



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

**Tuesday, June 21, 2016**

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

Call to Order: 5:41 PM

**Co-Chair Keller:** Good evening. The time is 5:41 p.m., and I call the meeting of the Citizens Advisory Committee on the Comprehensive Plan for the City of Palo Alto to order for Tuesday, June 21st. Secretary, could you please call the roll?

**Present:** Filppu, Fine, Garber, Glanckopf, Hetterly, Hitchings, Keller, Kou, Levy, McDougall, McNair, Sung, Uang

**Absent:** Emberling, Kleinhaus, Moran, Nadim, Packer, Peschcke-Koedt, Summa, Titus, Uhrbrock, van Riesen, Wenzlau

**Robin Ellner:** Thirteen present.

**Co-Chair Keller:** Just for the record, how many voting members and how many nonvoting members present?

**Robin Ellner:** Eleven voting, two nonvoting.

**Co-Chair Keller:** Since the Committee has a total of 21 voting members, that means that 11 voting members is a quorum. Thank you.

Oral Communications:

**Co-Chair Keller:** The first thing on the agenda is Oral Communications. Do you have any cards? Is there anybody who wishes to speak for Oral Communications? No. Nobody wishes to speak for Oral Communications.

Staff Comments:

1. Recap of June 6 City Council Meeting on the Draft EIR and Fiscal Study

**Co-Chair Keller:** We have staff comments, a recap of the June 6th City Council meeting on the Draft EIR and Fiscal Study.

**Hillary Gitelman:** Thank you all. Can you hear me? I'm trying to follow the directions of the microphone demonstration and have my notes in front of me. Thanks everyone. I see that the vacation season is upon us, but hopefully we can make some good progress today. Our goal is to get, if we can,



# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE DRAFT MINUTES TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT

1 the committee's consent and agreement to move forward this draft Transportation Element to the City  
2 Council for their review, recognizing it may not be at 100 percent but hopefully it's good enough to get  
3 that input, which we would like to schedule for the City Council when they get back from their break in  
4 mid-August. Just to briefly cover the meeting on June 6th with the City Council. For those of you were  
5 there or were paying attention, you know this. Briefly, it was about the idea of analyzing additional  
6 scenarios in the EIR. We got some direction from the Council on what those two scenarios would  
7 consist of in terms of population and employment projections, but we did not get the Council's direction  
8 on the policy parameters within each of those scenarios. We have to go back to Council in August for a  
9 discussion of that. I think the timing is going to work well, because that's going to be around the time  
10 the CAC is considering the Land Use Element again, so there's going to be a good confluence of  
11 discussions on some of these issues of interest to all of us. The next items at the City Council meeting,  
12 as I mentioned, will be hopefully the transportation draft that you're looking at tonight potentially with  
13 some modifications as you direct this evening and then concluding the discussion with them on these  
14 additional scenarios that they want analyzed before we get to the end of the process. A couple more  
15 things. Some of you know this. Andrew Hill, who's been working with us at PlaceWorks, has moved on  
16 to another job. A nice guy, new job. We're sorry to see him go. Joanna Jansen, who's been on the  
17 project from PlaceWorks from the beginning, is going to step into Andrew's shoes, but she has a  
18 daughter who's sick at home this evening, so she's not here. Ashley is here, taking notes. Elaine has  
19 offered to fill in and summarize the staff report and help as needed from a staff perspective this  
20 evening. I also have to beg your forgiveness. I have to leave early again this evening for a Finance  
21 Committee meeting Downtown. I'll be with you for the first 45 minutes or so, but then I'm going to split.  
22 I wish you a very productive meeting. Elaine, do you want to take it from there?

23

24 **Elaine Costello:** Yes.

25

26 **Co-Chair Keller:** Could I just ask a question? I believe that the comments on the EIR were extended. Is  
27 that right?

28 **Hillary Gitelman:**

29 The comment period on the Draft EIR closed, but the Council has directed us to open it again when the  
30 analysis of the fifth and sixth scenario is finished. Anyone who didn't comment, you'll get another  
31 opportunity when that additional analysis is added to the record.

32

33 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you.

34

35 Agenda Items:

- 36 1. Action: Review and Recommendation of the Revised Draft Transportation Element  
37 a. Report from the Transportation Element Subcommittee  
38 b. Discussion and Recommendation

39 **Elaine Costello:** We have had three full CAC meetings and five transportation subcommittee meetings  
40 and one sustainability subcommittee meeting on this Transportation Element. There has been a lot of  
41 discussion, as you know, about—parking was a big issue in those meetings. The most recent meeting  
42 took place on June 6th. I'll go over sort of how we went through the Transportation Element at that



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

1 meeting. I did want to say one thing about what to expect at this meeting and what we're doing about  
2 comments that people receive. Thank you very much, those of you who sent us written comments.  
3 They are extremely helpful. Our goal tonight is to go through goal by goal—that was how we did it at  
4 the transportation subcommittee on June 6th. I think most of us who were there found that a useful  
5 way to do it. We suggested to the Co-Chairs that we do that again tonight. We appreciate your written  
6 comments; they're very helpful. It's hard for us to know—we can tell the ones that are consistent with  
7 the policies as they've been developing at the meeting, but there are some that really have policy  
8 direction. If you have major concerns, if you can bring that—even if you wrote a comment, if you can  
9 bring those comments up. I know, for example, Don had some comments, and I know that Arthur had  
10 some comments that were really kind of more on the policy direction level and so did Hamilton. If you  
11 could bring those up as we go through them goal by goal, then we know that as we're revising. We  
12 don't necessarily have to have consensus. We have been working on—we can have options, and we can  
13 take votes. At least we know where the committee agrees and where you don't agree and would like to  
14 be bringing forward options. Our goal for tonight is to go through this version of the Transportation  
15 Element in enough detail so that we can revise it and get it to the Council in August. That's kind of an  
16 ambitious goal for tonight. At the June 6th meeting, we had a really productive meeting. Don, Bonnie  
17 and Ellen were there as well as a number of staff and consultants. We did go through—as I said, we  
18 went through goal by goal. I'm going to just hit some of the highlights. I think one of the things that we  
19 all found really helpful—I think this was Elaine's suggestion. Actually, this table of contents, we kept  
20 going back to it to help us organize as we went through. I actually now take it out and put it up, so I can  
21 keep it separately. We did spend a lot of time on the organization of the element and, for example,  
22 tried to put all the funding and all the monitoring together, so that you weren't finding a funding policy  
23 way over here and then another funding—and thinking, "What is the money supposed to be used for?  
24 Didn't we just spend that back on this other policy?" We really worked on that. We also focused on the  
25 fact that in a general plan the policies are really the heart and soul of a general plan. The programs are  
26 good to show how you move forward with implementation, but they have a shorter shelf life. The  
27 policies are really what are going to guide the City for the full time of the general plan. We also added  
28 some ideas to the Transportation Element, like gathering places and more issues referring to first and  
29 last mile, so that the focus on the Transportation Element—although, transportation for commuters and  
30 people for traveling to and from work is very important, there was a recognition by the subcommittee  
31 that transportation for gatherings like this is also very important and needs to be reflected in the  
32 element. There was more about—I think one of the major changes that was made was to create—  
33 instead of having a section on special needs, to actually have a goal and policies for transit-dependent  
34 people, people who are not making the choice to take transit as an alternative to their car but really  
35 don't have any choice, people who financially don't have a car and need to use transit. That turned out  
36 to be a very useful change and something that, I think, really changed the way that section of the  
37 policies was looked at by the subcommittee. There was a lot of reorganization. One of the things that  
38 we're continuing to work on is the maps. If you don't love the maps yet, we plan to get to the point  
39 where they're better, but we know they still need some work, and we're still revising them. I'm just  
40 going to pick up some highlights from each of the goals. I think one of the things that was really  
41 important in reviewing this is that there are some priorities that are laid out in the goals. We tried to  
42 get rid of conflicting priorities, where you'd have a priority on something in one place, and then you'd  
43 have a policy that conflicted it maybe 25 policies later. For example, we did keep—one of the things



# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE DRAFT MINUTES TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT

1 that came up was there are conventional roadway level of service standards maintained in Goal T-3,  
2 efficient roadway networks. There are some priorities that are set that are, at least in this draft from  
3 the subcommittee, more important than those level of services. For example, traffic calming measures  
4 and the neighborhood impacts, Goal T-4, is prioritized over maintaining a higher level of service for  
5 vehicles in neighborhoods on collector streets and neighborhood streets. Another for roads was safety  
6 is prioritized over level of service. Level of service is kept, but there are priorities, where there are  
7 things that are more important than having that automobile move through quickly. The level of service  
8 is also meant to be multimodal; it's to apply to bikes and not just cars. As I said, we tried to make it  
9 internally consistent. Another major change was, as we said, the section on transit-dependent  
10 community and how transportation works for people who don't have an alternative, don't have a car,  
11 and need to be relying on transit. I think that's kind of an overview. We will be going through goal by  
12 goal. We're here to answer any questions on any of the individual goals. I know you want to get started  
13 rather than go through each. I think that gives you a sense of it. Better organized and clearer priorities  
14 and more focus on transit dependency, I'd say, would be some of the things that came out of the recent  
15 transportation subcommittee meeting. Our next steps, our goal is to forward this to the City Council to  
16 revise it based on tonight's discussion, and then forward it to the City Council for a meeting. I think  
17 we're looking at a meeting August 15th, a little less than a month from now—a little more than a month  
18 from now. With that, I'll just turn it over to the Chair.

19  
20 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. I'm wondering if staff wants to comment on what things were chosen for  
21 the redline of the redline version and what things were chosen not for the redline version. I noticed a  
22 lot of things didn't seem to be in the redline that I was surprised about.

23  
24 **Elena Lee:** Thank you. Basically, as Elaine has mentioned, we've gone through multiple meetings and  
25 discussions with both the CAC and the subcommittee. We're trying to keep track of all the changes.  
26 However, after a while all those changes that show up as redlined get really confusing. In order to  
27 minimize that, what we've done was items that were not controversial, that were discussed previously,  
28 prior to the last meeting, were accepted as changes. Things that were discussed and implemented more  
29 recently have shown up as redline changes. That's how we've devised it.

30  
31 **Co-Chair Keller:** Do I understand that the intent was to have a redline from the February version?

32  
33 **Elena Lee:** Yes.

34  
35 **Elaine Costello:** What we're going to do in the future to be clear about that is to sort of on the redline  
36 say this is a redline from what version. I think we did give a link back to the earlier versions of that.

37  
38 **Co-Chair Keller:** I actually found a bunch of things that I thought should have been redlined from the  
39 February version that didn't seem to be redlined. I was quite confused about that.

40 **Elena Lee:** What we can do is just—we are keeping basically track of all these changes. What we can do  
41 is take a look at our internal list to make sure that everything corresponds correctly.

