



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES**

Tuesday, January 26, 2016

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

1 **Call to Order:**

2 **Co-Chair Garber:** Folks, it's a little after 5:30. Let's get started. The others, as they come in,
3 can join us.

4 **Co-Chair Keller:** It's actually—that clock is fast.

5 **Co-Chair Garber:** It's fast. What does your ...

6 **Co-Chair Keller:** My (inaudible) 5:29.

7 **Co-Chair Garber:** All right, it says 5:29 on Arthur's official phone, so we will start in 30 seconds.
8 Let's see what my phone says. All right, it's now 5:30. We will get started.

9 **Oral Communication:**

10 **Co-Chair Garber:** Now would be the time for those that would like to speak on items not on
11 our agenda to speak. Do we have any members of the public that would like to speak? One. If
12 you would use the speaker—excuse me—the microphone over there and introduce yourself. If
13 you haven't already, fill out a speaker card so that we know who you are and we can get you
14 into the minutes.

15 **Eileen McLaughlin:** Sorry, I didn't notice the speaker cards. My name is Eileen McLaughlin.

16 **Co-Chair Garber:** By the way, you'll have three minutes.



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 **Eileen McLaughlin:** Thank you. My name is Eileen McLaughlin, and I'm with the Citizens
2 Committee to Complete the Refuge. I've come tonight because I've become aware of one item
3 that was included under T-1 10.2 which refers to evaluate the feasibility of new transit routes
4 and includes bus rapid transit and a ferry. I'm here to recommend that you remove mention of
5 ferry as an option anywhere in the Plan. I will take you back in time. Palo Alto once had a boat
6 harbor which was dug out of the marsh that was there along the Baylands and no longer has a
7 boat harbor. The reason being that they couldn't keep it dredged. It's just not possible. We
8 have to remember that Palo Alto sits below the neck of Dumbarton Bridge. From a perspective
9 of hydrology, what happens is that below the neck of the Dumbarton Bridge versus above we
10 have less wave action and we have a shallower basin. Sediment tends to stay here. Sediment
11 was a problem for the boat harbor; it will stay a problem for the boat harbor. The other piece is
12 that you don't want to disrupt your marshes, because you want them to be there to protect the
13 treatment plant, to protect the infrastructure. As sea level rises, it's going to mitigate any
14 surges of waves, so you want to retain it. Finally, the Porter-Cologne Act of the '60s established
15 the Bay Conservation and Development Commission, and they would have authority over any
16 development there, along with Clean Water Act actions that would be assigned to the Regional
17 Water Quality Control Board and the Army Corps of Engineers. It's a permit that would go
18 nowhere. For all good reasons, it's important to realize that. There's a possibility of a ferry plan
19 coming out in Redwood City. You might want to look at a transit route that might connect



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 there, if that does come up, because that channel will stay open on Redwood Creek. Thank
2 you.

3 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Are there any other speakers from the public? It looks like we
4 have at least two, three, four. Do we have a fifth? Hillary, if you could tell me who's next, we'll
5 call the next person. Gabriel Lewis followed by Emily Renzel. Gabriel, you'll have three
6 minutes.

7 **Gabriel Lewis:** Thank you. I just wanted to express my concerns about the alternative fuels
8 mentioned on page T-4. My first concern is that alternatives like ethanol are not necessarily
9 more sustainable than gasoline. The economics literature that I've checked shows that by the
10 time one factors in the environmental costs of production, decreased combustion efficiency
11 and increased emissions, these alternatives can be worse than gasoline or only marginally
12 better. Not always, but often enough that I think we should be cautious about them. My
13 second concern is that some ways of subsidizing or promoting alternative fuels such as building
14 fuel stations for public use may be less sustainable than other transportation solutions like
15 public transportation. At worst, by subsidizing alternative fuels I think we might make it easier
16 to drive single-occupant vehicles and thereby subsidize congestion and environmental
17 detriments. I would like to propose at least a more stringent guideline on alternative fuel
18 adoption. I think that Palo Alto should be willing to support an alternative fuel only if (a) we
19 have a strong reason to believe that it will provide a clear and significant net environmental
20 benefit or harm reduction in comparison with standard fuels. By strong reason, I would say



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 preferably a peer-reviewed study that has not been funded by the company that makes the
2 fuel. Second, that benefit should not be less than the environmental benefits that might be
3 achieved by other means at similar expense. Third, the implementation should not encourage
4 single-occupant vehicle use. Thank you.

5 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Emily Renzel to be followed by Jeff Rensch.

6 **Emily Renzel:** Thank you for the opportunity to speak to you tonight. I've heard that some of
7 you have supported a proposed policy, T-1.10.2, to bring a ferry boat to the end of
8 Embarcadero and Policy T-1.11.1 to bring a railroad connection through the Don Edwards
9 National Wildlife Refuge. Those policies are fraught with problems, and I oppose them. Palo
10 Alto once had a yacht harbor, and it required dredging every couple of years because the Bay
11 was so shallow. Many acres of wetlands were filled with dredging spoils to keep the 109
12 berthed boats from sitting on mud. Much of the Bay south of Dumbarton Bridge is only a few
13 feet deep at low tide, definitely not deep enough for the draft of the ferry boat. If a hovercraft
14 is proposed, the noise and speed would definitely be terribly disruptive to wildlife including
15 endangered species which local governments, the State and Federal government have spent
16 decades to restore to the Bay. All of Palo Alto's Baylands are park dedicated. Then there's the
17 problem of parking, because some folks will want to take the ferry in the opposite direction. Do
18 you propose to use the already scarce parking in the Baylands Park as commuter parking?
19 Embarcadero Road east of Bayshore Freeway is designated a scenic route and is, of course, the
20 entrance to our 1,900-acre Baylands Open Space Preserve. It would be a travesty to convert



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 this scenic route into a busy commute arterial. This Saturday a memorial will be held for
2 Congressman Don Edwards who shepherded the San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge
3 legislation through Congress. The refuge has been named in his honor. The proposal to run
4 train tracks and trains through the refuge would be counter to the main purpose of the refuge
5 to protect wildlife and the health of the Bay. Parking at each train terminus would present
6 major problems for protected park, wetlands and wildlife habitat. Please do not support or
7 pursue Policies T-1.11.2 or T-1.11.1 any further. Thank you. I have a few copies ; I didn't quite
8 realize how big a group you are.

9 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you, Emily. Jeff, you're next followed by David Coale.

10 **Jeff Rensch:** I just want to make sure—I'm talking about Agenda Item 2, so this is the right time
11 to talk?

12 **Co-Chair Garber:** Given that's the only thing on our agenda, sure.

13 **Jeff Rensch:** Okay, all right. Dear members of the CAC, my name is Jeff Rensch. I live in Barron
14 Park, south Palo Alto, and I spent quite a number of hours today reviewing the Transportation
15 draft Element. I think it is generally quite good and filled with lots of new ideas and new ways
16 to approach our various challenges moving around this town. I feel there's one big missing
17 piece, though, that makes it seem a bit of a stove pipe document created without fully
18 reflecting on the other Elements despite that claim on page T-2 of connection to other
19 Elements. I feel what is missing is a clear sense of the way a certain type of housing, smallish,
20 dense units or groups of units near transit, can make the whole transit picture better for our



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 community. These units would be designed for people who never or very rarely use a car;
2 seniors who may no longer drive or want to drive, which includes me; millennials who don't
3 even want a car; and members of the working poor—we used to call them middle class—who
4 can't really afford one anyway. Smallish units for these folks will let them live a short distance
5 away from their jobs or from the services they need, and some people who may have been
6 congesting our roads will no longer be doing so. These groups of units will not need the
7 amounts of parking spaces typical for large families and other groups. Having these units
8 makes even a transit-oriented area safer, more walkable and with a much stronger sense of
9 community. The Element offers very tentative references to housing like this in Program
10 T.4.2.1 and in Policy T.9.1, but I had to use a microscope to find these. They are rather
11 misleading because they mention, for instance, mixed use which is kind of not really the issue.
12 They don't say anything about smallish units for 20-somethings for example. I feel the CAC has
13 a really great opportunity to emphasize the significant cross-connection between these two
14 particular Elements and their mutual reinforcing benefits. I personally feel it's very important
15 that you bring this promising approach much more to the forefront in the document. Thank
16 you for listening.

17 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. David, you're our last speaker.

18 **David Coale:** Thank you very much. My name is David Coale. I'm involved with many
19 sustainability issues. Last night there was a really great study session that happened at City
20 Council. I wish all of you could have been there. Dr. Heck from Stanford University came and



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 talked. He's been looking at transportation in Palo Alto. He listed three major things where
2 Palo Alto kind of fell down on transportation; although, we're doing great with a lot of other
3 issues with respect to climate change. The first one was parking. If we charge for parking, his
4 study suggests that we can have a 20 percent mode share shift away from business as usual.
5 That could solve a lot of the congestion and the parking issues Downtown. I think it would be
6 to the best interest to put that up higher level to get things done in terms of it being a very easy
7 thing to do. Mobility as a service was something that he brought up. As we look forward, we
8 see self-driving cars and we see electric cars and we see autonomous vehicles, things like that.
9 If we do any one of those, like if we switch everything over to EVs right away, we solve climate
10 change problems, but we still can't park and we're still stuck in traffic. If we have autonomous
11 driving vehicles, they may be safer, but I don't know that we've actually reduced vehicle miles
12 traveled. When you look forward, it's important to have all of these aspects happen at once.
13 You need the cleaner car that has more than one person in it at a time. Now, we get the double
14 win-win or the triple win-win. This leads me to the next thing he listed, the Bike and Ped Plan.
15 We have a very good Bike and Ped Plan, and we have very good staff in place. Sara Syed has
16 been doing a great job in getting this implemented, but we're not getting there fast enough.
17 We're not going to get our platinum LEED in the timeframe that we wanted, and we're not very
18 well connected to our neighbors. We think just Palo Alto, but actually people commute
19 through Palo Alto. It's very important in my mind that we push harder on this, that we get
20 more good staff and fund it that way. As Pat Burt was saying, you kill three birds with one



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES**

1 stone. He commutes to work. It's faster than taking the car. He gets his exercise, and he feels
2 better when he gets there. To miss a triple win-win and reduce vehicle miles traveled and
3 parking and all the rest of it, I think we need to get some really good staff and keep our good
4 staff in place and get the Bike and Ped Plan implemented, connected and get rid of the hotspots
5 that people can't get around because they feel too unsafe to get around. Thank you so much
6 for your consideration.

7 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. That's our last speaker.

8 **Staff Comments:**

9 **1. Update on January 19, 2016 Joint Council and CAC Meeting**

10 **Co-Chair Garber:** Jeremy's going to have some comments from the staff, and then we're
11 passing the baton over to Co-Chair Arthur who is going to be running the meeting here on out.

12 **Jeremy Dennis:** Thank you very much, and good evening to everyone. I have a variety of odds
13 and ends I wanted just to touch base on. First of all, I wanted to acknowledge that Council
14 Member Greg Schmid is here tonight. We're happy to have you here this evening. There is a
15 number of members of staff who are here, many of which this whole entire endeavor would
16 impossible to do. I wanted to acknowledge them. First, our leader, Hillary Gitelman. Behind
17 me, Elena Lee, Andrew Hill and Robin Ellner. We're also joined by Gil Friend, our Chief
18 Sustainability Officer, and two members of the transportation staff, Jessica Sullivan and Star
19 Lack—Sylvia Star-Lack. I got that wrong. Both Jessica and Sylvia are here to answer any
20 questions we have, because we're having a conversation around transportation and traffic



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 issues. In the at-places memo we gave you, the giant one, there's actually a mistake. We give
2 you two copies of the matrix. Just ignore the one you can't read anyway; it's so tiny. Just
3 ignore that one. The second one is the one we intended. There were some additional items
4 that came in a little late that we weren't able to include in the packet, so they're at places. One
5 of them is actually an analysis done by our friends at the Brown Institute for Media Innovation.
6 They did the work at the matrix and other analyses. They looked at the Transportation Element
7 digital commenter comments and provided their own independent analysis. I hope you do take
8 a look at that. I did briefly want to mention that moving forward we want to be very careful
9 with the online email conversations between subcommittee members. I think during the last
10 go around there was a little bit of email traffic on one of the subcommittees. We just want to
11 make sure that that doesn't occur. We want to make sure that most of the conversations, if not
12 all of them, related to anything we're going to be talking about happen in a public, transparent
13 way. Please limit any conversations you're having, particularly with a group of people online
14 that are part of this body. There was a set of requests related to data at our last transportation
15 meeting. We have not forgotten those. We actually have those, but we wanted to wait on
16 giving them to you for two reasons. One, we wanted to see if there were any additional ones
17 so we could package it altogether. Two, provide some context for the information instead of
18 just giving you a big handout with a lot of numbers on it. If you made data requests in the
19 previous meetings, we have not forgotten. That will be coming. Finally, I wanted to mention
20 that for those of you who attended last Monday's Council meeting—we'll be talking about this



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 in a minute—thank you for coming. We are developing a new schedule per the Council's
2 request. Both Council meetings—we're adding some additional Council meetings on items they
3 want to discuss. It will affect the CAC meetings. That will be finalized at the Council retreat this
4 weekend, I think, Saturday. We hope you can attend. It will affect, though, some upcoming
5 meetings. We've moved out the Community Services discussion to February 8th. That
6 happened actually prior to this, but just wanted to make you aware of that. We're rescheduling
7 the February 22nd housing conversation. That will probably move to March. We're trying to
8 incorporate the request from the Council to talk about this fifth scenario. That will probably
9 happen on that date. I suspect that that housing conversation will actually not be a joint
10 meeting of the CAC, so you'll probably be off the hook for that, but you can come as an
11 individual. Other than that, I have no further comments. Yes, I did forget that. Thank you. I
12 wanted to bring up one final point. Last week the staff were talking about the production of
13 the matrix document. I wanted to check-in with you guys to see about its use. How many of
14 you actually did have a chance to look at it when we sent it out last week and use it? A lot of
15 people did look. It was brought to my attention that, at this point, it's the deliverable we're
16 spending the most time and resources on. If the group continues to see it as a valuable
17 resource, we're happy to continue to produce it. I just wanted you to know that because we're
18 spending so much time on it, it does mean that we're not able to spend as much time on other
19 aspects of this project. I found that to be a very sobering note, and I wanted to share it with



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES**

1 you tonight. I did see a number of hands related to its use, so we'll continue to work with it.

2 Yes, Steve.

3 **Stephen Levy:** Did I hear you say that this Committee is now excluded from the housing
4 discussion with Council? How did that—or did I mishear?

5 **Jeremy Dennis:** No, you did not mishear. It was not really in the purview of the CAC to begin
6 with, because it's a discussion that we're asking the Council on moving housing sites. We
7 realized that it probably was not appropriate to have included the CAC initially.

8 **Stephen Levy:** I, for the record, disagree. The most comments in this room and at Council are
9 about housing. You eloquently in this Element have noted the interrelation between
10 transportation and land use and housing. It's an important, I think Gil would say, climate issue.
11 If they're going to discuss it, we ought to be able to discuss it with them. I just don't
12 understand it.

13 **Jeremy Dennis:** Any other comments? Bonnie.

14 **Bonnie Packer:** Since you mentioned the matrix, you asked us how many of us looked at it.
15 You didn't ask us how many of us thought it was valuable or if we actually read it. I looked at it
16 and I said—I didn't read it. I looked to see what it was about. I said, "This looks like it's
17 interesting for staff to know that they've captured all the comments and that they went
18 somewhere." It's nice to know that you're doing that, but I am concerned that with the limited
19 resources, that a lot of the effort is not really going into writing the Comp Plan. You'll see in
20 comments that we'll make today, there's issues I have with the organization of the draft and all



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 kinds of stuff that had you more time or whoever is actually doing the writing, we would have
2 another kind of document to be reviewing today. I don't know how others feel about the
3 matrix. I don't think it was useful for me to see that staff was doing its work and taking all of
4 our comments. I don't know where the public's comments are. It only reflected the Committee
5 members' comments. That's my two cents for now on the matrix.

