



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY
COMMITTEE

Minutes

Mitchell Park Community Center
3700 Middlefield Road
Palo Alto, CA 94303
September 8, 2015

1
2
3
4
5
6 **Call to Order**

7
8 **Chair Garber:** Folks, it's 5:35. We will start our meeting. I will call the meeting to order.
9

10 **CAC Member Introductions:**
11

12 **Chair Garber:** I would like to start by acknowledging our new members which are Shani, Len,
13 Jennifer, Annette, Mark and soon to be Julia who is also joining us. We wanted to give them an
14 opportunity to say a little bit about themselves. The recommendation has been that we all do
15 that, so that they know who we are. I'll start, and then maybe, Arthur, you can go and we'll go in
16 that direction. I'm Dan Garber. I'm the current Chair, about to be Co-Chair of this Committee. I
17 live in Old Palo Alto, about five houses from Oregon Expressway, and have a wife, two kids and
18 have lived in Palo Alto since '96. Arthur.
19

20 **Vice Chair Keller:** Thank you. Please make sure that when you use your microphones that
21 they're close enough to you. Please also make sure to turn off your microphones when you're not
22 using them; otherwise, we get feedback in the room. That's your public service announcement
23 for tonight. I'm Arthur Keller, and I am Vice Chair, soon to be Co-Chair. I've lived in Palo Alto
24 since 1977, originally as a grad student at Stanford and then I went away for two years to teach at
25 the University of Texas Austin. I've lived here continuously since 1987, raised with my then
26 wife, twin daughters who are now 22 years of age. I am a consultant; I advise startups and I
27 serve as an expert witness on patent cases. I served on the Planning and Transportation
28 Commission for eight years. I was on the subcommittee of the Planning and Transportation
29 Commission that drafted the Transportation Element that we're going to be discussing tonight.

30 **Elaine Uang:** Can you hear me? Okay. My name is Elaine Uang. I live Downtown North. I'm
31 a residential architect by profession, and I have lived in and out of the Palo Alto/Stanford area
32 since, oh I don't know, a total of 11 years over the last 20-some years.
33

34 **Stephen Levy:** I'm Steve Levy. I live behind the farmer's market. I came here to Stanford 52
35 years ago. Our kids went to school and graduated from Paly. I'm a regional economist
36 professionally.
37

1 **Amy Sung:** Good evening. My name is Amy Sung. I moved to Palo Alto from Ohio after I
2 worked at NASA for ten years. I came here with my two children and a husband. My two boys
3 went to Duveneck, Jordan and Paly. I've been living here since 2001. I live next to the Main
4 Library. I am now working as a realtor serving great Palo Alto area.

5
6 **Bob Wenzlau:** My name's Bob Wenzlau. I came to Palo Alto in the '70s, going to Stanford,
7 grew three kids in the Palo Alto School District, worked for the City, dropped out of Stanford for
8 three years much to my mother's enjoyment, but the goal was to start the City's curbside
9 recycling program, so we got that going. Since then, run a small business in Palo Alto involved
10 in land stewardship, called Terradex, and recently had worked on composting issues in Palo
11 Alto.

12
13 **Whitney McNair:** Hi. My name is Whitney McNair. I'm the Director of Land Use Planning
14 for Stanford University, and my office is in Palo Alto off of Page Mill Road.

15
16 **Alex Van Riesen:** My name is Alex Van Riesen. I've lived in Palo Alto since 1998, did go to
17 school here in the early '80s, Stanford, left and then came back with my wife. I have three
18 children. We live on Louis Road near Loma Verde. I'm a pastor at a local church here in Palo
19 Alto and glad to be on this team.

20
21 **Don McDougall:** My name is Don McDougall. I'm currently on—is that any better?

22
23 **Chair Garber:** Better.

24
25 **Don McDougall:** Good instruction. I'm Don McDougall. I'm currently on the Library
26 Commission, and I do work with environmental volunteers. Other than that I'm basically retired.

27
28 **Jennifer Hetterly:** I'm Jennifer Hetterly. I grew up here in Palo Alto, and after several years
29 back east, moved back with my family. I've a freshman and junior at Paly. I live in Midtown. I
30 also spent several years as a volunteer for the Greenmeadow Residents Association, and I'm
31 currently in my sixth year on the Parks and Recreation Commission and also was a former
32 subcommittee chair for the Cubberley Community Advisory Committee.

33
34 **Julia Moran:** Hi. My name is Julia Moran. I've lived in Palo Alto for about three years. My
35 background is in finance, but I am now home with my two kids. They're 1 and 3. That's about it.

36
37 **Adrian Fine:** Hello. My name's Adrian Fine. Is it on yet? My name's Adrian Fine. I was born
38 and raised here. I'm the youngest of six kids raised here in Palo Alto. I also serve on the City's
39 Planning and Transportation Commission, so I'm here as a nonvoting member, but I'm excited to
40 listen and give input where I can. Professionally I work for nextdoor.com, kind of in civic
41 technology and partnerships.

42
43 **Jared Jacobs:** Hi. My name is Jared Jacobs. I grew up mostly in South Carolina. I've been in
44 this area since 2002. I have a wife and three kids. The oldest is in first grade this year at
45 Escondido. Happy to be here.

1 **Hamilton Hitchings:** Hi. My name's Hamilton Hitchings. I've lived in Palo Alto for over 20
2 years. I have a freshman in Paly also. I'm an active volunteer in the Emergency Services
3 Volunteer Program, and professionally I'm doing my own startup right now.
4

5 **Bonnie Packer:** My name's Bonnie Packer. I've lived in Palo Alto since 1974. I went to law
6 school, commuted to San Francisco on Caltrain for 14 years, had two kids through the school
7 system. I was on the Planning and Transportation Commission for five years. Let's see, PTA
8 Council. I'm on the Board of the Palo Alto Housing Corporation, been a member of the League
9 of Women Voters, lots of stuff. I live in South Palo Alto near the "Y."
10

11 **Mark Nadim:** My name is Mark Nadim, and I live in Palo Alto Hills. I've been living in Palo
12 Alto since '86. My daughter just graduated from Gunn this past June, and now she's majoring in
13 engineering. I'm an engineer myself. I was in high tech for about 35 years, and now I'm
14 consulting.
15

16 **Len Filppu:** I am Len Filppu, originally from the East Coast. I've been in Palo Alto since 1980.
17 I worked a lot in high technology; now I'm writing and consulting. I live in the Fairmeadow
18 area, and I'm acting chair of the Fairmeadow Neighborhood Association.
19

20 **Lisa Peschcke-Koedt:** I'm Lisa Peschcke-Koedt. My parents came over and settled in Palo
21 Alto in the early '50s. I was born here and went to Addison School and Jordan and Paly,
22 Stanford undergraduate, and then I went actually back East for law school, worked in high tech
23 my whole career, still at Cisco. I was at HP and Agilent before that. I do finance and legal,
24 actually international and tax and customs. The reason I wanted to be here was my mom was
25 part of a plan 30 years ago or so for Palo Alto. I was always so impressed and admired her of
26 what she helped do for that. I realize my piece will be much, much smaller, but it's a pleasure to
27 get to be a part of it.
28

29 **Ellen Uhrbrock:** I'm Ellen Uhrbrock, and I came to Palo Alto in 1954 as a graduate student at
30 Stanford. Since then, I have lived and worked and especially keen on small business. I am
31 looking forward to planning Palo Alto for the next ten years.
32

33 **Lydia Kou:** Hello. My name is Lydia Kou. I'm a resident of Palo Alto, actually here in the Bay
34 Area for the last 27 years, first living in Mountain View, then Los Altos and then Palo Alto.
35 Started off here as a small business owner, mom and pop shop. It was a video rental business in
36 College Terrace. Now I am a residential realtor with Alain Pinel here in Palo Alto also. I started
37 volunteering for the Palo Alto Emergency Services group/program and help initiate a lot of the
38 programs that they have right now including teaching and training. That is actually what brought
39 me to interest in the City affairs, and so here I am today. I look forward to working with all of
40 you.
41

42 **Doria Summa:** Hi. My name is Doria Summa. I live in College Terrace in actually one of the
43 oldest houses in Palo Alto. I've been very active in my neighborhood association, and I've
44 volunteered for other committees such as the Development Center Customer Advisory Group
45 known as DCCAG, and have a fond interest in these issues in Palo Alto.
46

1 **Shani Kleinhaus:** My name is Shani Kleinhaus. I live in Adobe Meadows. I've been here for
2 almost 20 years. Professionally I'm an ecologist. I work for the Santa Clara Valley Audubon
3 Society as an environmental advocate, an advocate for birds and wildlife and habitat in cities and
4 in open spaces. I also work with many other environmental organizations in the area including
5 Sierra Club and many of the other local groups. I have reviewed many, many CEQA documents,
6 so I think that I can contribute a little bit. I've worked with Whitney before on some projects,
7 and many others here. Thank you.

8
9 **Annette Glanckopf:** Hello everyone. Annette Glanckopf here. I'm another Midtown resident,
10 so I look forward to talking to you, Alex and certainly Jennifer. I moved to California in the late
11 '60s to work at medical research at Stanford, so my background is healthcare, technology and a
12 lot of planning. As far as this effort right now, I'm involved with my neighborhood, Palo Alto
13 neighborhoods. I'm involved with Emergency Services, and we have quite a few others so that'll
14 be an interesting element. As far as planning, I was one of the co-chairs for the future of single
15 family housing as well as led the effort to get ground-floor retail in Midtown Shopping Center.

16
17 **Hillary Gitelman:** Thank you. I'm Hillary Gitelman, the Planning Director of Palo Alto. I
18 want to welcome you all and thank you all for doing this. We're going to have a lot of fun. I've
19 been a professional planner in the Bay Area for over 20 years. Doing a General Plan or
20 Comprehensive Plan like this is one of the greatest things that you can do in a community, not
21 just because I anticipate we're going to have a fantastic product at the end of it, but because the
22 process of getting there is so instructive and important. It's an opportunity for the community to
23 come together, air the differences that exist and find a way to structure a plan that is a consistent
24 and coherent vision for all of us moving forward. Welcome and I look forward to a great
25 discussion this evening.

26
27 **Jeremy Dennis:** My name is Jeremy Dennis. I'm the relatively new Advance Planning Manager
28 for the City of Palo Alto. It's good to see you all here tonight.

29
30 **Gil Friend:** Hi everyone. I'm Gil Friend. I'm the City's Chief Sustainability Officer, been with
31 the City of Palo Alto for just about two years. Before that, over the last 30 or 40 years, I've been
32 working in the sustainability field, advising governments and large corporations on how to
33 embed sustainability as a source of innovation and economic advantage. I'm leading the effort
34 here to develop our new Sustainability and Climate Action Plan which I'll be talking with you
35 about in a few minutes.

36
37 **Chair Garber:** Thank you all. I would also like to acknowledge our City Manager, Jim Keene,
38 who's joining us this evening, and our Mayor Holman back there and two Council persons,
39 Mr. DuBois and Mr. Schmid. Thank you for spending the evening with us. Just before we get to
40 Staff comments, let me remind the public that we are taking cards for oral communications. We
41 currently have how many? Four? Four, so if anybody else would like to speak, please bring
42 your cards up to Arthur here. I'm going to remind you that we had a couple of ground rules.
43 Those were the shared leadership, which we're about to enact. Transparency. I've made a
44 personal commitment to Arthur to share all of the communication that comes to me with him and
45 other members on Staff. This is a safe place for us to talk about things. We are going to do our

1 very best to make sure that all opinions are aired and shared. With that, let me invite Staff to
2 make some comments for the evening.

3
4 **Staff Comments:**

5
6 **Jeremy Dennis:** Thank you, Dan. I'll try to keep my comments relatively brief, because we
7 have a lot in front of us this evening. First of all, I wanted to start off with some additional
8 introductions of my Staff. To your left, my right, is Robin Ellner and Consuelo Hernandez. To
9 your right or behind you, Chitra Moitra and Andrew Hill from PlaceWorks who will be taking
10 notes live tonight. They'll be on the screen a little bit later. A few things. First, I wanted to
11 mention obviously the Council a week ago made a decision to add additional members, and
12 we're glad that they are here tonight. The second motion that was made that evening was that
13 this is the CAC that they wanted. If I may read a portion of the motion. Affirm that the resulting
14 CAC is well equipped to fulfill its role with 22 voting members and 3 nonvoting members
15 appointed to review all relevant materials, etc. I just wanted to make that point. Secondly, I've
16 appreciated over the last six, eight weeks as I've gotten to know everybody and get your
17 comments, keep them coming. They're really helpful to our process, both related to what we're
18 talking about but also how to make this process better for you. We will do everything we can to
19 implement those, knowing full well when we have 22 people who give us 22 different sets of
20 comments, I can't get to them all in exactly the way you may want, but we'll do everything we
21 can. If there's something though that we're missing, let me know and we'll try to do that for you.
22 Number three, taking a little personal exception for a second. Consuelo Hernandez is leaving us.
23 She is moving on to a new position. This is her last CAC meeting. I don't know what I
24 personally am going to do. Our next CAC meeting is going to be a disaster because she's
25 leaving, but I wanted to let her know how much I'm going to miss her. I know everyone else
26 here will. She's done an extraordinary job keeping this going, so thank you very much for
27 everything you've done. With that, I will turn it back over to our Co-Chairs.

28
29 **Oral Communication:**

30
31 **Chair Garber:** Okay. Let's get to oral communications.

32
33 **Vice Chair Keller:** Our first speaker is Mary Holzer, to be followed by Beth Bunnenberg.

34
35 **Chair Garber:** You'll have three minutes.

36
37 **Mary Holzer:** Tell me when I'm done. I read this document, nice light reading for my weekend.
38 I was interested to discover that 90,000 people commute into the city everyday which put in clear
39 picture for me exactly why we have a problem. I was dismayed to discover that there weren't
40 any numbers in there that projected forward what current development and development in the
41 pipeline will do to that number of people that are coming in, but Jeremy reassured me that they
42 are working on that and you will get those numbers. I don't see how you can make decisions or
43 proposals without having a clear picture of exactly what's going on in the town and where it's
44 going with respect to growth and development. Second point is this is a regional problem. If we
45 aren't in close contact and work closely with the cities around us, up and down the Peninsula, any
46 decisions and solutions that we come up with will be not particularly useful because it all has to

1 work together to solve this problem. The last thing is 90,000 people put out an awful lot of
2 greenhouse gases in addition to the greenhouse gases that the City of Palo Alto residents put out
3 when they travel around. I think that needs to be very carefully considered as we look forward
4 into development in this community and how we fix this, because the climate situation is not
5 getting better. That is what I have to say.

6
7 **Chair Garber:** Thank you.

8
9 **Vice Chair Keller:** Beth Bunnenberg, to be followed by William Ross.

10
11 **Beth Bunnenberg:** I'm Beth Bunnenberg speaking as an individual tonight. Thank you so
12 much for this opportunity to talk about the Comp Plan. I remember in some early discussions we
13 talked some about historic sites and districts and structures that very closely involved streets,
14 roads and highways. For years, train tracks, road construction projects, freeways have been
15 hazardous to historic properties. Probably our most endangered property that's in hazard's way is
16 our El Palo Alto tree, the symbol of our town, and the railroad bridge that the tree has its roots
17 kind of wrapped around some of the concrete bulwarks. Of course, El Camino Real is also very
18 near. In my estimation though, downtown University Avenue is very much in danger, and 27
19 University Avenue, that's MacArthur Park, is greatly in danger. Please include—I think maybe
20 at one point there was some inclusion; I don't know what happened to it—but include either as a
21 separate bullet point or incorporated in the wording, as you talked about the different important
22 things to do, to strengthen policies on preservation of historic structures and sites that are on the
23 National Register, California Register of Historic Landmarks and properties that are listed on the
24 Palo Alto Historic Inventory. I have attached a list for the Committee's examination. Thank you
25 very much.

26
27 **Vice Chair Keller:** William Ross, to be followed by Gabriel Lewis.

28
29 **William Ross:** Good evening. My name's Bill Ross. I spoke at the last meeting. I would first
30 like to comment on the draft minutes of your body at the last meeting. I suggested at that time
31 that there be a record of proceedings. I think the minutes reflect the need for that. I don't think
32 that they fairly represent several things that went on at your meeting. I can use my own
33 comments as an example. I specifically referenced the General Plan guidelines, the need for
34 economic diversity, referencing representatives from the Buena Vista project. I also referenced
35 the issue of horizontal consistency and how would your efforts be related to the currently two
36 required to be updated elements of a General Plan, Circulation and Housing. I would like to
37 comment on your consideration tonight of the Transportation Element, suggesting that it be
38 brought back after you consider Land Use. Cases clearly establish under Government Code
39 Section 65302(b) that the Transportation or Circulation Element is to be correlated to Land Use.
40 Clearly they require that. Why? So that any change in demands on the various roadways or
41 transportation facilities as a result of changes in land use contemplated by the plan are
42 considered. Also, if the Circulation Element is to be effective, for exaction it must be based on
43 traffic studies that are sufficiently detailed to link land uses and related demand for future
44 dedications. Respectfully, I certainly hope that you're not using the Transportation Element to
45 "back door" considerations for what land use should be. The cases for over 30 years have

1 indicated to the contrary. You look at land use and then, because of the demands predicated by
2 the intensity of those uses, you then correlate the Circulation Element to those uses. Thank you.

3
4 **Chair Garber:** Thank you.

5
6 **Vice Chair Keller:** The next speaker is Gabriel Lewis, to be followed by Stacey Ashlund.

7
8 **Gabriel Lewis:** Good evening, everyone. My name's Gabriel Lewis. I grew up here in South
9 Palo Alto. Hello? Good evening. I grew up here in South Palo Alto, and I'm working at
10 Stanford right now while applying to econ Ph.D.s. Anyway, I was reading the Transportation
11 Element, and I came across T-1.2.1 Program which has to do with encouraging the installation of
12 facilities that support alternative fuel vehicles by reviewing and amending the Zoning Code
13 where appropriate. That kind of sparks some more general thoughts about our investments in
14 supposedly beneficial innovations. I just wanted to say that in those kinds of—well, we need to
15 insert into the language that we should be more sure that programs like this are actually
16 beneficial before we invest in them. Alternative fuels are not necessarily better fuels.
17 Innovation is not necessarily improvement. Some innovation, I think, could be worth investing
18 in, like electric cars. The data says that those are pretty good ideas, but some are not. Ethanol is
19 a good example of something that is a relatively new invention, but it's actually a net energy loss
20 to produce it and it creates more carbon than gasoline. I think that we need to be a little bit more
21 careful about how we think about these innovations and be a little bit more cautious in investing
22 in them. Thank you very much.

23
24 **Vice Chair Keller:** The next speaker is Stacey Ashlund, to be followed by Penny Ellson.

