

1 **TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 17, 2015**

2 Rinconada Library
3 1213 Newell Road
4 Palo Alto, CA 94303
5 5:30 PM TO 8:30 PM
6

7 **Call to Order:**

8 **Co-Chair Garber:** As a reminder, we have a bunch more microphones. Click them on, and be sure to
9 click them off when you're not using them as everything is now being recorded. Hopefully, we can all
10 hear each other. One quick note before we proceed. That is we will offer Steve Levy congratulations on
11 becoming a granddad this week. We are going to go to Oral Communication.

12 **Oral Communication:**

13 **Co-Chair Garber:** I have two speaker cards. Is there anyone else that would like to speak? If there is—I
14 have three speaker cards. If anyone else would like to speak, please bring a speaker card up to me. For
15 members of the public, if you would please sign in. I believe there's a sign-up sheet back there as well,
16 even if you do not speak. Our first speaker this evening will be Bruce Heister, followed by Jan Stokley.
17 Bruce, you'll have three minutes. There's a microphone over underneath the clock over there.

18 **Bruce Heister:** Thank you, Mr. Co-Chair. I'm here to speak on behalf of the Community Working Group
19 who provides homeless services and develops homeless facilities here in Palo Alto. We have submitted
20 comments to the item on human services that is online. You have that material there, and some rewrite
21 of it to get a few facts straightened out. The real thing we're interested in is just letting the community
22 know and letting you know sort of the thinking about the costs. Basically, several studies done recently,
23 both at the Federal level and also here at the County level, shows that if you can get people into
24 supportive housing and off the street, chronically homeless people which are people with mainly mental
25 and drug, whatever, related things. That saves about \$20,000 a person a year. If you look at the
26 experience at the Opportunity Center over the last nine years that it's existed, we've had on average
27 about 50 chronically homeless in that center every year. That saved \$9 million of costs in the

DRAFT

DRAFT

DRAFT

1 community. I think it's something that has to be taken into account in looking at homeless services.
2 There are some new vehicles coming about to help finance that for governments. That is the use of
3 success bonds and what's called social impact bonds which the County is using, and they're also using
4 down in the City of San Jose right now. It does one thing for the city; it takes a little bit of the risk out of
5 the process of funding housing services. The people providing those services have to perform to get
6 their money. In turn, they have to achieve the savings of 20 or 30 or \$45,000, whatever it is, for the
7 communities they're operating in. I ask that you read the comments that we've made about the actual
8 positions in the paper, the section on human services. Thank you very much.

9 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Jan Stokley to be followed by **Charles Beecroft**.

10 **Jan Stokley:** Good evening. I'm Jan Stokley with Housing Choices Coalition. We're a nonprofit
11 organization founded largely by parents and service providers from Palo Alto. Our mission is to create
12 quality, affordable housing options for people with developmental disabilities. Developmental
13 disabilities include a range of conditions that occur before the age of 18, primarily characterized by
14 intellectual and social disabilities. Examples are people with autism, cerebral palsy and other conditions.
15 What's unique about Palo Alto is that there is a very large population of adults with developmental
16 disabilities who are living at home with aging parents. The reason they're still living at home is not
17 because they haven't had a wonderful education and a wonderful opportunity to develop independent
18 living skills, but because the cost of housing is so high. Our organization partners with housing
19 developers so that supportive services are linked to permanent housing that's affordable to people with
20 developmental disabilities. We've partnered on 14 affordable housing properties across Santa Clara
21 County. Unfortunately, none of them are in Palo Alto. I wanted to let you know that there are 166
22 adults with developmental disabilities who are living at home with aging parents, and they very much
23 need to have services linked with housing. You heard a little bit about the need for permanent
24 supportive housing for the homeless. What's different about the homeless is that they're very visible.

DRAFT

DRAFT

DRAFT

1 You see them on the street. Our population, they're living at home with parents who are getting older
2 and increasingly less able to cope with being the primary housing provider as well as the primary service
3 provider. As you consider the challenge of developing plans for community services, please provide
4 leadership to ensure that services are linked to commitments to provide affordable housing for people
5 with developmental disabilities. What we know from our experience is that cities through their
6 leadership role, their zoning power, their local housing funds have tremendous opportunity to create
7 affordable housing that's targeted for the most vulnerable. As you consider many different priorities,
8 we hope you'll consider affordable housing needs for the adults who are living at home with aging
9 parents here in Palo Alto. There are 166 of them, and Palo Alto has the largest percentage of adults still
10 living at home with parents of any city in Santa Clara County. It's very high; it's a very big need; it's
11 invisible. Please make it visible as you work on your service element. I have a handout which describes
12 our partner properties, so you can see that's being done across (inaudible). I also have a comment from
13 one of the parents who wasn't able to be here.

14 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Let's make sure our—is our timer operational? Thank you. **Charles**
15 **Beecroft** to be followed by **Corene Algar**.

16 **Charles Beecroft:** I'm **Charles Beecroft**. I'm a parent of a young adult who is on the autism spectrum.
17 He's very fortunate to be in the Palo Alto community, and he was hired here through the SAP Autism at
18 Work Program, which is a wonderful program worldwide. Housing is one situation that's very difficult
19 for him as he doesn't drive and transportation from other areas kind of becomes difficult. A lot of the
20 more affordable areas that he's looked at, it might be a combination of two hours bus and train rides
21 and maybe several changes. Young men on the autism spectrum don't deal with transition and change
22 as well. Again, it's just kind of reiterating what Jan would say, that you look at that disabled population
23 when we're looking at housing and affordable housing resources. In his situation, he found a place
24 that's a reasonable commute; he can walk to the bus and get to work from there. The downside is his

DRAFT

DRAFT

DRAFT

1 rent went up \$500 a month after he'd been there a year. His salary went up about \$100 a month. As we
2 move into next year, I expect similar situations. Long term, he may not be able to afford to stay at this
3 wonderful position in the community and may have to move further out and find a lot lesser position
4 elsewhere due to the housing situation. That's kind of unfortunate. There's a lot of other disabled
5 young adults that are in similar situations that are employed and contributing to society, but kind of in
6 the middle range where they don't qualify for the most support and really need help to be in housing in
7 your area and your community. Thank you very much for your time.

8 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. As a reminder, we have **Corene Algar** coming up next. If you would like to
9 speak, please fill out a card, and you will be next after **Corene. Corene.**

10 **Corene Algar:** Yes, hello. I'm one of those aging parents. I'm in my mid-70s; my husband's 86 and he's
11 had a stroke. We have two severely autistic children. Now, what does that look like? My son who is 47
12 can't speak; he can't brush his teeth; he can't comb his hair; he can't shave. He has seizures; he has pica,
13 that means he pulls the threads out and goes through two sets of clothes a day. He's in northern Marin,
14 in northern Novato. My stepdaughter is in Campbell. We live in Palo Alto. Thanksgiving, Christmas,
15 Easter, when I want all of us home for the holidays, I drive over 12 hours a day and cook and do all the
16 meals and all the prep for them. It's getting really, really hard. We don't have enough services here for
17 me to have my son closer. It means that I have to hire someone to be his advocate when I can't drive
18 that far or to help him in an emergency. I can't tell you how difficult it is to have the holidays. We have
19 a lot of needs here. I don't believe that Palo Alto is complying with the Olmstead Act. That's Senate Bill
20 812, about having inclusive housing for persons with developmental disabilities. There are a lot of
21 options that should be for people with disabilities. Some are higher functioning but many, especially on
22 the autism spectrum, are very difficult and very, very complex in their needs. They might need one-to-
23 one care 24/7. That means when we think of housing we need to think of having two and three-
24 bedroom units built, and maybe four-bedroom units built. There might be two compatible persons with

1 disabilities, each needing one-to-one care, but you have caregivers who might need days off, go on
2 vacation, not show up. It protects them from abuse, because there's more eyes on it. We need to think
3 of, in our plan, three-bedroom and four-bedroom units. Also, we need to be open or encourage
4 developers, maybe sharing with other cities nearby, housing where we have communities. People might
5 say they'll be nice to that guy who doesn't speak and has a funny expression on his face, and needs to
6 have a caregiver. In reality, it's very lonesome, and it's very isolating. I want you to be aware in Palo
7 Alto that for me to have to go that far for my son for every holiday, when we are getting in our late 70s
8 and 80s, that's really difficult. Thank you.

9 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Gabriel Lewis followed by Anne Hare.

10 **Gabriel Lewis:** Hello everyone. I just wanted to comment briefly on something that I've commented on
11 before, and just reiterate about the phrase "customer service," which I actually believe does not appear
12 thankfully in the current version of the document. I just wanted to explain why I had kind of pushed to
13 change that to something else. I've been told that some people are a little unsure of what else they
14 ought to say instead of "customer service." The reason why I thought that we shouldn't be using the
15 phrase "customer service" is simply that factually it's not correct. We're not customers; we're citizens.
16 There's something deeper behind that, which is that the relationship between a government and its
17 citizens is very different from that between a company and its customers. A company serves its
18 customers only inasmuch as they can increase its profits by law. If a company attempts to serve its
19 customers at the expense of its profits, it can be sued by its shareholders. In that sense we—a
20 government must be held to a higher ideal. Of course, we want to serve its citizens regardless of
21 whether it will somehow benefit. As to what we ought to say instead, I think it's actually okay that we
22 don't have a single word or phrase that can replace "customer service" in all of its uses. The words have
23 become kind of a cliché. It's something that doesn't really mean much. Every company claims to have
24 the best customer service. It might mean more if we're forced to devise a slightly different way of

1 saying it each time we're thinking about who are we serving, how are we serving them, why are we
2 serving them. In fact, I think the confusion or the seeming confusion over what do we put in instead of
3 "customer service" should just be guiding us to thinking more deeply about how exactly do we serve.
4 Thank you.

5 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Our last speaker, Anne Hare.

6 **Anne Hare:** Hello everyone. Thank you. My name is Anne Hare. I'm a resident of Palo Alto and the
7 mother of a lovely young adult son with developmental disability and autism, which I know you've
8 already heard about. He is currently living in Mountain View in a new development for individuals with
9 developmental disability, and it was built with the support of the City of Mountain View. I'd like the
10 Advisory Committee to look at how we can create a space for people with DD to live inclusively in Palo
11 Alto. I'd like the City to foster relationships and partnerships with nonprofits such as Housing Choices
12 Coalition—I know Jan spoke earlier—to help all our adult children find affordable housing in the
13 community they know. Housing Choices Coalition was instrumental in helping to build the new
14 development in Mountain View. It educates, advocates and helps to create housing opportunities for
15 individuals with developmental disability. Currently, the Coalition has 14 partner properties in Santa
16 Clara County, but none in the City of Palo Alto. According to the California Department of
17 Developmental Services, a total of 458 people with developmental disabilities live in Palo Alto and 401,
18 that's nearly 90 percent, are living at home with parents or guardians. Only 47 adults with DD have their
19 own place to live in Palo Alto. Twenty-six live at Page Mill Courts which is a Mid-Pen Peninsula Housing
20 property, but the waiting list has been closed for years and it's restricted to people who only need
21 independent living services. This means that there are 166 adults with developmental disabilities in Palo
22 Alto living at home with aging parents. Fifty-one people with DD who live in Palo Alto have been
23 referred to Housing Choices Coalition by the San Andreas Regional Center to help find affordable
24 housing, because it does not exist in their own community. I'm not certain of the total number of

1 younger individuals with autism spectrum disorder and/or developmental disability currently in our
2 schools. In 1986, when my son was born at Stanford Hospital, the number of individuals with autism
3 was 1 in 10,000. The number today is 1 in 68, and perhaps 1 in 62. I'm here because I believe the City
4 should make an effort to include all of our community members in future development plans,
5 particularly many of our most vulnerable. I'd encourage the Advisory Committee to consider the needs,
6 but particularly housing of individuals with DD in the Palo Alto Comprehensive Plan and to use the City's
7 housing funds to incentivize developers to include housing for individuals with DD. Thanks very much.

8 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. I'm going to remind our public that if they have comments, we are using
9 this public period to take any comments as well as comments that are related to our item of discussion
10 this evening. If you haven't already, please sign in on the sign-up sheet, regardless if you've spoken or
11 not. Let's move on to our Agenda Item Number 1.

12 **Staff Comments:**

13 *[Heard after approval of minutes.]*

14 **Co-Chair Garber:** Elena or Hillary, do you have comments? Then we'll come to Item Number 2.

15 **Hillary Gitelman:** Yes. Thank you, Dan. Hillary Gitelman. I'm standing in for Jeremy this evening. He
16 sends his regrets. He's at home in bed. He actually said, "I've been in bed since Sunday afternoon, but I
17 think I can get up and come to the meeting." We suggested that maybe he should stay home rather
18 than bringing us his germs. Anyway, he sends his regrets, and he did pass on some notes to me.

19 **1. Update on Nov 2nd Council Meeting**

20 **Hillary Gitelman:** Let me start by just saying that we had a constructive meeting with the City Council
21 on November 2nd about the Land Use and Community Design Element. This was specific about goals
22 and vision statement for that Element, in addition to the now-famous Policy L-8 that had Citywide
23 growth limit. It was a long discussion. I was just counting up the number of amendments or additions
24 to the first of two motions. There were 21 separate changes to the motion. When we talk with the CAC

DRAFT

DRAFT

DRAFT

1 about land use at your next meeting, we'll give you a full copy of the Council's direction and a staff
2 report that kind of sets the tone for that discussion.

3 **Male:** Can we get that earlier?

4 **Hillary Gitelman:** Sure.

5 **Male:** If we want to take that and provide written comments as input, we need it at least two or three
6 weeks (inaudible).

