



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

TUESDAY, February 16, 2016

Mitchell Park Community Center – El Palo Alto Room
3700 Middlefield Road
Palo Alto, CA 94303
5:30 PM TO 8:30 PM

1 **Call to Order:**

2 **Co-Chair Garber:** While my Co-Chair is taking his seat, why don't we call the meeting to order?

3 If I could ask Robin to call roll.

4 Present: Heidi Emberling, Len Filppu, Adrian Fine, Dan Garber, Annette Glanckopf,
5 Hamilton Hitchings, Arthur Keller, Shani Kleinhaus, Lydia Kou, Steve Levy, Don
6 McDougall, Whitney McNair, Mark Nadim, Bonnie Packer, Lisa Peschcke-Koedt,
7 Doria Summa, Ellen Uhrbrock, Alex van Riesen, Amy Sung, Jason Titus, Elaine
8 Uang, Bob Wenzlau

9
10 Absent: Jennifer Hetterly and Julia Moran

11
12 **Oral Communication:**

13 **Co-Chair Garber:** Now would be the time for anyone to speak that would like to speak to
14 actually anything they like this evening. Do we have any cards? If you would like to speak, you
15 should fill out a card, but don't let that stop you if you want to right now.

16 **Co-Chair Keller:** We have two cards. The first card is from Joanne Cultnow. You'll have 3
17 minutes.

18 **Joanne Cultnow:** Hello. My name is Joanne Cultnow. I live in Evergreen Park where I've lived
19 for about 45 years. I'm new to this, and I only have one tiny comment. Ellen Uhrbrock asked
20 those of us in Avenidas Village to take a look at the Plan and the survey. I looked at the Plan
21 online, and my comment is on the transportation map. I think it looks pretty. The dimension



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 that's missing is time. We have all of these things, but it doesn't say that the train only goes
2 once an hour on the weekends and once an hour in the middle of the day. I didn't look for sure,
3 but I don't think there's much connection in the various transportation options. I've worked at
4 home. I don't drive very much. I also walk; I use my bike. I go to a couple of places. I'm
5 thinking about it. Probably from my house in Evergreen Park to the JCC, I don't think there's a
6 transit option. I go to meetings at Stanford Hospital, and I drive. There's the Marguerite, but
7 it's not very convenient. It's about time and convenience in relation to the transit map.
8 Thanks.

9 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Our next speaker is ...

10 **Co-Chair Keller:** Gabriel Lewis.

11 **Gabriel Lewis:** Hello, my name's Gabriel Lewis. I'm a resident just down the street actually, but
12 I'm also an intern for the Sierra Club, the Loma Prieta Chapter. I'm here to read a prepared
13 statement from them. The Sierra Club Loma Prieta Chapter comprises 17,000 members in
14 Santa Clara, San Mateo and San Benito Counties. Our chapter headquarters' location is in Palo
15 Alto. This has given us a particular interest in various aspects of the City's planning process.
16 Although the time has passed for comments on the draft Transportation Element, we do want
17 to make a general comment that there is much to admire in the draft but that we are puzzled
18 by some aspects of it. We don't understand why there would be a further expenditure of staff
19 planning time on BRT as the City Council has been rather engaged on the topic. It has been
20 thoroughly vetted by City staff, and the Council has adopted a unanimous position. It does not



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 seem to be an efficient use of staff resources to be shoveling against the tide. On ferries, the
2 San Mateo experience with low ridership and extraordinary deficits should be a sufficient
3 deterrent without also considering the environmental mayhem that would be necessitated in
4 order to construct a terminal. Constructing significant infrastructure at the water's edge is a
5 form of climate denial in addition. We apologize for the brevity of this comment, but time is
6 short. We will try to compensate by commenting at greater length at the next public hearing.
7 Best regards.

8 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. The last speaker is Penny Ellson.

9 **Penny Ellson:** Thank you. I'm Penny Ellson. I am speaking as an individual because the City
10 School Traffic Safety Committee has not been invited to comment on this draft so I'm
11 commenting as an individual. Complete Streets, also known as streets for all users, must be
12 more than an affirmation in the Comprehensive Plan. That's a requirement if our bike-friendly
13 application is to be successful. Our previous Comp Plan was very specific about what this
14 meant. It provided a clear vision for Safe Routes to School but enabled the programs
15 subsequent to be successful. We've required goals, policies and programs built into the
16 updated Comprehensive Plan Transportation Element specifically related to Safe Routes to
17 School that will enable continued success, improving safety, and encouraging healthy, active,
18 sustainable school commutes. I sent a number of written comments; I'm not going to go
19 through all those. There's one that I want to particularly draw your attention to on page T-38,
20 Policy T-2.11, continue to prioritize safety and comfort of school children and street



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

1 modification projects. I'd like to add to this "and development that affects school travel
2 routes." We've had a lot of incidents where construction vehicles obstructed bike lanes and
3 driveways that children use with their bicycles, pushing them out into traffic. We'd like to
4 address that. On education, I don't know if it's necessary to put something this specific in, but
5 we've been talking recently about adding a secondary school education element, teaching kids
6 how to do group riding safely. We have large numbers now of kids that we never anticipated
7 out on bikes. Kids find themselves in packs of 40 and 50 bicycles sometimes. They need to
8 learn some new skills about how to ride in a group like that safely so that they can share the
9 road with other users without creating traffic obstructions and that sort of thing. Finally, I want
10 to point out that the City of Palo Alto City Council created a statement of policy related to the
11 school commute corridors network in 2003. I'd like to see the language from that policy
12 statement incorporated into the Comprehensive Plan. It basically prioritizes safety
13 improvements to all schools within the designated City of Palo Alto school commute corridors
14 network. That policy was adopted by City Council on October 27, 2003. You can find the
15 specific language in CMR 377:03. It's very important to have this in the Comp Plan. I don't
16 think we can just fall back on language that says implement the bike plan. This is some very
17 specific language. I'd also like to add to that that the policy statement says that we should be
18 periodically updating our school commute corridors network as the City's development rolls
19 out. Thank you for your time. Thanks for the great work you all are doing here. Appreciate it.

20 **Co-Chair Garber:** With that, we don't have any more cards from the public.



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

1 **Staff Comments:**

2 **Co-Chair Garber:** We will go to Item Number 1 which are staff comments. Hillary.

3 **Hillary Gitelman:** Thank you. Good evening, everybody. Jeremy's on his way. Actually he was
4 making last-minute copies at the office. We expect to see him. I was actually going to start by
5 thanking him for all his work. You will have all heard by now that Jeremy is leaving us effective
6 on February 25th. I just wanted to mention what we're going to be doing in his absence which
7 will be difficult. First and foremost, we're going to be recruiting to fill his position on the staff
8 and his role as the project manager for this project. In the interim, Elena and I are going to do
9 what we can to keep the ship afloat. I'm asking that all of you use Elena as your primary point
10 of contact. She and I will be in close communication and make sure that we continue to get
11 deliverables out to you and this process keeps going. If you know of anybody who's looking for
12 a great planning job, send them our way. We're going to be recruiting as soon as we can, as I
13 said, to fill both of those roles. I wanted to also talk a little bit about the schedule and about
14 the Community Services and Facilities Element. Just about the schedule. We're going to be
15 discussing the schedule with the City Council on February 22nd. We do plan to communicate to
16 the Council this Committee's desire to be engaged and involved on housing issues as you
17 articulated at one of your recent meetings. We think that we will have an opportunity to talk to
18 them about their desire for potentially more joint meetings with the CAC. We're also looking
19 for their guidance on what happens after Elements that you work on are presented to the
20 Council. That gets to the subject of Community Services, which I want to talk about for a



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

1 minute. Just before I do, I wanted to let you know that in addition to this meeting on
2 February 22nd, before we all meet again as a group, the Council's Finance Committee is having
3 a presentation on the fiscal study that's been prepared about the Draft EIR scenarios. That's
4 going to be on March 1st. If anybody's interested in that study, it'll be an opportunity for the
5 Committee to get a presentation from the consultants who prepared the study and ask
6 questions. It might be a good use of your time if you like that kind of stuff. We also have never
7 grappled with the subject of whether this Committee would like to hold a hearing on the Draft
8 EIR. I hope by now you all have either gotten a hard copy or at least a link to the electronic
9 copy. I see it, the big, gigantic book over there. We obviously want the Committee's comments
10 on this draft. It's a draft because it's intended to get better through the submission of public
11 comments. The choices are, one, to submit comments at a public hearing at one of the boards
12 and commissions or the Council when they hold a hearing, or for this group itself to actually set
13 aside time on an agenda to have a hearing and allow everybody to submit written or oral
14 comments. I'm posing that as a question. It doesn't have to be resolved right this minute.
15 Maybe before our next meeting, we can determine whether you want to hold a hearing or
16 whether you want to just submit comments at someone else's hearing, at the Planning
17 Commission or at the Council. We're still scheduling those other meetings. Maybe let me know
18 if you have strong preferences. Jeremy and I will work with the Co-Chairs to try and fit it into
19 your schedule if that's your preference.

20 **1. Update on February 8, 2016 Council Meeting on Draft Community Services and**
21 **Facilities Element**



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 **Hillary Gitelman:** Getting to Community Services and Facility. First let me say congratulations
2 to the subcommittee and to the CAC as a whole. If you remember, this was that first Element
3 that we kind of got started working on before all the wheels were turning in the direction they
4 are now. The Committee as a whole gave pretty clear direction to the subcommittee, and then
5 the subcommittee worked diligently on a work product that was presented to the Council last
6 week. I think just generalizing the Council's comments, they were incredibly grateful and
7 appreciative of the work that went into it. I think they thought on the whole the quality of the
8 work was fantastic. They did have a number of comments which, I think, it would be good for
9 us to address in revisions. Principally the comments were about tightening up the language,
10 dealing with some of the redundancies and just some of the—I guess we used the "big tent"
11 approach to this Element. We were kind of like someone had a good idea, and we put it in.
12 Someone had another good idea; we put that in too. I think what the Council would like us to
13 do now—I'm suggesting that the subcommittee reconvene to do this—is look at the whole
14 thing we've created and try and sort it a little to get rid of any redundancies, consolidate where
15 possible. The other thing that they wanted and clearly stated, at least some of the Council
16 Members, is that they'd like some flexibility when it comes to the programs. In this Element,
17 we made an effort to be very assertive and use action verbs like do this, do that. I think that's
18 okay for some programs, the ones that are the most important or most meaningful to us. On
19 the whole, I think the Council would appreciate a little more flexibility. Consider doing this,
20 evaluate this, so that they have an opportunity to prioritize and to implement these programs



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 as resources permit. There was by no means unanimity on the Council on that point, but I think
2 they're asking us to take another look at the programs, consolidate, eliminate redundancies
3 where we can, and inject this idea of flexibility in some of the programs. As I said, the staff's
4 recommendation is that the subcommittee get back together again, review what the Council
5 provided in terms of specific direction and these overarching issues, and develop a revised
6 draft. Beyond that, I guess my question for the group is whether the group, the whole CAC,
7 would like to see the work product—first of all, is the subcommittee okay with that? Are you
8 guys willing to reconvene and take that on with staff's support? Secondly, once the
9 subcommittee completes their effort, does the whole CAC wish to review the revised draft and
10 make another recommendation to the Council? If so, would you be interested in holding a
11 special meeting for that purpose? It would be a second meeting in a month. Hopefully it would
12 be shorter than one of your normal meetings, but it would give you an opportunity as a whole
13 to come together and see how the subcommittee had revised things and potentially to help
14 prioritize. Dan and Arthur and I were talking about maybe there could be an exercise where
15 you would give the Council your feedback on prioritizing among the policies at that meeting.
16 This isn't supposed to be a long agenda item, but I was hoping, Dan and Arthur, we could
17 entertain some comments and questions on these topics and get a sense of, first, whether the
18 subcommittee is interested in reconvening to do the editing and, two, whether the whole CAC
19 would like to see the Element again.



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 **Co-Chair Keller:** Does anybody want to weigh in on the—who's a member of the Community
2 Services Committee that wants to weigh in about how to handle that? Len, I think you—you
3 want to ...

4 **Len Filppu:** I'm on the subcommittee. To answer your one question, I'm definitely willing to
5 take another go at it. I did have another question, kind of looking for guidance. I've seen this
6 issue arise not just in our subcommittee hearing but in larger Committee meetings. I think that
7 it's a general question that may be hanging out there, and that is the issue of cost, potential
8 cost of some of the programs and policies that are recommended. It's been my experience in
9 the subcommittee that if someone had a good idea, this is the place for it. It's a brainstorming,
10 creative kind of session, let's put it in. The time for hatcheting [sic] and axing and editing things
11 out comes later. These aren't necessarily the—the citizen input is not the time to put the green
12 eyeshade on and do an accounting. We don't have the kind of information we need for that. I
13 don't know what head count costs and benefits. When I ran a business, I certainly knew how
14 much we paid for those things, but I could only speculate. When we find ourselves in this
15 subcommittee and other subcommittees and we hear Council Members questioning cost, can
16 you give us guidance on whether we should be concerned with that at this point in the process
17 or is that something that I would argue might be more effectively handled later on?

18 **Hillary Gitelman:** Thanks for that question, Len. I guess I would agree with you that later in the
19 process when we have an understanding of the full suite of programs that we're going to
20 recommend in all of the Elements is the best time to do a prioritization and evaluation of cost.



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

1 In a General Plan Update like this, what I've seen done is not a lot more than kind of high,
2 medium, and low cost when you look at all the programs together. You evaluate them against
3 each other, and you determine which are least costly and which are most costly. You're right
4 we don't have the tools with which to do that now. I think that would be best deferred. If we
5 just follow the Council's lead and their direction and inject a little flexibility so the most costly
6 items could potentially be deferred if the resources aren't there, that will be sufficient for now.

7 **Len Filppu:** That sounds great. My proposal to get the elephants in the children's zoo is back
8 on the table. Just joking.

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

10 **Elaine Uang:** I'm not on the subcommittee, but I just want to express my thoughts on whether
11 or not we meet. My sense is probably not. I think that I trust the subcommittee to evaluate
12 what the Council's comments were. It would be great if we have the opportunity to review and
13 provide comments back to staff, but I don't think we need a separate meeting for it.