6 **Jeremy Dennis:** The matrix, just to reiterate the intention of it. It wasn't intended as a
7 receptacle for public comment. It was only intended as a receptacle for the comments that
8 we've received from the CAC. That's what we've been doing since its inception. Hamilton.

9 **Hamilton Hitchings:** Just to follow onto Bonnie's comments. I think that we want to be very
10 respectful of staff time. The two Elements that I think are really the most interesting and may
11 even have the most churn within this update are the transportation and land use. I think it
12 would also be good to do it for land use because that is where some of the most—we need the
13 most attention and the most thought. We want to make sure we don't miss anything. I would
14 ask you to do it for that. It may mean that staff has to spend more time total, that we have to
15 move things out a little. I think it is important that we don't let things slip through the cracks on
16 either of those two Elements.

17 **Jeremy Dennis:** Shani.

18 **Shani Kleinhaus:** I use the matrix to follow on my own comments and see what the reasoning
19 was to include or not include them and what happened to them. I suppose I can try to follow
20 those without the matrix, and that would put a little more work for me and maybe a little less



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 for you. The other thing is when there are things in the document that I wasn't clear about, I
2 did look at where they came from at the matrix. I found it helpful, but I didn't read all of it, only
3 pieces that I found to be useful.

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

5 **Elaine Uang:** Is this on? On the matrix, I think it's a little bit redundant, and we do have
6 verbatim notes. Just a thought since everything is already captured. I want to go back too to
7 Steve Levy's point about the housing discussion. I do think that a significant portion of the
8 comments that were made to Council the other night from this body included housing. I think
9 it's an important discussion to have jointly. If it was scheduled for February and you're
10 rescheduling it, I would really strongly encourage that we keep that a joint session.

11 **Jeremy Dennis:** Thank you. Bob.

12 **Bob Wenzlau:** I'll just say that it's always a pleasure to agree with Bonnie. I believe that there
13 is a risk of this group suffering from information overload. That's how I personally feel, that the
14 volume of the submittal that we're getting before the meeting is too much. Broadly, I think we
15 just need to trust staff. I would agree that I don't feel enough artistry or effort is going into the
16 actual Comp Plan, and invite that attention. I'm sorry, Ellen, I couldn't let go of it. I do think
17 Steve's point on housing is a relevant one towards the topic of sustainability, so it'd be nice to
18 have it in our purview at least to discuss. Thanks.

19 **Jeremy Dennis:** Thanks. Lisa



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 **Lisa Peschke-Koedt:** Just maybe two action proposals. I agree with all those comments. I
2 would suggest we just do a quick vote how many people actually want to keep the matrix and
3 make you guys do all that work rather than other stuff. Then the action proposal with due
4 deference—I understand it's not our decision—would be maybe a request or recommendation
5 back to City Council, would they be willing to have some joint discussion with us, fully
6 understanding it's the City Council's decision and stuff. It's a City Council decision, but the
7 action might just be would it be appropriate to at least go back and say, "We'd really love a
8 chance to talk with you about housing." They can say no. Sorry. You can say no or there might
9 be a later opportunity once Council has been through it. Maybe we come in in a slightly later
10 stage when they might want some input on certain things or something. That would be a
11 second action proposal.

12 **Jeremy Dennis:** I want to amplify a little bit or clarify what the decision making was behind this.
13 Much of it had to do with the fact that we understood the Council's direction to be to look at
14 the moving of particular sites. If you're familiar with the Draft EIR, it's the sites in Scenarios 3
15 and 4. That was really the basis of the conversation that we were going to have with the
16 Council. It wasn't our intention nor recommendation necessarily to open it up much broader
17 than that. I mean, obviously, it could go there. As we understood it, that wasn't within the
18 purview of the CAC. That was the thinking behind the decision. Very comfortable with what
19 the group wants to do, and we can take that back. Steve.



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES**

1 **Stephen Levy:** I agree, Jeremy, that the original Council decision to relook at the Housing
2 Element was exactly what you said. The Housing Element ends in 2022. We are the Comp Plan
3 Advisory Committee. That goes to 2030. It's not appropriate from my point of view to say that
4 discussion about the relation of housing and land use and transportation stops at 2022, the
5 Housing Element, and there's housing in the Comp Plan.

6 **Jeremy Dennis:** The conversation that we were intending to have with the Council related to
7 (inaudible) on the Housing Element, specifically on the Housing Element. It wasn't a broad
8 discussion on housing related to the CAC. There were going to be a housing conversation more
9 broadly that did involve the CAC, that's in your purview.

10 **Stephen Levy:** I'm sorry, what was that last sentence.

11 **Jeremy Dennis:** The intention was to have a set of conversations with the Council on housing
12 on February 22nd. We've moved that out. There were two components essentially.

13 **Stephen Levy:** I understand.

14 **Jeremy Dennis:** Okay, you got it.

15 **Stephen Levy:** No. I don't understand why it's—how this Committee gets to talk about housing
16 and land use to 2030. We are not restricted to the 2022 Housing Element. Why does that
17 make sense?

18 **Hillary Gitelman:** Steve, maybe I can help out. I mean, certainly we can take back into this
19 discussion with the Council about the schedule the Committee's desire to be in on this
20 conversation. We have always anticipated that when the Committee got around to discussing



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 the Land use and Community Design Element that we would have a discussion about housing
2 and there would be policies and programs within the Land Use Element that supported and
3 expanded upon what's in the Housing Element. You guys are going to get a shot at that.

4 **Lisa Peschcke-Koedt:** That's still the case?

5 **Hillary Gitelman:** That is still the case.

6 **Stephen Levy:** Do we get a chance to discuss it with Council? Maybe Greg can get the other
7 eight folks to come. Greg has been pretty good about ...

8 **Hillary Gitelman:** Steve, that's what I want to take back. We're going to talk about the
9 schedule with the Council on Saturday. We can communicate your interest in being in on a
10 joint meeting about that subject.

11 **Co-Chair Keller:** A couple of things. Firstly, I went over the matrix. It's sort of like—I didn't
12 read every last line, but I did skim much of it. I also looked at my own comments to trace them.
13 I think maybe people looked at their own comments in particular. I noticed that one of the
14 comments from me said, "Is this thing in the Comp Plan?" I noticed that there was something I
15 thought about a long time ago, that I didn't trace. That is Program T-5.7.6 which isn't in the
16 Comp Plan and wasn't in my first pass of things. Therefore, having the matrix allowed me to
17 realize that got dropped on the floor. There is some use to that. With respect to the issue of
18 verbatim minutes, verbatim minutes are not indexed. They're not searchable. They're not a
19 substitute for the matrix from my perspective. I agree with the idea of doing it for the two
20 most detailed and important Elements, in my opinion, the Transportation Element and the Land



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 Use Element. We may not have to do it for all the other ones. I also think it'd be good to
2 include public comments, so that there's tracking for them too. I think that the public does give
3 comments in general. Tracking those would be useful; although, that's more work. Maybe they
4 can just be lumped into some generic source of the comment being the public. That's the first
5 thing. The second thing is I think that the housing sites may go into land use issues. Therefore,
6 to the extent that there's a shifting of housing sites in the Housing Element, which was the
7 thing that was left open in the Housing Element, reconsidering sites, that seems to be a land
8 use discussion broadly. Not necessarily looking at detailed sites, but broadly thinking about
9 where they should be. It seems to me that the policies of where we zone for housing is broadly
10 within the Land Use Element. That's different from the detail of the Housing Element, which
11 has this weird cycle of every eight years. That is somewhat overlapping, so we don't really have
12 leave to really do the whole Housing Element over again. Therefore, to the extent it's in the
13 Land Use Element, I think that's fair. To the extent that it's getting into the nitty-gritty housing
14 policy questions of policies and programs in our Housing Element, I don't think that we want to
15 reopen that until 2022 or a few years before.

16 **Jeremy Dennis:** Thank you, Arthur. I did want to remind everyone public comments do come
17 primarily in the form of the digital commenter. Any other comments we receive in email or
18 electronic form get included in that piece of information. We do capture everything. Annette,
19 did you have a question?



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 **Annette Glanckopf:** I wanted to chime in about this information overload. I actually would
2 prefer one or the other. What would be more useful for me? I couldn't read it. I mean, I did
3 look at my comments, and my comments were slightly off. They weren't accurate, so that was
4 a little bit of a concern. What would really be useful to me is to do things in sequence. Rather
5 than just having all of Arthur's comments and all of Dan's comments and so on, it would be
6 really nice to have them in some sort of order under the policies and programs, then I could
7 actually somehow—and then maybe sort of general comments. Otherwise, I mean, it was—
8 back to Bob's comment about information overload, you have to choose what you're going to
9 analyze and read. I would like it to be in a way that I could actually use it.

10 **Jeremy Dennis:** Thank you, Annette. There were two items that I think—per Lisa's request, I
11 just want to do like a quick straw poll, just get some sense from the group. Continue the matrix
12 for—this one's already been prepared—the land use one and then look at phasing it out for the
13 remainder. What do people think of that? You want to raise your hand if that's okay?
14 Opposed? Got a couple. Looks like the ayes get it. We'll do that from now on. Also per Lisa's
15 request ...

16 **Male:** What was the opposition (inaudible)? What did they vote for? I mean, when opposed.

17 **Jeremy Dennis:** You voted for continuing the matrix for all of the Elements.

18 **Male:** No, just for land use. Just for land use.

19 **Jeremy Dennis:** No, no. The people who voted yes were for land use only. If you voted no, you
20 voted to continue them for all of them. Let's try that again.



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES**

1 **Male:** How about three possibilities?

2 **Co-Chair Keller:** (inaudible) possibilities. Firstly, if you want to have the matrix for land use and
3 nothing else, raise your hand. If you want to have the matrix for everything else including land
4 use, raise your hand. If you want to not have a matrix for land use, raise your hand?

5 **Jeremy Dennis:** Clear as mud, all right.

6 **Co-Chair Keller:** It seems like there's a consensus not to have it for anything other than land
7 use. If you take the first two groups, it's probably a majority.

8 **Jeremy Dennis:** We'll continue it for land use, and we'll come back and have a conversation
9 with you again to see if it continues to be of use and then see where we are in a couple of
10 months. Is that okay? Does that work? The second straw poll is to petition the Council for the
11 CAC's participation in the Housing Element discussion coming up. If you're in favor of that, raise
12 your hand. Anyone opposed to that? Let me reiterate. If you'd like the CAC to be in a joint
13 session with the Council on the Housing Element, raise your hand. As it's in your current
14 schedule. I mean, it's going to be at any time.

15 **Co-Chair Keller:** I realize we're getting on, but the Council wasn't actually able to really
16 deliberate after our comments. It was a very long meeting. We have to be careful about how
17 we do it next time. If we do have a joint meeting, we need to think about how we strategically
18 deal with the comments with more structure so that the Council actually has time after us to
19 deliberate. We have to think about that.



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES**

1 **Lisa Peschke-Koedt:** I agree with you, Arthur. I actually think it would be a request to the
2 Council. Obviously, we don't decide. Would they be willing to have a joint discussion? I'd
3 actually suggest a dedicated meeting just for that, that's interactive rather than—I mean, I think
4 the Council was very kind to us, frankly, listening to us all go on for five minutes and then sit
5 down, and there was no discussion. I'm not sure that was the best use of their time either. I
6 mean, it's totally up to the Council, but an actual discussion meeting on maybe a couple of key
7 points or some things that the Council would like input on, that would be the proposal. As far
8 as date, it depends on what the Council wants. It doesn't have to be February.

9 **Jeremy Dennis:** Annette.

10 **Annette Glanckopf:** I just have a slightly different take on this. Since there was such a long
11 process to develop the Housing Element, I would think it would be necessary to have the
12 Housing Element group or at least a subset of them, since they're the ones that made the
13 original decisions. That might be really complex and lots of people

14 **Jeremy Dennis:** I suspect that that's probably difficult to do at this point, but appreciate the
15 comments. Is there any other comments on this before we try this vote again? We'll do this
16 one more time. Those members who are in favor of a joint session with the CAC on the
17 Housing Element, raise your hands. Those who do not want to see a joint session or are okay
18 with it not happening. We'll go back to the Council and reiterate that there's interest in
19 preserving the Housing Element joint session. Thank you. That's all my comments.

20 [Discussion moved to the Transportation Element.]



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES**

1 **2. Sustainability Committee**

2 [Discussion followed approval of minutes.]

3 **Co-Chair Keller:** We have some discussion about the Sustainability Subcommittee. I will hand
4 that to Jeremy.

5 **Jeremy Dennis:** thank you. It's very brief. We are ramping up to get our first Sustainability
6 Subcommittee meeting—spit that out—going soon. Basically, this was just an opportunity for
7 me to remind you to check your emails. If you're on the committee, I've sent out a poll asking
8 you for dates. We would like to try to get a meeting going in early February at this point. The
9 last time I did it (inaudible) I didn't hear from many people. I'll try a couple different ways to
10 get a hold of you. I have sent out the notice. I will send it out a third time. Just a reminder,
11 check your emails. Check your junk, maybe that's where it's going. I've been utilizing doodle
12 poll, that's the best way to get some idea of people's schedule. I had two other very brief
13 comments. The digital commenter for the Transportation Element will be up tomorrow
14 morning. We'll be pushing that out. Hopefully you can push that out through your own
15 networks. We'll have it up on our website and anticipate bringing back commentary from the
16 public at our next meeting. Finally, staff, particularly the transportation staff and the planning
17 department, is also reviewing the current draft right now. We've received some initial feedback
18 particularly on safe routes to school, but I wasn't able to get it into shape for tonight's meeting.
19 You'll see that coming out over the next couple weeks. We'll be feeding that back into your
20 process. Thank you.



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES**

1 [Discussion moved to future meetings.]

2 **Agenda Items:**

3 **1. Action: Approval of December 15th CAC Action Meeting Minutes**

4 [Discussion followed the Transportation Element.]

5 **Co-Chair Keller:** The next thing on our agenda is I'll entertain a motion to accept the minutes or
6 if there are any edits or comments on it.

7 **Female:** I'll move.

8 **Co-Chair Garber:** Bonnie moves.

9 **Co-Chair Keller:** Motion by Bonnie and second by ...

10 **Female:** I'll (inaudible).

11 **Co-Chair Keller:** Second by Doria. All in favor say aye. Any opposed? Any abstentions? That
12 passes unanimously.

13 [Discussion moved to the Sustainability Committee.]

14 **2. Action: Review of the Draft Transportation Element**

15 [Discussion followed staff comments.]

16 **Co-Chair Keller:** In the remaining not quite 2 1/2 hours, we will be dealing with the Housing—
17 not Housing Element. Freudian slip. We'll be dealing with the Transportation Element. Our
18 process will be that we will do the same thing that we've done in the past. We will start out
19 with the committee going—with the transportation subcommittee going first. Then after the
20 transportation subcommittee, we will then have comments from people who are not on the



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 transportation subcommittee. Each person will have about two minutes. The first person I
2 have on the list is Mark. You want to lead us off? Can you turn on your microphone, please?

3 **Mark Nadim:** I reviewed the draft document; I have a few comments on it. For Policy T-1.5 for
4 PAUSD charging fees for student parking, currently they are charging for student parking at
5 both high schools. What we need is actually to encourage Palo Alto School District to provide
6 buses to transport kids to school, especially in the elementary and middle schools. Policy 1.15,
7 we should add "with enough frequency." That's basically for the buses and providing the bus
8 system. For Policy 1.25, I'm not sure how using taxis and Uber-like services would reduce traffic
9 congestion, because they're going to require four trips to get a person from home to a
10 destination and then back home. They're going to go, pickup the person, take them to the
11 place, and then pick him up, go back and they go back to their own base. For Program 3.1.3, for
12 the one-way streets, I think Homer and Channing are working well as one-way streets. If
13 anything, we should convert more of the Downtown streets into one-way streets, similar to
14 other larger cities like San Francisco and bigger cities. For Policy 4.2, we should study the
15 inclusion of a limit on the number of vehicles owned for each unit of multifamily residential
16 developments. Basically, this limit to be included in the Ts and Cs of the development.
17 Currently, we're seeing that the streets are full of cars because they're allocated one or two
18 parking spaces, and they have more than two cars. As for Goal T-8 for the Palo Alto Airport, I
19 think Palo Alto Airport is an important asset and major infrastructure that should be well
20 maintained and cared for.