25
26 **Stacey Ashlund:** Hi, I'm Stacey Ashlund. I'm a resident of Barron Park for about 20 years. I
27 have two children, one at Terman and one at Gunn. I'm an advocate for inclusion of people with
28 disabilities, and this includes children all the way to the elderly, and I'm also ending my first
29 term on the Parks and Rec Commission. I wanted to speak about transportation from the point of
30 view of people with disabilities. The majority of the conversation about transportation relates to
31 cars. Obviously there are environmental problems as well as traffic problems. The second thing
32 we hear most often is bikes, bike paths and Safe Routes to School. What is blatantly missing
33 from the conversation is safe pedestrian access. I'm not going to detail by any stretch all of what
34 the ADA requires for safe pedestrian access, but there are a number of people that cannot drive
35 or ride bikes due to mobility impairments, vision impairments and even things such as anxiety
36 and Asperger's disorders. The sidewalks in Palo Alto, the majority of them are not wide enough
37 nor clear enough. If you walk on Arastradero, you have less than 3 feet of space and the
38 majority of that is encroached upon by bushes and trees from private property. If you try to use a
39 white cane on there, as a visually impaired person does, you'd actually be better off in the street
40 in the bike path, because the sidewalk is in such bad shape. The sidewalks are also not lighted.
41 Barron Park, my neighborhood, is one of those prime examples that is unsafe for pedestrians due
42 to that. The crossing lights, press to walk buttons are not at the majority of our intersections.
43 When they are installed, they need to have audio as we have in Midtown, so it tells you when it
44 is safe to walk. The curbs need to be painted to increase visibility, or they're not safe for visually
45 impaired residents. We had yellow curbs painted at Terman Middle School, and my son
46 attended there, so that he wouldn't trip over them. A couple of years later that paint has worn

1 off. I hate to say that I'm not at that school anymore advocating that paint needs to be refreshed
2 if the curbs are going to be safely visible to the visually impaired. The majority of people with
3 disabilities are not just mobility impaired, so just know that it takes a wider lens when you're
4 looking at what ADA covers. It does tend to focus on mobility, but vision is obviously another
5 equally important aspect. Lastly, public transportation. We have VTA and Marguerite shuttle
6 from Stanford. We do have the Palo Alto free shuttle. All of these are wonderful, but they have
7 very limited routes. We already have driverless cars where you don't have to stay awake. It's
8 called buses and trains. Many people don't use the public transportation because we don't have a
9 very extensive system. On the other hand, we don't have a very extensive system because it's not
10 heavily used. We can solve this chicken and egg problem by enriching the public transportation
11 system and the safe pedestrian access for the disability community, but also for the environment,
12 that it affects all of us. Lastly, I encourage the Comprehensive Plan to include an ADA review
13 of pedestrian access more often than on a 20-year basis, perhaps even five years or less. Thank
14 you.

15
16 **Vice Chair Keller:** Thank you. Our next speaker is Penny Ellson, to be followed by David
17 Cole.

18
19 **Penny Ellson:** I'm Penny Ellson, and I'm speaking as an individual tonight. First of all, I just
20 want to comment that we have a pretty good Transportation Element right now. I mean when
21 our Transportation Element was written, it was visionary for its time. As I was reading through
22 it last night, I thought "wow, a lot of this never got implemented." I would like us to look
23 backward, and I would like us to look at the Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Plan that was
24 approved unanimously in 2012 and make sure that the good things that are in that plan, that were
25 in our last Comprehensive Plan get implemented as we move forward. I like that we're talking
26 about alternative forms of energy. All of that is great, but I really think we need to put a large
27 emphasis on transit. I think our City needs to start working with transit authorities with the other
28 cities to put pressure on them to start working in a more cooperative way. I think our biggest
29 problem is not enough money is getting to Palo Alto, and I thank Joe Simitian for shedding a lot
30 of light on that recently. I think we need to start cooperating with some other cities to get more
31 resources down to this end of the county and also to get the various transit agencies cooperating
32 with each other. Caltrain and VTA, they're not sharing money; they're not sharing resources.
33 They're competing with each other in our community, and they're not just doing that to us. My
34 husband sits on a transit group in Sunnyvale; the same thing is going on there, and the businesses
35 there are frustrated with it. I think our community needs to start working with these other
36 communities who are having the same problems with the transit authorities; otherwise, that bit is
37 going to be out of our control for a long time. I'd like us to address that somehow. Then I was
38 interested to read some of the language in here. It talks about—in the old Comprehensive Plan,
39 its talks about considering the economic, environmental and social cost issues in local
40 transportation decisions. I'd like that policy to change to address those things and add the word
41 "safety" in there which is really, I think, critically important to the people who are the foot-
42 powered commuters and the people that Stacey Ashlund was just talking about. She's done a lot
43 to educate me about what kids in these groups need on our school routes. I'd also like to see
44 some transit management organization of businesses in Palo Alto contribute some money to
45 funding that would provide City Staff that could do some work. I'd like us to take a page out of
46 the Safe Routes to School book and apply it to our businesses and to the adults in our

1 community. I hear grownups all the time telling me, "I'm not comfortable riding a bicycle on
2 Palo Alto streets. I don't have the skills." We've been teaching kids those skills, and they're
3 learning them, and they're doing it in very large numbers, thousands of them every school day,
4 and they get to school. We've had some accidents; I think it was something like 83 accidents last
5 year total including all the adults and the kids. Right? Those are pretty good numbers. We can
6 do this with the grownups, so let's see if we can get something like that in there.
7

8 **Vice Chair Keller:** Our final speaker is David Cole.
9

10 **David Cole:** My name is David Cole, a 30-plus year resident of Palo Alto. In reading through
11 some of the material here, I was very glad to see a lot of mention of climate change.
12 Paraphrasing the Governor of Washington state, he said, "We're the first generation to experience
13 climate change, and we're the last ones to do anything about it in terms of really making a
14 difference." I'm glad to see this in the plan. I think there needs to be better numbers. A lot of
15 the goals are increase the good stuff and decrease the bad stuff, but some real numbers would be
16 good in terms of mode shift, in terms of greenhouse gas reduction. Perhaps we'll see this with
17 the S/CAP presentation. We have some pending State legislation that's going to be 50 percent
18 reduction in gasoline use potentially. If that's not somehow taken into account in this plan, how
19 are we going to know where we are? Thirty percent mode shift out of single occupancy vehicles,
20 for instance. I'd like to see a cap and trade on single occupancy vehicle trips Downtown. We
21 can measure this with a survey. Cap it right now. Stanford's done fine with a cap. Then reduce
22 that cap over time, and we have all the different options listed in the plan of how to do that.
23 Some real numbers will give some real goals and some real objectives to work toward instead of
24 increase the good and decrease the bad. We could do 1 percent on each, and we'd make all our
25 goals. I agree with Penny Ellson on a lot of those things. We have a lot of good plans sitting on
26 the shelf, but they're not getting implemented and we don't have the money to really do the good
27 job on the Bike and Pedestrian which is probably the cheapest, fastest way to reduce single
28 occupancy trips. The other thing she mentioned is the kids riding to school. That's a mode share
29 of about 40 or 50 percent on bicycles. If we could only get their parents to do the same thing,
30 we'd be done. Thank you very much.
31

32 **Chair Garber:** Thank you. I think that's it. No more cards?
33

34 **Vice Chair Keller:** No more cards.
35

36 **Chair Garber:** No more cards. We're going to go to our agenda items.
37

38 **Agenda Items:**
39

40 **1. Action: Approval of Minutes**
41

42 **Chair Garber:** The first agenda item is action, the approval of minutes. I think before we do
43 that, we need some discussion about that. There's several of us that have comments. Jeremy, do
44 you want to start us off?
45

1 **Jeremy Dennis:** Yeah, very briefly. I know that some members of the CAC had some questions
2 about the use of the action minutes and what they were seeing. There's actually two sets of
3 minutes that we're preparing. We prepare the meeting notes that you see in front of you as a way
4 just to capture very, very high level information. Those are the notes that we ask you to take
5 action on. We are developing in-house a much more substantial meeting note system. It's
6 essentially an Excel spreadsheet with everything that we hear. It requires us, though, to go back
7 and listen to the meetings to make sure that we're getting everything, so some of the things that
8 we heard tonight. We are doing that. It's our hope to have something ready for prime time in the
9 next couple of weeks, so you can see related to the Community Services, and then we'll develop
10 other meeting notes accordingly after that. It'll be part of any deliberations moving forward
11 under the items that you have. Thank you.

12
13 **Chair Garber:** Thanks. Are there any other Committee Members that need to speak to the
14 minutes? Yes, Doria.

15
16 **Doria Summa:** I'm happy that we're taping and audio and also visually tonight. I think that's
17 going to be a big improvement. It's no criticism at all of Staff, because I do know how hard
18 they've been working, but I can't really consider those five bullet points minutes, so I will not be
19 able to approve them. If we're going to get them next time, we can do that next time maybe.

20
21 **Chair Garber:** Jeremy, are there plans for adding the items that you just mentioned?

22
23 **Jeremy Dennis:** We're still discussing exactly how to do it. At some point it's a public
24 document that we want everyone to see. It wasn't our intention to bring them forward for action.
25 We didn't see them in that vein. We just saw them as another resource. We wanted to capture,
26 again, the high level points related to these draft minutes you see before you in each meeting,
27 and then bring forward those other ones at an appropriate time. Do you have anything you
28 wanted to add?

29
30 **Hillary Gitelman:** If I can just interject. Our thought all along, and I think this was reflected in
31 the rules, is that we would do very high level meeting summaries, trying to capture in most cases
32 just the actions and kind of the topics that were discussed. When there's a minority opinion, we
33 would capture that as well as the majority opinion in these meeting summaries that you see.
34 Separately, as Jeremy indicated, we are developing a comment matrix, so all the comments we
35 hear from the public, all the comments we hear from the CAC members, are being captured in
36 this matrix. Our thought was that that was not going to be an extension of the minutes, but it's
37 going to be a tool that's available to you. When you actually review a draft element, you'll be
38 able to have this matrix in your hand that lists all of the comments we've heard during the
39 discussions and compare that to the work product that you see. They're really two different
40 things. If you'd like slightly more expanded minutes, I think we could accommodate that, but the
41 more time we spend on minutes, the less time we spend on the comment matrix and all of the
42 other materials we're preparing for you. It is a fine line.

43
44 **Chair Garber:** Let me ask a slightly different question. At some point, your comment matrix,
45 which is capturing the comments that the Committee Members have made, I think at least for me
46 what's important is validating the things that are said in the Committee are actually recorded and

1 people are taking action on them. I can imagine where those are coming to us not necessarily for
2 action, but for recording and for the opportunity for the members of the Committee in one form
3 or another to respond to them and say, "yes, that is" or "no, they're not." Doria, do you have a
4 suggestion one way or the other to action those?

5
6 **Doria Summa:** I think there should be real minutes. These five bullet points to me don't reflect,
7 do not capture comments made by this group even for us to look back on them, but certainly for
8 the public. I've never seen something so brief and general being presented as minutes. I'm not
9 sure the best solution and I would leave that up to staff.

10
11 **Chair Garber:** Actually, let me just ask if there's other suggestions. Alex.

12
13 **Alex Van Riesen:** My suggestion would be—it seems like we need to have all that data back for
14 when we have the actual discussion about—it seems like if we had that—I mean we're the ones
15 that will be taking action on those comments. Right? We'll be coming back to them and
16 discussing the relative merits of them. It seems like that's the important point, is that at that point
17 they're on the table.

18
19 **Chair Garber:** Bob.

20
21 **Bob Wenzlau:** There was a section of the meeting that was at the end where basically it was
22 sort of process related. You recall for example, I'd asked about the use of subcommittees. I'm
23 wondering why a whole kind of element of the agenda where we spoke—my suggestion would
24 be that the minutes should capture when we're at that end of the meeting and bringing up
25 discussion points that at least the topic should be identified.

26
27 **Chair Garber:** Arthur, a motion possibly.

28
29 **Vice Chair Keller:** Well, let me give an example. At the last meeting, I mentioned that the
30 Program C7 required an assessment of school impacts prior to the approval of development
31 projects. They require legislative acts including General Plan amendments and zoning changes,
32 which was slated to be deleted from the Comp Plan according to the PTC draft is actually not
33 properly a program but is actually properly a policy that should continue. With that as a case in
34 point, I'm wondering how that input gets to be included in the process for determining what to do
35 about the Community Services and Facilities Element. I'm not sure what we're talking about
36 next meeting, because I have two copies of the agenda that are both dated July 27th, so I'm not
37 sure if on October 20th, we're talking about Transportation Element or we're talking about the
38 Community Facilities Element. Maybe it's Transportation. At some point in time, presumably
39 there will be a subcommittee that may be formed on Community Services and Facilities, and that
40 subcommittee will need input such as the one I provided. We need to make sure that that input is
41 provided, and it's not clear whether that input should be part of the minutes, should be part of
42 some other document, and if there's some way of making sure that we capture all the input and
43 make it going forward. With respect to that, I believe it was Council who suggested that as much
44 as possible the comments that we receive be attributed. The document that we received a week
45 ago for this meeting had a bunch of comments in the last few pages in landscape mode that were
46 not attributed; they were anonymous. I'm sort of wondering how we will capture that, how we'll

1 make sure that we capture all the comments, and how we'll be able to hand that off to, assuming
2 that that's what was proposed later on in the meeting in terms of Community Facilities and that
3 there's a subcommittee looking at it, how they'll be able to do that. Presumably, we don't have
4 that input for them today for Community Facilities to get going. I'm sort of wondering how that
5 affects our timing of the subcommittees.
6

7 **Chair Garber:** One moment. Then we have Shani, and then we have Elaine.
8

9 **Jeremy Dennis:** The current schedule has the Community Services Element being heard back
10 by this Committee on November 17th. Presuming that there is an action tonight related to
11 creating a subcommittee that looks at that particular element, we can move to get the notes from
12 the Community Services, get them completed as quickly as possible. We've got about 80 percent
13 done, but it does require us to go one more time back through and listen to the meeting, so it'll
14 just take some time. I'm happy to commit Staff resources to making sure that those are done
15 based on what I hear tonight related to an action on a subcommittee, if that addresses your
16 concern, Arthur.
17

18 **Chair Garber:** Let me—I know that there is a lot of conversation here. Let me try making a
19 motion. That motion would be that we direct Staff to assemble the Committee's comments for
20 input to subcommittee review and prior to the subcommittee convening to discuss the topic. We
21 can create other opportunities for a discussion among the larger group if we need to, but we need
22 to find a way to get those back in. Staff can refine that if they like. Then I will also make that as
23 a part of my motion, that we also then approve the minutes as they are right now. I'm not exactly
24 sure that's quite grammar but yet. Does the concept make sense to the group? Apparently not.
25 Shani first, and then Elaine, and then we have Linda.
26

27 **Shani Kleinhaus:** I also would like to have the comments attributed of the public as well as the
28 ones that are coming in oral communications. In this minutes, there is Gabriel Lewis provided
29 specific comments on policies, this and this and this. It doesn't say what that was. I think that's
30 important to know. Any oral communications should be included with the person who provided
31 that information. Thank you.
32

33 **Chair Garber:** Thank you. Elaine.

34 **Elaine Uang:** I also wrote to Staff with some concern about the minutes not reflecting a
35 significant portion of the discussion from the last round. I personally would also feel
36 comfortable seeing some measure of detail for that. I might suggest or propose an alternate
37 motion, which would just be to—well, two things. Can we delay the approval of this minute
38 until we receive the update, and then also request that the next meeting we do see comments and
39 details minutes from this session for approval next time?
40

41 **Chair Garber:** That's fine. Do I hear a second?
42

43 **Annette Glankopf:** I'll second it.
44

45 **Chair Garber:** That would second that. All those in favor? Is someone counting here? I'm
46 assuming there are sixteen.

1
2 **Hillary Gitelman:** Dan, if I can interject. I just wanted to acknowledge the direction. We're
3 happy to do that, so we'll do a very high level summary and we'll attach the comment matrix. I
4 just wanted you to be aware we're working with short Staff here. We may not be able to turn
5 these around in the month between meetings. It may mean—if you want the detailed comments
6 attached to the action minutes, it may mean that it'll have to come back another month or two
7 later, but we'll do our best.
8
9 **Chair Garber:** I think we understand that, at least until you can talk Consuelo back into her job.
10 Doria.
11
12 **Doria Summa:** Just another quick question. Are the digital recordings of this going to be
13 available on the Midpeninsula Media website like all other meetings?
14
15 **Chair Garber:** I don't know, but there is a moment of order here. My subchair, somebody's
16 pointing at me.
17
18 **Vice Chair Keller:** (inaudible) yes.
19
20 **Chair Garber:** What?
21
22 **Vice Chair Keller:** The media guy's nodding yes.
23
24 **Chair Garber:** Oh, he's—the answer is affirmative to your question, Doria. I did not ask who
25 was opposed to that motion. Are there any opposed? One, two. Any further conversation?
26 Bob, then Don, and then Lisa.
27
28 **Bob Wenzlau:** In the motion, the only thing for me that was missing was just some recognition
29 of when we have also sort of process discussions at the end, that those be added to the minutes.
30 These past minutes were silent on that, and so I think that procedural deliberations should be
31 recognized. They were not in the last. I don't know motion-wise—it would just be that the
32 deliberative comments at the end of the meeting also be summarized. I somehow lost my agenda
33 for this meeting, so I don't know what that last element of the meeting is called, but we ...
34
35 **Chair Garber:** Feedback for continuous improvement?
36
37 **Bob Wenzlau:** Feedback for continuous improvement. I'd ask that any feedback for continuous
38 improvement be recorded into the minutes.
39
40 **Chair Garber:** Okay. Thank you. Don.
41
42 **Don McDougall:** I have a feeling we're losing track of minutes of the meeting versus all the
43 details of the suggestions and records that we're trying to keep. I would prefer the minutes be not
44 much more than we have here with the inclusion of what Bob's talking about, so that they would
45 have process issues, they would have actions and they would have schedules, and they would
46 appear two weeks after this meeting. Things that came out of this meeting that said we're going

1 to have this subcommittee, we're going to meet then, we're going to do this, they would be in the
2 minutes. I would get them two weeks later. They would be in draft format, but at least I'd have
3 a record to confirm what my notes were about when we were going to meet or do something
4 next. I'm happy to wait for a much more detailed analysis of all of the suggestions. I didn't vote
5 for this because I'd really like to see two separate items. One of substance and one that records
6 the process.

7
8 **Chair Garber:** Without having to reopen the vote, I suspect we could get Staff to issue draft
9 minutes that do not include all the comments in a two-week timetable.

10
11 **Hillary Gitelman:** Yes, I think Don is articulating what our proposal was or what we were
12 attempting to do. If we missed some individual comments, like Bob's, my apologies. That was
13 kind of the method we were going towards. We're open to changing that. As I indicate, the
14 more detailed you make these, the longer they take to produce.

15
16 **Chair Garber:** Sure. Good. I'm going to close this item unless we've got—sorry. Lisa.

17
18 **Lisa Peschcke-Koedt:** The summary version with the key action items would be enough. For
19 the detail, I like the idea of having it sort of for the record, but frankly since I was here to hear it,
20 I may never read it. There are lots of really good software translation. If we have an audio
21 recording of it all, just have that translated, and it's 80 percent good enough and not worth the
22 time or Staff's time, I think, to make it perfect. It just captures the main ideas. If we have the
23 summary with the key action takeaways or next critical things and then the long sort of transcript
24 almost of it, for me as long as it's roughly right, I wouldn't spend anyone's time on it. I'd just
25 have a software translation.

