11.11%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	0.20	2.22%	
Grant	Sherman	11	2.33	21.21%	7.00	63.64%	0.00	0.00%	6.00	54.55%	1.80	16.36%	
Sherman	California	9	0.88	9.72%	3.00	33.33%	0.33	3.70%	0.00	0.00%	1.20	13.33%	
California	Cambridge	10	1.00	10.00%	3.00	30.00%	0.00	0.00%	1.50	15.00%	1.17	11.67%	
Cambridge	College	9	1.00	11.11%	8.00	88.89%	0.00	0.00%	0.50	5.56%	1.50	16.67%	
College	Oxford	12	3.00	25.00%	9.00	75.00%	2.67	22.22%	2.00	16.67%	2.83	23.61%	
Oxford	Stanford	9	6.67	74.07%	10.00	111.11%	5.67	62.96%	5.00	55.56%	6.33	70.37%	
Stanford	Leland	5	1.60	32.00%	5.00	100.00%	1.00	20.00%	1.00	20.00%	1.83	36.67%	
Leland	Park	12	3.40	28.33%	9.00	75.00%	1.67	13.89%	9.00	75.00%	1.83	15.28%	
Park	Park/Serra	9	1.70	18.89%	7.00	77.78%	0.00	0.00%	6.50	72.22%	0.67	7.41%	

Park/Serra	Churchill	1	0.20	20.00%	1.00	100.00%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	0.33	33.33%	Mostly No Parking.
Churchill	Embarcadero	70	10.60	15.14%	61.00	87.14%	0.33	0.48%	33.50	47.86%	6.33	9.05%	
Embarcadero	University	0											No Parking
Southbound Read from bottom			All Surveys Avg Occupancy		All Survey Peak Occupancy		Night Avg Occupancy		Weekday Day Avg Occupancy.		Weekend Day Avg Occupancy		
Monroe	Cesano/LA Ave	8	0.20	2.50%	2.00	25.00%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	0.33	4.17%	
Dinahs Ct.	Monroe	2	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	
W. Charleston/Arastra.	Dinahs Ct.	18	5.00	27.78%	15.00	83.33%	2.00	11.11%	7.50	41.67%	4.83	26.85%	
EC Way/Maybe II	W. Charleston/Arastra.	10	3.70	37.00%	9.00	90.00%	0.33	3.33%	5.00	50.00%	4.33	43.33%	
Driscoll	EC Way/Maybe II	13	1.40	10.77%	3.00	23.08%	1.00	7.69%	2.00	15.38%	1.17	8.97%	
Vista crosswalk	Driscoll	8	4.80	60.00%	8.00	100.00%	7.33	91.67%	4.00	50.00%	3.00	37.50%	
Apt Driveway	Vista crosswalk	5	1.40	28.00%	4.00	80.00%	2.00	40.00%	1.50	30.00%	0.83	16.67%	
EC Way/Los Robles	Apt Driveway	7	4.90	70.00%	7.00	100.00%	4.00	57.14%	4.50	64.29%	4.67	66.67%	
Ventura	EC Way/Los Robles	14	10.30	73.57%	12.00	85.71%	10.33	73.81%	10.50	75.00%	8.50	60.71%	
Military	Ventura	4	2.60	65.00%	4.00	100.00%	2.33	58.33%	3.00	75.00%	2.17	54.17%	
Curtner	Military	2	1.40	70.00%	2.00	100.00%	1.00	50.00%	1.50	75.00%	1.33	66.67%	
Barron Xwalk	Curtner	4	1.00	25.00%	4.00	100.00%	0.00	0.00%	0.50	12.50%	1.50	37.50%	