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

15 **Don McDougall:** Thank you, Arthur. If I can find my papers and step back a bit. The first thing
16 to comment on Hillary's comments, if I can. I'm going to make some comments about Council.
17 I asked Dan whether this is being recorded or not. I want to make some comments that I think
18 are pretty specific, but I think they're informative relative to what we should do with others.
19 Council commented a lot on the narrative. The biggest thing—I agree with Hillary—that they



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 said was shorten the narrative. I think that makes sense. They were certainly aware of details.
2 They wanted the Byxbee Park to be put in as open space, not as just general park. We got
3 advice of things like don't say disabilities. I bring this up because it's a comment that I disagree
4 with. The speakers that have come here to speak about disabilities have all used the word
5 disabilities. To find some other, softer word doesn't, I think, help us really address the issue.
6 They did make a really good point, which I think is really important relative to Transportation
7 and all the other Elements—I've talked about it before—which is we need to establish basic
8 assumptions of population growth and population and segmentation. We've been in this
9 conversation already that do we really want to use the School Board numbers or do we want to
10 use our numbers or do we want to use some other numbers. I think we need to establish what
11 numbers we're using and what the scenarios might be based on those different numbers.
12 Questions they asked about all of the programs were interesting. They wanted basically in the
13 end a side-by-side comparison of the 15-year-old Comp Plan and this Comp Plan. I don't think
14 that that's reasonable at all. I do think the question of what's been removed is a reasonable
15 question that we could address. They did talk about language, and I won't talk more about
16 that. To get away from that and to go to some of the other comments. They basically said,
17 "We want all the programs to be wishy washy." That was the word they used. We don't want
18 you telling us what we should do; we just want them to be wishy washy. Just make general
19 statements and consider and evaluate and whatever. Frankly, that's something I've objected to
20 right from the start, because that says if it's evaluate or consider, you can say, "I think about



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 this for 30 seconds, and it was considered. Check it off the list, and now it's done." I think
2 there needs to be some compromise that, yes, there needs to be some things that are
3 considered. I think there's some things that if the CAC feels strongly about, quite frankly we
4 should statement them strongly. We're sitting here. We just listened to several speakers; we
5 heard those speakers with passion talk about things they believed in. I don't think that we
6 should take input from some of these guest speakers and say, "Thank you very much. You're
7 very passionate about that. Now, we're going to rewrite that so it sounds really wishy washy."
8 I don't think that that's right, and I don't think we should do it. You did talk, Hillary, about the
9 fact we were going to go back. I know Jeremy talked about this at the beginning of that
10 presentation. We're here asking for guidance. That is an open-ended question that doesn't get
11 an answer, we found out. We tried. I think if we want guidance, we should ask a question; is it
12 this or is it that or whatever. Guidance to other subcommittees, I totally support what Len said.
13 Let's get back to the subcommittee and clean this up. I believe that the subcommittee acted on
14 a direction that we either created ourselves or were told—I can't remember—that said our job
15 is to make sure that every comment ever made in the CAC was included in the Element. We
16 were to make sure that nothing got left out. I think a subcommittee should be chartered to
17 consider everything that was said, decide on the things that are important enough to be
18 included, and maybe annotate the things that didn't get included so they could be debated
19 later. The strategy we took was to try and make sure to remember everything. I think that did
20 not do that Element well. In terms of prioritize, I did create this spreadsheet that everybody



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

1 has that took all of the Elements. It created a priority in terms of what we thought they should
2 be, high, medium, and low. It created a cost, high, low, medium. It put down what verb was
3 used. Did we say establish or explore or whatever, so that we can go back and do that. I think
4 the best we can do in terms of cost—I think we should do it—is guess. Is it a high, medium or
5 low cost? Is it building an overpass which is going to be high, or is it running a survey which is
6 going to be low? I think that would allow us to go back to the CAC here and even to Council
7 with some of what I think they're looking for which is some amount of disagreement. We could
8 go back to them and say, "We really like these things, but we think the cost is too high. Do you
9 want them in or do you want them out?" That would be a way for us to approach Council.
10 Thank you.

11 **Co-Chair Keller:** I think Bonnie was next.

12 **Bonnie Packer:** I agree with what Don said about the Council's direction—it wasn't clear
13 direction—concern about our strong language versus wishy-washy language. When I heard
14 some of the Council Members say that, I felt like the wind was taken out of our sails. We're
15 here; we're working really hard; we have all these meetings. We come to an agreement about
16 certain words, and then we go to City Council and they say, "That's nice. Thank you for all your
17 hard work, but we're going to write it the way we want to write it." That's a little disconcerting
18 for me. I don't know how the others feel. As a subcommittee member, I'm happy to look at the
19 draft again. We'll do our best to let City Council know that we're doing our best to let them
20 know how the community feels. We elected them, and I hope they listen.



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 **Co-Chair Keller:** Lydia, and then Heidi.

2 **Lydia Kou:** Actually, I would like to ask for your indulgence on the matter. If you could put me
3 on after this with regards to process and also the Brown Act, I'd like to discuss that a little bit if
4 you could put me on later. In terms of this question, I'm more than happy to come back as a
5 subcommittee member for the Community Services Element.

6 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Heidi.

7 **Heidi Emberling:** I'm also happy to come back and look at the Community Services Element.
8 Where to go from here? This is a very tough process. This is a very messy process. Although
9 we're talking about specific ideas, I do think there is overlap not only within an Element but
10 across Elements. It would be nice if the City Council said, "We want ten policies and no more
11 per section" or something. I mean, there's no guidance in terms of limits or structure or how
12 we organize. We spent some of our last subcommittee meeting talking about organization. I
13 see it's on the agenda tonight to talk about potential reorganization. How will this document
14 be used? Who's reading it? Who's using it? What makes it usable? I think is an important
15 question to ask before we finalize any of the sections.

16 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. I think that Shani wanted to talk, and then we're going to cut it off
17 because we need to move on. My request is that you leave your tags vertical until you've
18 spoken so that we don't miss you. I don't want to keep on going on this topic too long. Shani.



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 **Shani Kleinhaus:** Thank you. I attended the City Council meeting and listened to what they had
2 to say. The question of our language, how strong it should be and how prescriptive versus a
3 more general one as well as the issue of having everything that anyone ever suggested actually
4 making it into the Plan and how do you think about it. I think this is a certain problem when we
5 don't actually have a lot of discussion on something that is very prescriptive, and that's a point
6 towards doing things that are more fuzzy or wishy washy as the Council said. If we are saying
7 conduct a study, that's very strong. That has a lot of implications. That's something that
8 somebody had—they want that study. It doesn't mean that we all do. We didn't really have a
9 chance to have any type of conversation about any of these in deep. It was just like here are a
10 few things. Generally, the General Plan or the Comprehensive Plan doesn't have to be as
11 prescriptive as conduct a study. Consider a study, think about a study, or develop an ordinance;
12 that's really, really strong language. We have things like that in here. I think the more fuzzy
13 language is the right way to go in general; although, there may be some things that we feel
14 strongly about, but that has to be to some extent a consensus when you have something that is
15 very prescriptive. Thank you.

16 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. I'm just going to say that I think that calling it wishy-washy
17 language, I'm not sure where that phrase comes from. I'm not sure whose phrase that is. I
18 think that the idea is that with a number of programs, some flexibility in terms of prioritization
19 comes from using some sort of words that are not we're going to do exactly this. I agree with
20 Shani that studying something is more than simply considering, and then we can put in



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 language like that. I also think that perhaps we could have been better in terms of
2 understanding what happens. We were hoping that there would be some way of having
3 consensus where things would have to have more than one person's support to get in. Some of
4 those things would be pruned. I'm going to suggest a process way of handling this. I'm going to
5 suggest that the subcommittee do some work over the next few weeks trying to consolidate
6 this, figure out things which didn't seem to make sense, didn't seem to have support based on
7 people's—multiple levels of support or seemed pretty obvious, seemed a little bit more
8 controversial. Pull those out for additional questions. We have an opportunity when this
9 comes back to us, it can come back technically on consent which would allow the document to
10 be distributed to all the members of the Committee, allow us to provide feedback which can
11 then go to the subcommittee and still be within the Brown Act. I would suggest that we handle
12 that. We don't necessarily have to take time at the meeting to handle that. By giving things in
13 writing and having it be an agenda item, it allows us to move forward and give feedback to the
14 Committee. I'd like staff to consider that. Thank you.

15 **Hillary Gitelman:** Everybody, I think I got what I needed out of that. Thanks again to the
16 subcommittee. We'll work to schedule another meeting with you as soon as we can.

17 **Co-Chair Keller:** We should be timing these things. We should have timed the last thing,
18 because we're now at 6:10, 6:08. Can we time 2 minutes for the future comments from here
19 on? Lydia, I think you had a quick thing to cover.



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 **Lydia Kou:** I actually wanted to find out from Hillary, Jeremy, and the Co-Chairs in terms of how
2 far can we go with things like blogs and opinions on articles. When does it violate the Brown
3 Act and how selective and how minute can the message be in terms of blogs and public opinion
4 and so forth?

5 **Jeremy Dennis:** I'm happy to try. It's not black and white. This is the struggle and the
6 challenge with this. There's isn't a line where we can say, "You've just crossed that line,"
7 necessarily. There are areas that we know are not an issue whatsoever, and there's other areas
8 that I'm pretty clear that if you went on a blog and said, "Next week at the CAC, I'm going to
9 talk about this," that's a serial meeting and you should not be doing that. The tack we've taken
10 and, I think, the tack that our Council has taken is to inform you of the fuzziness, inform you of
11 the grayness of that, let you know that there potentially could be issues. They're not going to
12 be issues that are necessarily generated by us. It could be a community member coming
13 forward and saying, "I didn't like that," and then we've got to opine at some point. We've tried
14 to get specific where we can, but I don't know that that's particularly responsible of us because
15 this is not really settled law. It's very challenging. The way that I've approached it with those
16 members of the CAC who come to me, I've just said these are the areas that I think you have a
17 real problem. There's a certain set of areas that I wouldn't even worry about. There's a bunch
18 of stuff in the middle that, if I gave you my opinion, it's not a legal opinion. Don't listen to me,
19 because I don't know what that is. I think that our legal staff has somewhat said something
20 similar. We don't know exactly what it looks like. We want people to be careful.



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 **Lydia Kou:** There's a lot of wishy-washy things here, all over. In any case, I just want to
2 mention there's 24 of us here in this Committee, 25 before. The thing is we took out personal
3 time from work, from family, and from things we enjoy in order to be here. The last thing I
4 want to do is find out at a later date that this Committee has been compromised or our
5 decisions have been compromised. It would be really prudent for you to find out from the City
6 Attorney where is the line. I don't want to hear the gray stuff, because that does not help us
7 move into a good direction. I just want that to be noted.

8 **Hillary Gitelman:** Lydia, if I could interject, just add a thought to Jeremy's. This is really a topic
9 that I would prefer to address in writing. I would encourage anyone who has a question to the
10 staff on this particular issue, the Brown Act and how we're going to operate in this space, to
11 send us a question in writing, and we'll respond. If we think it's something that everyone will
12 be interested in, we'll respond to the whole group. Please ...

13 **Lydia Kou:** I think that it's something that we all need to know and adhere to. I mean, I would
14 be happy to write a blog and talk to people about where they're coming from, but I've refrained
15 myself because of instructions. I just want to put that out there. I think most of us here would
16 want to know where we stand if we do something. I think it's something everybody needs to
17 know.

18 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Just for the record, I was actually offered to write a blog for *Palo*
19 *Alto Online*. Because I'm Co-Chair of the CAC, I didn't feel it was appropriate for me to do that.
20 I respectfully declined.



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

1 **Agenda Items:**

2 **1. Action: Approval of January 26th CAC Meeting Minutes.**

3 [Discussion of this Item followed review of the draft Transportation Element.]

4 **Co-Chair Garber:** May I hear a motion to approve the minutes that were in our packet?

5 **Co-Chair Keller:** So moved.

6 **Co-Chair Garber:** Arthur moving, a second from Amy. All in favor, say aye. Any opposed?

7 That's a negative, or unanimously.

8 **2. Action: Review and Recommendation of the Draft Transportation Element.**

9 **Co-Chair Keller:** We're going to start off with members of the transportation subcommittee
10 who will go and kick us off. You have the list, I believe.

11 **Co-Chair Garber:** Lydia, do you want to go first if you have anything to say? Otherwise, we can
12 go directly to Mark.

13 **Lydia Kou:** No, I wasn't at the meeting. I'm sorry. I had to work. It was in the middle of the
14 day.

15 **Co-Chair Garber:** Hate that.

16 **Lydia Kou:** I hate that.

17 **Co-Chair Garber:** Mark, did you have comments?

18 **Mark Nadim:** For the February 3rd subcommittee meeting, there were two items that were
19 brought up I thought were already discussed in the CAC meeting of January 26. The members
20 have already made their opinions which are clear. These two items were the ferry service. At
21 the general meeting, nobody had supported the ferry service, so I don't know why it came back



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 in the subcommittee meeting. The second item was the airport. Again, majority had supported
2 the airport, but we ended up spending significant time discussing the airport at the
3 subcommittee meeting. We discussed the narrative that—the 26 pages before the draft of the
4 document. We suggested that there would be about three to five pages of narrative rather
5 than the 26. Again, the latest draft, the reduction in number of pages was minimal or kind of
6 cosmetic. That's basically my take on the meeting.

7 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Ellen, did you have comments?

8 **Ellen Uhrbrock:** I listened to the City Council meeting comments, and I completely concur that
9 the narrative has to be cut drastically and really cut in detail and be almost just a index of what
10 the goals are. The goals that interested me most actually was Goal 6 which has to do with
11 seniors and with people with special needs. I studied that one over with great interest. I have
12 come to the thought that it is not wishy washy at all, but it is that the Palo Alto shuttle fleet
13 needs to be transferred to use for school children only, and Palo Alto needs a new fleet of buses
14 for the adult market and seniors. You enclosed in your at-place things a picture I took of the
15 shuttle at the corner of Homer and Webster. It is a wonderful, complete illustration—not
16 complete perhaps—of what's wrong with the shuttle for seniors and for any handicapped. First
17 place, the shuttle stop is on the corner with just a stop sign on a pole. When I first moved
18 there, I asked where does the shuttle stop. Nobody could tell me. It's out there; there's no
19 seat; there's no nothing. There is parking all the way up on the street. You can't see a bus
20 coming without standing in the middle of the street. That's how you hail it down. It stops there



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 in the lane on a one-way street, and you hobble out to it. A handicapped person with perhaps
2 the exception of Bonnie who claims she was able to climb on it with a broken arm really can't
3 get on the bus. It is very awkward. Wheelchairs are out. It's not ADA friendly at all. Most of
4 the traffic in the midday on that shuttle is coming downtown. I think that's fine. Then that
5 shuttle turns right in the middle of the traffic too. I think that we need a separate—we need to
6 be at least as good of buses as they have for the Marguerite and for the Google/Mountain View
7 buses for the public which gets pretty high ridership. That's my not wishy comment. It'll cost
8 money, because it needs a new fleet of buses.