26
27 **Hillary Gitelman:** I just wanted to clarify one thing in response to that. The reason we're
28 organizing all of the detailed comments into a matrix is, at the end of the day, we'd like to be
29 able to show where those comments have been addressed, if they've been addressed. If they
30 haven't been addressed in the Comprehensive Plan Update, why. That's why we're taking a little
31 more time to get the comments down and attribute them and kind of put them in a format so we
32 can do that exercise later in the process.

33
34 **Chair Garber:** Thank you. I think with that we'll move on.

35
36 **2. Action: Amendment to CAC Rules and Schedule**

37
38 **Chair Garber:** Action Number 2 is amendment to the CAC rules and schedule. You have all
39 read that. It talks about four primary things, going from a Chair/Vice Chair organization to Co-
40 Chairs; the addition of the new members. It talks also about subcommittees which we'll get to in
41 a moment, and then the revision to schedule. Does Staff want to talk briefly about this before we
42 move forward with some action and/or discussion about it?

43
44 **Jeremy Dennis:** Nothing really additionally, other than to suggest one small change to the rules,
45 which is in item Number 3, the page 1 of the rules. It should have said third Tuesday of the

1 month, not second Tuesday. We would recommend that addition as well as part of any motion
2 please. Thank you.

3

4 **Chair Garber:** Again, which page was that? I'm sorry.

5

6 **Jeremy Dennis:** The first page of the amended role and ground rules of the Committee.

7

8 **Chair Garber:** In Item 2.

9

10 **Jeremy Dennis:** That would have been page 3 of that Item 2.

11

12 **Vice Chair Keller:** It's the first line. This thing (inaudible) meeting dates.

13

14 **Chair Garber:** Yeah, thank you. Yes, Arthur.

15

16 **Vice Chair Keller:** I assume you also want to change it from Mitchell Park Library to Mitchell
17 Community Center at least for the time being.

18

19 **Jeremy Dennis:** We could do that, but then I think we'd have to bring them back again for
20 further change.

21

22 **Vice Chair Keller:** It actually says "or otherwise noticed in advance." We know we're not
23 going to fit the Mitchell Park Library.

24

25 **Jeremy Dennis:** We'll entertain any suggestion you want. It sounds like you have a little earlier
26 draft of that, Arthur. The packet included an amended version.

27

28 **Vice Chair Keller:** I get your point. I see.

29

30 **Jeremy Dennis:** Yeah. I think you're referring to a little earlier version, Arthur.

31

32 **Vice Chair Keller:** Okay, thank you.

33

34 **Chair Garber:** Alex.

35

36 **Alex Van Riesen:** What exactly is the date on the most recent version that we should be looking
37 at?

38

39 **Chair Garber:** I have September 2.

40

41 **Alex Van Riesen:** I see one that says July September 8.

42

43 **Jeremy Dennis:** That's the correct one. September 8th. At the bottom of that, you should see a
44 redline July.

45

46 **Alex Van Riesen:** It's in red, correct?

1
2 **Chair Garber:** September ...
3
4 **Jeremy Dennis:** September 8th.
5
6 **Vice Chair Keller:** We have September 2 July 8th.
7
8 **Alex Van Riesen:** Yeah. I think there's a lot of versions floating out there.
9
10 **Jeremy Dennis:** In the packets that was sent out to everyone, on the top of your packet there
11 were three loose pages. We did not have time to include them back into the packet. In the email
12 that was sent out to the group on, I believe it was Thursday of last week, we said that your packet
13 was coming. It was being delivered that evening, and that we included a few extra pages that we
14 asked you to replace with—I'm sorry for the confusion. We didn't have an opportunity to go
15 back in and pull them apart. We caught that after they'd been printed. Everyone's packet
16 included those extra pages. I apologize if you don't have them.
17
18 **Alex Van Riesen:** Two questions. On that version, on Point 3, it says actually Rinconada
19 Library at 2013 Newell, so that's where the meeting ...
20
21 **Jeremy Dennis:** Got it. That's the—yes.
22
23 **Alex Van Riesen:** That is the new location?
24
25 **Jeremy Dennis:** That's the new location for the next meeting, correct.
26
27 **Alex Van Riesen:** (inaudible) okay.
28
29 **Chair Garber:** May I just have a show of hands of who's looking down at their paper ...
30
31 **Female:** (inaudible)
32
33 **Chair Garber:** May I—raise your hand if you have something that says September 2nd on it.
34 How many have July 8th? Now, how many have September 8th? Okay.
35
36 **Jeremy Dennis:** You have both. We'll talk through this again. If you did not pull your packet
37 apart, what's in your packet is the older version. The packet that was delivered to your house had
38 on top of it three extra pages that replaced the rules and replaced the timeline.
39
40 **Chair Garber:** Forgive me, Jeremy. For those of us that have the September 2 date, is it
41 possible to identify what changes are in that?
42
43 **Jeremy Dennis:** I don't know that I can do it from memory unfortunately. I think the most
44 significant changes were in the subcommittee section, but I don't know if it's worth ...
45

1 **Chair Garber:** The subcommittee—if that's true, Jeremy, perhaps what would be helpful is to
2 talk specifically about the subcommittees and ...

3
4 **Jeremy Dennis:** Sure, and I can read through it ...

5
6 **Chair Garber:** Yeah, exactly. You can read through it.

7
8 **Jeremy Dennis:** ... for the sake of those who did not get the replacement pages. We're looking
9 at page 5 of Item 2. This would be under participant roles in Number 3, subcommittee. I'm
10 going to read this verbatim. I think the majority of you have it, but if it doesn't look like you
11 have it. Subcommittees shall be created by action of the Committee and shall be made up of
12 fewer members than a quorum of the full Committee. Subcommittees can elect to invite outside
13 experts to their meetings to inform their particular discussions. Subcommittees shall agendize
14 their meetings and invite members of the public to watch and participate. All subcommittee
15 work shall be submitted to the Committee for review prior to the meeting and shall be part of the
16 agenda for said meeting. The Co-Chairs shall appoint the membership of subcommittees based
17 on interest and input from the Committee. Subcommittees are not empowered to make decisions
18 in place. The rest of that actually is the same. Sorry, let me read that. Subcommittees are not
19 empowered to make decisions in place of the group as a whole, but rather to frame and refine
20 issues in a form needs for resolution by the CAC. There's a deletion. Then subcommittees are
21 limited duration groups that only exist as long as they're necessary for them to accomplish their
22 tasks. I think the things that I would point out is that the subcommittees are created by the whole
23 of the Committee, but the power to
24 appoint is related through action of the Co-Chairs. Everyone follow that? Okay.

25
26 **Chair Garber:** Related to the topic of subcommittees ...

27
28 **Vice Chair Keller:** (inaudible)

29
30 **Chair Garber:** Thank you. Arthur, I think we also need to talk a little bit about—yep, okay.
31 The Council had also asked the Committee to talk to several members of the previous Comp Plan
32 and how they utilized subcommittees as well as the IBRC committee, which was another
33 advisory committee that convened recently on public infrastructure. Arthur and I have met with
34 Mark Michaels on the IBRC committee, and we've met with Yoriko Kishimoto and Bern
35 Beecham and Annette Bialson on the '98 Comprehensive Plan to get their understanding of how
36 they utilized the subcommittees. Some significant differences occurred. There are some
37 significant differences between what those two groups—how they were able to utilize
38 subcommittees than what this one can. Both of those advisory committees had meetings in
39 people's personal homes, which meant that essentially the public could not participate. That
40 would be a significant difference between what we want to have happen for transparency's sake
41 here versus those advisory committees. The second thing was that with the '98 Comprehensive
42 Plan, they had significantly more time. They had years; we have months. That was another
43 large, sort of determiner for how they were to use the subcommittees. In the conversations that
44 Arthur and I have had, we've imagined using the subcommittees to do, excuse me, to do is in the
45 sequence that Staff has set up, the visions and goals for each one of the elements will be
46 discussed by the Council to give guidance to this Committee. Then we will have a meeting on

1 that particular element and create, as we did in our previous meeting, a forum for which to share
2 all the different ideas of things that should, should not be in, things that should be revised, where
3 emphasis should be, etc., but the opportunity there is to get everything out that can possibly get
4 out. At which point, there's the opportunity to create a subcommittee that essentially supports
5 Staff in the synthesis of all those pieces into an organization that will eventually form the
6 element. One of the things that we learned from both IBRC as well as the '98 advisory
7 committees is that the chairs were not typically in the subcommittees. They stayed out of them.
8 They have to be of a certain size so that we do not run afoul of the Brown Act issues. What we
9 are likely to do and we will hopefully save 10 minutes at the end of the evening to talk a little bit
10 about what some of the subcommittees are that we might want to pursue. Then after this
11 meeting, we'll send out an email list to all of you indicating what interests you may have on
12 which committees. Our expectation is that there's likely to be a subcommittee for each one of
13 the elements, but there are some opportunities obviously for subcommittees to be formed around
14 topics that cross the elements. We want to save some time at the end of the evening to talk about
15 some of those different things, so that we can put together a list that's comprehensive. Arthur,
16 anything else that we should talk about relative to our conversations?
17

18 **Vice Chair Keller:** Well, I think that we'll have the topic on the actual discussion of
19 subcommittees later. I think that in the interest of moving on, I think the people understand
20 enough about what's happening with respect to the role and ground rules, so maybe we can go
21 ahead and vote on this as amended.
22

23 **Chair Garber:** I'm going to take that as a motion. Do I hear a second?

24 **Vice Chair Keller:** There's comments still.
25

26 **Female:** (inaudible)
27

28 **Vice Chair Keller:** No, that's fine. Yeah.
29

30 **Chair Garber:** Yeah. I'll entertain some discussion on the motion. Steve.
31

32 **Stephen Levy:** I think I'm the only one in the room that was actually on the IBRC. It is on; I'm
33 just klutzy.
34

35 **Chair Garber:** I apologize. We didn't speak to you about it; you were out of town, so we talked
36 with Mark Michael. I apologize.
37

38 **Stephen Levy:** They were dramatically necessary and helpful. There would without them have
39 been an overwhelming lack of division of labor. People had very different interests, but very
40 different backgrounds. I knew nothing about the police and the fire station. Actually we had
41 three Marks. We had Mark Michael and Mark Harris and Marc Berman and a whole bunch of
42 other people. I don't see how we do this efficiently without allowing people to congregate in
43 their areas of expertise and interests. I mean, I don't know about any of the rest of you, but I'm a
44 really good reader, and I'm inundated by this one element and the 400 policies and programs and
45 all of that. My experience would strongly support him. I know nothing about how it would
46 work here, but it was absolutely necessary for the IBRC.

1
2 **Chair Garber:** I tend to agree with you here as well. There's a lot of material to get through.
3 There's going to be a tremendous amount of comments. For a large group to do that is next to
4 impossible without taking all of our time just doing that. Any other comments before we vote, or
5 a discussion? Amy.

6
7 **Amy Sung:** While we are at this subject of subcommittee, I continue to feel so inadequate. I
8 sometimes feel that if I discuss it with a couple of neighbors, then that will violate the rules of
9 the Brown Act. On the other hand, I hear people ask like but how do you adequately represent
10 like the so-called neighborhood concerns. Then I say you have to go to this public commenter
11 and voice your concern. I feel that a lot of voice gets lost without having a small group
12 discussion. That's just my feedback.

13
14 **Chair Garber:** Perhaps Staff could provide a little instruction.

15
16 **Hillary Gitelman:** Thank you. I just wanted to clarify that you should feel free to assemble a
17 group of neighbors or members of your community and people that you would like to receive
18 input in. If that would help you bring forward their ideas to the Committee, that's absolutely a
19 great idea. You can also encourage folks that you know to participate in the online digital
20 commenter thing. You shouldn't feel that that's exclusively where the input should be gathered.
21 The concern about the Brown Act really comes into when you're meeting with other members of
22 the Committee. That's where we need to be careful not to meet more than one member either in
23 person or communicating by email, not more than a majority. Thank you.

24
25 **Chair Garber:** Anything else? Alex.

26
27 **Alex Van Riesen:** This is the motion agreeing about the amendments, er, the (crosstalk).

28
29 **Chair Garber:** About the new set of rules. There's four large topics there. One of which is that
30 there will be Co-Chairs, Arthur and myself. The second of which is that the new members that
31 have been added by the Council. We've been given auspice by the Council to convene
32 subcommittee. Then there's the schedule revision which adds frankly to the time that we have to
33 do all this.

34
35 **Alex Van Riesen:** Could I add just two quick. Just for clarity's sake over this. I just noticed
36 that there are three different times listed as how long these meetings go. On the agenda tonight,
37 it says 'til 8:00. On Point 3, it says 'til 9:00, and on Point 11 it says 'til 8:30. Just of having good
38 expectations, I was just wondering how long should we expect to be here on any given meeting.

39
40 **Chair Garber:** I'm not touching that one.

41
42 **Jeremy Dennis:** Depends on how late the library's open I think. Most of what you just
43 described is the issue that we're having about bringing forward a set of rules that are happening
44 at the same time that we're trying to find a better location. There's a little bit in there, I know,
45 that doesn't. I appreciate the confusion there. Tonight, we do have an opportunity to go a little
46 bit later than we normally would. I think 9:00 is probably fair. The previous room was only

1 open 'til 8:00. We anticipate a room that we get in the future will be open 'til 9:00, but it's about
2 locating the appropriate facility. Not meant to confuse anyone; it's just we're in the middle of
3 changing things, so there's not going to be—not everything is going to be reflected in the rules as
4 we'd hoped.

5
6 **Alex Van Riesen:** Appreciate that. Last thing was just can we get an updated list of everyone
7 on the Committee and maybe even contact information, if we would want to have further
8 conversation?

9
10 **Chair Garber:** Yeah.

11
12 **Jeremy Dennis:** Yes.

13
14 **Chair Garber:** Thank you. With that, may I call the question. All those in favor of accepting
15 the amendment to the CAC rules and schedules raise your hand. I've got 19. All those opposed.
16 That carries with 19. Thank you. Annette.

17
18 **Annette Glanckopf:** (inaudible) technology. Did we decide on a stop time? Did we as a group
19 understand—we had this long discussion about we were going to be flexible depending on the
20 facility that we're in, but I'm not sure that we voted on an actual stop time. I would like to do so.

21
22 **Chair Garber:** What was in the actual rules?

23
24 **Hillary Gitelman:** We're suggesting 9:00 p.m. be our target start time which is not to say we
25 have to (crosstalk).

26
27 **Chair Garber:** As an end time.

28
29 **Hillary Gitelman:** End time, yes, sorry. End time.

30
31 **Chair Garber:** Annette.

32
33 **Annette Glanckopf:** I'd like to propose that 8:30 will be the stop time, because obviously we're
34 not going to stop exactly at 8:30 and conversations will continue. That's 3 1/2 hours. That
35 would be my motion to make the stop time 8:30.

36
37 **Chair Garber:** Let's do this. Let's do our very best to end by 8:30. We can't stay longer than
38 9:00 because the doors are going to close. If that's okay with everybody, we will not revisit the
39 motion. Lisa.

40
41 **Lisa Peschcke-Koedt:** I think I would actually propose the same as you, is we officially set it as
42 ending at 8:30. If we don't set it that way, we'll always go 'til 9:00 happily. I think three hours,
43 it's also more energy and such, right, I mean after we've all had long days, right. I think three
44 hours is probably reasonable. What do you think?

45
46 **Chair Garber:** I think that's (crosstalk).

1
2 **Jeremy Dennis:** As long as I don't have to bring the rules back a third time, that's totally fine
3 with us on staff.

4
5 **Lisa Peschcke-Koedt:** Could we just—would it be all right to just ask now for votes either 8:30
6 or 9:00? There are only two options on the table, and see which one has the most votes.

7
8 **Chair Garber:** Everybody okay with 8:30, just a raising of hands here. I think we won't even—
9 that's perfectly fine. All right, thanks.

10
11 **Hillary Gitelman:** We will reflect that change in the rules.

12
13 **Chair Garber:** Thank you.

- 14
15 **3. Transportation Element Discussion**
16 **a. Introduction to the Element**
17 **b. Gil Friend, Chief Sustainability Officer**
18 **c. CAC Discussion: Policies and Programs**

19
20 **Co-Chair Garber:** All right. Let's get to the main event here, the Transportation Element
21 discussion. Now that we are officially Co-Chairs, congratulations Arthur.

22
23 **Co-Chair Keller:** Congratulations Dan.

24
25 **Co-Chair Garber:** We are going to switch roles. If you recall, last time I ran the conversation
26 and Arthur kept order. This time, Arthur is going to run the conversation, and I'm going to keep
27 order, so catch my eye when you want to talk. I will keep a list and keep that running. With
28 that, Arthur, here you go.

29
30 **Co-Chair Keller:** I have my own mike here.

31
32 **Co-Chair Garber:** Oh. I'll take this back.

33
34 **Co-Chair Keller:** All right. We're talking about tonight about the Transportation Element.
35 Why don't I defer the conversation about the Transportation Element, and let Staff give their
36 presentation.

37
38 **Jeremy Dennis:** Sure, and I will keep this extremely brief because of the amount of time that
39 we have left to have the substantive conversation. I just wanted to make a few points, and
40 hopefully I'm not confusing anyone here. There was a change between the time that the Staff
41 report was put together and Council direction on the structure of the goals before you. In the
42 digital commenter, we had the goals related to the existing Transportation Plan. We also
43 structured most of the discussion in the Staff report, the meat of it, based on the existing
44 Transportation Plan. The Council last Monday then (inaudible) direction and adopted a revised
45 set of goals based on the PTC's revision and some other changes that they made. We wanted to
46 recognize that upfront. It's a little difference. The nice thing about this is that it actually doesn't

1 really change the substance of a conversation related to the policies and programs. If you wish,
2 you can actually take Goals 1, 2 and 3 in the existing Transportation Plan and just moosh them
3 together and that's your new Goal 1 in what the Council has approved. I just wanted to put that
4 out there. We also had a few slides that we put together here. I'm going to go through these.
5 We'd like you to refer back to these if you want to use these as any part of your discussion.
6 Andrew, go ahead and start here. The Transportation Element. There's a few pieces that we
7 wanted to make sure you were aware of. Must address complete street issues, must also have
8 relation to the Land Use Element. Next one. There were some—the staff report didn't have
9 existing mode share, so we had this slide put together. This just shows the mode share changes
10 from 2000 and to 2013. Next slide. Again, you can call on these if you want to use them during
11 your discussions. Go back.

12
13 **Co-Chair Keller:** You're not on the microphone, so we can't hear you. It's being broadcast, so
14 you ...

15
16 **Don McDougall:** Palo Alto residents commute mode in 2000 and 2013.

17
18 **Co-Chair Keller:** This is Palo Alto residents commuting out of Palo Alto, not workers working
19 in Palo Alto, commuting into Palo Alto.

20
21 **Don McDougall:** Right. Palo Alto residents commuting to where they work. Some of them
22 may work in Palo Alto. Yes, you're correct it does not include people from outside Palo Alto.