7 **Hillary Gitelman:** Happy to do that. It's a part of the public record. I think the Clerk has already put it
8 together, so we can send it out to you. Just moving into tonight's discussion. Jeremy wanted me to
9 make sure that you knew what materials we had provided at places this evening and just make a few
10 opening remarks before handing this over to the Chair. First, at places this evening you should have in
11 front of you a revised matrix with minor corrections, but really no substantive changes. There were
12 some misspellings and other errors; we've corrected those. Secondly, you should have emails with
13 comments on the Element by CAC members including some items that were mistakenly left out of the
14 packet. I hope you've learned by now to come a few minutes early, so you can read through some of
15 these materials. You also should have received a memo from the Human Relations Commission on the
16 draft. Rob de Geus from the department is here if we have questions for him during the discussion that
17 follows. We also have provided to you the public comments that came in via the digital commenter.
18 Staff had an exchange with Jennifer earlier this week about just recognizing how important it is that you
19 take the time to read through those comments, because you're the filter. This is the place, you are the
20 body that we want to pay attention to the comments that come in that way and decide which of those
21 you want to introduce or use to influence the outcome of your efforts. The purpose of tonight's
22 meeting is to review the preliminary draft of this first Element and confirm that the previous comments
23 provided by the CAC have been addressed. We'd like to hear from you what we got right and what we
24 got wrong. This one is kind of a practice round a little bit. We weren't taking verbatim minutes when

DRAFT

DRAFT

DRAFT

1 we had our first brainstorming session on this. It's fully conceivable that we left some things out.
2 Tonight is your opportunity to make it clear what we did leave out and see if your colleagues will agree
3 to put it in. As we discussed in the staff memo, we had a very constructive small subcommittee meeting
4 on this subject. I'll let the subcommittee speak for themselves, but I think the subcommittee believes
5 that the draft included here addressed the issues that were of concern to the CAC. Hopefully, Bonnie
6 and Len and Lydia will be able to go into more detail and specifically identify those issues where
7 resolution is still necessary. The idea of the subcommittee is that after this meeting, they would meet
8 again to do two things. If there are still areas of disagreement or areas that need resolution, they would
9 work on a draft report characterizing kind of the pros and cons and the full flavor of those unresolved
10 issues. They would also work with the staff to make sure that your direction from this evening is
11 incorporated into the draft work product that will go to the City Council. Just like this is sort of a
12 practice round for you, the City Council gets the first work product in January as kind of their
13 opportunity to see that they will also get to weigh in on each Element as the Committee starts to
14 produce work products. I think that's it for my introductory remarks, unless there are any questions.

15 **Co-Chair Garber:** We have one question from Co-Chair Keller.

16 **Co-Chair Keller:** It would be good if staff could send out to the CAC an updated schedule of CAC
17 meetings.

18 **Hillary Gitelman:** Thank you for that suggestion. What I was going to recommendation is that at your
19 next meeting, we actually have a discussion item on the agenda to look ahead at the schedule for the
20 first quarter of next year. We've thought of one adjustment already that we would like to make. It'd be
21 good for all of us to collectively look at the schedule and see what we have coming at us.

22 **Co-Chair Garber:** Very good. With that, I'm seeing no other hands here.

23 **Agenda Items:**

24 **1. Action: Approval of October 20th CAC Meeting Minutes**

DRAFT

DRAFT

DRAFT

1 **Co-Chair Garber:** Action, the approval of our October 20 meeting minutes. Do I hear or see a motion?

2 Thank you. We have a motion from Doria to approve. Do we have a second?

3 **Hamilton Hitchings:** Second.

4 **Co-Chair Garber:** From Hamilton as second. All in favor raise your hands and say aye. Opposed. The
5 motion passes. Let's go to Agenda Item Number 2.

6 **2. Action: Review and Recommendation for the Draft Community Services and Facilities Draft**
7 **Element.**

8 **Co-Chair Garber:** This is the review and recommendation for the draft Community Services and
9 Facilities Draft Element. I apologize. I have skipped the Staff Comments.

10 *[Discussion moved to Staff Comments above.]*

11 **Co-Chair Garber:** By the way, we're organizing this meeting in the way that we have other meetings, in
12 that the first round here we're going to start on the left with the subcommittee presenting first. Then
13 you'll each get three minutes. We'll go right around the table. The second piece of the discussion will
14 be to focus on ideally the pros and cons that the subcommittee has asked for a fuller discussion as well
15 as if there are other items that come up during the first part that we need to vote on. In between the
16 first round and the second part, we're going to take a brief break where the subcommittee and the Co-
17 Chairs are going to get together to review what we should be creating our straw polls off of. There will
18 be a brief break ideally around 7:00, 7:10 or thereabouts. We'll see how well we do. With that, can the
19 subcommittee please give us their report? It's Bonnie, Lydia and Len. Although we're going to be timing
20 you at three minutes, if you happen to go over a little bit, that's perfectly fine. We want you to have a
21 full report. Then we'll rein everybody else into the three minutes. Thank you.

22 **Bonnie Packer:** Thank you, Dan. The three of us met. As the memo shows, there were three items.
23 The first one is not really controversial, but I think it was thought that we'd put it out here so we get
24 more input from everybody about how to implement it. One of the things I just want to say is I feel that

DRAFT

DRAFT

DRAFT

1 community services, this Element, this represents the heart of the City as opposed to the legs and the
2 whatever. This is the heart. What the City serves are, some people say citizens. I like to think of the
3 recipients of the services are members of our community. These include all the local residents, all the
4 businesses that are here, people who live and work here of all ages, genders, ethnicities, socioeconomic
5 status, physical and mental abilities. There may be more adjectives to add to that, that I didn't include.
6 That's everyone. That's why we felt that Goal 1, which is called efficient and effective service delivery. A
7 lot of the goals and programs seem to us to address the efficiency of delivering the services, but what's
8 really effective about services is if it really reaches everybody or if everybody really has the opportunity
9 to access the wonderful things that the City has to offer. We thought that there was some really good
10 language in the goal that addresses health and wellness that triggered the idea that what the City should
11 really be doing is studying the barriers to access to all these services, not just the services dealing with
12 health and wellness, which is what the last goal is about. We thought that Goal C-5 which addresses this
13 had some very excellent language about this issue which we felt should be the overarching policy for
14 Goal C-1. That could say something like "proactively ensure that all members of our community have
15 easy access to community services and facilities." Then, a program could be—this is based on one of the
16 programs in C-5—"conduct a study of barriers to accessing community services and facilities across age,
17 gender, socioeconomic and ethnic groups in Palo Alto and adopt strategies to remove barriers
18 identified." There could be some more proactive language and this can come from ideas from you. In
19 the first goal about delivery and access, it's about giving and receiving. There were some good ideas
20 also on Policy C-5.8 that could be for all these services, not just health and wellness. Keeping
21 community members informed; ensuring there's adequate transportation to the services and the
22 facilities where the services are being offered; providing financial assistance; and establishing cross-
23 cultural outreach programs. That's the report on that item. We welcome ideas from you about how we
24 can achieve this in the first goal.

DRAFT

DRAFT

DRAFT

1 **Lydia Kou:** The second item that we have that is—I won't say controversial, but more for clarity,
2 especially since it involves our schools which of course in this Element already states that schools are
3 vital to our community. We would like to see much clearer and direct language in working together. For
4 example, Page C-17, Program C-1.13.2, right now it says "assess the potential for City shared use for
5 PAUSD facilities for childcare, libraries," etc., etc. Instead of using "assess," perhaps "discuss and
6 determine" or just use the word "determine," so it's a action word. Another example would be perhaps
7 Policy C-1.15. At this point, it says "continue to enhance City efforts to assist PAUSD in anticipating and
8 addressing land development related school enrollment impacts." Instead of "continue to enhance City
9 efforts," we should say "the City shall make it a high priority to assist PAUSD in anticipating and
10 addressing." Using more direct language so that we can move forward and have an action plan, rather
11 than just continuing to study. Lastly, another example would be Policy C-1.16. It was in the original
12 Comp Plan. The wording over there is much more better. The draft uses "assess." In the original, it says
13 "require an assessment of impacts to schools prior to the approval of development projects that require
14 legislative acts," etc., etc. Again, use action words rather than using study words. Hopefully we can
15 have a discussion about certain language. Thank you.

16 **Len Filppu:** I wanted to add just a couple of things to Lydia's discussion on the schools and the City.
17 These are two elected bodies. We have the City Council and the School Board. Sometimes they act like
18 silos and don't communicate with one another. We don't want to make them start communicating with
19 each and make one larger silo. We want to make sure that the public, the citizenry, is involved in this.
20 We can help do this through this process. If you look at the bottom of page C-17, there's a program, C-
21 1.15.1, provide regular status reports to Palo Alto School District on potential and approved
22 development projects. We could easily add the words "and report them to the public." I think it's
23 critical that the public get involved in the actions of these two elected bodies. Similarly, on the very top
24 of the next page which is C-18, Policy C-1.16 says "assess impacts to schools prior to the approval of

1 development projects that require legislative acts including general plan amendments and zoning
2 changes. Report impact findings to Palo Alto." We should add "and the community and the public and
3 the citizenry." That way they are aware of the impacts that can occur to the citizens with the decisions
4 they make. Moving on to the third area of alleged controversy. These were not real controversial
5 issues, but they're subjects that we're interested in getting information on. That is the discussion that
6 Gabriel brought up about the use of the word "customer." In business, customer is always right but, in
7 government, "customer" is really a wrong term to use. This was not a controversy. As soon as we
8 brought it up in the subcommittee, the City representative said, "No, no. We're trying to find a different
9 word." We're all in agreement "customer" is not the right word. It implies a transaction of money, and
10 that is not the kind of activity you want to have in a public governmental sphere. I'm partial to use of
11 different words. As Gabriel from the public commented, "citizen" is an excellent word and "citizen" not
12 in the legal sense. There's some discussion that we had in the subcommittee that not everyone is a
13 citizen, but the use of "citizen" does not necessarily have to talk about crossing the border, citizenship,
14 passport kind of legal sense. It's more in a general sense. Like the second major definition in almost
15 every dictionary you take a look at, a citizen is an inhabitant of a particular town or city. I think the
16 people would get the sense. Using the word "citizen, "stakeholders," "public," "residents,"
17 "inhabitants," "community members," these are all good words that are better than "customer."
18 Thanks.

19 **Co-Chair Garber:** Anything else? If not, let's start with Doria.

20 **Doria Summa:** I wanted to thank Staff and the subcommittee for working so hard on this. I think in
21 general there was a lot of good in it. I agree with Len and Gabriel's point about the word "customer." I
22 think in most places it can just be left out, and it will say "performance" or "service" or "quality of
23 service" instead of "quality of customer service." That was one thing. I also appreciate the public that
24 came to speak about the need for adults with developmental disabilities housing; that was very helpful.

1 Some other things I wanted to talk about. The community health and well-being goal, I thought the goal
2 was very good in the first several, four or five policies, very good. Then I thought it sort of got a little—
3 there was too much specificity in some of the policies and programs for me. Although they're all a lot of
4 good ideas, I'm not sure they should be in the Comp Plan. It's not that it's bad that they're there. Things
5 about, like, evaluating nutrition for vending machines and things like that, I think those are all good
6 things to do; I'm not sure that they rise to the level of things that need to be included in the Comp Plan.
7 One idea I wanted to talk about, which would be a new idea, and that is concerning EIRs and
8 environmental review that depends on statements of overriding considerations. I thought it would be
9 interesting to consider whether we should discourage that when it pertains to health and well-being
10 issues and maybe discourage ignoring overriding considerations being used when it really is something
11 that's contributing to the degradation of our health and well-being. I think that's it for now.

12 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Shani.

13 **Shani Kleinhaus:** Thank you. Doria and I wrote a long list of recommendations. I hope you have time to
14 look at them. I won't go through all of them, but I think the issue of development disabilities is really
15 important and is missing for adults. There is something in the Plan now for children with developmental
16 disabilities, but actual number for autism is now 1 in 45. It's a wave that is going to inundate us and a lot
17 of people living, as some of our audience has mentioned, as people that are elderly having to take care
18 of adults in their homes. They need services, housing for sure. There should be something for that.
19 Also, we suggested some programs that are similar to what is already there, just also for this population.
20 I agree with the "customer" discussion here. I think for Policy C-1.10, I think the idea that corporate
21 citizenship, while I totally agree that citizens live and work in this community, I'm not so sure that we
22 need to have corporate citizenship. I would say "corporate participation" or "corporate sponsorship" or
23 something else for C-1.10. In Policy 4.8, there is something about expanding space for community art. I
24 think that's a great idea, but some community art project, if they're placed in nature, can actually cause

1 harm to nature and wildlife. The same disclaimer that appeared in one of the other programs, I would
2 add here, that only when new exhibits, classes and other activities are consistent with goals of
3 protecting and conserving wildlife in natural environment, at least for open space parks. There is some
4 program, C-5, 6, 2 and so on, that I think are overreaching. I'm not sure who wants to develop nutrition
5 charts for any catering event like the one we had just now here. Somebody has to check that all those
6 checkboxes are just right, and they didn't include, I don't know, the wrong mayonnaise or something. I
7 don't think these are the level of this Plan. Something about the programs in C-5 that the committee
8 has mentioned about barriers to participation in existing programs, I would like to add "the ability" here.
9 It didn't mention ability or disability; I think that should be added. I probably forgot some of them, but.
10 Thank you.

11 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Don.