9 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. I'm going to interrupt just briefly, because we didn't give Jeremy
10 a chance to introduce a member of the City's transportation staff.

11 **Jeremy Dennis:** It's actually two people I just want to make sure that you know is here. Jessica,
12 wave, and then Sylvia in the back is in Safe Routes to Schools. They're here. They've been part
13 of our team internally looking at the draft Comp Plan. They've provided us with some of their
14 comments. We're feeding their comments back into the draft. I just wanted to make sure you
15 knew they were here. They can answer any questions you may have.

16 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Don, Julia, Bonnie, Lisa, Jason, and then we will continue around
17 the table. Bob, sorry, did I miss you? You're next, Don. I know; I haven't got through all the
18 subcommittee. You're a "W."

19 **Don McDougall:** Between Elaine and I, we agreed to submit my four pages of things to the
20 subcommittee and not to the whole thing. In my interest area, I focused on the parking, the



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 segment for the vehicle parking and the bike parking. I did the same thing I did with the
2 services, created a matrix. I do that so I can think about it. I don't pretend that it's right or
3 wrong or whatever. I put down what the verb was. Consistent with what Shani was saying, we
4 could look for where the right kind of verb is and the right kind of action is. I put a guess at
5 dollars, and I put in also what the policy was in the old document. The other thing I did was I
6 looked at what that said the most important thing that we're talking about right now in Council
7 and it was at the off-site that they had here was congestion. Everything's about congestion.
8 The question about parking is if you have more or less parking, do you improve or worsen
9 congestion. If you take all of the policies that we have that are in that list—I don't pretend this
10 is right; I just pretend that it deserves discussion—those policies fall in different quadrants
11 relative to whether they provide more parking and decrease congestion or they provide more
12 parking and increase congestion. There are contradictory policies within that. Relative to
13 subcommittees and the other thing, I want to quickly say two things. One is there were some
14 Council Members who basically separately said back to me, "We don't agree with the wishy
15 washy request. You can use whatever verbs you want," number one. Number two, in terms of
16 Brown Act, the other thing that is true is that if we wanted to have an ad hoc committee that
17 was to discuss just this Element or just this goal, we could say let's meet at Don's house, three
18 or four of us. We don't have to document it or whatever. We could have a good discussion of
19 these things, and then come back. That's not a Brown Act violation. Brown Act is mostly secret



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

1 meetings of majorities or secret meetings that result in chain communication. I would welcome
2 people saying let's get together and discuss the parking with this approach. Thank you.

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

4 **Bonnie Packer:** In the staff report, the staff described pretty much what happened at the
5 transportation subcommittee. We spent a lot of time talking about park or not to park. I'm
6 sure later this evening we'll be talking a lot more about the parking issue. The other thing that
7 happened at the subcommittee—this is sitting at your table—is that before the meeting met
8 that morning, I put together this little chart. I presented it to the subcommittee, and it's at your
9 places. It was a way for me to think about all the ideas that were in the draft Element that we
10 were asked to look at. The people on the subcommittee seemed to like this organization and
11 the way it puts the thoughts together. It reinforced my idea—I hope others of you think that
12 too—that there are a lot of good ideas in the Element, but if it was reorganized better, then we
13 can see how they all interrelate. There was a motion the City Council made back in August that
14 said add a new goal called traffic congestion which staff did. That's been in there, and it has a
15 lot of good policies and programs in there. They repeat a lot of the stuff that's in Goal T-1, Goal
16 T-2. The suggestion was to put it altogether so we can see how all these things work together.
17 Our goals are to reduce greenhouse gases, to reduce traffic congestion, to reduce bad traffic
18 impact on neighborhoods, and to have safe streets. To do that we reduce the reliance on single
19 occupancy vehicles. In order to do that, there are all those policies. How do we get there?
20 There's transit. Maybe there's parking fees. I don't know if that'll work. All kinds of ideas.



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

1 That's how we get to those goals. We talked about that, and I hope we can talk about it here
2 somewhat to see how far can we go in this Element to change the structure a little bit even
3 though staff is interpreting the guidance from Council as dictating structure. If we can suggest a
4 better structure that reinforces their goals, can't we do that? That's what I'm asking this
5 Committee to weigh in on today as well, because we did discuss it in the subcommittee. Thank
6 you.

7 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you, Bonnie. Does everybody have a copy of Bonnie's handout? Just
8 checking. Lisa, and then Jason.

9 **Lisa Peschcke-Koedt:** First of all, I thought it was a really good job by the subcommittee and
10 also a very good job of just incorporating what all our comments were, of course with your
11 judgment added to it. Right now we're on the 2 minutes on the specifics of what the
12 subcommittee asked for, right? As far as the parking, I actually agree to this approach that's
13 outlined by the subcommittee here in the cover note. I think that's the right thing. I think
14 we're doing the demand. We deal with the demand at the same time we're dealing with how
15 do we get rid of some of the need for the parking and such. I think what we would need to add
16 to that would be some other thoughts that we've all raised around housing by the transit and
17 parking technology like available spaces. I would just add a few things, but I agree with the
18 general approach that the subcommittee was taking. I also very much agree on deleting the
19 ferry to the Baylands. I'm fine with the airport part. In going through the comments that I think
20 are not yet quite in there, it touches on what a couple of other folks mentioned. I still think we



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 should do some prioritization here of identifying—it goes to the layout of the Plan, but it also
2 goes to I don't think we'll do everything. If we, the subcommittee maybe, and then the CAC
3 could say these ten programs or ten things are the most important to do—I think you've kind of
4 highlighted some of that, Dan, in your comments—I think that would be a good thing for us to
5 do. Going to the shuttle, similar questions kind of, what do we need for the shuttle. I still feel
6 like there's not quite enough there that meets all the needs. I would add that. That was really
7 the important—a minor one was in one of the programs later, but I think we're doing that later,
8 right? This was more at the top level. I'm done.

9 **Co-Chair Garber:** Jason, Bob, Elaine.

10 **Jason Titus:** I'll be brief because I also wasn't able to make the subcommittee meeting. I
11 thought the edits overall looked really good. They seemed to capture a lot of the feedback.
12 One area where I felt we still had not kind of captured it was around Program T-1.1. We said
13 we should gather data and analyze usage. I think we should actually explicitly say "and make
14 that publicly available." I think that is how and certainly in this area, I think a lot of useful things
15 will come out of it, if we can make that available. People who care can go in and analyze it for
16 different kinds of purposes and then end up doing analyses that the City wouldn't have done
17 otherwise. I will pass the rest of the time on.

18 **Co-Chair Garber:** Bob, and then Elaine.

19 **Bob Wenzlau:** I want to make my comments towards the airport. I found that in some respects
20 the minutes of the meeting didn't adequately capture some of the narrative that happened at



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 the subcommittee. One element that I recall we spoke about was having a program related to
2 the expansion of the terminal or the movement of the terminal be deleted. We talked a lot
3 about the use of an airport Master Plan and didn't feel that the Comp Plan needed to be so
4 specific to kind of outpace what the Master Plan might do. Another area that was discussed
5 but doesn't seem to come up directly enough was the community-wide concern associated with
6 noise at the airport. I feel that there's strong sentiment in the community around noise. One
7 program that I believe I spoke to was additional noise monitoring around the airport. I would
8 ask—I've written just some comments in—that we consider noise monitoring. There was an
9 additional suggestion that—I don't think the minutes are supposed to be per se verbatim. I
10 spoke about low-flying aircraft west of Bayshore from Palo Alto Airport, perhaps at a 1,200-foot
11 ceiling and the consideration of a policy statement related to trying to limit low-flying aircraft
12 other than when there are emergency situations. Finally, there was an observation, I think, that
13 occurred there that basically said, "What's the airport doing in that transportation section
14 anyways?" If you spend a moment to read the vision of the Transportation Element, the airport
15 while it might be vital for emergency services perhaps, it's not vital for transportation and
16 anything that has to do with transportation. Frankly, most of the policies are associated with
17 environmental impact at the airport. It's not in our purview, but it is a question that perhaps
18 could go to Council, going why is it there. Those are some comments.

19 **Co-Chair Garber:** Elaine, and then we'll break briefly for Jeremy, and then we'll go around the
20 table.



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 **Elaine Uang:** For the transportation subcommittee, I just wanted to make one comment about
2 parking and then one comment about the reorganization. On parking, I mean, you've read the
3 conclusion that we came to about managing demand. I also wanted to point out that in the
4 DEIR there were two mitigations measures: Trans 1A and Trans 1B on page 4.13-51. I think
5 those are worth looking back at, because they kind of directly relate to tools that we can use to
6 better manage parking inflow, managing future demand, managing existing supply, and that
7 type of thing. The challenge that I have with Policies T-4.1 and 4.2 is that it may actually—while
8 it might provide parking for future developments, it actually might even also induce demand for
9 future developments. According to Don's diagram, that's not a good thing. We want to be in
10 sync with sustainable transportation, not in conflict. The mitigation measures noted in the DEIR
11 are actually the better tools to think about. Much of the parking problems that we see in
12 downtown, Cal. Ave., where there's a lot of like overflow onto streets and commuter accesses
13 because there's a lot of buildings that just never had parking. Most of our downtown core was
14 built in 1890, 1920, 1930; they didn't have parking. A lot of the extra usage of those structures
15 still don't have places to go. Mitigation measures Trans 1A really focuses on trip caps and
16 requiring development projects to work with Transportation Demand Management. They have
17 actually very specific percentage reductions in SOV for the downtown district, the Cal. Ave.
18 area, Stanford Research Park, El Camino. I really urge you guys to take a look at those
19 mitigation measures. I would love to find—our group as a whole should weave that back into
20 the Element. Also, one note about unbundling parking. In the narrative we talk about



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 unbundling residential parking. I think it's important to note we should be unbundling
2 commercial parking. The challenge Palo Alto has which is different from what—you cite a
3 Portland article. Time's up. Unbundling commercial parking.

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

5 **Jeremy Dennis:** Thanks. I just want to make a few comments on some of the things that I
6 heard. First of all, I wanted to say thank you to Elena for running what, by every indication, was
7 a great set of subcommittee meetings. Thank you for all the work that you did on that. To
8 Don's comments on sub-subcommittees or whatever we want to call them, we're not able to
9 tell you not to meet. If a group of people want to get together and have conversations, they're
10 going to do that. Early in this process, I had intimated that the reason that things may have
11 gotten derailed earlier on when the PTC was doing its work was the concern that a lot of work
12 happened during non-publicly accessible subcommittee meetings. We made a concerted effort
13 here to ensure as much as possible that everything was out in the open, available, that the
14 public could participate. Certainly if one or two people are getting together for coffee and
15 talking about things, there's nothing wrong with that. We're not going to tell you not to do
16 those kinds of things, but we want people to be very aware that was the understanding that we
17 had. That's what we're trying to protect the work from. If people do decide to do that, just
18 understand that that might be a criticism that comes along, and we'll have to subsequently deal
19 with that. I'm just being blunt about it. Related to prioritization, I think this is a very good
20 point. I should have been clearer upfront. We have this part of the Comp Plan called the



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 implementation plan. If you haven't seen it in the existing Comp Plan, it's literally a list of all of
2 the policies and programs with dates and when we're going to do that work. There is work that
3 this group will do related to prioritization or implementation, whatever you want to call it, but
4 it makes the most sense for that to occur at the end of this process when you've seen all of that
5 work done. That's what we're recommending. Certainly the subcommittees could take a look
6 at it, but I'd hate for the subcommittees to get embroiled in implementation without doing the
7 work related to the actual Plan. Implementation is coming. That is something that we want
8 you to participate in. We expect multiple meetings related to that. I think there's a lot of good
9 work to do there. Finally, another set of comments that Don made that I couldn't help to
10 chuckle. The Community Services subcommittee did some extraordinary work. I think it's a
11 product that the CAC should be proud of. I'm very appreciative of the Council's set of
12 comments back, even though it wasn't in the form of a motion. We heard a lot of different
13 things from them, and that will be helpful moving forward. It was a challenge this first go-
14 around to really understand how we were going to deal with the whole set of comments that
15 came from everyone. We went through this round without a matrix; we provided a matrix.
16 That's been a lot of work, as I've suggested in the past. I do think that the subcommittee
17 actually did a fairly good job, concentrating on certain potential policies and programs, and
18 other ones did not make the final cut. We do run the risk of these Elements become a
19 repository for everybody's comments and getting into that kind of dialog here. We've got to
20 think about the bigger project here and the greater good here, which is to produce a Comp Plan



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 that is worthy of Palo Alto and something that can go back to the Council and that they can
2 discuss and debate which is their prerogative. We do our best from the staff perspective to
3 suggest why certain things weren't in. We encourage this group wholeheartedly to get into
4 that debate. We want to be careful about the expectation that any individual CAC member has
5 related to every single comment they're going to make. They're not all going to make the cut.
6 That's something that staff gets to do; that's something the subcommittee gets to do. I don't
7 want to go down that road too far, because then we get stuck in those sets of conversations
8 which I think could be very, very cumbersome. I just wanted to throw that out. I think the
9 subcommittee did an extraordinarily good job making sure that the best comments from this
10 group were included and the ones that didn't meet a certain minimum were not part of it.
11 That's exactly what they were supposed to do. Thank you.