23
24 **Co-Chair Keller:** Right. There are about 30,000 employed Palo Alto residents, and somewhat
25 on the order of three times that many who are employed in Palo Alto and live anywhere. This
26 figure, as I understand it, is of those who are a resident in Palo Alto and employed anywhere, of
27 which I think about a third of people who live in Palo Alto actually work in Palo Alto.

28
29 **Jeremy Dennis:** Next slide.

30
31 **Don McDougall:** Just to be clear. Does that mean that (inaudible) going to work from Palo Alto
32 (inaudible) 100,000 people (inaudible).

33 **Hillary Gitelman:** If I can interject. I don't think it's irrelevant. I don't think it's anywhere near
34 the full picture or necessarily the most interesting data set that we're showing. What we put
35 together is a sampling of slides. You have a lot more information in the existing conditions
36 report sections we produced. This is just—I actually think has a couple of really interesting
37 takeaways. One is that we've actually managed to achieve something of a mode shift when you
38 look at this population in the time since the last Comp Plan to today. A lot of it has to do with
39 people who are working at home. We've managed to shift by using new technologies, alternate
40 work schedules and getting people out of their cars that way. There may be other takeaways
41 from this. Really, Jeremy is running through some slides that we thought of as kind of a palate
42 cleanser. Let's try and get past the nuts and bolts we've just talked about, get you in the mindset
43 of transportation. If you have a more detailed questions about the data in the Staff report or the
44 packet you got, we can get into that later in the evening.

45

1 **Jeremy Dennis:** This is not meant to be remotely comprehensive in any way. These are just a
2 few things we threw together to transition us.

3
4 **Co-Chair Garber:** Why don't you finish your presentation, and then we can take the
5 conversation (crosstalk).

6
7 **Jeremy Dennis:** Thank you. Another just interesting fact related to the increase in the number
8 of high school students we see riding to school between 1999 and 2014. A very quick slide that
9 we put together related to trends in transit use. You can see some significant changes related to
10 Caltrain. We wanted to show you this is the three-pronged approach the City's taking on parking
11 and transportation-related issues. On the left hand, parking management. Most people, I think,
12 are familiar with the RPP program coming into place. Number 2, transportation demand
13 management where, I think, again the piece that most people are hearing about is this association
14 that's being created to help with that. Then on the third slide, we've got some parking supply
15 measures that we're trying to put in place. Next slide. We're going to go back to this, but we
16 have the draft vision statement and the draft goals that we'll have up on screen moving forward.
17 That concludes what I wanted to say, and then we can move to Gil.

18
19 **Co-Chair Garber:** Mark and then Adrian, you had your hand raised. Mark.

20
21 **Mark Nadim:** Do we have any count of vehicles coming into Palo Alto from 101 and 280?

22
23 **Co-Chair Garber:** Gil or Jeremy.

24
25 **Jeremy Dennis:** Yes, we do. There is some information in the draft existing conditions report
26 that should refer to some of that. There's also going to be a set of information that we're
27 developing related to the Draft EIR that we'll include that. We don't have that in the memo.

28
29 **Hillary Gitelman:** If you look at the existing conditions report that was attached to the packet,
30 there's a table of average daily traffic volumes on selected roadway segments. It's page 12-32.
31 It's just a sample of some of the streets in Palo Alto and some of the average daily volumes we're
32 seeing, in addition the volume to capacity ratio and the level of service on those links. That's just
33 a kind of snapshot of where we are. There's other data in this report that I think is worth
34 spending a little time parsing through, and it might inform the group's deliberations going
35 forward.

36
37 **Jeremy Dennis:** Do remember that was a snapshot in time when we collected the data. The
38 Draft EIR is going to actually have some of that updated.

39
40 **Co-Chair Garber:** Adrian, then Shani, then Len and Steve.

41
42 **Adrian Fine:** I just wanted to say I think in general Staff does a really good job of attributing
43 data to the correct source, and that helps promote validity. It's on. Staff normally does a really
44 good job of attributing data to the correct source. That promotes validity and helps orient the
45 Committee. I think it'd be helpful to do that in the slides as well, if you would just give a source

1 or a table. I'm guessing a lot of that came from the ACS, which is publicly available. Just let
2 people know where it came from.

3
4 **Jeremy Dennis:** Thank you.

5
6 **Co-Chair Garber:** Shani.

7
8 **Shani Kleinhaus:** In Goal T-1 of the old plan, it said on a typical day in 1995 600,000 one-way
9 car trips were made in the Palo Alto/Stanford area. An additional 150,000 daily trips were made
10 by carpools. I'd like to know how we compare to those numbers now if possible, because that's a
11 lot. That's 750,000 trips a day, and that's 20 years ago.

12
13 **Hillary Gitelman:** We'll make sure to get that comment and that request down and provide a
14 response at a later date.

15
16 **Co-Chair Garber:** Len.

17 **Len Filppu:** Yes, thank you. The slide went by real quick on bikers to school. I think it said
18 1,700 bike to the two high schools. Do you have numbers on then how many walk and how
19 many drive or are driven to the two high schools? Thank you.

20
21 **Hillary Gitelman:** We have much more data than we showed on that slide. This is a subset.
22 We'd would be happy to provide the full data set if it's not already in this packet. We just
23 showed you one age group. The point of the slide was to show the trend line. We've been
24 incredibly successful as a community in Palo Alto in shifting school trips out of cars and into
25 alternate modes, primarily bicycle and walking. We're happy to provide you with a fuller picture
26 of that, but I hope everybody was suitably impressed by the trend line there.

27
28 **Co-Chair Garber:** Steve.

29
30 **Stephen Levy:** Hillary, on the existing conditions report, Table 1211 on page 12-35, I wrote you
31 about it. It appears to say that virtually all of the VMT related to in and out is people coming in.
32 It's an overwhelming number. You responded to me that you were going to update the table. It's
33 on page 12-35.

34
35 **Hillary Gitelman:** Thank you. Stephen is inquiring about the tables on page 12-35. I think we
36 did in an email communication indicate to the group that these tables need to be updated. We
37 have used an updated and what we think is a better, more defensible methodology to recalculate
38 vehicle miles traveled and slice it into trips that are internal to Palo Alto versus internal/external
39 and external/internal. I apologize. We didn't get it together to bring the table with us this
40 evening. We will transmit that to you separately.

41
42 **Stephen Levy:** Does it change the basic conclusion that the vast proportion are coming in?

43
44 **Hillary Gitelman:** it is quite a change. If I'm remembering back to the updated data, it has a
45 much higher percentage that is internal/internal. We actually generate quite a bit of vehicle miles

1 traveled internal to Palo Alto, because of the character of the community and just we have a lot
2 of traffic within the city.

3
4 **Stephen Levy:** We'll have that before the next meeting, right?

5
6 **Hillary Gitelman:** Pardon me?

7
8 **Stephen Levy:** We'll have that before the next meeting?

9
10 **Hillary Gitelman:** We will have it for you before the next meeting.

11
12 **Stephen Levy:** Thank you.

13
14 **Hillary Gitelman:** My apologies.

15
16 **Co-Chair Garber:** Lisa and then Arthur, er, did someone have their hand raised over there?
17 Elaine, okay. Go ahead Lisa.

18
19 **Lisa Peschcke-Koedt:** This is more of a proposal. I'm hoping that we can actually get to the
20 substance of the different proposals here. This is my personal take. I think we have enough data
21 to get to the substance of it. Then if we find that there's a particular place we need more data,
22 maybe we could save and dive down into the data there. What do you guys think? Is that okay?
23 I'd suggest that.

24
25 **Stephen Levy:** I disagree, but I'm happy to take that up in my comment. I actually strongly
26 disagree, but it depends on what part of the element you're talking about.

27
28 **Co-Chair Garber:** Elaine, and then Don. Then I would like to get to the first goal, so we can
29 talk about that.

30
31 **Elaine Uang:** Well, I was just going to make one additional data request, which is a
32 complement to the mode share tables. If you have the data for Palo Alto residents and their
33 outbound commutes, if there's a way to get the inbound commute mode share into Palo Alto that
34 would be extremely helpful. If there's another process for us to request data, I would—for the
35 interest of time, it'd be good to move in that direction.

36
37 **Co-Chair Garber:** Don. Then Gil needs to leave us sooner rather than later. We will go to,
38 after Don, Gil and then we will get into the substance of our meeting here. Go ahead.

39
40 **Don McDougall:** Quick comment. I would support the fact that we plain and simply don't have
41 enough data. I would like to see the whole Transportation Plan be more data driven. I think
42 there's a propensity to want to make good decisions based on data. I think we can discuss it. I
43 don't think we can make conclusions without better data.

44
45 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Gil.

1 **Jeremy Dennis:** Just a quick comment to Elaine's point. We will take requests on data anyway
2 you can get it to us, call, email, whatever you want. Just it's very difficult for us to put anything
3 together particularly in the last couple of days before we're putting out a memo. As long as we
4 ask a little patience, if you can give us some lead time, we're happy to try to get it to the next
5 thing. If it's just a few days before we're coming to this meeting, staff reports already out, we
6 don't have time to do that, but we'll try to do it for the next one. Thank you.

7
8 **Co-Chair Garber:** Gil.

9
10 **Gil Friend:** Thanks Dan. Once again, I'm Gil Friend. I'm the City's Chief Sustainability
11 Officer. Hillary and Jeremy have asked me to talk with you for a few minutes to orient you to
12 the Sustainability and Climate Action Plan that we're in the process of developing, and then talk
13 in a bit more detail about the perspectives on transportation that are an important part of that
14 plan. As you may know, the City created a Climate Protection Plan in 2007. This was one of the
15 first of any city in the United States. Next slide please. Since that time, the world has gotten a
16 lot hotter. The West has gotten a lot drier. That's some of the context in which we're operating.
17 Next slide please. We've done a lot in the intervening years. I'm not going to read this slide; I'll
18 just leave it up for you. There's been an enormous amount of creative action from the City and
19 the community in a variety of realms, public policy, investment, actions, policy, mandates,
20 education, incentives and community initiative, lots more in the pipeline. Next slide please.
21 We've done an enormous amount. We've reduced our emissions about 33 percent against the
22 1990 baseline. This is really stunning, and I think one of the best records of any city in the
23 United States. It's a long way from there to the 80 percent reduction by 2050 goal that Governor
24 Brown has set out for us. You see our challenge very clearly. The column on the right is our
25 2014 numbers, and you can see where the remaining emissions are. The red bar is
26 transportation, road travel into and out of and through the City as we have been discussing. The
27 blue is natural gas. Those together represent more than 85 percent of our remaining emissions.
28 A much higher ratio than other cities, because you'll notice there's a yellow bar on the left.
29 That's the emissions from our electricity. We've zeroed that out with our carbon neutral
30 electricity. Now our challenge. If we're going to achieve the Governor's goals or perhaps
31 something more dramatic than that, we have to transform transportation and transform our
32 relationship with natural gas. That's just very clear from this chart. Next one please. The
33 Sustainability and Climate Action Plan is asking what future do we want. The red line shows the
34 trajectory from 1990 to the Governor's goals by 2050. We are arguably on track to do that. If
35 we can maintain the record of the last ten years, we can probably hit that target 35 years out from
36 now, but we're also in the Climate Plan looking at two other possible scenarios: hitting the target
37 by 2030, the target year for the Comprehensive Plan; and what we're terming a California moon
38 shot, getting to be a carbon neutral city in ten years or less. Now it sounds like an outrageous
39 goal, but Copenhagen, Melbourne and a number of other cities have set that goal. The question
40 we're raising here is to develop three scenarios and road maps to ask what would it take to
41 achieve each of those goals, and then bring those three options to the Council and community for
42 deliberative discussion, a grounded discussion grounded in data and facts and investment
43 estimates to decide what do we want to do. Any of those is a pretty creditable strategy to take.
44 There's no shame in any of them. Eighty by 50 is not slow and it's not easy, but we have a long
45 trajectory of being out in front on sustainability initiatives. One of the decisions for you all and
46 the community and the Council to make will be do we want to do that now. Just by way of

1 context, we've just received the administrative draft of the plan from our consultant. Staff is
2 reviewing it now; we should have that done in the next couple of weeks. I anticipate late
3 September, early October, we should have a draft available to share. We're also looking to
4 schedule a sustainability and climate summit probably somewhere around mid-November, so
5 there'll be details on that to come, so a much broader and engaged community discussion on this.
6 Next one please. To just give you a summary of what's in it. We're not going to go into detail
7 tonight, but you can see here some of the elements that we are focusing on. Transportation of
8 course, and energy, buildings, water, City operations. In these chiclets are some of the key
9 themes that have risen to the top in each of those areas. A more detailed discussion about this
10 another time. Next one please. Other areas, personal choice, ecosystems, adaptation and
11 resilience in relation to climate risks, how do we pay for these. I'll call your attention to the
12 right-hand column just to point out that this is not just about reducing carbon; this is about doing
13 this in a way that enhances quality of life and builds prosperity and strengthens resilience in this
14 community. This is not a tradeoff of environmental benefit at the expense of quality of life or
15 the things we care about. It's looking for how do we innovate and generate all of those goals
16 together at the same time. Next slide please. Let me talk a bit about transportation.
17 Transportation is expensive. This is from our colleagues from Rocky Mountain Institute,
18 estimating a \$3 trillion cost in the U.S. alone. What's notable about this is that it's a trillion in
19 direct expenses and 2 trillion in indirect expenses. A lot of the cost is not visible to us. Making
20 that visible, I think, is an important part of thinking about how we should move. Next slide
21 please. I think what's important to note is that things are changing very rapidly in the
22 transportation environment. Technology and costs are shifting very rapidly. The chart on the
23 right is the projected cost of electric vehicles with a 200-mile range, dropping very quickly.
24 You've seen the price declines on Tesla. The next vehicle from Tesla is a 200-mile range car at
25 \$30,000 soon and a \$20,000 car a few years out. You see that curve shape, and you see that for
26 electric vehicles, you see it for the cost of photovoltaics. You see the same shape for the cost of
27 battery storage. You see the same shape for self-driving cars, for sensors and a number of other
28 technologies. The convergence of these trends will likely drive a sea change in transportation in
29 the next 10 to 20 years. I think one of the big challenges that this Committee has is—we
30 generally plan based on the past. We extrapolate from past trends. Past performance is no
31 guarantee of future performance in this case, so we have to figure out how to plan for a future
32 that may be extremely different than the path that we have been used to. Next slide please. The
33 demographics of transportation are changing as well as the population. Automobile purchasing
34 from people 18 to 30 years old peaked in the United States in the 1980s; it's been coming down.
35 Millennials are not buying cars; many aren't even getting driver's licenses. Some people seem to
36 have figured out that having the second largest investment in your life sitting idle 95 percent of
37 the time may not be a good use of capital. There's interest in other modes, and we're seeing that.
38 The graph on the right is showing the traditional "business as usual" projections of vehicle miles
39 traveled, and we're seeing them start to bend down. What does that mean for how we think and
40 how we plan? Our traditional approaches to transportation have tended to focus on build more
41 roads and build more parking capacity. Unfortunately, both of those engender more of the
42 problem. They provide the incentive for more travel, more congestion requiring, therefore, more
43 roads and more parking. The question we're raising, the challenge we're raising, is what if we
44 stopped incenting the behavior that we don't want. Our 1998 Comp Plan talked about reducing
45 reliance on the automobile in Palo Alto. Great principle, yet we provide free parking and other
46 incentives that encourage automobile driving. Many of the things you're grappling with are

1 looking at how to shift that. We think that's one of two key elements in grappling with this issue.
2 The other is how do we make more convenient what we do want. Not just a "raise the cost"
3 approach, but make it easier for people to access what they need to access and help. Take the
4 next slide please. In fact, the driving design question as we see is how do we make it more
5 convenient for anyone anywhere at any time to not drive alone or not drive at all. For us that
6 becomes the test question for all the strategies we're looking at. Does a strategy solve that
7 problem or not? Anyone means anyone; young, old, firm, infirm, worker, commuter, student,
8 large family, single mother, kids, whatever. How do we design a system that really makes that
9 possible? Absent that, I think we don't get the shift that we want. Next slide please. Around the
10 world people are thinking about mobility in a different way. The phrase mobility as a service we
11 learned from our colleagues in Helsinki who have set a goal to be a car-free city in ten years.
12 Looking at the notion of mobility as a seamless, interconnected bundle of services available on
13 demand. This is your next car. Just as with your phone, you're buying a bundle of services,
14 voice, text, data, broadband and so forth, for a monthly subscription fee. The Finns are
15 proposing a transportation system that's like that. You buy a bundle of services. Your bundle
16 might be different than yours and different than mine. Based on your needs, you do the
17 combination of VTA, bike share, Uber, Lyft, taxis, shuttles, what have you. Mobility friendly
18 cities, this is to the land use point that a number of you raised. Urban form and our land use
19 planning drives transportation needs. How do we think about them together in the most
20 efficacious way? The right vehicle for the job. It's not a matter of thinking of what car do you
21 need to own for your life; it's what car do you need for today or for the trip right now, so the on-
22 demand services become a much better way of allocating resources to that need. Of course, self-
23 driving cars you've heard plenty about. They're on their way. They will change many things
24 about what we do, how we plan and how we deploy resources. Next slide please. We are
25 working with partners at Joint Venture Silicon Valley, the VTA, other cities in the region, to
26 look at how can we start to articulate this sort of system here. It's clear that Palo Alto can't solve
27 its transportation problems by itself. It's part of a commute shed of millions of people in a region
28 that has the second worst traffic in the United States. By the way, speaking of interesting
29 metrics, probably more transit agencies per million people than anywhere else on earth which
30 makes the challenge of coordination particularly tough here. We're looking at working with at
31 least some of these regional organizations to start to build a pilot. RideScout, one of the mobility
32 service companies in the United States, is trying to build out an app that would provide this
33 capability for us. Couple with that, pushing for interoperable data between transit companies and
34 services companies so that we can have the network effect that comes from that data sharing.
35 Next one please, Andrew. The other component goes to the pricing question that I talked about
36 before. We think there's a very interesting model here in Stanford which, under its general use
37 permit, raised its parking fees and invested that parking revenue in the Marguerite and the
38 various other transportation alternatives. Notably, they took their SOV rate down from 77
39 percent to 48 percent. Pretty impressive. Really striking is they saved \$107 million in parking
40 structures that they haven't had to build, because the demand wasn't there. Lo and behold, they
41 get to use that money and that land for things like classrooms and laboratories and things that a
42 university should be spending its money on. You can see some of the other SOV numbers.
43 Downtown Palo Alto is doing pretty respectably at 55 percent. Hillary, I don't think we know
44 yet what the overall number for the City is. Do we have an overall SOV number for the City
45 total? Okay. We've got that there, and we've got a Council resolution from, I think, 2012 calling
46 on us to drop our SOV rate 30 percent. That's one of the specific numbers on the table. We'd

1 like to experiment with small carrots and sticks. Do small, rapid-learning experiments, because
2 frankly we don't know exactly what works here. We're going to learn by doing, so let's find
3 ways to do that. Next slide please. Some of the transportation levers that we've identified in the
4 Sustainability and Climate Plan were four main topic areas: expanding non-auto mobility
5 options; creating the right financial incentives; implementing land use development approaches
6 that engender less, not more, demand for personal vehicle travel; reducing the carbon intensity of
7 all of the elements of those systems. Behind each of these, there's a lot of analysis as well as
8 modeling, looking at what is the potential impact on VMT and greenhouse gas emissions of
9 bringing these strategies on at different rates. In fact, we have some interactive tools; we'll
10 probably use these at the summit so you can toggle strategies on and off, speed them up, slow
11 them down, and see what kind of impact they have and then find what seems most suitable. Next
12 slide please. People often say to me, "Gee, Gil, that sounds impossible." I have to keep on
13 remembering where we are and this is the place where we do impossible. That thing on the left
14 is a 5 megabyte memory array from back in the days of Pan American Airways which some of
15 you may remember. Thirty-two gigabyte in the middle. One hundred twenty-eight gigabyte on
16 the right. I just got today, but didn't have a chance to paste it in, something that was 512
17 gigabytes, four times the memory, same size, cheaper. That's what we do here. Saying
18 something is difficult or impossible by itself isn't interesting enough. So, okay, like why do you
19 think that? What are the challenges? How do we design for them? How do we build something
20 to the criteria that we really care about? Next slide. I think I'm just about out here. That's the
21 quick orientation. We'd love to know what you think, not just in this meeting but ongoing. As I
22 mentioned, we'll be putting together a summit in November. We should have the dates nailed
23 down and the locations nailed down in the next couple of weeks. In the meantime, we have an
24 interactive survey at the link below. If you'd like, come take a look at that. It'll give you a
25 chance to express your current preferences on some of the ideas that we're considering. That
26 again feeds back into the conversation and the summit. Let me stop there and take any questions
27 if we have time for that.

