

Hawthorns Area Public Access Working Group
PAWG Individual Assessment of Concept Parking Design Options
Hawthorns Area Plan

Below are individual assessments from PAWG members on parking design options 7, 8, 9, and 10. This was the homework for June 13, 2024 PAWG meeting #7 and was the only written assignment during the PAWG process. Staff has compiled all of the individual assessments into a single document, with each comment beginning with the respective PAWG member's initials.

Parking Option 7 (in Hawthorns Meadow):

Project Design Assessment Criterion	Supports (pros)	Concerns (cons)
Natural Resources Protection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DS - Uses existing road. Reduces some construction impacts/cost? • KV - Most of this area is already disturbed as it is along the existing fire road and has been used for parking in the past. • KV - This option requires limited grading. • RO - Phased design of parking design may require fewer parking spaces overall and allows analysis of usage before increasing total number of parking spaces • RO - Limited grading required • TF - Leverages pre-existing impacts on landscape by using paved driveway and pre-existing fire road. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WW - I think we should eliminate this option because it is the most disruptive. It brutally cuts the park in two. • BC - This is the worst option with respect to natural resources protection; I would go so far as to say it is unacceptable. • BC - Hawthorns is already a small area, and putting parking in the middle of the preserve defeats the purpose of having a preserve, both for the wildlife and for the humans who want to enjoy nature due to the noise pollution and view pollution of having cars and a parking lot in the middle of the preserve. • BC - Violates Midpen’s Parking Area Design Guideline to “Establish a Transition Zone” because contrary to the recommendation to site “parking areas on the areas on the outer edges of preserves and close to areas of existing circulation and/or development such as access roads, highways, property lines to non-open space lands,” this option places parking in the middle of the preserve.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BC - Location in the middle of the preserve requires the most amount of grading, paving due to the long access road to parking. • BC - Located in sensitive grasslands habitat, which Midpen’s Parking Area Design guideline states are “particularly vulnerable and have decreased in area compared to other habitat types in the Peninsula Watershed. • DS - Disturbs tranquility of the location • DS - Disrupts wildlife with noise, pollutants • DS - Disturbs plant community at the site • KD - Creates a new and ongoing high disturbance area. • KD - Too much roadway- construction and usage. • RO - Creates too large of a footprint of paved surfaces in the park • RO - May risk milkweed patch for monarch butterflies with creation of new road • RO - Greatest amount of tree and vegetation removal • JG - Extensive environmental impacts make this an unacceptable option to consider • JG - Concentrating vehicles and visitors in proposed parking area WILL impact the Hawthorns Meadow, resulting in sensitive habitat fragmentation and reduced ecological resilience • JG - The driveway into the preserve is much longer and steeper • JG - Requires significantly more vegetation removal than Options 8 or 9 • JG - Requires significantly more paved area and utility improvements than Options 8 or 9 • SS - Parking disrupts the ecological integrity of the Hawthorns Meadow
--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SM - This option has the largest negative impact to the natural resources given the length of the road and the fact that it is in the middle of the preserve. • SM – This option will wreck the natural beauty and habitat of the meadow. • TF - Larger vector for introductions of invasive species and pathogens. • TF - More tree removal needed and higher paved area than other options. • TF - Regular vehicle traffic could impact root systems of the milkweed patch by compacting the soil or introducing pollutants. • HQ - Central location interferes with wildlife movement • HQ - Destroys large and currently unimpacted meadow
<p>Driveway Access Point and Traffic Safety</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WW - OK • BC - Much safer access point than Option 8 • BC - Traffic will already be slow at the Hawthorns driveway because they will have either just left the three-way stop intersection or will be slowing down because of it. • BC - The fact that the driveway is near one of the town’s commercial centers, with lots of businesses and parking lots, will indicated to drivers that they should slow down and to cyclists that they should be cautious. • BC - The entrance is closer to a pedestrian crosswalk to cross Alpine Road than Option 8, which makes it less likely that pedestrians will attempt to cross Alpine Road where there is no crosswalk. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TF - 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. • TF - Hikers may walk along roadside to reach Alpine Road or certain trails. • HQ - Multiple entry points to Alpine rd on opposite side near this point, adds traffic complexity

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• BC - There is no conflict with Hillbrook Dr, as there is with Option 8. • CK - Driveway's comparatively safe location is this design's sole positive attribute.• DS - Uses existing driveway• DS - Good lines of site• DS - Reduces construction reqs.• KV - The Hawthorns Entry is a far safer egress point for vehicles and for cyclists traveling northeast downhill from the Alpine and Portola intersection. Cyclists will not have picked up much speed yet after the stop sign.• KV - The area also has limited shade along Alpine enabling better visibility.• KV - The Alpine and Portola intersection along with the commercial buildings' egresses have a fair amount of congestion that will naturally help drivers, cyclists and pedestrians stay alert.• RO - Safest access point of the options• RO - Location across from Robert's Market means drivers are more aware of vehicles entering traffic• SS - Location across from Roberts Market is advantageous because cyclists heading northeast on Alpine Road will be moving more slowly, due to the flatter road.• SM - Location provides the best and safest access to the property.• TF - Slower speeds in cars and cyclists coming from Portola x Alpine intersection would reduce collision probability.• TF - Higher visibility for entrance and egress.	
--	---	--