Kendall xwalk	Barron Xwalk	4	2.20	55.00%	4.00	100.00%	1.00	25.00%	2.50	62.50%	2.33	58.33%	
Marg/Matadero	Kendall xwalk	8	1.50	18.75%	3.00	37.50%	1.33	16.67%	0.50	6.25%	1.67	20.83%	
Fernando xwalk	Marg/Matadero	5	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	
Hansen/Portage	Fernando xwalk	10	6.00	60.00%	10.00	100.00%	7.00	70.00%	6.50	65.00%	4.33	43.33%	
Acacia	Hansen/Portage	7	0.29	4.08%	1.00	14.29%	0.00	0.00%	0.50	7.14%	0.20	2.86%	
Olive	Acacia	10	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	Reduced parking
Page Mill/Oregon	Olive	0											No Parking
Soccer Drive	Page Mill/Oregon	0											No Parking
California	Soccer Drive	18	12.20	67.78%	17.00	94.44%	15.33	85.19%	8.50	47.22%	9.83	54.63%	
Cambridge	California	10	0.33	3.33%	1.00	10.00%	0.00	0.00%	0.50	5.00%	0.40	4.00%	
College	Cambridge	6	1.33	22.22%	2.00	33.33%		0.00%	0.00	0.00%	1.33	22.22%	Reduced parking.
Oxford	College	6	2.67	44.44%	6.00	100.00%	0.00	0.00%	3.50	58.33%	3.40	56.67%	
Stanford	Oxford	4	1.56	38.89%	3.00	75.00%	1.00	25.00%	1.00	25.00%	1.80	45.00%	
Park/Serra	Stanford	32	7.00	21.88%	13.00	40.63%	6.33	19.79%	13.00	40.63%	3.60	11.25%	
Churchill	Park/Serra	29	5.89	20.31%	10.00	34.48%	4.67	16.09%	5.00	17.24%	5.80	20.00%	
Embarcadero	Churchill	71	35.33	49.77%	60.00	84.51%	30.67	43.19%	51.50	72.54%	24.60	34.65%	
PAMF	Embarcadero	26	12.56	48.29%	15.00	57.69%	14.00	53.85%	10.00	38.46%	10.20	39.23%	
University	PAMF	0											
			All Surveys Avg Occupancy		All Survey Peak Occupancy		Night Avg Occupancy		Weekday Day Avg Occupancy.		Weekend Day Avg Occupancy		

Kinds of parking uses.

The difference in the daytime and nighttime parking use gives insight into the kinds of use found on ECR.

Nighttime use

In addition to vehicle dwellers, the nighttime use consisted primarily of parked cars adjacent to under-parked developments, taking advantage of unrestricted all day parking, or perhaps just unrestricted overnight parking. This was particularly noted in these locations:

Northbound		
Dinahs Ct.	Deodar St	Overflow from Hyatt Rickeys' development?
Portage	Acacia	Night parking for Campers and storage trailers.
Oxford	Stanford	Oxford->Stanford has no restrictions, permanent car and banner truck storage.
Southbound		Read from bottom
Vista crosswalk	Driscoll	Overflow from Vista Development
EC Way/Los Robles	Apt Driveway	Overflow from Apt. Development (or Buena Vista?)
Ventura	C Way/Los Robles	Overflow from Buena Vista park.
Hansen /Portage	Fernando xwalk	Night parking for Campers and storage trailers.
California	Soccer Drive	Overflow from housing development at night and all hours.
Park/Serra	Stanford	Night parking for Campers, plus workday use.
Churchill	Park/Serra	Night parking for Campers
Embarcadero	Churchill	Night parking for Campers, plus heavy workday use.
PAMF	Embarcadero	Night parking for Campers

Daytime use (weekday or weekend survey) was particularly noted near these locations

Northbound		
EC Way	Vista Crosswalk	Some impact from current construction (Pizza Chicago)
Vista crosswalk	C Way/Los Robles	Excess parking from Palo Alto Commons (located on El Camino Way, parking on ECR.
Grant	Sherman	Weekday parking occupancy.
Cambridge	College	Cambridge to Oxford Peak Parking from an Ananda Church event on a Saturday AM.
Stanford	Leland	Stanford -> Serra: Weekday employee parking, plus evening overflow at restaurant?
Churchill	Embarcadero	Paly 87% parked in only survey during school hours. 61 cars.
Southbound		Read from bottom
Charleston	Dinah's Court	Charleston -> Monroe, mostly near Charleston. Overflow from Hobbie's on Sat AM. Tent in parking lot, so customers on ECR.
EC Way/Maybell	Charleston/Arastuain	Businesses (Walgreens?, car dealers) with parking lots using street parking.

Sections that appear to have limited parking occupancy, or appear to have abundant on-site parking.

