



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
AT PLACES MEMO
Tuesday, June 21, 2016**

The following documents are attached for your review and information:

1. CAC member Arthur Keller's comments
2. CAC member Don McDougall's comments
3. CAC member Hamilton Hitchings's comments
4. CAC member Jennifer Hetterly's Comments

5. Public Comments

High Level Comments

1. Under Traffic Congestion (Goal T-2), the draft document eliminates Level of Service and replaces it with Vehicle Miles Traveled and Multi-Modal Level of Service. I request a vote to see whether there are sufficient CAC members who want to retain Level of Service requirements along with the other metrics. Add a policy, **“Retain the use of Level of Service (LOS) and Traffic Infusion into Residential Environment (TIRE) metrics, including cumulative impacts, when evaluating development applications.”**
2. This policy from the February 2016 CAC draft disappeared without explanation or notice and should be reinstated. Policy T-4.2 New office, commercial, mixed use, and multi-family residential development projects should not rely on the use of on-street parking to fulfill minimum parking requirements, and should comply with parking regulations in the Municipal Code. [PTC Policy T4.6] [T128] I request that we vote to see whether there are sufficient CAC members to include PTC Policy 4.6 as edited here. **“All new development projects should be completely self-parked to meet parking demand generated by the project without the use of on-street parking intended to fulfill the minimum parking requirements and compliant with the established parking regulations in the Municipal Code. As demonstrated parking demand decreases, parking requirements for new construction will decrease and excess parking in existing developments may be made available to existing underparked developments.”** Policy T-5.1 “Provide for sufficient but not excessive parking.” is not an adequate substitute.

Detailed Comments

Program T1.3.2 Work with transit providers, including SamTrans and VTA, to encourage the adoption of electric, fuel-cell plug-in hybrid or ~~other zero-emission~~ hybrid vehicles. [NEW PROGRAM] [T215] *Fuel cell buses have failed and there are no other zero emission vehicles other than electric ones. The use of electric, plug-in hybrid, and hybrid vehicles would be an improvement over the current practice.*

Program T1.4.1 Review the Zoning Ordinance and update as needed to ensure compatibility with the electric vehicle infrastructure ordinance, including parking technology improvements such as vehicle lifts and electronic monitoring. [(PTC Program T4.7.1) (Edited)] [T14] *There is a real question as to the extent to which “vehicle lift” technology is compatible with the electric vehicle infrastructure ordinance. So this issue does need to be studied.*

Program T1.4.2 Further encourage the installation of facilities that support alternative fuel vehicles by periodically reviewing requirements for electric and plug-in vehicle infrastructure in new construction. Consider and periodically review requirements for electric and plug-in vehicle infrastructure for remodels. Consider costs to the City,

including identifying payment options. [(PTC Program T1.2.1) (Edited)] [T16] *The word “vehicle” is missing. No substantive change.*

*Based on the notes, this probably should be Program T1.5.1 followed by Policy T-1.6. Policy T-1.6 Collaborate with transit providers, including Caltrain, bus operators and rideshare companies, to develop first/last mile connection strategies that boost the use of transit and shuttle service for local errands and commuting. Focus on connections to/from major corridors such as Bayshore Rd., Alma St., El Camino Real and Embarcadero Rd.. [NEW PROGRAM] [T21] and [T22] Continue to work with Caltrain, Amtrak, and public bus operators to expand bicycle storage on public transit vehicles during both peak and off-peak hours. [(NEW POLICY) (Previous Program T-27)] [T26] *Also, there is no Bayshore Road; there are East Bayshore Road and West Bayshore Road, on opposite sites of US 101.**

New Policy under Enhancing Bus and Rail Service. Encourage Caltrain to increase frequency of midday and evening service, including express trains.