Attachment 9

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HQ - Close to Portola Rd, means bicycle traffic is still moving slowly 	
Visitor Experience in the Preserve	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KV - The experience at the parking lot itself might be a bit more peaceful than one right along sometimes quite busy Alpine Road. KV - Easy to locate a restroom as it is off the Alpine scenic corridor. RO - Shortest route from car to scenic viewpoints TF - Easy trail access and provides sense of place upon entry. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> WW - It would also negatively impact the visitor experience—as a visual “eye sore” and a trail disruptor. BC - Not ideal to have parking in the middle of the preserve; car traffic and noise in the middle of the preserve disrupts the natural experience CK - The “Hawthorn’s meadow” is probably the only quiet, minimally impacted place in Hawthorns area. I think it’d be a shame if it were to become a parking lot. DS - Inserts visitors into the center of the preserve. Potential impacts on loop trail experience. KV - The parking being situated in towards the interior of the site would somewhat limit the experience of arriving at a destination and then looping through the park. RO - Hikes would circle the parking lot, making it harder to focus on experiences in nature RO - Hikers on the loop trail would have to cross the driveway SS – Parking entry road becomes a dominant feature in the preserve interior, and two trail crossings are required. SM - This location in the middle of the preserve wrecks the natural beauty of the meadow. It effectively subdivides the preserve into smaller areas and creates a less unified natural experience for visitors. TF - Trail crossing driveway could lead to collision and injury. HQ - Negatively impacts experience of trail users
Local And Regional Connectivity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> WW - I do like the large number of parking spaces, but it could become a just a connector and not a destination. BC - Provides 50 parking spaces 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DS - Existing road could eventually be part of a regional trail connection, parking would impact that opportunity. SS - Staging location is less conducive to a loop trail system. TF - Pedestrians would need to walk on the driveway to enter the trail network or use restrooms.

Attachment 9

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SM - Provides reasonable, safe access to / from Alpine road. 	
Aesthetics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WW - The only positive in comparison with the other options is that it's not visible from Alpine Road. • BC - Parking would be hidden from Alpine Road, which is supposed to be a scenic corridor • DS - Not visible from Alpine Road. • KV - The Alpine scenic corridor has the least impact with the parking away from Alpine Road. • SS – Parking not visible from Alpine Road Scenic Corridor • SM - Improves the aesthetics from Alpine road as the parking lot is not visible. • TF - Parking lot would not be visible from Alpine Road maintaining the scenic corridor. • HQ - Less visible from Alpine Rd than other options 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WW - Driveways are not attractive and should be minimized. • BC - Takes a peaceful, beautiful and environmentally sensitive meadow in the center of the preserve and destroys it with a parking lot and associated car and visitor noise. • CK - Grassy meadow vs 30-50 cars?... even if they were all EVs, the meadow is better. • DS - Beautiful quiet meadow becomes a parking lot. "Pave paradise and put up a parking lot" Joan Baez • KV - A handful of homes might have a their view disturbed by cars in the meadow. • KD - Hawthorns Meadow view is changed forever. • RO - Destroys peace and tranquility in the meadow • SM – Worst aesthetic once you are inside the preserve. • TF - Long paved driveway challenges aesthetics and impacts vista of Hawthorns Meadow. • HQ - More visible from internal trails
Operations and Maintenance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DS - Uses existing road. Reduces some op/maintenance? • RO - Easily surveilled from the existing house on the property, and regularly supervised • TF - Parking lot visible from ranger housing. This accessibility may help prevent theft, and keep a regular watch on needed maintenance. • HQ - Not easily monitored overnight 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would not be visible to local police and harder for emergency services. • BC - Any maintenance equipment will have to be transported a long way away from the access point into the middle of the preserve. • KV - A parking lot away from Alpine Road is a bit harder for the Sheriff or a ranger to patrol. • SS – Parking set so far back from the street would have lowered vehicle visibility from a crime prevention and ranger patrol perspective. • TF - Parking not visible from the road

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HQ - Longer entry road may require more maintenance than other options
Other Considerations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KV - A parking lot situated closer to the viewpoints allows better ADA access by shortening the walk and climb to the scenic locations. • RO - Not visible from Alpine Scenic Corridor 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I don't think we need more square feet of driveway. • CK - I think driving in the existing "Roberts gate", driving part way up a steep hill, and then down another steep hill to the lot makes for a clumsy, inelegant design. • KV - Any road cyclists who wish to ride to Hawthorns but hike the loop would have a steep driveway to climb up and park their bicycle. Note: Mountain bikers and gravel cyclists who arrive at the Hawthorns will simply ride on the trails and will not be affected. • SS - Large paved area and long driveway increase construction and maintenance costs. Higher level of utility improvements needed (swales, piping). 640 ft (1/8 mile) of steep driveway (over 10%) • SM – Overall, the cons strongly out way the pros. Therefore, I 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. However, in the case I would recommend building Phase 1 and monitoring use over the first 1 – 2 years before proceeding with Phase 2. • TF - Construction is more expensive.