Block Start	Block End	
Northbound		
Los Altos City Limits	El Camino Way / Maybell	Typically 6 cars in 40 spaces here.
El Camino Way / Los Robles	Page Mill	Low average parking occupancy observed. A few blocks (Ventura - Curtner, and Matadero - Fernando) may have limited off street parking.
Page Mill	Cambridge	Low parking demand observed with parking available off street on city lots nearby,
Embarcadero	Encina	No parking allowed.
Southbound		Read from bottom
Dinahs Ct.	Los Altos Ave.	Practically zero parking occupancy observed.
Driscoll / El Camino Way / Maybell,	Dinahs Ct.	All businesses have on-site parking.
Page Mill	Portage	Minimal parking occupancy observed,
Oxford	California	Lightly parked. Can businesses share off street resources and garages?

Conclusion

The immediate goal of tabulating this data is to enable Palo Alto City Council, Commissioners, and Residents to make a considered decision regarding parking removal on El Camino Real. Independent of the view of relative value of parking spaces versus travel lanes, the author hopes this information can inform decision makers to understand the impacts of parking removal on current users, and decide if any other actions or mitigations would be needed.

A deeper conclusion requires acknowledging the planning assumption of the past, that the parking on El Camino Real is available for free, and permits under-parked developments, be they apartment buildings, dense Planned-Community development, or new business development. The locations with significant overnight parking on ECR (which were not in use by vehicle dwellers) and many of those most heavily parked during the day were all near developments created in the past 20 years.

References

1. Copy of Los Altos Parking occupancy survey:
https://drive.google.com/file/d/15oOcg8e9CzrXVxTDakz4nzMjr4Vkahs7/view?usp=drive_link
2. Copy of CalTrans parking space survey:
https://drive.google.com/file/d/1LM0e3dNGlePYgr8OrghPUNjkVMjFAung/view?usp=drive_link
3. Link to photo album of the driving surveys:
<https://photos.app.goo.gl/PKv94Ss8EbMnMghs7>
4. Spreadsheet with raw data and occupancy analysis:
<https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1W04b3W7dgAprkfsBxgxLqkhDQoHHHIORsm-Nc7WLP7l/edit?usp=sharing>
5. City of Palo Alto Staff Report for Item 11 at the April 1, 2024 council meeting:
<https://cityofpaloalto.primegov.com/api/compilemeetingattachmenthistory/historyattachment/?historyId=898d4b48-538d-485b-9a01-f83a183b7eeb>

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Cc: [Lait, Jonathan](#)
Subject: retail recommendations
Date: Tuesday, March 26, 2024 2:58:24 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

Dear Commissioners.

I see that you are studying zoning changes to support retail.

They look reasonable, particularly in light of the massive problems outlined in the PPT.

But the most impactful policies in support of retail are missing--

Those are to support more housing in DTN and around Cal Ave proposed by both the ED and retail consultants.

It is the surefire way to boost the number of customers

Re zoning, I strongly support allowing alternative uses and dramatically easing the regulations surrounding applying for permits.

The practical zoning changes can come from the policies applied in the ECR focus area-- talking to property and business owners.

Stephen Levy

From: [Melanie Grondel](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Subject: Survival of neighborhood serving retail.
Date: Wednesday, March 27, 2024 10:35:09 AM

You don't often get email from mel.grondel@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

Dear Commissioners,

I am very concerned about losing neighborhood serving retail while we are creating high density housing which is under parked on purpose to promote ways of transportation other than the use of cars. This is a key problem in the area of California, Avenue, our second downtown.

* Retail rent and leases need to reflect neighborhood pricing not Santana Row pricing so neighborhood serving retail can survive and thrive. This is a necessary community benefit. Programs to deal with this issue are a necessity.

*Prevent death spiral of empty storefronts. Example in case. The empty former Nuthouse property is now to be joined across the street by a proposed gym to be built, while loosing 3 thriving businesses that will result in empty store fronts for several years to come while the new project is under consideration and under construction. In addition there is the very large Mollie Stone highrise project proposed to be built right down the street. Temporary measures need to be made mandatory to preserve the retail environment while development projects are being realized.

*There needs to be a strategy to develop a variety of" pop-up shops for existing and new business, to retain neighborhood serving retail during project construction. Family retail cannot survive a 5 year hiatus while projects are being planned and realized.

Thank you for your consideration. - Melanie Grondel - College Terrace, PA