

PAWG Meeting 7 Summary Attachment 3: PAWG Assessment of Conceptual Parking Design Options

**Hawthorns Area Public Access Working Group**  
**PAWG Assessment of Concept Parking Design Options – Finalized 6/13/24**  
*Hawthorns Area Plan*

Following their March meeting and at the request of the project team in coordination with the PAWG co-chairs, PAWG members were asked to assess the Hawthorns Area conceptual parking design options 7 through 9 using the six criteria per the Board approved goals for the Hawthorns Area project. The goals can be found on the project website at [openspace.org/hawthorns](https://openspace.org/hawthorns). The PAWG members will assess option 10 separately after the June 13<sup>th</sup> meeting packet is published, and the summary of their input will be shared during the meeting.

Below are tables that compile and summarize the input received on parking design options 7, 8, 9 and 10. Comments on options 7 – 9 were received in May 2024 from 12 of the 13 voting PAWG members, prior to the posting of 6/13 PAWG meeting agenda packet. Comments on option 10 were received in June 2024 from 9 of the 13 voting PAWG members, after the posting of 6/13 PAWG meeting agenda packet.

Note: Roman numerals in parentheses after certain comments indicate the number of similar mentions from other PAWG members.

**Parking Option 7 (in Hawthorns Meadow):**

Project Design Assessment Criterion	Supports (pros)	Concerns (cons)
Natural Resources Protection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Leverages pre-existing impacts on landscape by using paved driveway and pre-existing fire road (III)</li> <li>• Limited grading required (II)</li> <li>• The area has been used for parking in the past</li> <li>• Phased parking design may require fewer parking spaces overall and allows analysis of usage before increasing total number of parking spaces</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Destroys the ecological integrity of the large Hawthorns Meadow and creates a new and ongoing high disturbance area (VI)</li> <li>• Greatest amount of paved area. The driveway into the preserve is much longer and steeper. Too much roadway, construction and usage. (VI)</li> <li>• Putting parking in the middle of the preserve (V)</li> <li>• Largest negative impact to the natural resources (IV)</li> <li>• Disrupts wildlife movement with noise, pollutants (IV)</li> <li>• This is an unacceptable option to consider (III)</li> <li>• Greatest amount of tree and vegetation removal (III)</li> <li>• Disturbs sensitive grasslands habitat and plant community at the site (II)</li> <li>• May impact milkweed patch for monarch butterflies by compacting the soil or introducing pollutants (II)</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Disturbs tranquility of the location (II)</li> <li>• Greatest amount of utility improvements</li> <li>• Larger vector for introductions of invasive species and pathogens</li> </ul>
Driveway Access Point and Traffic Safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OK, safer access point for vehicles and cyclists than option 8 (VI)</li> <li>• Close to Portola Road three-way stop intersection, bicycle and cars are still moving slowly (III)</li> <li>• Driveway near the town’s commercial centers signal drivers to slow down and alert cyclists to exercise caution (III)</li> <li>• Higher visibility for ingress and egress, since the area has limited shade along Alpine Road (II)</li> <li>• There is no conflict with Hillbrook Drive as there is with option 8</li> <li>• Closer to an existing pedestrian crosswalk to cross Alpine Road than option 8, reducing the likelihood of pedestrians crossing Alpine Road without a crosswalk</li> <li>• Uses existing driveway</li> <li>• Good lines of sight</li> <li>• Reduces construction requirements</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Multiple entry points to Alpine Road on opposite side near this point, adds traffic complexity</li> <li>• Steep slopes on the driveway could result in poor visibility for small cars. This could become a safety hazard depending on the specific location of the trail crossing</li> <li>• Hikers may walk along roadside to reach Alpine Road or certain trails</li> </ul>
Visitor Experience in the Preserve	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The experience at the parking lot might be more peaceful than the option right along the sometimes quite busy Alpine Road</li> <li>• Easy trail access and provides sense of place upon entry</li> <li>• Easy to locate a restroom as it is off the Alpine scenic corridor</li> <li>• Shortest route from car to scenic viewpoints</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Negatively impacts trail user experience on the loop trail (V)</li> <li>• Parking area in the middle of the preserve wrecks the natural beauty of the meadow. It subdivides the preserve into smaller areas and creates a less unified natural experience for visitors. Car traffic and noise in the middle of the preserve disrupts the natural experience of arrival. (IV)</li> <li>• Trail users would circle the parking lot, making it harder to focus on experiences in nature (III)</li> <li>• Trail users on the loop trail would have to cross the driveway (III)</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parking entry road becomes a dominant feature in the preserve interior</li> </ul>
Local And Regional Connectivity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides 50 parking spaces (II)</li> <li>• Provides reasonable, safe access to / from Alpine Road</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Like the large number of parking spaces, but Hawthorns could become a just a connector and not a destination</li> <li>• Existing road could eventually be part of a future regional trail connection, parking would impact that opportunity</li> <li>• Staging location is less conducive to a loop trail system</li> <li>• Pedestrians would need to walk on the driveway to enter the trail network or use restrooms</li> </ul>
Aesthetics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not visible from Alpine Road (IX)</li> <li>• Least impact to the Alpine Scenic Corridor (IV)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Worst aesthetic once inside the preserve. Destroys peace, beauty, and tranquility in the meadow in the center of the preserve. Destroys it with a parking lot and associated car and visitor noise. (VI)</li> <li>• Driveways are not attractive and should be minimized. This option challenges aesthetics and impacts vista of Hawthorns Meadow. (II)</li> <li>• Hawthorns Meadow view is changed forever</li> <li>• Even if the parking spaces are all EVs, the meadow is better than a parking lot</li> <li>• “Pave paradise and put up a parking lot” – Joan Baez</li> <li>• A handful of homes might have their view disturbed by cars in the meadow</li> <li>• More visible from internal trails</li> </ul>
Operations and Maintenance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Easily surveilled from the staff residence on the property, and regularly supervised (III)</li> <li>• Uses existing road</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A parking lot away from Alpine Road would not be visible and would be a bit harder for the Sheriff, emergency services, or a ranger to patrol (IV)</li> <li>• Maintenance equipment has to be transported a long distance from the access point into the middle of the preserve</li> <li>• Longer entry road may require more maintenance than other options</li> </ul>