42



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

1 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. At this point, we'll go to the members of the Transportation Element  
2 subcommittee. Transportation subcommittee, I think, Elaine, you were. Who else was on it?  
3

4 **Don McDougall:** I think I'm the only one who was there.  
5

6 **Elaine Uang:** (crosstalk) was the only one that was there.  
7

8 **Co-Chair Keller:** Don, why don't you lead us off?  
9

10 **Don McDougall:** I have no specific comments. The thing I would comment on. In the preamble to  
11 tonight's session, from page 3 to page 6 is a summary of the edits. I would like to commend staff for  
12 doing a really good job of summarizing that. I think understanding what's in there gives you a good idea  
13 of what the conversations were and what some of the outcomes were. The only other major change in  
14 here—I think we all know about it—is that the airport, which was part of transportation before, has now  
15 been moved to land use. I think that's important. I think the transit-dependent move—I'm excited  
16 about that. It means that it's not just special needs. It's all sorts of people that have transit  
17 dependencies. Consistent with that, a lot of conversations we had all mention the concept of  
18 gatherings. The idea that transit is there to support getting people to and from particular places at  
19 particular times, particularly the free shuttle. It was in somebody's comments too, the idea that there  
20 are just simply a fixed route that goes through neighborhoods or whatnot doesn't necessarily address  
21 the fact. The VTA meeting that we were at, Arthur, some of the people had to leave early in order to  
22 catch the bus. There was no concept that there was a gathering of people there that were transit  
23 dependent. Maybe the shuttle should have been aware of that. Maybe there should be a system by  
24 which you can notify the shuttle that there are transit-dependent people at a gathering like that. The  
25 concept of gatherings was reinforced in the land use subcommittee we had, where there was both dog  
26 lover who were for a dog park and there was pickleball players, both of whom really constitute the  
27 concept of gatherings. That may not be related to transportation, but it's related to, I think, as a City the  
28 kind of thinking we should be applying to what we're doing. The only other comment I would make in  
29 here is that in the—I forget which section it's in. It talks about in the short term people are going to  
30 have to—for first and last mile, people are going to have to use walking and biking, and even we'll get  
31 the shuttles to deal with that. I think in fact the shuttles shouldn't be dealing with first and last mile. It's  
32 outside of the first and last mile that a shuttle becomes important. If you think of a Venn diagram with  
33 things overlapping, maybe the shuttle needs to overlap with mass transit as opposed to totally intersect  
34 with mass transit. That could alleviate lots of problems and potentially deal with the concept of  
35 gatherings. I'd like to commend the rest of the transportation committee. I think there was a lot of  
36 good work went into it. I appreciated the candid conversation and discussion we had. Thanks, Arthur.  
37

38 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thanks, Don. Lydia. (inaudible) Sure.  
39

40 **Lydia Kou:** In terms of the gathering places, I appreciate the explanation, but I'm still not understanding  
41 what's the purpose and the goals. (inaudible) to create community? To have conversations?  
42



# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE DRAFT MINUTES TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT

1 **Don McDougall:** It's two things. One, my initial conversation on gathering places had to do with when  
2 we were dealing with land use and we were dealing with parks. The question is if you look at the  
3 demographics of Palo Alto and the changing demographics of Palo Alto, one of the things we all agree  
4 on is there will be an aging population. Do we need more playing fields for those aging population? No,  
5 we don't need more Frisbee fields for the 80 year olds. Maybe we do need interesting, comfortable,  
6 attractive gathering places. They don't necessarily need to be just stone benches to sit on, but a place  
7 that a group of people could logically go with your cohorts, your age group, your bridge club, your chess  
8 club and if we sprinkled more of those around. That creates the idea of a gathering place. Once you  
9 think of gathering places, then you think of gatherings which don't necessarily have to be specific,  
10 designated places. They could be right here. Now, you need to deal with the transportation relative to  
11 those gatherings.

12

13 **Lydia Kou:** Sounds like pocket parks, that sort of thing.

14

15 **Don McDougall:** When you're dealing with public parks, you're dealing with gathering places.

16

17 **Lydia Kou:** But it's much smaller.

18

19 **Don McDougall:** Much smaller. You don't need a Frisbee field to accommodate that. There may be  
20 effective ways to put more gathering places. If you extrapolate the idea of gatherings, it's not just the  
21 parks. It's the facilities, the libraries. The shuttles don't necessarily address the libraries sufficiently  
22 well. Maybe they should, because book lovers gather and create those gatherings. Besides, sea otters  
23 gather as rafts. There's all sorts of gatherings. Sorry.

24

25 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you, Don. Now, we'll go around. I think there was nobody else at the  
26 subcommittee who wants to talk. We'll go around and talk at the overall CAC as we do. Today, we'll  
27 start on my left. Steve, why don't you lead us off. I think it's interesting to go by goals. Maybe we  
28 should go through several of them at a time. The problem is that if we do that, we'll never get to Goal 8,  
29 because everybody will want to talk in order. Can we do a couple of goals at a time?

30

31 **Elaine Costello:** Goal 1 is very big. In fact, one of our goals was to (inaudible). I think if we did Goal 1  
32 that has a lot of them. Then, I think it's easier to combine some of the other goals.

33

34 **Co-Chair Keller:** Great.

35

36 **Hamilton Hitchings:** The only thing I'd say, since Hillary is going to be leaving early, it'd be nice for us to  
37 surface what we think on the most important issues before she departs. I would like at least a first  
38 round where we can talk about what we think the most important issues are.

39

40 **Co-Chair Keller:** We'll go first around to talk about what you think are the most important issues, and  
41 then we'll go through the goals. We'll see how long this round takes. We don't have that many people,  
42 so we can have more rounds. Steve, lead us off with what you think are the most important  
43 transportation issues in the Comp Plan.



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

1 **Stephen Levy:** We have a short group tonight, and I may leave. Even if we didn't have a short group, I  
2 think the most important thing to me is to transmit options to the Council rather than have a gunfight at  
3 the OK Corral here. With 11 or 12 people, you're going to get an 8-4 vote or a 9-3 vote, and there are 12  
4 people who aren't here. We are doing that on the land use subcommittee, where there are differing  
5 perspectives, bringing back options. I know, Arthur, you've raised some issues about level of service and  
6 VMT and some other issues. I hope that in some of this discussion we can bring back options. My own  
7 perspective on that is that both are important. The State has chosen VMT for the purpose of meeting  
8 environmental goals and improving mobility by getting cars off the road. I think that is primary and  
9 really, really important. I understand there are specific intersections that are absolutely terrible, and  
10 the terribleness is measured by level of service. You don't want to pretend that VMT measures the  
11 difficulty at intersections. I see a role for both in that. I have to admit there's been a death and I'm a  
12 trustee, and I've had five meetings, and I haven't read this stuff very well. I'll pass now.

13

14 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you, Steve. Lydia.

15

16 **Lydia Kou:** Going back to what Steve was saying about the LOS, the level of service use, that's  
17 something that, if I remember correctly, City Council also directed us to continue using the level of  
18 service method of measurement. If the State has brought forth the VMT method, then both should be  
19 used in order to measure. I think it's important on a (inaudible) level to be measuring using VMT;  
20 however, we do have local issues. It cannot be put aside; it does need to be addressed as well and  
21 measured. That I feel very strongly about. I do support Arthur's notes on that and his comments. Also,  
22 I feel very, very importantly that all development definitely needs to be self-parked. We have not  
23 resolved our parking problems, not even come close to it. It's something that needs to be upheld. I also  
24 support Jennifer Hetterly's high-level comments, especially to ensure that policies do not shift problems  
25 to other places or other neighborhoods, other streets, etc. I'll pass it along.

26

27 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you, Lydia. Annette.

28

29 **Annette Glanckopf:** Just looking at the high-level comments, I think level of service is actually probably  
30 one of the key things Council is going to discuss. I agree with Lydia and Arthur pretty much in general on  
31 that. I also agree with Elaine and comments that other people have made. There's too much writing in  
32 this. Anything that could be put in—that's true of many of the other elements. I know we're working on  
33 getting everything shorter and smaller. The maps in this, you can't even read them. Maybe that's my  
34 poor eyesight. I also think parking is a huge, huge question that needs to be debated. I stand on every  
35 project should be fully parked. Maybe in the next Comp Plan we can talk about reduced parking. I think  
36 now we can always adjust. If the demand is not there, some of the space could be reused for other  
37 purposes. I think that staff needs to, since we talked about this earlier, make clear what the priorities  
38 are of each goal. We were just talking about some goals are prioritized over the others. I think that's  
39 very important. For me, when I look at this element, I am just very, very concerned about the cost to  
40 implement a lot of these suggestions. There's all sorts of things about incentives, develop plans and  
41 programs. It's going to be very, very costly. With all due respect, I feel like this is a plan, the element  
42 that the Bicycle Coalition will love and anyone who sells a lot of signage and striping. One of my big  
43 concerns, which is not one of the key elements—I'll just say it—is the City has sort of lost its rural feel



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

1 with all of these things on the road and signs to look at. It's just very confusing. That's my own personal  
2 thing. That's high-level comments.

3

4 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you, Annette. Hamilton.

5

6 **Hamilton Hitchings:** First, I want to say I agree with everything that's been said so far, by the previous  
7 speakers. It's really nice to see a cleaned up Transportation Element with a lot of improvements. One of  
8 the challenges I had is that I thought this was a delta from the February version. When I went back and  
9 looked at the February version, for me Section 4 in the February version is a big one. There's a lot of  
10 things that aren't redlined that are missing from the February version. I didn't notice them until I  
11 actually went back and reread that. The element has changed a lot since we reviewed it in February.  
12 Unlike the Land Use Element which is continually coming back for incremental changes, the  
13 Transportation Element has not come back. This is the first time, I think, since February. The idea that  
14 we're just going to sort of rubberstamp this and send it off to Council, I believe, is a little bit premature.  
15 I want to make sure that—there's a number of things even from people on the committee. The  
16 comments from folks on the subcommittee are rather extensive for things that are not in the element. I  
17 still feel like there's more work to do. That doesn't necessarily mean we can't get it to the Council in the  
18 August-September timeframe. I feel like we need at least one more round. There's been a lot of  
19 improvement. It looks much better than the February version. I'm going to talk about a couple of  
20 things, but I want to start with the National Citizen Survey of Palo Alto, which is a comprehensive,  
21 statistically valid measure of Palo Altans' view about the City. The most recent survey showed that only  
22 36 percent said the ease of parking was good to excellent, one of the lowest measures in the survey  
23 along with vehicle travel which was 44 percent and housing. It's imperative that the Comprehensive  
24 Plan Update has teeth to meaningfully address these residents' and commuters' concerns. If the  
25 majority of the committee is not willing to do so, then these clauses—I agree with Steve—need to be  
26 added as a minority opinion for the Council to vote on. That's my biggest thing I want to get out of this  
27 meeting. I'm glad Hillary's still around to hear that. Specific changes I propose include for the latest  
28 revision of Policy 5.1, which currently has "provide sufficient but not excessive parking." We need to  
29 add back in "limit under-parked development while there is insufficient parking." I want to clarify what I  
30 mean by under-parked, because we're throwing that term around. I have a little bit more. Under-  
31 parked in my book means less parking than there is demand for it after an accurate assessment of need,  
32 taking into account a realistic assessment of TDM. I just have one more thing. I want to make sure that  
33 we address the level of service for vehicles in the intersection. I do support adding VMT as an also very  
34 important, maybe even equal measure. We have a number of traffic intersections that are "E" and "F."  
35 I want to make sure that those don't get swept under the rug, because we say, "It's good for bikes and  
36 walking, but it's terrible for vehicles, and that's okay." I just want to make sure that doesn't happen. I'll  
37 save the rest of my comments for later. Thank you.

38

39 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you, Hamilton. Jennifer.

40

41 **Jennifer Hetterly:** I think I also agree with everything that's been said before. I think it's clear that LOS  
42 and parking are issues we need to develop some options around. I don't have any objection to using  
43 VMT and to developing new multimodal LOS, but I don't think we should abandon the current vehicle





# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE DRAFT MINUTES TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT

1 LOS. I want to see that put back in. On parking, there's lots of stuff in here to reduce future parking for  
2 new development, but there's not really much about meeting existing excess demand or addressing  
3 spillover. Looking at the Downtown RPP, it's expensive; it's complicated; and it has predictably just  
4 moved the problem around to new areas. I think that we should consider using that College Terrace  
5 model for a Citywide RPP with designated paid lots for commercial areas. Also this draft, while trying to  
6 reduce parking supply, only takes baby steps on the demand side. I think that we need to consider  
7 eliminating free public parking in all commercial areas in combination with Citywide RPP. Charging for  
8 parking creates an incentive not to drive in the first place, and a Citywide RPP eliminates the motivation  
9 for spillover. I think that's something I would like to see considered in the options. Finally, shared  
10 parking. I think it's a great idea, but it should only be considered where complementary demand timing  
11 can be demonstrated. It shouldn't be anywhere that two developments think they want to share. We  
12 have to be able to demonstrate that there's not an overlap. It should run with the land, so that if one of  
13 them sells the property, it's not then developed in a way that makes that parking inaccessible to the  
14 sharer. I have other comments, but I'll bring them up goal by goal.

15  
16 **Co-Chair Keller:** Jennifer, thank you. Len.

17  
18 **Len Filppu:** Thanks, Arthur. The LOS is one of the instruments that needs to go back into this discussion  
19 and in print. It should be throughout Goal 2. It's in addition to some of the other measurements. It's  
20 important to have LOS help for the cumulative impact of development applications, not just seen in a  
21 one-off situation but the cumulative impact. I agree with much of what has been said already. Parking  
22 is critical. We're not yet at a point where behaviors have changed so much that we can anticipate less  
23 parking than is required by demand. Developments need to self-park. Policy T-5.1, provide for  
24 sufficient but not excessive parking, I don't really know what is meant by excessive parking. Maybe I'm  
25 just clueless on that. I don't understand that concept. All in all, I think it reads much better now. I think  
26 a lot of good work has been done on it. I see that the organizational efforts have been extreme. I  
27 applaud the subcommittee on its work and hope that we all remember that Council clearly has asked to  
28 see majority and minority options in the presentation of these drafts. Let's not be shy about showing  
29 where there's a difference of opinion and presenting it to those who chartered us with that  
30 responsibility. Thanks.