12 **Don McDougall:** I've submitted a number of specific comments on the Plan, but I'd like to make some
13 general comments. I agree with the committee when they talked about moving the "easy access" and
14 "access for all" out of Section 5 into Section 1. I would go further and suggest that maybe, even if it's
15 repeated, it should be moved into the vision statement. The vision statement says an awful lot of
16 statements about we're going to supply this or we're going to supply that, we're going supply that, but it
17 never comments to what end. It would seem a vision statement should have a vision of what the end-
18 goal is of providing easy access to all or providing a vibrant community or whatever it might be, and not
19 just detailing out who the special audiences are. My second comment would be that I've heard a
20 number of times that we need to see if we can prioritize these things. I'm not sure that prioritizing is
21 possible or even necessarily correct. I do think that we could signal the seriousness of some of these
22 things by changing where it says "periodically review" something, to saying "monthly review" if we think
23 it's really serious or "biannually review." I think the CAC has some obligation to signal what amount of
24 attention we would like seen to some of these things. The same thing with defining metrics. One of the

1 comments back was—I think it's now a program—that we're going to use the capital budget metrics.
2 I've read the capital budget. I can say I've read it; I can't say I've studied it. I couldn't find metrics in
3 there that were in any way related to what you would call a services and facilities plan. I would like to
4 see us define some metrics. In terms of Goal 1, there are 29 policies here. A lot of those policies are in
5 fact not necessarily the efficient delivery; they're just the delivery. I wonder if there should maybe be a
6 different section that defines here's the things we're going to deliver, and then let's talk about the
7 efficient and effective delivery separately. As it is, it's just all about the availability. Maybe we need to
8 put something again in the narrative or something, but I don't think we call that out. In terms of the
9 excellence of customer service, I agree with what people have been saying about "customer," but it
10 does say "customer service" in the vision. I do think that we need to look at, say, 2.1.2. It says "tangible
11 incentives." On the one hand, we're being general about periodic. On the other hand, we're telling the
12 City Manager how he has to run his business and provide tangible incentives. Maybe it should just
13 simply say "appropriate recognition and rewards." We could start arguing with a union about what is
14 tangible. In the maintenance section under 3.1.1, it says we're going to evaluate the costs of the
15 appliances and fixtures and irrigation. It doesn't say anything other than we're going to evaluate the
16 costs. It doesn't say what we're going to do about it. I would suggest the appliances and fixtures should
17 be separate from the irrigation. Those are two separate kinds of uses of water. They're not the same
18 thing. Can I have another 30 seconds?

19 **Co-Chair Garber:** Go ahead.

20 **Don McDougall:** Under planning for parks, I heard the committee say something about they'd rather
21 have statements in there about being proactive. I think, in terms of the park requirements, I know the
22 Council told us not to worry so much about C-28 or whatever, but I think a program should proactively
23 identify the park needs as opposed to reactively put out a map that says "here's where the parks are."
24 How about putting out a map that says "here's where the parks aren't"? Under health and well-being,

1 there are 13 different items there. To me, most of them are about either eating—somebody had that
2 right—or the transportation to the facilities or the amenities that we might provide. Particularly in light
3 of the *Atlantic* magazine article that came out, I'm surprised that we don't say something about mental
4 health as opposed to just simply physical health. The total implication here is that this is all about being
5 healthy and getting out to the parks and whatever. It doesn't address mental health at all. I suggest
6 that we should do that. I suggest also that since we have Palo Alto Medical and Stanford Medical in the
7 immediate vicinity, there should be a statement in here about demanding that they participate and
8 cooperate in providing health and well-being. In the vision statement, we talk about police and fire.
9 Under health and well-being, we don't talk about police and fire. I would suggest we add that. Thank
10 you for the extra time.

11 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Ellen.

12 **Ellen Uhrbrock:** I'll start with the vision statement, which I really like. I think it really is the vision. It
13 well describes what the Palo Alto customers are, and it limits it to the residents, businesses and visitors.
14 I think that's a pretty good definition of our customers. I object to replacing that as a term and replacing
15 it with something that is vague. It's not vague. I certainly object to stakeholders which I basically feel is
16 a way that management and maybe the Council can compensate people who volunteer their time
17 without compensation. Stakeholders is out as far as I'm concerned. In the section on consider other
18 Elements, I really think that it needs to be mentioned that transportation is an Element that is so
19 incorporated with delivery of any kind of services to the public and to your customers. I would like that
20 included. Under the existing Community Services and Facilities, I would like to have you add the e-
21 branch of the libraries. This is new; it has its own budget; it has staff; and it has a separate business
22 model. It is a major and very important facility that is available to Palo Alto. I'd add that. In some way,
23 I'd like to add the Palo Alto e-services. These are listed under the library section. There's a whole
24 section where it goes to the e-services. The e-services often are compensation or a way to avoid

1 transportation problems. It needs to be listed as one of the facilities that we have. Finally, on the goals
2 and policies and programs in efficient delivery, I think that whole Goal Number 1 needs to be edited.
3 There are not good action words introducing any of the policies or the programs. They say things like
4 "Palo Alto should continue to take a leadership role." How are you going to budget that and how are
5 you going to plan to do that? That could be said instead just "take a leadership role." Your Council can
6 decide whether or not that is something they want to do. If they don't, it's yes or no. If you ask them to
7 continue to take a leadership role or discuss it, they can discuss it for months and months and you're
8 going to be further and further behind on your schedule. There are lots of illustrations. Especially it's on
9 Goal C-1. The other goals are much better with action words of what we're going to do. That kind of
10 summarizes my two minutes.

11 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you, Ellen. Julia.

12 **Julia Moran:** I think given the makeup of Palo Alto and so many new families with kids coming into Palo
13 Alto that aren't from Palo Alto, instead of people coming home that went to school and moving back, I
14 think it's important that we have something about intergenerational community programs, not just
15 senior programs and youth programs. Policy C-1.11 talks about intergenerational interaction with
16 regards to childcare. Maybe that could be fleshed out or Program C-5.12.1. I think that's important in
17 our community. Along those lines, that Program C-5.12.1 is under a policy which seems much narrower
18 than the program is. I think the program's really important, so I think either that should be under a new
19 category or the policy should be expanded. Separately, I'm not sure if this makes sense or not. I think
20 that we should be putting somewhere within, especially our library system, looking into the
21 developmental needs of young children and making sure that there are spaces that follow along with
22 early childhood experts and American Association of Pediatrics recommendations when it comes to
23 screen time and having spaces that don't have low-level computers, so that people with young children

1 have a space to go to, within some of the libraries at least. That's about it. Thank you so much for all of
2 your work.

3 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Jason.

4 **Jason Titus:** First I would say I definitely agree on the interest or the need to sort of expand that kind of
5 intergenerational interaction, because I think that is definitely something that is somewhat unique to
6 this community, that so many folks have moved in. I think certainly I witness that a lot. I think
7 expanding that would be valuable. One of the other areas that I think falls into the parks section, was it
8 C-2? I feel that we have to have something that describes a way we will analyze how well our parks are
9 being used. If you look at the parks and their usage across Palo Alto, it varies widely. I used to live right
10 next to Johnson Park, packed all the time, people are eating meals there, picnics. It's a highly utilized
11 park. Now I'm near Scott Park and Heritage Park, and they're not used nearly as much even though the
12 population density seems like it's probably pretty similar with the number of new developments there. I
13 believe that comes out of park design and kind of some questionable decisions on both of those parks. I
14 think Comprehensive Plan-wise, we can say we should have an ongoing goal to improve the usage and
15 appreciation of the park space we have. I saw that people were saying it's very difficult for us to get
16 new parks. When you have large open spaces that are specifically designed to not be used as sports
17 fields, but they don't have picnic tables or they don't have shady spaces and a place where it's sunny 300
18 days a year, I feel like we could have a policy saying we are going to on an annual basis or a recurring
19 basis evaluate park utilization through surveys or some other mechanism like that to consistently
20 improve the utilization of our park resources. I feel like that could be helpful. That's it.

21 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Whitney.

22 **Whitney McNair:** Thank you. I wanted to thank staff and the subcommittee for putting this together. I
23 think that they've done a good job. I think the Comp Plan is a place to celebrate those ideas which are
24 unique to Palo Alto. I agree with Julia in the intergenerational programs. That is something which I see

1 as sort of very unique to Palo Alto or it should be celebrated more within Palo Alto. I just had a couple
2 of little points. On the map which is the parks and park service areas, Map C-2, I just didn't think that it
3 accurately represented the areas that are sort of the Foothill Expressway, Arastradero, Deer Creek,
4 Coyote Hill. There's identification of park service areas within a half mile and a quarter mile of an area
5 which is designated as open space or conservation lands. That really isn't a City park nor is it a service
6 that the community really has access to. To show that there's a buffer zone around there and an
7 identification of a land that truly isn't a space where you're going to be going and participating and being
8 at a park is just a little disingenuous, to identify that on the map. I would just look to clarify. I can work
9 with staff if you need help to that. On Policy C-2.1, it's the Program C-2.1.2. Don made a comment
10 about this tangible incentives. It just seems like a really odd thing to put into a Comp Plan. It just
11 doesn't seem like an appropriate place in a policy document. Lastly is Policy C-5.9. It's the partner with
12 businesses to facilitate public access to privately owned open space and facilities. That's a new one, and
13 it was in response to trying to provide more open space on private lands. I don't have a problem if the
14 desire is to keep it in there. It's probably better stated to partner with property owners, not businesses,
15 because you'd really be needing to work with property owners on that. Just from past experience in
16 working with cities, that is a challenging thing to get property owners to agree to, to get public access
17 across a private property for all sorts of different liability purposes and insurance and all that sort of
18 thing. Just to set the intention that that one would be difficult to obtain. If the goal was to keep it,
19 that'd be fine too.

20 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Amy.

21 **Amy Sung:** Hi. Thank you so much for this opportunity. I would like to start off by saying about this
22 public comment about the service for the mental disabilities. I myself have a son who has a disability
23 and also my family. I have witnessed that. When they are young, they receive all sorts of services.
24 Once they graduate from school, that seems to be on the family's shoulder. I have visited overseas in

DRAFT

DRAFT

DRAFT

1 the facilities, and that community has been supported and organized by the local governments. I think
2 for this group of people that need help, that need more than just housing, it should be almost as a
3 complete community that provides opportunity for them to work, to live, also with the medical support
4 and social support and also there's some sort of education. I think that when I look at our Comp Plan, I
5 see in Goal C-4, there is a Policy C-4 (inaudible) that establish almost like a really comprehensive
6 community for teens. I think that is an opportunity there to establish an independent community to
7 accommodate this group of people that really needs help. Like the public comments says, this invisible
8 group. Also, I notice in some of the policies, some of them will have a wordings like "provide funding,"
9 some do not. I wonder when there is a policy there, does that have an implied funding that comes with
10 it or it has to be specifically included in the policy? Also, in Policy C-3.4, it says "preserve El Camino
11 Park." I don't really know what that means. Does that mean it currently is not a recreational resource
12 for the community? I don't really know what that means. For the Policy C-5.2, Program 5.2.1, I would
13 like to see that will include across age, gender, socioeconomic and ethnic groups. We will add physical
14 and mental ability. The other thing is about our park and the school ...

15 **Co-Chair Garber:** Do you want to finish your sentence, Amy?

16 **Amy Sung:** All right. I just wanted to add that I know park and school play structures, they all look very,
17 very structured and organized. A couple of months ago, there was an article on (inaudible). It says that
18 children do more when they are exposed to items that they don't know. Maybe we need to incorporate
19 our park and play structures at this beautiful and this structured that comes with instructions. Thank
20 you.

21 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Adrian.

22 **Adrian Fine:** First of all, I would like to thank staff and the subcommittee. I think this was a really
23 (inaudible) draft that (inaudible) actually. I think the subcommittee hit some of the major issues on the
24 head. Just a few comments there. I completely agree that Goal 1 should address the removal of

1 barriers to services. That could probably (inaudible) throughout the Element here. Later when there's
2 something that we want to include in the vision (inaudible) suggest that. With regards to the School
3 District and City cooperation, maybe there's a place for a policy (inaudible) look at best practices that
4 other cities and school districts have done in cooperation. Given that these are two distinct authorities,
5 I think we need to be more specific in terms of encouraging their cooperation and collaboration. We
6 talked a little bit about citizens, customers, clients. I don't like the term "stakeholder" in this, but I think
7 the vision statement's done a pretty good job of identifying the folks who the City services. Just last
8 comment. I agree with some of the other speakers that there are a few overly specific policies in here
9 such as the vending machines and food at City (inaudible). Thank you.

10 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Annette.

11 **Annette Glanckopf:** Hello everyone. I don't have any specific criticisms on any of the policies or
12 programs. We certainly added a lot. Although, I totally agree with Lydia about stronger language and
13 not using fluffy, high-level words. I will be in the minority and say that I think this Element, again, is very
14 unmanageable and unbalanced. There is so much detail about kids and health, and very little about
15 seniors and, as pointed out, those that are more vulnerable. The policies, I don't know how anyone can
16 track them and implement them. I do believe there should be prioritization. One way to do that might
17 be to highlight the ones that are just really critical. Again, I say that some of the programs imply a
18 financial commitment that shouldn't be enshrined in a Comp Plan. Back to "customer service," I too
19 wanted to comment on that. I really like the term "service performance" that came out of what Shani
20 and Doria said. I still think that that concept, "service performance," should be in the Governance
21 Element, not in this particular Element. That all being said, I wanted to add a couple of points. In Goal
22 C-1, I would like to see a program, maybe a C-1.6.26.3, to provide support for healthcare nonprofit
23 organizations and continue to subsidize rents at Cubberley for organizations like the Cardiac Therapy
24 Foundation. We talked a lot about getting involved in publicity, so publicize healthcare programs,

DRAFT

DRAFT

DRAFT

1 include them, recognize them when appropriate. Abilities United, Achieve Kids, Pacific Stroke, Breast
2 Health, etc., are some that I would call out. Another program, C-1.27.1, which would be new, I really
3 think we need to establish and fund a location in south Palo Alto for senior services. We might say adult
4 services. It's going to be very difficult for everyone to park Downtown with the wonderful additions for
5 Avenidas. Under still Goal C-1, I resonate with the HRC's comments that they wanted to add C-1.22, 23,
6 24 that talked about senior nutrition, transportation and again mental health, which we've talked about.
7 I wanted to support Lydia and, I'm sorry, Doria and Shani's addition, C-1.24.2 and 3, which would be
8 programs for children, youth and adults that address developmental disabilities. Finally, under the parks
9 and libraries and community foundations, I would like to see an additional program, 4.3.2, to implement
10 public art in parks which hasn't really went where appropriate. Public art has not been incorporated in
11 this Element. I really think it defines any community and makes it better.