<p>Other Considerations</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A parking lot situated closer to the viewpoints allows better ADA access by shortening the walk and climb to the scenic locations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction is more expensive. Large paved area and long driveway increase construction and maintenance costs. Higher level of utility improvements needed (swales, piping). (II)</li> <li>• The Hawthorns Meadow is probably the only quiet, minimally impacted place in Hawthorns area. A shame if it were to become a parking lot.</li> <li>• Don't need more square feet of driveway</li> <li>• Driving into the existing driveway, driving part way up a steep hill, and then down another steep hill to the lot makes for a clumsy, inelegant design</li> <li>• Any road cyclists who wish to ride to Hawthorns to hike the loop would have a steep driveway to climb up and park their bicycle. Mountain bikers and gravel cyclists who arrive at the preserve will simply ride on the trails and will not be affected.</li> <li>• Overall, the cons strongly out way the pros, so do not support this location. However, if the PNR determines that the parking lot must not be visible from Alpine Road, then this is the best of the internal options considered. In that case, would recommend building Phase 1 and monitoring use over the first 1 – 2 years before proceeding with Phase 2.</li> </ul>
-----------------------------	---	---

**Parking Option 8 (By Eastern Boundary):**

Project design assessment criterion	Supports (pros)	Concerns (cons)
Natural resources protection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• On the perimeter of the preserve, most of this parking lot is already disturbed (VI)</li> <li>• Infrastructure is contained to an area already exposed to disturbance and human impact, limiting potential for</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Larger footprint impacts more natural resources than option 9</li> <li>• This option requires a fair amount of grading</li> </ul>