31  
32 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you, Len. I think that—you want to add something?

33  
34 **Don McDougall:** Can I comment at the "important things to Hillary level" as opposed to the ...

35  
36 **Co-Chair Keller:** Sure, go ahead.

37  
38 **Don McDougall:** Just quickly ...

39  
40 **Co-Chair Keller:** Don.

41  
42 **Don McDougall:** Thanks, Arthur. I agree with all of the level of service comments. As a subcommittee  
43 member, I think we may have misled staff or whatever. I don't think we ever intended for LOS to—for



# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE DRAFT MINUTES TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT

1 VMT to take over. Beyond that, I think the whole multimodal level of service does add value if you study  
2 that further. I agree with the comments, and we could put that back in. Annette had mentioned  
3 prioritized. I'm concerned that—I've said it in my notes, and I've said it before—that Goal T-1 that has  
4 30 policies in it and Goal T-2, which is congestion which is the one the City Council added, are so  
5 imbalanced that it clearly says to me that sustainability is much more important than congestion. In my  
6 notes, I've suggested four or five of the policies in sustainability that could just as logically be in  
7 congestion and, I think, would provide some more balance and not sort of this implied prioritizing. In  
8 terms of parking, our thought there was and our discussion was, if you read it, some sort of phased  
9 approach. We may not have properly defined the phases, but the idea was let's do something now that  
10 creates some more parking. Let's not get carried away, and let's go to a second phase where we—let's  
11 just park, do some parking right now, and then let's do some measurement or whatnot. We may not  
12 have properly defined what the phases are but, I think, the right idea for parking is in there. Thank you.

13

14 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you, Don. Adrian.

15

16 **Adrian Fine:** Thank you. In reading this—it might seem a little simple—I was kind of struck that all of  
17 our transportation decisions and many of these goals and policies are being driven by the constraints of  
18 the lack of land for roads and parking and the need to reduce greenhouse gases. I think the major  
19 enforcement mechanisms that we have at our disposal are demand, pricing, and then actually policies. I  
20 think the subcommittee did a great job. Don, I think it was really nice in terms of I was kind of thinking  
21 of it as a ratcheting mechanism. As the City attains certain goals, certain policies could be implemented  
22 or removed. I think at the current time the phased approach to these parking issues may be the best  
23 Palo Alto can do. If Council wants some other choices, we could explore, as Jennifer has mentioned and  
24 I agree with, charging for parking or we could go to the other extreme which is fully parking everything.  
25 If we do that, then we should cost it out in terms of land use, housing, rental costs, additional VMT  
26 added to the City. Speaking of VMT, I'm somewhat okay removing LOS actually. It's an old and costly  
27 system. It's point-based rather than network-based, and it seems like it's kind of going out of style in  
28 California. I'm sure Hillary can comment more on that. VMT is pretty familiar to folks under the Clean  
29 Air Act. A nice thing about it is that thresholds can be set locally actually, so the City can determine "this  
30 is a VMT we're okay with on this road, not on that road or this intersection." Last two comments. One  
31 is there's a lot of focus on neighborhood impacts, which I think is great, but what about business  
32 impacts? They're also users of the City and the transportation network, and they also need an efficient,  
33 sustainable delivery and transportation system for their employees and their goods and services. The  
34 last thing is I just agree with Hamilton. We probably could have another refresh of this section when it  
35 comes around again.

36

37 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you, Adrian. Elaine.

38

39 **Elaine Uang:** Thank you. Thank you, staff, for creating that table of contents, invaluable. Glad to see it  
40 finally go there. To comment on LOS and VMT, I think that in the narrative there should be a little bit of  
41 clarification. I think first of all it should be noted that LOS is an important tool for measuring local  
42 impacts. Whereas, VMT is a different tool for measuring overall systemic traffic impacts. That's not  
43 called out. Right now, you have VMT buried under LOS. In the narrative, those two should actually be



# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE DRAFT MINUTES TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT

1 pulled apart. For reasons that other people have stated, we should include both. At the policy and  
2 program level, there was some discussion—I think at the sustainability subcommittee—about maybe  
3 not being too prescriptive about the exact metric called out in each policy and program. The intention is  
4 not to do away with LOS even though it's not explicitly mentioned. We just wanted to bake in flexibility  
5 for using the right tool to measure the right thing. I agree that there should be different flavors and that  
6 we should call out different things. I think we're getting to marching towards some consensus that both  
7 are important impacts. They measure different things. We should be a little bit more clear about that in  
8 the narrative. On parking, I had a suggestion. I do think it's very important to retain Policy 5.1, to  
9 provide sufficient but not excessive parking. This was really important from the subcommittee's  
10 standpoint, because we wanted to also support the sustainable transportation goal, T-1. Ultimately, we  
11 have a distribution problem. I want to offer two suggestions. We should consider—hang on, let me  
12 look at my notes. I want to just offer a slightly different take. Instead of fully parking projects or fully  
13 parking according to Zoning Code, I did offer an article—it's at the back of my comments—that pretty  
14 clearly lays out the data for why, when you build more parking, you actually encourage more driving.  
15 That's borne out from the '60s and the '80s, the 2000s and now. Please take a look at that. In terms of a  
16 phased approach, I want to offer another suggestion. Let's start with the need to provide sufficient  
17 parking. The problem is if you build parking for one building, you're not providing parking for the other  
18 buildings that are under-parked. We should maybe couple 5.1 with 5.3, the idea of shared parking, and  
19 really analyze it for an area. Not on a project-by-project basis, but analyze parking on an area or district  
20 basis, so that we can really accommodate different parking needs and somehow pull in that shared  
21 parking concept. I'll stop there.

22  
23 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Amy.

24  
25 **Amy Sung:** Hi. This is so many good input about the level of service and VMT. I'm going to talk about  
26 something else. The grade separation for the Caltrain, I think the arguments against grade separations  
27 has been primarily centered around the prohibitive cost. I actually see that this might be an  
28 opportunity. The land value in Palo Alto, I really think, is priceless. I thought maybe that if we will have  
29 some public and private cooperation to fund this underground option in exchange for the co-  
30 development of the surface land that can be harvested, it could be something considering. This sounds  
31 like a farfetched dream, but just think about Microsoft spent \$26 billion acquiring LinkedIn. I think there  
32 is a huge interest in how we can better provide transportation. I just read this news this morning that  
33 Uber subleased 140,000 square feet of office space in Research Park. This is a technology giant who are  
34 interested in better providing their transportation needs for their employees. Let's just think outside  
35 the box. There is huge land that can help us to breach east and west. The surface land is something that  
36 we are still (inaudible). That is my wildest suggestion.

37  
38 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you, Amy. Go ahead.

39  
40 **Amy Sung:** I don't think it's easy. If it is easy, it would have been done already. The second one is—am  
41 I done with my time?

42  
43 **Co-Chair Keller:** I'm sorry. I thought you were done. Please keep going.



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

1 **Amy Sung:** The second one is about the first mile and last mile. I saw there is a suggestion about a pilot  
2 program for transportation, like public and private cooperation and to do ridesharing to Downtown. In  
3 fact, I think this is an opportunity to serve our seniors. Right now, I think the outreach will provide—you  
4 can pre-schedule, you can do so far and then a volunteer basis. In fact, I think this is an opportunity to  
5 team up with ridesharing operators like Uber, like Lyft. We will give them priority for them to provide  
6 service to our seniors. We can subsidize those seniors with cash or allowance or whatever. In return,  
7 Uber promise to give us a favorable rate or cap the max that they will charge per ride, \$5 for example.  
8 Thanks.

9  
10 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you, Amy. I apologize for interrupting you. I thought that you were done. I  
11 couldn't tell. Sorry. Whitney.

12  
13 **Whitney McNair:** I have a couple of different topics. One, the language in the staff report talks about a  
14 goal in the Comp Plan is to reduce single occupant vehicle trips. If that is the goal, then that language  
15 needs to be clarified and consistent throughout the document. You get mixed up in some of the  
16 language within the element that talks about just reducing trips in general, which is different than  
17 reducing commute trips or reducing single occupant vehicle trips. That should just be consistent. Also,  
18 under Goal T-1, increasing transit use, Policy T-1.5 talks about improving and supporting transit access  
19 with multimodal transit stations, and Policy T-1.9 talks about amenities such as lighting and signage.  
20 With so much emphasis on alternate modes of transit and if the City really wants to encourage transit  
21 use, then I think this is an opportunity to really think bigger here and, in a way, to incentivize things like  
22 a transit hub. If you want transportation to be successful, you have to expand on the model that you  
23 have now. It's not about making a bus stop just with a bench or something, making it look more  
24 friendly; it's trying to co-locate those things, transit, altogether in one hub space. That's where you can  
25 bike share. You can really get something there, but the City has to take steps to encourage that type of  
26 amenity and maybe that it has some gathering space associated with it as well. Encouraging it would be  
27 looking at benefits towards maybe not counting it towards your FAR or looking at the densities around  
28 those types of hubs. Lastly, I like the way the element groups different things together. It really got me  
29 looking at the funding piece of it. It was really hard to tell and very unclear what—you have a lot of  
30 different fees and what they're trying to pay for. Policy T-1.26 has a funding source for ongoing  
31 transportation improvements. There is already an annual fee, a TIF fee, and it's looking at those. Then,  
32 there's the annual fee to reduce motor vehicle trips; that's an EIR mitigation. Then, there's a funding  
33 source to expand the Palo Alto shuttle system, and then a local source to supplement external sources  
34 for grade separation. Then, parking fees and tax revenues for alternative transportation projects. Then,  
35 another one's for market pricing effort for transportation regulatory changes. Some of them are vague;  
36 some of them are a little more specific. It's really hard to tell are these ten different funding sources  
37 that are all local, what are they going towards. That really needs to get cleaned up. For parking, I would  
38 just say I supported the idea of looking to optimize space and then look to determine where there needs  
39 to be changes. I would just say parking issues aren't the same everywhere within the City, and studying  
40 the different areas to find out what the issues are and then coming up with solutions is an appropriate  
41 procedure.

42  
43 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you, Whitney. Dan. (inaudible) Sure. Go ahead.



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

1 **Hillary Gitelman:** I'm sorry to jump the queue, but I am going to have to step out. I wanted to exhort  
2 you to talk about a couple of these issues together. We get into the habit of going around and all saying  
3 our piece, and we don't interact and solve the problems and the issues. I think you guys are really close  
4 on level of service. I think it would be so easy to put a policy in before the one about multimodal level of  
5 service that just says the City desires to maintain a level of service of "D" or better at local intersections,  
6 and then add a few more phrases that are consistent with our practice and what we've been doing in  
7 the CEQA process for years now, understanding that's not going to be there in CEQA anymore. It could  
8 be in this one policy. I don't think there's disagreement around the table about doing that. I think we  
9 can easily come up with some language. On the parking side, I would encourage you to talk to each  
10 other and listen to each other. I think again we're not really far apart on that. If folks feel like we have  
11 to have a few different ways of saying these things with slightly different emphases, see if you can't  
12 tonight come up with a couple different alternatives. Please do be realistic. Particularly the idea of a  
13 Citywide RPP, I think that ship has sailed. The Council has understood that neighborhoods are different  
14 and that some neighborhoods need different approaches. That's why we ended up with this system we  
15 have where each neighborhood kind of gets considered separately. Maybe 20 years from now that  
16 won't be the case, but for now it is. I think that shouldn't stop you from a policy stating what it is you  
17 desire in neighborhoods. I actually think that's already there in terms of parking, avoiding spillover  
18 impacts and adequate parking in residential areas. That's my observation on what you've identified as  
19 two areas of disagreement. I think one really isn't, and the other is something where, if you came up  
20 with a few observations around the table today, you'd make a lot of progress. It sounds like you're  
21 really close, and I encourage you to all good speed. Thanks.

22  
23 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Dan.