12 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Hamilton.

13 **Hamilton Hitchings:** First of all, I want to commend the City and the subcommittee on putting together
14 a nice draft. What I was most excited about is we're down to a single draft now. It actually looks quite
15 good. I think that is fantastic. I also think there have been a lot of great suggestions tonight. What I'm
16 going to speak about is helping to ensure that these great suggestions get incorporated. First, I really
17 like Bonnie's point on barriers of access to service. Lydia's comments on strengthening the language
18 around schools such as "the City shall make it a high priority to assist PAUSD," is an excellent suggestion
19 in that schools are just such a fundamental part of our community. Len's point on transparency and
20 communicating this information not just within the City, but to the community. As a Committee
21 member, it's actually been hard, especially in the beginning, to get access to a lot of this basic
22 information about schools. I actually think the new service Element does a nice job of laying that out at
23 the top. I also liked Doria's comment about overriding considerations. We really need to protect health
24 and well-being, so not using the EIR as a way to essentially skip over them. I'm just going to keep going.

DRAFT

DRAFT

DRAFT

1 Don McDougall's proactive, I think the word "proactive" is something that I really want to see us come
2 out of this process with. We also want to be proactive about things like growth and many other things,
3 but certainly about park needs. We need to add the word "mental health" to the health section; that's
4 absolutely a requirement. Ellen, e-services and an e-branch, thank you for helping us move into the 21st
5 century. We really need to incorporate that. I like Jason's point about improve park design. I agree
6 with Annette that seniors are a growing demographic. In the next 15 years, they're going to consume a
7 significant larger portion of City services and be a higher percentage of the community. This is a good
8 chance for us to prepare and plan for that. With that, I'll turn it over to the next speaker.

9 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Heidi.

10 **Heidi Emberling:** Thank you. Thank you, thank you. Great to be working from one document. Where
11 to begin? I'm going to go back to the National Citizens Survey that Palo Alto did in January 2015 where I
12 brought this up last time. We are ranked 100th out of 215 benchmarked communities in availability of
13 affordable, quality childcare or preschool. One hundred out of 215. Just for comparison, we're ranked
14 2nd out of 215 for K-12 education, 2nd. We're ranked 3rd in adult educational opportunities, again out
15 of these 200-plus communities that are benchmarked to us. I don't want to read any more of those
16 numbers. We're providing about 56 percent of the children here in our community, 56 percent of our
17 available childcare slots, that's it. We're really, really low on access to childcare. I don't see it yet in this
18 version. I would like to propose, which I proposed last time, continue to use the Palo Alto Advisory
19 Committee on Early Care and Education to connect providers and professionals working with families
20 with young children, explore challenges and opportunities to programs and services for young children,
21 and support early education programs in the community and their efforts to enhance quality;
22 collaborate with Palo Alto Community Child Care to identify, develop and promote high quality early
23 childhood learning environments to serve all families in our community; explore opportunities to
24 provide access to childcare for families of City employees. Let's model, people. Yay. I want to do the

1 same thing for School District employees as well. Partnerships, leverage local, County and Statewide
2 partnerships to pursue First Five Tobacco Tax resources to support families with young children, birth
3 through five. This is really important as we think about the renovation of the Junior Museum and Zoo.
4 All programs for young children, you can leverage County and Statewide partnerships with First Five
5 funds. I don't see that listed anywhere, so I would add that. For PAUSD, I mentioned this last time, but
6 the wording hasn't been changed yet. In Policy C-1.14, there's still the "continue to use the City School
7 Liaison Committee to remove barriers to community use of schools." I don't know what these barriers
8 are. I would say "maximize the benefit of the City School Liaison Committee to promote collaboration
9 between City and School District personnel. Plan for community use of schools, fields, pools,
10 gymnasiums, libraries and auditoriums and other facilities. Identify and address other areas of mutual
11 interest between the city and PAUSD." For that, good for now.

12 **Co-Chair Garber:** Jennifer. Thank you, Heidi.

13 **Jennifer Hetterly:** Thanks. I did submit a number of comments, so I'm going to focus tonight just on
14 issues that I think were raised by the CAC in the last discussion, which was before my time, but that I
15 didn't think were fully captured in the draft revision, that I think we need to address. I'm concerned
16 now that there are quite a few other written comments that were submitted that also thus have not
17 been incorporated in the draft. I have quite a few concerns about moving forward with the draft that
18 we have before us. The issues I wanted to highlight were some I think may have been mentioned.
19 Mental health gaps for non-teens. We have several policies and programs in here about teen mental
20 health; nothing for adults or young children. The parkland, there were some revisions to the policy on
21 innovative ways to expand parkland. I don't like it primarily because it loses the whole element of the
22 importance of public gathering spaces as we look at open space and park and community service
23 facilities. Special needs, I think the scope for special needs access and programming is too limited.
24 Accessibility is not just about physical facilities and transportation. ADA requirements are really just a

DRAFT

DRAFT

DRAFT

1 floor, so that shouldn't be what we're striving to achieve. We're required to achieve that. I think the
2 new wording in 5.1.3 weakens our commitment by the new language. I also think that we should add
3 PTC Program 3.6.4 about improving access for persons with non-physical or sensory disabilities and
4 partnering with Abilities United and other organizations. I think we have nothing in here about services
5 for adults with developmental disabilities, so we absolutely have to fill that gap. Lack of strong policy on
6 responding to changing demographics. There have been a lot of comments about the fact that our
7 demographics have changed and the need for data-driven decision-making. There's nothing in here
8 about we're going to monitor and evaluate that and periodically reassess how those needs are changing.
9 The matrix says there's a new program for volunteerism, but I couldn't find it anywhere in the
10 document. I'd like that to be added. It's a program, so it would need a policy that we could put it under
11 along with the Program C-5.8.1 about civic engagement. The Parks and Rec Master Plan is only cited
12 twice and only about bathrooms. I think that's a mistake, and we should reference the entire Master
13 Plan as a guiding policy. I had similar concerns about childcare. I think the changes in the childcare
14 section weaken it, don't strengthen it. I think that needs more work. There's nothing in here about
15 Cubberley. It seems maybe we would have some policies that we might want to propose about
16 Cubberley. Finally, I think the organization—also I think we have gaps in recreation and arts. We don't
17 really have any policies about what we want that to look like. I think there are several organizational
18 problems that need to be resolved.

19 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thanks. Elaine.

20 **Elaine Uang:** Is this on? Okay. Just I will echo a couple of things. There are two populations I actually
21 want to make sure that we acknowledge in this Element. Heidi's already mentioned the first, and
22 Jennifer as well. The preschool-aged children and mention of early childhood care and education, that
23 was actually discussed pretty extensively, but it's fallen out of the notes and out of the matrix. I would
24 like to see that included back. There's a lot of great language on school-age children, but there's—zero

1 to five, kids do exist. It's actually childcare in this category is a pretty substantial burden for families.
2 Some language and policies to emphasize early childhood care, education, perhaps even integrating it
3 with some of the intergenerational comments that were mentioned earlier would be a good place to do
4 this. I think Policy C-1.19, coordinate delivery of childcare services, maybe re-include some words that I
5 know that Heidi mentioned the last time, infant, toddlers and early childhood education. That might be
6 a place to do this. Just my suggestion. Again, the school population, we acknowledge that the school
7 system is kind of our crown jewel, but I think we don't acknowledge enough the people who work in the
8 School District, the educators and the staff. I think just because they're such a fundamental piece of our
9 school, when staff and teachers are now kind of at-risk, commuting so far, some choosing to drop out of
10 being educators because of the burdens of living. I think somebody told me that teachers are now
11 considered working poor, which is not really what we want to encourage in our community. I think this
12 is just as we look ahead at some of the next Elements, particularly land use, we might want to kind of
13 start thinking about the connections between community services and some of the other sections. I just
14 want to make sure that we don't miss these two populations, the preschool-age children, infants,
15 toddlers and pre-kindergarten, as well as all of the folks who do serve the schools. We could even
16 broaden this to the folks who serve our cities, who provide the customer service, so the librarians, the
17 firefighters, the policemen, everybody who works for our community and makes the great community
18 services and facilities that we're talking about. If we do not allow them to be a greater part of our
19 community, then we're not going to have those services. I also just want to echo Jennifer's comment
20 about ADA being a floor. The HRC made a comment about this in their notes. Absolutely, we need to go
21 beyond just ADA. There's so many disabilities out there that ADA doesn't really touch upon, sensory
22 disabilities, mental disabilities, a whole series of things that really we should be pushing universal
23 design. Magical Bridge is a great example of where all types of abilities were included. All of our public
24 facilities and community services should really rise to that standard.

1 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Steve.

2 **Stephen Levy:** Is it on? Okay. I'd like to reiterate the comments that Don Barr made in the written
3 comments to us. I think there's a language issue there. I always want to go with the language that the
4 people affected and the people in the profession think is correct. I am told that homeless is correct, and
5 unhoused is not. He has made a number of changes in that language. I'm not an expert on that. He
6 asked me to make that comment. I'd like to pass it on and see whether there are other people that
7 know. I don't think we get to pick language when there's a whole community of expert opinion about
8 that. The next comment is on that section that deliciously says later on we're going to talk about the
9 interaction of the Elements. Some of the speakers eloquently brought that to our attention now.
10 Community services for groups of people where it's very important that they live near the caregivers
11 and the services. That's absolutely true technically for the homeless population. Housing without the
12 provision of services doesn't work; you have recidivism. As Elaine was pointing out, there are a whole
13 number of other ways that you can think about community services connected to housing. When our
14 kids grew up, there were teachers around, there were librarians around, the people providing the
15 community service. It's not only that they could live here, but that our children and we as adults could
16 interact with them. They became real. It's probably true, I think as an economist, but we can check on
17 that, that the hiring practices of our City for good community service providers is affected by their ability
18 to live here. I know we can't house everybody, but that's a connection that I want to talk about. Now,
19 I'll probably get a few people fairly annoyed. Before we end, Hillary, Arthur and Dan, we need to have a
20 discussion about housing. We need to have a discussion about whether this Committee as a whole
21 intends to honor the Housing Element obligation to plan for 2,000 units. I want to know what people
22 are thinking about when they talk about school impacts. Does that mean we should dishonor our legal
23 obligation, because there might be some more children in school? When I grew up, it was the obligation
24 of the School District and the citizenry to provide access for children in schools, just like we provide

DRAFT

DRAFT

DRAFT

1 access for people at swimming pools. The idea of saying, "You can't have young families here with
2 children, because we don't want to provide for schools," doesn't sit well with me. I'd like to have that
3 discussion, and I don't know any way we can do it without bringing housing before the Committee or a
4 joint meeting with the Council. Finally, I'm certainly an outlier on "customer service." Palo Alto was
5 ahead of the trend. I just looked it up, and there are 15 references from established organizations about
6 improving customer service in government because residents were dissatisfied. It was to bring the level
7 of service up, not to degrade it. I found that's missing in those comments.

8 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Lisa.

9 **Lisa Peschcke-Koedt:** I also want to say thanks to the subcommittee and of course the staff. This is a
10 great document to work from. I have some substantive comments and then more kind of form—Is it not
11 close enough? Is that better? Anyway, I think it's just for that, isn't it?

12 **Co-Chair Keller:** It's for recording as well.

13 **Lisa Peschcke-Koedt:** Can you hear? Okay. The substantive comments. One of the nice things about
14 being toward the end is many of you have already mentioned them, but I'm going to reinforce them to
15 say another vote on it. First one is I do think we should do more active marketing of the community
16 services. It shows up a few places. How we reach out and how we truly build a community in Palo Alto.
17 This definitely goes back to my old roots. When I was a kid growing up here, it really felt like a
18 community. Maybe it's just because I was younger, but you had all those ties in the community you
19 mentioned but also others. I think we can build more of that for newcomers, for people with money,
20 without money, different ages, all that kind of stuff. I would put that kind of front and center. They're
21 elements, but I would reinforce that as one of the policies and programs. Totally agree on the mental
22 health. I think that that was missing and needs to be added. Wondering whether there's something
23 more to do in partnership with Palo Alto Medical Foundation, Medical Clinic and Stanford around maybe
24 programs or education or anything. Just a thought. I would propose maybe a program or a policy that

DRAFT

DRAFT

DRAFT

1 says look into that and then decide whether to do something with it. Again, I had a bunch of comments
2 on the Palo Alto School District, but I agree with what Heidi proposed. I would do that; we should
3 actively go after it. A practical suggestion is what if the City of Palo Alto offered to pay the insurance,
4 could we use all the facilities on weekends or something like that? Again, that gets into the practical.
5 Very much agree with that and the actual language Heidi suggested. Childcare, agree that that should
6 be higher up. Wondering whether we shouldn't do some City-sponsored childcare available for all
7 different economic groups, again, whether it be City employees or residents, businesses, etc., and have
8 maybe a sliding scale. I would do more there. I know we already have a foundation for it, but I would
9 actually be more active. Agree with Elaine on the e-services; had thought about something like that as
10 well. How do we make it more accessible but also what can actually be done over the web? Essentially,
11 whether it be teen engagement or whatever. On the terminology, I like "citizen." It's kind of the French
12 idea of citizen; you're just a resident, but also community. I know it's called the community services, but
13 I think it's actually service to the community. Between "community" and "citizen," it looked like we
14 could put that in instead of "customer" and might pick it up better. This goes a bit to what you said as
15 well, want to draw the connection back to transportation and housing, including for homeless, including
16 for disabled, shuttle, all that stuff. We have to connect the different Elements, and I assume we will at
17 some point. Last, one more minor one is I do think that some of the business resources like parks could
18 be made available, again, if we paid the insurance or something. I don't know if that's the right way, but
19 that's one. From a form, this is more language in the Element. This will be quick.