12 **Co-Chair Garber:** I'm going to go first as opposed to last. Then we'll go to my left, and Amy will
13 go next. First a couple of comments about the City Council. I heard three things that night as
14 they were discussing the Community Services Element. One, to make the language of the
15 programs more flexible. I'll use that word as my Co-Chair has. Two, to streamline the narrative,
16 policies, and programs. As one of the Council Members put it, it's a lot easier to add stuff than
17 it is to take away. They are looking for us to take things away; they're looking for the editing
18 piece. Three, to help them prioritize the programs. We've got some ideas about how we as a
19 group can do the prioritization. The other important piece is that, as Len or Don had
20 mentioned—I think what this really does is it tasks the subcommittees with more editing. I



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

1 think in general the perception I came away with was that the Council was looking for us to do
2 more, not less on all of these topics, to that end and more cumbersome perhaps. I had
3 mentioned talking about editing the last time we all met here. I have taken a first pass as a
4 series of suggestions to the subcommittee regarding the language that you have at places. I've
5 got a couple of other copies if you need it. What I have tried to do was go through to reduce
6 wordiness. We often bury our lead in the actual text. I was trying to find ways to consolidate
7 policies and programs or revise policies that were so specific they didn't allow for reasonable
8 flexibility going into the future and/or removing policies and programs that were better
9 enacted as zoning standards or other things or belong in other Elements. Finally, the Comp
10 Plan will be referencing the other Master Plans and other plans with the City to become part of
11 it. I've also taken out a lot of references to the other plans except—I couldn't get all of them,
12 but many of those other plans which are subordinate to the Comp Plan reference policies in the
13 Comp Plan. Those policies that are tied back to the Comp Plan, we have to be careful about
14 sustaining. I'll talk more later. Thank you. Amy.

15 **Amy Sung:** First of all, I read this transportation draft, and I was very, very impressed. I
16 thought that it was very clearly organized. I adopted each subsection, and I was very pleased
17 that you find out that a lot of thought has been put in about convenient to use and reliability. I
18 mean the reliable of the transportation. That is on top of the safety and efficiency. I was very
19 pleased that you see that. As far as the parking, I thought that occupied almost the centerpiece
20 of this transportation. When I looked at this Transportation Element, it talks about the



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

1 Complete Streets, expressways or freeways, transit, walking, bicycling, parking, special
2 transportation needs and aviation. That looks like we are trying to solve today's problem in the
3 Plan that we think that will continued to be used for the years to come. Regarding the special
4 needs section, I see what Don was talking about that use the words of disabilities. I happen to
5 believe that it is best that you keep the word disabilities. That is the word that American
6 Disability Act is based on. I would use that. As far as reducing the reliance on the single
7 vehicles, I continue to hold out my hope that the self-drive autos is in the near future. I do
8 want to talk about something that is less focus, the rail corridor. I am very much in favor of this
9 grade separation. I also like to see that while Caltrain is in the process of electrifying, the noise
10 reduction is also important. Can I also touch upon the airport? I do not really understand very
11 much about the airport, but I do not understand why we want to limit it to only one runway. It
12 shall remain only one. How do we account for the future growth? Thank you.

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

14 **Whitney McNair:** Thank you. I wanted to follow the staff report and just focus tonight on
15 parking. Bonnie, I wanted to thank you for this flow chart. I found that really helpful to try and
16 understand what the main focus of the Comp Plan was trying to say about those particular
17 things. I at the last meeting talked about my position regarding the ability to require TDM
18 measures, so I'm not going to go into that again. I was a little confused about what the Comp
19 Plan was trying to say about parking. In the staff report it says strategies to reduce the demand
20 should be incorporated over time. I'm not quite sure what that means. Policy T-4.9 encourages



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 the use of adaptive design strategies in new parking facilities in order to facilitate reuse in the
2 future and when conditions warrant. I'm not quite sure what that means either. It's kind of
3 bland, banking some parking. There's also a policy that encourages below-grade or structured
4 parking. Those aren't really suitable for reuse, so those two things to me are a little bit in
5 conflict. There's also Policy T-4.23 which is consider updating parking standards for
6 nonresidential uses to better reflect occupancy and employee density. I just want to caution
7 it's really difficult to regulate employee density. If the issue is to try not to have parking within
8 the surrounding neighborhood, I understand that. I get that position. There's also a lot of
9 discussion around reducing trips, in particular drive-alone trips. If you have a lot of policies in
10 there that encourage ample parking at the door of the building where you work, it really flies
11 directly in the face of getting people out of their cars and into alternative means. There's just a
12 balance. I'm not quite sure the Comp Plan has quite settled on what that balance is going to be.

13 **Jeremy Dennis:** I'd like to make a quick comment to that. I appreciate those comments. I think
14 this is the most challenging section that we've encountered at this point in the process. We
15 were trying to find a balance between recognizing the short-term parking needs of the City
16 while also looking at the long-term plans the City has around reducing SOV trips. Completely
17 appreciate that we may not have found that balance yet. It could create some tension in the
18 document if we didn't write it correctly. Last month, I said that we don't think that this is a
19 consistent document at this point given that there isn't consistency yet here at this group and



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 there may not be. I wanted to acknowledge that I think you're spot on with your comments.

2 Thank you.

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

4 **Heidi Emberling:** Thank you. Thank you to the subcommittee for all your work on the
5 Transportation Element here. I just have a couple of questions. One is do we want to spell out
6 in the Elements continuing things that we're already doing. I just pose that as a rhetorical
7 question. I'm just wondering like under road safety we have continue Safe Routes to School
8 partnership with PAUSD and the Palo Alto Council of PTAs. I assume that's not going anywhere.
9 I'm just wondering why we call that out in the Comp Plan unless we're trying to make some
10 change to it. I mean, this is a committee that's worked well together. It's so critically
11 important, I wouldn't want anyone to consider it as something to get rid of or prioritize. It's just
12 part of the work that we do together. I don't know if that's the sort of thing we're thinking
13 about when we think about consolidating and just sort of focusing on the vision for change.
14 Also I'm wondering about putting stuff in that we don't have any control over. For example,
15 encourage private schools within the community to develop walk and roll maps which is great.
16 I know that's been a conversation with the Safe Routes to School group, but we don't really
17 have any jurisdiction over that. I'm not sure why it's in our Comp Plan aside from work with
18 everyone to develop walk and roll maps, businesses and otherwise. I'm not sure why we call it
19 out there. I'm just trying to think about ways to streamline the process, because there just are
20 so many things in here. All the collaborations with the School District, of course, around road



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 safety are critical. I appreciate the thinking about programs for our teachers and staff in order
2 to reduce auto vehicles. We have teachers as we have many other City workers who commute
3 from far distances. It would be great to figure that out. That's sort of a very big issue that I
4 think a Comp Plan can talk about in terms of this is something we really want to put some effort
5 into. The smaller things about continuing programs we're already doing, again, I'm just not sure
6 about that. Thanks.

7 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Annette. I'm sorry, Sylvia wanted to respond briefly from the
8 City.

9 **Sylvia Star-Lack:** Hi, Heidi. Thanks for the comments. It is true we have a Safe Routes to
10 School program that I'm very happy to work for. However, when I went through the
11 Transportation Element the first time, I noticed that our program isn't mentioned by name.
12 There's actually nothing, I think, in the current version that we're using. That doesn't mention
13 it. I wanted to make sure that we had a firm policy foundation for this program that is such a
14 huge part of the quality of life in this town. That's why that was there. I just wanted to
15 acknowledge the fact that this program encourages 4,000 students; imagine getting 4,000
16 students to bike in town. I just wanted to make sure that was going to remain in the document,
17 because our current document doesn't mention it.

18 **Heidi Emberling:** Absolutely. I'm just wondering if we should just put it in the narrative as this
19 is in the fabric of our life here or not as opposed to calling out every individual program. I think
20 it's essential, absolutely.



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

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

2 **Annette Glanckopf:** I'm a little bit drowning in paper, so I focused basically on the staff report
3 and the matrix, which I never got a hard copy of. I agree the preface is much too long and the
4 maps are really hard to read. I'm not sure that's going to be so useful. I support reducing not
5 only the preface but also a lot of the programs and policies. I have some general comments
6 about the subcommittee. I just could not support anything that would touch the Baylands. The
7 ferry is absolutely out, and we need to figure out how to get people in from Redwood City.
8 With all due respect, I don't support the comments on the airport. Most of the noise does
9 come from San Francisco, and we might incorporate something about the work of Sky Posse.
10 As far as the shuttle, Ellen probably has a good point about the seniors there. I am very
11 concerned about developing all these new routes that are going to be very expensive to run
12 and maintain, much less new buses which make sense. I think before we do that we should
13 really survey some of the residents out there and see what they want. Perhaps they want these
14 innovative new transportation services such as Uber and Lyft. I'm not sure that's really going to
15 help on the environment with the double trips. I'd also like to see LinkAGES which is the PAMF
16 volunteer program mentioned in the study, because I think that has a lot of growth. I'm not
17 sure what coordinating with neighborhood planning efforts mean. I think we need to really talk
18 a little bit more about that and see if that is just cosmetic or how we would actually do that.
19 Parking, that is really tough. I basically support most of what I hear about commuter parking,
20 but I don't respect that in view of resident parking. I think we really need to consider residents



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 a little bit more carefully. Not everyone, with all due respect again, is going to ride bicycles
2 especially the older you get or in the dark and the cold. As far as any kind of overflow to
3 neighborhoods, I think the RPP—although, Jessica and group did a wonderful job—is really a
4 custom solution for downtown. Any time we mention parking permits for neighborhoods, I
5 think it's very, very important to mention College Terrace. I wanted to talk about over-parking.
6 I just can't support a lot of that. I guess I'll get another round on that.

7 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you, Annette. Hamilton.

8 **Hamilton Hitchings:** Thank you, Dan. We can best serve the City Council by reaching
9 thoughtful consensus wherever possible, thus making passable, effective, and long-lasting
10 zoning changes more likely. I want to build on some themes from the last meeting presented
11 by my colleagues such as adaptivity and exploration while at the same time exploring
12 addressing the current parking shortage that is of concern to so many. My comments are
13 focused primarily around Goal 4 which is parking. Policy T-4.1, please add "do not allow new
14 construction of under-parked buildings where under-parked is defined as having less parking
15 space than would be needed for the occupants of the buildings." Program T-4.2.4, this would
16 be a new one. "Allow businesses and apartment buildings to rent their parking spots including
17 to the City through RPP, thus being able to generate fees and income for any unused parking."
18 In the meantime, we should allow as an experiment a one single-bedroom style apartment
19 building for carless seniors and affordable housing in downtown. In order to mitigate the risk
20 that this program doesn't work, we should provide it with 50 percent of parking but only to be



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

1 used for the RPP, not for any of the residents of that building. Use it as a case study, measuring
2 the number of permits actually allowed and resident compliance. As a footnote, this program
3 failed in Portland, but I still think it's worth trying here and getting some good data. With the
4 extra parking, I think it's fairly low risk. It allows us to explore without significant consequences
5 if it fails. Policy T-4.3, remove the sentence—I feel pretty strongly about this as do many other
6 residents—"the City should eliminate minimum parking requirements in (inaudible)-served
7 areas." There was a consensus in the last meeting that this was not acceptable, and yet it's still
8 in this version. That raises concern. On a slightly different topic, Program T-1.3.1, Stanford
9 should offset new incremental office space by 120 percent of the impact on new car vehicle
10 trips for SRP. Thank you.

11 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thanks. Shani.

12 **Shani Kleinhaus:** I agree with Bob about the airport comments, that there is too much detail
13 about the building. I also think that the general public has spoken again and again about
14 looking for the Baylands and nature to trump development in the airport. I don't see that
15 coming through. It's like staff will figure out how to minimize the impacts of the airport on the
16 Baylands. I don't see that as answering the concern that I had and others. I definitely do not
17 want to see the airport grow and develop into a bigger one. That's one thing. I also don't know
18 why the ferry and BRT are still here given that there was not a lot of support for a ferry on
19 Embarcadero. Like the Sierra Club has written, BRT was essentially eliminated by the City
20 Council, and it's coming back. I think in Palo Alto it showed that that would actually increase



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 traffic into neighborhoods. One of the things that the introduction talks about a lot but is not
2 really coming through very much in the actual Plan is the level of service. There's a lot of
3 discussion of that, but it's not really coming through. The only place, maybe there's other
4 places that I didn't find it, is Program T-2.4.1 which is maintain current thresholds for
5 acceptable levels of service for intersections in Palo Alto and establish protocols for office,
6 commercial and multifamily residential development, to evaluate level of service for transit
7 vehicles, bicyclists and pedestrians. I don't understand why vehicles, just private vehicles, are
8 not in there. I don't understand why schools and hotels and all sorts of other things are not in
9 there. I also think that level of service really ties to health because of emissions. It really
10 impacts all of us. Health is not really included here very much, but this is where it should be. I
11 think I've said that in one of the previous meetings. I would like to see CEQA requirements for
12 the City that would actually have or maybe there should be a program to develop threshold of
13 significance for level of service in Palo Alto. That way we can implement that in any future
14 projects that come through.

15 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Lydia.

16 **Lydia Kou:** Basically Annette, Hamilton and Shani have just said all my comments. I'm going to
17 just go with that.

18 **Co-Chair Garber:** Doria.

19 **Doria Summa:** I would like to agree, to be brief, with Hamilton's comments especially about
20 Goal 4 and Annette's comments and Shani's comments especially about level of service, the



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 airport, ferry, and CEQA threshold of significance. To go a little further, I think one of the
2 problems with T-4.3 is that given the way the RPP is being developed for downtown with
3 unlimited day and week scratchers and the very minimal reduction annually which amounts to
4 2 percent, I think that the residential streets will be very impacted by purposely at this point
5 under-parking more buildings in that the streets will be just as full because of the minimal
6 annual reduction and the unlimited day and week passes. It just doesn't make sense given the
7 current deficit. I also wanted to—airport is done. Wait a second. I got confused. Unbundling,
8 I'm trying to find what page it's on. Basically I think the unbundling of parking, residential I
9 think Elaine wanted to add maybe in her comments and commercial. I think that this also could
10 be a problem because where this is most likely to happen is next to the most impacted
11 residential neighborhoods, downtown and California Avenue, where the same thing will result if
12 there's just this endless use of 2-hour parking, day passes, and week passes. Page 57—no,
13 that's the airport. We don't need that anymore. I appreciate the appreciation and shout out
14 that the Element gives to Stanford's TDM success in the Stanford Research Park, but I think you
15 should add something about how the College Terrace style RPPP really helped contribute to
16 that success. It would just be good to acknowledge that. I was confused by the use of **MASS**
17 **versus our own kind of phrase commuter wallet**. If we're using those interchangeably, I think it
18 would be better to use the more general term that more people would understand. Maybe
19 we're not using it interchangeably. That's sort of a question.