24  
25 **Co-Chair Garber:** Three very general comments. One, for me, I'd say that probably one of the most  
26 important things, policies is T-4.2, which says implement traffic calming measures to slow traffic on local  
27 and collector residential streets and prioritize traffic calming measures over congestion management.  
28 What that does is it sets up the hierarchy from the very—you don't really read it when you're reading  
29 the Plan here. I think there is a very strong focus in the community that the neighborhoods are different  
30 than everything else. That sets the priority above and beyond. We may have a mess every place else,  
31 but it's not going to be in the neighborhoods. We may have to manage a lot of stuff every place else,  
32 but the neighborhoods better be easy. You may end up having to read through it, but it'd be somewhat  
33 more interesting for me to be able to see that more clearly somehow in the Plan. That's very general  
34 Comment Number 1. Number 2 talks about parking. Without going into all the comments that are here  
35 in the staff's summary, on Goal T-5, parking, it says as revised they (the policies) articulate a phased  
36 approach, which I think is spot on. All of you, I think, are supportive of that. When you read through  
37 the parking, that goal, you don't—again I'm not sort of getting that. That doesn't kind of come off the  
38 page as to "we're going to deal with stuff now, and we're going to deal with stuff later, and here's how  
39 we're going to deal with that transition. Here are the pieces in place that are going to bridge that, and  
40 here's how we're going to manage that," and all the rest of that. It would be interesting to me to see  
41 that rewritten in such a way that that was a lot more obvious. In the same breath, although, I  
42 completely agree with Policy 5.1, provide for sufficient but not excessive parking, I need more guidance.  
43 It doesn't give me enough guidance. I'm not looking for necessarily something measurable. A program



# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE DRAFT MINUTES TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT

1 should be measured. Policies don't necessarily need to be. The policies need to either do one of two  
2 things. It needs to make clear why we are interested in something or it needs to be pointing at a  
3 solution that we're interested in. I just think some more attention needs to be focused on that to tell us,  
4 to read what it is the City wants there. Maybe it talks about phased approach or maybe there's another  
5 way of talking about it, but that's it. Finally, really quickly, Elaine in her comments made a really obvious  
6 observation as to why transit is key to Palo Alto. Let me say that inversely. Why Palo Alto is key for  
7 transit regionally. That is because we are the terminus for every major transit mode in the City. That all  
8 comes together at the Transit Center. Let me combine that also with Whitney's comments that there  
9 isn't a focus as to how important and the key role that that plays and why Palo Alto cannot avoid taking  
10 the leadership on a number of these roles. To boil that altogether and emphasize that in the Plan, I  
11 think, is something that would also benefit us as a community larger. I'm waving away the fly, not your  
12 comments. Thank you.

13  
14 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. I'd like to say first that—I guess I'm done. I'd like to say first that there is no  
15 mention, that I could tell, of level of service as a policy in the Comp Plan elements, Transportation  
16 Element in terms of policies for level of service. Multimodal service, there's VMT. There's no explicit  
17 mention of level of service, and there needs to be explicit mention of level of service, particularly with  
18 the changes in State law. What I originally suggested is—actually I'd like to reword that, because I did  
19 find (inaudible) on Policy T-4.5, on page T-40; however, that's actually incorrect. It says impacts from  
20 new development of all types in residential neighborhoods. There's also potential for new development  
21 outside of a residential neighborhood that has an impact on a residential neighborhood. I think that the  
22 way that's done is actually a mistake. I think we need to have level of service in there, and it needs to be  
23 explicit, particularly with the change of State law. Retaining it needs to be a policy in the Comp Plan or it  
24 doesn't have effect. It can't be just sort of understood with the changes in State law. What I would  
25 suggest is that have a policy to retain the use of level of service and how that's worded, and then a  
26 program which says to update the LOS rules. That's what I originally actually wrote in the Comp Plan  
27 before this thing came up. I think that's what needs to be there. In terms of parking to meet demand,  
28 we have offered that as consensus at the last meeting in February. We talked about the idea of phased  
29 approach, but the first phase is, frankly, missing. The thing is this: at some point in time, parking  
30 demand will go down. However, I think that the thing I proposed talks about the idea that parking  
31 demand will decrease over time. If you look at the thing I wrote, all new development projects should  
32 be completely self-parked and meet parking demand generated by the project, then I go on. Then, I say,  
33 "as demonstrated parking demand decreases, parking requirements for new construction will decrease,  
34 and nexus parking in existing developments may be made available to existing under-parked  
35 developments." I think that's the kind of thing that we should have. I've reworded my first one but not  
36 the second. The next thing is about shared parking. We had an example of shared parking; it was—  
37 Alma Plaza had shared parking with the Stanford Villa Apartments. Fifty parking spaces in Alma Plaza  
38 were assigned to Stanford Villa Apartments. When Alma Plaza was redeveloped, the question was what  
39 happened to those parking spaces. We got a letter in our packet that says Stanford Villa doesn't need  
40 those parking spaces. It shouldn't be a private agreement between two property owners; one property  
41 owner, because of who knows what goes on behind scenes, goes ahead and says no, we don't need that.  
42 The City needs to be a party to that. The City needs to be an enforcer to that. The City needs to make  
43 sure that it goes with the land that's talked about. I agree with the idea of Caltrain grade separations. I



# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE DRAFT MINUTES TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT

1 don't know why we're only focusing on East Meadow and Charleston grade separations for  
2 undergrounding. I think we also need to think about Churchill. I think we should also think about Palo  
3 Alto Avenue and actually going under San Francisquito Creek and continuing in cooperation with Menlo  
4 Park where they have at least four grade crossings in a mile. That's a mess. Finally, I agree that we need  
5 to think about Residential Parking Permit programs. Certainly the City has allowed them to have a  
6 process for including them. I'm not sure we should go immediately Citywide, but we should certainly  
7 have on the table the potential of using College Terrace-style Residential Parking Permit programs and  
8 not just the ones that involve commercial parking in there. Thank you. If staff wants to make any  
9 comments before we go through. Can you talk on mike?

10

11 **Elaine Costello:** Thank you. Those were very useful comments. I think it was a good idea to start with  
12 that overview. As we said, we could probably do—we might be able to do Goals 1 and 2 together, since  
13 they seem to be linked in people's comments, both the sustainability and the congestion. We could  
14 probably take two at a time in the interest of making sure that we get to Goal 8.

15

16 **Co-Chair Keller:** Maybe we should do Goal T-1 and T-2. I don't think we'll have more time than—this  
17 round took about 45 minutes. If we consider that we have until 8:30, maybe we should just have two  
18 more rounds, and we'll see how that works. We'll do Goal T-1 and T-2, and then we'll do all the other  
19 goals, if that's agreeable to people. Yes, Annette.

20

21 **Annette Glanckopf:** At some point, we really do need to comment on other people's comments. I'm  
22 not sure—we sort of go when the emotion is hot. I'd like to elaborate on a number of comments that I  
23 heard. I don't know where—you sort of lose it if it gets merged in all the goals. Maybe we could just  
24 pick it up or else we could start our comments with some highlights on what we agree or disagree.

25

26 **Co-Chair Keller:** Sure. Do you have a suggestion on ... Dan.

27

28 **Co-Chair Garber:** I don't have a specific suggestion. It seems to me in the course of conversation if  
29 people have specific comments about the goals, I suspect there are going to be some goals that are  
30 hotter than others, that there'll be more comments on. It seems to me—I'm somewhat in favor of that  
31 suggestion, that we find a couple of topics that we all want to talk about. LOS may be one. To Hillary's  
32 point, we may be able to solve that fairly easily or at least come up with some suggestions for the  
33 subcommittee or somebody to consider. Are there other topics that people would want to raise to  
34 discuss more specifically? Maybe the other one is parking.

35

36 **Co-Chair Keller:** Let me just ask a high-level question and see a show of hands for this. I'm wondering  
37 how many people think that this element as it's described now should—is it such that we could sort of  
38 make suggestions or requests to the subcommittee, and then it goes on to the Council, whether it  
39 should come back to us in July on consent. In some sense, how we handle this is going to depend on—in  
40 the next hour and a half, how we handle this is going to depend on what we intend to happen next.

41

42 **Co-Chair Garber:** Perhaps we could ask staff what their plan is right now, and then we can make  
43 comment on that.



# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE DRAFT MINUTES TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT

1 **Co-Chair Keller:** Yeah, hearing the comments. Maybe the staff could comment on what you think we  
2 should do.

3  
4 **Elaine Costello:** The plan right now is to make revisions based on the comments that are made tonight,  
5 and take it to the—we could send it back out for "do people have refinements that they'd like to make."  
6 The idea of getting it to the Council is not to have them take final action or anything. More to just keep  
7 them up to date on sort of where we are. I think one option that could be pursued is to make these  
8 changes tonight with the idea that we're just going to give an update to the Council, these are the issues  
9 that are emerging, level of service, VMT, parking, and get some feedback from them so that it's part of  
10 the iterative process. We do have the July meeting planned at this point for land use, which is going to  
11 be a very meaty topic for the CAC.

12  
13 **Co-Chair Keller:** The reason I'm suggesting that at least it be on the consent calendar for the CAC is, first  
14 of all, it gives us an opportunity to see what we understand staff is going to give to the Council. If it goes  
15 to the subcommittee and the subcommittee makes edits on it and doesn't go through the CAC, at least  
16 seeing what comes back, I'm a little concerned particularly since I heard that the June 6th meeting had  
17 only three out of nine subcommittee members. That's pretty skewed. I'm not sure that staff made sure  
18 that all opinions and the CAC were represented at that meeting. I do have concerns about that. The  
19 other thing is it also give us an opportunity to have it go and be a public record and allows us to put  
20 written comments at that meeting that can go to Council. Otherwise, if it doesn't come to us on at least  
21 the consent calendar, we don't have the opportunity to review that and to give additional comments.

22  
23 **Co-Chair Garber:** Hamilton, you had some feelings that you had expressed earlier. Do you have any  
24 thoughts right now regarding the conversation that's been going on?

25  
26 **Hamilton Hitchings:** Appreciate that. I actually want to second Arthur's. I believe this needs to go back  
27 to the subcommittee. I actually feel a very common vibe even from the people who would be most  
28 (inaudible). I feel like a lot of what we're saying is really on the same page, but the element just doesn't  
29 quite get us there. I think it needs to go back to subcommittee. It needs to come back here for review.  
30 If the subcommittee does a good job in their session, then we can sign off and send it. We could always  
31 just add additional comments that are submitted by individual members of (inaudible).

32  
33 **Co-Chair Garber:** The subcommittee could also return it to the main committee, saying "good as is" or  
34 "good with these comments" or the other end of the spectrum is "there's three things that we'd like to  
35 bring forward; give us some feedback on these" or something of that sort.

36  
37 **Hamilton Hitchings:** I just don't think something should go to the Council without having the committee  
38 (inaudible) a pretty broad consensus.

39  
40 **Co-Chair Keller:** My sense of things is, based on a number of comments; we're not quite there yet. Don.  
41 **Don McDougall:** As a subcommittee member then, I think that the committee that has opinions could  
42 be expected to submit written comments on spelling mistakes or typos or all of those kind of things. I  
43 would submit at this point, instead of trying to go through the goals in order, that we adopt Annette's





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

1 position. If there's discussion that people want to have (inaudible) what's going on. As a subcommittee  
2 member, I'd like to hear that if this is going to come back to me. I'm not even clear where this violent  
3 disagreement is that I'm supposed to resolve. I'd like to hear it.

4  
5 **Co-Chair Keller:** I think that's a good suggestion. Can we have this come back to us at least on consent  
6 in July?

7  
8 **Elaine Costello:** Yes, we can. We won't make the Council meeting in August. We need to have the staff  
9 report 5 weeks in advance. That would push it to later for the Council, but that's up to the committee.

10  
11 **Co-Chair Keller:** I'm confused. I thought we have to have it like 2 weeks or 10 days in advance. I'm not  
12 sure about 5 weeks.

13  
14 **Elena Lee:** Sure. Thank you. The timeframe for staff reports for Council have changed. They are  
15 requiring a much longer lead time. We'd actually have to have the Transportation Element finalized  
16 probably a month and a half at least ahead of a Council meeting in order to prepare the staff report. I  
17 think if we do go—certainly we can bring this back in July, but that does mean that it would affect future  
18 hearing dates. Right now, we've tentatively scheduled quite a bit for the City Council, because we  
19 definitely want to keep this project moving along. If it's important, certainly we are happy to adjust our  
20 timeline, but it does have an effect on the overall project.

21  
22 **Co-Chair Keller:** I appreciate that. If it came to us on consent in July, could it go to the Council around  
23 Labor Day?

24  
25 **Elena Lee:** We'd have to look at the schedule to see what availability there is. We've tentatively  
26 identified August 15th. We'd have to look at what is on the agenda for other departments as well as for  
27 our department. If the decision is to bring this back to the CAC on July, we'd have to work internally  
28 with Hillary to identify new dates.

29  
30 **Co-Chair Keller:** Elaine.