	<p>introduction of invasive species, <i>Phytophthora</i>, litter, etc. (II)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parking location allows North Meadow to remain generally intact (II)</li> <li>• Stays away from the milkweed patch, wood rat dens and Hawthorns Meadow (II)</li> <li>• A good location that is relatively flat</li> <li>• Short driveway would minimize paving and environmental degradation</li> <li>• Less intrusive into the preserve</li> <li>• Less impact than option 7</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To make the driveway safer for visibility, a fair amount of trees may need to be removed or trimmed back</li> <li>• Larger parking lot area and would need to cut into slope. Soil disturbance could provide new habitat for invaders and limit water retention.</li> <li>• Located in sensitive grasslands habitat; however, this is mitigated because the location of the grassland is on the edge of the preserve by Alpine Road</li> </ul>
<p>Driveway Access Point and Traffic safety</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minimizes vehicle impact within the preserve</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern of potential bike/car accidents as bikes accelerate at high speeds downhill, since the access point is at the bottom of a hill along Alpine Road (VIII)</li> <li>• The least safe option because of traffic speeds and the offset cross street (VI)</li> <li>• The driveway T-intersection is offset from another T-intersection at Hillbrook Dr (VI)</li> <li>• Offset intersection with Hillbrook Dr may increase risk of vehicular collisions (VI)</li> <li>• Neighbors have a major concern about overflow parking clogging their street and obstructing emergency access (VI)</li> <li>• Low visibility of traffic (III)</li> <li>• The potential for a major safety concern, involving bicycles and cars, makes this an unacceptable option to consider (III)</li> <li>• There are few things that can be done to improve safety at this driveway other than signage</li> <li>• Depends upon Town of Portola Valley to make necessary roadway / signing improvements</li> <li>• Peak traffic times for both road cyclists and hikers are the same time on weekend mornings during good weather</li> </ul>

<p>Visitor experience in the preserve</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is a good location for parking because it is located at the edge of the preserve (VI)</li> <li>• Better user experience of the full loop trail, allowing for a more immersive experience in the preserve (V)</li> <li>• Less vehicle interactions for pedestrians and cyclists within the preserve compared to option 7</li> <li>• Perimeter location has less impact than 7</li> </ul>	<p>None received</p>
<p>Local and regional connectivity</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Possibly the best connectivity because it offers the most parking (II)</li> <li>• Parking lots, trailheads, and interpretive signage more accessible by being easily connected to Alpine Trail and other Town Trails</li> <li>• More accessible to cyclists who may want to lock bikes at trailheads to explore preserve</li> <li>• Preserves the option to use existing road into Historic Complex as a regional connection</li> <li>• Easily accessed from Alpine Trail and nearby homes (including new developments)</li> <li>• Staging location is conducive to a loop trail system, being in a corner of the preserve</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Challenging for neighbors on Hillbrook Dr making left turns onto Alpine Road</li> </ul>
<p>Aesthetics</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minimizes visibility from Alpine Road with additional screening (e.g., grading, boulders) (IV)</li> <li>• This would be an attractive site</li> <li>• Better to place parking at the edge of an open space than disturbing the scenic views of a relatively untouched Hawthorns Meadow. Parking lots will always be ugly, but some screening will make parking near Alpine Road the least unpalatable alternative.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Visible from Alpine Road, and adds visual impact on Alpine Scenic Corridor (III)</li> <li>• Requires screening to minimize visibility on Alpine Road (III)</li> <li>• Portola Valley residents are still concerned about how a parking lot next to Alpine Road will disrupt the Alpine Scenic Corridor. However, this can be mitigated by grading and screening.</li> <li>• There is already a much more visible parking lot located across the street for Robert’s Market, and the nearby intersection of Alpine and Portola Roads is a “Town Center” area that is already a break in the Scenic Corridor. Additionally, new developments specified in Portola Valley’s Housing Element are slated to be almost directly</li> </ul>