20 **Co-Chair Garber:** Yeah, finish your sentence.

21 **Lisa Peschcke-Koedt:** I think that the new version is much better and more active, but there's still places
22 where we say things like "assess" rather than "do." I would change them all. Do it, rather than assess
23 something. Research it if you have to, but then implement what you just decided. The last is, again,
24 more I think for ease of reading. I think there could still be more grouping of it. There seemed to be a

DRAFT

DRAFT

DRAFT

1 lot of redundancy in some, but that's form stuff, not substance stuff. Thank you for the extra few
2 seconds.

3 **Co-Chair Garber:** Sure. Alex.

4 **Alex van Riesen:** Wanted to comment on Policy C-5.12, dealing with services for those with special
5 needs. It says "facilitate access." I wanted to suggest that we change that to "increase access." I was
6 talking to my wife—we have a special needs son—and was asking her for input on this. She noted that
7 there's really not enough recreational services provided for special needs kids, only one summer camp. I
8 thought "increased" was a better word for that there. On page 9 of the matrix, I look to the right
9 column. There is no Policy C-4.11 in the draft. It says it was changed to C-4.11, but I didn't see it in the.
10 Also, there's no Program C-3.4.1. It says it was added. That's page 15 of the matrix. I didn't see that
11 added as well; that may be my mistake. I looked for them, and I couldn't find them. I want to say I
12 agree with Don on the inclusion of mental health in wellness. That should be consistently. I thought
13 about including it at C-5.2, somewhere; I don't have that reference right now. Also agree that Goal 1
14 needs to be streamlined with some measurable metrics. I'll just use my computer as light. Should I keep
15 going? I guess my question with Goal 1 was there's no mention of this, but should we put a cap on the
16 policies or programs? I don't know how to suggest that as a program itself, but there's no mention of
17 any sort of limitation on programs and policies. How do you actually get a measurable metric on
18 something as unwieldy as Goal 1? Last, more specific, C-1-13. I thought there should be a policy—I'm
19 creating this or adding this—to develop a plan for Cubberley as a community center and relationship
20 with PAUSD. As we know, there's been an ongoing confusion where they share the Cubberley facility.
21 They've revised it for five years, but there's no sort of clear plan beyond that. I think that should be a
22 part of this, to get clarity on the City's future desires for Cubberley. There's actually a plan that was
23 done by a group of citizens, the Cubberley something plan, last year. It was presented to the City
24 Council, and they effectually buried it. I haven't seen anything done with that. Lastly, just two

1 observations. I see no direction to the City Council or the reader as to how this Plan will be pursued
2 should there be a severe reduction in resources. What's the prioritization of how to pursue these goals
3 and priorities in that event? The other thing is I was concerned that given the (inaudible)—Don
4 mentioned the article in the *Atlantic* today, especially that teen suicide was such a big deal and a very
5 present problem in Palo Alto over the first half of the Comp Plan. There isn't a more specific addressing
6 of that issue for the second half of the Comp Plan. I don't have a specific proposal to make, but I
7 thought that should be a discussion.

8 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Arthur.

9 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. One of the things that was talked about by several people was the idea of,
10 if you will, underserved parts of Palo Alto. If you look at the map that's on page—it's Map C-2, it's based
11 only on distance. It's not based at all on population density. The tiniest park, like for example Boulware
12 Park, still has a quarter-mile and a half-mile radius around it. Yet, for example Rinconada Park, which is
13 much bigger, has the same quarter-mile and half-mile radius. That's ridiculous. That should be based on
14 the size of the park and the population density. For example, if the population is dense, then the radius
15 should come in. If the park is small, the radius should come in. If the population is sparse, then the
16 radius can come out. Some sort of way of measuring based on population and park size. Population
17 density and park size adaptation might make sense there. Another thing is in terms of the headline
18 above Goal C-1. Goal C-1 is "deliver community services effectively and efficiently." However, the
19 headline above it says "efficient service delivery." Maybe that should balance both of them, efficient
20 and effective service delivery, to include both of those. I agree that the wording of previous Program C-
21 7 should be retained. C-1.16 is not a new policy; it is the resurrection of Program C-7, which was not
22 complete because it wasn't a program. It should be a policy. Adding to it "report impact findings to
23 PAUSD" and, as Len Filppu mentioned, "and to the public" makes sense. I think that there are a lot of
24 very important comments here. We're going to have to figure out some way of dealing with these. One

DRAFT

DRAFT

DRAFT

1 of the ways we might want to deal with them is, as some of them are suggestions that are not too
2 controversial, and things that we might just want to mention those and have a show of hands, see if the
3 people want to adopt them wholesale. If there's controversy about that, we can consider. Some of the
4 issues are somewhat more controversial, and we'll see if we get consensus on those. Thank you.

5 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Just a couple of comments. I have heard precious little that I would take
6 argument with. A couple of very specific thoughts here related to the subcommittee's questions. I
7 would end up supporting their desire to find the removal of barriers to service to be more strongly
8 addressed. Would also support the various recommendations that have created more direct language
9 to tie the City and the PAUSD relationship more strongly together. Regarding Number 3, the "customer
10 service" language, "customer service" was a relatively new term in the '80s and was used as sort of
11 management speak to address the responsibility of client-server relationships. I am sympathetic to
12 those who feel that that is outdated and doesn't address the more mutual responsibility that citizens
13 and city government need to have. My sense here is I don't have a specific suggestion or preference as
14 to which term is used. I think that what we should do is suggest that we have some discussion of
15 whatever term it is we end up using in the narrative, so that we understand that the transactional
16 nature of a customer is not what the Comprehensive Plan is trying to get at, and what it's really talking
17 about is the mutual responsibility that the community shares to itself. That's my comment or suggestion
18 there. Some other very specific things. The word "development" has been used for any number of
19 different topics in this Element. We need to be very careful; it occasionally occurs alone and not with a
20 modifier, so you don't know if it's development meaning people, the development of people or
21 education. Sometimes you don't know whether it is development of a house versus a commercial
22 property versus something that is impacting land use legislation. My recommendation is that staff
23 needs to go through and be much more careful about how they use that term and either modify it or
24 change it so that it is not confusing. Regarding Program C-5.3-2, considering marketing City employee

DRAFT

DRAFT

DRAFT

1 health and wellness programs as a model for local businesses and other organizations, I'm not sure I
2 want to create a funding source around that. I think sharing our model as opposed to marketing it might
3 be more appropriate. One comment. Preserve El Camino Park as a recreational resource for the
4 community. I suspect that the reason that that is held out as unique, because it is sort of odd that it sits
5 out there, is because I think it's the only park that is leased from Stanford. At which point, the objective
6 may be more at our relationship with Stanford and what our interest in that park is as opposed to just
7 simply saying preserve it as a recreational resource. There's something in there that might be more
8 specific. Let us take a brief, hopefully no more than five minutes, break here. We can have everyone
9 take their seats. A bit of a change in strategy here in terms of how we're going to use the next hour and
10 10 minutes. This is an imperfect process, and one that we are working through here. The City Council
11 has limited the amount of meetings that we can have and has given us a schedule that we have to
12 perform to. We can't iterate this again. However, we have a proposal for sort of getting through some
13 of this. Here it is. There was precious few things that we were hearing disagreement on. What we
14 would like to do for this next item here is to hear specifically if there are things that you do disagree
15 with. Two, if you like, also take a moment to tell us very broadly, the way that Hamilton did, the large
16 groupings of things that you are supportive of. The inclusion of mental health; the importance of
17 barriers, moving that up in terms of priority and emphasis; etc. That may help organize the work of the
18 subcommittee. Three, we will take a vote to empower the subcommittee to take the transcript as it—
19 first of all, to empower the subcommittee to take the work of the staff who will then use the transcript
20 to incorporate all these things into another version of the draft Element. Then we will empower the
21 subcommittee to take our conversation today and work with staff to get the draft that would go to
22 Council in place. The way that we then—the Committee formally will then not have an opportunity to
23 review that, but we can do that individually. That essentially two weeks, three weeks before the
24 Council's meeting July 12th, whether this will be discussed ...

DRAFT

DRAFT

DRAFT

1 **Co-Chair Keller:** January.

2 **Co-Chair Garber:** January, sorry. Before the January 12th meeting, the draft will be issued to the public
3 at which point we can all see that. We can make individual comments. Those would be then sent into
4 staff and then included in the staff report with the draft comment that would go to the Council. That
5 would be the gist of the motion that we would ask you to consider making. Actually what we thought
6 we'd do is we would call on you individually as you like with two minutes. We'd give everybody two
7 minutes, so we have a little bit of time at the end here. Forgive me. There's another clarification over
8 here. Don, did you have a quick clarifying question?

9 **Don McDougall:** The written comments that we've submitted but haven't commented on would be
10 included in that analysis?

11 **Co-Chair Garber:** That's exactly right, yeah. Would also be supporting the work of the subcommittee in
12 terms of their revision and the work that they do with staff. Heidi.

13 **Heidi Emberling:** I'd like to know when the subcommittee meeting will be scheduled, more than one
14 day in advance please. I think that's why only three people could make it. Two, I would love to involve
15 the Director of Community Services, so that we can have a conversation about priorities within the
16 department as well.

17 **Co-Chair Garber:** To that end, there are currently only three people on the subcommittee, and we can't
18 have more. We'd like to encourage especially those of you that have rather longer lists of suggestions to
19 participate in that committee. Not that I'm looking in any particular direction.

20 **Heidi Emberling:** Are you looking at me? I'm already on the committee.

21 **Co-Chair Garber:** Yeah, that was before. I apologize.

22 **Heidi Emberling:** I couldn't make it to the meeting for the one-day notice problem.

23 **Co-Chair Garber:** Got it. Hillary, you had a few comments before we start?

DRAFT

DRAFT

DRAFT

1 **Hillary Gitelman:** Yeah, thank you. First I wanted to respond to a couple of things that came up.
2 Stephen talked about housing. The idea of linkages to other Elements came up a few times. I just want
3 to ask you to set that aside for a minute. We'll have an opportunity to make sure all of that works at the
4 end of the day. We do have a joint meeting with the Council currently scheduled in February where we
5 would talk about housing issues too. That is on the schedule at some point. As I mentioned earlier, I'm
6 proposing that at our next meeting we take a hard look at the schedule and really go through it
7 together. Secondly, I'm also hoping you will leave to us this question of prioritization that's come up
8 from a number of you. I think we will have an opportunity later to take all of the programs from each
9 Element, put them in a list and try and prioritize or make sure they have a clear sense of priority or some
10 way to talk about them and measure their effectiveness over time. We're going to have to do that later.
11 Right now, we're engaged in an exercise of making sure the right pieces of information are on the paper.
12 We can talk about prioritization at a later date. I think, as Dan said, there was broad agreement when
13 we went around the table here. No one raised new ideas or thoughts that I think a lot of you will say,
14 "No, terrible. We would never want to include that in our Element." I think we're in a good position to
15 take this to the next step. I'm hoping that you'll feel comfortable delegating a revision to staff and
16 allowing the subcommittee to be the entity that vets that version before it goes to the Council. I would
17 also say if this doesn't work, I am confident that the City Council will look at the schedule again with you
18 and talk about ways that we can add in more meetings or they'll ask you to meet more often or
19 something, because we want to make sure that you're comfortable ultimately with these products.
20 Right now, I'm thinking let's just try it this way. If it doesn't work, we'll modify and make changes the
21 next time around. I do hope that Rob can join us at the subcommittee meeting. Maybe, Jennifer, you
22 had so many comments; you could join the subcommittee. If there's maybe one or two other people
23 who want to do this second round of review, that you could join the subcommittee. With that, I like this
24 idea that Dan and the subcommittee came up with of just identifying if there are areas of disagreement.

DRAFT

DRAFT

DRAFT

1 **Co-Chair Keller:** If you want to speak, please put your card on end. I'll try to note your hand. If there's
2 anybody else who would like to join the subcommittee, we have I think—Jen, do you want to join?
3 Doria, did you want to speak or join?

4 **Doria Summa:** (inaudible)

5 **Co-Chair Keller:** Join, okay. You want to make a note of that? Great. Anybody else wish to join? Don,
6 did you want to join?

7 **Don McDougall:** I've got pages of comments here. I might as well (inaudible).

8 **Co-Chair Keller:** Great.

9 **Don McDougall:** (inaudible) to help.

10 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. One thing is that the—I just want to point out, remind people that this
11 process is going to be different from the process the next go around. We're hoping to have all of the
12 comments combined from various sources together in the matrix, as I understand it. Thereby, when it's
13 evaluated by the subcommittee, we won't have to go through as much processing there. It would be
14 easier to do. This is an experiment. We're learning. If you have any other comments about the process,
15 please send them to staff so that we can incorporate them next time. Thank you.

16 **Co-Chair Garber:** Comments, things that you have found to disagree with that have been mentioned
17 and/or other generalized comments about what you agree with. Think globally here and not specifics.
18 This is going to be a very short meeting, folks. You can be specific if you want to, but I'm encouraging
19 you to think. In this particular round, we are just doing it as people had comments. Shani, please start,
20 followed by Heidi followed by Annette and then Doria.

21 **Shani Kleinhaus:** I wanted to agree with Hillary about the issue of prioritization. I think that this is a
22 very high level document. If we start looking at prioritization now, priorities can change completely for
23 the City in about three years. I prefer to have things more or less even and let staff later and City
24 Council to decide how to prioritize things. That goes to frequency of reevaluation as well. If we say

1 something has to happen every five years, something may come up which is a lot more important. I
2 think that just saying evaluate frequently or just say occasionally or something, but I wouldn't say a very
3 specific time. This came up, and that's just my opinion.

4 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. By the way, I'm going to probably try and cut the conversation off at 8:15
5 so we have a few minutes to talk about process improvement and/or other announcements. Heidi and
6 then Annette.