31  
32 **Elaine Uang:** I have a suggestion. Since it's a small group and we have what, a little over an hour and a  
33 half? I don't think it needs to come back to the subcommittee for another round of review. Would it be  
34 possible to just have a discussion here now and have staff take back some updates? I'm not seeing what  
35 necessarily the value of going back to the subcommittee and then bringing it back is necessarily going to  
36 do. Just in the interest of time, maybe we can just have a discussion here. It does sound like we're  
37 coming to some closer alignment. I have a few additional suggestions of wording and things that we  
38 can....

39  
40 **Don McDougall:** Could we at least make that decision in an hour and a half?

41  
42 **Co-Chair Keller:** We can certainly. My sense of things is based on seeing what's in the Transportation  
43 Element now. I personally don't have confidence in this going to the Council without at least us seeing it



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

1 one more time. This is far enough away. There have been too many changes between February and  
2 now that aren't tracked, that we weren't able to figure out, as far as I can tell. We saw the Land Use  
3 Element a couple of times with a bunch of changes, a meeting in between. We haven't seen this in 4  
4 months; a lot of changes happened in there. A lot to digest. Maybe we can revisit this later. I'm sort of  
5 wondering if people—have a show of hands whether they'd like it to come back. We don't necessarily  
6 have to discuss it on July 17th, but at least it gives us an idea—allows us to have the opportunity to see  
7 it and have the opportunity to give comments that can go to Council. I'm wondering how many people  
8 think that's a good idea.

9  
10 **Jennifer Hetterly:** Arthur, we don't have a quorum now anyway. Could we make a choice one way or  
11 the other?

12  
13 **Co-Chair Keller:** The thing is this. According to *Robert's Rules of Order*, until somebody calls the  
14 question, we do (inaudible) event. The interesting thing is we'll wait 'til Don returns. Yes?

15  
16 **Annette Glanckopf:** I'm wondering on July 17th, it's sort of difficult 2 or 3 days before the meeting to  
17 get a huge packet on the revised transportation and then another packet. I just don't have the schedule  
18 in front of me.

19  
20 **Female:** Land use.

21  
22 **Annette Glanckopf:** Land use. This is the two most important elements. We're going to get it a couple  
23 of days before the meeting. I guess I'm not for your recommendation for that reason. It's a lot to really  
24 read through and comprehend and make comments on. Perhaps we could get the transportation part a  
25 month out. Maybe we could get that earlier. I'm concerned about two huge packets.

26  
27 **Co-Chair Keller:** I sympathize with you. What does staff think about the idea of getting it out to us  
28 earlier?

29  
30 **Elaine Costello:** I think it's going to be a struggle. If you want to have a transportation subcommittee  
31 meeting and then—there's a lot of preparation that goes into creating a packet for each meeting and  
32 making the changes to the policies and trying not to have missing redlining and all those details. I think  
33 realistically we're going to have trouble getting back on transportation by the 17th if we go back to the  
34 subcommittee. I think it was a suggestion. Let's see how much discussion there is, and then maybe as it  
35 gets to about 8:15 or so, sort of say "does this seem like enough that in fact the staff and the consultants  
36 could make the changes and just bring this back." Maybe then we could get it out sooner. If we're also  
37 trying to get a packet to the subcommittee, make all the changes from the subcommittee and then a  
38 packet out again. It's just a lot of—it's just everything takes a couple of—every turnaround takes a  
39 couple of weeks. The most expedited way to do it would be to—I think this idea of talking to the major  
40 issues and then seeing if we can do that by about 8:15, then we could get transportation back by the  
41 17th. Then, we could see where we are on land use. I think that's something we're just going to have to  
42 give some thought to, how we juggle both of these.



# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE DRAFT MINUTES TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT

1 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. We have two issues so far. The big issues on the table that everybody  
2 spoke to, to some extent, are level of service and amount of parking. Are there any other major issues  
3 that we should reserve today? Adrian.

4  
5 **Adrian Fine:** I don't know if it's a disagreement or the (inaudible). A number of folks have brought up  
6 the issue of pricing parking. If that might be a separate issue or if it's within parking itself.

7  
8 **Co-Chair Keller:** Maybe we'll just cover that under parking. Annette.

9  
10 **Annette Glanckopf:** Crazy, this little microphone. One issue we haven't really talked about—I've had  
11 some feedback about this. It's great that we involve Stanford; it's great that we involve Planning  
12 Commission, but so many parts in this element refer to businesses. We haven't involved the Chamber. I  
13 think that's a real omission. I don't know how to correct it at this point. To me, that's a major issues.

14  
15 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Any other issues? Maybe what we should do is revisit the issue of level of  
16 service and sort of see how we can nail that down. Who wants to lead us off? Hamilton.

17  
18 **Hamilton Hitchings:** I was going to recommend we see if we can agree on Arthur's addition. I hear  
19 we're kind of all in agreement. We think vehicle miles traveled needs to be part of the element. We like  
20 the full multimodal, because we want to make sure we look at walking and biking. We also understand  
21 that some of our intersections are at "E" and "F," and we don't want to ignore that. Now that it's being  
22 pulled out of the law, we want to make sure that the LOS for vehicles is actually a policy and a program  
23 in here as well. I think if we could get to that, we don't even have to have a minority opinion. I think if  
24 there's strong objection to having it explicitly state vehicle LOS in the Plan, then we can have it as a  
25 minority opinion. It's possible we could all just agree on that and be done with the issue.

26  
27 **Co-Chair Keller:** I think that makes sense. I would amend my thing to delete the reference to  
28 (inaudible), because that's already in there; although, I think that should be changed. It would read  
29 retain the use of level of service, LOS, metrics including cumulative impacts when evaluating  
30 development applications, would be the goal. We can think about adding a policy which is to update the  
31 LOS metrics—the LOS thresholds. Sorry. A program would be to update the LOS thresholds. Elaine.

32  
33 **Elaine Uang:** I don't mind adding a policy that references LOS, but I think LOS is more appropriate for  
34 measuring localized impact. Actually cumulative and more systemic impacts are best measured with  
35 different tools. I'm not quite understanding how you can use LOS for cumulative impact. I would  
36 actually prefer to in some way, if we're going to change it, have a policy for LOS. I think make it very  
37 clear that LOS is a measure of localized travel through an intersection.

38  
39 **Co-Chair Keller:** Certainly LOS is an intersection-based metric; however, I read lots of CEQA reviews  
40 when I was on the Planning Commission. There are in it cumulative impacts. There is the idea of the  
41 project at baseline, the current amount and then 2025 or some future date including—that's where you  
42 get cumulative impacts, the future projections. I've read that, so I'm not sure that my (inaudible)  
43 doesn't match yours. Whitney.



# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE DRAFT MINUTES TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT

1 **Whitney McNair:** I would just say contemporary environmental analysis is changing to VMT analysis. I  
2 understand the City wants to keep the LOS for localized analysis. That is something the City has the  
3 ability to do. CEQA Guidelines and CEQA is going to change to an LOS model. What I had a concern with  
4 in the element is that, to me, the VMT discussion within the narrative was in the sidebar. That is the  
5 new State-mandated criterion that we should be considering or that will be mandated, that all the CEQA  
6 analyses do. It's in a sidebar, that it's something in the future. It really is going to be the metric by  
7 which you're measured through the life of the Plan. I like, Hamilton, the way you described it. It needs  
8 to be included to some level that shows that it's an important component, but it's just not relegated to  
9 some sidebar issues.

10

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

12

13 **Co-Chair Dan Garber:** I was going to say much the same thing. I don't think there's any attempt to not  
14 acknowledge VMT. I think it's additive, and I think it's important for a variety of reasons to our  
15 community, to include it as something that's an addition. Presumably over time we're going to find that  
16 its value becomes less as we become more comfortable with VMT and how to use it. I was going to ask  
17 staff, because I wasn't seeing it in here and I wasn't digging, what the original policy that incorporated  
18 LOS in there, that Hillary was just speaking to, do you happen to know what that was? I don't want to  
19 get too embroiled with the cumulative impacts. I think what's important here is getting LOS in there. It  
20 can be utilized in any number of ways depending on what the needs are. I can wait for my answer. Don.

21

22 **Don McDougall:** It would appear there's two things. One is to include LOS, and the other is to make  
23 sure that VMT is more properly described both in the narrative and maybe in the actual policies. I agree  
24 that that section sort of has mixed up paragraphs. If we could sort out the narrative relative to VMT and  
25 make sure that the LOS policies are there, it would seem to me that we'd have consensus. The wording  
26 that Arthur has proposed is (inaudible) as far as I'm concerned.

27

28 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Are there any other comments about this? Can we have a straw poll? I  
29 think that we don't have a quorum, and we can't officially recommend this, but we can have straw polls.  
30 I'm wondering how many people are in favor of a policy that is retain the use of level of service metrics  
31 including cumulative impacts when evaluating development applications and a program that says  
32 update LOS thresholds.

33

34 **Hamilton Hitchings:** Propose an amendment.

35

36 **Whitney McNair:** The one thing I didn't hear is a consensus about being very specific. You have a very  
37 specific motion out there that uses LOS in the cumulative analysis. What I heard the group saying is  
38 there seems consensus about including VMT, including LOS. I feel like we keep going back to something  
39 which is very specific, and I haven't heard the consensus around that specificity.

40

41 **Co-Chair Keller:** That's why I'm trying to do a straw poll. This motion says nothing about VMT. We can  
42 say something else about VMT, about the narrative, but I believe that there is VMT mentioned in the  
43 policies. This is about putting back LOS into the policy. We can cover one thing at a time. Again, how



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

1 many people are in favor of the motion to retain the use of LOS metrics including cumulative impacts  
2 when evaluating development applications and also having a program to update the LOS thresholds?  
3 We have at least four, which is the minimum for—are you in favor?  
4

5 **Don McDougall:** No. What I want to point out is I agree with what Whitney just said. If you left out the  
6 cumulative, then it would be—I don't think it dilutes ...  
7

8 **Co-Chair Keller:** Are you on a microphone?  
9

10 **Don McDougall:** I'm done.  
11

12 **Co-Chair Keller:** There's some people who think it should be with cumulative and at least four people  
13 who want it with cumulative. Yes, Hamilton.  
14

15 **Hamilton Hitchings:** Can you help explain to me cumulative? Does cumulative mean if I build one  
16 project and then I build another project, you sort of need to look at how they all add together? What  
17 exactly does cumulative mean?  
18

19 **Co-Chair Keller:** The typical way that CEQA works now, because VMT has not been adopted yet—I  
20 understand the State law says it will be adopted, but the policies around it are not completely done.  
21 The way I've read CEQA analyses on LOS is you do an analysis of the project at an intersection with and  
22 without the project. You do an analysis in the future of what you expect the projection to be at a future  
23 date, based on the growth in traffic. That's what cumulative impacts are. Under an analysis, you pick a  
24 future date like 2025 or 2030. I think that still makes sense.  
25

26 **Hamilton Hitchings:** Why wouldn't you want to look in the future and see what the impact of the  
27 project is in the future?  
28

29 **Co-Chair Keller:** I guess Whitney should respond to that.  
30

31 **Whitney McNair:** I got it; I got it. User error, I believe, is what they call it. The difference is—Elaine's  
32 right. LOS is a standard, and it's measuring how many trips are going through an intersection. The idea  
33 is that you put a building or you put a use, and then you measure the trips that go through different  
34 intersections as they disperse throughout the City or disperse throughout the region. It doesn't take  
35 into account—pardon? I'm sorry. Are you having a sidebar conversation? I'm just kidding. It's really  
36 looking at those localized intersections. Over a cumulative analysis is taking what those impacts are and  
37 then looking out, say, 25 years or so, and you build in all the background growth that's occurred  
38 throughout the region and how many more trips are going through that intersection. A VMT analysis is  
39 really looking at—it's trying to look at land use in a different way. It's saying if you—the level of service,  
40 it just basically means that you're building further and further out. You're dispersing those trips to this  
41 wider network. A VMT analysis is saying it's actually better from an environmental standpoint to build  
42 things in closer so you're not on so many roads. Let me put it this way. LOS is saying if I built out in  
43 Tracy and drove here to Stanford Research Park that would be less of an impact than if I built housing



# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE DRAFT MINUTES TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT

1 within the Research Park. Putting housing would say maybe there's more trips that go through that  
2 Page Mill/El Camino intersection. The model where I'm building housing out in Tracy is there's only one  
3 trip that's going through that intersection. On a cumulative basis in an environmental analysis, you're  
4 looking to say what's worse, what's causing more greenhouse gas, what's causing more pollution, is it  
5 that trip that's coming from Tracy or that trip that's coming from the Research Park. A cumulative  
6 analysis should really be looking at that VMT model rather than just that centralized mode of the  
7 intersection.