		<p>across the street from this parking lot, so the Scenic Corridor will already be disrupted by that development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grading needed to create level parking lot. Cut slope at rear would need careful contouring and revegetation to appear natural. Appearance of large paved turnaround would be improved with addition of central planted median.</li> <li>• Potential to be visible for neighbors in housing development</li> </ul>
Operations and maintenance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More easily patrolled and accessed by ranger, local police and emergency services (III)</li> <li>• Easier to maintain, as equipment won't need to be transported deep into the preserve</li> <li>• More accessible to cyclists who may want to lock bikes at trailheads to explore preserve</li> <li>• Visible from Alpine Road, can be monitored from outside preserve after hours, but screening may limit this capability</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The farthest from the staff housing</li> <li>• Additional access point and gate increase routine operation to monitor and secure gate. Additional ongoing maintenance.</li> <li>• Because of the heavy shading disrupting visibility, the overhanging oak trees will likely need more ongoing maintenance to protect road cyclists</li> </ul>
Other considerations	None received	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The fact that the parking area can be seen from Alpine Road might encourage bicyclists to use the Hawthorns parking lot as a staging area for bike rides, which would use up precious parking and possibly create the need for overflow parking</li> <li>• Requires adding a new access point into the preserve</li> <li>• Visibility from the road could increase the probability of thefts</li> </ul>