7 **Heidi Emberling:** What happened to cultural arts? That's totally gone. I felt like that was a big hole
8 missing. I'd love to have cultural arts back in. I think we're a community that really values our cultural
9 arts.

10 **Hillary Gitelman:** Excuse me. I think that's an area of agreement, unless I'm mistaken.

11 **Heidi Emberling:** Good, perfect. I don't know how specific you want to get, but in Policy C-1.1, anything
12 that starts with "recognizing the importance of" feels like why does it need to be in here. We recognize
13 the importance of public participation. "Encouraging public participation in civic life," I think, would be a
14 stronger way to say that. Also, this first goal is very long. You may want subheadings. Civic life,
15 children, youth and teens, seniors and vulnerable populations were the four that I saw. Policy C-1.5, .6,
16 .7 are all similar; I think you could combine those into one. Community service issues that cross
17 jurisdictional lines, partnerships within mid-Peninsula region, where economies of scale are possible,
18 cooperate with neighboring communities. These three could combine into one. One thing that I'd like
19 to remove is Policy C-1.11. I'm very supportive of intergenerational activities, and I actually had
20 something in the notes about identifying intergenerational partnerships between seniors and students
21 in our community. As solutions to childcare needs, the key is we want to provide access to high quality
22 early learning environments within the community. I'd rather see a focus on that. I'm not sure why we
23 deleted under Policy C-1. 18 support and promote the provision of comprehensive childcare services in

1 Palo Alto by public and private providers including employers. That was stricken out, but I'd like to put
2 that back in.

3 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Annette.

4 **Annette Glanckopf:** Thanks. I'm not sure exactly what we're doing. I had just a couple of high level
5 comments. I think arts absolutely has to go in there, not just in parks but all through the City. There's
6 not any mention of that. Cubberley is vital to put in. I think additionally with this concept of a nonprofit
7 facility would be great. I would like to add, Hillary, along with priorities to incorporate what Don said
8 about deliverables. It'd be nice to know what is actually going to come out of this. This is true of all of
9 the different Elements. I think this was mentioned just a minute ago. If there was some way to group
10 things, especially the vulnerable population, seniors, mental health, physical disabilities, language
11 barriers, etc., and give some more specific programs. It seems like the stuff is really fuzzy and high level
12 for that group, and it's not as concrete with programs as many of the other areas.

13 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you, Annette. Doria and then Steve.

14 **Doria Summa:** I don't really need to speak. There weren't comments that I really disagreed with. If
15 that's what we're doing, I don't need to speak now.

16 **Co-Chair Garber:** If you have other comments, this is the time to make them.

17 **Doria Summa:** I'll just reiterate very quickly what I am hearing that we all agree on. Mental health,
18 adults with disability, preschool care. I think Jen's comments about including the entire Park Master
19 Plan is vital. The one issue that was spoken about, bathrooms in parks, is actually pretty controversial. I
20 mean, there are a lot of people that don't want that for various reasons. One thing I didn't mention that
21 I would like to explore, if it's appropriate, is the use of non-potable water in more parks. We already use
22 it at Rinconada and the golf course. I agree that Cubberley and arts Citywide is vital and has been left
23 out. Once again, my idea about discouraging, maybe is the right word, overriding concerns in

1 environmental review when they impact negatively on health and well-being would be an interesting
2 discussion.

3 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Steve.

4 **Stephen Levy:** I'm going to lose on the "customer service" issue. I'm extremely uncomfortable with the
5 word "citizen." In the world in which I live and I think most of you live, "citizen" is a word of exclusion,
6 not inclusion. Technically we have many residents in Palo Alto who are not citizens either because of
7 the way they came here or because their choice not to apply for citizen. When you talk about access to
8 healthcare or access to the university system, "citizen" becomes a word of exclusion. If you listen to the
9 Republican national debate or the immigration debate in the United States, "citizen" is a code word of
10 exclusion. I'm happy if we just say "service to all the people that we interact with, government should
11 provide good service." I'd hate to have to explain to someone why Palo Alto chose an exclusion word.
12 Even though the people who are doing it don't see it that way, I think that's the way it is being seen
13 now. It will be seen that way in the 2016 election debate. This is a word that's going to live for a long
14 time. It's really not, for me, the right word. It's a word of exclusion, not inclusion.

15 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Hillary, you had a brief comment.

16 **Hillary Gitelman:** Yeah. I just wanted to address that. I listened carefully to what everybody said, and I
17 thought that there was not universal consensus, but everybody agreed generally that we could look to
18 describe serve and community service and find words that didn't include "customer" or "citizen"
19 necessarily, and still make our point. Did I get that wrong? Are there people who disagree with that
20 approach? Okay. I think we can go in that direction.

21 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Lisa followed by Arthur.

22 **Lisa Peschke-Koedt:** I actually put mine up because I was going to agree with Steve on this one point. I
23 had used "citizen" in a different term. I think we could define it; I think it could be used. I think Steve's
24 right; in the current politics of the world, that's not what we mean. I like Hillary's idea of not use

DRAFT

DRAFT

DRAFT

1 "citizen," not use "customer." Thought maybe we could even just show hands. Is there anybody who
2 disagrees with that? We'll find some other term, but not "customer," not "citizen." Does anybody
3 disagree? You disagree. You like "customer." Anybody disagree not to use "citizen"?

4 **Female:** I do.

5 **Male:** I find "citizen" to mean the residents who use and live in the town. It's also kind of an
6 aspirational term, knowing that people give back to the city which they're in. I'm not stuck with it.

7 **Lisa Peschcke-Koedt:** That's certainly how I would mean it. My dad wasn't a citizen of the US, and he
8 lived in Palo Alto most of his adult life. I agree with Steve. I think right now it's just too politically
9 charged. It's the wrong word. Anyway, that's all.

10 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Arthur and then Lydia.

11 **Co-Chair Keller:** I'm going to address the "citizen" issue. I think that the "customer service" is not only
12 to residents, it's also to businesses, it's also to visitors. Therefore, the use of the term "citizen" on that is
13 probably misplaced even if you use "citizen" in the large. I like the term "community members," but I'm
14 wondering the degree to which this even belongs in the Community Services Element and whether it
15 belongs in Governance. I'm just going to throw that out there. The other issue to think about is that
16 when, for example, the Planning and Community Environment Department is providing services to, say,
17 a property owner, are they focused on providing service to the property owner or are they also focused
18 on the needs of the people that are general community at large. I think that "customer service" at the
19 expense of the community at large is a problem. One thing is that who does what. I'm a little
20 concerned with words here about who does what. What does the City do? What does the City
21 facilitate? What does the City pay for? What does the City encourage? Where does the City partner?
22 Where does the City provide a place, a house for something? I think that we're all over the map on that.
23 The City can't do and pay for everything. I think we need to be somewhat concerned about that in
24 general. I'm not going to be down to the particular policy or program for that, but I am concerned with

1 the expectation that the City do everything, which it can't. I think that in particular there needs to be a
2 concern about underserved neighborhoods, particularly for parkland. In particular, I have concern
3 about the need to add parkland when adding housing, especially for multifamily. If you think about it,
4 when you have single-family residences with backyards, we can hang out in our backyard. Multifamily
5 residential typically doesn't have backyards or it has 150 square feet of private open space which is
6 pathetic compared to what a single-family residence has. Therefore, the need for open space and
7 parkland is important. If you look, for example, in some places like Japan, places are very dense. On the
8 other hand, there's a lot of parks for people to go to. I think that there's especially a need to increase
9 the shared parkland when we're adding dense housing. I think that the idea of thinking about it
10 aspirational, no. We need to think about particularly adding that need. Thank you.

11 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Lydia and then Jennifer.

12 **Lydia Kou:** I just want to add some more things which I had added at the subcommittee, but then it
13 didn't get put in. Regarding Policy C-1.28 which is about providing funding and promotion of services for
14 people with disabilities, I'd like to add a few programs. The first program is "identify staff and financial
15 resources to partner and support organizations and initiatives to provide skills and job training for
16 people with functional needs or people with disabilities." Another program, "provide job internship
17 opportunities in City departments for people with functional or special needs." Another program, third
18 program, "encourage and promote to local businesses to engage and employ people with functional
19 and special needs." Going into Goal C-3, under Policy C-3.2, I'd like to also add a link to provide the IBRC
20 report, but also have a program which will state "coordinate City actions to ensure annual review of
21 conditions and mitigation measures on new development impact fees to ensure that all new
22 developments bear its fair share for impact with the City." I think Doria mentioned this about parks and
23 potable water. I think that in Program—it's still under C-3.2. No, I'm sorry, C-3.3. You have evaluate the
24 cost of retrofitting all park facilities. I agree with somebody here who said irrigation systems should be

1 different. Also, we should start thinking about using potable water, putting in new irrigation systems so
2 that we're using recycled water. In C-5 goal, for Policy C-5.11, Program C-5.10.1, evaluate whether
3 existing shuttle routes should be changed or a new shuttle route established. I think that also we should
4 incorporate coordinating the shuttle routes with other public transportation, so that we're using
5 efficiently all the different services. Thank you.

6 **Co-Chair Garber:** Jennifer, then Don.

7 **Jennifer Hetterly:** As far as disagreement, I think most of my disagreements (inaudible). Sorry. Were
8 with how the previous comments were incorporated into the new draft. I am concerned about the
9 process going forward, that we won't see another draft. I gather that staff will incorporate the new
10 comments that were at places today, and then the subcommittee will have an opportunity to review
11 that before a final product is produced. Is that right?

12 **Co-Chair Garber:** That's the concept. There is a transcript that will be produced as a result of this. Staff
13 will take that and take a first pass at a new draft. Then the subcommittee will take a look at that and
14 work with staff to revise it to be submitted to the Council. When it is then issued publicly, that's when
15 the rest of the Committee would have the opportunity to see it as well and would be able to comment
16 on it then individually as opposed to as a Committee.

17 **Jennifer Hetterly:** Then I'll go ahead and add the ones I didn't get to earlier. I think under childcare, I
18 can't remember if someone mentioned the deletion of the impact assessments program, policy. C-14
19 was deleted, and the matrix said it was deleted because it was not applicable. This was about evaluating
20 the feasibility of requiring childcare impact assessments for proposed development projects. I would
21 like to understand why it's not applicable. I think it's a worthwhile policy to consider. On C-3.3.1, it says
22 "periodically assess the need to adjust parkland mitigation fees to ensure they remain proportional to
23 real estate values in Palo Alto." I'd like to change that. I'd like to delete "the need to adjust," and
24 change it to "periodically assess and adjust parkland mitigation fees." I don't think we need to assess

1 the need to adjust them. I agree with the recycled water comments. Under Policy 3.5, which is about
2 making infrastructure improvements only when they incorporate sustainability concepts and are
3 consistent with the goals of protecting and conserving the natural environment, I would like to add in
4 PTC Program C-3.3.1 which was under that same policy, that says "develop comprehensive conservation
5 plans for Foothills Park, Baylands Nature Preserve and the Pearson-Arastradero Preserve that will
6 address both conservation and passive recreation needs." I think that's the way we'll know whether it's
7 impacting those things. Thanks.

8 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Don, then Ellen.

9 **Don McDougall:** Just quickly to go through this. In the preamble, in the table of parks and facilities, the
10 Baylands Lucie Evans building and the Eco Center are both owned by the City, and they should be added
11 to that table. I've already submitted some comments to Jeremy about the description of the library
12 there and adding the e-branch. I've agreed with Monique in terms of what some of the content is. I'll
13 submit a new table for your review. We keep talking about the different categories of citizens, old,
14 young, etc. It'd be nice if we actually had some sort of agreement, U.S. census or something, that we
15 were working from that was always a point of reference, that was consistent. I'm going to disagree with
16 Shani. I think we could put in –where it says periodically, we could say "at least annually" or whatever.
17 When you say periodically review something, that's open-ended. You could wait 20 years and that
18 would be the 20-year period. If you said at least annually, then if something was more urgent, you could
19 do it sooner. In C-1.2, it says we should use available data. I think there should be a program to
20 generate data. What the hell's the available data? There isn't any, so I guess we don't do that. There
21 ought to be a program there specifically to generate data. There is something in here about PAUSD and
22 the library cooperating and that that was deemed complete and therefore removed. As a member of
23 the Library Commission, I can tell you we don't think it was complete, and we don't think there's much
24 cooperation. We keep talking about art all over the place, Performing arts was removed because it was

1 considered already reviewed and done, and it didn't work the first time. I would think you should leave
2 something in here that says you continue to review performing arts. Stanford and the Paly school
3 facility are not sufficient relative to some arts, and it doesn't have to be TheatreWorks we're talking
4 about. It could be dance. It could be anything else. Performing arts are an important part of the vitality
5 of the community. 5.4 says we're going to keep the amenities that we have. I have no idea what an
6 amenity is. Does that mean the bathrooms or does that mean the candy machines or what? I think we
7 should define that. I'm glad people have picked up on separating the appliances from the irrigation and
8 dealing with that water. I agree with Steve on the comments about "citizen."

9 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Ellen and then Whitney.

10 **Ellen Uhrbrock:** I'm looking at Policy C-1.22 which says "foster a culture of peer-to-peer support," etc. I
11 would like somebody to explain to me what that is.

12 **Co-Chair Garber:** C-1.22. Why don't we return to that when whoever wants to tell you that fesses up.
13 Whitney and then Len.

14 **Whitney McNair:** I just wanted to disagree with a couple of comments that were made tonight about
15 creating a policy to discourage overriding considerations in EIRs when it degrades our well-being. The
16 City has adopted thresholds of significance which are used in any environmental review. The
17 appropriate place to amend those would be the thresholds of significance. You wouldn't want to put in
18 a policy in a Comp Plan that may be contrary to your thresholds of significance. I was just going to say
19 that if the idea was to do something different, that this wouldn't be the place for it.