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 **Co-Chair Keller:** Perfect timing. I forgot to do the introduction, because we're running a little
2 late. A couple of things we will do at the end. We'll talk about sustainability committee, and at
3 the end we'll also approve the minutes which are in our packet. Just a comment. Firstly, let me
4 clarify what our objective is. First of all, part of our objective today is to identify what we agree
5 with and what we disagree with. To the extent that you disagree with what's in the current
6 draft, say so. To the extent that you agree with what's in the draft, you can say so. Mostly it's
7 important to find out things where there's points of disagreement. If you have organizational
8 changes that you'd like to make, if you think that the order of policies and programs should be
9 different, then you can identify that. If you think that there should be an expansion or
10 contraction of the number of policies and programs, you can say that. However, if you do think
11 that there should be fewer, give an example of one that you'd like to go away. It's easy to say,
12 "Cut taxes," but then you can say, "What else are you not going to pay for?" At the next
13 meeting, our objective is to do more of this, in particular to come up with providing input for
14 the subcommittee of the report that they need to produce which is a report on pros and cons.
15 In the next meeting that we have on this Element, we'll come back and be focusing mostly on
16 where we disagree and the pros and cons of where we disagree, and then use that as an
17 opportunity to give that focus for the Council, so the Council can then make a decision
18 according to those pros and cons and then come back and make the appropriate changes to the
19 Comp Plan. What we're going to do—again we're talking about two minutes or so for each



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES**

1 round. In the second round, we'll have more opportunity to talk because in the first round we
2 did start late because of the longer discussion that we had at the beginning. Anything else?

3 **Co-Chair Garber:** (inaudible)

4 **Co-Chair Keller:** You have a clarifying question? Elaine.

5 **Elaine Uang:** I just wanted to clarify is the Transportation Element coming back to the CAC one
6 more time. I just thought it was going straight to the Council after this meeting.

7 **Co-Chair Keller:** No, we have another meeting of the Transportation Element, to have another
8 action meeting. This is the first of two action meetings.

9 **Elaine Uang:** I do have one question. The transportation subcommittee met. There was a
10 summary put together by staff. I don't see that in the CAC packet. Are we required to just
11 report back and let everyone know what the status of that discussion was?

12 **Jeremy Dennis:** We incorporated that document as Elena sent out to you into the staff report.
13 That is there.

14 **Elaine Uang:** Staff report ...

15 **Stephen Levy:** What (inaudible)?

16 **Elaine Uang:** Yeah.

17 **Jeremy Dennis:** The staff report for this meeting that you received Thursday.

18 **Elaine Uang:** That's what I'm not seeing.

19 **Co-Chair Keller:** We don't have a report; we just have an Element.

20 **Elaine Uang:** Yeah.



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES**

1 **Jeremy Dennis:** No one received a staff report?

2 **Elaine Uang:** Looks like some people did, but I don't think the whole group did. That's why I'm
3 a little confused. I didn't see the document that Elena sent to the subcommittee reflected in
4 the packet that I got.

5 **Jeremy Dennis:** Who received a staff report?

6 **Co-Chair Keller:** I think we received a packet containing the Element, the minutes and some
7 presentations.

8 **Jeremy Dennis:** Hold on just a second. We're checking here to see what happened.

9 **Co-Chair Keller:** Why don't we move ahead while we figure that out. Staff will figure out how
10 to get that to us.

11 **Co-Chair Garber:** You might encourage the subcommittee members to just (inaudible).

12 **Co-Chair Keller:** To the extent that the subcommittee members can, if you can give us some
13 idea of the discussion that happened at the subcommittee meeting, that will be helpful. In
14 particular, if there's any issues of discussion, for example, issues where there's disagreement or
15 things that you came to consensus that you were surprised about, that would be helpful too.
16 The next one on my list is Ellen.

17 **Ellen Uhrbrock:** One of the last things that happened at the City Council meeting last night was
18 Mayor Burt saying that he wanted the transportation in Palo Alto custom to be on his iPhone,
19 an app that would be able to plan any kind of transportation that he wanted within Palo Alto,
20 how it connected with other communities and he could book it, he could research it, he could



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 book it and he could pay for it all through his app. That was a nice ending. I thought about the
2 seniors that have a great transportation problem as number one. Actually, seniors have two
3 magic wands that they can use in Palo Alto with great success. One is the library card and all
4 the e-books. They can expand their whole world by mastering use of the apps and using the
5 library. The other magic wand which is growing of use is the senior Clipper Card. You've got
6 the basis, basically, in order to make an app that is all inclusive. The other comment at the end
7 of the meeting I liked so much was Jim Keene saying that you can set goals and you set projects,
8 but you also can change them within the next ten years. You don't have Minerva springing
9 from Zeus' head with a final app that is perfect. You have things that you start with what
10 you've got and you build from there. I have to add that I was the one that brought up the
11 drone problem at the airport. I will say I like the goal that the staff wrote. One of the things I
12 would like is to expand the services at the airport to not only flight and pilot training, but flight
13 and pilot training for drones.

14 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. The next speaker is Julia.

15 **Julia Moran:** Elena and everyone, thank you so much for all the work you've done on this. I
16 think my main concerns that I've had were really addressed in here. I feel great about the
17 language that you put in. A few things. Like Ellen was saying, I think we've talked a lot about
18 how we want the information consolidated. It sounds like the commuter wallet is the first step
19 in that direction, and that looks great. It says that the app will house information about all
20 transportation modes under one platform. I just want to make sure that included in that is



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 pedestrian, cycling in addition to buses and shuttles and everything else, and also room for
2 flexibility for future technologies. Who know if we'll have ridesharing, self-driving cars in the
3 next 15 years. Going on to page T-11. The street classifications, I think we should change the
4 last sentence on that page to be stronger for cyclists and pedestrians. Right now it says "but
5 must consider the needs and safety of pedestrians." I think it should just be "must make streets
6 safer for vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists." Simplify it and make it stronger. Bicycle parking is
7 referenced in both T-21 and T-47. I'd like to include in that children's bicycle trailers. I think
8 that's important. At the first transportation meeting, Whitney mentioned the baby bullet and
9 how, I think it was San Mateo staggers their train between their two stops. It's somewhat
10 mentioned in here, the possibility of adding the California Ave. train as a staggered, second
11 baby bullet stop, but I don't think it's strong enough. I think the issue that keeps coming back is
12 the Stanford Research Park and single-occupancy vehicle trips there. That seems like it
13 potentially could make a huge difference. Looks like that would be Policy T-1.18.5. I can go
14 back to the rest later.

15 **Co-Chair Keller:** Next is Bonnie.

16 **Bonnie Packer:** Thanks. You're asking for a report of our subcommittee meeting. Frankly, that
17 was the one-page summary, and I didn't memorize it, and I don't have it here. I think what we
18 were asked to do at that meeting was to look at all the minutes and the matrix we had and see
19 if the draft that we were looking at had captured it. We thought it did. Part of the meeting we
20 heard from Jessica about what's going on with the traffic demand association, that whole thing



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 that's going on and all the creative ideas that are going on in the City. We didn't have a long
2 time to discuss a lot of stuff in depth. We mainly said that you've captured it and there's not
3 too many areas of controversy. Since other people are doing it, I have a little thing I'd like to
4 say. The draft that we got this weekend, I thought, just captured all the ideas really well, but I
5 think it would be much stronger if it was organized totally differently. Like, the whole part on
6 traffic congestion which was added at the end of the introduction and also as the last goal, I
7 think that should be right up front and included in everything else that is in the goals. The way
8 the goals could be organized is what do we want and how do we get there. What we want is to
9 reduce greenhouse gases and reduce traffic congestion. To do that, these are the things we
10 need to do. We need to reduce reliance on the single-occupancy vehicles. To do that, we have
11 to provide convenient and adequate transit for people to get to all the places where they want
12 to go. We should list that in our policies, like shopping, public and private schools, childcares,
13 early childcare centers, parks, cultural centers, community centers, libraries. In order to get the
14 transit, we need to rethink our shuttle, so you have all the section about the shuttle. We need
15 to ensure those with special needs can get around. We need to work regionally and coordinate
16 with all the various transit organizations. I didn't know what the ferry was all about; I just
17 thought it was a typo. I didn't know what they were talking about. We have to encourage
18 more transit within the cities that bring the employers to Palo Alto. Can I have a few more
19 minutes, because I had to talk about the committee too?

20 **Co-Chair Keller:** Go take another minute.



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 **Bonnie Packer:** Another minute. All I'm saying is that all the things that are listed in here as
2 policies and programs would come as—because these are the things we need to do to reduce
3 greenhouse gases and to reduce congestion. I have a document that I'll share with you that
4 suggests where all those T-9 programs and policies could be moved to, to be more ... I did
5 more this afternoon; you don't have it. I'll get it to you. That hopefully will help. Thank you for
6 the extra time.

7 **Co-Chair Keller:** The next speaker is Elaine.

8 **Elaine Uang:** I do have the document. I'll just go through the real highlights. I think staff
9 identified four major areas where there was a lot of consensus all the way around, which was
10 exploring the use of technology to solve problems. The committee actually felt like we should
11 more proactively emphasize that. The second was better collaboration or partnerships with
12 schools and private companies. We also felt that that should include private schools and
13 tighter collaboration with other institutions and companies. The third was to expand transit,
14 especially shuttle routes and schedules. That we felt also should include other providers of
15 transit like Google which provides Google buses. The fourth was there was consensus on safe
16 routes not just to schools but to work, to shop. We felt that that should also be inclusive of
17 libraries, community centers, parks, retail centers, childhood centers, etc. There were five
18 areas that staff identified as possible areas of conflict, but we actually ultimately decided that
19 they were all moved to the consensus category. I think a lot of people felt that a regional
20 approach to transportation planning was helpful. We wanted to emphasize more proactive



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 work on the City's part with other regional entities that may not exist and to help facilitate that.
2 A lot of the CAC members wanted to incentivize transit, walking, biking, etc. We felt that, yes, it
3 was important to provide alternatives and options for everyone and not vilifying driving was
4 important and was important to educate and incentivize the sort of non-driving options.
5 Another area of potential conflict was the bike and the master plan, but we kind of ultimately
6 said that it's not supposed to be all about bikes, that it should be all inclusive. We also felt like
7 it should emphasize the fact that bicyclists and pedestrians have different needs that should be
8 addressed. I actually think in going through this draft that's not emphasized enough quite yet in
9 this particular draft. That's my own thought. Back to the committee, the CAC members also
10 felt that tighter parking regulations driving into the City, but we wanted to make sure that that
11 didn't just adversely affect Downtown retail or limit folks who have fewer means, the less
12 wealthy. Ultimately to move this into the consensus category, we should start pilot programs
13 and be accountable for issues that come up. I generally agree. This is just my own thought. I
14 think in reviewing the draft, I think one thing that is overemphasized is the Downtown parking
15 programs when there's actually a lot of parking programs that could be applicable to a lot of
16 other places. This is a Comprehensive Plan. Sorry. Can I just finish up the summary? New
17 issues that were identified by the subcommittee were parking requirements, the number
18 should be aligned with the sustainability goals. Policy was needed to sort of review the airport
19 due to its importance in the region but also, as Ellen mentioned, the drones Metrics are
20 important. Again, we all felt like the data-driven approach was really important. There's a



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 couple of areas that I can go back later and mention where I think that this should be surfaced
2 much more highly. It's important to measure the overall systems, we felt, and optimize the
3 travel transportation system as a whole and not just look at specific numbers locally.

4 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Was there anything you wanted to add about your own
5 comments?

6 **Elaine Uang:** It'd be a lie if I said no. I've already mentioned the Downtown focus. I think the
7 data-driven analysis is really important. I noticed that Bonnie had written a comment. I'm glad
8 that you included the packet from the State about SB 743 which has now been adopted and
9 changed. The CEQA rules are going to shift. I think that we have to be careful about, in the
10 language that we use in the Comp Plan, not to hamstring ourselves into specific metrics, but
11 talk about what our goals are. In a lot of areas, we use the term of level of service when I think
12 what we really mean is like ease of traffic flow. There are many ways to measure that. I think
13 another important thing to consider is it's not just all about flow of cars. I think ultimately the
14 metric should be about flow of people. If you have the same number—if you have 1,000
15 people and we shift from 800 people going by cars and 100 going by bike and 100 going by
16 walking and we ultimately shift that to 500 going by cars, 300 going by bike and 200 going by
17 foot, that's kind of a win. The level of service will probably go down for the cars. It might go up
18 for the bikes, and it might go up for the pedestrians. Overall, I think that's a net system
19 positive. I think we might want to just review the language and align our goals so that we're
20 talking about what we're really after and not constraining the language to specific metrics that



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES**

1 may or may not be used. I think we also need to consider the role, especially in parking
2 minimums. We can't rely on 20th century Institute of Traffic Engineering Standards. I think we
3 really need to think critically about where those standards came from, think about where we're
4 going, what we want to get out of it, and align our Comprehensive Plan to that and not just the
5 sort of status quo. I think things are going to vary across the City. We already know that more
6 people go to certain areas; other people go to other areas. There's different land use patterns.
7 I don't think it's fair to say this parking requirement works—the same parking requirement that
8 works in Charleston Meadows is going to work in Downtown South. Those are two different
9 places. I'll stop there.

10 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. That's the people who attended the committee. We'll also have
11 the other members of the committee. Bob, I think you're next.

12 **Bob Wenzlau:** On the ...

13 **Co-Chair Keller:** Transportation committee.

14 **Bob Wenzlau:** I'm on the sustainability committee, not the transportation (inaudible).

15 **Co-Chair Keller:** You were sort of listed on it. Do you want to go next or do you want to go ...
16 You'll have your—go ahead.

17 **Bob Wenzlau:** I'll be very quick. In terms of taking some of the organization you provided,
18 Arthur, I thought the clarity on agree/disagree and organization was quite helpful. I would urge
19 staff to reduce by 50 percent or 75 percent the narrative in the front of the Transportation
20 Element. I think that people open the Comp Plan to see the goals, policies and programs and



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 not necessarily get a long discourse on Palo Alto and traffic engineering. I find that the maps in
2 this sort of document are not that useful. They're too small. I'll offer some ideas a little bit
3 later tonight. I think the transportation section is emblematic of how we love to put plates and
4 maps in it, but they aren't that effective, I feel, as communication. The other thing in the
5 narrative is I watch policy and intent creeping into the narrative. I really think an eye should be
6 to not put policy and "this is our opinion" in the narrative, because then you get confused
7 between the narrative and the actual goal and Element. I agree with what Elaine said in that
8 the pedestrian and bike transportation should actually be separated into two different titled
9 sections or goals. A cyclist is commuting, and I'm not sure that a pedestrian rises to that same.
10 We tend to blend them into the same bucket. There are a couple of sort of technical details
11 that I would offer. There was a policy, T-2.15, which talked about bicycles and ostensibly the
12 roadways. I would ask that parking be considered as an element that might block or eliminate
13 certain bike transportation. I just bring to your attention anyone who's been to Whole Foods
14 and gone down Channing. It's a one-way street with a bike corridor until you get to Whole
15 Foods. Then all of a sudden, there's cars there. As a cyclist, you're left with no route to get to
16 Whole Foods. The choice and the tension is we want to have car parking or we want to have
17 bikes, somehow I'm trying to find a way that Palo Alto would tip towards bikes as opposed to
18 number of cars parked. I think those are my comments. I guess there'll be a second round, and
19 in the second round I'd like to turn to the airport and talk about some concerns on the airport.
20 Thank you, Arthur.



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Lydia is also on the committee, if you want to speak.

2 **Lydia Kou:** I'm sorry. I didn't attend that meeting.

3 **Co-Chair Keller:** Feel free to talk next. If you want to talk later, I can ...

4 **Lydia Kou:** I'll talk later. Thank you.

5 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Jason.