**Parking Option 9 (by existing driveway):**

Project design assessment criterion	Supports (pros)	Concerns (cons)
Natural resources protection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Least overall impact on the natural resources of the preserve (VI)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires the most grading and largest retaining wall (IV)</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limits extent of built environment to property edge in already disturbed area along the disc line near existing roadway (VI)</li> <li>• Maintains integrity of meadows and sensitive vegetation communities to the greatest extent possible, supporting habitat connectivity and ecological resilience (VI)</li> <li>• Requires less vegetation removal (IV)</li> <li>• Smaller footprint option of total paved area and shortest driveway length (III)</li> <li>• Protects milkweed patch (II)</li> <li>• Disturbance of resources close to other developed areas (buildings and parking across the street) rather than creating a new one further down Alpine Road</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires significant cut into hillside (II)</li> </ul>
<p>Driveway Access Point and Traffic safety</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Slower vehicle and bike speeds in this area increases safety (V)</li> <li>• Driveway near the town's commercial centers signal drivers to slow down and alert cyclists to exercise caution (V)</li> <li>• The safest access point off Alpine Road (IV)</li> <li>• Much safer access point than option 8 (III)</li> <li>• Driveway access has adequate lines of sight (III)</li> <li>• The area also has limited shade along Alpine Road enabling better visibility (III)</li> <li>• Close to Portola Road three-way stop intersection, means bicycle and cars are still moving slowly (III)</li> <li>• Uses existing driveway/road (II)</li> <li>• Closer to an existing pedestrian crosswalk to cross Alpine Road than option 8</li> <li>• There is no conflict with Hillbrook Dr, as there is with option 8</li> <li>• Not located in a residential neighborhood</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential overflow parking may extend to neighbors or commercial area (III)</li> <li>• It would be nice if Midpen could come to an agreement with Roberts Market across the street for overflow. Good signage needs to be posted on Alpine Road to ensure that overflow parking does not take place on Alpine Road (parking on Alpine would create a very dangerous situation for bicyclists and fire/emergency evacuation for the Town, which relies on Alpine Road as an evacuation route)</li> </ul>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This location might make monitoring the parking lot and enforcing traffic easier for Midpen staff and the Town.</li> <li>• Minimizes amount of paved area and reduces construction requirements</li> </ul>	
Visitor experience in the preserve	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is a good location for parking because it is located at the edge of the preserve (VIII)</li> <li>• Better user experience of the full loop trail, allowing for a more immersive experience in the preserve (VIII)</li> <li>• Less vehicle interactions for pedestrians and cyclists within the preserve compared to option 7 (II)</li> <li>• Perimeter location has less impact than option 7</li> <li>• Maintains vistas from Hawthorns meadow, North Meadow, and hilltops</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The large retaining wall that may be required could negatively impact the visitor</li> </ul>
Local and regional connectivity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides 50 parking spaces, allows visitors to connect to adjacent trails and open space lands (II)</li> <li>• Parking, restroom, trailhead and other amenities are more accessible by being close to Alpine Trail and other Town Trails (II)</li> <li>• Easily accessed to/from Alpine trail (II)</li> <li>• Preserves option to use existing road into Historic Complex as a regional connection</li> <li>• Staging location is conducive to a loop trail system, being located on the side of the preserve</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fewer parking spaces than 50 may or may not be viewed as a negative factor. Perhaps additional parking could be potentially added as a Phase 2? While this may be difficult to envision at this time, considerations may change if this option is selected, based on the assessed demand for additional parking.</li> </ul>
Aesthetics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minimize visibility from Alpine Road with additional screening (e.g., grading, boulders) (III)</li> <li>• Aesthetically almost as good as option 8 (II)</li> <li>• Parked vehicles would be clustered in the already developed commercial core, across from Roberts Market (II)</li> <li>• Keeps amenities such as the restroom outside the 75-foot Alpine Scenic Corridor (II)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parking may be visible from Alpine Road, may add visual impact on Alpine Scenic Corridor (III)</li> <li>• Requires mitigation with screening to minimize visibility on Alpine Road</li> <li>• Concern with the 12'+ retaining walls above an 80-96' diameter turn around area. Suggest designers work with Woodside Fire Protection District and find a more elegant solution for turnaround</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parking and restroom on the preserve’s perimeter minimizes visibility from trails within the preserve</li> <li>• Meadow views are preserved</li> <li>• Preserves roadside tree screening</li> <li>• While this option still is visible from Alpine Road, it is across from Roberts Market which also has a large parking lot in front of it. Therefore, it does not disrupt the scenic corridor as much as option 8.</li> <li>• Farther from residential neighborhood</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some local residents have voiced concerns about this option</li> <li>• Because of grading and visible parking, the scenic view of the Hawthorns grassy hillside from Robert’s parking lot would be ruined forever. Pushing into the Conservation Easement area for extra parking extends the negative visual impact.</li> <li>• Significant grading to create level parking lot. Retaining wall would need aesthetic treatment and vegetative screening to appear more natural. Cut slope at rear would need careful contouring and revegetation.</li> <li>• Appearance of large paved turnaround would be improved with addition of central planted median</li> </ul>
<p>Operations and maintenance</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Keeping parking to the preserve’s perimeter facilitates better access for law enforcement, ranger patrol and emergency response personnel (V)</li> <li>• Easier to maintain, as equipment won't need to be transported deep into the preserve (IV)</li> <li>• Visible from Alpine Road (II)</li> <li>• Easily surveilled from the existing house on the property, and regularly supervised</li> <li>• Can be monitored from outside preserve after hours, but screening may limit this capability</li> <li>• Reuses the existing driveway entry across from Roberts Market</li> <li>• Single access point reduces ongoing operation and maintenance.</li> <li>• Less expensive than option 7</li> </ul>	<p>None received</p>
<p>Other considerations</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is the best option by far (III)</li> <li>• Options 7 &amp; 8 include inherently unacceptable disqualifying designs – either extensive environmental</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The fact that the parking area can be seen from the road might encourage bicyclists to use the Hawthorns parking lot as a staging area for bike rides, which would use up</li> </ul>

	<p>impacts or potential major safety issues – both of which are “show-stoppers” that cannot be endorsed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This location encourages support of local businesses by being situated across the street from a grocery store with a deli and a hardware store</li> <li>• POST granted permission to extend parking into the “Unimproved portion” defined in the Conservation Easement, indicating that a parking lot in this location is in line with their values</li> <li>• Unclear why a 12-foot retaining wall is needed. Site is mostly flat and parking could extend further to the west along disc line and stay on flat portion</li> <li>• Water fountains in Triangle Park are more accessible from the trail network</li> </ul>	<p>precious parking and possibly create the need for overflow parking</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 50 parking spaces seem excessive for this 75-acre parcel</li> <li>• Are there other parking options along Alpine Road?</li> <li>• The possibility of overflow parking occurring on adjacent streets</li> <li>• Some of the mitigation strategies recommended rely on Midpen, while others rely on the Town. This option will need more coordination with the Town.</li> <li>• Visibility from the road could increase the probability of thefts</li> </ul>
--	---	---