Parking Option 8 (By Eastern Boundary):

Project design assessment criterion	Supports (pros)	Concerns (cons)
Natural resources protection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WW - I like that it parallels Alpine already a fragmenter of habitat. • BC - One of the two best options (along with Option 9) for natural resources protection because the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BC - Located in sensitive grasslands habitat, which Midpen's Parking Area Design guideline states are "particularly vulnerable and have decreased in area compared to other habitat types in the Peninsula Watershed. However this is mitigated because the location of the grassland is on the

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BC - A good location that is relatively flat and is at the edge of the preserve • BC - Short driveway would minimize paving and environmental degradation from building an access road. • DS - Preserves Meadow • KV - Most of this parking lot is already disturbed as it is along the disc line. • KD - Less intrusive into the parcel. • RO - Limits foot traffic near milkweed patch and wood rat dens • SS – Parking location allows North Meadow to remain generally intact. • TF - Infrastructure is contained to an area already exposed to disturbance and human impact, limiting potential for introductions on invasive species, <i>Phytophthora</i>, litter, etc. • TF - Stays away from the milkweed patch and Hawthorns Meadow. • HQ - On perimeter so less impact than option 7 	<p>edge of the preserve and already disrupted by the fact that Alpine Road, Portola Valley’s main thoroughfare, is adjacent to it.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BC - There is a milkweed patch adjacent to this parking area and MidPen would need to ensure the patch is not destroyed during construction. • DS - Larger footprint impacts more natural resources than option 9 • KV - This option requires a fair amount of grading. • KV - To make the driveway safer for visibility a fair amount of trees may need to be removed or trimmed back. • TF - Larger parking lot area and would need to cut at slope. Soil disturbance could provide new habitat for invaders and limit water retention. • HQ - Impinges on wetland
<p>Driveway Access Point and Traffic safety</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TF - Minimizes vehicle impact within the preserve. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WW - The access point is less safe than the driveway across from Roberts Market. • BC - This is the worst option from a safety standpoint because the access point is at the bottom of a hill, in shade, where the many bicyclists who ride on Alpine road will be moving at full speed will be difficult for drivers to see as they enter and exit the driveway. • BC - There are few things that can be done to improve safety at this driveway other than signage. • BC - This driveway is almost directly across from Hillbrook Drive, where neighbors are very concerned that overflow parking will clog their street and prevent emergency egress. There is also potential vehicular conflict between cars