6 **Jason Titus:** I was very happy that the draft now really incorporates a lot more about the data
7 and trying to be more data driven specifically around T-1.9.1, just saying like we'll actually
8 gather data and then actually the fact that that data should be used. I thought it was great to
9 see T-4.9.1 saying actually that we'll gather data about parking and then we'll actually make it
10 available to people so they can use it to make choices. I think that's actually—it would be really
11 nice if everywhere we say we're going to gather information, we have information about how
12 we'll use it. That usually gets you to choose the right data. Also, it seemed like there was some
13 good incorporation of the things around bike, like specifically saying that some of the areas
14 where I guess is more general safety, but (inaudible) biking on the underpass for Embarcadero
15 needed to become safer. That is something that I've constantly watched my kids almost spill
16 into the road every time we go under that underpass. I think actually lastly I know that there
17 was some edits made around how to improve access to Stanford Shopping Center. I still feel
18 like we should be—I know there was a (inaudible) not extend Alma. It's something that it is so
19 clear as a citizen that these two places don't like each other and don't want you to go between
20 them. Yet, as a person, you actually want to go to those places. Despite the fact that it's



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 Stanford University and the City, it just seems like we have—I'd like to have some language that
2 we're saying it should be possible and not life threatening to go from Palo Alto to Stanford Mall
3 with children and back. It's just so broken. I feel like just saying we should explore stuff to
4 make it better. We should actually spend money and build a bridge or a tunnel or actually
5 better lighting. It's very wrong. That's it.

6 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Now, we'll do our rotation. Hamilton, you're first.

7 **Hamilton Hitchings:** Thank you, Arthur. I think this draft looks good overall. I'm pretty happy
8 with it. I only have one major concern, and that's that this draft has two places where it
9 proposes removing the minimum parking requirement for new development. Specifically,
10 these two places are Program 4.2.1, study the feasibility of reduced parking requirements for
11 development that are well-served transit and demonstrated walking and biking connections
12 including senior development, and Policy T-4.3 which says the City should also consider
13 eliminating minimum parking requirements in transit-served areas. Both, by the way, directly
14 conflict with the policy immediately above it, T-4.2, which states new development projects
15 should not rely on the use of on-street parking to fulfill minimum parking requirements. In the
16 most recent National Citizens Survey, which just came out in January, it said that only 36
17 percent of residents rated the ease of parking good or excellent. It also, by the way, only 31
18 percent of residents rated the traffic flow on major streets as good or excellent. Downtown has
19 an estimated 2,000 parking spot shortfall. I don't think we should consider reducing or
20 eliminating minimum parking requirements until this shortfall has been completely removed. I



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES**

1 actually believe in order to do this we are going to need to add some more parking in addition
2 to all these other things. I think the idea that we don't have to add any more parking spots is
3 optimistic. There is an argument for providing housing where people don't have cars, where
4 you remove the parking requirement. I support that in theory; I just worry about the
5 practicality because we see cheating both with Stanford and with the RPP where people park
6 just beyond the limits. I know that if I was a 21-year-old and my peers, somebody would be
7 cheating and parking their car somewhere and claiming they didn't have one to get into this
8 apartment. I think that the theory is good, but the practice isn't. I'd actually like to see one
9 apartment building with this that we could measure, so we could use it as a test case. I'm still
10 open to it. My big concern is we can't remove the minimum parking requirements while we
11 have such a big traffic problem in the Downtown areas.

12 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Shani. I think you're next, Shani. Yeah.

13 **Co-Chair Garber:** Shani.

14 **Co-Chair Keller:** Shani.

15 **Shani Kleinhaus:** What's that?

16 **Co-Chair Keller:** I'm sorry. I think that Jeremy (inaudible). No, they already went (inaudible).

17 **Jeremy Dennis:** I just want to briefly say had you got the staff report, you would have seen
18 within it actually something that Hamilton is speaking to very directly. We understood that the
19 draft we wrote had inconsistencies related to parking. It is something that we hope that this



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 body has a discussion about over the next two meetings. We saw it and we pointed it out.
2 Thank you for pointing it out.

3 **Shani Kleinhaus:** A couple of things that I wanted to say. I agree with Bob that we need better
4 maps. I agree with Elaine that bikes and pedestrians have different needs. I wanted to add
5 something to the airport, and that is that when they do the master plan to study integration of
6 burrowing owl habitat into the airport. Moffett is doing it right now; they have burrowing owls
7 living at San Jose Airport. It can be compatible with the wildlife hazard management plan. I
8 wrote that in my comment. I do want to talk about—where is that one? The idea of new
9 transit routes especially the ferries. The new transit routes, the way I see it is places that we
10 don't have transit routes yet. That means either the Bay or the Hills. I don't think we need new
11 ones. I think we do need to explore different ways and better ways to use what we have, but I
12 wouldn't go into places that we haven't put transit routes yet to start some new ones. We
13 already have such huge impact of transportation on this Bay area that we don't need new
14 routes. That is both in terms of the ferry and in terms of BART. To get to BART, the only way
15 which is not what we already have, which Caltrain takes you to Millbrae and then you take
16 BART, is to cross the Bay and get to the east side. Unless you want to go to San Jose, which
17 makes no sense. I'm not sure we want to coordinate regional transportation providers
18 including BART to improve connections to the airport in San Francisco. Those two policies on
19 mass transit, T-1.10.2 and T-1.11.1, I think they're not serving us well. They also will eventually
20 get into a nightmare of regulation, so it will be a huge expense and probably will never happen



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 anyway. There's better ways to explore on that. There is a policy, T-43, page 50-43, Policy T-
2 3.3, that really looks at flow more than at neighborhood benefits. While we want to have
3 flows, I'm not sure that we need to eliminate one-way streets. Sometimes they work well,
4 especially if we can combine that with bicycles or more trees. Policy T-3.9, which allows to put
5 new areas of pocket, little trees here and there and things like that, I like that a lot. Thank you,
6 Arthur. Thank you all.

7 **Co-Chair Keller:** Doria.

8 **Doria Summa:** I agree with a lot of the comments that have already been made. I had the
9 exact same concerns about reduced parking scenarios that Hamilton had. I think it's premature
10 when we have already such a deficit and a problem with having enough parking. Let's see. I
11 noticed six places both in the narrative and in the policies—excuse me—itsself where—excuse
12 me—there were statements about neighborhood quality, parking solutions and traffic
13 (inaudible) and parking management, TDM and even the very first vision statement that I think
14 are just inconsistent with the Downtown North and South RPP in all of these areas. I don't need
15 to go into it in detail. In all of those areas, I think that the Downtown RPP does not express the
16 goals or policies in here. I just want to point that out. I wanted to point out on page T-17, level
17 of service measurements, that Council expressly asked to retain level of service as a
18 measurement along with other measurements like VMT. I also think multimodal level of service
19 is very good to measure, but I want to make sure that the auto data can be separated out so we
20 can really get a clear picture of that and not how the intersection is working for everyone. Let's



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 see. T-19, it's a list of chronic problems in residential neighborhoods. I think nonresident
2 parking should be added to that list. The Stanford Research Park, T.1.3, I think there could be
3 much stronger suggestions and more creativity about how the Stanford Research Park as the
4 biggest employment center can reduce their single-occupancy vehicle trips from the existing
5 development and certainly going further with the rest of the development they have. I wonder
6 if we could think of ways to help them explore things like maybe Stanford Research Park needs
7 its own regional private bus system. I just did want to agree with the comments already made
8 about the ferry, that it wouldn't be appropriate in the South Bay. Thanks.

9 **Co-Chair Keller:** Lydia.

10 **Lydia Kou:** I agree with Hamilton and Doria in regards to T-4 policy which eliminates parking or
11 makes parking less for new developments. As it is, it should not be limited and it should not be
12 under-parked. I would say Program T-4.2.3, I would like to see instead of "consider," to use the
13 word "update" parking standards, so that it is action item. Policy T-4.5, I would like to eliminate
14 the word "encourage" and use the word "require" the use of TDM strategies to minimize the
15 need for all day employee parking. Alongside University Avenue, Downtown and California
16 Avenue, I'd like to see that implemented as well as in Stanford Research Park. Policy T-4.10, I
17 would like to add vigorously to protect residential areas from the parking impacts of nearby
18 business. Program T-4.13.1, add Stanford Research Park to the verbiage as Stanford Research
19 Park is a giant contributor to traffic issues in the City. Policy T-4.14, I think that is the one that is
20 about—when I read it, it actually encourages under-parking new developments. I'd like to see



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 that to be either eliminated or reworded. Program T-5.1.1 and T-5.1.2, I do not agree to have
2 safe routes to work, shopping and community services, simply because we already have bicycle
3 boulevards in place for all of these new items. Children, I totally understand. Program T-5.4.2,
4 instead of partnership with community-based educational organizers, I would like that to be
5 replaced with Palo Alto PD. I don't think emphasis is placed on the traffic laws for bicyclists as
6 well as for vehicles when it's coming from a educational group within the community. It needs
7 to be more enforced by Palo Alto Police Department. Policy T-6.5, collaborate where
8 immediately able to coordinate with VTA, SamTrans, Stanford Marguerite for seniors. I'll finish
9 the rest later.

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

11 **Annette Glanckopf:** I think we're getting there and look forward to the Council discussion. I'm
12 still concerned that a number of policies and programs have hefty, ongoing funding
13 implications. Actually there's 32 places that require funding or massive studies. I would like to
14 go back to the discussion about prioritization, high, medium and low. I agree with a lot of the
15 comments that have been made, particularly those by Hamilton and Emily Renzel. I mean, our
16 Baylands are so precious. Shani also said we should not establish any more routes. I'm against
17 the ferry and the rail. I have a lot of other little comments, but I'm concerned in Program T-
18 1.2.1 there is this concept about changing the travel habits. I think that we need to be a lot
19 softer and talk about encouraging residents, visitors, workers to modify their travel habits. I
20 don't think we want to come across as so harsh. It's not going to be possible. There are people



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 that you will be able to incentivize, but not others. We need to realize that carrots work better
2 than sticks. There's a lot of discussion in this, in two places, about the RPP. Forgive me, Jessica,
3 but I think that when we look at other neighborhoods, we should also look at the College
4 Terrace model. That doesn't seem to be included here. There are a couple of places that we
5 talk about coordination of transportation. We always need to coordinate with Marguerite. I
6 love this idea of the TMA looking at all neighborhoods, across the City, Midtown, on Charleston,
7 El Camino and also trying to connect up with some of the employers in town to have a
8 comprehensive program. We get to the rail corridor. I think that grade separation is absolutely
9 critical even if we don't have High Speed Rail. Along with that, I'm a little concerned about the
10 tree canopy. Just a couple of other quick things. Program T-6.4, we talk about volunteers
11 driving people back and forth. I agree with Mark Nadim who said that Uber and Lyft—I mean,
12 that's extra hours. We'd have lots more trips rather than someone just driving. Palo Alto
13 Medical has a really interesting program for time banking of hours. It's called LinkAges. That
14 might be something to do. I just want to say one more thing. I totally support looking at policy
15 for drones at the airport. The airport is incredibly valuable. We're going in that direction, so we
16 need to add that. I think that Elaine mentioned that was there. Other comments, but I'll stop.

17 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Whitney.

18 **Whitney McNair:** Thank you.

19 **Co-Chair Keller:** I think you're done.



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 **Whitney McNair:** Thank you, good night. I wanted to talk about Senate Bill 743. I don't feel
2 that it gets its due course in the Element as it's written. It's only a sidebar in the Element right
3 now. A lot of the discussion still is around level of service. Senate Bill 743 required the State to
4 change how impacts on transportation are evaluated under CEQA, California Environmental
5 Quality Act, removing barriers to infill development, public transportation projects and projects
6 that increase walking and biking. Sort of how it works is that CEQA is a lot of the State's land
7 use legislation, protects natural resources and directs growth to developed areas to reduce
8 greenhouse gas emissions. While much of CEQA does that, its traffic impact analysis does the
9 opposite. In its current form, CEQA looks at transportation from a perspective of how quickly
10 can a car get through an intersection. It doesn't consider how long a distance a car is traveling
11 or the air quality degradation and greenhouse gas emissions that will result from the trip. This
12 law's inconsistency with the State's emphasis on smart and concentrated growth comes from
13 using level of service as a threshold for significant environmental impact. Level of service is an
14 older approach. It's auto focused. It's really sort of that '50s dominated style of development.
15 The State Office of Planning and Research describes in detail the negative greenhouse gas
16 generating effects relative to using LOS as a metric. LOS really doesn't tell you how long
17 somebody's sitting in a car. It's just how long they're sitting at that one intersection. It's not
18 that they've traveled two hours to get to that place. I think the Transportation Element really
19 does need to take into account this new, and the State has just put out this week new
20 standards for vehicle miles traveled. It needs more airtime in this document. It's not included



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 at all. The City will have two years to adopt something, but this Comp Plan is going to last
2 longer than that. I had just one last thing. It has to do with there is a State statute that
3 prohibits TDM mandates to employers. The City should really be working towards the
4 voluntary willingness of employers to do TDM measures, which is what's happening now, I
5 would say, with the Research Park. There are several policies in the Element as written that are
6 in conflict with this law. It's T-1.4 and T-9.3.

7 **Co-Chair Keller:** Adrian.

8 **Adrian Fine:** Thank you. It's great to hear everybody's comments. Just a reminder. In all the
9 Comp Plans I've looked at, they're rarely internally consistent. That's one of the problems of
10 them; that's one of the beauties. I'm glad to say this committee, we're finally getting to the
11 nitty-gritty of that. I want to politely push back on two things I've heard. I actually am for
12 removing parking minimums. There's increasing evidence that elderly and youth don't need
13 them actually. Wouldn't it be terrible if we devote even more precious space to parking and
14 end up not using it? I think that also relates to the issue of Uber and Lyft or other ridesharing
15 services. I recently heard the other day that Uber is booking over \$500 million per year in San
16 Francisco. That is not something we can ignore. Whatever these industries end up being, they
17 are viable ride transportation services. I myself use them. I know lots of friends who use them.
18 I know lots of older people and younger people use them as well. They are viable options. I
19 want to speak to one program, one policy and one goal. Program T-2.4, it's talking about pilot
20 programs particularly around transportation projects. Once again, I'd really encourage the City



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES**

1 to implement a system that enables staff and the public to quickly implement new ideas, run
2 tests around transportation and parking. I think that's really, really important. Policy T-1.4,
3 essentially it's saying don't make traffic worse. I think that's a really, really broad brush to take
4 in a policy. I'm wondering if we can make this more granular. Maybe there's a per
5 neighborhood stat or an area stat. In some areas, maybe traffic could be slightly worse. Finally,
6 Goal T-7, it's all about influencing regional transit and lifting up Palo Alto as a leader in that.
7 There's a lot of talk about coordination, supporting, working with that group, working with this
8 group. Something I often face on the Planning Commission that troubles me is that when
9 you're that vague, those policies can back up anything you want them to. I'm wondering if the
10 City has priorities and how it would like to influence regional transportation programs. Thank
11 you.

12 **Co-Chair Keller:** I think you already talked. The next speaker is Len.

13 **Len Filppu:** Thank you, Arthur. Kudos to the subcommittee. I think that the work shows, and
14 it's moving along well. I'm very pleased to see a few points such as the enhanced shuttle
15 coverage and flexibility. I'm happy to see language about trenching and rail grade separation.
16 There's language addressing greater cooperation between the City and the School District on a
17 variety of issues. My hat's off to you for that. One area that I'd like to raise at this point, and
18 that is in the area of sidewalk widths for pedestrians. I don't want pedestrians to be the
19 forgotten transporting people here. It could either be under Goal T-5 or possibly the bicycling
20 and walking section of Goal T-1. I think we ought to review sidewalk widths with reference to



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 the Grand Boulevard Design Guidelines which will give pedestrians a greater area to walk. It'll
2 be good for pedestrians. It'll be good for bicyclists. It'll be good for trees. It will be good for
3 the way that the City looks. Sidewalk widths with reference to the Grand Boulevard Design
4 Guidelines. Thank you.

5 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you, Len. Next is Stephen.