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Mark, you've already spoken, so I'm going to skip you. We'll go
2 to Adrian.

3 **Adrian Fine:** Thank you. Just some quick comments. I agree in general the introduction is way,
4 way too long. A couple of people, myself included, have highlighted the need to at least discuss
5 prioritization, and perhaps the introduction is a good place to do that in terms of prioritizing the
6 goals, programs and policies. Maybe we want to highlight specific goals such as a sustainable
7 transportation network with things like EVs and TDM backing it up as the policy is to get that
8 done. I really appreciate what the subcommittee wrote about parking. I think it is helpful to
9 evaluate all parking needs comprehensively, but I don't think that means we should build to
10 meet all of those demands. If you build it, parkers will come. I think that needs to be clearly
11 stated because we can link a rationale there to essentially reducing SOV. It's kind of
12 disingenuous to say we want to evaluate all parking needs and build for all of them, but at the
13 same time we want to reduce single occupancy vehicles. Those two are in opposition. Finally, I
14 think the biennial parking study is a great idea, just be sure to make it Citywide. Thank you.

15 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Len, and then we'll go to Stephen, Lisa—excuse me. Not Lisa,
16 Stephen, Alex and then Arthur, and then we'll put it up to the whole group.

17 **Len Filppu:** Thank you. I really like the way parking should be provided to meet demand.
18 There is a problem with parking in this town. Residents feel it. The people I talk to feel it all the
19 time. While we're saying that parking should be provided to meet demand, not future demand
20 but demand, then a number of the programs and policies kind of contradict what that overall



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

1 principle is. For example, Program T-4.2.1 where we study the feasibility of reduced parking
2 requirements for office, commercial and multifamily residential. Policy T-4.3 where the City
3 should consider eliminating minimum parking requirements. Policy T-4.6, continue to
4 encouraged shared parking in order to reduce the overall number of new parking spaces that
5 must be provided onsite for new office, commercial, and residential development. My concern
6 is that if we're not dealing with future growth and the current demand for parking and we're
7 hoping that fewer people drive whether it's millennials or older people, then we're creating
8 more of a problem, because we're not guaranteed in a marketplace who is going to be
9 purchasing those buildings, those occupancies or what kinds of businesses are going to be
10 there. The School District is so good a lot of the people coming in here have families and kids,
11 and it's very difficult to go to soccer and girl scouts if you don't have a vehicle. I just want to be
12 a little bit careful about how lax we're going to be about new buildings or discussing new
13 buildings and projects in light of our demands on parking and the fact that parking should be
14 provided to meet demand. Thank you.

15 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Steve, then Alex, and then Arthur. Everyone else has spoken.

16 **Stephen Levy:** Hamilton and I talked on the way over. I want to appreciate his opening remark.
17 I think at some point we and the Council are going to have to discuss this issue that we really
18 haven't about growth. We've gone all around it. I appreciate adaptive and exploratory. We
19 talked about trying a single room occupancy, micro unit place. We talked about maybe having
20 residents being able to sell their permits. I find the sequential nature of what we're doing,



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 going Element by Element, very difficult. In response to what Hillary said, I'd like us to be able
2 to discuss the EIR alternatives including the new one that they might make. If we're going to
3 discuss parking and development, shouldn't we do that after talking about business and the
4 economy? Shouldn't both of those things be informed by the fiscal presentation that's going to
5 go to the Finance Committee on March 1st? I'd like them to come here too. I can't imagine
6 that everyone around the table or on the Council wants to make development decisions
7 without any clue as to what it means for the City budget or the City economy going forward.
8 Unless we find some way to integrate all this stuff and we just march through Element by
9 Element and never come back, I just don't see how we do that. I love what I think the
10 subcommittee said here. I don't pretend that I understand it all about parking, but I have no
11 way to judge that without knowing whether we're shutting down the City. The last time I
12 looked at the numbers, businesses provide 50-60 percent of the revenue. I want to know how
13 we're going to provide the services if we end up with some policies that restrict development.
14 Housing is a completely different thing. I'm very supportive of housing whatever we do on job
15 growth.

16 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Alex, and then Arthur.

17 **Alex van Riesen:** I wasn't at the last meeting, so I was just trying to catch up, read all the notes.
18 I think the main thing I was just struck by is just the sheer quantity of policies and programs. I
19 guess I was curious if someone here or you all could speak to that, the nature. There's a set
20 amount that we're gunning for. Is this actually doable? From a bigger perspective, what you're



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 looking for from us. I actually tallied it up, and it was a lot, but I can't find them now. They're
2 somewhere buried in this ream of paper. There were like 100 programs and 128 policies. It
3 just seems kind of mindboggling. I don't know if that's—that just struck me. Is this the point
4 where the CAC Chairs- will vet the disagreements that exist? Is that what comes next? I think
5 what I would like to know is what are the three main disagreements that the CAC has with
6 regards to transportation and could we dialog about it with one another.

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

8 **Co-Chair Keller:** Firstly, response to something that Heidi said. If we required all private
9 schools in all zoning areas to have a conditional use permit, then we could require TDM and we
10 could require walk and roll maps from these. I've long advocated that they have that. It seems
11 a simple change to make. That is a land use issue that affects transportation. The second thing
12 is that self-parked does not mean it satisfies Code. Self-parked means that it satisfies the
13 demand for parking regardless of what that demand is. The idea is to work that demand so it
14 decreases over time. I entirely agree with what Annette, Hamilton, Shani, Lydia, Doria and Len
15 have said. I'm not going to repeat what they say. I do want to say that the document is written
16 in a biased manner, because the document assumes that we're going to have all the growth and
17 we're going to basically not park it and we're going to exacerbate the parking issues in the RPP
18 District and the surroundings. That's the bias in the document, particularly since the notion of
19 it being self-parked has been eliminated. The idea that minimum parking requirements near
20 transit are eliminated. That's minimum parking requirements for a bus, for example, served by



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 transit. It says in transit-served areas. Midtown is served by transit by a bus that runs every
2 half hour and by the shuttle that runs every half hour. That's not rich transit. If you're going to
3 eliminate minimum parking requirements in Midtown, that's crazy. The issue is that it needs to
4 be a little bit more finely tuned than that, and it needs to happen based on reduction in
5 demand not leading it the other way first. The example in the document I gave of Portland
6 shows that that's incorrect. The assumption that millennials won't have cars is proved incorrect
7 from the other document that I distributed in my thing. I just want to briefly talk about San
8 Antonio and Charleston. I distributed another document which is from a Mountain View study
9 of north Bayshore, which talks about the transportation alternatives they're considering closing.
10 These three documents are from the initial draft study of widening 101 and basically says that
11 there are more collisions at the Charleston onramp/off-ramp on 101 southbound than
12 anywhere else north of 85 on 101. The fact that we haven't fixed that is crazy. In addition,
13 showing that there's traffic congestion over there, amazingly at 5:08 when I took it, there was
14 an accident near there. Even if I didn't take it when there was an accident, it would still show
15 congestion right at that interchange where there's no auxiliary merge lane. It's crazy.

16 **Co-Chair Garber:** We'll now open it up to the floor. I see Bonnie. If others would like to speak,
17 I will add you as I see you. Go ahead Bonnie.

18 **Bonnie Packer:** I'd like to hit the parking issue head on. A couple of things. I understand that
19 many of us are not going to give up driving right away. The goal in this Comp Plan, the
20 overarching goal, is to reduce greenhouse emissions, reduce reliance on SOV. One of the ways



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 of getting there is to provide more transit and other options for people to use. If that happens,
2 hopefully, the demand in certain areas of our City, the demand for parking will decrease. We
3 won't need as much parking. I think what the staff report said about what the subcommittee
4 said is to talk about managing parking demand is more flexible language looking towards the
5 future. I know it's not going to happen tomorrow. Maybe in 10 years we will have less demand
6 for parking downtown. We want to have the language in this 15-year looking Comp Plan to be
7 not so restricted, to be not so knee-jerk responsive to an existing problem in downtown,
8 University Avenue, affecting one area. It doesn't affect me in the Palo Verde neighborhood. It's
9 one issue. If we keep on saying self-park—what self-park means to Arthur doesn't mean the
10 same to me. That's why I would like to not use those terms, but just say the parking should
11 meet whatever the demand is and the demand is determined by regular studies and about the
12 demographics of the occupants of the particular building. That's what determines the demand.
13 The minimum parking requirements in the Zoning Code need to be looked at like on a regular
14 basis so that they can be refined to meet the demand of where this particular new
15 development is. That's why I'm saying that those of you who are really concerned about the
16 environment should try and be more flexible in the language, not be so adamant about saying
17 all new buildings have to be self-parked. To me, that says you're going to have to put lots and
18 lots of parking spaces, because we haven't changed the Zoning Code yet. On the other hand, if
19 you say let's have policies where we're constantly looking at what the demand is, that's what
20 determines what the minimum parking requirements are, that's where we can go, the adaptive



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 view. I don't disagree that we shouldn't solve the parking problem. I'm saying this is 15 years
2 in the future. I mean, in 5 years we may have a recession, and there will be tons of parking
3 spaces downtown. We need to have adaptive language, is what I'm urging. I think we can
4 come to agreement on that.

5 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you, Bonnie. Annette, and then Elaine, and then Hamilton.

6 **Annette Glanckopf:** I think parking is definitely one of the areas that we are in a little bit of a
7 minority/majority position. I do believe the parking should meet the demand. If you look out
8 there in the next 10 years, maybe 15, we're not there yet especially with all the new projects.
9 Let me just read what I said in one my writings. Every commercial project, I feel, should be fully
10 parked unless in the future there is a demonstrated significant reduction in use of cars. I don't
11 think that's going to happen in the next 10 or 15 years with all the development. Downtown,
12 Cal. Ave., and Midtown is just ripe for development. Potentially we could analyze it and look at
13 the Zoning Code and make changes. Whitney mentioned that the Plan is sort of schizophrenic
14 in that we say one thing in one place and one thing in another. Jennifer also wrote something
15 that I thought was very good. I strongly oppose the Comp Plan policy that calls for eliminating
16 minimum parking requirement in transit-served areas. What I like is this is a policy that calls for
17 baby steps informed by area specific data about successful reduction in parking demand. I'd
18 like to see this as the majority/minority position. One other thing is we talk about these
19 disabled or whatever people. I would like to see the language "special needs." There's some
20 very awkward phrasing in here, especially the wording "those lacking resources," which sounds



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 very strange to me. Let's consider maybe the special needs population or the vulnerable
2 population.

3 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Hamilton, then Bob, and then Arthur.

4 **Hamilton Hitchings:** I think one of the ...

5 **Co-Chair Garber:** Sorry, I'm sorry. I apologize. Elaine, then you, Hamilton.

6 **Hamilton Hitchings:** Sure, no problem.

7 **Co-Chair Garber:** I'm sorry. I'm trying to find a reference, and I apologize I wasn't paying
8 attention then.

9 **Elaine Uang:** Thanks, Dan. Parking. Hamilton's point about self-parking is right, but I think we
10 need to also use and think about the right tools for parking. I think we need to separate
11 ourselves from—we need the right tools to get the right outcomes. What I was trying to
12 explain earlier is a lot of the parking problems that we see downtown, for example, are
13 generated by buildings that have no opportunity and no way to actually self-park themselves.
14 At the same time, we're doing what Whitney pointed out which is by creating these minimum
15 parking requirements and like creating free parking basically for new developments, we're
16 actually inducing demand. The challenge is how do we align the sustainable transportation
17 goals that I think a lot of us are interested in moving forward and Council has directed us to
18 work towards and align the parking programs and policies so that they work together. I think
19 Hamilton's comments are kind of getting us there, but we need to think about what the 21st
20 century tools are for that, to manage parking in a 21st century way and not actually creating



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 more parking demand than we actually need in future. Donald Shoup said that parking
2 minimums are to parking policy what bloodletting was to medicine in the 19th century. We
3 really need to be careful about the tools that we use to manage the parking and manage the
4 demand and not simply just say okay. We have to recognize too where the parking
5 requirements came from. They are set from a sort of 1950s, 1960s style. I understand that
6 they're still relevant. I'm not saying that we need to abolish them. I think we should consider
7 right-sizing them so that they are in step and in sync with our sustainable transportation goals
8 and align those two major goals so that we're getting towards a Palo Alto that only needs as
9 much parking as it needs so that we're not creating more than we actually need and not also
10 simultaneously incurring a lot of traffic and a lot of excess greenhouse gas and emissions. On
11 the point of unbundling, I think—never mind.

12 **Co-Chair Garber:** It's Hamilton, then Bob, Arthur, Heidi, Doria, and then Stephen.

13 **Hamilton Hitchings.** Continuing to talk about parking. This is partly talking about where we
14 think there might be some controversy. I'm going to follow up on some of my previous
15 colleagues' comments. If you want to call it manage parking demand, absolutely. The goal is to
16 have the right amount of—the goal is not to create more new, let's say, office employees or
17 residents than cars that are created. We definitely want to manage the parking demand, and
18 we definitely want it to be adaptive. Elaine, one of the reasons I didn't mention some of these
19 tools is because I already feel like we're successfully moving down the path with them. For
20 example, pricing. We're now doing pricing; hopefully, it'll go up. I think \$500 is kind of cheap



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 for a one-year permit. I do feel like we are already starting down the path of pricing. We do
2 want to do all these other programs. I think the programs need to be accountable for the
3 results. If we look at areas of compromise, the big concern from a lot of residents is that we're
4 trying to—we have this problem. For example in downtown, we're 2,000 spaces short. It's not
5 like we have excess parking right now. We have a significant shortage. You can't get parking in
6 City Hall at noon. All the spaces are filled unless you have a permit. What people want to see is
7 that we have some mechanism in place that while we're managing demand and essentially
8 suppressing it through parking fees and providing lots of good alternatives, we're also not
9 making the problem worse before we make it better. If we can get to that point where we
10 acknowledge there's a program and we need to make it better, it's not mutually exclusive with
11 any of these other things. There's a nice program in here to do a biennial measurement; that's
12 a great tool for us to constantly reevaluate. At some point we are going to hit a recession, and
13 it'll be a different landscape. I think the City Council would greatly appreciate it if we can also
14 remain flexible and adaptive.