20 **Co-Chair Garber:** Len and then Bonnie.

21 **Len Filppu:** I've certainly heard everyone on the "citizen" and "customer" issue. I think there's been a
22 slight misunderstanding on some of it. The term "customer service" is kind of a concept like a Q&A or
23 an oil change or something like that. My comments weren't directed to that kind of usage but more to
24 the reference in general of residents and citizens and the community at large in the document

1 throughout. For example, in vision there is a sentence "Palo Alto's success in providing these services
2 will be expressed and measured by the satisfaction of its customers," the public at large. I think it would
3 be stronger to say "the satisfaction of the public at large." Again, my "citizen" is more inhabitant of a
4 community and it isn't getting into some of the political border-crossing things that are going on.
5 However, that's heard. There are other terms that I think can be sprinkled throughout the document,
6 "residents," "community members," "public," "stakeholders," that don't also have the negative
7 connotation of "customer." A customer is for business, and this is not running a business. One other
8 thing. On Table C-2, Palo Alto parks and recreation facilities, in Mitchell Park I think there's a dog run in
9 Mitchell Park too. We might want to add that, because we've added dog run in some of the other parks.
10 Thank you.

11 **Co-Chair Garber:** Bonnie and then Dan.

12 **Bonnie Packer:** Ellen, I think I have the answer to your question. The whole section there is about
13 mental health for teens, that you were talking about. That was in reaction to the 2009 suicide cluster,
14 that all that was put in there. The developmental assets are a group of about what? Fifty-one assets
15 that youths should have. Heidi knows what these are about. Peer-to=peer means that the teens talk to
16 each other, and that teens get more out of talking to someone their age than an adult. Developmental
17 assets list all—there's 41. The kinds of assets that promote a healthy teen from having adults saying
18 "You're a great kid," having a good family life. There's a whole bunch of them. It was developed by
19 some group in Minnesota or some place. Have I got it right? You can look up developmental assets on
20 Google. You'll find out what they are. It's a great list. One of the things I wanted to mention and not
21 just answering Ellen's question is that we've been talking tonight. A lot of people have mentioned really
22 good ideas about specific populations with specific needs. When I was listing all these characterizations
23 from infants all the way to seniors, you have every age. It's like the stages of life, and it covers all of us.
24 Then you can put a cross thing on it about mental and physical health. It covers all of us. Then you have

DRAFT

DRAFT

DRAFT

1 all the ethnicities that exist in our wonderfully diverse City. It touches all of us in one way or another. I
2 think when we go through all these ideas as a subcommittee or as staff, we might want to look at this
3 list and say, "Is there a policy or program that touches somehow one of these groups," that we haven't
4 left anything out. Another group I can think of that Steve and Elaine mentioned, the people who work
5 here that provide the services that we need so much, the firefighters, the police, the teachers, the
6 service workers, the waiters in the restaurants. How is the City serving these people? And the
7 caregivers, the healthcare givers for older or adults with mental disabilities. There's all kinds of people.
8 I think it would be great if we could do a checklist and say have we covered everything. The other thing
9 we need to think about is the City provides services, but we can't do everything for everybody as a City.
10 We can say we encourage or we support those providers, those nonprofits or whoever. The City isn't
11 necessarily—what's it called? *Parens patriae*?

12 **Male:** *Loco parentis*.

13 **Bonnie Packer:** *Loco parentis*. That does everything for everybody. We need to recognize that. If you
14 see that there's a program that didn't get covered or wasn't mentioned, it may be that the City supports
15 the idea but isn't necessarily the provider. Those are my thoughts. I think as a larger subcommittee we
16 may be looking at these things.

17 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you, Bonnie. Dan and then Heidi. Thank you for the reminder about the
18 cultural arts. I had meant to mention that. I was just going back through and comparing the Comp Plan
19 from 1998 to this Element in 1998 and the narrative that was written there. This narrative that has been
20 drafted here touches just about everything, but it is missing cultural arts. It's missing fire and police and
21 a couple of other things that I think would be important. What the narrative does is it does give
22 emphasis to how we think about things and how we group things. I think using the narrative to do that
23 will be helpful to us. Whitney, relative to your comments on the EIR, I think your points are well taken
24 that we cannot be trying to modify the requirements of State law. I think there are some issues relative

1 to the values by which we evaluate these things that, I think, probably can find their way into the Comp
2 Plan with some other verbiage. Heidi then Jennifer. Thank you.

3 **Heidi Emberling:** Just very quickly I wanted to second what Len was just talking about in terms of using
4 the word "public." I do like the idea of having it in Governance. If it's going to be in here for community
5 service, then public service, demonstrate a commitment to excellent, high quality public service. That's
6 one. You're just using "public service" throughout. We are the public. I think that's pretty neutral, I
7 would hope. I'm glad you said that word. Thank you. That's (inaudible).

8 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Jennifer then Steve.

9 **Jennifer Hetterly:** I just wanted to follow up on the questions about the developmental assets item,
10 which was Policy C-1.22. I'd like to add an edit to that so that it doesn't just foster peer-to-peer support,
11 but also community connections. Peer-to-peer support is a very limited piece of the developmental
12 assets. I think all of those assets apply to people of all ages, not just children. I would discourage any
13 effort to make this a teen mental health policy. I was going through some of the written comments. I
14 did find one that I maybe disagree with, but I wonder about. To Doria and Shani, you suggest moving C-
15 5.11 to the Transportation Element. That is about providing services for seniors at convenient locations
16 that are accessible to public transit, parking, walking or biking. Certainly that should be a policy in the
17 Transportation Element, but I think it's also perfectly appropriate to include it here in the Community
18 Services Element. For seniors in particular, we want to be able to locate services where they can access
19 them. They don't have a mom to drive them. They may not be able to hop on their bike. I do think it's
20 important to have some mention of that in this Element.

21 **Shani Kleinhaus:** I think we agree that it's a very important policy to have. I don't mind it being
22 redundant, if you think that's okay.

23 **Jennifer Hetterly:** Thank you.

24 **Co-Chair Garber:** Steve followed by Whitney and then Arthur.

1 **Stephen Levy:** In a paragraph on page C-12 of our handout, the text in the human services section, it
2 points to the growing percentage of seniors in Palo Alto's population. That's completely correct, and
3 lots of people have talked about what the implications of that are. The next sentence says that the
4 percentage of people under 18 is going to rise. I'll check that with—Hillary, if that's true, it probably
5 deserves more weight in our discussion of schools and child services. It's counter to what I know about
6 the state and the region and the county. It doesn't mean it's not true for Palo Alto, but I'd like the
7 chance to check it.

8 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you, Steve. Whitney, then Arthur.

9 **Whitney McNair:** (inaudible)

10 **Co-Chair Garber:** Sorry, I thought I saw your thing up. Arthur.

11 **Co-Chair Keller:** With respect to the thing that Steve just mentioned, I think that the Palo Alto schools
12 are a magnet. That means that people locate here to have their kids in Palo Alto schools, which drives
13 an increase in the school population. I would be surprised if it weren't increasing. The second thing is
14 I'd like to echo and expand on what Dan said in response to Whitney's comment about EIRs. My
15 understanding is that the threshold of significance is a grading function. You don't want to change a
16 threshold of significance in order to be able to determine that things are no longer a significant impact.
17 In other words, that impacts should be addressed doesn't mean that you should basically eliminate the
18 impacts by changing the thresholds of significance. I do think that it is reasonable for there to be a
19 policy in—I'm not sure it's Community Services, but let's assume it's there for a placeholder. Which
20 discourages the use of a statement of overriding considerations when there's a degradation of health
21 and well-being. I think that that makes sense in terms of policy of the City. It doesn't meant that you
22 can't do it for some reason, but essentially it's a reason not to. You still go through the EIR process. You
23 still go through the analysis. You still go through the thresholds of significance. Then, if the thresholds
24 of significance are met so that there's significant and unavoidable impacts, the idea of a statement of

1 overriding considerations to say you'll do it anyway, discouraging things like that which means that you
2 have impacts that are not mitigated, that affect health and well-being, I think it's a reasonable thing for
3 the City to say. I'm not sure if this is a significant enough controversy that we should vote on it. Perhaps
4 we should. I don't know. It's something that could be easily addressed.

5 **Co-Chair Garber:** I suspect it's technically (inaudible) that it's (inaudible).

6 **Co-Chair Keller:** Is this a thing that staff should deal with or any comment on that?

7 **Hillary Gitelman:** I'd be happy to offer my perspective. I think I understand Whitney's point. It's just a
8 little odd to have in a Comprehensive Plan a reference to this other process which is about balancing the
9 benefits of a project versus its impacts. That's what the process of overriding considerations is about. I
10 also agree with Arthur. There's probably a way to phrase this policy, so that it's something that we can
11 work with. Maybe give us a chance to frame something up and see what it looks like. If the Council
12 doesn't like it or the Committee ultimately doesn't like it, we can talk about removing it then. I just
13 wanted to respond to one other thing that Dan said. Your observation that the narrative no longer
14 includes a summary of police and fire services. Our intention is to move that to the Safety Element.
15 That's why it's no longer in here. Thank you.

16 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you.

17 **Co-Chair Garber:** Anything else? I really hate to say this, but we're ahead of schedule here. Wait, wait.
18 Bonnie and other members of the subcommittee, do you feel like you have enough to work with? Go
19 ahead, Bonnie.

20 **Bonnie Packer:** I don't know if this should be in the transcript. I just wanted to say something in
21 response to the *Atlantic Monthly* article that some of you referred to. My daughter is mentioned in
22 there. Gabe Lewis, who spoke to us earlier, who is a friend of my daughter's, wrote a response to that
23 article which I think is worth reading. I agree with his comments. If anybody's interested, I could send

1 that response to you. I'll forward it to staff, and you all have access to the article. I think it's good to
2 have that other point of view.

3 **Co-Chair Garber:** I'm sorry. Shani.

4 **Shani Kleinhaus:** Thank you. I wanted to support Jennifer's comments about the need to incorporate or
5 to refer to the Parks Master Plan, and not only to the bathroom issues which, as Doria said, is
6 controversial. I don't know why it appears twice under Program C-3.3.2 and C-4.3.1. I would take both
7 of those out and just look to how to integrate the Parks Master Plan when it comes in into this process.
8 I agree with Arthur about the need to look at the park services in terms of density and not just distance.
9 Also, in Policy C-5.6, it says that every City-owned facility should offer fruits and vegetables. I would
10 take the word "all" out of there. About the CEQA, I completely agree with Arthur. Thresholds of
11 significance will tell us which projects can be harmful to the environment. Maybe they're noisy; maybe
12 they have toxic impacts; maybe they have other impacts. The statement of overriding consideration,
13 often the developers rely on being able to get that before they even start the project. They know that
14 when they get to the end, the City can say no, by the end of an EIR. Even though the thresholds of
15 significance have been determined, they can say, "Yeah, but we're going to exceed all these thresholds
16 and we're still going to permit the project." A tool for the City Council to be able to say, "Wait a minute.
17 This project may be impacting the health of our residents and community too much," would be really
18 good. Thank you. I would support that.

19 **Co-Chair Garber:** Don and then Ellen.

20 **Don McDougall:** Back to the development assets. I would encourage Heidi to actually put a specific
21 program in there that Council subscribes to the development assets, the library subscribes to the
22 development assets. Actually out of Wisconsin, there's 40 of them. The City has added one to make it
23 41. It's pretty substantially important, and I think it ought to be in our Plan or be in the Plan not to
24 continue it. In terms of C-1.23 which is encourage the continuation and development of mental health, I

DRAFT

DRAFT

DRAFT

1 think that should be under the C-5 health section, rather than under the programs section or the
2 efficient delivery. I think that would make more sense and provide a more robust place to identify it.
3 Steve asked if Hillary would give him information about the school population growth. Arthur
4 commented that he would be surprised if it wasn't going up or whatever. I still don't understand
5 relative to generating data why we can't have a set of data that we all agree is the data. I would say that
6 the CAC ought to be asking staff to come back and tell us is the school population going up or going
7 down, is the 0-5 going up or going down, is the elderly going up and going down. Throughout this whole
8 document, it continually says, as we all know, the senior population is doubling or whatever it is. We
9 don't all know that. I'd sure like to see something that we could continually refer to. In terms of police
10 and fire, I'm glad to hear that we're planning on moving it. I would suggest if we're going to move it to
11 the safety section, then police and fire should be removed from the preamble to this section, because it
12 causes you to start looking for it. In terms of the article, as Heidi mentioned, it is absolutely worth
13 reading the article online and reading the comments. The comments are as constructive as the article
14 was in the first place. Lots and lots of comments in different directions that are worth looking at.

15 **Co-Chair Garber:** We've got Ellen, Jennifer, Arthur, Elaine, Steve, Dan and Hamilton. I think Hamilton
16 will have the final word here, so we can get done. Ellen.

17 **Ellen Uhrbrock:** Brief comment. Somebody mentioned the seniors and the transportation problem. I
18 don't know when it's a good point to introduce this idea. The scheduling of the shuttles and the
19 transportation problem is a seven-day-a-week problem. It is not limited to the normal 40-hour a week.
20 We have to expand that as a concept that we accept that it is a seven-day problem that faces all seniors.

21 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Jennifer then Arthur.

22 **Jennifer Hetterly:** I wanted to elaborate just a little bit on the area of disagreement I had with another
23 CAC comment. I think it was yours, Hamilton. It was for revising Policy C-4.5, the new policy about
24 innovative ways to expand parkland using grade and rooftops, pocket parks, plazas, rain gardens, blah,

DRAFT

DRAFT

DRAFT

1 blah, blah. I didn't like it because it replaced the existing policy that included an emphasis on public
2 gathering space, as I mentioned earlier. I also don't ...

3 **Hamilton Hitchings:** I didn't propose replacing them. I only proposed adding them.