Policy T-1.7 Support efforts to ~~integrate~~ coordinate train, bus, and shuttle schedules at multimodal transit stations, ~~and other transit information centers~~, to enable efficient transfer among public transit modes. [(PTC Policy T1.15) (Previous Policy T-11) (Edited)] [T27] *The original intent was the coordinate schedules to facilitate transfer, not merely to provide information.*

Policy T-1.11, and Programs T1.11.1-1.11.3 were not in the February version of the element.

Policy T-2.4 Encourage the location of childcare facilities near major employment hubs but not near hazardous materials to reduce traffic congestion associated with child pick-up and drop-off. [NEW POLICY] [T201] *Childcare facilities should not be located near hazardous materials.*

Policy T-2.5 Work with PAUSD to ensure that decisions regarding school assignments are analyzed to reduce peak period motor vehicle trips to and from school sites. [EIR Mitigation Measure Trans-1e] [T204] *and* Policy T-2.6 Work with the PAUSD to resolve traffic congestion issues associated with student drop-off and pick-up. Address pedestrian and bicycle access, circulation, and related issues on City rights-of-way adjacent to schools and on PAUSD property. [NEW POLICY] [T205] *Also work with PAUSD regarding coordination of bell times of nearby schools to reduce multiple concurrent sources of congestion.*

Policy T-3.17 Pursue grade separation of rail crossings along the rail corridor as a City priority, including a below-grade alignment ~~from~~ between San Antonio ~~to the and~~ Oregon Expressway for both high speed rail and Caltrain. [NEW POLICY] [T96] and [T98] *The below-grade alignment won't go all the way from San Antonio Road to Oregon Express, but under West Meadow Drive and West Charleston Road.*

Program T3.17.1 Undertake studies and outreach necessary to advance grade separation of Caltrain to become a “shovel ready” project. [NEW PROGRAM] [T99] *Having the project be “shovel ready” is the best way to get the funds once available.*

The following policy and these programs from the February 2016 CAC draft appear to have

disappeared without a trace and without explanation.

Policy T-4.2 New office, commercial, and multi-family residential development projects should not rely on the use of on-street parking to fulfill minimum parking requirements, and should comply with parking regulations in the Municipal Code. [PTC Policy T4.6] [T128]

Program T4.2.1 Study the feasibility of reduced parking requirements for office, commercial, and multi-family residential developments that are well-served by transit and demonstrated walking and biking connections, including senior housing developments. [NEW PROGRAM to be added if PTC Policy T-1.9 & T1.12 are not sufficient] [T129]

Program T4.2.2 Consider changes to the zoning ordinance to count partly or fully enclosed private garages dedicated to individual housing units as floor area in mixed use and multifamily residential developments. [PTC Program T4.6.2] [T130]

Program T4.2.3 Consider updating parking standards for non-residential uses to better reflect occupancy and employee density. [(PTC Program T4.6.3) (Edited)] [T131]

Program T5.9.1 Coordinate with neighborhood associations and residents' groups to monitor the availability of parking in residential neighborhoods and ~~gauge the need for~~ implement a residential parking permit program as needed in areas outside Downtown Palo Alto and College Terrace. [NEW PROGRAM] [T147] *Gauging the need alone is not sufficient; the parking programs should be implemented as needed.*

Program T8.6.2 Encourage VTA to improve connectivity to transit ~~within the South Bay~~ to serve workers who live in the South Bay and work in Palo Alto. [NEW PROGRAM]

Comments Don McDougall

SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORTATION
FIRST/LAST MILE CONNECTIONS PAGE T-8

Walking and biking should remain the best option for the first/last mile from major transit centers, especially the two Cal10:46 AMrain stations. Shuttle service for that “mile” should not be necessary for people who are capable of taking the train or even bus. BUT improvements should be made to make walking and biking more efficient, comfortable and safe for that mile. The shuttle service should be focused on serving beyond the “mile” and improvements focused on the larger radius.

BIKING AND WALKING APGE T-9

The narrative has a one liner that says “Palo Alto is in a position to significantly increase its proportion of travel by bicycle.” Maybe we should at least state what we think it is today even if we can’t put a future goal in place? And what is it that puts us in this position?