8  
9 **Co-Chair Keller:** Elaine.

10  
11 **Elaine Uang:** I guess this is where my definition of cumulative and your definition of cumulative is  
12 different. I think the cumulative that you're looking at is that particular intersection for an extended  
13 time horizon. T Whitney's point, I think the cumulative that I'm concerned about is more what I call the  
14 systemic effect of what happens to the systems load of traffic and transportation. I offered in my  
15 comments a very specific example, very similar to what Whitney said. If we considered two projects.  
16 Project A, infill, mixed-use in Downtown Palo Alto, which might generate a slight increase in LOS at a  
17 couple of local intersections, but reduces VMT and overall traffic system stress, because people can  
18 transit and bike to it. That's one example. You can review the LOS and VMT together to look at the  
19 tradeoffs. Compare that to a Project B of the same size on Bayshore, by East Meadow, that doesn't  
20 increase LOS or local traffic, but increases Citywide VMT and overall system traffic volumes, because no  
21 one can bike and take transit there. I think we need to look at both of those metrics together. I think  
22 my definition of cumulative is probably a little bit different from—where I had the concern with your  
23 motion, Arthur, is in your definition of cumulative. I'm talking about time impact at a local intersection  
24 for 15, 20 years. I'm talking about I want us to consider in this Comprehensive Plan the cumulative  
25 effects for our City and the region as a whole.

26  
27 **Co-Chair Keller:** I think that the thing is that the idea is we're still having VMT. We're having three  
28 things: VMT; MMLoS, multimodal level of service; and level of service. This motion is simply about level  
29 of service and adding level of service back with cumulative impacts as they have been understood for  
30 level of service, which is based on the future. Hamilton is next? Hamilton.

31  
32 **Hamilton Hitchings:** Arthur covered some of it. I agree with VMT is very important, and that's actually  
33 why it's in the Comp Plan. No one is talking about removing it. What we're talking about is not  
34 removing level of service. If you tell me it doesn't matter if in 25 years this intersection doesn't work  
35 and there's massive congestion around it because that's a cumulative impact in the future, it does  
36 matter. Just like VMT matters and the cumulative impact. We're trying to move things locally. I would  
37 argue that if VMT really works, overall it should net reduce the amount of LOS throughout the Bay Area.  
38 I think if LOS goes up everywhere, then the VMT promise doesn't work. That doesn't really compute in  
39 my mind in terms of what will happen. I think it's about we have VMT. The problem is we took out LOS,  
40 and we're just trying to get LOS back in. If we need to have cumulative in all three of these things  
41 together, I'm fine with that, because we actually want to look at all three and how all of them impact  
42 the system.



# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE DRAFT MINUTES TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT

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

2

3 **Adrian Fine:** It seems like folks are in general in support of the motion. I think there's a little bit of issue  
4 about this cumulative. I think most folks are probably in favor of something that's a longitudinal  
5 measure of these different impacts. You can do VMT longitudinally as well. One thing I'd like to  
6 mention. Another way of thinking about LOS and VMT is LOS is those little rumble strips you see on the  
7 road. They see how many cars pass this point. That is it. VMT, there's many ways of doing it. One of  
8 the most popular is looking at a given land use or business or residence and kind of figuring out the  
9 origins and destinations from that location. You can say there's 50 people who drive here every day,  
10 and they come from an average distance of 10 miles; that's 500 VMT. That kind of a way of looking at it.  
11 I'm actually not sure about your assumption if LOS is going up across the board, so is VMT or vice versa.  
12 They're more—one's local; one's more systemic and network effect.

13

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

15

16 **Hamilton Hitchings:** When I think of LOS—correct me if I'm wrong. Specifically in the staff reports that  
17 I've read, it's about the delay at intersections. It's not just about the number of cars going over; it's  
18 about how many seconds delay there is of each one. When I think of LOS, I'm really thinking Stanford  
19 Research Park, because I think about that Page Mill/El Camino. I think about when you come in off  
20 University Ave., trying to get into Downtown. That road isn't getting any wider. When you're coming off  
21 280, getting to the Stanford Research Park. I just want to make sure that—some of those intersections  
22 are really bad right now during peak rush hour. I want to make sure that over time those intersections  
23 are improving based on the policies that we're putting in this Comprehensive Plan.

24

25 **Co-Chair Keller:** Amy. We'll let you use the other microphone. That one.

26

27 **Amy Sung:** You know what I just figured out? It needs three touches. Thank you so much for all this  
28 explanation. When I was reading, I was really not real clear about what's the significance of the LOS and  
29 also the VMT. I understood the definition but did not quite understand the impact it has. In fact, it  
30 appears to me that the LOS is talking about a different goals. It seems to me that it would be perfect  
31 solution to see that we can sync up the traffic lights using LOS; whereas, VMT is to combat the  
32 greenhouse emission. That seems to be more appropriate. If that is the case, the way I understand it, I  
33 think that if our transportation is to look at reducing the greenhouse emission, VMT simply is the priority  
34 that we should have. It looks like the two measures are looking at two different set of goals.

35

36 **Co-Chair Keller:** Are you suggesting that we have both measures?

37

38 **Amy Sung:** It looks like, if I read it correctly from the background information, that the State is shifting  
39 away from LOS. If our goal is to discourage the use of a single use vehicle, that our environment is more  
40 important, I think that maybe we retain both of them. One, to retain the LOS because maybe that is  
41 how we measure how we do the traffic lights and synchronize them. In fact, I think Microsoft teamed  
42 up with San Jose to do just that. Was I too loud again?

43



# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE DRAFT MINUTES TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT

1 **Co-Chair Keller:** Yeah, just about 6 inches away. Dan.

2

3 **Co-Chair Garber:** Just some quick comments. For me, VMT—I advise (inaudible) addressing these two.  
4 For me VMT directly connects land use with transportation in a way that LOS doesn't. LOS is very  
5 important because it talks about the experience in getting from end of town to the other. A question for  
6 staff though. Relative to CEQA, the State is going to be dropping LOS as part of the legal requirement.  
7 Just to make it clear, that doesn't mean that Palo Alto can't still implement that policy and ask for that  
8 information when applications are made and those impacts are asked for.

9

10 **Co-Chair Keller:** Let me say this. Is staff okay with the idea of modifying the write-up regarding VMT to  
11 clarify rather than in just a sidebar to put more language about that?

12

13 **Elaine Costello:** Sure.

14

15 **Co-Chair Keller:** The staff is going to do that. I think in a previous meeting we said we're not as  
16 concerned with the narrative, but I realize that Whitney has expressed a concern about that. Staff is  
17 going to do that. Considering that staff will beef up the use of VMT in the narrative, I'm going to ask the  
18 question again. How many people are in favor of the policy with cumulative impacts where cumulative  
19 is a technical term meaning longitudinal? I'm wondering how many people are in favor of LOS under  
20 that along with updating the LOS thresholds. I'm going to do that again.

21

22 **Co-Chair Garber:** Not to the exclusion of VMT.

23

24 **Co-Chair Keller:** And not to the exclusion of VMT. We have nine. Elaine.

25

26 **Elaine Uang:** (inaudible) can you use the word longitudinal instead of cumulative?

27

28 **Co-Chair Keller:** The only reason I'm using cumulative is because that's the term that's been used in  
29 CEQA and understood. If you look at ...

30

31 **Elaine Uang:** Never mind. That's fine.

32

33 **Co-Chair Keller:** Dan, isn't that what you saw in the...

34

35 **Co-Chair Garber:** Yeah, absolutely.

36

37 **Co-Chair Keller:** That's what I've typically seen, the term cumulative. That's why I'm trying to use that.  
38 It seems like we—again, could you raise your hand again please?

39

40 **Don McDougall:** It does seem confusing enough. Why couldn't we say cumulative or longitudinal? Why  
41 not clarify it?

42





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

1 **Co-Chair Keller:** How about staff will figure out how to explain this in such a way that in a narrative it  
2 says cumulative means whatever? Essentially, it's clear. Can we have a show of hands again? Show of  
3 straws. Looks like—No. Ten. In a straw poll, I think the idea is that the nonvoting members don't vote.  
4 We have ten. Did you vote? We have eleven voting members all voted unanimously in favor. Thank  
5 you. Actually, ten voting members, because we only had ten people here. Parking. We put that to bed.  
6 Staff happy with that?

7  
8 **Elaine Costello:** (inaudible)

9  
10 **Co-Chair Keller:** I think we had something specific and good wording. Who wants to kick off parking?  
11 Adrian.

12  
13 **Adrian Fine:** I'm actually not going to kick it off, but I would suggest that we kind of chunk it out into a  
14 couple of issues. Some of the ones that have come to mind are pricing parking; there's the issue of  
15 maybe a ratcheting mechanism; there's an issue of whether all future buildings should be fully parked.  
16 I'm sure there's a couple more, but that might be an easier way to attack this problem. One that comes  
17 to mind is pricing. Two is the ratcheting mechanism the subcommittee brought up. There was some  
18 comments that maybe that first step needs a bit of work. Third is whether all future developments are  
19 fully parked or over-parked or under-parked, whatever we decide.

20  
21 **Female:** (inaudible)

22  
23 **Adrian Fine:** Yeah. There has been an issue of residential parking too.

24  
25 **Female:** (inaudible)

26  
27 **Adrian Fine:** I didn't see it.

28  
29 **Co-Chair Keller:** Could you tell us a little bit about what you mean by ratcheting? I ...

30  
31 **Adrian Fine:** The subcommittee had this idea that we can either implement or remove parking policies  
32 across the City as we reach certain thresholds. I think that's a smart strategy.

33  
34 **Elaine Uang:** Your two and three are linked.

35  
36 **Adrian Fine:** Are you talking about the development standards?

37  
38 **Elaine Uang:** Mm-hmm.

39  
40 **Adrian Fine:** They're probably linked, yes.

41



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

1 **Co-Chair Keller:** I'm going to suggest that, since there's been a lot more thought about the self-parking,  
2 we deal with that first, if that's okay. (inaudible) The issue of whether projects be self-parked, that we  
3 deal with that first. Yes, Elaine.

4  
5 **Elaine Uang:** (inaudible)

6  
7 **Co-Chair Keller:** No, it doesn't have number. It's basically in my comments. It was deleted from the  
8 previous element.

9  
10 **Elaine Uang:** I'd actually have a suggestion for what you call self-parking and what Adrian calls  
11 ratcheting and development standards. I actually think that they're all linked. The one suggestion that I  
12 was just going to make about clarifying language, especially in a phased approach, was if you take Policy  
13 T-5.1, I think there should be some clarification language about sufficient but not excessive parking and  
14 maybe just an additional sentence about a time-bound strategy. Then, Programs 5.1.1, 5.1.2, 5.1.3  
15 could be set up so that it could describe the short-term, medium-term and long-term parking  
16 requirement proposals. In the short term, provide sufficient parking per existing Zoning Code or as  
17 demonstrated need for a particular area. Program 5.1.2 could be the sort of medium term, evaluate  
18 parking requirements for a local area based on parking needs and requirements. Then, 5.1.3 could be  
19 the longer term, let's really adjust—if it makes sense, adjust parking requirements in an area. That was  
20 actually what I was going to put forward like a way to sort of clearly describe the phased approach and  
21 then also—I think this is what Adrian is calling ratcheting. It also touches on the fully parked, self-parked  
22 concept.

23  
24 **Co-Chair Keller:** Go ahead, Hamilton.

25  
26 **Hamilton Hitchings:** It's interesting. I think we actually all agree, and we're just using different  
27 nomenclature. I think there's an opportunity to get even better nomenclature. I don't have that perfect  
28 one, but I'm going to throw out some ideas to help the brainstorming. We all like this idea of phased  
29 approach, but we actually can't really put a timeline on it because it could happen sooner. It could be  
30 the next recession, which could be in 3 years. It might be 15 years from now. We don't know what's  
31 going to happen with self-driving cars. This is an example where we want a dynamic system which  
32 adjusts based on how well the system is parked. If we can capture that ... For me, fully parked just  
33 means that the actual number of spaces that are going to be used by that company, taking into account  
34 TDM and everything else that's going on, is built. What happened was in the last 10 or 15 years, we've  
35 essentially done a number of projects in Downtown where they haven't had enough parking. As a  
36 result, there's been more parking in the residential neighborhoods combined with economic growth. A  
37 lot of people feel a little burned about that. The key is we want to actually be accurately measuring and  
38 properly parking for where we are at any given point. We don't want to over-park. Maybe in the short  
39 term we will do a little bit of over-parking, but long term we don't want to over-park. Empty parking  
40 spots during peak hour are essentially a waste. If we can capture the sense of dynamic—I think it's hard  
41 to put an exact timeline, but if we can sort of agree on what we think the definition of it is. To me, fully  
42 parked just means they're properly parked for where we are that moment in time. What was fully



# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE DRAFT MINUTES TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT

1 parked 10 years ago might be very different than what's fully parked 10 years from now. I don't know  
2 what the right language is, but I throw that out.

