



DATE: February 8, 2016

TO: Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC)

FROM: Jeremy Dennis, Advance Planning Manager

Hillary Gitelman, Director Planning and Community Environment Department

TITLE: Review of the Transportation Element (Meeting Two)

This staff report provides instructions to be used for the review of the draft Transportation Element.

WHAT TO EXPECT AT THE MEETING

After roll call and oral communications, staff will turn the meeting over to those members of the Transportation Subcommittee who wish to speak to the work they completed on February 3rd.

Following the overview, each member of the CAC will have two minutes to share their thoughts, focusing exclusively on those areas of controversy or new issues identified by the Subcommittee that were not resolved.

Finally, the Co-Chairs will lead a process to vet any identified areas of controversy.

This direction will then be used to finalize the draft element.

Issues Remaining

The Subcommittee requests that the CAC review and, if possible, find consensus around the following issues:

1. Parking –The Subcommittee wished to pursue a policy of proactively reviewing parking demand, while embracing long term strategies that will provide more alternatives to single occupancy vehicles that need to be parked. Strategies should be tailored to the specific needs of the area residents and occupants. An effective approach would respond to existing conditions but be flexible enough to adapt to changes that occur over time. Additionally:
 - a. Parking should be provided to meet demand. Strategies to reduce the demand should be incorporated over time. Measures to support reductions could include implementation of a TDM program, TMA, sufficient public parking in specific areas, expanding shuttle system, proximity to transit and evidence that transit would be used, unbundled parking, etc.
 - b. Implement a biennial study of parking standards to better reflect parking needs and to support the update of the parking regulations as needed. Studies can also include industry and technological changes.

- c. Parking demand should be analyzed from a system wide perspective, including residents, businesses and customers.
 - d. Continue to work with existing and form new regional partnerships as needed to seek solutions to provide more options to driving, which should reduce parking demand.
2. Reorganization of the document – members of the Subcommittee suggested a variety of ways to better reorganize the draft element. CAC members who wish to discuss this item should come prepared to share their thoughts on reorganization. Overall though there was an interest to simplify and shorten the narrative section, much like the existing element.
3. Ferry to Baylands – the Subcommittee did not desire to see an option for a ferry to the Baylands included in the final element, but seeks CAC feedback on its deletion from Program T1.10.2, as well as emphasizing regional opportunities to create other public transportation connections to the Redwood City port.
4. Airports – Airport staff was consulted to obtain a better understanding of the complex relationship the airport has with the FAA. As they described to us, when airport owners or sponsors, planning agencies, or other organizations accept funds from FAA-administered airport financial assistance programs, they must agree to certain obligations (or assurances). These obligations require the recipients to maintain and operate their facilities safely and efficiently and in accordance with specified conditions. The duration of these obligations depends on the type of recipient, the useful life of the facility being developed, and other conditions stipulated in the assurances. The Subcommittee suggested that policy language be incorporated into the element that is forward looking, specifically that the airport be responsive to future technological and potential operational changes.

Vetting Draft Element Disagreements

After the first round of CAC comments, the Co-Chairs will take five minutes to synthesize any comments made into a set of potential policies or programs to be selected by the CAC. If there are conflicting concepts for potential policies and programs, each will be vetted by the CAC by giving any member two minutes to address why they believe a certain policy or program should be selected. Those who disagree or have a counterproposal will have two minutes to argue their position. If, after vetting there is no clear consensus, minority opinion will be captured for those positions with more than four CAC members in favor.

ATTACHMENTS

- Attachment 1: Draft Transportation Element
- Attachment 2: May 2015 Downtown Palo Alto Mode Split Survey
- Attachment 3: January 26, 2016 CAC Verbatim Minutes
- Attachment 4: January 26, 2016 Draft Action Minutes