The WALKING SECTION say walking is inexpensive. Why not just say it FREE?

dsLEVEL OF SERVICE PAGE T-16

LOS Model Outputs LOS Letter Grade

The current state of the Transportation research Board output is the Multimodal LOS that uses different, model-based measure of service. I wonder if the current table and LOS measure is appropriate any more. (Is it really average or peak average or ...?)

ECONOMIC DISADVANTAGE PAGE T-22

The concept of Transit-Dependent transit and shuttle users in particular includes the issue that there are people of lower income who don’t have cars or don’t have a parking permit but work in Palo Alto. They need access to public transportation to get to and from jobs and these jobs (servers in restaurants?) may be outside the current shuttle time frames. I think to make sure this gets attention in the future it needs to be spelled out better what problem is being solved or at least considered.

Goal T-1 SUSTAINABLE TRANSIT PAGE T-24

The number of Policies and Programs in this goal still far outbalances other Goals beyond its importance relative to other Goals such as Congestion. Although certainly relevant to Sustainability several are just as relevant to Congestion and it would give the Transportation Element better future usability if the Goals were more balanced. Policies such as T-1.1, T1,2, T1.17, T1.26 could be moved to Congestion and help reflect the cities current concern with congestion.

SHUTTLE SERVICE, RIDESHARING ETC. PAGE T-30

A bullet under Program 1.15.1 says “Develop clear and engaging materials to explaining and promote shuttle.” This does not sufficiently convey the discussion that a major barrier to shuttle use is FEAR and that engaging explanations might not be enough. The concept needs to be a separate Program or even Policy and state the purpose of giving confidence to nervous users.

Program T1.20.1 would be more meaningful as a Program under Policy T1.19 as it is about to/from surrounding communities.

FUNDING IMPROVEMENTS PAGE T-33

The Policies (T1.26) and Programs should use verbs such as “Investigate” instead of “Establish” which will surely get scrutiny from future reviewers.

GOAL T-3 EFFICIENT STREETS

Like Goal T-1 this Goal seems to have a larger number of Policies that could influence its importance in future use of the Plan. Policies such as T3.2, T3.4T3.9, and T3.15 seem just as useful in the Goal T-4 Neighborhoods.

BICYCLE PARKING

Programs T5.10.1 and T5.10.2 seem to be more related to a section about SAFE ROUTES and not PARKING.

GOAL T-6 SAFETY PAGE T-50

Somewhere the Element should have a Program establishing safe routes form other public venues such as the Libraries or even City Hall.

GOAL T-7 TRANSIT DEPENDENT

Policy T7.8 needs more explanation as to why expanded evening service is useful. Also the concept of expanded evening service for “gatherings” (such as the recent CAC meeting and VTA meeting at Rinconada where people left early because of “last bus”).

HIGH LEVEL COMMENTS

Parking – I suggest the subcommittee develop a range of options representative of the differing perspectives regarding parking. I don't think the parking policies/programs fully address the range of concerns on the CAC. For example:

1. Policy T4.2 stating that new office, commercial and multi-family residential projects (mixed use should be added) should not rely on the use of on-street parking to fulfill minimum parking requirements had strong support on the CAC. Yet it was deleted with no explanation.
2. The unbundling of parking in Program T5.1.4 [T129] also threatens to shift parking from private to public facilities.

The overflow of commercial parking into residential neighborhoods is a significant community concern and substantial new residential development will exacerbate this. Reducing parking supply in new developments is hoped to reduce development costs and SOV use, but the latter, more important goal, is poorly served by that strategy as long as free street parking is readily available.

Tinkering on the edges, making policy based on project specific rather than cumulative impacts, and selectively protecting neighborhoods on an ad hoc basis are piecemeal solutions. Downtown RPP efforts have predictably just moved the problem to additional streets. We should consider permit parking City-wide, with designated paid lots for all-day parking.