3

4 **Co-Chair Keller:** I think Dan has a question for Hamilton.

5

6 **Co-Chair Garber:** I am completely with you with the dynamic. If we can find a way to create language  
7 that acknowledges this dynamic, I think that's spot on. What I wanted to ask you about was—in my  
8 mind, what fully parked means is that—this may not be the way that you understand it. What it means  
9 to me is that for whatever the use is in that particular zone, what the zoning requires that parking to be  
10 is fully parked. There's no—you can't negotiate part of that away in some way, which is what has  
11 happened in the past.

12

13 **Hamilton Hitchings:** That's a good question, and different people may have different opinions. For  
14 example, if we look at the project that was just—what is that one off California Ave., between California  
15 and Page Mill? Anyway, there have been a number of projects like 425 Page Mill. They take off some  
16 parking spots for Caltrain passes and for bikes and stuff. There's arguments about what the proper  
17 square footage is per employee. There's a lot of language in here about studying and updating these  
18 numbers to be accurate, so that we will properly define it, and to continue to update them over time so  
19 they continue to be accurate as things change. I feel like we already have a lot of good language in here  
20 about trying to make them accurate and updating them. I don't know if (inaudible).

21

22 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Could you put your tag up so I can see who I want to call? Annette.

23

24 **Co-Chair Garber:** It's Annette, and then Whitney.

25

26 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you.

27

28 **Annette Glanckopf:** I'm fine with this concept of ratcheting back parking, but we are going to take, it  
29 seems like, another year or so with getting this whole Comp Plan out there. There is some interesting  
30 language in T-5.1.4. I think there will be projects that come to Council that are ahead of the Comp Plan  
31 in some of these ways that we can measure. The thing I wanted to stress is today I'm fine for less  
32 parking for housing developments that have seniors or for disabled. I don't want to lose that right now,  
33 today. I wanted to call that out as something a little bit different.

34

35 **Co-Chair Keller:** Whitney, do you still want to talk?

36

37 **Whitney McNair:** I was just going to say I'm looking at Goal T-5.1 and the programs that are below it.  
38 As Elaine mentioned in the beginning, we should really be focused on the policy, and the programs have  
39 a little bit less shelf life. The policy is provide sufficient but not excessive parking. That doesn't, to me,  
40 sound like anything that we—I do feel like there's some consensus around that. Maybe I'm  
41 misunderstanding. From an implementation standpoint, I think we just need to be realistic. When a  
42 project goes forward for approval, they are trying to meet the City Code. That's what you were saying,  
43 Dan. If 100 parking spaces is required, they are going to provide 100 parking spaces. In 5 years from



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

1 now, if those standards change, they have still built 100 parking spaces. You're not going to change their  
2 parking; that's there. They're not coming back in for another approval from the City. There's different  
3 mechanisms that you can do to bank parking. You can build 80 spaces and put 20 spaces in a landscape  
4 reserve. If at such point in the future they need those extra 20 spaces, they can put them in at a later  
5 point in time. You still have to reserve that space for whatever number of spaces that the City's  
6 requiring. I just want us to recognize that the City doesn't have the ability to be super flexible with  
7 those parking over time on one particular project. You may be able to affect different projects over time  
8 as you go forward and as you modify the parking requirements based on the programs here as you start  
9 to refine them over time. In projects 5 years from now, you may figure out that 87 spaces is the  
10 appropriate number and require a project at that time to put in that number. I just want us to be  
11 realistic with what it is that we think we would be able to accomplish with this. I think the way that  
12 Elaine laid it out, of walking through sort of chronologically, is to understand the parking, to evaluate it  
13 and modify it in sort of the short, medium and long-term type goals. I think that seems appropriate too.

14  
15 **Co-Chair Keller:** Dan.

16  
17 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. I like all that. I don't think we have to, in a certain sense, solve what the  
18 ratcheting is this evening. The policy can be to direct staff and/or other agencies to develop and  
19 evaluate other ratcheting mechanisms, if we want to use that term, and come back with the following  
20 objectives for them to create solutions around. I do think at the baseline you have to come back to  
21 what the underlying—you have to talk about the zoning, because that's a line in the sand. Trying to  
22 redefine that without actually going back to a document is hard to do. I think it's an important thing  
23 that Annette brought up. I think that's an interesting topic that we should also talk about, which is  
24 where are there exceptions and where are they allowable and not allowable. Maybe we could separate  
25 that and have that as another sub-conversation after this or maybe not. I'm just thinking that is a  
26 separate topic that's worth discussion.

27  
28 **Co-Chair Keller:** Jennifer.

29  
30 **Jennifer Hetterly:** I'm not sure I entirely understand what we're talking about when we talk about  
31 ratcheting. The way I was seeing it was this phased approach that the subcommittee is putting forth. I  
32 think the intention is in the short term we have some problems now that we're going to have to deal  
33 with, so let's deal with them. Maybe that's the part where you maintain self-parked requirements. In  
34 the short term, we're maintaining our self-parking requirements. Meanwhile, we're starting to study  
35 what the facts are about parking usage, demand, whatever. As we learn from those studies, then we  
36 start to change our policies going forward. I understand that you can't undo necessarily what has come  
37 before. What I'm worried about and I also hear that there's not great enthusiasm about is Citywide RPP;  
38 however, as you test out the feasibility of these new concepts like unbundled parking, expanded shared  
39 parking, and you're measuring "this development isn't having any problem. Even though they've  
40 unbundled, they're meeting the needs of all of their people." If the way they're meeting them is by  
41 those folks choosing not to buy the parking onsite and instead parking on the street, then you're  
42 creating a different problem that you're maybe not counting at the same time. I think that it's  
43 important to be able to have some controls on the overflow that results from those new strategies.



# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE DRAFT MINUTES TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT

1 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. I think we've gone around. Have you talked in this round? I'm going to add  
2 in if I may. One of the things I'm going to say is that one of my concerns, which relates to what Jennifer  
3 just brought up, is that the idea that sometimes development is done in such a way that the benefit is  
4 private, but the impacts are socialized. In other words, the community deals with the impact through  
5 spillover parking. We've dealt with that especially around California Avenue. There's been spillover into  
6 a bunch of neighborhoods around Downtown. We're seeing that proliferating. If you look at what I  
7 wrote in my high-level comments, Number 2, I talk about new development projects being completely  
8 self-parked to meet parking demand generated by the project and on-street parking not being used to  
9 fulfill the minimum parking requirements and compliant with the parking regulations in the Municipal  
10 Code, which already allow for reductions in terms of situations like low-income housing, senior housing.  
11 There are already established processes for dealing with that in our Code. We already have ways of  
12 dealing with that exception. I also have here "as demonstrated parking demand decreases, parking  
13 requirements for new construction or maybe new projects"—maybe that should be that—"will decrease  
14 and excess parking in existing developments may be made available to existing under-parked  
15 developments." The idea is that there is already a shortage of parking; there's a way of sharing it in  
16 there. That specifically talks about the idea of as the demand decreases, that parking requirements for  
17 new construction will decrease. There already is this notion of this decrease based on demonstrated  
18 reductions in demand. I thought carefully when I put this together to indicate in a single policy the  
19 notion that there's a time phasing and that there's a reduction that happens over time and demand. It's  
20 not explicit here, but the idea is that reduction may be place-based, that the reduction around  
21 Downtown may be different from the reduction around, say, Stanford Research Park where the  
22 transportation is not nearly as available. I think the Municipal Code should be changed to take in that  
23 nuance, and that's what's going on here in terms of T-5.1.2. There already is a notion here, "in parallel  
24 with each parking needs assessment, establish performance standards that represent the conditions  
25 that must be met before parking requirements for new development can be reduced." It's already got a  
26 notion of phasing. We don't need to talk about Phase 1, Phase 2, Phase 3. There already is this notion  
27 of phasing in there. The thing that's missing is the base condition, which is right now developments  
28 aren't being properly parked. Right now, what's happening is that we are under-parking, and there's a  
29 "consider spillover parking in the neighborhood." That's the problem that's missing. I think that  
30 "provide for sufficient and not excessive parking" is not operational. That's a goal; that's not a policy.  
31 The idea of "provide for sufficient and not excessive parking," I don't know how I'm going to implement  
32 that. It's not operationalized. I don't whether a product is compliant with that or not compliant with  
33 that. Therefore, essentially it's not useful. (inaudible) additional sentence I don't think necessarily  
34 helps. I would suggest that the wording I suggested, that's in bold in my Item 2, replace Policy T-5.1. In  
35 particular, I'm concerned that previous T-4.2, which is similar to what I have here, was eliminated  
36 without a trace, without any comment from the February draft. That's very disconcerting to me.  
37 Adrian, I think you're next.

38  
39 **Adrian Fine:** Sure. I just wanted to emphasize what you brought up, Arthur. Even if something does  
40 have parking requirements, there are Codes and ordinances that can modify it, increasing or decreasing  
41 it. Maybe another way to think about our conundrum here is measuring those and measuring the  
42 impact, because they get implemented on an ad hoc basis, on a project basis. Saying this one has got a



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

1 shared loading dock so it can take off two spots, that's not something that's routinely measured across  
2 the City.

3

4 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Hamilton.

5

6 **Hamilton Hitchings:** Looking for language that can meet this dynamic, phased approach while  
7 acknowledging that we do currently have a parking problem, I feel that Arthur's language, for me,  
8 checks all the boxes. It talks about being self-parked to meet the demand of the project and that we will  
9 decrease it over time as we make improvements. I want to point to Annette's comments that it also  
10 addresses things like disabled, because with the disabled population there typically isn't any or very few  
11 drivers or developmentally impaired, which is something we talked a lot about, trying to provide more  
12 housing for these folks in Palo Alto. In other developments, we—like in Mountain View, we can see that  
13 there's almost no drivers in that population. With elderly, they may be significantly reduced. The  
14 language I'm very passionate about in Arthur's is that we're not using on-street parking to absorb some  
15 of this additional parking from new projects. I think that's critical, especially at a stage where we're at.  
16 It does give you that valve for reducing it over time as the parking situation increases. I would like—  
17 we're not really doing motions, but I would like to see this replace the "provide sufficient but not  
18 excessive parking" as the overall policy for 5.1. That would do it for me.

19

20 **Co-Chair Keller:** Anybody else? Whitney.

21

22 **Whitney McNair:** I recognize and support the idea of not to use on-street parking to meet the parking  
23 requirements. I actually think that language is probably in the Zoning Ordinance already. Some of this  
24 language that meeting the minimum parking requirements and not counting on-street parking probably  
25 exists today in the City Code. If it's something that you think is important to put in the Comp Plan, I  
26 don't see any—I'm not opposed to that. I think if that helps with the parking issues that are being faced  
27 within the City right now, that's a good thing. I would just say the part about decrease the excess  
28 parking within an existing development being made available to existing under-parked developments,  
29 that may be appropriate in a place like Downtown or where there's shared parking. I just don't see how  
30 that's going to be implemented on a project in the Research Park. If you have extra parking on one lot,  
31 they are very individualized parcels; they are leased to different people; they have different—I know  
32 where I am in the Research Park, I can't park in the lot next door, even when we had construction, or  
33 you get towed. They are very independent parcels. The City's not going to get in the business of  
34 allowing people to park on somebody else's property. If there's shared parking, like in the Downtown  
35 where you have shared lots, or even in the Research Park if someday there was a shared parking facility,  
36 there is the ability to do that. I would just recognize that on a traditional lot you can't say that you're  
37 going to provide parking on somebody else's property for your project.

38

39 **Co-Chair Keller:** Len.

40

41 **Len Filppu:** Thanks. I support Arthur's language. It just seems to me that we lose track sometimes of  
42 what we're talking about where. What we're talking about is that as developments come in, they be  
43 responsible for what they're bringing into the environment. If I go camping to a national forest, I take



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

1 my stuff in; I treat the environment correctly, and I remove everything that I came in with. That is the  
2 issue, to ask these developments to be responsible to the environment in which they're coming, and  
3 that's a wide range of people, other businesses, public, residents. It's a City. The discussion about we're  
4 thinking maybe if we require less parking, they may be more apt to come in, I don't think that's relevant.  
5 I believe that we have a dynamic City where people—the right businesses will come. I think we need to  
6 carefully protect existing interests in this town and ask everyone to be responsible for the actions they  
7 take in our fair City. Our support Arthur's language.