**Parking Option 10 (by Alpine and Portola Road):**

<b>Project Design Assessment Criterion</b>	<b>Supports (pros)</b>	<b>Concerns (cons)</b>
Natural Resources Protection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limits extent of built environment to property edge in already disturbed area near existing roadway, minimizing human impacts to the preserve (VI)</li> <li>• Least overall impact on the natural resources of the preserve (V)</li> <li>• Smallest footprint option of total paved area and shortest driveway length (IV)</li> <li>• Maintains integrity of meadows and sensitive vegetation communities to the greatest extent possible, supporting habitat connectivity and ecological resilience (III)</li> <li>• Requires far less vegetation removal than option 7, and incrementally less than option 9 (III)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Almost entirely within conservation easement, may need mitigation</li> <li>• Requires more grading into hillside</li> <li>• Removes trees and grassland, however located on the edge of the preserve in area that is already disturbed by existing fuel break</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Most of this parking lot is already disturbed by the disc line (II)</li> <li>• Limiting potential for introductions on invasive species, <i>Phytophthora</i>, litter, etc. (II)</li> <li>• Farther from Milkweed patch</li> <li>• Reasonable sized retaining wall</li> <li>• Like parking near the existing commercial center near the developed area</li> </ul>	
<p>Driveway Access Point and Traffic Safety</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The best and safest access for drivers, cyclists and pedestrians at the 3-way stop (VIII)</li> <li>• Driveway access has adequate lines of sight (IV)</li> <li>• Really like how access to lot is at Portola Rd, a simple “elegant” solution, removes impact on road biker safety as a concern</li> <li>• Uses existing crosswalks at Alpine and Portola Roads.</li> <li>• Located at existing 3-way stop, so traffic and bicycle speeds are already reduced</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires construction of a new driveway entrance</li> <li>• Two driveways close together. Can ranger access be through the new lot and close the existing driveway?</li> <li>• May get more non-preserve users, e.g. school drop off, road cyclists stopping to use bathroom</li> <li>• Overflow parking would go into parking lots of local businesses at Triangle Park</li> <li>• Additional cross traffic for pedestrians when entering the preserve on foot</li> </ul>
<p>Visitor Experience in the Preserve</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enhancing visitor experience by keeping parking to the preserve’s perimeter, ensuring the tranquility of the remaining preserve for low intensity activities on loop trail (VI)</li> <li>• Internal trail is separated from vehicular traffic, minimizing potential conflicts and bolstering safety for visitors (IV)</li> <li>• Parking, restroom, and other amenities are more accessible by being close to Alpine Road (III)</li> <li>• Provides good access and conducive to loop trail system (III)</li> <li>• Straightforward entrance from an existing stop sign</li> </ul>	<p>None received</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintains vistas from Hawthorns meadow, North Meadow, and hilltops</li> </ul>	
Local And Regional Connectivity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides 50 parking spaces and allows visitors to connect with adjacent trails and open space lands (III)</li> <li>• Location at major intersection enhances regional wayfinding</li> <li>• Parking lots, trailheads, and interpretive signage more accessible by being easily connected to Alpine Trail and other PV Town Trails</li> <li>• Supports realignment of Alpine Trail</li> <li>• The parking may be limited to fewer spaces, if desired</li> <li>• Preserves option to use existing road into Historic Complex as a regional connection</li> <li>• Supports safe routes to school via Alpine Road trail connecting at a monitored intersection</li> <li>• Closer to the rest of Windy Hill preserve, may help alleviate overflow problems at Portola Rd lot</li> <li>• Road (not mountain or gravel) cyclists would not have to ride up a steep slope to lock up their bike</li> <li>• Provides reasonable, safe access to / from Alpine Road</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• So well connected that parking may serve as regional staging area (beyond Hawthorns Area of WHOSP)</li> </ul>