28
29 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you, Gil. We are down to 7 minutes per goal if we're going to get out
30 of here at 8:30. Let's—I'm sorry?

31
32 **Co-Chair Keller:** I think we're doing the first five.

33
34 **Co-Chair Garber:** Just the first five today? Thank you. Double that, 14 minutes. Let us start,
35 and then we're going to add your comments into the first discussion here as ...

36
37 **Female:** (inaudible) first five of the whole nine or (inaudible).

38 **Co-Chair Keller:** All nine.

39
40 **Co-Chair Garber:** Excuse me. I had Ellen. I had Bonnie. I had Don.

41
42 **Don McDougall:** I just have a quick question. How do we get copies of this presentation?

43
44 **Co-Chair Garber:** Gil, you can make this available to the Committee?

45
46 **Gil Friend:** I'll make it available to Jeremy through the (inaudible).

1
2 **Co-Chair Garber:** Great. Bob. There is somebody else over there. Jennifer, was it you that
3 had your hand raised? Okay. We're doing it by goal. Arthur.

4
5 **Co-Chair Keller:** Yes. We're starting with Goal T1. I just want to make a preliminary remark
6 that may set this in context for people. That is the Comp Plan, we're going—it was supposed to
7 have started in 2010. We're late, but we're going through 2030 which is 15 years from now. I'll
8 (inaudible) an interesting statistic that people may wish to compare it with. That is nationally the
9 small vehicle, the regular passenger vehicle fleet turns over in 15 years nationally. Typically, 15
10 years from now, we're essentially going to be dealing with a completely replaced vehicle fleet for
11 Palo Alto. When you think about that, what's going to be in 15 years is going to be completely
12 different from what we see now. We're beginning to see beginnings of trend lines, but there's
13 going to be a considerably different, even if we just stay with regular passenger vehicles. The
14 technology will be completely different, and they'll be all new vehicles. The first one, Goal T1 is
15 less reliance on single occupancy vehicles.

16
17 **Co-Chair Garber:** Ellen, then Bonnie, then Bob, then Hamilton, and then Jennifer. Ellen, go
18 ahead.

19
20 **Male:** I did. I asked my question.

21
22 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Ellen.

23
24 **Ellen Uhrbrock:** Well, long ago, I just wanted to add that I would like very much for the Staff
25 to provide us with a glossary of all these acronyms of the different programs. It's too hard for a
26 newcomer to follow it when you're mentioning different things. Just a one-page glossary would
27 be enormous help. Then can I say something about Goal 1? Yes?

28
29 **Co-Chair Garber:** Yes.

30 **Ellen Uhrbrock:** Okay. On the first one, I think the real immediate problem that we can start
31 and have a long-range plan is to educate people to where they are living in the community, what
32 their options are, every single residence, and have it noted on the house how walkable it is and
33 how accessible to transit things. The other thing is that every business in town ought to know
34 where they are located close to transit. If you walk down El Camino or University Avenue today
35 and go in and ask any clerk, "Where is the nearest bus stop," they do not know. The answer is, "I
36 drive a car." Make this an educational requirement that employers teach all the people who have
37 contact with the public to know what the situation is and what their options are to come and be a
38 customer and where the parking is and where the transit is. That could be done in all sorts of
39 ways, but I think it's essential that you know. Otherwise, people think, "This is not for me." I
40 have my plans, and they don't know what the alternatives are.

41
42 **Co-Chair Keller:** Let me take a moment. The suggestion was that the Council has combined
43 the first three goals into one goal, so let us deal with that goal. I'm going to read it for people.
44 That is sustainable transportation. Create a sustainable transportation system that emphasizes
45 walking, bicycling, use of public transportation and a mix of uses and other methods to reduce

1 greenhouse gas emissions and by reducing single occupancy vehicle trips. That is the first three
2 goals combined. We can take a little bit more time for that. If you could ...
3

4 **Jeremy Dennis:** I was going to say, Arthur, if you would like to follow along with the goals, the
5 new goals, it's Item 3. The main Staff report, it's page 4 and 5. We can also do one of two
6 things. We have up on the screen right now, you see we're doing meeting notes. We're trying to
7 do that live. We could do that or we could put the goals up, whatever you prefer. Right now,
8 we're going with meeting notes. We figured that was more important, but either way. The goals
9 are on page 4 and 5, Item 3. The new goals.

10
11 **Co-Chair Keller:** The new goals. Also, would people like to see the comments up there as
12 they're being typed or rather would people like to see the goals up there? How many people
13 want goals? How many people want comments? Okay, so most people want to see the goals up
14 there. As Jeremy said, we're going to be using this, the comments, as we are here. That
15 corresponds to T1 through T3 is the purview for tonight, and then next time we'll look at T4
16 through T9. If you could make sure your microphone is close, so that you can be heard. It's a lot
17 easier to pick it up and get the notes and get it broadcast. Make sure that your light is on. Some
18 people have green lights; some people have red lights depending on what it is. Make sure your
19 microphone is close enough so that you can be heard. If you're like me and you can project in a
20 room, then put it an appropriate distance. Thank you.

21
22 **Co-Chair Garber:** Ellen, thank you. Bonnie, you're next, and then Bob.

23
24 **Bonnie Packer:** I've been waiting to say this. I'm not going to speak directly to the goal,
25 because what I think should be the first goal is an emphasis on regional planning. I think Gil
26 spoke to that and how important that is, because we're not going to get to where Goals 1, 2 and 3
27 want to get to unless we get a metropolitan transportation authority, something stronger than the
28 MTC, the Commission or whatever that is. I think Palo Alto, because it receives 90,000-plus
29 drivers into our city everyday and they're coming from places that don't have good transit
30 options, which is why they're taking the freeways. Unless we can work regionally with those
31 other places, we're not going to get effectively to T1, 2 or 3. I'm suggesting that when Staff
32 comes together, or the subcommittee or whatever, and rewrites this element, that the first goal be
33 an emphasis on regional cooperation. We can have lots of different policies under that. That's
34 why I wanted to sort of put that framework. Everything that I've read in the Staff report,
35 everything we heard from Gil, it's just begging for that. It's just what it's saying, all the data,
36 everything we're hearing. We're not living in a bubble here. I mean if we reduce greenhouse
37 gases just over our little 5 square mile city, what good is that going to do unless they're doing it
38 in San Jose and Sunnyvale and Cupertino? I hope the summit that you're planning, Gil, is a
39 regional one. Maybe what Palo Alto does could be a template for other cities. We should be
40 leaders, because we're such an employment center.

41
42 **Co-Chair Garber:** Jeremy, you had a brief comment?

43
44 **Bonnie Packer:** That's my little speech for today.

45
46 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Good.

1
2 **Jeremy Dennis:** I would say two things very quickly. Number one, the goal structure has been
3 adopted by the Council as you see on page 4 and 5. Number two, more importantly to your
4 point, Bonnie, the new T7 and the old T-9, I think, speak directly to what you're referring to.
5 That is something that we hope you discuss as part of your deliberations.

6
7 **Co-Chair Garber:** Bob.

8
9 **Bob Wenzlau:** My questions, Dan, are just a little bit more initially process oriented as we're
10 participating in this. When we again get the packet and we work deliberatively to address the
11 questions in the packet, and there were many of them and they were well formed. I get confused
12 because while we're addressing and giving input to these questions that are raised in the packet,
13 it's hard to know if that is in fact becoming the input that you're seeking as Staff or whether you
14 want our—my concern is that the existing Comp Plan is written in goal, policy and program.
15 Because the questions you ask are not necessarily rigorous to policy and program, I get
16 concerned that we are—I don't want to say being taken for a ride in the Transportation Element
17 here—maybe we're spinning our wheels, but maybe we're off point. I was wondering if you
18 could maybe help me understand how these questions come into your process to inform, to be
19 helpful for you as opposed to just generating a bunch of commentary.

20
21 **Jeremy Dennis:** Sure. First of all, the questions are not intended to be the end of any discussion
22 at all. We hope that the questions help begin a discussion if they're helpful. We hope that they,
23 in your own heads, cause you to ask additional questions. It's a starting place. When we on Staff
24 talk to one another about the goals that we see, these are the kinds of questions we ask ourselves.
25 Where do we think—what will a new draft look like related to these issues? Some of them are—
26 complete streets is something we need to consider because it's required, so we put those kinds of
27 things in. Otherwise, we come up with questions because we think it'll help inform a fun,
28 interesting discussion for people. I think what we said in the last meeting was you can use them,
29 you cannot use them. It's really up to each individual. If it's helpful for your process moving
30 forward, then look at them and see where that takes your imagination. If it's not, it's not
31 necessarily required to help inform what you're saying to us.

32
33 **Bob Wenzlau:** Well, I guess just to clarify it. Obviously in the packet, everyone will see that I
34 amongst a few of the team took the bait and hit all of your topics with as much rigor as we could.
35 Because I put that energy in, I just wanted to commensurately understand whether it provides
36 input to you.

37
38 **Jeremy Dennis:** Yes, it does.

39
40 **Bob Wenzlau:** Or whether you're trying to get the juices—beyond getting the juices flowing,
41 the questions are not informative, er, the responses are not informative. I think what I hear
42 you're saying is that by spending the time responding to your questions and those questions that
43 you've written, that it is the type of input you want from the CAC, so that you will be, I don't
44 know, putting it in the database. That's what I'm trying to understand.

45

1 **Jeremy Dennis:** I don't want to parse it out too hard. It's not intended to be the only place that
2 you're providing us input. It was never the intention of the questions. We never expected that
3 the input would be necessarily driven from CAC members that you'd have to answer the
4 questions that we put in. They were intended to provide a starting place for your thinking. We
5 fully expected that some members may not look at the questions in the same way. There's no
6 directive related to the questions. Any input we receive from the CAC is vital to the process that
7 then we subsequently use related to drafting something. If it's the questions that give us input,
8 that help inform drafting the element or if it's something else, I see them equally as important.

9
10 **Co-Chair Garber:** Let me interrupt just briefly. We should expect to see Bob's comments, for
11 instance, in your comments matrix. That would be ...

12
13 **Jeremy Dennis:** Correct, absolutely.

14
15 **Co-Chair Garber:** ... a part of the deliberative material that we would see there.

16
17 **Jeremy Dennis:** Absolutely, absolutely.

18
19 **Bob Wenzlau:** Is it okay to ask one more question? It's more ...

20
21 **Co-Chair Garber:** Of course.

22
23 **Bob Wenzlau:** Okay. I'm really into this. This is really fun. We had the—the Planning
24 Commission did some great work on this. Then we were directed by Council to use as the
25 baseline the '98 work, which is broadly confusing because you've got one, the '98 version which I
26 guess is authoritative, but then you have all this great work by the CPCC or whatever to improve
27 it. As a Citizen Advisory Committee member, how do you want us to communicate to you,
28 "Hey, I like what the CPC"—I mean broadly I like what they did. I'll tell you that right there, but
29 I didn't know—aside from taking all this time talking right now—what the best way to inform
30 you to carry the CPC work, to say, "yeah, that looks good," or "that doesn't look good." I don't
31 even know how to write a note, because the numbers are so bizarre between the two.

32
33 **Jeremy Dennis:** I mean, I hope that the first place you've shared the comments are here at the
34 meeting so they're a part of the public record and that there's something that we can then
35 incorporate. We encouraged CAC members, at the last staff meeting, that as long as you can get
36 some mention of what you want to talk about, but then provide maybe some more specifics later
37 on, so our meeting doesn't go down to some minute level of detail that isn't productive. As long
38 as you're telling us some basic information about what direction you like that it's going and there
39 are some points that you'd like to make are meta-level issues, and then subsequently follow up
40 with us in something that we then put into our matrix and make part of the public record and then
41 put into our process, that's fine. Does that answer your question, Bob?

42
43 **Bob Wenzlau:** Yeah, I think—well, we'll get there over time. I do think what I'm hearing is that
44 writing comments in, even if they don't get vocalized here tonight, is in some respects the same
45 thing because when you come back ...

46

1 **Jeremy Dennis:** You're going to see everything.

2
3 **Bob Wenzlau:** ... somehow everything's going to come back. That's where we're going to get
4 the "forest through the trees" view. I just want to know how to—because I don't want to—even
5 though at this one moment I'm taking a lot of time, I didn't want to feel like obligated to create
6 airtime on every point I wanted to make and that the written form is just as effective getting it.

7
8 **Jeremy Dennis:** It is. The purpose of this meeting, other than to provide feedback to what will
9 be a draft that you see again, is also to make sure that we're capturing the differences of opinion
10 that will exist in some of the more substantive sections here. I mean, we encourage everyone to
11 say whatever they feel like they need to say, and that may engender a debate, a discussion, and
12 then we'll understand both what a majority opinion is and then we want to preserve all the
13 minority opinions and make sure those go back to the Council. We want to provide as many
14 different avenues for you to get that information out. We prefer that it starts with the public
15 vetting and then you can follow up with us to get more specific information, and then we put that
16 in. You've then see it all back.

17
18 **Bob Wenzlau:** Thank you.

19
20 **Jeremy Dennis:** Sure.

21
22 **Co-Chair Garber:** Arthur, did you have a brief comment?

23
24 **Co-Chair Keller:** Yeah. We'll be talking about subcommittees later. My expectation is that the
25 subcommittees will be doing some synthesis on all the comments, whether they are from all the
26 comments that are deltas from the '98 Comp Plan. That means the PTC inputs, the comments
27 made by the public, through the commenter, at the meeting, comments made by the CAC at these
28 meetings and in writing. Certainly if you agree with, for example, the PTC comments as you
29 mentioned, it's worthwhile putting that in writing. I'm not sure we want to spend a lot of airtime
30 talking about that. Certainly put in writing that you agree with some things or disagree with
31 some things certainly makes sense. In terms of these meetings, I said something at the last
32 meeting, and I think that is worth repeating. That is that the purpose of this meeting from my
33 perspective is to get the ideas aired. If you agree with somebody, you don't have to say, "I agree
34 with so-and-so" on something, because we really want to get the ideas out. However, if you
35 disagree with something that somebody says, then in order to get that idea that there's a point of
36 disagreement, that's important to bring out. If you agree with somebody's disagreement, that's
37 unnecessary to say, if you understand what I'm getting at. We want to get basically a range of
38 opinion brought out there in whatever form, whether it's writing, whether it's orally or whatever
39 form, to try to capture that. In the synthesis process, we can bring that together and try to see
40 what the range of opinions are and see where there's consensus. Thank you.

41
42 **Co-Chair Garber:** Hamilton, Jennifer, Alex. Hamilton.

43
44 **Hamilton Hitchings:** Thank you. I thoroughly reviewed the PTC Transportation Element, and
45 thought it was a significant improvement over the original element and much more up-to-date. I
46 would recommend that we use that as the baseline. I'm going to make a couple of comments

1 about T1 which are relative to the PTC version. The first is that mixed use is an important
2 concept that has been widely embraced in Palo Alto. That was actually removed from T1. I
3 would like to see that in T1 for this element. The second is we've been talking a lot about
4 mobility as a service, which enables point to point on-demand driver services for a subsidized fee
5 in Palo Alto. This reduces the need for car ownership and parking. I think that there's been a lot
6 of talk about it, and I hope it makes it into this section. Finally, I was really happy to see in the
7 PTC version the section on the rail corridor, which I think is really important that we do trench
8 Caltrain and specifically at a 2 percent grade, because it's half the price and the project has a
9 much higher success of completing closer to on-time and on-budget and being a successful
10 outcome. The last point I'd like to make on the rail corridor is that it should have a park and a
11 bike path to be built above the Caltrain. I think that would be a big asset to the City. Those are
12 my comments.

13
14 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Jennifer.

15
16 **Jennifer Hetterly:** I hate to belabor the process question again. I'm still trying to figure this
17 out. I agree with Hamilton.

18
19 **Co-Chair Garber:** That's okay.

20
21 **Jennifer Hetterly:** I thought that the PTC version reflected a lot of really good work and a lot of
22 important ideas that ought to be considered by the whole group. I'm a little concerned about just
23 working off of the '98 version of the Comp Plan, because I think that limits us to saying we like
24 this policy program, we don't like this policy program, we think this new one should be there.
25 We're starting from scratch in that perspective, when we have a lot of work already done that we
26 can say we like what they did here, we don't like what they did here, we want to restore this or
27 we're okay with getting rid of that. I find it a cumbersome way to progress and maybe not the
28 most efficient way. I also agree with Bob about the review questions and how best to use them
29 in this group. I think it would be helpful, if you're going to break them out into sections, to have
30 just the ones related to that particular topic in each section. We had topics all over the place in
31 various sections.

32
33 **Co-Chair Garber:** Jeremy.

34
35 **Jeremy Dennis:** Jennifer, I just wanted to say in the end you'll have all of these different
36 resources in front of you. Part of the reason we try to direct people to one or the other is so we
37 have a common starting place of the conversation. That shouldn't preclude you at any point from
38 saying, "I prefer this. I prefer that." Just starting from the existing Transportation Plan programs
39 and policies doesn't mean that you can't go to the PTC's version and say, "I prefer this. I prefer
40 that. Let's bring it in." It's just that we found in our first meeting and the (inaudible) on the Staff
41 that we made it incredibly confusing because we were combining a bunch of things into one.
42 You were all here; you remember what that was like. We wanted to try to make that much less
43 complicated. That's really the intention. Please, any points you want incorporated send them our
44 way.

45
46 **Co-Chair Garber:** Jennifer, anything else?

1
2 **Jennifer Hetterly:** No. I think I have to reorganize my thinking about things, and I will come
3 back around. I also will submit my comments that were in a different format.