		<p>trying to enter/exit Hillbrook Drive and cars trying to enter/exit Hawthorns.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• CK - We're told this location will generate a significant hazard to road cyclists. I believe this to be true, and can't support this option. Additionally, the nearby residents strongly object to possible "overflow parking" on their streets. I think they have a point as well. Though we'll never keep everyone happy, over flow would best be handled near a commercial area, at the corner of Portola Rd and Alpine• DS - Significant traffic safety concern along higher speed section of Alpine Road.• DS - Potential bike/car accidents as bikes accelerate downhill.• DS - Proximity to Hillbrook Drive concerning.• JG - The potential for a major safety hazard, particularly involving bicycles and cars, makes this an unacceptable option to consider• JG - The grade of Alpine Road at this location is significantly steeper than at the existing driveway entry opposite Roberts Market• JG - The driveway T-intersection is offset from another T-intersection at Hillbrook Drive• JG - Local residents and city groups have warned of significant safety hazards presented at this location• KV - The historic entrance is dangerous entry point for road cyclists going Northeast along Alpine Road with speeds around 20-30 mph. The road is covered in dappled shade due to the many overhanging trees decreasing visibility for cars entering and exiting Hawthorns. Note: Peak traffic times for both road cyclists and hikers is the same time on weekend mornings during good weather.
--	--	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KD - Considered the least safe option because of traffic speeds and the offset cross street. • KD - Residential neighborhood. • RO - Low visibility of traffic • RO - Bicycles traveling at higher speeds making it dangerous for them to pass that point with cars coming out • RO - Parking overflow (if needed) may extend into neighborhoods • RO - Offset intersection with Hillbrook Dr may increase risk of vehicular collisions • SS – Higher potential for traffic conflicts because cyclists heading northeast on Alpine Road will be moving more quickly, due to the steeper road. Potential turning movement complexity together with Hillbrook Drive. • SS – Depends upon Town of Portola Valley to make necessary roadway / signing improvements • SM – The location of the driveway creates serious safety concerns for both cars entering / exiting the preserve and for cyclists / pedestrians. For me, these safety concerns trump all other pros associated with this location. I would not support location under any condition and therefore did not complete the remaining pros / cons. • TF - Driveway entrance in a location where vehicles and cyclists are moving fast, which could lead to collisions. • TF - Could be challenging for visibility when exiting preserve. • HQ - Bicycle traffic from left at this point is moving fast • HQ - Not quite across from Hillbrook Dr makes a complicated 4 way intersection
<p>Visitor experience in the preserve</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WW - 8 & 9 would both provide better visitor experience than 7. Good place to start and end a visit. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BC - This is a good location for parking because it is located at the edge of the preserve. • BC - Once visitors park and begin hiking the loop trail, they won't see the parking lot and can immerse themselves in the natural environment. • CK - Parking on the edge of a destination size open space makes more sense than parking in its middle: leaves an "un-impacted middle" to explore on foot or bike • DS - Inserts visitors at the loop trail, full experience. • KV - A parking lot along Alpine Road allows the visitor to park near the edge and walk the full loop trail in a straightforward way. • RO - Parking at the perimeter decreases impact on nature and wildlife, allowing for a more immersive experience in the park • SS – Parking area at edge of the preserve minimizes intrusion of parking, reserving a greater area for quiet enjoyment. • TF - Less vehicle interactions for pedestrians and cyclists within the preserve compared to option 7. • HQ - Perimeter location has less impact than 7 	
Local and regional connectivity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WW - Possibly the best connectivity because it offers the most parking. • BC - Better than Option 9 because it allows a greater number of parking spaces to be built than Option 9 (50 instead of 30) • DS - Preserves option to use existing road into historic complex as a regional connection. • RO - Easily accessed from Alpine trail • RO - Easily accessed from nearby homes (including new developments) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TF - Challenging for neighbors on Hillbrook Dr making left turns onto Alpine Rd.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SS - Staging location is conducive to a loop trail system, being located in a corner of the preserve. • TF - Parking lots, trailheads, and interpretive signage more accessible by being easily connected to Alpine Trail and other PV Town Trails. • TF - More accessible to cyclists who may want to lock bikes at trailheads to explore preserve. 	
Aesthetics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WW - This would be an attractive site. • BC - The consultants showed renderings that indicate that cars will not be very visible from Alpine Road due to the lot being at higher elevation than the road and numerous trees growing between the road and the parking lot. What can be seen from the road can be mostly hidden behind large boulders. • CK - I think it better to have parking on the edge of an open space than disturbing the scenic views of a relatively untouched meadow. Parking lots will always be ugly, but some screening will make parking near Alpine the least unpalatable alternative • SS – Parking elevated and set back to be out of sight from view along Alpine Road. Roadside tree screening preserved. • TF - Maintains vistas within Hawthorns meadow by screening parking area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WW - Possibly some visibility from Alpine • BC - Portola Valley residents are still concerned about how a parking lot next to Alpine Road will disrupt the scenic corridor that is supposed to be along the road. However, this is mitigated by the fact that the parking lot would not be easily visible and what is visible can be partially screened by large boulders. Further, there is already a much more visible parking lot located almost exactly 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. Finally, new developments specified in Portola Valley’s Housing Element are slated to be almost directly across the street from this parking lot, so the scenic corridor will already be disrupted by that development. • DS - Some screening from Alpine but adds visual impact at currently all-natural site. • KV - A parking lot (even if screened) along Alpine road, which is an official scenic corridor, does disrupt the vistas. • KD - Visible from Alpine Road. • RO - Vista requirements of the Alpine Scenic Corridor • SS – 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.

Attachment 9

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TF - Potential to be visible for neighbors in housing development. • HQ - Requires screening to reduce impact on Alpine Rd scenic corridor, can be achieved
Operations and maintenance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WW - More easily patrolled and accessed by ranger, local police and emergency services. • BC - Easier from a maintenance/security standpoint because lot is near Alpine Road, so issues can be seen from Alpine road, and any equipment needed for maintenance won't have to be moved as far into the preserve. • RO - Easily visible from the road • TF - Easy access from Alpine Road better for monitoring and enforcement. • TF - More accessible to cyclists who may want to lock bikes at trailheads to explore preserve. • HQ - Can be monitored from outside preserve after hours, but screening may limit this capability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WW - It is, however, the farthest from the staff housing. • DS - Additional access point and gate increases routine operation to monitor and secure gate. Additional ongoing maintenance. • KV - Because of the heavy shading disrupting visibility, the overhanging oak trees will likely need more ongoing maintenance to protect road cyclists.
Other considerations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BC - 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 precious parking and possibly create the need for overflow parking. • DS - Requires adding a new access point into the Preserve. • TF - Visibility from the road could increase the probability of thefts.