6 **Stephen Levy:** Five points to maybe easy, three not easy. The document uses the word
7 "modernization and improvement" for Caltrain. I strongly urge we use the word "capacity
8 expansion" and "expansion to frequency" following on what Stefan Heck said. I would
9 encourage the staff to put in some statistics about Caltrain ridership—Arthur had some in his
10 comments—and about the fact that at this point we're 120 percent on the peak hour trains, so
11 expansion is important. I'll come back to this in the Business Element. Two, I offered another
12 piece of language on the connection section, merely saying that housing and land use are
13 perhaps the best policies we have along with TDM to reduce transportation use or location of
14 things. Everybody knows now I urged that we talk about housing as the transportation
15 solution. There are three controversial ones. I agree with Adrian. I think we're talking about a
16 plan for 2030. I was very impressed by Gil earlier and Stefan Heck yesterday. I think there are
17 specific projects in Downtown areas and around Cal. Avenue shopping and services where
18 parking requirements are redundant. They not only use unused space, as Adrian said, but they
19 also add to cost. We're dealing with a cost crisis. I'm happy, as Hamilton said, to consider some
20 pilot projects on that. I think the evidence about seniors and millennials is pretty overwhelming



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 that we can reduce parking. I agree with Whitney and Adrian. I don't like imposing blanket
2 requirements that projects not increase traffic unless we have some evidence that that's
3 possible. I would distinguish dealing with Stanford and the Research Park with big developers
4 that have lots of options. I really can't see constraining that for every development. I don't
5 think they have the options. Finally, there is a sentence in which much of this Element and the
6 other ones are in conflict. In the regional approach, it says "if needed, regional approach is
7 needed to avoid local solutions that simply shift the problem elsewhere or produce unintended
8 effects." I think a lot of the things in this Comp Plan simply push the problems elsewhere.

9 **Co-Chair Keller:** Lisa.

10 **Lisa Peschcke-Koedt:** I actually have eleven, but I'll try and do them quickly. The most
11 important, number one, I totally agree with what Emily and the other speaker said and some of
12 us said. I would not do a ferry, and I would not affect the Baylands. That's one of our treasures.
13 Second one, I think you mentioned as well as the Stanford Research Park. Like a park and ride
14 with a specific private shuttle, I think would make a big difference for that area. The third,
15 again someone else mentioned, I do think we should do the work to prioritize the high,
16 medium, low. There's a lot of good stuff. Overall, I actually think it's a good plan. I mean,
17 there's good stuff in here, but I would make it a high, medium, low explicit about what's most
18 important to folks. Those were the most important. Then Stephen's point about the housing,
19 whether we talk about housing or not, I think using that as part of the transportation strategy.
20 Next level down comments. The public speaker that mentioned ethanol, I agree with that. I'd



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES**

1 suggest we just word that as better or safer, more effective, efficient fuels rather than saying
2 bio-diesel or something, because some are good and some are not good. That's page T-4. Page
3 T-15, I'm not sure the preferred alternative—I think that refers to the growth options we'd talk
4 about, but it just wasn't clear to me. Page T-28 ...

5 **Stephen Levy:** You did it; you brought the room to a (inaudible).

6 **Lisa Peschcke-Koedt:** I'll get out my flashlight. Do I get an extra ten seconds?

7 **Co-Chair Garber:** Yes.

8 **Lisa Peschcke-Koedt:** Thank you. Sorry. Thank you. Page T-28, Policy T.1.4, that talks about
9 how a developer would address parking and such. I think we need to add a program or policy
10 that says including reducing the traffic impact directly, like their own policies. The rest is all
11 offset or fees or something. I think it's just missing. Page T-29, this is T-1.6 and T-1.7. I actually
12 think T-1.7 is redundant, and we could take it out. I would add a program in addition to
13 parking, because T-1.6 is broad, something going to the City vehicles being electric or parking
14 fees reduced for electric vehicles, things like that. Page T-30, that's T-1.7.1. I would add more
15 electric outlets for parking garages, again over time, not immediately. T-32, Policy T-1-21. I
16 would add safe to the idea of doing evening and night services. Agree with that, but safety is
17 such a big consideration then. Page T-51, Goal T-7, I think we're still missing in that regional
18 area something around the Caltrain partnership and the High Speed Rail. Not just in the
19 roadways, I think it needs to be in that regional partnership. That's it. Thank you.

20 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Co-Chair Dan.



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thanks. I'd like to also thank the subcommittee. An incredible amount of
2 work. I'm afraid you've got more to go. I really have only one thing I want to talk about right
3 now, and I will make a bunch of my other comments later. Also, I'm taking my Co-Chair's cue. I
4 think I will do most of my comments in a handout so that you can all read that for the next
5 meeting and respond to it. The one thing I wanted to share with you is a little bit of research I
6 did in the last day or so. I'm afraid this is just pure numbers here. The proposed Element that
7 we've been creating here has the nine goals that the Council has iterated. It now has 123
8 policies and 98 programs in it. Our last Comp Plan had 10 goals, so we're down one. That's a
9 good thing. It had 63 policies, and it had 76 programs. We've doubled the number of policies,
10 and we've added a third to the number of programs. If we look at some other cities that are
11 our same size, Mountain View, 11 goals, 44 policies, no programs; Petaluma, same size, 8 goals,
12 52 policies, 95 programs; Walnut Creek, 13 goals, 42 policies, 114 programs; San Francisco,
13 interesting to note more than ten times the size of our City, 40 goals, 205 policies, no programs.
14 I am not suggesting that we should be limiting ourselves; however, I suspect that it's worth us
15 disciplining ourselves to see if we could possibly even get perhaps 20 percent out of what we've
16 got now. I have gone through this, and I will make some suggestions which I will include in my
17 notes in a couple of days when I can get them out. I do think there is some redundancy. I think
18 there's plenty of opportunities to consolidate things. I think there's opportunities to reorder, as
19 Bonnie has said. I will leave it at that for the moment.



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Firstly, I'd like to thank the subcommittee. I'd like to thank staff
2 for their hard work. I think that an amazing amount of work went into the matrix, I have to say.
3 I hope that the subcommittee found that that was of use. Sounds like you did check that.
4 Thank you all for your comments. I agree with Annette about carrots versus sticks in that we
5 want to focus on carrots and less on sticks. I agree with removing the ferry to Palo Alto. I guess
6 I hadn't noticed that in the thing. I also agree with removing biofuels. In fact, perhaps we
7 should, because our electricity grid is 100 percent renewable or at least 100 percent
8 greenhouse gas free, maybe we should limit our discussions about alternative fuels to
9 electricity. Although the issue is that we might install electric vehicle chargers over time, when
10 you build a building, you need to provide capacity for as much chargers as you will need 50
11 years from now, because the building will last that long. We have to be careful about the order
12 in which we do things as we get to more sustainability in terms of transportation. You think
13 about charging for parking, but be worried about the effect of spillover parking and the effect
14 of that. There's interactions of these things. We need to be careful about the sequencing. I
15 think we need to update the level of service standards. They have worked to some extent, but
16 they also have problems. We do need to add VMT to the mix, but not eliminate level of service
17 standards. The people have spoken and complained about congestion. If we remove level of
18 service, we won't have any tools to deal with congestion. Level of service is effectively the
19 closest proxy we have for congestion. We also need to add multimodal level of service which
20 deals with bicycles and pedestrians and such as well. I am in favor of Dumbarton rail. I think



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 that that's going to reduce congestion to the East Bay. That may be even a faster way to get to
2 San Francisco than taking Caltrain and BART, maybe. Who knows? I'm not sure how often it'll
3 deal with ... In terms of reduced parking, that's also an issue. It's the timing of when we start
4 reducing parking based on—it has to be demonstrated based on reduced demand. Parking
5 should meet demand. That's one of the policies in there that we said was in conflict. It actually
6 says policy should meet demand without using off-street parking. If demand is lower, then you
7 can reduce parking but not until you demonstrate that demand is lower. We have to be careful
8 about building versus use. You build parking for the building, but the uses may change over
9 time. If uses intensify, the parking need may intensify as well, so we have to be careful about
10 that. Two more things. One is in terms of I don't want us to build apps. I want us to have open
11 data standards and provide data to open data standards and let somebody else build the apps.
12 Let somebody else integrate all these kinds of things. There's Google maps and all kinds of
13 thing like that. People should be able to integrate that together, not us. That's not our job.
14 Secondly or finally, I'd like to focus on one thing that Bonnie said. Bonnie said that we have two
15 goals which is reduce greenhouse gases and reduce congestion. In her comments, Bonnie
16 actually said something else which is also important, which is you've got to get to where you
17 want to go. You can reduce greenhouse gases and congestion by going nowhere. Hopefully
18 we're not going nowhere. Since Bonnie is on the subcommittee, I think the subcommittee can
19 take a crack at working with staff to reorganize how things are within the goals. The City
20 Council has given us the goals. We can organize things within the goals and try consolidating



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 things. I think that there is some redundancy; I've mentioned some of it there. Think about the
2 better ordering and better structure. I'm not as worried about how many goals there are. In
3 some sense goals are intent to what we want to accomplish or what our policies are.
4 Therefore, if we need to specify those policies, that is, programs actually are really—if there's a
5 proper distinction between programs and policies, programs are the ones that actually involve
6 fiscal obligation of money, fiscal impact on the budget of the City. A program should be a
7 measurable thing, have a defined time and a budget associated with it, start and end in a
8 budget. Policies are just a statement of intent; therefore, I'm not as worried about how many
9 policies we're going to have. I'm more concerned with how many programs we have. I believe
10 we were told—my understanding is the mixture on the City Council, but I think we should focus
11 to some extent on how much things cost and not simply put things in there because we want
12 them, but think about how we're going to pay for things to some extent and be realistic to the
13 extent that we can. There's a point that we're being aspirational, but you can't put cars in
14 aspirational parking spaces. You can't deal with aspirational reduction of cars; they don't
15 disappear because they're aspirational. We need to be a little careful about that. Thank you.
16 Dan will keep track of people. We'll then go through another round. Once again, a reminder,
17 it's been a while. Put your card on end. I guess we'll continue with two minutes continuing,
18 and we'll have as many as we can. We'll go for an hour, and then we'll deal with the other two
19 topics on our list. Thank you. Hamilton, then Bonnie, then Elaine.



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 **Hamilton Hitchings:** I wanted to start by responding to Adrian, then I'm going to go into more
2 detail. I actually agree we don't want to overbuild parking. We don't want excess parking spots
3 beyond peak demand. The issue we have right now is that just in Downtown we're 2,000
4 parking spaces short. Actually the problem has been getting worse. I feel like we have a lot of
5 makeup to do to break even. However, one of the things mentioned in the last City Council
6 meeting was this concept of adaptivity. I think we want to mitigate the issues we're having. In
7 the ideal Comp Plan it would be adaptive. Once we had successfully mitigated those, we could
8 significantly loosen it up. We don't want to overbuild parking, but right now we have a major
9 deficit. I have a few cleanup points. On Policy T-4.1, we want to change "limit under-parked
10 development" to "do not allow under-parked development." On T-4.1.1, it says "construct new
11 parking or use existing parking more efficiently." Since we're 2,000 parking spaces under just in
12 Downtown, we want an "and" there for the short term. We need to both build more parking
13 and use it more efficiently until we close that gap. Policy T-1.17, I'd like to see us provide public
14 transportation subsidies for low-income retail workers. Also, on Policy T-1.25, the fuel efficient
15 taxi, if we're forward-looking, we also want to add "and autonomous taxis." There's actually a
16 company in Stanford right now that's working on this. We want to have it be forward-looking,
17 because this is the first step or one of the steps of mobility as a service. I also agree with
18 Arthur; we still need to maintain level of service while adding vehicle miles traveled. I agree
19 with Lydia that we want to move on T-4.3 from "encourage" to "requiring" TDM programs for
20 companies whenever possible. Those are my comments. Thank you.



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 **Co-Chair Keller:** Bonnie. If you can make your name tag so we can read it, that would make it
2 easier for us.

3 **Co-Chair Garber:** Bonnie, then Elaine, then Rob. Bob I mean.

4 **Bonnie Packer:** Thanks, Hamilton. First, I thought I was going to really disagree with you, but I
5 guess we're not that far apart after all on the parking issue. The thing is, the City's thinking
6 about studying whether there should be a fee for parking. That may end up reducing people's
7 use of their cars. I think the problem is that we're putting the cart before the horse. I think
8 what we really need to do is provide more transit options so that people don't have to go
9 Downtown and park and make sure that there's other ways for them to get there. That will
10 limit demand. We have to be working on the transit issue and the shuttle and improving the
11 routes for the shuttle; that might really reduce the demand for parking. My vision is, if we ever
12 get this transit thing going and the parking demand at least in Downtown has been reduced
13 significantly, then we can turn the parking garages or tear them down and build affordable
14 housing which doesn't need so much parking. We have data about that. That could be a
15 phased-in transit, reduced parking fees, reduced need, and then we have housing where you
16 used to have parking.

17 **Co-Chair Keller;** Thank you. I just want to point out that this is a good way to engage each
18 other in this and respond to other people's comments and talk about where you agree and
19 disagree. I'm glad that Bonnie talked about tearing down the garages when we don't need
20 them and not having the homeless parking their cars. Who's next?



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 **Co-Chair Garber:** Sorry. Elaine, Bob and then Julia.

2 **Co-Chair Keller:** Bob and then Julia.

3 **Co-Chair Garber:** (inaudible)

4 **Co-Chair Keller:** Elaine, then Bob, then Julia.

5 **Elaine Uang:** I'm going to continue the parking debate. I think that this is where data-driven
6 analysis meets sustainability goals. I think this is the perfect example of where we can really
7 align some things. I just want to step back and frame the issue. I think the problem with
8 Downtown specifically is it's kind of an allocation problem. I don't think it's necessarily that
9 we're—it's both an allocation issue and an incentives issue. I think, Hamilton, you mentioned
10 certain tools. I think the problem is that the best tools to ensure that we don't have over-
11 parking is actually parking pricing or some mechanism to discourage that. If we just
12 immediately set parking minimums and allow all those parking spaces to be free and you don't
13 charge for it, guess what? Everyone's going to fill up those parking spaces. I think we have to
14 think carefully in future. I think one of the concepts that didn't get put in—I think it got put in
15 for housing, but I think it actually works from a commercial standpoint—is unbundling parking
16 from commercial buildings. If you have excess capacity in one building, you can offer it to
17 another building. It's not just dedicated to that one building. That's a way to better allocate
18 and even out the supply. A lot of the older commercial buildings in Downtown and Cal. Ave.,
19 they don't have anything. That's in part causing the problem. The new buildings that come
20 online—those older buildings don't have access to those parking spaces. They get free parking,



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES**

1 so they all drive. I think it's a matter of really evaluating the tools, the right tools, for managing
2 the parking. I don't think parking minimums by themselves really do anything except
3 encourage parking, especially if those parking spaces become free. To Bonnie's point, I think
4 there is a lot of evidence in a lot of cities if you co-locate commercial properties next to transit,
5 you are going to get a much better or lower SOV rate, because that's just closer to the
6 alternatives. I think we really have to think carefully about that. I think there is pretty good
7 evidence that parking requirements are variable depending on where the location of those
8 structures are. There's the commercial side, and there's also the residential side. We know
9 that certain residential uses such as senior housing—I think Palo Alto Housing Corporation has
10 the data. Senior housing is—I mean, the utilization for parking is .5 cars per unit. I think we
11 have to really calibrate and be data driven about the parking requirements. The way that
12 Policies and Programs T-4.2, that whole suite, is written, I think there's some tweaking we can
13 do, but I think we have to be nuanced about looking at parking requirements.

14 **Co-Chair Keller:** Bob, then Julia, then Doria.