Furthermore, reduced parking requirements and unbundled parking reduces supply, but doesn't address demand. The only mention of paid parking is Program T5.2.4 [T136] that recommends "pricing and management policies" Downtown. As noted in the Narrative, "charging for parking makes it more likely that people will carpool, take transit, walk or bike." The CAC should consider a Policy/Program in the Transportation Element that dis-incentivizes demand such as eliminating free public parking in commercial areas.

Level of Service (LOS)

The narrative, on page T-17, says "...this Comp Plan includes policies establishing the City's LOS standards, individual development projects will still be required to analyze, disclose, and address LOS impacts as a part of the project review and approval process." But the Policies regarding LOS standards seem to have been eliminated and replaced with establishing new multi-modal thresholds [t69]. There

was significant support on the CAC for retaining current LOS vehicle thresholds. I don't object to developing additional, multi-modal, LOS thresholds, but abandoning the current thresholds does not reflect a consensus position.

DETAILED COMMENTS

NARRATIVE

"Alternative Fuel Vehicles"

p. T-3 -Add reference to the electric vehicle infrastructure ordinance.

"Bus Service"

p. T-7 - Map is difficult to read, but it doesn't look like there are 14 VTA bus routes in Palo Alto.

"Shuttle Service"

p. T-8 - Cites "four" types of shuttle services in PA, but only lists three. List the fourth, is it paratransit Outreach?

"Roadway and Intersection Improvements"

p. T17 - Says "...this Comp Plan includes policies establishing the City's LOS standards, individual development projects will still be required to analyze, disclose, and address LOS impacts as a part of the project review and approval process." But the Policies regarding LOS standards seem to have been eliminated. They should be restored.

"Motor Vehicle Parking"

p. T-20 - States that "charging for parking makes it more likely that people will carpool, take transit, walk or bike." But there don't seem to be a Policies/Programs about charging for parking.

GOALS, POLICIES AND PROGRAMS

GOAL 1

Reducing Reliance On SOVs

p. T-25, Program T1.2.2 (no universal identifier) –

First paragraph: TDM should be applied to large housing developments in addition to employers. Delete periodically. Enforcement of compliance should be ongoing, not just once in a while.

Third bullet: Replace "that allows for" with "to monitor the success of TDM measures and track...." Delete "through one of the following methods."

Reducing GHGs

p. T-27, Program T1.4.1 [T14] – Does the electric vehicle infrastructure ordinance apply only to residential projects? If so, consider expanding.

Increasing Transit Use

p. T-27, Policy T1.7 [T27] – What are the “other transit information centers”?

Enhancing Rail And Bus Service

p. T-28, Program T1.11.2 [T35] – Not sure parking structures Caltrain stations should be “option of last resort.” From a sustainability standpoint, don’t we want *easy* parking at Caltrain stations of all places? We’re trying to incentivize train use and adding another leg (and wait time) with shuttle service makes that mode far less appealing.

p. T-29, Policy T1.13 [T40] – Do we really want to “advocate” for queue jump lanes on El Camino? There was a lot of public opposition to dedicated bus lanes, this could have similar impacts.

Shuttle Service, Ridesharing And First/Last Mile Connections

p. T-29, Program T1.14.1 [T208] – What is the pilot “transit program” envisioned here? Doesn’t the free Shuttle already do this?

BICYCLING AND WALKING

p. T-32, Policy T1.21 [T58 and 59] – change narrow “concrete” to broader term “surface.”

GOAL T-2

Traffic Congestion

p. T-35, Program T2.2.1 [T199] – insert “aggregate data and” before “realize measurable reductions...” and make it “to and from” Downtown and SRP, not just “in.”

p. T-36, Program T2.3.1 [following T69] – Appears to replace former Programs T2.4.1, T2.4.2 and T2.4.3 (re: current LOS thresholds, monitoring and reporting and a transportation strategic plan) with a new program to establish and maintain thresholds for acceptable multi-modal LOS. The deletion of those programs is not evident in the marked-up version, nor is the replacement designated as a new program.