Parking Option 9 (by existing driveway):

Project design assessment criterion	Supports (pros)	Concerns (cons)

<p>Natural resources protection</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WW - This site is the least disruptive of the natural resources. • BC - Same as Option 8 • DS - Preserves meadow. • DS - Impacts are all in existing disc line. Minimal impact to natural resources. • JG - Least overall impact on the natural resources of the preserve • JG - Limits extent of built environment to property edge in already disturbed area near existing roadway, minimizing human impacts to the preserve • JG - Smallest footprint option of total paved area and shortest driveway length • JG - Maintains integrity of meadows and sensitive vegetation communities to the greatest extent possible, supporting habitat connectivity and ecological resilience • JG - Requires far less vegetation removal than Option 7, and incrementally less than Option 8 • KV - Most of this parking lot is already disturbed as it is along the disc line. • KD - Less intrusion into the parcel. • KD - Disturbance of resources is close to other developed areas (buildings and parking across the street) rather than creating a new one further down Alpine. • RO - Protects meadow • RO - Protects milkweed patch • RO - Maintains integrity of greatest number of resources in the park • SS – Avoids extending roads and vehicles into core of preserve; all meadows remain intact. Avoids milkweed patch. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BC - Requires more grading than Option 8. • JG - Requires the most grading and largest retaining wall. • KV - This option requires the most grading of the three options. • TF - Requires more grading into hillside. • HQ - Probably requires significant cut and fill to achieve spaces and turnaround
-------------------------------------	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SM – Minimizes the impact to natural resources given its close proximity to Alpine Road and the short driveway. • TF - Infrastructure is contained to an area already exposed to disturbance and human impact, limiting potential for introductions on invasive species, <i>Phytophthora</i>, litter, etc. • TF - Protects Hawthorns Meadow and North Meadow vehicle impact. • HQ - On perimeter so less impact than option 7 	
<p>Driveway Access Point and Traffic safety</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WW - Along with option 7 –the safest entry off Alpine Rd. • BC - Same as Option 7. • HQ - Same as option 7 • CK - The best of the bunch: Alpine rd traffic will be slower, reducing the possibility of car vs road bike accidents. • DS - Uses existing driveway • DS - Good lines of site • DS - Reduces construction reqs. • JG - Driveway access has adequate lines of sight • JG - Maximizes traffic safety conditions, as existing driveway entrance has clear sight lines due to its gentle downslope on Alpine Road and minimal tree cover • JG - Proximity to the Portola Road intersection and Town Center Driveways enhances driver awareness of cross-traffic and turning vehicles • KV - The Hawthorns Entry is a far safer egress point for vehicles and for cyclists traveling northeast downhill from the Alpine and Portola intersection. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BC - The fewer parking spaces may result in the need for overflow parking. 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 of Portola Valley, which relies on Alpine Road as an evacuation route). • RO - Parking overflow (if needed) may extend into neighborhoods or take advantage of business parking lots, such as Roberts Market. • TF - Potential overflow to neighbors on or Triangle Park parking lot.

	<p>Cyclists will not have picked up much speed yet after the stop sign.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• KV - The area also has limited shade along Alpine enabling better visibility.• KV - The Alpine and Portola intersection along with the commercial buildings' egresses have a fair amount of congestion that will naturally help drivers, cyclists and pedestrians stay alert.• KD - Slower traffic in this area increases safety.• KD - Good visibility for ingress/egress.• KD - Not located in a residential neighborhood.• KD - This location might make monitoring the parking lot and enforcing traffic regulations easier for MROSD staff and the Town.• RO - Safest access point of the options• RO - Uses existing roads• RO - Minimizes amount of hardscape required• RO - Location across from Robert's Market means drivers are more aware of vehicles entering traffic• SS - Location across from Roberts Market is advantageous for several reasons:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Cyclists heading northeast on Alpine Road will be moving more slowly due to the flatter road.• Parked vehicles would be clustered in the already developed commercial core.• SM - Location provides the best and safest access to the property• TF - Slower vehicles close to Alpine x Portola intersection would be safer for pedestrians.	
--	---	--