Aesthetics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Locates parking across from existing commercial area and associated parking lots e.g. Roberts Market. (IV)</li> <li>• Lowest effect in terms of scenic corridor, with addition of a tree-vegetated berm as shown in the cross section. Restroom and trailhead located outside 75-foot scenic corridor. (IV)</li> <li>• Possibility to screen (e.g. screening berm) from Alpine Road reduces visual impact. (III)</li> <li>• While this option still is visible from Alpine Road, it is across from Roberts Market which also has a large parking lot in front of it. Therefore, it does not disrupt the scenic corridor as much as option 9. (II)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parking may be visible from Alpine Road (III)</li> <li>• View from Alpine Road will need some mitigation such as the berm shown in drawings</li> <li>• Although short in distance, the retaining wall is 10' tall</li> <li>• Requires berm and screening tree planting. Initial appearance after construction would likely appear harsh, until screening trees fill in</li> <li>• Appearance of large paved turnaround would be improved with addition of central planted median</li> <li>• Substantial grading to create level parking lot. Retaining wall would need aesthetic treatment and vegetative</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parking and restroom on the preserve’s perimeter minimizes visibility from trails within the preserve (II)</li> <li>• Smallest paved footprint for both parking and driveway (II)</li> <li>• Retaining wall along Alpine Road will be visible for the less than a quarter of the length of the parking lot and will be screened by existing trees (II)</li> <li>• The entrance driveway at the 4-way stop intersection is the most intuitive and the least obtrusive alternative</li> <li>• Existing 3-way stop will require less new signage and crossing markings than other entrances. Turning this into a 4-way stop sign will eliminate using this area for the frequent public signs that are currently placed on the fence.</li> <li>• Limited screening required to hide the parking lot</li> <li>• Most aesthetically impacted area would be busy intersection, Triangle Park, and parking lots of businesses. Much of the view from these locations is previously obstructed by hedges at Triangle Park.</li> <li>• Unclear how the turnaround will work without lots grading and retaining walls</li> <li>• Driveway and parking consistent with appearance of commercial center</li> </ul>	<p>screening to appear more natural. Cut slope at rear would need careful contouring and revegetation.</p>
<p>Operations and Maintenance</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Easy access for law enforcement, ranger patrol and emergency response personnel (V)</li> <li>• Easier to maintain and operate given the short driveway, proximity to Alpine Road and the fact that visitors will not need to drive up and down a relatively steep road (as is the case for option 7) (II)</li> <li>• Easy to monitor and open/close from existing driveway</li> </ul>	<p>None received</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Readily oversight of access</li> <li>• Lowest amount of paved area among all the alternatives</li> </ul>	
<p>Other Considerations</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overall the best option, if allowed by POST (IV)</li> <li>• Construction costs are relatively low (IV)</li> <li>• Consolidates all parking in an already visually impacted section of Alpine Road</li> <li>• This builds upon the benefits of option 9, while reducing grading and retaining walls, and significantly increasing safety with the entrance at a 4-way stop</li> <li>• An informal but popular after school pickup is just across the street at Triangle Park. Some families could move their pickup spot to this parking lot and perhaps enjoy a short hike</li> <li>• Located next to a grocery store and a restaurant provides convenient post hiking or biking opportunities to the public</li> <li>• Water fountains in Triangle Park are more accessible from the trail network</li> <li>• Located away from residential areas. Encourages support of local businesses. Consistent with land use in commercial core</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has POST granted access in the conservation easement area?</li> <li>• Can it be built within the conservation easement?</li> <li>• An unlikely but potential conflict could occur if this location becomes a very popular spot for picking up children after school. Fortunately weekday school pickup in mid afternoon is not a very popular time for hikers.</li> <li>• Extends the parking area into the Unimproved Portion defined in the Conservation Easement. POST could request steps taken to mitigate the scenic impacts due to the proximity to Alpine Road. These could include using natural coloring of the parking area and/or installing natural features along the perimeter to shield the view.</li> <li>• Visibility from the road could increase the probability of thefts</li> </ul>