15 **Bob Wenzlau:** I'm going to shift gears for a moment. This is something that I've wanted to
16 actually bring out maybe outside. There's an exhibit that you were given called Design of Palo
17 Alto Comp Plan for the Citizen User. What I wanted to do was—is it okay to chat about this
18 now? Okay. I've just got probably 90 seconds left. My interest that I wanted to bring forward
19 was looking at the design of the Comprehensive Plan so that the citizens, so that we as users
20 would actually find the document useful. Right now I view the Comp Plan as kind of like an



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 insider's document. There's four exhibits. Sadly, I'm going to run out of time before I really can
2 develop this. I've looked, like Dan, at many Comprehensive Plans and have discovered broadly
3 that I think the Santa Cruz Comprehensive Plan from a standpoint of usability which says I come
4 to the document. I can go in there and use it. It's helpful, is a model view, but Palo Alto can do
5 better. If you turn to the second page, it's basically a wire frame or a mock-up of the webpage.
6 One of the things I wanted to introduce was My Palo Alto Comprehensive Plan. I live in a
7 neighborhood; I live in Crescent Park. When I come, I'm interested in my neighborhood. It
8 brings in tags. I'm interested in sustainability; I'm interested in seniors. Basically I can see my
9 Comprehensive Plan; I can see how this document touches me. Basically, you touch and you
10 see the components that are relevant to that. It uses indexing and tagging. If there's a
11 particular subject area that you're interested in, you can search it by keyword. It uses modern
12 technology like cloud, cloud-based tagging and keyword search. My view of the mapping is
13 there's wonderful tools for mapping. We come into mapping building the map that we're
14 interested in. Perhaps I want to see a layer of housing, libraries and traffic. I can see what I
15 want to see and not see it spoon fed. There's the ability to basically get to the document itself
16 and ask questions. This is basically a mock-up of perhaps a representative homepage where we
17 would come to the document. As you look at the Santa Cruz, these are the next two. Sadly, it
18 got printed in portrait mode, and the whole intent was frankly to show that it's in landscape
19 mode. It orients the way your screen does. The layout is such that rather than our Comp Plan
20 is in portrait, where most of the time people are looking at in the shape of their screen, that



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 you're able through hyperlinks to get through the document. One PDF operates as the entire
2 document. By comparison, Palo Alto's is eight or nine different downloads that's shown on that
3 page. The other thing built into the Santa Cruz document is navigation. It's very easy to roll up
4 to the homepage, left and right. If you look at the model that I'm inviting, there's a homepage
5 that's web-based, that kind of gives an experience. When you do download the document, the
6 actual document itself is in a landscape PDF mode. My focus is that if we're doing all this work,
7 we should also be looking at the design of the document. I was troubled by some commentary
8 with staff that there really isn't much they can do with the shape of the document. I hope as a
9 group sometime we can have a discussion about let's make the document usable as well as
10 brilliant. Thank you.

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

12 **Bob Wenzlau:** One other thing I just wanted to add, just for orientation, and then you can take
13 my minutes later. There's a final page that I created at the Summit. Basically it's a little—I just
14 wanted to let you know what it was. It's a flow of how you would basically see this experience
15 working from how you would get to maps, what the actual detail might look like on the web,
16 how tagging works. There's a lot of reference plans that are called out. Basically, I'm trying to
17 create an environment that allows someone that's smart to basically be empowered by the
18 document. I think that we have a lot of opportunity in Palo Alto to generate sort of a modern
19 Comp Plan. Thanks again. Sorry for that overage. Bye.



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES**

1 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. I'll just take the privilege of the Chair to interject a comment.
2 There was a suggestion I think I will participate in that some time ago that we might have
3 multiple representations of the Comp Plan. One might be a document that you print and put in
4 a binder, and one would be an online version. They need not have the same formatting.
5 Perhaps the kind of suggestions that Bob has would be useful for the online version which
6 would allow you to sort of hyperlink through and think of cross-references and stuff like that. I
7 just wanted to add that as a response. Who's next?

8 **Co-Chair Garber:** Julia, Doria, Steve.

9 **Co-Chair Keller:** Julia, Doria and Steve.

10 **Julia Moran:** Just a few more things. On page T-51, the regional leadership section, one thing
11 we talked about in the subcommittee that I didn't see reflected here was when working
12 regionally, do it in a strategic manner, partnering with the first and last mile destinations. It
13 looks like we have data about where people are coming from and where they're going. It
14 doesn't make sense to work with everyone. Ellen, I was interested in your opinion. There's
15 several places within the document talking about communication and information. I know
16 you've mentioned on other things that the apps and if everything is high tech, it can be hard for
17 seniors. Should we be adding more language or should we be adding programs that also
18 have—I don't know if it's paper maps or information or a lower tech way of finding out so that
19 all of our citizens know what is happening within transportation. Just a nitpicky thing in Policy
20 T-9.5. There's a couple of programs under it. It's childcare facilities near employment centers.



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 There's a couple of programs under it that don't apply to that policy. I think they just need to
2 be moved. The first program is about parking management and strategies. T-9.5.1, I think it's
3 redundant with Program T-4.4.3 which says pretty much the exact same thing. I think one
4 program we could potentially take out.

5 **Co-Chair Keller:** Next is Doria, and then Steve.

6 **Doria Summa:** Back to the parking thing. I want to agree with Co-Chair Keller that you can't
7 park a car in an aspirational parking spot. Though, we want to move towards having less
8 parking and less driving, I think we all agree about that. These spaces can be converted later
9 into housing. At the present time, we do need a place to put cars. I wanted to add just about
10 self-driving cars. I was listening to something on NPR last week with experts who really don't
11 expect there to be anything realistic for 25 years with self-driving cars. We're a long way out,
12 so to depend on that for any kind of present solution, I think, is misguided. I wanted to add
13 something that's at the end. About Policy T-9.2, favor new development that is within 10-
14 minute walk of transit stop or station and provides walking, etc., etc., I think that should say
15 "favor new residential development with retail that supports residential" to be quite specific
16 that what we want is residential that's really close to transit. I think that should just be added.
17 Let me just look really quick. It's not a very big thing, but I do agree that the truck route thing
18 should be looked at and improved. There are specific places that don't work very well. As far
19 as the airport goes, I think the language there is a little bit contradictory. It says don't allow any
20 intensification, and then it says allow minor intensification basically. I think that's unclear.



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 Given its sensitive location in the protected Baylands and the fragile ecosystem, I don't think we
2 want intensification of use there at all, but I do like the idea of figuring the drone thing out.
3 That's it.

4 **Co-Chair Keller:** Steve, then Whitney, then Adrian.

5 **Steve Levy:** The Comp Plan is our vision and policies for 2030, not 2016. I'd like you to make
6 space for Stefan Heck to come and reduce his presentation to 15 minutes. I think there's been
7 a lot of misquoting of what he actually said, and the committee should hear that. For parking, I
8 think future parking by 2030, by 2025 will be much less. This is a Comp Plan; I want our Comp
9 Plan to reflect that we're going in a direction where less parking will be needed and the cost
10 and space associated with that parking can be reduced. If it can be reduced in 2016 or 2017,
11 that's for the Council. That's not for the Comp Plan. Then I have two large gripes. One is that
12 the regional cooperation says "a regional approach is needed to avoid local solutions that
13 simply push the problems elsewhere." I think we're on the verge of that with restrictions,
14 mandated parking, aspirational. Asking people that they can't develop without reducing traffic,
15 that's as aspirational as anything else. I don't see how that applies to a small development. All
16 I see that doing is pushing stuff on our neighboring cities which are no better able than we are
17 to handle the problems. That's a real conflict between doing what you think helps you right
18 here and not pushing the problems off on others. The last piece. I agree with Arthur; the costs
19 matter. I favor everybody paying. I favor people who use their garage for some other space
20 paying for their parking space in front of the house. I favor Palo Alto if it wants grade



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 separation, chipping in to pay for it and not stopping Caltrain expansion because we're asking
2 somebody else to pay for it. I resent all these policies that don't ask us to pay for it, but ask
3 new businesses and new households and new, but never us to pay for it. That's a little over
4 much, but you got my point.

5 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you, Steve. I'm just going to ask Hillary to weigh in. Is this Comp Plan
6 supposed to be what's in effect in 2030 or what's in effect over the next 15 years?

7 **Hillary Gitelman:** Funny you should ask that. I was just thinking about—we're seeing this real
8 divide on parking minimums and this parking issue come up from committee members. Some
9 thinking, "You've got to keep the parking minimums the way they are. We already have
10 deficiencies. We can't make that worse." Some thinking, "You've got to start reducing parking
11 in order to start reducing demand." It's like a chicken and egg thing. I think one of the ways to
12 address that divide—maybe the subcommittee can help do this—is introduce time into the
13 equation. We are going to have to create an adaptive plan where today, if there's not enough
14 park, we need parking. In the future, if we're trying to get to a society that has a lesser parking
15 demand and less reliance on the private automobile, that maybe in the future we'll be able to
16 have less. It's going to take some careful crafting. Hopefully the committee will help staff do
17 that.

18 **Steve Levy:** Can I follow up on that?

19 **Co-Chair Keller:** I think you can ask to be added to the end of the list. We have a long list of
20 people. Whitney, then Adrian, and Annette.



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 **Whitney McNair:** Thank you. I just wanted to add some points about the Stanford Research
2 Park. There's been a lot of discussion about that tonight, the Research Park and a TDM effort
3 that's going on there. The Research Park is unique in that it's really comprised of about 150
4 employers, so its challenges are similar to those in Downtown Palo Alto. It doesn't have the
5 advantage of a convenient access to a Caltrain station or a baby bullet stop. The employers are
6 inherently motivated to offer alternative means to get to their business, because it's taking a
7 toll on everybody, the employees and the employers alike. What's been happening is the
8 largest employers have formed a Stanford Research Park TDM working group in order to
9 strategize and implement what are anticipated to be the most effective TDM programs on a
10 Research Park-wide basis. We are funding a survey this spring to look at what the mode share
11 is out there. TDM measures are very unique to a particular area. You can't just lift those that
12 work well in the Downtown and put it in the Research Park, nor can you lift what's at Stanford
13 and put it in the Research Park. You have to look at where people are commuting from, what
14 the demographic is, what the number of businesses is. You really need to create a
15 comprehensive package of things that needs to be tested and analyzed over time. It is a very
16 unique thing. You can't just mandate it and say, "Pick this, this and this and you'll get a SOV
17 rate reduction of Y." Anyway, I just wanted to put that out there, that there is a study, there is
18 some TDM efforts going on in the Research Park. Just a couple of quick little clarifications. I
19 didn't see any mention of High Speed Rail, really only an incidental mention within the Element.
20 There's really no mention of Cal. Ave. improvements or service. Program T-2.16.2 talks about



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 Sand Hill Road to El Camino. That's already a road, so I just think that's a holdover from the old
2 Element. Goal T-6 is about special needs. It really only focuses on para-transit, and it really
3 ignores pedestrian facilities for this group, such as improved signal timing and ramps and
4 sidewalk gaps and repairs. I think that's just a missing piece the subgroup can take a look at.
5 Also, looking at support for HOV lanes on expressways and improvements in coordination with
6 County Roads and Airports could be included in regional leadership. One last one is just Policy, I
7 think it's T-7.10. It withholds support for Dumbarton rail across the Bay as one of the things it's
8 saying there isn't support for. It seems like you could consider support with a condition of no
9 adverse environmental. It's just a wholesale no support.

10 **Co-Chair Keller:** Adrian, and then Annette, and then Co-Chair Dan.

11 **Adrian Fine:** Thank you. I hadn't thought of this before, but I completely agree with Bob and
12 Arthur about an interactive plan. That would be so refreshing, and I think it would be helpful to
13 committees, boards and staff as well. It'd be a really nice way to put us a parallel plan for the
14 City. I want to echo what Steve was saying about us paying for various programs. Frankly,
15 we've all been freeloaders for decades here in this City. At the same time, there's a converse of
16 that, that Palo Alto should fight for its fair share of funds from programs such as VTA, MTC and
17 other groups. That's another part of funding. Thank you, Hillary, for suggesting that we adopt
18 some time as a protocol to change some of our development practices. I think that's a good
19 suggestion for us as a committee. A few specific programs to go over. Program T-1.2.2, it's
20 talking about a annual TDM program for the City. A lot of projects that go through the City are



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 required to have a TDM onsite, and perhaps those could be incorporated into the City's annual
2 review. Policy T-1.3 is asking the City to coordinate with Stanford on transportation measures,
3 but it specifically calls out the Stanford Research Park. I'm wondering if that shouldn't be across
4 the whole university. Stanford has a really laudable transportation demand program already.
5 Program T-1.18.1 and 18.3 is about improving Palo Alto station. I'm wondering if there's
6 anything beyond circulation and transportation options there. Perhaps the station could be
7 improved with transit-oriented development as well. Finally, Policy T-5.2 is about Vision Zero
8 where we hope to have no pedestrian deaths. That seems more of a program to me, less of a
9 policy. I thought it actually needed some policies beneath it. Although, Dan, I'm very thankful
10 for you for actually going up and counting up those numbers. That's really interesting to see.
11 Thank you.

12 **Co-Chair Keller:** Annette, and then Chair Dan.

13 **Annette Glanckopf:** I'd like to get back to parking. Seems like a lot of the emphasis is on the
14 Downtown and really not south Palo Alto and more for employers and less for residents. The
15 other element of parking that we don't really think about is sort of tied to zoning in that the
16 more density we have, whether we have second units or whatever, that's more cars. If you
17 look at it currently, no matter what we want, maybe the millennials don't live in south Palo Alto
18 or in the suburbs, but in my neighborhood some families have five cars. Let me just finish this
19 point. This is forcing more and more cars—they don't even park in their driveway. Forget
20 about the garage; they don't even park in their driveway. There's really not a way to regulate



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 this with residents having a lot of cars. Let me just finish one other point. There are two places
2 in the Comp Plan that should not be in there in my opinion, because it relates to zoning, T-4.2.2,
3 consider changes to the Zoning Ordinance, and there's also something about FAR for
4 basements. I think that should be reserved for either the land use or some other part, but not
5 in the Comp Plan.

6 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Actually you got shortchanged on your time. If you'd ...

7 **Annette Glanckopf:** Okay. I have one more point. I mean, I could go on about parking. I like
8 the idea of a timeline, and I also like what Arthur said. The parking for what we really have is a
9 demand. Right now, I do agree that Neilson Buchanan has really done some great work, along
10 with Jessica, about the demand for parking Downtown. The neighborhoods are really getting
11 crowded. In Midtown, the commercial development is moving out into the neighborhoods, and
12 that is really a concern as well as a lot of these households which are now turning over to
13 businesses. People have their business in their homes. That really forces more cars out into
14 the neighborhood. My last point that I really wanted to make is the low tech point. Although, I
15 totally encourage giving seniors lots of options, I just worry a lot about producing documents
16 that are never going to be read and never going to be used. I just caution that. I spent years—I
17 mean, a lot of people in town don't even know that we have a Council with nine people on it, so
18 much more than that. We just have to have a caution about what we produce may never get
19 used.

20 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Co-Chair Dan, and then Lisa, then Mark.



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES**

1 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. In my perusal of different general plans, comp plans, it was
2 interesting to note that San Francisco's exists only as a hyperlink document. Just two things
3 here. Again, I'll have more, but they will be written. First of all, this is underlining a point that
4 Whitney had made earlier. In my mind, the most powerful new policy that's in here is T-2.5
5 which is to monitor and evaluate VTM and VTM per capita Citywide.

6 **Co-Chair Keller:** VMT?

7 **Co-Chair Garber:** VMT, I'm sorry. What did I say?

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

9 **Co-Chair Garber:** A little dyslexia. That has impacts that will impact the community especially
10 in south Palo Alto in ways that, I think, we don't know about yet, and we haven't thought it
11 through entirely. I think importantly, again to the point, this would be one policy that, I think,
12 would be worth us thinking more carefully about what programs and how it is we want to use
13 that. That said, the other piece there that, I think, my Co-Chair Arthur is spot-on about, is that
14 the very large concern of the Council as well as our community is on the visual impacts of
15 congestion. I think it's important for us to find ways to not only use LOS as a measure, but to
16 also recognize and give airing to so that we can increase the perception of the tools that we
17 have to deal with that to include mode share, to include timing of TDM measures, etc. We
18 need to expand our palette of tools so that we aren't focused just only on that, but to recognize
19 that we have a variety of ways to attack that. The last thing I will mention, just again very high,
20 something that I found missing here was any mention about working with regional partners to



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 plan for the future use and need of the multimodal center. Transit in this town doesn't work
2 unless the multimodal center works. It's currently overburdened which is why we have buses
3 stacking up on El Camino. You can't expand Marguerite without expanding the multimodal
4 center. You can't have increased capacity without increasing the utility of that. That is really
5 the knuckle that everything is dependent on in the City. I think we need some mention of that
6 in here.