Attachment 9

<p>Visitor experience in the preserve</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WW - A good location to start and end a visit. • BC - Same as Option 8 • CK - As in the previous alternative: Parking on the edge of a destination size open space makes more sense than parking in its middle: leaves an “un-impacted middle” to explore on foot or bike • DS - Inserts visitors at the loop trail, full experience. • JG - Better visitor experience by keeping parking to the preserve’s perimeter, ensuring the tranquility of the remaining preserve for low intensity activities on trails • JG - Internal trail is separated from vehicular traffic, minimizing potential conflicts and bolstering safety for visitors • KV - A parking lot along Alpine Road allows the visitor to park near the edge and walk the full loop trail in a straightforward way. • RO - Parking at the perimeter decreases impact on nature and wildlife, allowing for a more immersive experience in the park • SS – Minimizes intrusion of parking into the preserve, reserving a greater area for quiet enjoyment • SM – Provides the best experience in the preserve • TF - Maintains vistas from Hawthorns meadow, North Meadow, and hilltops. • TF - Limits vehicle/visitor interactions • HQ - Perimeter location has less impact than 7 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WW - The large retaining wall that may be required could negatively impact the visitor.
<p>Local and regional connectivity</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WW - Same as option 8 if it can accommodate 50 parking spaces. • DS - Preserves option to use existing road into historic complex as a regional connection. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BC - Fewer parking spaces provided than other two options (only 30 instead of 50) • JG - This option includes fewer parking spaces than Option 8, and potentially Option 7. • JG - This may or may not be viewed as a negative factor.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JG - The proposed 30 parking spaces allows visitors to connect to adjacent trails and open space lands • JG - Parking, restroom, and other amenities are more accessible by being close to Alpine Road • RO - Easily accessed from Alpine trail • SS - Staging location is conducive to a loop trail system, being located on the side of the preserve. • SM - Provides reasonable, safe access to / from Alpine road. • TF - Parking lots, trailheads, and interpretive signage more accessible by being easily connected to Alpine Trail and other PV Town Trails. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JG - 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.
Aesthetics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WW - Aesthetically almost as good as Option 8. • BC - Same as Option 8 • DS - Consolidates all parking at the already fully impacted corner of Alpine/Portola Road. • JG- Parking and restroom on the preserve’s perimeter minimizes visibility from trails within the preserve • JG - Keeps amenities such as the vault toilet outside the 75-foot scenic corridor • KD - Meadow views are left as they are • SS - Parked vehicles would be clustered in the already developed commercial core, across from Roberts Market and the office complexes. Parking elevated and set back to be out of sight from view along Alpine Road. Roadside tree screening preserved. • SM – 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. • TF - Slope limits visibility from Alpine Road. • TF - Farther from housing development. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WW - May be visible from Alpine Road. • CK - I worry about unsightly, ~12’+ retaining walls above an 80-96’ diameter turn around area. Suggest designers work with WFPD and find a more elegant solution for turn around • A parking lot (even if screened) along Alpine road, which is an official scenic corridor, does disrupt the vistas. • JG - Parking may be visible from Alpine Road • JG - Some local residents have voiced concerns about this • JG - This likely may be significantly mitigated with screening from trees & shrubs, landscaping, and grading • KD - Because of grading and visible parking, the scenic view of the Hawthorns grassy hillside from Robert’s parking lot would be ruined forever. • KD - Pushing into the conservation easement area for extra parking extends the negative visual impact. • RO - Vista requirements of the Alpine Scenic Corridor • SS – Significant grading to create level parking lot. Retaining wall would need aesthetic treatment and vegetative

		<p>screening to appear more natural. Cut slope at rear would need careful contouring and revegetation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SS – Appearance of large paved turnaround would be improved with addition of central planted median. • TF - May be visible from Alpine Road Scenic Corridor. • HQ - Because of land gradients likely more visible from Alpine rd
<p>Operations and maintenance</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WW - The best option for operations and maintenance by staff and local law enforcement. • BC - Same as Option 8 • CK - Better to be near Alpine for ease of Patrol? • DS - Single access point reduces ongoing ops and maintenance. • JG - Reuses the existing driveway entry opposite Roberts Market • JG - Keeping parking to the preserve’s perimeter facilitates better access for law enforcement/ranger patrol and emergency response personnel • JG - Less expensive than Option 7; roughly equivalent to Option 8? • JG - Less developed infrastructure to operate and maintain than Option 7, and slightly less than Option 8 • RO - Easily visible from the road • RO - Easily surveilled from the existing house on the property, and regularly supervised • SM – This option should be 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). • TF - Easily accessible from Alpine Road for emergency vehicles and maintenance. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HQ - Can be monitored from outside preserve at night 	
Other considerations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BC - This is the best option by far. The only downside is that it provides fewer parking spaces (only 30) than the other two options (which provide 50). • DS - 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. • JG - This is the only identified option which is viable for consideration. Options 7 & 8 include inherently unacceptable disqualifying designs – either extensive environmental impacts or potential major safety issues – both of which are “show-stoppers” that cannot be endorsed. • KV - This location encourages support of local businesses by being situated across the street from a grocery store with a deli and a hardware store. • RO - 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 • SM – I strongly recommend this as the best option, especially given the recent permission from POST to extend parking into the “Unimproved portion” defined in the Conservation Easement. • TF - Water fountains in Triangle Park are more accessible from the trail network. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BC - Same as Option 8. • KD - 50 parking spaces seem excessive for this 75 acre parcel. Would the donor have wanted or expected so much of their property to be used for that much parking? • KD - Re/ POST’s ability to amend the conservation easement- are there other parking options along Alpine Road? • JG - The possibility of overflow parking occurring on adjacent streets • JG - Some of the mitigation strategies recommended rely on Midpen, while others rely on the Town. This option will need more coordination with the Town. • TF - Visibility from the road could increase the probability of thefts. • HQ - Fewer parking spaces than other options

Parking Option 10 (by Alpine and Portola Road):

Project Design Assessment Criterion	Supports (pros)	Concerns (cons)