There was significant support on the CAC for retaining current LOS vehicle thresholds. I don't object to developing additional, multi-modal, LOS thresholds, but abandoning the current thresholds does not reflect a consensus position.

p. T-36, Policy T2.6 [T205] – Consider adding something about adjusting school Bell Schedules. All four DEIR scenarios will lead to significant enrollment growth that is likely to exacerbate traffic impacts. Working w/PAUSD to evaluate bell schedule alternatives could prove a valuable mitigation.

GOAL T-3

Efficient Circulation

p. T-37, Policy T3.4 [T73] – Why was this policy deleted? Retain the first part: “Require traffic impact analyses for individual office, commercial and multi-family residential development proposals.”

p. T-37, Program T3.4.1 [T76] – How does this wording preserve the residential character?

Rail Corridor

p. T-40, Policy T3.17[T96 and T98] – With trenching not expected to extend past Oregon, it's important to call out Churchill as a target for alternative grade separation, at least for bikes/peds.

p. T-40, Program T3.17.1 [T99] – Why was former [T106] deleted? Replacement is shorter, but weaker.

p. T41, Program T3.19.2 [T105] – Not sure what “neighborhood planning efforts” means. How about “Incorporate neighborhood input in planning and implementation of crossing improvements.”?

GOAL T-4

Neighborhood Impacts

p. T-42, Program T4.2.2 [T111 and 112] – I've raised this before, why is conversion of Channing and Homer to two-way streets a priority?

p. T-42, Policy T4.3 [T116] – Shouldn't Oregon Expressway between Alma and Bayshore also be on this list?

GOAL T-5

Managing Parking Supply

p. T-43, Policy T5.1 [T220] – Seems to replace Policy T4.2 though that policy is not shown as deleted: “New development projects should not rely on the use of on-

street parking to fulfill minimum parking requirements, and should comply with parking regulations in the Municipal Code.” Merge the two to address on-street parking element or restore original.

p. T-45, Policy T5.3 [T139] – Shared parking doesn’t affect demand, just use. Revise as follows:

Encourage shared parking *where complementary demand timing is demonstrated* in order to ~~reduce the overall demand for~~ optimize parking spaces in commercial centers and employment districts.”

Bicycle Parking

p. T-47, Programs T5.10.1 and T5.10.2 [T241 and 242] – These two programs are about road safety, not bike parking. Move them to Goal 6.

p. T-53, Program T8.3.2 [T248] – Duplicates T8.12.1 [T251]. Delete.

From: Hamilton Hitchings [<mailto:hitchingsh@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, June 21, 2016 1:08 AM
To: Lee, Elena
Cc: Gitelman, Hillary
Subject: Comments on Transportation Element

Here are my initial comments. I'm going to spend a bit more time going over it more detail Tuesday.

It's nice to see a cleaned up Transportation Element and its clear a lot of improvements have been made and its getting close to being completed. The element has changed a lot since the CAC committee last reviewed the Transportation Element and I'd like to see some of the committee feedback incorporated before sending this to the City Council.

Specifically I agree with Arthur's Written Comments. That new developments should be fully parked for their projected vehicle parking demand and not use on-street parking to satisfy their parking requirements. I also want to ensure that LOS for vehicles will not be compromised (e.g. if its good for pedestrians and bicycles then its ok that its an F during peak rush hour for vehicles.

In Program T1.2.2 it says "Establish a mechanism that allows for the cumulative reduction of peak motor vehicle trips through one of the following methods:" but does not list the methods.

Hamilton Hitchings

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Email Input from Penny Ellson

Hi Elena & Chitra,

Here are some comments on the Transportation Element Policy T.4.2 –change to incorporate language like what I have written in red “Implement traffic calming measures to slow traffic on local, collector and residential arterial streets, and prioritize traffic calming measures for safety over congestion management.