4
5 **Co-Chair Garber:** Alex.

6
7 **Alex Van Riesen:** I guess I wanted to say that it seems to me from the conversation tonight that
8 there's some need to identify what the main issue is in the Transportation Element, particularly in
9 these three main points condensing into the first one. If it's reducing the single occupancy
10 vehicle, it seems like the biggest issue is those who are coming to work here in Palo Alto. It
11 seems like that's one big issue. The other issue is the transportation within Palo Alto itself and
12 how it serves the residents of Palo Alto. It seems to me that we would in addressing that, the
13 incoming traffic issue, that that would be the place to start or to focus especially if we're trying to
14 reduce the carbon emissions and all that. It seems like how to divide or break down that
15 conversation into those two elements would be helpful. I was struck in terms of the
16 transportation within Palo Alto by the Table 12-4 in the transportation and traffic handout that
17 we received. I just wanted to say I was—I think it's, oh, sorry. It's 12-2, Table 12-2. Is that
18 right? Did I get it right? Well, I think I mixed it up. It was the one that had to do with the fact
19 that—oh, sorry. It's Table 12-4. I was struck by the Palo Alto shuttle total ridership in all
20 categories is decreasing from 2012 to 2014. I was struck by that. It seems to me that there's
21 something that may be fundamentally either not working or certainly not attractive about the
22 current Palo Alto shuttle system. I just want to draw our attention to Figure 12-2 which is on
23 page—I don't know if we even have pages here. Figure 12-2, and it's a graph of Palo Alto. I
24 think the thing that struck me was if you look at Palo Alto as four quadrants, you see that—in a
25 diamond fashion—you have the Marguerite over there on the left. I think people have all argued
26 that the Marguerite is incredibly efficient and has served the University well and actually is quite
27 a good economic solution to their problem. If you look over at the other quadrants, what's
28 striking to me is that there isn't something in those three that mirrors that. It occurred to me that
29 there could be some solution there to either pattern after the Marguerite in the other three
30 quadrants of Palo Alto or—I appreciated some of Elaine's drawings and her handout that she
31 handed out tonight about some of this direct point destination. It made me think how could we
32 create a hub even in Palo Alto which four quadrants would come together to serve, so that people
33 could move through the city. I think when you just look at the table, it's striking that the rest of
34 Palo Alto doesn't look anything like the Marguerite. I think we could take a lesson from that.
35 My last question is, is there current data on the SOV coming into Palo Alto each day? Did we
36 already discuss that or do you have that? Sort of what that number is.

37
38 **Hillary Gitelman:** (inaudible)

39
40 **Alex Van Riesen:** Okay.

41
42 **Hillary Gitelman:** (inaudible) the packet, but we do have good data on Downtown, and we have
43 estimates for the City as a whole for workers coming into Palo Alto. We have good data on
44 residents of Palo Alto.

1 **Alex Van Riesen:** I guess my last statement would be if that's such a big part, and I assume that
2 number's fairly large, maybe not as large as Steve was noting from the table. It's not 80 percent.
3 If it's huge, it would seem to me there's some immediate things that we could do to de-
4 incentivize people coming in and parking in Palo Alto. We should do that.

5
6 **Co-Chair Keller:** I just wanted to point out that the Table 12-4 that you talked about, 2014 is
7 only half a year obviously. If you take the cross-town shuttle, you'll notice that ridership is
8 actually up. Half a year for 2014 is about 90,000 people, which is up from 2012 and 2013. The
9 Embarcadero shuttle is somewhat down. I notice also that there was discussion about
10 increasing—that part of the discussion about the satellite parking for Downtown being on
11 Embarcadero Road, there was a suggestion that that satellite parking actually be parking for
12 Embarcadero Road, for that area of business. It seems to me that if ridership is down, there's
13 something broken there, and we should encourage them to use the Embarcadero shuttle rather
14 than trying to increase parking so that we're actually increasing the single occupancy vehicle at
15 that location. There's some disconnect in respect to the east Embarcadero and shuttle use and
16 Caltrain use. That should be studied. Rather than enhancing parking there to make it worse, we
17 should try to fix that.

18
19 **Jeremy Dennis:** Thank you.

20
21 **Co-Chair Garber:** Alex, anything else? If not, Whitney and then Steve.

22
23 **Whitney McNair:** In Gil's presentation, he talked about some of the companies that have the
24 lowest SOV rates are near the Caltrain stations. Palantir being one in the Downtown; Stanford
25 being another. What I don't see in this goal or in this policy are anything addressing the Cal.
26 Avenue station, in looking at trying to have Palo Alto promote working with Caltrain to improve
27 the stops at the Cal. Ave. station. In some cities, say in I think San Mateo, they split the baby
28 bullet stops between stations, so that some are going to one station and some are going to the
29 other. If the goal is to try and get people out of their cars, the biggest employment center is the
30 Stanford Research Park, which is more directly connected to the Cal. Ave. station. Having, say,
31 a component of baby bullet stops stop there and having a direct shuttle into the Research Park,
32 you would be able to capture that—you'd be able to capture more people or incentivize people to
33 take the train a lot more than you do in having them go to the University Avenue stop. I would
34 really want to see that promoted or have Palo Alto take a bigger stand in doing that. The other
35 thing is there was a question in some of the reading material about the level of service as a
36 calculation. A lot of the new regulations are moving towards looking at vehicle miles traveled as
37 a different way to measure sort of the impacts on the environment. Gil talked a lot about the
38 VMT—that's the vehicle miles traveled—going down, and that is a sign that if you're reducing
39 greenhouse gases. I do see in the policies that there's some language in here about changing
40 from an LOS to a multi-modal LOS standard, which is one way to consider that, especially for
41 transit and bikes. I would just say that if you're going to go that route is to really identify are
42 there particular streets or types of streets where you would prioritize bikes and peds over cars
43 and maybe really highlight those are the routes to schools or particular places where that is a
44 priority rather than just blanketing it across the City as a whole. That's pretty tricky when it gets
45 into the CEQA analysis and doing sort of your environmental review in the future. Lastly, just in
46 Policy T-1-1, it does say that the City's goals for greenhouse gas emissions by 2020. That may

1 be just because this is an older document. I would think that the City has a 2035 goal or
2 something else, because by the time this gets to 2020, we're going to hit that pretty quickly.
3 Lastly, there was one just as—it didn't quite seem to fit in the railroad section. It was RC Policy
4 5.1, and I just wanted to make note that it's about parks and recreation improvements. I'm not
5 sure; I think it just might have gotten in here for some different reason.
6

7 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Steve.
8

9 **Stephen Levy:** I have one very nitty-gritty proposal and three shorter questions and comments.
10 For the early part of my career, I worked on transportation studies including as a consultant for
11 the high speed rail. Don't kill me, please. I have children; I'm about to be a grandfather. To do
12 mode shift, which is really what this set of goals is about, you need—Bob wrote eloquently in his
13 comments to us—you need data about where people are coming from and where they're going to,
14 origin and destination data. I know someone said we don't need enough data, and maybe we
15 don't need any more data to talk about safety or bicycles or safe neighborhoods. If you're talking
16 about mode shift, I'd really like to have a specific program request that we ask all of the
17 employers in the City, the ones that are signing up for the Business Registry, to anonymously
18 give us the residence addresses of their employees. Second, I'd like to replicate what the Palantir
19 and SurveyMonkey and other folks did Downtown at the Research Park. We talk about Caltrain,
20 getting people to and from Caltrain at Cal. Ave. We talk about the Page Mill Expressway. At
21 the heart of that is the Research Park. I'd love to have a survey of those folks, so we have a
22 better idea of what's realistic. I'm a data person. I can't do goals without testing them with
23 numbers, so I'd really like to get that information. Three quick comments. One, I'd like to echo
24 one piece of what Elaine wrote, and I think others have said. I'm all for the investments that Gil
25 talked about. I think we should have something explicitly in the Transportation Element that
26 we're willing to pay for it and have identified funds, whether that's Caltrain trenching or shuttles
27 or something. I think investments without us putting up the money doesn't seem right to me. I
28 hope I read what Annette said correctly. If not, please correct me. There's so much to read. I
29 read this perhaps unintentionally as disrespectful to the people who need and use cars. Okay.
30 I've never been able to drive in my life, so I'm not talking for myself. I'd love to see mode shift,
31 but I want to do that in a way that gives people options, not makes drivers villains. I think we
32 can do that. It's a little heavy here. The last point that I think is a little heavy is I read a lot about
33 greenhouse gas reduction. Okay. Which can be done without affecting driving. You can double
34 mileage standards; you can have clean fuels; you can have clean cars. Okay. You can address
35 greenhouse reduction substantially without affecting driving. I see the word mobility once or
36 twice, and that's mobility for people with special needs or mobility as a service. I don't see what
37 used to be the number one thing about a Transportation Element, that we were helping people
38 and businesses move goods and services, people. Whether we do that in cars or not, mobility in
39 a growing region is really important for the economy. I don't see enough emphasis on the basic
40 element of transportation of moving people and helping businesses and people get around. If
41 they can do it without cars, that's okay. That's not the only way to me. It felt a little bit heavy.
42 The last point is a question. I'm confused about how we're handling land use and transportation.
43 I think all of us know that land use can affect the need to drive. My wife and I live Downtown
44 behind farmer's market. Whether or not I could drive or not, I don't have to drive to go to the
45 grocery store, to go to Caltrain, to go out to dinner, to get shopping at Walgreens or CVS. I don't
46 have to drive because of the land use decisions. I don't know how they're related in our work

1 through this process, but I don't see enough talking about land use as a way to reduce single
2 occupancy vehicle at least in the materials I've seen.

3
4 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Elaine, then Amy.

5
6 **Elaine Uang:** Okay. I want to just throw out one kind of big organizational suggestion which
7 is—Gil alluded to this earlier—combining T1, sustainable transportation, with T8, providing
8 attractive parking facilities both for cars and for bikes. I think that parking is kind of at the crux
9 of a lot of the transportation issues. It's often an incentive to drive and to increase SOVs,
10 because it becomes the more convenient way to get around. I think that thinking about those
11 things together, a lot of the programs seem to be redundant, especially with transportation
12 demand management. If we really want to reduce demand, I think we need to be serious about
13 integrating sustainable transportation with parking. I did also just want to highlight, I think that
14 the, on my handout, the image. This is Jarrett Walker, who's I guess a transit consultant, calls
15 this the image that pretty much explains almost everything. The image is of 60 people and how
16 much space it takes to fit in a bus, on a series of bikes or in 60 vehicles. That, I think, is just a
17 very good, compelling graphic that transportation—I mean think about all the GHG and the
18 fumes that come off these three scenarios. It's a spatial problem as well. I think that we need to
19 really consider that. It takes over a lot of our space on the streets, a lot of space; cars do. Not to
20 vilify, but this is just a geometry problem, and I think we need to be aware of that. I want to get
21 to some people have mentioned land use and transportation. I think that it's really important to
22 consider district level transportation management and aligning land uses to those districts. A
23 case in point, I think the Downtown area really needs a precise plan. We have parking
24 assessment districts. We have a Downtown CAP area, which don't exactly correspond to each
25 other. Then we also have functionally where people are doing work and coming into work; those
26 don't align. In our parking strategies, we're actually going to leave people out in the cold because
27 the only people who can access the garages at the moment are the people who happen to work in
28 the Parking Assessment District. If you happen to work two blocks away and your office is not
29 in the Parking Assessment District, you've got to park on the street and that's all you've got. If
30 we're really going to talk about any sort of future development, whether that's housing or
31 anything, we have to really think about those boundaries and draw those boundaries in tandem
32 with each other. Two more things. There's been a lot of things spoken about bikes tonight. I
33 think that I agree with a lot of the comments and the audience. I bike a lot. I might be a little bit
34 of a crazy biker. Today was a Spare the Air Day, so I did bike here. Implementing that Bike
35 Plan from 2012 is really, really important. I think it's also important to think about going beyond
36 that. We're going to do a plan until 2030. Copenhagen has a bike mode share of 50 percent.
37 We're at 9. We have better weather. We can ride most days of the year. I think we should really
38 push that. I would like to see us push that. I think we need to do safe routes to work, safe routes
39 to shop, and last time we talked about safe routes to play, go to the park, the library, the
40 community centers like this one. I spent a lot of time this weekend biking up to the Baylands.
41 There is no flipping good way to get to the Baylands on your bike, especially if you've got kids
42 and you're hauling them in your trailer. It sucks. Those are just some things to think about, I
43 think, going forward. Oh, and one small, last piece. Metrics. I think that we probably need to
44 not rely on a single, sole metric. I think VMT is probably a good starting point. It's going to
45 measure transportation impact a lot better. In my packet, I included a presentation that I saw
46 from Chris Ganson who is the project manager from the Office of Planning and Research in

1 Sacramento, and he's the guy responsible for allowing VMT to be considered as a measure for
2 transportation impact. The State is moving away from LOS and trying to move towards VMT.
3 He kind of explains a little bit about why that's important. I think thinking about VMT per capita
4 is important, maybe thinking about VMT per trip. On the parsing of trips coming into Palo Alto
5 as one category, maybe VMT per capita is a better measure. On the parsing of trips within Palo
6 Alto, maybe VMT per trip is a better measure. Maybe we think about ways to incentivize non-
7 auto use for those one, two-mile trips. I do think that absolute measurement of vehicles, just
8 basic traffic counts, is probably a good measure. I think Stanford does that pretty regularly to
9 determine whether or not they're violating their terms of agreement. They haven't. I think we
10 need to kind of bring to bear a lot of different metrics.

11
12 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Don, and then Bonnie, and then Lisa. Oh, I'm sorry. Was there
13 ...

14
15 **Female:** (inaudible)

16
17 **Co-Chair Garber:** I'm sorry. Amy. Amy, then Don.

18
19 **Amy Sung:** Is this on? I have a couple of thinking as I was reading through the document. I
20 wanted to start from this sustainability and then here with the presentation we just heard from
21 Gil. He talks about in the future then we would have all this interoperability like in mobility.
22 We will see a lot of cooperation across the city boundary, but how do we get from here to there?
23 I thought for right now how we reduce the single occupant vehicle, is it because really hop into
24 your car is so convenient and easy. Every time I'm thinking about biking to Safeway, and I'm
25 thinking, "How am I going to get all my grocery home?" If you think about—if you are going to
26 buy something more substantial like from Ikea, how are you going to bring those home with
27 public transportation? I really think that we need to focus on the last mile. Maybe there should
28 be some apps that you purchase, and then there'll be something separate public transportation
29 that brings your grocery home or something. That is my first thought. We talk about young
30 people. They grew up with this bike to school. They don't really want to own their own vehicle.
31 They don't take the driver's test. My own son grew up in Palo Alto school system, and he's really
32 exercising that. He is 19 years old; he doesn't want to have a driver's license. Here is the issue.
33 He is coaching in Los Altos, and he needs to find a way to get there. You take various buses
34 over there; it takes hour and a half. He doesn't have that, so he's going to do his planning. At the
35 last minute he's going to say, "Would you please take me there?" Then I was thinking like how
36 do we reduce the incentives for us to own homes. I think that we need to start with our permit,
37 because right now we still ask that every family to accommodate the two-car parking. I don't
38 know if I'm right about that. I think maybe moving forward, do we need to decouple the need of
39 housing and the need of having cars parked within our boundary. I thought of that, because a
40 friend of mine told me that in New York, when you buy a house, you buy a house. You want to
41 buy parking, you buy parking. I thought maybe that is something for us to think about. How do
42 we reduce the use of vehicles? I grew up in Taiwan. In Taiwan, we seem to move around easily
43 with public transportation, because the streets are too crowded for me to drive. It's just too
44 dangerous. I cannot compete with bus drivers and taxi drivers. I think maybe we need to have
45 more frequent. Back in NASA when I was working in the big campus, we drive to work and
46 then, in order not to lose that precious parking spot, the center provides shuttles all around. I go

1 from building to building, to lunch and everywhere with shuttle. There are also bicycles
2 provided, so I can just take a bike from one building and then drop it off at destination and not
3 worry about I need to come back with that same bicycle. That's just my ideas.
4

5 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Don, and then Bonnie.
6

7 **Don McDougall:** I hate to go back to the issue of are we going by the new program or the old
8 program or whatever but, Jeremy, you suggested that what we should be doing is talking about
9 single occupancy vehicles, excuse me, public transportation and walking and biking, which are
10 the first three in the old one, and considering them as one, which is sustainability and greenhouse
11 and gas and by the way maybe reducing SOV. There's not a real connection. With all due
12 respect to Council, they didn't make it any easier because they added Number 9 to the new one
13 even though they recommend that we go by the old one, so I don't know why they didn't add
14 Number 11 to the old one instead of Number 9 to the new one, which is congestion. What are
15 the solutions to congestion? They're going to be the same, public transportation, walking and
16 biking and whatever, that we're dealing with in terms of reducing SOV. Other than just a rant,
17 my suggestion is that we look at this Number 1 and Number 9, that we should group those two
18 together. We should take single occupancy vehicle reduction—public transportation should be
19 divided into public transportation in and out of the city versus in the city. When you look at this,
20 it's mixed up. You're talking about the Marguerite at the same time you're talking about can you
21 take a bus from San Jose. I think those two public transportation elements should be broken
22 apart. I also think that walking and biking should be broken apart. I think there's an awful lot of
23 emphasis in here and rightfully so. I totally support it on biking, but biking is solving a different
24 problem than walking was. When the plan was made in '98, yeah, walking and biking were sort
25 of maybe solving the same problem or they were just simply not motorized, and so you put them
26 together. I think today walking and biking are very, very different. I think biking is a deliberate
27 solution to a problem; whereas, walking is a necessity particularly when you start talking about
28 special needs. At the last meeting we talked about do we have enough representation of old
29 people, whatever you want to call us, and they're the walking crowd. I think there's not enough
30 in here about walking. We could separate those two. What you've done in the structure of the
31 new one is you've got goals and policies and programs, but then you've got subheadings. The
32 subheadings aren't anything other than helping you sort out what the heck you're looking at. I
33 would suggest that under this new combined "1" and "9," because they're fundamentally the
34 same challenge, you use those subheadings broken up as I've suggested, public transportation in
35 and out and local, and walking and biking separate.
36

37 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thanks. Bonnie, then Lisa.
38

39 **Bonnie Packer:** I'm really enjoying everybody's comments, because I agree with so many of
40 them. One of the things that we learned in the past couple of weeks was this wonderful statistic
41 that the people coming to Downtown use Caltrain, because they're coming from San Francisco
42 where there is good transit. All the other people who are driving are coming from the south
43 where there isn't good transit. Why isn't there good transit? Because it's suburbia, like we are.
44 Like the quadrants, Alex, you were mentioning those white areas in Palo Alto where you don't
45 see any lines. Maybe there's a shuttle that goes on a weird route somewhere once an hour and
46 doesn't do anybody any good. I had kind of this dream. We have all this great technology. We

1 have Zip cars. We have this ability to learn where buses are coming from or whatever. One of
2 the comments on the digital commentator said, "Wouldn't it be great if there was a goal that it
3 took no more than ten minutes to walk to a transit option?" Ten minutes to walk to the shuttle.
4 If I live on Ross Road, like it's 15 minutes to walk to Middlefield to find wherever the shuttle is.
5 It goes down Waverley. It's a mile away, so how can I take the shuttle anywhere? If we had a
6 system that was a combination of maybe smart golf carts that you knew were going up and down
7 Louis Road or up and down Ross Road every so often to connect with wherever our shuttle is,
8 then people would more likely use the transit and wouldn't have to use their car. The reason we
9 use our cars is because we can't get to the good transit because we live in suburbia, many of us,
10 not everybody. The young people who live in San Francisco can hop on Muni or whatever and
11 go to Townsend and pick up the train and they're here. It's easy. The people who live in San
12 Jose, what are they going to do? How many places does light rail go to? BART doesn't go
13 anywhere near here. That's what I would like us to have a policy of no more than ten minutes to
14 walk to transit. If you have good transit, then you can really try for parking. All these ideas—
15 and I love the idea that we're really going to do a paid parking study because that's what we
16 really need. You charge for parking, then people will choose transit because they don't want to
17 pay for parking. That's what we do when we go to San Francisco, right? We take the train so we
18 don't have to park. All these things, I think they have to be done together. If you have a fee for
19 parking but you haven't improved the local transit, it's not going to work. Something should be
20 said in these policies that these have to be done as tandem projects in order for it to work.