7 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. We have Lisa, then Mark, then Ellen.

8 **Lisa Peschcke-Koedt:** Just following up on a couple of earlier comments. Actually a question
9 whether this subcommittee would be willing to bring back to the next meeting, and then we as
10 the group actually deal with it in the next meeting, is two things. Would we agree to do the
11 prioritization? Which policies and programs are the most critical and which are just less
12 important? They could maybe stay in, but they're not as important. The second one is what
13 Hillary said about sort of phasing or time. What's the most important to do first? What's the
14 goal, shorter term? What's the medium, and what's the long-term? I think that's something we
15 could do and add value too that would really help kind of move the Plan forward. I would be
16 very interested if others agree or you think that's a dumb idea.

17 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. I think that Hillary wanted to weigh in on the prioritization.

18 **Hillary Gitelman:** Yeah. I love the idea of having the subcommittee come back on this parking
19 issue and how all the policies related to that can be framed in a way that more of the
20 committee can agree. In terms of prioritization, I just think we should put that off. If there are



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 programs that people think we should eliminate, great. Let's try and pare down a little bit. We
2 can save to later in our process, we can pull out all the programs and prioritize them at some
3 point. I don't think we need to do that right now.

4 **Lisa Peschcke-Koedt:** If we do it later, I'd be fine with that. I think it also goes to the
5 affordability. I'm just guessing we can't do everything. If we knew what are the highest
6 priorities, then we would also do those first or put the funding there first. If we come back to
7 that later, I don't have a timing issue with that. It's more that we do it at all.

8 **Co-Chair Keller:** I'm sort of wondering—I thought the Council was reserving priorities, but I'm
9 not sure about that. Since our Chief Sustainability Officer is about to leave, I'm going to
10 mention and respond to something that Steve brought up. There was a presentation last night
11 by Stefan Heck. When that is available online at the Media Center, then our Chief Sustainability
12 Officer is going to make sure that staff sends to the entire committee the link to that, so that
13 we can all watch it online, the full presentation. I just wanted to respond to that, so that he
14 could hear it and so that you could also hear it, Stephen. Thank you. Who's next?

15 **Co-Chair Garber:** Mark (inaudible).

16 **Co-Chair Keller:** Mark, Elaine and then Shani.

17 **Co-Chair Garber:** Excuse me, Ellen not (crosstalk).

18 **Co-Chair Keller:** Mark, Ellen and then Shani. What we're going to do is before we give anybody
19 a second round to talk, we're going to make sure that everybody who has not already spoken in
20 the second round talk before we give anybody a third round. Thank you.



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 **Mark Nadim:** Regarding the ferry service, I think it's too expensive. We should use the
2 Redwood City port for ferries and just provide frequent shuttle services. For the narrative and
3 the maps at the beginning of the draft, the maps should be on larger scale paper or sheets that
4 can be folded. Again, the narrative is a bit too long at 26 pages. One has to wade through that
5 whole thing before getting to the actual policies and goals. I agree with the Co-Chairs that VMT
6 is not enough to measure whatever we have, and LOS is not enough. Basically, we need like a
7 combination of these two measures for the congestion and the miles traveled. As for parking, if
8 we don't have a trend that the excess of cars going down, it doesn't make sense for us to
9 remove the minimum requirement. This is something that needs to be monitored over a few
10 years before removing the minimum requirement for parking of new developments. That's it.
11 Thank you.

12 **Co-Chair Keller:** Ellen and then Shani.

13 **Ellen Uhrbrock:** If you want to get some of the cars off the streets of Palo Alto, you can start
14 with the seniors. A lot of the seniors who are driving are driving very old cars which have
15 tremendous impact on the atmosphere there. You can't get rid of the cars for the seniors
16 unless they have an alternative. Really the alternative of Uber and Lyft are very exciting.
17 They're starting to use them a lot. If they don't have, as many of them don't, phones to use the
18 apps, their caregivers do. It can be used, and it is a great inspiration. I can see this spreading in
19 use. I want to tell you about a new share ride program called Zum. It's really Uber for kids. It's
20 a new startup; it's just come off of beta. It has all women drivers, for example, and they'll take



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 your kids someplace so that other people don't have to do it. They'll pick them up again and so
2 forth. I'm in argument with them and discussion, and it's turning out well that if you can take
3 children and take care of them, you can take care of seniors too. I have used Zum three times
4 to come to these meetings, because I don't drive at night, and I need to have some alternative
5 way to do it. I think it's very exciting. I think that one of the helpful things would be to develop
6 these apps which help people know what the alternatives are. There's a good start on this
7 already. There's a site called Transit511 which can put together any itinerary that you're
8 wanting to go to. We try to teach them that at Avenidas in the computer labs. The exciting
9 thing about Avenidas is they're starting a generation lab, just starting. They gave the kick-off a
10 little while ago, immense success. I think they will be a great help to work in partnership and
11 the problems with the seniors and transportation.

12 **Co-Chair Keller:** Then Jason.

13 **Co-Chair Garber:** No, it's Shani.

14 **Co-Chair Keller:** Shani. Sorry. Shani, then Jason.

15 **Co-Chair Garber:** Then Lydia.

16 **Co-Chair Keller:** And Lydia.

17 **Shani Kleinhaus:** Thank you.

18 **Co-Chair Garber:** Then we'll start the rotation over again.

19 **Shani Kleinhaus:** On the vehicle miles traveled, I think it's a very important measure. We'll
20 have to do it according to CEQA. The question of congestion and how to measure it, I'm not



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 sure whether the LOS is the best way, but we do need to measure it for a lot of reasons. You
2 mentioned aesthetics. I think health is critical. It's something that the City Council has asked us
3 to look at. Anxiety, people get really angry when they sit too long in waiting for the traffic to
4 move. Those are things that are important to mental and physical health in the community.
5 Urban Forest Master Plan, I would like to add it to several programs that should have it because
6 they're related. Parking, for example, there is a requirement currently that 50 percent of
7 parking lot be shaded. It's not really compatible, so we need to look at it. I want to say
8 something to Steve Levy's comment of pushing our problems on our neighbors. I think right
9 now we're at the risk of getting those problems from our neighbors, given what is happening in
10 Sunnyvale, Mountain View, Santa Clara. Those cities are growing tremendously. Some of it we
11 see already, but it's coming closer and closer to us including North Bayshore. There would be
12 impacts to Palo Alto. I don't know. We have nothing here to deal with what other people are
13 pushing onto our streets. We probably should look at that. I don't know exactly how, but we
14 don't have any of that here. Lastly, to the issue of timeline, I do think it's important because
15 things are moving so fast and developing fast. It's really intertwined with prioritization of what
16 do you do first and when do you do it. If you think that there is a timeline and we have to do
17 something by a certain year, it can be changed later. I'm not sure. I'm thinking about what
18 Hillary offered, and I'm not sure what the resolution on that would be. Thank you.

19 **Co-Chair Keller:** Jason.



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 **Jason Titus:** I just wanted to a certain extent echo and support, Arthur, what you had said
2 around when we look at building applications or services to try and make this data available. I
3 think we should probably call out very specifically that we want to make sure that all the data
4 we gather is tracked in a open standards way and available broadly. That is exactly how you'll
5 get innovations of people integrating these things and actually using it. It also gets out of a
6 little bit of the producing things, books and maps and such that are never used. If you actually
7 do a good job of making this data open and usable, then it'll get integrated into a whole range
8 of services and products that people will use. In this area in particular, we have a lot of folks
9 who will at least kick the tires and try things out. On perhaps a more controversial note, I feel
10 like there's a whole discussion of should we reduce the parking requirements for new
11 developments now or later out of our timeline. It is true that when you create supply it is
12 absorbed. This has been true like we tried this very (inaudible) as a country. Build as much
13 highway as we want, there is somehow still traffic. I would like to at least say that if we go for a
14 scaled out program of going we will start reducing the parking requirements for developments
15 that it should be done only after we start charging for parking. A expanding free resource that
16 we know the more parking there is the more cars there are. We already have a traffic problem,
17 so creating more parking won't fix the traffic problem; it'll make it worse. I feel like we have to
18 put a price on this and start to make some sort of incentive for people not to drive rather than
19 just say we will always continue to every time we build more things. We want to be more
20 dense, but that would mean more cars, unless we make an incentive for that not to be the case.



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Lydia.

2 **Lydia Kou:** I want to continue some of the safety and reducing traffic speeds. On Program T-
3 3.4.1, I'd like to change "equipment enhancements to roads" and instead have it say that the
4 "treat the streets with landscaping and solar-powered lighted pedestrian crossings to
5 distinguish them as residential streets in order to reduce speeds." Also, in terms of grade
6 separation for rail crossing, while it says here it's a City priority, it should also be implemented
7 prior to Caltrain's electrification and increase of capacity to ensure that we do get the funding
8 and the grade separation. Otherwise, it adds more to traffic and causes safety issues. Program
9 T-2.14.2, I want to add into it "to establish the procedure in cooperation with Palo Alto Police
10 and Fire when considering the effects of street modification on emergency vehicle response
11 times." I'd like to recommend changing Policy T-1.1 to "commission a Citywide traffic analysis
12 report to create a baseline as to circulation and mobility each of the traffic modes." Also
13 include into Program T-1.10.2 "to look into expanding shuttle services to service within the
14 neighborhoods in order to take the connection to VTA at VTA stops on the major roads." Again,
15 on certain roads and areas we can improve by placing solar-powered warning lights. That's all I
16 have for now. Thank you.

17 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. I will go next, because I haven't gone in this round. The first thing
18 is that we have to be careful about differential parking fees. If you charge for parking within a
19 development and don't charge for parking on the street, guess where the parking will wind up.
20 You have to be careful about how you initiate this idea of charging for parking so that you do it



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 in a systematic way that does not cause distortions in the market. The second thing is that I'd
2 like to make sure T-5.7.6 in the PTC draft, which talks about adding routes to the safe routes to
3 schools map, to encompass new schools, new residential development and underserved
4 neighborhoods. I think that's still relevant. The comment is it isn't there, and it should be
5 there. I think that we should, as was mentioned, focus on safe routes to school. I think that, in
6 general, safety for other purposes makes sense, but we should really focus on safe routes to
7 schools for that and not simply expand it to safe routes to schools, shopping, parking, working.
8 Those go without saying, but safe routes to schools is a program that we should not dilute. I
9 think that we need to think about adaptiveness. I brought that up at the City Council, and I
10 think that's important to think about. We need to think about how we adapt to conditions and
11 how we time-phase things. I think that's important. My understanding is that there's a new
12 theory advanced that the Stanford Research Park is one parcel. Therefore, if there's any
13 development on that one parcel, that may trigger a TDM requirement for the entire parcel.
14 That's a theory that I'd like staff to understand and explore. Secondly, Steve mentioned the
15 issue of paying for grade separations. In terms of grade separations, I think that we should
16 expect the County or somebody else or High Speed Rail to pay for the minimal cost grade
17 separations, be that over ground or whatever, and for us to pay for the incremental cost to
18 putting that underneath. We shouldn't have to pay for all the costs of grade separations.
19 Similarly, San Jose should pay for the extra cost of putting BART underground between
20 Berryessa station and when it gets to Downtown. I don't mind the County paying for under



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES**

1 Downtown. A couple of other things. I talked about prioritization. We should think about
2 doing that, but not yet. I also mentioned Stefan Heck. Thank you. Who's next? First of all, if
3 you've already spoken and don't intend to speak again, please put your name tag down.

4 **Co-Chair Garber:** The people I'm showing that would like to speak again, Hamilton. Bonnie, did
5 you?

6 **Bonnie Packer:** I want to speak again.

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

8 **Co-Chair Keller:** Hamilton and Steve.

9 **Co-Chair Garber:** And Steve. Hamilton, then Bonnie, and then Bob, and then Steve.

10 **Hamilton Hitchings:** I wanted to build on Hillary's statement about time and sort of take the
11 next step beyond that. I think it's actually about outcomes and results. What we want is to
12 make this Plan adaptive, so if we hit it out of the park and we solve all our parking problems in
13 five years, we can move on to the next generation which is more of this like essentially under-
14 parked for people who don't have cars. I would like to make it adaptive and outcome-oriented.
15 It's not we have to wait 15 years to do some of these programs; it's as soon as we achieve
16 them. I think this is really important because it gives a motivation. Everybody wins. It makes
17 everybody motivated to solve these problems faster so we can move on. At the end of the day,
18 if we can get more people without cars living in the Downtown areas, it's just such a huge win. I
19 also agree with Elaine that parking fees are our number one tool. In fact, she's the one who
20 convinced me of it. I do think it's good. My only concern with parking fees, I just want to be



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 careful about two-hour retail parking. I don't want this to have a negative impact on our retail.
2 I think that new development does need to pay the full impact of their parking and traffic. New
3 development has been massively subsidized or there's been subsidies when they under-parked
4 relative to the actual impact. It's that differential that I'm concerned about. Moving on to a
5 different topic. The reason that we don't mention Stanford University is it's not within the
6 jurisdiction of Palo Alto. Stanford Research Park is within the jurisdiction. I also agree with
7 Whitney that we want to be outcome-oriented when we talk about Stanford Research Park.
8 Not only does Stanford have more expertise in how to mitigate their traffic issues, but we want
9 to be careful about being over-prescriptive. The one thing I'd like to see is that as they're doing
10 new development, for that incremental development they're not only mitigated but even
11 reducing a little bit beyond that. I don't think we should be telling them how to do it. I think
12 they may benefit from some of the other things going on like, for example, if Page Mill was
13 expanded for high occupancy vehicle, they would get a natural windfall that would help them
14 with that. Those are my comments.

15 **Co-Chair Keller:** Bonnie is next, then Bob.

16 **Bonnie Packer:** I just have one terminology issue that I think might solve some of the angst
17 we're having about parking and those requirements. Every time there's a policy or program
18 that refers to development or new development, it's totally unclear what kind of development
19 that policy is aiming at. Is it commercial? Is it residential? Is it both? How large? I think when
20 we look again more carefully at some of these policies, look at the context of the policy where



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 they're referring to new development should do this or shouldn't do that, be a little bit more
2 specific. That way we could understand what the goal is. If it's like new development should
3 not be under-parked, if it's new development in Downtown, I can understand that. If it's new
4 development out on Embarcadero in the Baylands, if that's possible like replacing one of the
5 auto dealers, then maybe it's a different issue. That's why I think we should be a little bit more
6 careful in our terminology. That's all.

7 **Co-Chair Keller:** Bob, and then Steve.

8 **Bob Wenzlau:** I wanted to talk to the airport. There's a debate in Palo Alto where there is a
9 constituency that does not like the Palo Alto Airport. Bonnie and I chatted it out a little bit.
10 Let's not try to have the Comp Plan tip the cards to one group's favor versus the other favor.
11 We thought that broadly an airport commission or some deciding body should deal with it. I
12 just wanted to point out—I'm not going to play totally fair in my comments, but I'm going to
13 offer some thoughts. One is there's a statement in Policy T-8.1 that the airport is vital. I think
14 that that word "vital" should be struck. It's not in the goal. There is a statement in Policy 8.1
15 that allows minor expansion. I don't agree that minor expansion should be in there. There is a
16 program that basically dictates the relocation of a terminal building. I don't agree that that
17 should be a program. I think that should be discussed, but it shouldn't be baked into the Plan. I
18 think a program should be added—I'm maybe a little bit out of sync here—for an airport
19 commission, some public body. I had a recollection it was in there. All of a sudden I don't see
20 it. Under Policy T-8.2, I would like to introduce into the policy the topic of noise, because noise



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 is the issue. Right now, noise is not mentioned in the policy. I wanted to support or say thank
2 you for the introduction of Policy T-8.2.4 which talks about monitoring noise at the airport. I
3 wanted to introduce in the spirit of Dan wanting Palo Alto to be number one in the count of
4 policies, I'm going to try and add one.

5 **Co-Chair Garber:** I really admire you, Bob (inaudible).

6 **Bob Wenzlau:** What I would like to do is have staff consider a policy that west of Bayshore,
7 that overflight from Palo Alto Airport that is lower than 1,000 feet should be prohibited. Right
8 now there's enormous overflight from Palo Alto Airport below 1,000 feet affecting our
9 neighborhoods. That would be something I'd ask for. Thank you very much.