Residential arterials are important connectors for neighborhoods, used by large numbers of bikes and peds, including school commuters. It won't become easier to walk/bike if we don't calm traffic on residential arterials—especially those included in the CPA School Commute Corridors Network. Please make sure they are included in this language. I suspect this proposed language may be a typo? Please make the proposed language for Policy T.4.2 more consistent with the 1998 Comp Plan and more consistent with Policy T-4.3 that follows it on the next page.

A similar change should be made to the language in the first paragraph of the TRAFFIC CALMING narrative section on page T-19. While 25 mph is the desired speed limit in neighborhoods, 25mph also is the posted limit in school zones (these include residential arterials in Palo Alto) and state law is changing to permit lower posted speeds in school zones. Physical changes to streets to achieve these safer target speeds should include residential arterials, especially those that are designated school commute routes. Please include this in the narrative.

Also (same page, T-19), lane reductions shouldn't be limited to commercial areas. They are effective in many other applications like school routes, residential arterials near parks, and many other locations that draw large numbers of peds and bikes.

Page T-50, Program T6.6.3—Correct typo. PASUD should be PAUSD.

Finally, I see no mention of encouragement events (like Palo Alto Walks & Rolls, Bike to Work Day, *Bike Palo Alto!* which CPa currently supports) in the Transportation Element. These events are an important factor in creating a Gold (or future Platinum) Bicycle Friendly Community. More importantly, they help to build the bicycling culture that gets new people out on their bikes. Maybe I missed it. Let's make sure it's in there!

Finally, the document is still pretty long. WAY too much narrative.

Thank you.

Penny Ellson

Email Input from Catalina Verdu-Cano
Greater Miranda Neighborhood Representative

Hi Chitra,

I am writing to you because I am concerned that our neighborhood (Greater Miranda) is not appropriately represented in the map. I see Manuela Ave but where are Miranda Ave (the section across the street from Gunn High School), Miranda Green and all of the street in our area? They appear all as a big area in gray but no streets have been drawn. The City of Palo Alto is responsible for maintaining these streets and thinking of the quality of life for a neighborhood that has been historically neglected.

In considering calming actions for our streets, we would like to for the measurement that is cited in the preliminary documents as affecting quality of outdoor time to be measured for our neighborhood as well. Our neighbors in Los Altos have a sound wall separating them from Foothill and continuous nice landscaping to visually separate them from Foothill but the City of Palo Alto hasn't done such a good job at taking care our neighborhood. Please make sure that our area is drawn in the map with all streets represented. The noise levels in our area for walking, biking, etc... way exceed the levels that are considered optimal for quality of life.

The efforts in this study seem to all be concentrated around the Caltrain crossings and downtown. A better representation of all neighborhoods is needed for fairness.

Sincerely,

Catalina Verdu-Cano
Greater Miranda Neighborhood Representative

Email Input from Robert Neff

Dear Elena Lee,

Thank you for incorporating PABAC's suggestions from for improvements to the Transportation Element into this draft of the comprehensive plan.

It took me a little while to find them, and it looks great.

As a follow-on to input originally from Penny Ellson, I have an additional suggestion. For Policy T-1.17: Promote bicycle use ...

The city already promotes bicycle use by supporting Bike Palo Alto, Bike to Work Day, and Palo Alto Walks and Rolls. It seems natural to merge these with Program T1.17.2: "Consider marketing strategies, such as a recurring Palo Alto Sunday Streets program..." How about making the program more general, but adding bullets for specific events:

Program T1.17.2:

Support local and regional encouragement events and marketing strategies, such as:

- o Bike to Work Day: A regional event encouraging bicycling for commuting.
- o Bike Palo Alto: A local event encouraging discovery of the bike network around Palo Alto.
- o Palo Alto Walks and Rolls: A joint PAUSD program encouraging biking and walking to schools.
- o Palo Alto Sunday Streets: Consider a new, recurring program of events potentially in coordination with local business groups, which would include street closures and programming.

Thank you,

Robert Neff
Emerson Street
robert@neffs.net