15 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you, Hamilton. Bob, Arthur, Heidi.

16 **Bob Wenzlau:** My comments are pretty quick. I wanted to turn towards the sustainability
17 elements in the transportation plan. I understand that the Sustainability/Climate Action Plan
18 has new policies and programs that are being suggested. One of the things logistically I'm
19 trying to figure out is when the S/CAP comes forward into the process, how do we as a team all
20 of a sudden see new input that's sort of coming in where perhaps new policies and programs



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 are suggested. I look forward for some feedback at some point from staff around that. I think
2 there's some really great ideas that are going to be in the S/CAP, but it's something that I think
3 we need to kind of factor in. I felt that Council enjoyed Stefan Heck's commentary at the
4 sustainability regarding transportation. Again, I wondered whether there were elements of his
5 remarks that would inform our Transportation Element. In particular, one area that got me
6 really excited was his view of transportation where it's generated within Palo Alto and the use
7 of bikes and e-bikes. Occasionally I hear this remark, with great respect, that why are we
8 talking about bikes when it won't necessarily work for seniors. There's a lot of people who still
9 can use that as a transportation mode. I feel that we tend to discount it as a solution that could
10 reduce inner-trip demand that goes to downtown and almost could begin identifying special
11 parking for bicycles and his notion of e-bikes. I rode my bike from north Palo Alto to this
12 meeting, and it's a pain to ride 30 minutes. By the time you get here, you're worn out. Finally, I
13 wanted to thank Penny for the thorough and comprehensive remarks regarding the school bike
14 program and wanted to support them. If a statement of support helps, I wanted to make sure
15 that they got locked into the minutes. Thanks.

16 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thanks, Bob. Just before Arthur, Jessica from City staff, you had a couple of
17 comments.

18 **Jessica Sullivan:** Hi, everyone. I just wanted to say this is a really great and engaging
19 discussion. I did want to kind of just maybe add some color from the perspective of the City
20 staff who are responsible for implementing the programs that come as a result of Council



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 direction when considering this Plan. Around the parking, I'll call it the controversy. Clearly we
2 have some very polarized points of view in this room. I just to want to kind of add a little color
3 from a planning perspective on that. Parking is the single biggest tool we have when it comes
4 to regulating traffic and congestion. The single biggest. We talk about Stanford a lot. I heard
5 the Stanford Research Park TDM and the success of Stanford University's TDM program
6 mentioned. That program is successful because Stanford actively subsidizes lots of transit
7 programs, and they actively regulate and very highly price parking. In the conversation we have
8 tonight and what I see echoed in the Plan, we have a lot of comments about subsidizing transit.
9 Sylvia mentioned codifying the Safe Routes to School program, making sure we have these
10 things in the Plan so that we can create programs that promote active transportation. We have
11 things about regulating managing parking. On the flip side, we also have things about parking
12 to meet demand. I just want to sort of explain that if we believe that the future of Palo Alto
13 should be about the single occupant vehicle and remain about vehicular transportation, we will
14 not be successful in implementing these programs that we're all talking about. We want people
15 to ride the shuttle. We want people to ride bikes. If we continue to put parking minimums on
16 everything, if we keep adding parking, parking creates traffic. If we believe that the future of
17 Palo Alto is more about alternative transportation and sustainable modes of transportation,
18 having things like parking minimums will slow that down considerably. I'm not saying either
19 one is the right one, but I am saying that having a Plan which has both in sort of equal measure
20 and sort of gives staff, "We can do this or how about we could do this? We could not park this



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 or we could park this." We want to hear from all of you, and all of your points are valid. That
2 "we sort of we want everything and we want to eat our cake too" is challenging for us.

3 **Co-Chair Garber:** Welcome to Palo Alto. Arthur. Thank you, Jessica.

4 **Co-Chair Keller:** The comment about having our cake and eating it too makes sense to me.
5 What I'd like to suggest is that we implement the College Terrace style RPP program Citywide.
6 If you want not parking for the businesses, go ahead and figure out how they're going to get
7 there and where they're going to park, because they won't park in the neighborhoods. That's a
8 tradeoff you have to make. If you're going to do a tradeoff that says we're going to continue to
9 park in the downtown neighborhoods and around California Avenue and such for a period of
10 time, then you have to provide parking for the new businesses that come in. That's a tradeoff
11 that you have to make. I think that the issue is the conflict between the PTC Policy T-4.6 which
12 hasn't made it into this draft even though I count at least eight people on the CAC who
13 specifically said that they want it there. That's clearly a controversy. I'm not sure if it's a
14 minority opinion or majority opinion, but it certainly has enough support to be in there. That's
15 the policy that says all new development should be completely self-parked or at least parking to
16 meet demand. The issue is that the narrative should explain the transition. That's a good
17 purpose in the narrative, to explain the transition that now they have to be self-parked for the
18 current demand. Our objective is to drive demand lower so that future projects will have less
19 parking because the demand will be demonstrated to be lower as was mentioned by Hamilton,
20 I believe. That's the issue that needs to happen. If you have a project that has excess parking



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 now, that is built to current standards for which it is determined that it has excess parking,
2 Hamilton suggested, and I agree, the idea of rent that parking out to the City or rent that
3 parking out to other buildings that are under-parked because they were built without parking.
4 You have to create a transition. You can't assume the conclusion and say suddenly cars won't
5 appear. They will; they'll appear, and they'll be in the neighborhoods. If you want to eliminate
6 parking in neighborhoods tomorrow, then you can think about the idea—Phase 2 immediately,
7 no business parking. Will people be willing to do that? If you're saying, "Tomorrow buildings
8 built near transit have no parking," that's the same kind of argument. They're saying we need a
9 transition; you need a transition for parking as well. One last comment I'd like to make on this.
10 There seems to be a new idiom that's been sprinkled through like pepper (inaudible) document.
11 That is insertion of office, commercial and multifamily residential. I'm sort of wondering why
12 was that inserted , what does it leave out, what's excluded by that, what's the point. I don't
13 understand why that was thrown in there. It seems to be excluding—I'm not sure—mixed use,
14 hotels. I'm not sure what it's excluding. If you want to exclude single-family residential or low
15 density like RMD and R-2, then say so. Don't do it by selecting a few things that you have
16 selected to be in and who knows what's taken out. Thank you.

17 **Co-Chair Garber:** Heidi, then Doria, then Stephen.

18 **Heidi Emberling:** Exciting conversation. Thank you, Jessica, for that overview. It's always good
19 to know what staff is going to do with the guidance in the Plan in terms of thinking about this
20 issue. Compelling points. To Jessica's point, we are going to have different ideas contained



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 within this Plan. It will be up to the electeds to figure out sort of how to implement that. It's
2 good to have short-term and long-term ideas and possibilities. We don't have to solve every
3 problem here right now; although, it's nice to know where we're going. I wanted to clarify
4 something I said earlier about the Safe Routes to School, which is such a valuable program. I
5 think what I meant by not putting just continue the Safe Routes to School partnership is this is a
6 visioning document, so what do we want to do within that partnership? We have another
7 program that says establish a comprehensive, proactive traffic safety program. Do we want to
8 expand Safe Routes to School, expand K-5 on? If we're going to put in something about the
9 partnerships that already exist, what vision do we want to attain with that? That was just my
10 clarification. Also on bicycle parking, we have a policy, T-4.1.4, to improve and add attractive,
11 secure bicycle parking at public and private facilities including multimodal transit stations, City
12 parks, City streets and other public rights-of-way, private developments and other community
13 destinations. I think around schools should be listed there. I would add schools to that one.
14 Thank you.

15 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Doria, then Steve, then Adrian.

16 **Doria Summa:** I agree with everything that Arthur said. If you want to reduce greenhouse gas
17 emissions and get people out of single occupancy vehicle, gasoline-driven cars, you should
18 agree that the best way to do that is to not fill up neighborhoods, which were never intended
19 for nonresidential use of the streets with commuter parking. You're not helping the TDM
20 measures at all. The Transportation Management Agency should be outraged that the



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 reduction annually is only 2 percent, because that's not helping them. We want much better
2 than that. If you really want to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, you'll vote for Arthur's idea
3 of Citywide, which I've discussed here before. I'd also like to add that on page 19 in the
4 narrative, neighborhood impacts, it describes chronic problems on neighborhood streets,
5 speeding, commuter shortcut and too much traffic, and doesn't even mention the parking
6 which may not yet be in every single neighborhood. I think most of us would agree that this
7 Comp Plan is for everybody. It's for everybody right now and everybody up 'til 2030. It's not
8 just for neighborhoods that haven't been affected yet by a problem. I agree that pricing is an
9 absolutely important tool for Traffic Demand Management. The sad thing, though, is the paid
10 parking that we have in the City is very, very cheap especially for business people who, in other
11 cities, would expect to pay way, way, way, way more. We're still giving it away. The problem
12 with saying relying on the fact that buildings in downtown especially are old, from the '20s or
13 '30s, does not reflect the fact that the buildings have tripled and doubled in size in many cases,
14 through sometimes legal means like TDRs and sometimes through negligent planning errors.
15 TDRs, in-lieu parking fees never created one single parking spot when they took the money.
16 The parking lots downtown were paid originally by the assessment, so the buildings are much
17 bigger. There's way more people there, and there's also the fact that lots of ground-floor retail
18 has been transitioned to office, and it's very dense office. It's not fair to say the buildings are
19 old, and they were never parked. Thanks.

20 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you, Doria. Steve, Adrian, and then Mark.



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 **Stephen Levy:** I get that parking in new development is controversial. I'm a numbers person,
2 and I'd kind of like to second what Jessica said. If you're a numbers person, you know that
3 reducing the demand for parking, reducing the number of people who have to drive or drive
4 alone, you want to be going after the whole pool not just the small amount o people who are in
5 new buildings. The most reductions will come from changing the behavior of the people who
6 were already here. Now, I've heard in Hamilton's idea of consensus a couple of ideas. One
7 from Arthur of allowing existing places with extra parking to rent them out. Some residents
8 who might get extra permits might be induced to sell them and take the money and maybe
9 park in their garages. I'll never bike in my life; I don't see well enough. I think a bicycle program
10 can allow some existing residents to reduce their demand for driving as might a good shuttle
11 program. The main point is if we're really serious about reducing car use and the associated
12 demand with parking, we ought to spend a little less time talking about parking related to new
13 developments and a lot more time talking about the stuff that Jessica and the TMA is talking
14 about that affect the behavior of all of the residents and all of the employees.

15 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you, Steve. Adrian, Mark, and then myself.

16 **Adrian Fine:** Thank you. I thought this was a bit of a controversy, but it seems in some ways
17 we're coming together a little bit which is encouraging. I tentatively agree with Arthur about
18 the RPP program. It is a hard tradeoff, and it's one that Palo Alto's going to have to choose. I
19 think that's probably a decision for Council to make and implement. Just to reemphasize,
20 providing and building free parking is like giving out chocolates except for cars. You build them



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 and they will be used, as Jessica mentioned. The vast majority of parking in the City is
2 completely free. It's also a tradeoff. In Palo Alto, you often hear people saying we don't have
3 enough space for that next new building or for a new development. I want to ask, do we have
4 enough space for parking? Is that really the tradeoff we want to make, building parking lots
5 instead of homes or businesses or parks? I also just want to agree with Bonnie, what she said
6 about using adaptive language in this Comprehensive Plan. The language of the Comp Plan
7 shouldn't be based on what we are thinking here today. I think we can do a better job of
8 defining adaptability, whether it's a time-bound measure based on demand as a number of
9 folks have mentioned. Maybe it's on technology or maybe it's on the economics of our region.
10 You might want to look into that a little bit in terms of the narrative emphasizing how we might
11 evaluate what is flexible in terms of parking or other transportation measures.

12 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you, Adrian. Mark, then myself, then Don.

13 **Mark Nadim:** For parking, if we don't provide an alternative for people to use, there's no other
14 way for them to get from Point A to Point B. Jessica mentioned that the TDM at Stanford was
15 very successful. They provided buses, they provided passes, and they provided buses that go
16 from the campus to the East Bay. That's why it's successful. Just saying we're not going to
17 provide parking and expect people to show up; that's an unreasonable thing to say. Buses that
18 show up every half hour or every hour are not considered public transportation. They are
19 useless. To go from somewhere in San Jose to Palo Alto, if you drive and it takes you 20
20 minutes and 1 1/2 hours by bus, that is not acceptable. These are the things that we need to



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 think about. Actually it takes much shorter time to provide a bus system than build a parking
2 lot. That's something that we should look into a lot sooner than thinking about parking lots.
3 Another thing for parking is to unbundle parking from high-density developments, and then
4 have the parking for purchase separately from the unit. The ones who don't need to buy cars,
5 they don't need to have parking. Again, it is a delicate balance, but it's something that we need
6 to look into. As for congestion, I looked at Policy 1.25 about a fuel-efficient taxi service. I don't
7 think that will reduce traffic congestion. It will reduce the greenhouse gases. I think that's
8 something that needs to be fixed in the policy. Again also for congestion for the School District,
9 if the Palo Alto Unified School District would consider returning the busing for students, that
10 will eliminate hundreds of car trips for people taking their kids to school. The other thing is we
11 should also provide car lifts to reduce the area needed for parking.