21

22 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank ...

23

24 **Bonnie Packer:** The other thing I wanted to say about pedestrians versus bicycles, where we
25 can we should separate the uses. A lot of places do that. They have this is where the bikes go,
26 and this is where the people walk. It's really unsafe, especially for older people. They're
27 walking on the streets. On the sidewalks, I mean these kids riding on the sidewalks; they should
28 not be doing that with their bikes. It's dangerous. These are safety issues that when we get to the
29 safety section, I might raise again. Thank you.

30

31 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you, Bonnie. Folks, I've got Lisa, Annette, Shani, Jason, Lydia,
32 Julia, Mark, Len. Then hopefully ...

33

34 **Female:** Doria.

35

36 **Co-Chair Garber:** And then Adrian, and then Doria. Stephanie (inaudible) I'm sorry. And
37 Jared. We're going to get through all these comments in five minutes, so we can save ten
38 minutes for the conversation on subcommittees. In our dreams. Let's go with Lisa.

39

40 **Lisa Peschke-Koedt:** There's so many good ideas in here, right. I think we have to, by the
41 time we're done, cover all of it from basically the airplanes to the walking, right. You start from
42 the big and go to the small. I think one thing, and it goes a bit to what Bonnie said before. If I
43 could look forward maybe ten years, what would solve so many problems? I think if we had an
44 underground kind of BART, call it subway, call it whatever you want, but electric, fast transit
45 from San Francisco to San Jose, underground, safe, electric, right. It hits so many of the things
46 we're trying to do. That would solve so many of the issues that we're dealing with. It would

1 solve a lot of the safety issues, right, some of the things we talked about last time on the suicides
2 and all that. It would definitely help on the greenhouse gas. It would help a lot of the people
3 that are coming in to work in Palo Alto. If that were a frequent, easy, relatively cheap, fast and
4 reliable, you've seen how Caltrain with the baby bullet has gone up. I think this would solve it. I
5 hate the old politics of why BART didn't come through. I think it's time to revisit that. Palo Alto
6 needs it. If we solve that and then we add within Palo Alto transportation, which several people
7 mentioned, frequent shuttles on frequent routes that you could rely on, no more than the ten-
8 minute walk. I think it would solve so many issues. I think that first comment is sort of my big
9 picture view of where we need to go. I know it'll be expensive, and it'll take a long time, and we
10 can't do it ourselves. We'll probably come back to it when we talk about the T7, the regional
11 leadership. When I was reading through all the different goals, that just seemed like it solved so
12 many of the issues we're trying to solve. If we could just tackle that. It might even allow the
13 high—I mean I don't really care whether we have high speed rail. If we're going to do that, it
14 would also solve—it's going to have to go underground. The last part, just to add on that—sorry,
15 this will be the last comment. When we talk about land use, I also think that would free up all
16 the space that currently is Caltrain, because now we're talking about it all being under. We'll
17 need access and all that, but think of what those areas could be used for, whether it's housing,
18 whether it's bike lanes, whether it's whatever. We're very land constrained in the main corridors.
19 That would also open up that.

20

21 **Co-Chair Garber:** Great, thank you. Annette, and then Shani.

22

23 **Annette Glanckopf:** That's on? Okay, good. Well, I just wanted to say first of all as far as the
24 regional transportation, I go one more. I think we need a whole Bay Area coordinated plan. It's
25 greater than the region. It's ridiculous to have all these different transit agencies and each one
26 doing their own thing and competing for resources. Looking at the Comp Plan itself; however, I
27 think the biggest impact in the next period of time is the high speed rail. We need to really add
28 to that section on the impacts in Palo Alto, because I they're going to be significant.
29 Undergrounding, obviously, is very key. When I look at what I've seen of the Comp Plan and
30 this element, I see a lot of emphasis on commuters and bicyclists. I think that is certainly fine. I
31 support a lot of the policies and programs to get people out of their cars. When I was traveling to
32 San Francisco every day, I would have loved to have some sort of subsidy, and that would have
33 definitely gotten me out of my car. When my employer cut off my parking fees, that got me on
34 the train really fast, and I was converted. It really is a sea change. As far as bikers, I don't think
35 we should have any more emphasis. I agree with what Penny said. Let's just make what—we've
36 already gotten policy and programs, let's make that happen. What I see really missing is more
37 emphasis, a more robust section for our residents, especially the seniors and those that have some
38 sort of mobility problems. This is a group that's not early adopters, so the future is going to be
39 different. I think that all of us are getting used to services on demand, and I think we should
40 have in our Comp Plan some way to support some of these things like Uber or Lyft or other ways
41 that seniors or those with any kind of impairments can get around to their satisfaction. I would
42 support parking fees, either in parking lots or even parking meters. If traffic really gets bad, we
43 could go to the London/Singapore model of charging people to actually move into a certain area
44 and charge them for the trips in. I think incentives will do a lot to get people out of the cars, but
45 I'd like to see more on high speed rail and areas for seniors and those with mobility issues.

46

1 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thanks. Shani, then Jason.

2
3 **Shani Kleinhaus:** Okay. I agree that the shuttle program is not working well. It needs huge
4 reinforcement, and I would like to see a lot more of that. I want to go over a few things that
5 others haven't mentioned. In the PTC document, Policy T-1.1 and T-1.2 should be merged. It's
6 almost the same thing. One of them has programs; the other doesn't. Those could be merged
7 together. Program T1, encourage infill, redevelopment and reuse of vacant or underutilized
8 parcels. I think the time for use of vacant green fields for infill is gone. Now we need every one
9 of those remaining infills for parks in the city, because our population is increasing. The time for
10 looking at every piece of land as infill should be passed; we already got that, or most of it. The
11 next thing I wanted to mention is something that Penny Ellson mentioned. In Policy T2 in the
12 old version was changed in the new version to T-1.5. The language in the previous one says
13 "address" as Penny mentioned rather than "strive to balance." I support adding safety but also
14 health to this policy, or maybe just scratch it altogether because we have to do all these things
15 anyway. In Policy T-1.8, there is a policy and then a PTC report, survey the community
16 regularly to measure the effectiveness of the city's transportation network to make better
17 decisions on transportation issues. I think this is very, very important, but it's a program, not a
18 policy, because they are going to survey and do something. It's a program. The opposite is for
19 T-1.19.7 which is support the development of Santa Clara countywide bicycle system and other
20 regional bicycle plans. That's a policy. Palo Alto is not going to develop these things; that's not
21 a program. Did I have any—I have a lot more, but I think I'll let other people speak.

22
23 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Jason, then Lydia.

24
25 **Jason Titus:** All right. I'll just be real quick. I had heard—one thing I thought that Steve and
26 others said that was really important was about being data driven. The idea of saying that we
27 actually should add to the survey of companies or the registry of companies to actually have
28 some—I would actually argue annual or a biannual process by which we say rather than perhaps
29 actual all employee addresses, at least saying like employee ZIP Codes, and being able to say we
30 will track, have some survey that says employee ZIP Codes and method of transit, and just
31 actually use that as a driver of saying when we look at regional leadership and things like that.
32 Actually knowing where people are coming from and how they commute will tell us if we have a
33 huge portion of San Francisco Caltrain, okay, there's an area where we're doing well. If we have
34 a huge portion that's Morgan Hill and driving, then that might guide us on where should we be
35 focusing on. I feel a lot of times generic transportation solutions end up with empty buses and
36 confusing routes. Whereas, if we could say here's the four hotspots that if we could partner well
37 for transportation, we could help the city. That would be more beneficial.

38
39 **Co-Chair Garber:** Great, thanks. Lydia, then Julia.

40
41 **Lydia Kou:** First, I want to say thanks to Stephen for bringing up that the Comprehensive Plan
42 at this point looks a little bit heavy, leaning towards one group of people and trying to eliminate
43 a method of transportation. It is a Comprehensive Plan, so I think that we should be looking at
44 how to engage and how to encourage everybody to use different modes of transportation.
45 Encouraging and giving more frequency services, education along with enforcement. I think
46 that's one of the most important things, especially since there is—it's a safety matter as well. I

1 think that enforcement is one of the things that we need. Secondly, I did want to say that there's
2 a lot of—this is a safe place to talk, so I just want to bring the elephant from under the table up.
3 There's a lot of talk about GHG; however, you also have to take into consideration that there are
4 services included. Is your level of service going to go down? Is your infrastructure not going to
5 be looked at just because we're trying to have more emphasis on reducing greenhouse gases? I
6 think that that's something that we need to kind of review. Steve also brought up another point
7 that I had, which was in regards to land use. I think transportation is very closely related to land
8 use. There is a whole slew of projects that are in the pipeline that are still going through ARB
9 and PTC before it reaches Council. I just want to kind of say if we don't know what the capacity
10 of what our land use or our zoning for each parcel is here in Palo Alto, how do we even go into a
11 viable or even sensible way of transportation? We're just kind of feeling in the dark over here. I
12 think that having a map stating parcels and what the zoning is currently, and then on top of that
13 let us know what the capacity could be based on that zoning, then we can have also better idea of
14 what we're looking at in terms of transportation. Going to T-13 in the PTC draft about make
15 land use decisions to promote infill, yada, yada, yada. Seventeen years this Comp Plan has been
16 there; 17 years. We have seen the policies being abused. I mean, look at how much density we
17 have now. I mean, this is insanity. I think that this policy, especially T-13 really needs to be
18 better considered and constrained. T-14 in the PTC draft, locate higher density near transit
19 corridors. First and foremost, I didn't see a map in terms of where the transit corridors are. Also,
20 I want to know the definition of transit corridors. Also, this language in this policy, T-14, is very
21 restrictive. It just seems that you're eliminating other locations for consideration for
22 development, especially for housing. I think that's it. Thank you.

23

24 **Co-Chair Garber.** Thanks.

25

26 **Lydia Kou:** Oh, I'm sorry, one more.

27

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

29

30 **Lydia Kou:** Just one more. While we're talking about VMT and LOS, I think that also we need
31 to have ideas of what they actually mean. I mean, you can just kind of throw out all the
32 acronyms and you can tell us what the words actually are for these acronyms, but I want to know
33 what is behind each of them and how do you use it to evaluate the streets, the intersections, etc.
34 Thank you.

35

36 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thanks. Julia, then Mark, and then Len.

37

38 **Julia Moran:** Just in regards to deterrence's from more parking and paid parking, I'm all for
39 that. I just want to make sure that we're very thoughtful with the way that we put together those
40 programs, especially for non-commuters. My two concerns are, one, we are within a region
41 where people go to other cities. If we have paid parking here, does that mean residents just go to
42 Los Altos? That doesn't solve any real environmental issues. Second, we also live in a very
43 wealthy city. I am concerned that the parking lots will be filled with Teslas and Porsches, and
44 those that are socio-economically disadvantaged will then be pushed out of Downtown. I want
45 to make sure that those are thought through with paid parking.

46

1 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Mark, and then Len.

2
3 **Mark Nadim:** Once thing I didn't notice here in the document, not that mention of using
4 technology in transportation. I mean, for example, there are these apps that allow us to know
5 when the bus is coming in and some on-demand transportation. These are things that I didn't
6 notice in these documents. Another thing is the congestion that all the traffic that is coming into
7 Palo Alto. Again, it was mentioned earlier and I want to emphasize on it, is without regional
8 transportation plan we will not be able to resolve the congestion on our streets. I live west of 280
9 and, if I go out of town in the morning, I can't come back home until after 10:30. There is a
10 quarter-mile backup on both exits of 280 on Page Mill. I mean, it's ridiculous to look into this
11 type of congestion. The regional transportation is one thing, then we'll need to have more routes
12 on our shuttles. The shuttle, looking at the map that I saw in the document here, it's just
13 insufficient. I mean, people are not going to walk that much to get to a shuttle that goes maybe
14 every 30 minutes, so we need more frequency and more shuttle coverage. Bicycles is a great
15 idea. The only issue is we have an older generation that are not able to use bicycles for
16 transportation. Lane diet was one of the solutions that was presented some time ago to make
17 drivers get out of their cars. The problem is if we don't provide an alternative for the drivers,
18 they're not going to get out of their cars. I mean, look at the roads that we narrowed down, like
19 Arastradero. The backup's still the same. People don't enjoy sitting in their cars behind traffic
20 lights for several minutes. Also, that generates more greenhouse gases. We need an alternative
21 for transportation narrowing our streets. Then there's the high-density housing that was also one
22 of the solutions that was presented. A lot of people move to Palo Alto not to work in Palo Alto,
23 but to have their kids go to schools in Palo Alto while they work somewhere else. This is really
24 not going to solve the issue. Also, when people want to get married and have a family, they want
25 to have a dog and a cat and a backyard, so that's why a lot of people are moving away from Palo
26 Alto and then they drive, come back to work in Palo Alto. That's what I wanted to say. Thanks.

27
28 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Len, and then we have Adrian, and Doria, and that's it. I've got
29 two comments I'll add at the end, and then Arthur.

30
31 **Len Filppu:** Real quick. Just one point. I did have two, but I'm going to just make one now. I
32 talk to people all over Palo Alto, neighbors and friends. They complaint about traffic; it's traffic,
33 traffic, traffic, traffic. One practical thing, I think, that could be done with the increased
34 enrollment in the schools, that's why I wanted to dig down a little bit deeper on the numbers. It
35 is excellent, the number of people who are biking. I just wonder how many are not biking, how
36 many are being driven. My understanding is there's huge numbers still of traffic, and it's right at
37 the time when people are coming into work and trains are going. There's backup; the frustration
38 gets higher. It might be time for the City to take a look at shuttles or buses, maybe as a joint
39 venture with Palo Alto Unified School District, to see if there are ways to go deeper into the
40 neighborhoods, make it more convenient, more quick; so that if you miss a bus, you don't have to
41 miss your start of school to catch a next one. Just some of those things. Palo Alto Unified might
42 be open to some kind of thing like that. Thank you very much.

43
44 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thanks so much. Adrian, then Doria.

1 **Adrian Fine:** Thanks. I've really appreciated everyone's comments. Just three quick ones of
2 my own. There's a bit of talk about how this plan might be anti-car or against traveling by
3 vehicle. I think maybe we could be a bit more specific in our goals, policies and programs about
4 actually addressing the externalities of these vehicles and single vehicle trips. I think that's
5 actually the bigger issue rather than being against cars in general. In general, I'm not in favor of
6 breaking apart transportation by residents and visitors. Many different people participate and use
7 the city and deserve to. The rub is that residents and visitors have different travel demands and
8 different supplies. I think that's how we actually have to think about these issues. That gets back
9 to Bonnie's point and a few others that these are inherently regional issues. I think we really
10 should consider that. Finally, there's been talk about land use driving transportation decisions.
11 One of the members of the public had a comment on that, warning us against it or warning us
12 against doing it the other way. Maybe Staff could give us a quick primer on that in a future
13 presentation.

14
15 **Co-Chair Garber:** Great, thank you. Doria.

16
17 **Doria Summa:** Sorry (inaudible). I've whittled my list down, but I did want to point out that the
18 new vision statement that Council wrote includes very strong language about protections for
19 residential streets from congestion and that they should be attractive and designed to enhance the
20 quality. It was up there a little while; I won't read the whole thing. I think we need to emphasize
21 that. I don't see—to quote Gil, our sustainability guy, don't build parking capacity. I don't see
22 how that's consistent with some of the current policies the City has, especially the new
23 Downtown residential parking, Downtown North and South. I think that should be maybe
24 looked at. I also wanted to point out that since there's a new goal, T9 about traffic congestion
25 that we need to create some policies under that goal. That just hasn't been done yet. Just really
26 quickly, I think level of service for congestion at intersections is a very important tool. I
27 understand the State's moving to VMT, but I think for our own purposes we should surely retain
28 level of service. It gives us a lot of information. I'm a little concerned about—unless I don't
29 understand it correctly—that the multi-modal level of service as I understand it—if I'm wrong,
30 you can tell me—it'll mix all the uses together. I think they should be pulled out separately, so
31 you can still say overall it's working better for cars, pedestrians and bikes, but the cars maybe are
32 still too high or whatever. Those are a few quick comments. I'll just leave it at that. Oh, I have
33 one question though. If we bring materials for the group that we put at places, shouldn't they be
34 provided for the public also? Just a clarification, I think, would be helpful. Thanks.

35
36 **Co-Chair Garber:** Jeremy.

37
38 **Jeremy Dennis:** Any materials we receive are provided; although, there's a little bit on timing.
39 If we get anything from CAC members before a certain time before our meetings, it's available to
40 people. Hopefully you pick those up. Actually Elaine brought a copy of her own, but we will
41 bring you those. If they come from other sources, they may come at a little different time. Like
42 the matrix, we'll be putting those in. We'll be putting those types of comments into the matrix. It
43 kind of depends which ones you're talking about and when, but even they're all part and available
44 to you.

45

1 **Co-Chair Garber:** Two quick comments from myself. I think we've got everybody. I'll add
2 my two, and then Arthur can close us out. We are, I'm afraid, ten minutes over time here. Is
3 everyone willing to stick around for a few more minutes to talk about subcommittees briefly?
4 You ...