<p>Natural Resources Protection</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JG - Least overall impact on the natural resources of the preserve • JG - Limits extent of built environment to property edge in already disturbed area near existing roadway, minimizing human impacts to the preserve • JG - Smallest footprint option of total paved area and shortest driveway length • JG - Maintains integrity of meadows and sensitive vegetation communities to the greatest extent possible, supporting habitat connectivity and ecological resilience • JG - Requires far less vegetation removal than Option 7, and incrementally less than Option 9 • DS - Preserves meadow. • DS - Impacts are all in existing disc line. • DS - Minimal impact to natural resources. • DS - Farther from Milkweed patch • HQ - Location at property boundary minimizes impact on property as a whole • KV - On the perimeter of the preserve, most of this parking lot is already disturbed by the disc line. • KV - Infrastructure is contained to an area already exposed to disturbance and human impact, limiting potential for introduction of invasive species. • KV - Short driveway would minimize paving resulting in smallest total paved area. • KV - Limited tree removal • KV - Reasonable sized retaining wall. • SM – Minimizes the impact to natural resources given its close proximity to Alpine Road and the short driveway. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HQ - Almost entirely within conservation easement, seems to violate easement requirements, may need mitigation for this reason • TF - Requires more grading into hillside • SS - Removes trees and grassland, however located on the edge of the preserve in area that is already disturbed by existing fuel break.
-------------------------------------	--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SM – Least amount of paved area of the options under consideration. • TF - Infrastructure is contained to an area already exposed to disturbance and human impact, limiting potential for introductions on invasive species, <i>Phytophthora</i>, litter, etc. • CK - I like how 10 positions parking near the commercial area. makes sense to collocate parking near this developed area. • RO - Limits extent of built environment to the property edge in already disturbed area near existing roadway, minimizing impacts to the preserve • RO - Smallest footprint of total paved area, retaining wall and shorter driveway length • RO - Maintains integrity of meadows and sensitive vegetation communities in those meadows • RO - Requires less vegetation removal than options 7 and 9 • SS - Locates parking on periphery of preserve, which is better for ecological integrity. 	
<p>Driveway Access Point and Traffic Safety</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JG - By far, the best driveway location, since a 4-way stop at the intersection with Portola Road and Alpine Road will result in safest ingress/egress. • JG - Driveway access has adequate lines of sight • DS - New driveway at 4 way stop is safest option. • DS - Good lines of sight • DS - Safest for road cyclists and walkers as all traffic stops • HQ - Absolutely the best choice from a safety point of view, 4 way stop 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JG - Requires construction of a new driveway entrance. • DS - Two driveways close together. Can ranger access be through the new lot and close the existing driveway? • HQ - May get more non-preserve users, eg school drop off, road cyclists stopping to use bathroom • TF - Overflow parking would go into parking lots of local businesses at Triangle Park. • TF - Additional cross traffic for pedestrians when entering the preserve on foot.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KV - Hands down the safest choice for drivers, cyclists and pedestrians. • SM - Location provides the best and safest access to the property as it is part of a 4-way stop. • TF - Entry at the 3 way stop sign would be safest for cyclists and pedestrians. • CK - really like how access to lot is at Portola Rd. a simple “elegant” solution... removes impact on road biker safety as a concern. • RO - Driveway located at intersection with Portola Road and Alpine Road would create a four-way stop that provides safest entry of all options • RO - Driveway access has adequate lines of sight • SS - Uses existing crosswalks at Alpine and Portola Roads. • SS - Located at existing 3-way stop, so traffic and bicycle speeds are already reduced. • SS - Good line of sight. • SS - Safest Alpine Road location 	
<p>Visitor Experience in the Preserve</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JG - Best visitor experience by keeping parking to the preserve’s perimeter, ensuring the tranquility of the remaining preserve for low intensity activities on trails • JG - Internal trail is separated from vehicular traffic, minimizing potential conflicts and bolstering safety for visitors • JG - Parking, restroom, and other amenities are more accessible by being close to Alpine Road • DS - Inserts visitors at the loop trail, full experience. • HQ - Provides good access to loop trail 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KV - Straightforward entrance from a existing stop sign. • KV - Parking at the edge allows a fully immersive experience while in the preserve. • KV - Parking and restroom are more accessible to the public. • SM – Provides the best experience in the preserve as it is not located very far in the preserve. • TF - Maintains vistas from Hawthorns meadow, North Meadow, and hilltops. • TF - Limits vehicle/visitor interactions • RO - Siting parking along the property boundary preserves the tranquility of the remaining preserve, enhancing the visitor experience • RO - Internal trail is separated from vehicular traffic, minimizing potential conflicts and bolstering safety for visitors • RO - Parking, restroom, and other amenities are more accessible by being close to Alpine Road • SS - Conducive to loop trail system (with inclusion of trail segment 14). 	
Local And Regional Connectivity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JG - The proposed 50 parking spaces provides ample opportunity for visitors wishing to connect to adjacent trails and open space lands • JG - The parking are may be limited to fewer spaces, if desired. • DS - Preserves option to use existing road into historic complex as a regional connection. • DS - Supports Safe routes to school via alpine road trail connecting at a monitored intersection. • DS - Preserves option to use existing road into historic complex as a regional connection. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SS - So well connected that parking may serve as regional staging area (beyond Hawthorns Area of WHOSP)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DS - Supports Safe routes to school via alpine road trail connecting at a monitored intersection. • HQ - Feels closer to the rest of Windy Hill preserve, may help alleviate overflow problems at Portola Rd lot • KV - Road (not mountain or gravel) cyclists would not have to ride up a steep slope to lock up their bike. • SM - Provides reasonable, safe access to / from Alpine Road. • TF - Parking lots, trailheads, and interpretive signage more accessible by being easily connected to Alpine Trail and other PV Town Trails. • RO - The proposed 50 parking spaces provides ample opportunity for visitors wishing to connect to adjacent trails and open space lands • SS - Location at major intersection enhances regional wayfinding. • SS - Supports realignment of Alpine Trail. • SS - Provides 50 parking spaces and allows visitors to connect with adjacent trails and open space lands 	
Aesthetics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JG - The entrance driveway at the 4-way stop intersection is the most intuitive and the least obtrusive alternative • JG - Locates parking across from existing commercial area and associated parking lots • JG - Parking and restroom on the preserve's perimeter minimizes visibility from trails within the preserve • JG - Keeps amenities such as the vault toilet outside the 75-foot scenic corridor • DS - Possibility to screen from Alpine Road limits visual impact. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JG - Parking may be visible from Alpine Road • HQ - View from Alpine Rd will need some mitigation such as the berm shown in drawings • KV - Although short in distance, the retaining wall is 10' tall. • TF - Visible from Alpine Road. • RO - Parking may be visible from Alpine Road • SS - Requires berm and screening tree planting. Initial appearance after construction would likely appear harsh, until screening trees fill in. • SS - Appearance of large paved turnaround would be improved with addition of central planted median. • SS - Substantial grading to create level parking lot. Retaining wall would need aesthetic treatment and