12 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you, Mark. Myself, then Jason, then Lydia, then Amy, then Shani. I
13 think we will have heard from everyone at that point. I'm sorry, Don, and then Jason, Lydia,
14 Amy, Shani. I'm really liking the comments this evening. A couple of very quick things. First of
15 all, in Comp Plans in the past, it was very easy to make broader statements. Today we cannot.
16 Solutions almost have to be done block by block. Parking solutions that are appropriate for
17 California Avenue are not appropriate for University Avenue. Parking solutions that are
18 appropriate for University Avenue at the Caltrain station are inappropriate for Cowper Street.
19 Our language, our solutions, the vision for it has to become far more specific, far less general in
20 order to be able to make these things work. I agree with a lot of the comments. I think the



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 observation by Jessica in terms of dealing with the entire City as opposed to the individual is
2 spot on. This is a great opportunity for us to be bold as a community and make
3 recommendations to the Council for how to deal with that. A couple of quick things. A social
4 justice topic. I was talking with Jeremy a moment ago. The findings of trying to get the staff,
5 many of whom don't have the economic wherewithal to afford a \$500 parking permit, and then
6 their employer saying, "That's not our problem. You've got to figure that out." How do we
7 drive that in the City? How do we get them to perform? How do we address those sorts of
8 issues? I want to talk very briefly, Policy 4.2.2, consider changes to the Zoning Ordinance to
9 count partially or fully enclosed private garages dedicated to individual housing units as floor
10 area in mixed use and multifamily residential developments. Hadn't really focused on that one
11 before, but if I'm understanding it, that would essentially halve to third the size or the amount
12 of housing units that we can have in the City because they would be filled up with parking. That
13 really as a policy or something to consider really needs to be rethought unless we're also going
14 to be coupling that with enlargements of FAR to allow the amount of housing that would
15 otherwise be able to go in there. That's a big topic for me. Also, Policy 2.2., design and
16 maintain the City street network to provide a variety of alternate routes so that traffic loads on
17 any one street are minimized. I don't actually think that's our policy. We want to keep big
18 loads, big traffic onto arteries. We want those larger loads to not go through neighborhoods. I
19 think that policy, Policy 2.3 and 2.8 all deal with those topics and can be rolled up into one. We



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 can find a way to better express what we believe the policy should be in our City. Don, then
2 Jason, Lydia, Amy, and then Shani.

3 **Don McDougall:** Thank you, Dan. I want to agree with what you just said that the parking was
4 block by block, and the same strategies will not apply everywhere. I want to slightly disagree
5 with the fact that looking at the City as a whole. I agree that it's a City as a whole problem, but I
6 was informed by reading this that the cohorts of young versus old, of employees versus citizens
7 and whatever, did really answer all these questions quite differently. In the end, 50 percent of
8 the people said they would use some other transportation rather than single user vehicle if they
9 had it. Just like block-by-block parking, we need to look at cohort-by-cohort strategy if you
10 could reduce one of these things. I want to agree with Jessica, who just disappeared. What I
11 was trying to say with this diagram is that if you can consider all of the parking policies, they
12 have different effects on what congestion is or what the environment is. I think that those
13 relationships are really important. In terms of the parking and the fact that, like Adrian just
14 said, people don't take shuttle because why would you if they only come every half hour or
15 whatever. I think that Policy 1.23 that talks about the shuttle needs to explore the availability
16 of an on-demand service and the possibility of that in the future and also talk about the
17 reliability and confidence that a shuttle will come when you need it and expect it. We need to
18 market that. With due respect to Ellen relative to 1.23.2 where we were talking about we need
19 to study including schools and seniors, I would argue the shuttle service, if it also serves
20 businesses. If I knew I could get from somewhere in Palo Alto to my lunch downtown because



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 there was a shuttle available that was on a 10-minute service on something, I might take that
2 shuttle instead of driving and parking downtown. I think any study needs to include—if we
3 could put all the seniors into shuttles that aren't currently in shuttles, we would make it better
4 for seniors, and I totally support that. I'm not sure we would change congestion very much.
5 We can change congestion by getting business users and others into shuttles. Thank you.

6 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you, Don. Jason, Lydia, Amy, Shani.

7 **Jason Titus:** There's two things. One a general concern about the process. I feel like to a
8 certain extent we've boxed ourselves in, in the way we've dealt with this review. I would like to
9 at least think that when you go for other sections we try and do it better. We have one issue
10 that is the most contentious issue that actually there are probably paths to resolving despite
11 what it may seem by actually saying what are the problems, let's focus on the problems, how
12 do we address those problems rather than going through 50 subpoints and what are we going
13 to do at this intersection, actually say what are we concerned about. Traffic, congestion,
14 parking. What are our goals and walk through them. If we had spent some time on that, and
15 I'd like us in some of these other sections, if there are particularly contentious things, to talk
16 through it. If we walk through what are the issues that we're concerned, like I said, every one
17 of the parking spots—if we tomorrow opened up 2,000 parking spots downtown, what
18 happens? Traffic gets worse. We know that. There's 2,000 more people who can now drive in
19 every single day. Every one of those spots is going to be in and out, unless we somehow
20 convince everybody to come in and out off cycle. We'll have challenges. I think we want to



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 address these things in a holistic way rather than just saying every building will have parking,
2 and then somehow we'll reduce traffic. If we can go through the concerns, I think we can help.
3 A lot of those things also—I'm an avid biker, I used to be an avid biker. I have three kids, and I
4 ride my kids around in a cargo bike all the time. You may have seen us cruising around the
5 farmers market, up and down downtown. We do all of our shopping that way. The City does
6 not make that easy. I would never ride to this library. I would never ride to many of the places
7 outside of downtown. In a few areas downtown, we've made it easy enough where my 70-
8 something-year-old father who just moved from rural Maryland where he hadn't ridden a bike
9 in 20 years now at least bikes ten blocks to our house every day, because in that area it's okay
10 to bike. If we spent more time and effort actually making cross-routes for the places people
11 want to go, have actual bike routes—I live just off Addison. I'm frightened to have my son ride
12 on Addison up to his school, because the first two blocks have no bike lanes. I wish we could
13 try and spend a little more time focusing on the big problems and then coming up with some
14 more holistic solutions rather than just the fine points.

15 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you, Jason. Lydia, Amy, Shani. Everyone will have spoken. I have
16 asked Jeremy to see if he would reiterate for us what he's heard and be able to distill some of
17 the topics. Then we can take our remaining time and focus in on those.

18 **Lydia Kou:** First I want to say that I do agree with Arthur wholeheartedly along with Doria on
19 this in their comments about parking. I don't agree with Adrian's comment about if you build it
20 they will come. At this point, today, we're at a deficit. Parking is at a deficit, so we're playing



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 catch-up right now. No matter how much we catch-up, growth is going to happen. Even in the
2 Comp Plan itself, it says that we've done everything that we can do for streets and to mitigate
3 it, but traffic has only increased. If growth continues and building continues, parking is going to
4 be needed, and traffic is going to increase. To plan for that is what we need to do. I do agree
5 with Jason that we do need to make more effort, but make more effort not on one particular
6 mode of transportation, on all modes. Public transportation, at this point we're really leaving
7 behind with all this adaptive apps and all this technology. We're leaving behind a big segment
8 of our community, and it's continuing to grow. It's the seniors. It's not convenient for them;
9 they can't get to it; they don't know if they can get to the next one; how long is it going to take.
10 In this Comp Plan it mentions all the outreach programs and the paratransits and whatever. If
11 you read a comment on the digital commenter, one of them says that it can take quite a while,
12 3 hours, for them to get wherever it is that they're going to get to. By that time, when they
13 return they're exhausted. It needs to have an easier method and more convenient. In terms of
14 goals to reduce SOV and GHG emissions. I think, again, it goes back to public transportation,
15 providing more of that. That's one way of trying to find a way to decrease it. We've been going
16 through this for the last 10 years. I see this growth over here and all this congestion since 2003.
17 It hasn't let up. If we think that by 2035 it's going to let up by reducing things, I think that's a
18 big step back. As for parking, even though people get out of their gas cars, they're going to go
19 get their electric cars, and they still need parking. That's my comments.

20 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Amy, Shani. Sorry, Amy's first, and then Shani. I apologize.



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 **Amy Sung:** I think there's a lot of good ideas floating around. I'm just going to throw
2 something in. Transportation is highly related to housing, so we hear that you build it, they'll
3 come. I see that in a lot of the demands coming from my clients and the people in my industry.
4 I hear about the older people, the younger people, the working young. They all like to stay
5 close to where they work where they can walk to. Downtown is a wonderful location, Cal. Ave.,
6 and University. How do we build it such that they will come? We will build it such that it is
7 suitable for seniors and the young. They do not need a big three-bedroom, four-bedrooms.
8 They do not need a two-car garage parking. That's how we will take these two Elements and
9 combine them and make it work. The other thing that we talk about, parking. Parking is that
10 part of the traffic congestion that a lot of frustration also come from wasting time in traffic and
11 also it produces a lot of pollution. I wonder if we can study about synchronize traffic lights.
12 From what I think is happening right now is that all the traffic lights are out of sync, and there's
13 some sort of preprogrammed. I don't know when they were last updated and programmed, so
14 we can signalize the lights so that we can go back to these old level of service to see how fast
15 that we can go through. I think that it is part of the transportation that I would like to see
16 happen. Thanks.

17 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you, Amy. Shani.

18 **Shani Kleinhaus:** I agree with all of Arthur's comments and with the comment about Policy 2.2
19 that the City network should not be equal and some streets should have more traffic than
20 others. I think that a parking program that's Citywide will be needed. Our neighborhood,



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 where Arthur and I live, right now there is no impact. I expect that when the bridge over 101,
2 Adobe Creek Bridge, will be constructed, there will be a traffic issue or parking issue in our
3 neighborhood, because people will want to park and take their bikes over the creek to get to
4 north Bayshore. North Bayshore is expecting to build 10,000 housing units; they're not talking
5 about parking those housing units. Somehow they assume that the people living there will not
6 want to travel by car. What does that mean for us? I think that we need to start thinking ahead
7 about what is coming given development around us. The other thing that is happening and we
8 see it already, but it's kind of out of sight so we don't think about it too much, there is a lot of
9 parking happening at the airport. I guess that's the car sellers that are parking their fleets at
10 the airport. We're already using very precious land for parking where it shouldn't be. The
11 buses that are part of TDMs and other programs do need parking. They used to park in
12 Mountain View in certain neighborhoods. People got really upset because many of them idle as
13 they park. They started pushing them away. Now a lot of them are parking in parks, actual City
14 parks. They're parking at Moffett, and they're parking at other places that are out of sight. If
15 we get more of those programs, we have to think about those modes. Yes, a (inaudible) bus
16 saves 40 single vehicle trips, but it still needs parking and it's a big vehicle. Thinking about that
17 and what's coming, I don't see enough of it in our Plan. I see a lot of things that are addressing
18 a lot of the current problems, but this is going 15 years forward. In 15 years, a lot more
19 development will happen not only in Palo Alto but all around us, especially in this part of town.
20 What's going to happen in north Bayshore is definitely going to impact us, and along San



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 Antonio. One thing about the demand is that if we base—I'm just going to say one sentence. If
2 we base our solutions on demand, we are assuming the demand will go down. It could go up
3 and a lot. It's better to have something that deals with things in general and not depending on
4 demand, because we could lose that gain really fast and having a lot more parking needed. I
5 really don't want to see parking in residential neighborhoods. Thank you.

6 **Co-Chair Garber:** Jeremy, can you crystallize some of the things that you've heard? After you
7 do that, we can do one more short round.

8 **Bonnie Packer:** (inaudible)

9 **Co-Chair Garber:** Bonnie, you had spoken at the very beginning. Everybody has spoken once,
10 so I've got you on the second round after Jeremy speaks.

11 **Bonnie Packer:** (inaudible)

12 **Co-Chair Garber:** If I could ask you to wait until after Jeremy. Thank you.

13 **Jeremy Dennis:** You've made this very challenging for me this evening to try to find some
14 consensus. I do think there's some consensus. I'm purposefully staying a little higher level too.
15 There were a couple of areas that just looking around and hearing the comments I think people
16 are generally agreeing on. Number one, the entire City benefits from some sort of suite of
17 solutions. There's isn't going to be one solution in one particular part of the City that's going to
18 make it better for everyone. I heard consensus around looking at the entire City. I heard
19 consensus around the protection of our neighborhoods as much as possible. I think that
20 everyone agrees on that point. I did hear consensus related to the use of demonstration



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 projects, whether they're of the ilk Hamilton was suggesting or other versions of that. There
2 seemed to be some consensus and understanding of what is possible here. There seemed to be
3 a lot of consensus around one of the comments that Bonnie made, that parking should meet
4 demand, but we should study what the demand should be. People seemed to be agreeing with
5 that kind of concept. I would have a moment ago said I thought I heard some consensus
6 around looking at some demand management policies. I'm not sure we're quite there, but a lot
7 of people seemed in agreement that demand management, whatever that looks like—I'm not
8 going to define that for you—is a possibility. I would say that even though there isn't complete
9 agreement that RPP is the perfect program, there is a lot of consensus that RPP-like things have
10 helped and could help in other places. I saw some agreement around Arthur's comments and
11 the like. Those are the areas that I heard that I thought people were starting to come together
12 at. Not perfect, but I think we were getting there. If there was any additional ones that I
13 missed, I'm happy to include those.

14 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. I've currently got four people on the list: Arthur, Annette, Bob,
15 and Bonnie. If there are others. Shani, did you want to go as well? Why don't you go ahead,
16 and then Arthur will go.

17 **Bonnie Packer:** Arthur mentioned a couple of things which I don't agree with. There isn't
18 consensus on having an RPP program all throughout the City. It's a little crazy. I don't know
19 what's going to happen in Mountain View that's going to affect south Palo Alto. South Palo Alto
20 is all R-1. Everybody is required to have a two-car garage. Whether they use it or not for their



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 cars is their problem. I walk all over that area. There's no parking problem. There aren't any
2 cars parked on the streets. I mean, there's a few of course, but it isn't an issue. Plus, you have
3 these many churches, especially along Middlefield, that have huge, wide, empty parking lots. A
4 Citywide RPP program, until we have a problem there, would be absurd to put in the Comp Plan
5 now. The other thing I wanted to say is health. People have mentioned health. Here's a
6 healthy tip. If you want to have lunch downtown, you can park south of Embarcadero and have
7 a nice 10-minute walk to a restaurant downtown. You've got your lunch and your health, and
8 you're not impacting the neighborhoods that are immediately towards downtown. The other
9 most important thing I want to say, the numbers that I saw about the traffic, the data, show
10 most of the traffic is coming from outside Palo Alto. Even if we have a shuttle that will be a
11 wonderfully convenient thing for those of us who drive internally in Palo Alto, I don't think
12 that's going to make a bit of difference to the parking problems in downtown and Cal. Ave. Our
13 regional influence is critical. If people who live in San Jose find that it's too expensive to park in
14 downtown Palo Alto, hopefully they will go to their jurisdictions and say, "Make transit better
15 for me so I can get to Palo Alto." This is the big picture. The emphasis on making sure our
16 region has better transit will really, really help. Thank you for letting me speak again, Dan.

17 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you, Bonnie. Arthur.