4 **Jennifer Hetterly:** That was just something staff did as they interpreted. I think we should either add
5 back in the original policy or revise it somehow to include both of those concepts. I'm also a little bit
6 concerned, Hamilton, about listing all those items. Several of those specific options, I think, are easy for
7 private property owners to restrict to private users. Like a green rooftop in a development, that's not
8 always going to be open to the public. I would prefer to revert to the original.

9 **Hamilton Hitchings:** There's cities like (inaudible).

10 **Jennifer Hetterly:** You can respond to that when it comes back around to you. The other thing I wanted
11 to mention was the existing conditions report for transportation was included in our binder or packet or
12 whatever. I could not find the existing conditions report for this Element. I looked for it online and
13 couldn't find it there either. I think it would be really helpful for the Committee to have those
14 documents provided for each Element before we discuss them. Thanks.

15 **Co-Chair Garber:** Arthur then Elaine.

16 **Co-Chair Keller:** Firstly, on following up on that. It might be good if staff could provide us with the
17 entire existing conditions report all at once, rather than piecemeal, so we can review that.

18 **Male:** It's all online.

19 **Hillary Gitelman:** It's all online.

20 **Co-Chair Keller:** Maybe you could send that out to us where everything is and such. If anybody wanted
21 a hard copy, they could request one. The second thing is that one of the things about the City and
22 schools and impacts and enrollment and such, it is correct that when a student shows up living in the
23 Palo Alto Unified School District territory, that the School District has to educate that student. However,
24 the type of housing that we zone for has some effect on that. I realize that. That's why that's going in

DRAFT

DRAFT

DRAFT

1 there. If we were to zone for big units versus small units or whatever, that might affect the number of
2 students that are there. There's an interesting disconnect. This Comp Plan goes on for 15 years. The
3 Housing Element goes on for about another seven years; there's going to be another one after that. The
4 School District tends to look only five years out, if I remember correctly, in its demographic projections.
5 It tends only, as far as I understand, to look at—maybe Heidi wants to respond to this—the projects that
6 are actually defined, specific projects that are proposed or well known or whatever, but notional
7 projects like we're going to zone for 2,000 housing units and, therefore, one might expect there to be x,
8 y, z students from that coming down the pike. Buildings being built in 2020 or 2022 or whatever, those
9 aren't in the process for the School District projections. I think that there's a disconnect here. That is
10 why when the City rezones things, when the City does projections, it'd be good if we can go further out
11 than just five years on that. Why it's important to actually have projections for schools that I'd like to
12 see, as far as the Comp Plan is concerned, bringing us out to 2030, not just out for the Housing Element.
13 In fact, the Housing Element did not consider the impact to schools. I went to a bunch of meetings; I
14 raised the issue; I didn't go to all the meetings. It did not consider the impacts of schools. I think that
15 that is a failing.

16 **Co-Chair Garber:** Elaine. Actually we're at 8:15. I'd like to not have you respond if I can, because I ...

17 **Male:** I can give her my (inaudible).

18 **Co-Chair Garber:** In which case you will come after me. Elaine then Steve then Dan.

19 **Elaine Uang:** Don, I think, raised a couple of issues that just triggered some thoughts. I want to add to
20 his comment about let's lead with data, let's sort of generate data. I think some of the biggest pieces of
21 information that's missing is we have really not a good sense of where people live. It would be great to
22 just take the population and map it out, so we know where the senior population is growing fastest. We
23 know where the 0-5 or the 5-12 population is growing the fastest. I actually asked staff earlier if there
24 was a breakdown by neighborhood of the different age groups. I'm not sure that that's easily parsable,

1 maybe it is through census track information. It would be nice. I think one thing I did learn was there's
2 55 percent of the population roughly living north of Oregon Expressway and 45 living south. If we could
3 get more finer grained information about what the different populations are within each neighborhood,
4 map that over the parks, map that over the schools, we get a better sense of, like, the distribution of
5 people and the resources and the community facilities that we do have. As a baseline, I think that would
6 help us operate and make better decisions going forward.

7 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Steve then me and then Heidi. Heidi, you'll have the final word.

8 **Shani Kleinhaus:** I have one sentence.

9 **Co-Chair Garber:** Steve.

10 **Stephen Levy:** I didn't expect to get into this technical discussion, but I guess my comment sparked
11 some stuff. Data refers to stuff that's already happened. The existing conditions report is perfectly
12 appropriate. I have perhaps been the loudest in asking staff for information about what the travel is,
13 where the people are coming from and all of that. Projections, how many kids will be here in 15 years, is
14 a whole different deal. As Art pointed out, it will depend on the kind of housing we build. It will depend
15 on how many aging seniors remain in their houses. We lived in houses where the school enrollment
16 went down and then the families sold over. No one that I know does any age projections for cities that
17 don't rely on what the State demographers have done for the State and the County. That's why I use
18 the word I want to check it out with Hillary. I don't know anybody that does official city projections, and
19 I want to make sure it doesn't somehow deviate or I understand the reason that it would deviate from
20 the Department of Finance County and State trends. Just report back.

21 **Co-Chair Garber:** In the interest of time, I'm going to skip my comments. Shani, you want to give your
22 one sentence, and then we'll give it back to Heidi.

DRAFT

DRAFT

DRAFT

1 **Shani Kleinhaus:** I wanted to again support Jenny about Policy C-4.5 that any encouragement would be
2 for public areas. In one of the neighboring cities, private porches became open space. I really don't
3 want to see that kind of thing happen to Palo Alto. Thank you.

4 **Co-Chair Garber:** Heidi.

5 **Heidi Emberling:** I just wanted to let everyone know that we at the Board just had a special Board
6 meeting on enrollment growth. The report is on the PAUSD website under October 26th meeting
7 packet. It's 173 pages of fabulous information about enrollment. I can just tell you that enrollment has
8 gone up every year if you look at 1989 and on. If you look at 1969 and on, you will see the rollercoaster
9 of enrollment where it shrank for 20 years, and we went from 22 elementaries to 12 elementaries, 3
10 middle schools to 1, and almost down to 1 high school. All of that information, all of the demographer's
11 projections, looking back ten years at demographer's predictions back then. It's the most
12 comprehensive, unbelievably amazing report done by our advisory committee on enrollment. It's all
13 there on the website.

14 **Male:** Are we agreeing that that's what we're using?

15 **Heidi Emberling:** This is the best information that we are using in planning. You can go ahead and take
16 a look.

17 **Female:** (inaudible)

18 **Heidi Emberling:** It depends on the demographers you use. We've used two over the past ten years.
19 One has consistently overcast. One has consistently undercast. It sort of depends. Again, nobody has
20 the crystal ball. You can't predict things like recessions and booms and busts.

21 **Co-Chair Garber:** We've got a couple more moments here. First of all, Co-Chair, I have a question for
22 you. Do we want to ask for a motion to support the subcommittee's work with staff to produce another
23 draft and then the individual review by the Committee members going forward?

24 **Co-Chair Keller:** Sure.

1 **Don McDougall:** I'll so move.

2 **Co-Chair Garber:** Do I hear a second? Moved by Don. Is there a second? Annette seconds. All in favor
3 raise your hand and say aye. All opposed. It passes unanimously. Let's go on to Feedback for
4 Continuous Improvement.

5 **Feedback for Continuous Improvement:**

6 **Co-Chair Garber:** Any comments? Lisa.

7 **Lisa Peschcke-Koedt:** This is more, I think, a little bit longer term. I mentioned to Dan earlier I'm still a
8 little unsure about our role in the CAC. I don't really know if we're decision making or we're just giving
9 our views through a subcommittee but also just individually and just kind of throwing out information. I
10 think it would be more useful if we got it to a more targeted decision-making, specific input. I don't
11 know that that that's our role. This was our first action kind of meeting. I can see a direction that this
12 will be a little bit more productive rather than—sharing views is useful, but it doesn't actually get us to a
13 conclusion. Where might we go with this longer term? I'm not expecting it to be answered tonight, but
14 I'd like to come back to that and actually have a discussion of what does staff and City Council want and
15 what do we think we can do to be most useful. That would be a topic, again, not to solve tonight but to
16 raise for thought.

17 **Co-Chair Garber:** Hillary, do you want to have a brief comment?

18 **Hillary Gitelman:** I think we should talk about that next month when we talk about the schedule. It'll be
19 an opportunity to look forward, see how many discussion meetings we have versus action meetings and
20 if they're aligned properly.

21 **Co-Chair Garber:** Arthur.

22 **Co-Chair Keller:** I'll just add one thing. I think it's more likely that we'll have more controversy when we
23 get to land use. Then we'll have more differences of opinion.

24 **Unknown:** Housing.

25 **Co-Chair Keller:** To the extent we get to housing. At least in land use, clearly be more issues of
26 potential controversy for which there will be pros and cons which should go to the Council. On
27 Community Services, I would have suspected there would be fewer controversies. It's a good thing we
28 did that one first.

29 **Co-Chair Garber:** Whitney, you had a comment.

30 **Whitney McNair:** I just found that the first round of comments on any of the Elements, it sort of was a
31 round robin. It was hard for me to understand where the big picture issues might be located. In the
32 digital commenter online, staff was asking some specific questions of the community. I didn't know if

1 we might sort of bring those questions back to the group to have the discussion focused around some
2 particular big picture questions. If that might be more productive than just targeted little comments on
3 individual policies for that first meeting on a particular Element.

4 **Co-Chair Garber:** Got you. Other comments or in support? I'm sorry. Don.

5 **Don McDougall:** In anticipation of land use and housing, some of us recently heard a consultant make a
6 presentation, part of a planning process. What he did was actually invite the participants to go out into
7 their community and take photographs of what they liked in terms of single-family, multifamily or
8 whatever houses. I'm not necessarily suggesting we do that and everybody submit them; although,
9 maybe that would be a possibility. At least in my own mind I went away from that thinking it was a
10 useful exercise to walk through my community and think, "If I had to do that, what is it that I would take
11 pictures of and submit?" As we get to land use and housing, I think if you think about if you had to take
12 pictures in your community, what would you take pictures of as representing what it is either that you
13 like or don't like. You could sort of figure out what it is you're doing. Hillary's frowning, but I happen to
14 think it's a really good idea.

15 **Co-Chair Garber:** Actually, this is something that we've raised with staff. There are several consultants
16 that have made presentations related to land use, planning, etc. It's somewhat problematic to create a
17 presentation for all of us to attend, because we wouldn't want to take up our discussion time with
18 presentations of that sort. However, we are trying to figure out if there are—some of these
19 presentations are online. If we can find a way to share them, in particular before the land use
20 discussion, there may be some ways that we have yet to figure out with staff to see if there are some
21 ways to both educate us as well as cause us to think more creatively about the topics we're about to be
22 getting into. Jennifer and Elaine and Don.

23 **Jennifer Hetterly:** I'd like to comment on continuous improvement about the process of our first
24 meeting. I find that the first meeting on any particular topic feels hugely inefficient to me. Several
25 people do written comments, and some don't. You go around the table with three minutes, and you
26 pick out your top three comments, but it's not comprehensive. You're guessing what might be
27 controversial, might not be controversial. Frankly, I think you all can read my comments without me
28 pointing them out. I wonder if we couldn't, since we all have both the PTC version and the original
29 Comp Plan version in our possession, can we just submit our written comments further in advance and
30 have staff put them into the matrix before our first meeting. Then our first meeting is more of a working
31 meeting where we're talking about how it all came together. It's easier to see where differences of
32 opinion come up, because they're altogether on one document. I would hope we could do something
33 like that.

34 **Co-Chair Garber:** I'm not sure I have an immediate response. Hillary.

35 **Hillary Gitelman:** I think we'll have to give that some thought. We have this constraint of the Brown Act
36 and this messy democracy part of what we're doing. I actually think it's kind of interesting that some of
37 you bring many, many comments and are forced by the format to kind of select your top three. That in

1 itself is kind of a telling thing. It doesn't mean the other things don't get into the record. I don't know.
2 To me, that's kind of an interesting part of what we're doing. Let me think further about how we could
3 exchange written products earlier. We haven't come up with a way to do that.

4 **Jennifer Hetterly:** It wouldn't be any different than what we did for transportation with the second
5 meeting. We all had everybody's written comments already before we had our second meeting. I'm not
6 sure it's a Brown Act constraint.

7 **Co-Chair Garber:** Yeah, we'll see if we can't find a way to incorporate that. Folks, we've got Elaine, Don
8 and Annette, and we have two minutes. We're going to go until we get to 8:30, and then it's going to
9 end. Elaine.

10 **Elaine Uang:** I'll just send you a web link to a presentation to share.

11 **Co-Chair Garber:** Great. Don. Send it to staff. Okay. Annette.

12 **Annette Glanckopf:** I love Jennifer's idea, but I think it's very optimistic. I don't see every single person
13 submitting comments. That's not critical, but we all have time constraints. Sometimes I really like
14 listening to the comments and that provokes other ideas. I'm not being critical, again, of Jennifer. I also
15 did want to mention I love the idea of taking pictures. When we were doing the future of single-family
16 housing, we considered going around the City and taking pictures. We were told very strongly that
17 legally it would not be good for people's houses to either be—especially if you're going to talk about a
18 negative architecture, design, streetscape, etc. There might be some ramifications there.

19 **Co-Chair Garber:** It's 8:29. If no one has any other comments? Lisa.

20 **Lisa Peschcke-Koedt:** Just on Jennifer's proposal. I would actually disagree with it. I think the written
21 comments are useful, but they're too long. I'd rather hear the key points when we're face-to-face, so
22 we can discuss them. That's my view.

23 **Future Meetings:**

24 Next meeting: December 15, 2015. Mitchell Park Community Center

25 **Adjournment:**

26 **Co-Chair Garber:** May I hear a motion to adjourn?

27 **Male:** I agree with Jennifer.

28 **Annette Glanckopf:** So moved.

29 **Co-Chair Garber:** So moved by Annette. Seconded by Lydia. All in favor. It is 8:30. Thank you.