5
6 **Female:** I've got a commitment that I'm (inaudible).
7

8 **Co-Chair Garber:** I would never hold you up, so of course you can be excused. Two
9 comments. One, I think it's clear that there needs to be a program that drives the creation of a
10 data collection, monitoring and reporting organism within the City. That needs to be in the
11 Comp Plan. That's just the program for it; it doesn't address necessarily what all that data is. It's
12 clear that it needs to be funded, supported. My sense is that it's an organism that probably bears
13 some similarity to our audit service that currently exists, just in terms of it being a one-off,
14 separately funded sort of activity. Second of which, my second comment really has to do with
15 the fact that all of the transit organisms rely on a specific tie to land use, and that is the multi-
16 modal center that's at University Avenue and El Camino. That multi-modal center is woefully
17 inadequate to current needs and demands, and it's why the buses stack themselves up along the
18 exit ways on El Camino during the day and during the evening. It is not positioned or anywhere
19 near what is needed for the capacity that is projected for the next 30 years. If there's anything
20 that requires attention, it is that area. As part of the specific plan, that Elaine had also mentioned,
21 it needs to include that as a tie-in. If there is any one thing that would affect service in all parts
22 of our community, it is how that operation works. There's a second piece to that which has to do
23 with actually just safety as well as continuation of the various mode paths, pedestrian, bike,
24 vehicle, bus, train—what have I forgotten—that all come together right there. There is
25 significant infrastructure in terms of storm drain, in terms of high voltage electric and gas, that
26 all comes through there that needs to be coordinated in order to create those improvements.
27 That's something that needs to come into the Comprehensive Plan. Whether it's a part of
28 transportation or the land use, I'm not exactly sure. Maybe parts of it are shared between both.
29 That, in my mind, is a very critical portion that will bear fruit and is important for the entire
30 community. Arthur.

31 **Co-Chair Keller:** Let me make a few comments that are responses to some of the things people
32 said, just to think about things. There was a lot of comments about grouping of the goals in
33 different ways. As far as I understand, that's handed down from the Council. You can think
34 about different ways of grouping them, but essentially it's a design issue. Underneath you're
35 going to have policies and programs. Probably if they're grouped a different way, they're
36 probably the same policies and programs; they'll be just grouped differently. I think we don't
37 really need to spend that much time thinking about redesign. We should spend most of our time
38 thinking about how those policies and programs should be structured. Within this structure, it's
39 not going to change that much with different architecture. The second thing is that we can think
40 about policies and programs that might make sense in different environments. If I lived in
41 Manhattan, I wouldn't have a car. I don't live in Manhattan; I live a few blocks from here. I
42 drive a lot of different places, walk a lot of different places. The notion of what makes sense in
43 terms of decoupling housing from parking in Manhattan or even in San Francisco is different
44 from what makes sense in Palo Alto. After all, even in walkable Downtown Palo Alto, they're
45 talking about wanting permits for people who live there, residential parking permits. Why would
46 they have residential parking permits if we're going to decouple parking? If you decouple

1 parking, they're going to park on the street. Is that fair? There's something broken about that. A
2 regional transit agency sounds like a great idea, but we are a wart on VTA as far as San Jose is
3 concerned. San Jose is the big, 800-pound gorilla for VTA that controls it. We get the crumbs;
4 they get BART. Joe Simitian showed that. If we had a regional transit agency, would we be the
5 wart on San Francisco, Oakland and San Jose? Who knows whether that would mean that we'd
6 get anything anyway. I don't think the regional transportation agency is a solution. It may be
7 better things, but I think that we have to think carefully to make sure that instead of being 6
8 percent of the sales tax revenue for VTA, where we have more say perhaps, where a somewhat
9 smaller percent of the all nine county, and then we have even less say. In terms of VMT versus
10 LOS, VMT vehicle miles traveled is greenhouse gas reduction. That means that you want fewer
11 cars going shorter distances. If they all go in front of my house, I'm going to be pissed. If they
12 all go in front of the street that I want to take to get to my shop or get to my office or get to my
13 school, I'm going to be pissed. LOS talks about congestion. In some sense, people talked about
14 adding things to the traffic congestion. I think there already are policies and programs that are
15 sprinkled throughout, that can be collected into T9. I think initially that's not too hard of an
16 exercise. In terms of covering Caltrain, don't think of it entirely covering. You can't do that.
17 You have to have gaps for safety and for letting exhaust out. Think about lattice cover instead,
18 like lattice cake, in from either side, because they have to have gaps there. Not all of it can be
19 used. We have more leverage in terms of commuters and in terms of trying to get commuters to
20 use public transit, than we have in terms of our residents. In terms of residents, the biggest
21 leverage is in terms of bikes and pedestrians. In terms of our commuters, we have other things
22 we can do to try to promote that. I'm glad to see that Stanford is interested in terms of things
23 with the Stanford Research Park. The data that I've seen is that the Stanford Research Park has
24 the highest drive-alone rate of any business district in Palo Alto. I talked about VMT in terms of
25 congestion. I think that that's a place to go. In terms of multi-level of service, I think this is an
26 experimental thing to think about. I don't see it as a single number. I really see multi-modal
27 level of service as a number for each different mode. Then you put them together and combine
28 them together in terms of trying to balance them. At least you measure what is the mode for
29 bicycles, what is the mode for pedestrians, what is the mode for buses, what is the mode for cars.
30 Then you have a better picture. In any event, we'll be back here in a month to deal with more of
31 this stuff. I'll close that out. The next topic is subcommittee formation.

32

33 **4. Subcommittee Formation (if needed)**

34

35 **Co-Chair Keller:** We can talk about subcommittee formation. Let me kick that off, if I may.

36

37 **Co-Chair Garber:** Sure.

38

39 **Co-Chair Keller:** We talked about the idea of having subcommittees on a per element basis. In
40 particular, I think that there was a separation in terms of—I believe that the Safety Element is
41 being separated from the Natural Environment Element, so that's another one we have to think
42 about. Let's assume that as a given that we have subcommittees for each of the elements of the
43 Comp Plan. Then what we need to think about is the extent to which there are subcommittees
44 for cross-cutting issues, for example, sustainability or S/CAP or that kind of thing as topics that
45 people have talked about. In particular, one comment about sustainability I'll bring up is that the
46 PTC some years ago asked the question, posed the question of whether there should be a

1 sustainability element. The decision was made not to have a sustainability element but instead to
2 have sustainability sprinkled throughout the other elements where they're integrated in and have
3 a section on sustainability where all the policies and programs related to sustainability are
4 collected together and then addressed in one place as sort of a cross-reference. That was what
5 was thought about there. As Dan mentioned earlier, what we will do is we will be circulating out
6 to all the members of the CAC a list of all the subcommittees that have been identified, and then
7 you'll sign up for all the ones that you're interested and then sign up for how much time you
8 have, whether you want to be on three, four, one, two subcommittees. Also, if you don't have
9 time to be on any subcommittees, indicate that because these monthly meetings are all the time
10 they have available, so indicate that on your thing. Dan and I will try to balance out the interests
11 and needs and try to balance to try to achieve some level of participation that's balanced. Then
12 I'll (inaudible) back in.

13
14 **Co-Chair Garber:** Looking for a conversation around two topics. One, what the
15 subcommittees are going to do. We described that as essentially supporting Staff, synthesizing
16 and organizing to bring back an element for discussion to the Committee. Two, suggestions for
17 the subcommittees themselves. Hamilton, then Bonnie. I'm sorry, forgive me for a moment.
18 Jeremy, did you want to add to that?

19
20 **Jeremy Dennis:** Yeah, I just want to make two quick comments, sort of a recommendation I
21 suppose. One, any subcommittee that is formed, it probably would make sense to form it right
22 around the time you're talking about that particular issue, so no forming the noise or the safety
23 one today. There's no point to do that. We do it kind of in conjunction with when we're meeting.
24 Secondly, we think it makes some sense to have the subcommittee do its work between the time
25 the CAC completes its brainstorming, but before it comes back for the Round 2 when you guys
26 actually get to review a draft.

27
28 **Co-Chair Garber:** Yeah. The list is to identify your interest, then we'll put it together.
29 Obviously the Council has an interest in having geographic distribution, and so that's going to be
30 one of the prime criteria for Arthur and I to pay attention to. Bob, you're Number 3. Hamilton,
31 Bonnie and then Bob.

32
33 **Hamilton Hitchings:** I think the subcommittees are a good idea. My only concern is with the
34 land use. If we have a majority of people, I'm sorry, a minority of people who want to be on it, if
35 there's a majority of people on this Committee who want to be on land use, which I think is a
36 reasonable possibility, then I think that's a problem. I think that's the big elephant in the room. I
37 think most of us agree on most things. Only the real major point of contention in the room is
38 probably the level of growth over the next 15 years. I would actually propose, if there is that
39 level of interest that I anticipate there will be in the land use subcommittee, that instead we hold
40 an entire additional group meeting to discuss that. That's my comment.

41
42 **Co-Chair Garber:** That's an excellent point. One thing that I might solicit some more
43 conversation about is there opportunities to create multiple subcommittees that address specific
44 issues of land use, again, so that we can try and distribute the workload some. You're welcome
45 to come back. Let's go to Bonnie, then Bob, and then Steve.

46

1 **Bonnie Packer:** I just have a suggestion. When you do send out the list, if you could identify
2 approximately what time of day these subcommittees would meet and what days would be
3 available. That would help people decide how to manage their time.

4
5 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. The subcommittees themselves will be self-governing. They
6 will have to establish their own chairs, co-chairs, their schedule, where they want to meet and all
7 the rest of that. They'll be working with Staff to work that out. There isn't a prescribed day or
8 whatever. Hillary.

9
10 **Hillary Gitelman:** I just want to interject. We did make the commitment to the Council that the
11 subcommittees would meet in public and you'd post an agenda in advance. We have limited
12 Staff support, so we're not going to be able to staff every one of these committees if there are
13 more than a few of them. We're going to rely on the membership of the subcommittees to help
14 us make sure that the meetings are happening in a public area. We can help arrange facilities,
15 meeting in public, noticed in advance, so anybody who wants to attend can from the public.

16
17 **Co-Chair Garber:** Probably with minutes as well. Thanks, Bonnie. Bob, Steve, and then
18 Shani. Go ahead, Bob.

19
20 **Bob Wenzlau:** One subcommittee I would hope that we would form or that I'd ask that be
21 formed would be one on climate change. The reason I feel that it needs to be formed is not so
22 much—there was some discussion about the passion or the importance of climate change, but it
23 was more that it has this cross-program impact that we need to decide. What I would like to see
24 is the subcommittee could come back with an examination of what other Comp Plans have done
25 on climate. This subcommittee could research the issue of metrics. I kind of view that—the
26 reason I was bringing up the subcommittees is that this process right here is like a mile wide and
27 an inch deep. The subcommittee allows a group to come back to this Committee not so much—I
28 would suggest making the types of recommendations that are a form of advocacy, but more the
29 examination of the experiences and best practice. One ask out of my remarks is that we do form
30 a subcommittee on climate. I did disagree with the notion that these subcommittees should be
31 occurring between the two meetings. This comes back to my own concern which was in the area
32 of the environment. I had had the opportunity to have some discussions with different people in
33 the City to realize that there's a lot of plans and programs that inform the Environmental
34 Element. The notion of jamming perhaps a subcommittee between what I think is a one-month
35 period, if I had it right. Maybe you could clarify. Is that the window that you were thinking this
36 would operate in? I feel like we need more time to be effective.

37
38 **Jeremy Dennis:** The revised schedule that I believe most of you have is at the end of Item 2
39 shows a separation typically lasting a couple to three months between the time that the CAC
40 finishes its brainstorming and the time it comes back for review as a draft.

41
42 **Bob Wenzlau:** My request—we're brainstorming; I don't know the answer. If I were to think of
43 the world I might want it to be would be that if we were to opt to do a subcommittee approach
44 that maybe it might actually get commissioned a little bit earlier, a little bit before the meeting. I
45 feel like when we jump into these topics, like transportation, we don't really—I don't want to say
46 we don't understand it that well, but we don't get a little bit of the bigger picture. It might

1 actually help if the subcommittee were to look at it a little bit and maybe stand and talk to the
2 group for five or ten minutes as to just kind of what their take on this topic is. I think ...
3

4 **Co-Chair Garber:** To become experts that the group could use as resources?
5

6 **Bob Wenzlau:** A little bit, yeah, but without again—with the nuance that they aren't pitching.
7 As an environmental professional, even though I have concerns about the environment, I think I
8 can do the arm's length to try and frame the issue. I feel like our process lacks that. Again, my
9 ask would be, when we form it to—I have two things on the table. One is let's do one on
10 climate, and the other thing is, where we can, kick it off sooner. In particular, climate we should
11 get going sooner than later because it touches every element. I'll stop there. That's my ...
12

13 **Co-Chair Garber:** I will just add; one of the things that the IBRC committee did—Steve, you
14 can maybe help there—is that they had subcommittees that were formed around their goals.
15 Then they ended, and they reformed subcommittees that sort of were more synthesis. That was
16 also a way—it was not the same group of people. That was another way to distribute the load,
17 for instance, that we could utilize in particular for the land use, potentially for transportation as
18 well, which I thought was an interesting strategy. Steve, go.
19

20 **Stephen Levy:** This is for Jeremy and Hillary. I'm now looking at the schedule and, as I read
21 the schedule, we have a joint meeting on the fiscal draft and the EIR draft, both of which I think
22 would be really important for the land use discussion, one day before our first land use meeting.
23 Are we all supposed to go to both meetings? Will there be a summary for those who can't?
24 That's the first question. Then there's a joint meeting on the Housing Element which the Council
25 and the Staff pledged to revisit. I don't see the Housing Element coming back to us even though
26 it is now open for discussion again. That would raise a question of whether there would be a
27 housing subcommittee or an EIR subcommittee. I'm a little confused by the schedule, and it's
28 late at night.
29

30 **Hillary Gitelman:** Thank you for that question. Stephen, we've tried in the schedule to
31 anticipate when would be an appropriate time for the Committee to meet jointly with the Council
32 on these two big issues. One being the draft EIR and the fiscal study that'll be ready in January
33 for public review. We think it'll be an important moment in this Committee's work to meet
34 jointly with the Council and have a presentation on what the preliminary findings are and to start
35 to be able to provide some input on those important analyses. The second, we've tried to
36 anticipate shortly after that where the Committee and the Council can jointly have this discussion
37 about whether we want to reopen the Housing Element that was just adopted at the end of last
38 year. It's really a question that's going to be up to the Council and whether they want to charge
39 the Committee to go off and do some updates. We're going to have to wait and see. Let me just
40 say one more thing with regard to subcommittees. I'm making a plea, I think, for you to keep
41 these within reason. We cannot have just so many committees that we lose track of what we're
42 doing here. We can't offer the kind of support that I think this process needs, particularly if the
43 role of the Committee is to take the ideas that come in from the digital commenter, the two
44 versions we have, the existing Comp Plan and the PTC version, and then the brainstorming work
45 of this Committee and synthesize it all. That's a lot of work, and I think you will, with Staff
46 there to help, turn that into policy and program language. We just cannot support umpteen

1 million of these subcommittees. If you can keep your focus as narrow as possible, I'll reiterate—
2 I hate to disagree with Bob, but I reiterate our suggestion, our strong suggestion is that the
3 committees be formed after the first brainstorming Committee by the full Committee, just so you
4 all have a sense of what all the issues are before the subcommittee is charged with going off and
5 trying to consolidate or coordinate what's being said into a coherent package of policies and
6 programs. Thank you.

7
8 **Co-Chair Garber:** Shani, Don, and then Amy, and then we need to wrap up.

9
10 **Shani Kleinhaus:** I think I generally agree with that, that we need to keep these extra
11 committees that are broad to a small number. I think we might be able to get there if we were
12 allowed to add and suggest policies and programs to existing elements so that if somebody wants
13 to add sustainability or health or other things that are important on a broad spectrum, they can
14 add them to existing elements. I think that the issue of climate change fits well and sustainability
15 already represented. Throughout this plan, I think things that are missing and health and sea
16 level rise. Those are important issues; they're connected to sustainability and to climate change,
17 but I would not necessarily want to see a proliferation of too many committees. Maybe just
18 opening it to adding sustainability proposals into existing elements would be easier.

19
20 **Co-Chair Garber:** Don, and then Amy, and then we need to wrap up.

21
22 **Don McDougall:** What I thought I heard from the Council meeting was when and where
23 appropriate, please feel free to use subcommittees. What I hear us getting into is let's divide up
24 and have subcommittees on every element and every program and every policy and whatever. I
25 see Hillary sitting there –the usual line is "I'm from the government, and I'm here to help." That
26 should scare you. Now, we're saying, "Hillary, we're from the CAC, and we're here to help." I
27 don't see why we can't just as we go—I understand the Chair's interest in making sure that
28 everybody gets a chance to participate or has the obligation to participate, whichever way it may
29 be. You could keep track of that as you go. People's interests over the next 18 months—I think
30 that's what we've got or more than 18 months now—or their availability or whatever may
31 change. I'm not sure that filling out a form now saying, "I want to be on this subcommittee"
32 when I'm not even sure there should be an airport subcommittee, for example.

33
34 **Co-Chair Garber:** Point taken. Part of our interest in just sending out a list for the interests is
35 to see if there are any blank columns in that way. Don, now Amy. Amy, where'd Amy—oh, did
36 you have some comments?

37
38 **Amy Sung:** About this subcommittee, what kind of a format are we going to talk about? Are we
39 going to have a small group to discuss about, for example, the housing and then this group come
40 back and give the entire Committee a presentation? Then are we going to discuss any further?
41 I'm not really clear about what is the role. Would this subcommittee have a really in-depth
42 discussion and then the rest, we'll have a high-level summary? That would be my question.

43
44 **Co-Chair Garber:** Jeremy.

1 **Jeremy Dennis:** the rules were written in a way to allow some flexibility in how they should be
2 constructed and makeup other than being less than a quorum. That's all we really suggested. We
3 do think that structurally what it may look like, the subcommittee does its work and then comes
4 back and makes some sort of presentation in tandem with the draft being presented. They're part
5 of that conversation so people can understand why they made certain decisions that they made
6 available for questions, that kind of thing. Does that answer what ...

7
8 **Co-Chair Garber:** Arthur, and then ...

9
10 **Co-Chair Keller:** One of the purposes of a subcommittee is to synthesize the comments of the
11 Committee and to basically create a coherent presentation of that in terms of a draft, if you will,
12 of the policies and programs and then the goal structure. That is when we get to the action part
13 of our schedule. There's also the potential for that subcommittee to continue its work where
14 there is identified controversy. Part of the purpose of the subcommittee is to see where there is
15 controversy and to identify that and bring it out to the Committee as a whole. Where there's
16 identified controversy, for the subcommittee to coherently write down the pros and cons of the
17 various positions and to tee that up for Council action, Council decision. I think is also a good
18 use of the subcommittee, because they've done the groundwork on that. Proceeding along that
19 makes sense as well. In terms of the cross-cutting committee, I think that in terms of
20 sustainability that one might exist for a longer period of time with sustainability, climate change,
21 sea level rise, sort of all different (inaudible) ball of wax, looking at it from a different point of
22 view. That one might continue over some period of time, but typically a subcommittee for an
23 element is a defined thing. I wouldn't expect that there would be one for just airports. It would
24 be one for transportation as a whole, a subcommittee for transportation as a whole, looking at all
25 the various issues related to transportation and synthesizing that. Thank you.

26
27 **Feedback for Continuous Improvement:**

28
29 **Co-Chair Garber:** Folks, if you have comments to improve the way that we do our work for
30 the continued improvement, please would you please email Jeremy and then we'll hear about it.

31
32 **Jeremy Dennis:** No, we can talk about it right now, Dan, if you want.

33
34 **Future Meetings: October 20, 2015, Location TBD**

35 No discussion.

36
37 **Adjournment**

38 **Co-Chair Garber:** Unless there's anything else, we're adjourned. Thank you.