18 **Co-Chair Keller:** I actually agree with what Bonnie just said. I wasn't suggesting that we have
19 RPP along all of Palo Alto, but that's what we would have to have if we didn't acquire new
20 parking for new developments. That's the tradeoff you need. I don't think we should have no



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 parking for new developments and, therefore, we don't actually need RPP everywhere. We
2 need it where we need it which is in more places. We need to get to College Terrace as soon as
3 possible. Firstly, searching for parking causes congestion unless you have parking apps. If you
4 don't have parking, you're going to have people circling around for parking that doesn't exist.
5 Secondly, if people don't use parking, don't give them permits. Those permits are in the day;
6 they can still park at night causing congestion on streets at night. That's still a problem. New
7 parking garages that were proposed under the TOT tax could sell cheaper permits for low-
8 income seniors and retail workers. That's a solution to that. This is a sequence to the issue.
9 First of all, we have to realize that the reason that Stanford University was so successful is
10 because the County had a general use permit that says if you increase your driving, we stop
11 your development. That's a severe limit. There was no new net trips in post. We need
12 something similar to that to really get this to work. The first problem is when you're in a hole,
13 stop digging. At least new development shouldn't make it any worse. New development
14 should be parked based on demand. Secondly, we should rapidly reduce the amount of parking
15 in neighborhoods to zero for businesses. The amount of business parking in the neighborhoods
16 should be reduced to zero. That will drive businesses to provide transit. They could provide
17 transit the way Stanford has, but we need to do that collectively because it's kind of hard to do
18 that business by business. Downtown may be a little easier, and the Stanford Research Park.
19 We need to work collectively. The TMA should work on that. Maybe instead of Google-type
20 buses, we pay VTA and SamTrans to run the equivalent so anybody can get to Palo Alto by



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 paying their \$5 and get to downtown Palo Alto from wherever these buses go. That wouldn't
2 be too bad. Then what you do is that availability of transit which is driven by business, because
3 their employees need to park. That reduces parking requirements because transit is being
4 provided. Because you're providing more transit, then and only then can you reduce residential
5 parking. You can't reduce residential parking until there's actually less demand for that parking.
6 That's actually the last step. We need to put leverage, as was mentioned, on people who
7 commute into Palo Alto, because that's where the leverage is. One final thing about this. Dan
8 mentioned Program T-4.2.2 which talks about the idea of townhouses with garages that are
9 sort of glued to the townhouse and fully enclosed where people don't park in their garages,
10 they put stuff in them. That's okay in a R-1 neighborhood where you've got an apron you can
11 park in, the setback. In RM-30, RM-15, whatever, there's no space in front of your house to
12 park in, so you can't do that. The issue about discouraging that kind of parking is by counting it
13 towards FAR. I'm not proposing counting it towards FAR. If you build podium parking with all
14 these open spaces that nobody's going to store stuff in, they're going to park cars. That was the
15 idea of discouraging that kind of parking, because we can't increase the parking requirements
16 based on the State Housing Density Law, but we can penalize parking that people won't use for
17 their cars. Witness the development Arbor Real where there's a lot of overflow parking into the
18 surrounding neighborhood because people are not parking in their garages. They're parking on
19 the street on Wilkie Way and in that surrounding neighborhood. We need to basically
20 discourage that kind of development. Thank you.



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

1 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thanks. Annette, and then Bob, and then Whitney.

2 **Annette Glanckopf:** I just wanted to clarify my points. First of all, I totally believe in TDMs. I
3 think that we really need to look regionally at a Transportation Management Association, and I
4 think that's the only way to do it. Put some money there. I was really struck by this; two-thirds
5 of the drivers say they prefer to drive and plan on continuing on doing so. I really think the
6 Comp Plan addresses commuter parking, the 80,000 or so people that move around into our
7 City. It does not address the 1,000 or 2,000 maybe of residents who have needs to drive
8 around the City. That's really my concerns, and I wanted to clarify I'm very concerned about
9 that. Currently, the people I talk to just don't go to downtown or Cal. Ave. They're going to
10 Mountain View; they're going to other places. They don't go to meetings. They're not
11 volunteering for things, because they can't find parking. I think that's really an issue for
12 residents. I don't personally think the shuttles are going to cut it. I did want to clarify my
13 thoughts are more to protect residents, and I support the TDM/TMA issues. My personal
14 concern right now is residents that have more than two cars. Some people on my street have
15 four cars or five cars in the three-block area. That is really a concern. Not only do we
16 potentially have commuters that are just finding these nice places in neighborhoods, but you
17 also have these people that have a lot of cars. I wish we could do something for that. They
18 park them all in the street; nothing is every parked in their driveway or even in their garage. I
19 don't know if we can address that in the Comp Plan, but I see that more and more and more
20 with these very large houses and multiple generations of people that are living there.



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you, Annette. Bob, and then we have Whitney, Shani and Lydia.

2 **Bob Wenzlau:** I'm agreeing with Annette. I like your comments that you just made. This
3 strategy with parking to become a little bit more selfish for the Palo Altans and let the
4 commuters sort of suffer their fate. This is a little bit where I and maybe Jason were going with
5 the bicycle thing. For that sector of the community that's Palo Altans, if we can really find a
6 way to let people get to their location with alternate modes of transportation and carve out
7 some spaces, that would be something I could get behind. Jeremy, I asked a question about the
8 S/CAP. I didn't hear an answer, but I understand it's coming out. It has a lot of policies and
9 programs, I believe, in it. What's the plan to manage that input when the S/CAP comes out?
10 Maybe it's not (crosstalk).

11 **Jeremy Dennis:** As it relates to the CAC, is that the question that you're asking?

12 **Bob Wenzlau:** I don't know. Let's say the S/CAP has 20 new policies that it proposes that
13 would come into the Comp Plan, and it has a large focus on transportation. How do those
14 policies that the S/CAP might have, which I think are policies that look to me like they're
15 Comprehensive Plan policies—how do we manage that?

16 **Jeremy Dennis:** I think it's potentially a larger conversation than I want to have tonight. The
17 short, short answer on some of this is that I wanted to wait until everything was out and see
18 how we do that and actually start having some sustainability subcommittee meetings where I
19 think a lot of this work is going to be done. I'd rather concentrate tonight on the transportation
20 piece (crosstalk) offline.



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 **Bob Wenzlau:** The biggest part of the Sustainability Plan is transportation. The Sustainability
2 and Climate Action Plan speaks so broadly to transportation that I'm confused how a
3 Sustainability/Climate Action Plan that's speaking to transportation, that we can be talking
4 about transportation and the Com Plan without assimilating what that sustainability/Climate
5 Action Plan—it's a collision. I'm just trying to understand how we plan to manage it. It's not
6 another Element. Does that make any sense?

7 **Jeremy Dennis:** Yeah, I'm following you. I don't have a short answer for you. I want to
8 preserve the 12 minutes we have for the remainder of the transportation discussion. We can
9 do it offline, if that's okay with you, Bob.

10 **Bob Wenzlau:** I guess it wasn't, but I'd have to just take it.

11 **Jeremy Dennis:** I don't want to spent 5, 7, 8 minutes having a larger discussion around
12 sustainability issues when we're just completing what we're doing right now. That's my
13 preference. Thanks.

14 **Co-Chair Garber:** Whitney, Shani, Lydia, and then Elaine (crosstalk) final speaker.

15 **Whitney McNair:** There's been a lot of discussion and a lot of reference to Stanford's TDM
16 plan. There's been a couple of inaccuracies. I just wanted to take a second to talk about that.
17 Stanford has actually had in the general use permit a requirement, this sort of no net new trip
18 concept, actually since 1989. It isn't a new policy that was just put in place in the last couple of
19 years, but it's something we've operated under for quite a long time. In the 2000 GUP, which is
20 the general use permit we operate under now, there is a requirement, this no net new trip



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 concept. If you don't meet it, it doesn't mean that Stanford—as Arthur said, it doesn't mean
2 that we stop growing. That's inaccurate. What it does say is that if you don't meet it, you have
3 to install some improvements to some selected road segments and to some intersections in
4 Palo Alto. Stanford actually chose to spend the money and resources to putting a big, robust
5 TDM package together to get trips off the road, in essence, because it's the right thing to do. I
6 think it works well for the community. It does work well because there is a Caltrain station, and
7 a lot of the employees at Stanford and students come by Caltrain. We provide Go Passes for all
8 the employees. There's a big, robust TDM program that also goes along with it, and they're
9 constantly testing out and seeing what works well. The thing how it applies, I think, and
10 translates to the Comp Plan here is that it wasn't just a mandate, pick these two things and
11 you'll get a lower SOV rate. It is a really sort of ground up, really robust transportation program
12 that's evolved over time. Stanford's been able to modify that and manipulate it in order to try
13 and reduce that SOV rate as much as possible. It's not just the stick mechanism, but it is also
14 the carrot mechanism, but it's allowing Stanford and that employer to really think about and
15 really test what's best for the employees that come to Stanford. Like I said, they're doing the
16 same kind of thing in the Research Park and starting to look at where employees come from,
17 what's the demographic and whatnot and looking at how that kind of program can be
18 developed as well. I just wanted to sort of clarify that inconsistency about the GUP.

19 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you, Whitney. Shani, Lydia, and then Elaine.



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 **Shani Kleinhaus:** I just have a few questions about—we didn't talk about the airport. We
2 didn't talk about the ferry in the Baylands, other things that I think there's consensus, but we
3 didn't discuss them today. I also was wondering how what we're working on here is compatible
4 with the Sustainability Plan. I know that's what Bob was asking. I would like to know as well.
5 Maybe it's not for today, but I would like to have more information about that. I don't see that
6 we have a problem in south Palo Alto now. Knowing what's coming in Mountain View because I
7 follow what that city is planning, I know what's coming, and we have to be prepared especially
8 in the areas that are from here towards 101. We need to think now whether there needs to be
9 something in the General Plan that anticipates this development. We are proposing to facilitate
10 transportation to the other side of 101 by that bridge. That's okay; we should do that. We
11 should also be prepared to what's going to happen to this area when we do that. I don't want
12 to see that in 5 or 10 years. We go, "We didn't think about it," because I am thinking about it.
13 It should be there; there should be something anticipating what happens when there is
14 suddenly about 10,000 residents in another 3 1/2 million square feet of development in north
15 Bayshore and a lot more along San Antonio and potentially more elsewhere. We need to be
16 prepared for that.

17 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Lydia. Elaine is our last speaker.

18 **Lydia Kou:** I did want to talk about the Stanford TDM. I thank both Whitney and Arthur for
19 clarifying it. It's great that it's successful, but most of its success is on campus. I have
20 community members who have come up to me and have informed me that there is parking in



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 their neighborhoods from Stanford staff, student, faculty. I don't know who they are, but
2 they're all walking or skateboarding or bicycling over to Stanford or to the train stations. For
3 me, it's very difficult for me to say it's a true success, because it's actually taking problems from
4 one area to another area. To piggy back off what Shani said, Mountain View is developing that
5 part of their town with high density and so forth, but also in Palo Alto itself. It's moving south.
6 Google has nine properties in the East Meadow Concept Plan Area. What is going to happen to
7 that? We don't know. One thing that we do know is that while we can't determine what
8 growth is going to be in the future, we know human nature. Young folks are going to grow
9 older, have children. They're going to bike today, but tomorrow they're going to have three
10 kids that go different places, and they're not going to be able to bike to it. At some point, we
11 don't drive anymore because we're too old or our eyesight goes, whatever. We're going to
12 revert back to going by public transportation. Some of us are just not going to ride bicycles. It
13 has to be diverse and really common sense and sensible. Thank you.

14 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Elaine, our final speaker.

15 **Elaine Uang:** I was just going to also mention the trip cap, because the TDM and a lot of the
16 parking policies and programs we've been talking about really need to have that sort of stick
17 applied first before we can really create an effective set of tools. The other thing that hasn't
18 been talked about tonight, but I just want to throw out; I think we all recognize that parking is
19 going to have to be solved on a kind of case-by-case, custom basis, but we haven't talked a lot
20 about area plans and prescribing parking policies and programs to a specific geographically



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 bounded area like a downtown or Cal. Ave. or even just on the side of that, like near Ventura.
2 Absent from this conversation has been the area plan, the district level parking planning and
3 tying that to the problems that are created by the mix of office, retail and housing for that
4 particular area. It would be great to actually have that kind of put back into the language
5 around Goal T-4 for parking. People are right; we need to focus on alternatives, because
6 without the alternatives you are not going to get that reduction in demand. I appreciate the
7 mentions of the bike plans and networks as well as the shuttle and the bus. Mark is right that
8 we can focus a lot of money on getting a better bus system for the money that we would have
9 to spend building a parking garage. Jason's right about building out that bike network so that
10 internally a lot more of us and even other people who come into our City or pass through our
11 City feels safe going through without a car. Thanks.

12 **Co-Chair Garber:** Are you ready to give a short last word? That's going to wrap us up here.

13 [The discussion moved to the Minutes.]

14 **Feedback for Continuous Improvement:**

15 [No discussion]

16 **Future Meetings:**

17 [No discussion]

18 Next meeting: March 15, 2016, Mitchell Park Community Center

19 **Adjournment:**



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 **Co-Chair Garber:** We have one more thing to do before we excuse ourselves. Robin, would
2 you bring out a cake for Jeremy please? May I have a motion to adjourn? By Annette, and
3 seconded by Don.

4 **Co-Chair Keller:** We should adjourn in acknowledgement and thanks to Jeremy for all his work
5 and to thank Elena for working for us and taking on the ball. She's going to have a lot more
6 work to do. We thank her for ...

7 **Co-Chair Garber:** Not leaving.

8 **Co-Chair Keller:** ... not leaving.

9 **Jeremy Dennis:** I can do this before you adjourn. This is ridiculous, this cake is crazy. This is a
10 fantastic group. The reason it's fantastic is—there I am. Look. Amy's taking a picture—
11 because of your difference of opinion on a variety of issues. If you were able to sit back and
12 watch tonight's discussion as an observer, as I was able to, you guys are doing exactly what
13 you're supposed to do. You did it in a polite, courteous, informative way. This a testament to
14 all of you. This is going to be a better product because of it. I know I've only been here a few
15 short months, but I've appreciated being here. I hope I've been helpful. Come to Portola
16 Valley. There's all kinds of things going on there. Thank you.

17 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you, Jeremy.