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DS - Smallest paved footprint for both parking and driveway • KV - Parked cars would not be visible from the street for either pedestrians or motorists helping maintain the Alpine Road Scenic Corridor. • KV - Existing four-way stop will require less new signage and crossing markings than other entrances. • KV - Retaining Wall required for the turnaround is in a limited area. • KV - Limited screening required to hide the parking lot. • KV - Turning this into a four way stop sign will eliminate using this area for the frequent public signs that are currently placed on the fence. • SM – 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. • SM – Agree that a screening berm would be a good addition to reduce visibility from Alpine Road. • TF - 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. • CK - I don't get how the turn around will work without lots grading and retaining walls, but defer to your judgement here • RO - Locates parking across from existing commercial area and associated parking lots, e.g. Roberts Market • RO - Sites parking and restroom to the preserve's perimeter, minimizing its visibility from trails within the preserve 	<p>vegetative screening to appear more natural. Cut slope at rear would need careful contouring and revegetation.</p>
--	---	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RO - Keeps structures, such as the restroom, out of the 75' setback of the Alpine Road Scenic Corridor • RO - A potential screening berm could be built between Alpine Road and the parking area, preserving aesthetic resources • RO - 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 • SS - Driveway and parking consistent with appearance of commercial center. • SS - Lowest amount of paved area than other options. • SS - 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 scenic corridor. 	
<p>Operations and Maintenance</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JG - Keeping parking to the preserve's perimeter facilitates better access for law enforcement, ranger patrol and emergency response personnel • DS - Easy to monitor and open/close from existing driveway. • HQ - Readily oversight of access • KV - More easily patrolled and accessed by ranger, sheriff and emergency services. • SM – This option should be 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). • TF - Easily accessible from Alpine Road for emergency vehicles and maintenance. • RO - Keeping parking to the preserve's perimeter facilitates better access for law enforcement, ranger patrol and emergency response personnel 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SS - Good visibility for law enforcement. • SS - Lowest amount of paved area among all the alternatives 	
<p>Other Considerations</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JG - With POST now permitting this option, this becomes the clear preferred option. • JG - 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 • JG - Construction costs are relatively low • DS - Least expensive option • DS - Consolidates all parking in an already visually impacted section of Alpine Road. • HQ - Overall the best option, if allowed • KV - Lower construction cost than option 9 • KV - 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. • KV - Located next to a grocery store and a restaurant provides convenient post hiking or biking opportunities to the public. • SM – I strongly recommend this as the best option, even better than Option 9, especially given the recent permission from POST to extend parking into the “Unimproved portion” defined in the Conservation Easement. • SM – More cost effective than Option 7 and 9. • TF - Water fountains in Triangle Park are more accessible from the trail network. • RO - Construction cost is relatively less than options 7 and 9 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DS - Has POST granted access in the conservation easement area? • HQ - Can it be built within the conservation easement? • KV - 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. • TF - Visibility from the road could increase the probability of thefts. • RO - 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.

Attachment 9

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• SS - Located away from residential areas. Encourages support of local businesses. Consistent with land use in commercial core.• SS - Best option of all other parking alternatives. Pros outweigh the cons.	
--	--	--