10 **Co-Chair Keller:** Steve.

11 **Stephen Levy:** Adaptive is good. I'd like to be exploratory and innovative and action-oriented.
12 I'd like to go back to something that Hamilton said at the very beginning. He had some
13 concerns, but he's willing to do a pilot project. I think we can build housing Downtown that will
14 solve a myriad of goals and that people will actually use that unit with less parking, and it'll be
15 more affordable. I don't need to try ten of them; let's try one of them and see if it works. If
16 Hamilton's fear is right, that they say, "I don't have a car," and we find them sneaking out, we'll
17 monitor them. Let's try that. Let's try micro units. Let's not wait to be adaptive. Let's try one
18 of a kind things that have the potential for actually working now. I really think housing
19 Downtown and on Cal. Ave. is important. In the walkable section, we talked about making
20 streets safer. That's great. I don't drive; I don't see very well; I walk all the time. I'll tell you



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 because we live Downtown, we walk every place. It's the location that cuts down our car use.
2 We don't park Downtown; we don't drive Downtown; we walk Downtown. Making walkable
3 communities is about location of jobs and housing near shopping and services. It's some other
4 place, but it's a transportation policy; it's a parking policy.

5 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Elaine.

6 **Elaine Uang:** I wanted to build on that. The Sustainability Summit on Sunday, I guess he
7 couldn't make it because he was snowbound, but we heard from Mark Mykelby, Nickleby. He
8 really, I think, emphasized the nexus between housing and transportation and really
9 emphasized walkability. He saw it as really a matter of national security. Building good
10 communities that have layered uses and really minimize that transportation impact is really
11 something that all cities need to think about. Not just for livability, but also just for dealing with
12 our biggest problem which is climate change coming forward. The other point that I just want
13 to raise from the Sustainability Summit which I thought was really important was this idea that I
14 think Jim Keene brought up of tactical sustainability. I think this point of lighter, quicker,
15 cheaper, testing, back to Hamilton, is again another thing that I really just want to push for. If
16 we can incorporate that into our sustainable transport section, I think that would be great.

17 **Co-Chair Keller:** Annette.

18 **Annette Glanckopf:** I want to disagree and agree with Bob. I feel like it's really important to
19 put a voice in about the airport. I do believe it is vital for the City of Palo Alto. You talk about
20 Stanford Life Flight. You talk about what might happen in a disaster. Although I think I agree



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 with Bob in that some of the detail in the Comp Plan probably should be decided by another
2 body. As far as the way it's written, it already does pre-prejudice some of the things that might
3 happen. I'm not sure the body should be another brand new commission that's already
4 established. That's very difficult to make happen. Perhaps it could be under the auspice of
5 another group, either Parks and Rec or maybe the Citizen Corps Council. I just want to make
6 sure we have two opinions on record.

7 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. I will make some concluding comments. Firstly, I think that it's all
8 development that should be self-parked. I think that that's why the original goal which came
9 from the PTC goal which I think I drafted was specific on development. Self-parked is
10 dependent on what parking demand is, and parking demand evolves over time. As we see with
11 parking demand as it diminishes, I think we will change our parking standards to accommodate
12 it. That comes to the next point which is that I think we need an environment that is adaptive.
13 We need to basically think about adapting our standards based on the outcomes so as we
14 mitigate—I've been talking for a while about the idea of you mitigate the problems, you grow
15 some more, and then you mitigate those problems, then you grow some more. You have a
16 cycle of mitigation and growth. They go hand-in-hand and you don't really—the problem we've
17 had in the last few years is we've sprinted ahead on growth and haven't really caught up on
18 mitigation. We need to do them in parallel and have a feedback loop cycle. I agree with the
19 experimental. Some of the experiments have been done. For example, some low-income
20 housing has had landscape reserve. The landscape was parking reserve that has been



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES**

1 landscaped. The issue is if the experiment doesn't work, you're not stuck with something that
2 fails. You basically can convert the landscaping into parking. If it works, then you have extra
3 landscaping. I think that's been very successful. I'd like experiments that don't get us into
4 trouble but that have a failure mode that we can accept. I'll just end there. I'd like to thank
5 everybody for their thoughtful comments. I think we've been very collegial. I think we've done
6 some very good work. We have a bunch of work now for the committee to do in synthesizing
7 this and bringing us back to the issue next time where we will focus a lot, I think, more on
8 parking and adaptivity and things like that and talking about what the controversies are and
9 how to really deal with that. Maybe we'll be able to come up with a synthesis through the idea
10 of adaptivity and time phasing. We have a couple of things on our agenda.

11 [Discussion moved to approval of minutes.]

12 **Feedback for Continuous Improvement:**

13 [Discussion followed future meetings.]

14 **Co-Chair Garber:** We have 14 minutes before we all have to leave. Can I get some feedback on
15 how we think this evening's discussion went? Do we feel that you were able to get all the
16 issues out? Do you feel that we were actually dealing with substantial information? Are you
17 satisfied? Other suggestions? Adrian.

18 **Adrian Fine:** I think tonight we had a bit of two opinions on parking, which is helpful. It's good
19 to have a discussion about that. I think when we recognize that we do have a bit of a
20 disagreement on this committee, it'd be helpful to kind of point out a few bullet points where



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 that disagreement really is and also where we might agree on things. I'm not sure we totally
2 got to that on parking tonight. Where there are these issues in future, it'd be helpful to maybe
3 take five or ten minutes just on that issue and get everyone's quick opinion, pluses, minuses, in-
4 between.

5 **Co-Chair Keller:** I think that we'll be spending a lot more time on that at the next meeting. I'm
6 hoping that we will really get into the pros and cons. If we can get into the pros and cons issue
7 and perhaps some ways of resolving those and give that to the Council, then we will have done
8 a good job of queuing that up for their discussion.

9 **Co-Chair Garber:** As a reminder, we're really hoping that the subcommittee will pull those
10 bullet points together for discussion for the rest of the committee to have. Any other
11 comments? Bob.

12 **Bob Wenzlau:** I should say I almost resigned today. I was finding—but I was rescued from my
13 sentiments in that I've found the process of this group to be difficult. I think many of us are
14 used to having impact. I think I've had the opportunity to develop some concerns that the
15 process to me is not clear how our input comes across into the Plan. I feel extremely trapped
16 by the Brown Act. I did not like the fact that there's no discourse or creativity. To me, I'm
17 worried that the back-and-forth that I think creates ideas is not allowed. I won't quit. I don't
18 feel like I can sit here and give this process a big love hug and go, "Isn't it wonderful what we're
19 doing." I had also shared some frustration that the subcommittee on sustainability has not
20 been allowed to get going. That is a problem for me, because it's a big subject area. It's



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 important to the Council. We have some thinking to do, but it is not happening. Doodle poll or
2 not, it's not going. I'm not going to quit, but I was just about to do it. I think a lot of us are
3 clever folks. I've been sort of asking staff or asking how we could find more ways for discussion,
4 creativity. I don't have the home run, but I think it was a little bit like, "If I can't find a way that
5 this is useful, why should we play the game? It's not my job to fix it." I do care about Palo Alto.
6 If it's not going to work, then don't spend the time. I'm going to stay. I did want to share that
7 close call today. I felt it was a great meeting. I actually felt like the vibe in the room was good.
8 I did have a shot of mescal before I came.

9 **Co-Chair Garber:** You're welcome.

10 **Bob Wenzlau:** Thank you.

11 **Co-Chair Garber:** More comments? I'm interested in pulling some of Bob's comments out,
12 because that's actually one of the things I wanted to touch on today. Lisa, and then Bonnie.

13 **Lisa Peschcke-Koedt:** I actually shared some of Bob's. I wonder still if we're having enough
14 impact. At the end of the day, I'm a born optimist so I figure we are doing something good,
15 even if it's this much instead of my goal of that much. We are doing something good. This was
16 to me one of the best meetings, having something concrete to look at. Great job by the
17 subcommittee and staff to have something to look at and really go through it more concretely.
18 I'm hoping the next one is even more so. I share some of Bob's. I think this was going the right
19 direction and would like to go even further.

20 **Co-Chair Garber:** Bonnie. Thank you, Lisa.



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 **Bonnie Packer:** When I got all this stuff, when was it? Friday night when we got it. Now that I
2 know that there was supposed to have been a staff report, that might have solved some of the
3 problems. I didn't know how should I get my brain around all this stuff. How should I be
4 thinking? How can I prepare myself for this meeting to provide effective comments? I did a
5 little bit, and I wrote something up, and I sent it in. I did some more this afternoon. I didn't
6 know where to go. I would like—maybe the staff report would have said that, so that we could
7 have a focused discussion. Like, this is what we're going to talk about, get your thoughts
8 together on that. Also, I know there's limited resources, but if we had a packet let's say a week
9 before our meeting, give us time to write our comments up, send them in, then you can send us
10 a package of comments to look at. Then we don't have to repeat everything from our written
11 comments. Then we can have more time for a discussion. I don't know if it's feasible because
12 you guys have so much to do. We're at community services, and then there's transportation,
13 then there's land use. It's like you're just running around. That would be a suggestion, because
14 we don't get to read the at-place comments until we're here five minutes before. We can't
15 really absorb all the good ideas that people are having in advance. That would be a suggestion,
16 if we can get the stuff about a week before. The other thing I'm concerned about is I don't
17 know what the subcommittee—people are thanking the subcommittee. We didn't really meet
18 again after December 16th. We didn't really do very much except say this looks good, and we
19 had a little discussion. The staff created the draft that we saw this weekend. I don't know how
20 far we're allowed to go. People are saying the City Council said these are goals you have to



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES**

1 have, and we're saying maybe we need to move things around a little bit and have it expressed
2 differently. They asked us Monday night, "How's our feedback?" I don't know if we're being
3 dictated to or if we're dictating to City Council. I don't know if we're going to be spinning our
4 wheels in saying we'd like to see it organized this way, and they say no. We need to know more
5 about—we don't want to sit here and spend all two years working on this and the City Council
6 says, "That's nice. We've had our citizen input, but we're going to do it our way anyway."
7 That's what I'm afraid of. The City Council Member left.

8 **Co-Chair Keller:** At least he was here.

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

10 **Whitney McNair:** I just want to echo if we could get the packet a couple of days beforehand, a
11 couple of days earlier than we have been getting it. I did find that I was scrambling at the last
12 minute, and I was a bit disorganized. I do feel like if we can start to funnel our comments down
13 so that we're getting to an end result. What I did like about the digital commenter as far as
14 when we first start talking about an Element, the digital commenter puts forward some bigger
15 questions to the community. It's sort of these larger questions, and then people comment on
16 it. I find reading those interesting to get sort of a bigger picture perspective. When we get in
17 the room, everybody has their comments or particular comments and it's a round robin of sort
18 of separate, individual, little comments peppered around. We don't really talk about what
19 those big picture issues are. It's really sort of slammed into a finite amount of time. As we're
20 moving forward, like today parking was a big issue. If we can the next time we meet say we



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 heard a lot of these, but the biggest things were parking. Let's spend our time talking about
2 parking and the airport, those things which still need some big discussion points that are still
3 unanswered so we're sort of focusing our discussion. If we just meet again and everybody
4 peppers their comments again, I don't feel like we're going to be moving towards resolution of
5 those things. Anything that can sort of start big and funnel down, I think, we would all feel
6 more comfortable that that was a policy thing we talked about and here's how it's getting
7 resolved in some way.

8 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Shani, you had some comments. Then we'll return to the Chair.

9 **Shani Kleinhaus:** I understand the need of a lot of people to feel that we're getting
10 somewhere. I actually like the fuzziness of this. Anyone who has something to say about
11 something, it may be esoteric, but to them it is important and they were selected to be here.
12 They have a chance to say that. I'm not too uncomfortable with the process as it has been. We
13 still have not seen an end result. I'm waiting to see what that looks like when we're done with
14 the current. I'm not looking to change it yet. That's all I have to say.

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

16 **Len Filppu:** I think in one of the previous meetings we tried to limit people to their top three
17 comments on an Element. I think that was helpful. It got more specific. It was prioritized, and
18 we eliminated the laundry list kind of discussion. I thought that was a better process. I'm
19 frankly amazed with this large of a group we're able to get good input, capture it and come up
20 with all the policies and goals that you're trying to build to the winning list in the Bay Area. I



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 think that this is an extraordinarily difficult process in democracy. This is not the way
2 something would look in business. If we just realize the amount of different creativity and ideas
3 this captures, we can go down and hone them out or the City Council may, but at least there's a
4 lot of energy and a lot of ideas coming at it. I'm pretty impressed with all of this.

5 **Co-Chair Garber:** Segue. Thank you, Len. Thank you, everybody. I just had two things, and
6 then I'm going to hand it back to Arthur to close this out. I wanted to talk about one which
7 you've all been talking about. This is hard. It's not hard because the topics are hard. It's hard
8 because in the construct and the constraints in which we've been put, it's hard to talk about it
9 easily, freely. Dealing with the public process is frustrating. It requires a tremendous amount
10 of patience, and it requires you to remember what you said not just yesterday or an hour ago,
11 but like five weeks ago, and somehow string that altogether so that you can pull it together at
12 the end of the whole process. Very hard to do. We'll get better at it. I'm not an expert in it by
13 any means. We'll all get better at it, but we do need patience, and we need the resolve to get
14 through it. I suspect Bob isn't the only one that has considered resigning. I'm not taking a
15 straw poll. The second thing I wanted to talk about is a little more serious, but I think it's very
16 important. At the very beginning of our meetings, both of us were emphasizing that we want
17 this to be a safe place for us all to speak. I think to a large part we've done that. I think it's
18 important for us to remind ourselves that tolerance of each other and how it is we work with
19 each other is extremely important. We need to remember that every time that we get together
20 inside this meeting and outside. We have to recognize that every one of us has something to



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 contribute, and that none of us deliberately is attempting to try and undermine or get around
2 or shut somebody down. We are all going to make mistakes, and it's going to feel like that. I
3 ask you to hold off and, before you make an assumption, allow it to play through or ask a
4 question rather than make a statement. I think we are in large part doing that. There will come
5 a time when all of us are going to feel like we have been not called on or that we haven't been
6 heard or we've been put onto the wrong committee or something of that sort. It's important
7 for us all to recognize that we're just trying to make it all work here. With that, Arthur.

8 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. I'd like to focus on something that Co-Chair Dan said, and that is
9 next time we'll have to disagree without being disagreeable. That's our objective. A couple of
10 things. It would be useful if—I realize staff is overloaded, but it would be useful to get the
11 report out a little bit earlier next time. That will make it easier for us to review. I think the
12 Brown Act kind of prevents us from getting our own comments back other than at the
13 meetings, so I don't think that's possible. People who are more lawyerly than I can feed into
14 that. I also appreciate the fact that the staff report is three-hole punched so that we can put it
15 in our binder or another binder. That was useful. I'll close with two of my favorite quotes. One
16 of those quotes is—Lisa mentioned the issue of optimism. One of my favor quotes about
17 optimism is the optimist believes we live in the best of all possible worlds. The pessimist fears
18 this is true. The second quote is—there was a comment about theory and practice, so I'll close
19 with that quote. In theory there's no difference between theory and practice, but in practice
20 there is.



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES**

1 [Discussion moved to adjournment.]

2 **Future Meetings:**

3 [Discussion followed Sustainability Committee.]

4 **Co-Chair Garber:** When's the next transportation meeting here?

5 **Jeremy Dennis:** The next transportation meeting, I believe, is on February, I want to say 16th.

6 It will be back at Mitchell Library.

7 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Co-Chair Dan.

8 **Co-Chair Garber:** Bonnie, you had a question.

9 **Bonnie Packer:** When is the subcommittee meeting going to happen?

10 **Jeremy Dennis:** We are working on that. Thank you.

11 [Discussion moved to feedback.]

12 **Adjournment:**

13 [Discussion followed feedback.]

14 **Co-Chair Keller:** With that, I'll entertain a motion to adjourn.

15 **Female:** So moved.

16 **Co-Chair Garber:** By Annette, seconded by Lisa.

17 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. We're adjourned.