8  
9 **Elena Lee:** Excuse me. If I could add something.

10  
11 **Co-Chair Keller:** Elena, please.

12  
13 **Elena Lee:** I just wanted to clarify something that Whitney brought up. The Zoning Code does say that  
14 parking shall be provided onsite. On-street parking cannot be considered part of required parking. I  
15 think the issue here is that the Code-required parking doesn't address the parking needs. Maybe that's  
16 the way the language should be looking at, that parking requirements shall be analyzed or shall be  
17 calibrated to require sufficient parking where overflow parking or on-street parking will not be relied  
18 upon for parking. It's a nuance, but I think we need to clarify it so it's consistent with the Zoning Code.

19  
20 **Co-Chair Keller:** I think that's a worthwhile comment. I notice that for the Olive Garden project there  
21 was an allowance of a required loading dock that was actually on the street. I'm not sure that the Code  
22 is actually being followed. I think such a project does require a loading dock. Am I correct that that  
23 loading dock was on the street?

24  
25 **Elena Lee:** I'm not familiar with that project, but loading should be provided onsite.

26  
27 **Adrian Fine:** No, no. The loading was onsite. It was in the circulation for the underground parking  
28 garage.

29  
30 **Elaine Costello:** While we're making clarifications, if it's okay, the last phrase, I think that Arthur's  
31 language can work well until we get to the point where "and excess parking in existing developments  
32 may be made available to existing under-parked developments." Whitney's point is right on that. We  
33 can't really say that another property owner—that you have to let other people use your property if you  
34 have excess parking. I think what you're getting at is that as there's a demonstrated decline in parking  
35 demand, then the requirements can change for future projects to require less parking. We can't really  
36 say that people who have extra parking have to let other people use it on their site.

37  
38 **Co-Chair Keller:** I'll just respond to that. The word is "may" be made available, not "must." Therefore,  
39 it's allowing for that possibility. It's not requiring that possibility. Annette.

40  
41 **Annette Glanckopf:** I like that language, and I think it should be deliberate. The concept of helping  
42 companies that are under-parked have other spaces to me is good. I don't think it should be casual. I  
43 think there should be an MOU in place, and there probably should be some money passed. It's not just



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

1 "I'm going to park there because there are extra spaces." I like the way it's written because it does allow  
2 that to happen. That's how I read it.

3

4 **Co-Chair Keller:** Dan.

5

6 **Co-Chair Garber:** A number of different thoughts. First, Elena, your comment is a very good one,  
7 because I think that is a large part of the community's concern, that things aren't under-parked by  
8 zoning but they become under-parked by use. How do you capture that? I think there are sort of a  
9 bunch of operational pieces that need to be—I don't know if we have to solve them here tonight, but  
10 we'd have to sort of walk through them. If I'm a property owner, unless I'm incented to share my  
11 parking spaces, I'm not going to. I'm not sure that as a citizen I'm going to be in favor of incenting a  
12 commercial property owner Downtown by giving them greater density or greater height or something to  
13 share their parking spaces. Maybe it's money, but I just don't know what it is exactly. Although, I do like  
14 the sense of there's a lot of underutilized parking spaces and, if there's a way that we can make better  
15 use of them, it helps the community. Operationally, I don't know how we get there. Going forward, it  
16 obviously makes sense. How we utilize it today, harder to do short of having another sort of shared  
17 parking facility, which is I think, Whitney, how you were using the shared. The money is raised by a  
18 bond by all of those particular property owners that would benefit from it, and then you would create  
19 that shared parking facility.

20

21 **Elaine Costello:** Just to offer one clarification, that maybe I wasn't clear. I think what we're getting at  
22 here is that there is underutilized parking even right now, to encourage the shared use of that parking.  
23 There are communities, that I've done work in, where that is happening right now, especially in  
24 downtown situations, where people have office buildings that are for whatever reason underutilizing  
25 their parking. There are now many more efforts to go back and find ways for property owners to work  
26 together to share that parking. That's just becoming kind of—it didn't happen in the past, but is  
27 happening more. I know a couple of communities that are doing it. I think we could, with the  
28 indulgence of the Chair, just reword this a little bit so that it's clearly about encouraging the shared  
29 parking of underutilized parking. That, I think, is what you're getting at, Arthur. Am I right?

30

31 **Co-Chair Keller:** Yes, it is what I'm getting at. Part of the issue is that people—I'm hearing a complaint  
32 that if we require parking to meet current demand for a new development, that parking will be excess in  
33 the future. This is recognizing that something can be done with that parking. I'm not tied to the  
34 particular language here. There is something nice—I was actually pretty deliberate when I wrote this.  
35 I'm not a land use attorney, and I don't know all the nuances that could be put in here by staff. I'm  
36 giving staff editorial license to change it, and I'd appreciate seeing what comes back if you want  
37 feedback. Who else wanted to talk?

38

39 **Co-Chair Garber:** Jennifer, did you want to say something?

40

41 **Co-Chair Keller:** Hamilton.

42





# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE DRAFT MINUTES TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT

1 **Hamilton Hitchings:** At the risk of making things more complicated, one thing we could do to address  
2 people's concerns is pull the "may be made available for under-parked developments" out of the policy  
3 and put it in a program underneath it which said the City will encourage property owners to share  
4 parking spots and explore infrastructure and incentives to do so.

5  
6 **Co-Chair Keller:** The thing about that is if it's a program, it's a one-time thing, and this is expected to be  
7 ongoing.

8  
9 **Hamilton Hitchings:** What?

10  
11 **Co-Chair Keller:** The issue is that this is written at the policy level as opposed to a program level. At the  
12 policy level, you're saying that you are encouraging the sharing as a policy statement. A program means  
13 that you actually have to do something about it. What?

14  
15 **Hamilton Hitchings:** Or just add something like "optionally may" to address anyone's concerns that are  
16 worried that this might be a requirement as opposed to it's at the discretion of the property owner.

17  
18 **Co-Chair Keller:** It certainly wasn't intended as a requirement. Giving staff discretion to play around  
19 with the wording here of—I think several people have suggested the language here. Giving staff some  
20 discretion on that, how many people are in favor of the concept that's behind my second high-level  
21 comment in bold? Did I get it right?

22  
23 **Co-Chair Garber:** Eight and a half.

24  
25 **Co-Chair Keller:** Can you hold your hands up again? We have nine. Do you have a comment, Don?

26  
27 **Don McDougall:** (inaudible)

28  
29 **Co-Chair Keller:** I'm not suggesting changing 5.1.1, just talking about the policy. Are you in favor?  
30 We're unanimously in favor of replacing the policy of 5.1 with this one, but not changing the programs  
31 underneath it, which can stay. Yes, Amy.

32  
33 **Amy Sung:** Could I just clarify that I understand it correctly, what you mean by sharing the space? Are  
34 we talking about in Downtown that during the day that is office parking, and at night those could be  
35 open to the public for parking? Is that your idea about sharing? Or during the day that I am driving to  
36 work and somebody could conceivably park in my parking space with my permission. Is that your idea  
37 of sharing?

38  
39 **Co-Chair Keller:** First of all, my sense is that it would have to be made available by the property owner,  
40 that nothing happen without permission of the property owner. It could be made available to other  
41 uses such as public parking or other under-parked developments. That's why my intent is to give staff  
42 discretion to flesh this out appropriately. We have another half hour. We're moving forward. We had



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

1 some other issues, I think, that were brought up. We had a consideration—Hamilton, you have a  
2 question, comment?

3

4 **Hamilton Hitchings:** To jump in on paid parking. Go ahead and when you get to that.

5

6 **Co-Chair Keller:** Why don't we first deal with RPP. I think that will be very quick. Any comments on RPP  
7 first, if I may? I think that will be fairly quick. I believe that Lydia was—no. Hamilton. Lydia, do you  
8 want to say something?

9

10 **Lydia Kou:** With regard to RPP, I think for any TDM or TMA to be successful, it's absolutely necessary to  
11 have RPP. It cannot be—I think it's actually—I don't see the RPP Downtown working as well. However,  
12 College Terrace's RPP is actually working very well. It keeps their neighborhood free of over-usage by  
13 the commercial part. I do believe that there has to be a pretty stringent RPP in place for TDMs and  
14 TMAs to take off.

15

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

17

18 **Annette Glanckopf:** I think the whole process has to be smoothed out. Obviously the Downtown  
19 program is very specialized. I'm not going to address the problems there. It'd be nice to have a model  
20 that the neighborhoods could pick off the shelf. I am for this. One thing that really concerns me is the  
21 lack of enforcement. Somewhere through here, we talk about spillover into neighborhoods, just the  
22 general comment. What can the City do actually other than tow cars away? Again, I'm very, very  
23 concerned about the whole thing and the cost to the City. Again, I think we need to figure out a way to  
24 make this easier for neighborhoods. The Evergreen process has been going on for what, 8 years, 9  
25 years? That's not workable. I think that you have to get the neighborhood associations involved. It  
26 cannot deteriorate into something like the single-story overlay, where you're pitting people against  
27 businesses or neighbors against neighbors.

28

29 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you, Annette. Next is Jennifer.

30

31 **Co-Chair Garber:** Then Adrian, then Don.

32

33 **Jennifer Hetterly:** My problem with the policy—it's really with the program. I think the policy is fine,  
34 5.9, to minimize spillover. I think for the program, it just feels to me a little wishy-washy and puts a lot  
35 of burden on resident groups to do all the legwork. I think that it should be stronger and reflect a  
36 stronger commitment by the City to drive that process of data collection, figuring out what is going on. I  
37 think that the—sorry, I'm trying to read it while I'm talking. Instead of gauging the need for RPP, the City  
38 should work with neighbors to monitor the need and implement a Residential Parking Permit program  
39 as needed in areas outside of Downtown Palo Alto and College Terrace. I think there should be  
40 something in here—I think this is what Lydia was referring to—emphasizing that we do have two models  
41 now and not leaving it to be a default to the Downtown RPP, because I think that carries a lot of failings.

42

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



# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE DRAFT MINUTES TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT

1 **Adrian Fine:** I want to concur with Annette, that I think it would be helpful if there were a couple of  
2 models that different neighborhoods could choose for an RPP. There's different situations for each of  
3 them. I also agree that in terms of comparing it to single-story overlays, there's a bit of a mess that  
4 could happen. At least in College Terrace—I've been there for 20 years. When we first (inaudible) the  
5 RPP, they said people who don't vote won't count, but then it switched, so it pushed it over. Frankly, I  
6 don't think it's been that much of a success. I simply disagree with you, Lydia. We live in a  
7 neighborhood called College Terrace, and there were students parking our neighborhood. It's like you  
8 live in College Terrace, you should accept some of the benefits of living in the City. In terms of  
9 enforcement, I have friends who get ticketed. My cars get ticketed for other things just as the parking  
10 patrol officers come through. It's really, really annoying. I never felt we had much of a parking problem.  
11 I just had to bring that up. Sorry. That's my personal axe to grind.

12

13 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Don.

14

15 **Don McDougall:** I just want to echo something that Jennifer said which probably will surprise Jennifer.  
16 In fact, what you really need to do is make sure we're measuring. I live in Downtown. As far as I'm  
17 concerned, the RPP program means that there's no parking in front of—there's vacancy in front of my  
18 house. It's just not crowded; I can park there any time I want, which is new. What I don't know,  
19 because there's no measurement, is what did that do to the neighboring neighborhood. Does that  
20 mean everybody is just using their skateboards to come further away? Certainly, to say that it didn't  
21 work Downtown is a mistake, because I think it did. The other thing I want to do is echo something else  
22 Jennifer said in her notes. By the way, living on Channing I have no propensity to be interested in  
23 making Channing back into two-way. I'm quite happy with it being one-way and Homer being one-way  
24 the other way. I just don't understand where that came from. That shouldn't be in here.

25

26 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. We'll ask about that in a moment. Amy. Sorry. Elaine.

27

28 **Elaine Uang:** Thank you. I agree with Don. To say that the Downtown RPP hasn't made a difference is  
29 not correct. I think it really has. I've been looking at some of the numbers, and you can see on most of  
30 the streets where the RPP is implemented, it's gone from 100-plus percent down to 80, 85. That was  
31 really the goal of the program. If you break it down even further, we have to accept that in a lot of  
32 these neighborhoods, it's not going to be one-size-fits-all. For Downtown and probably for a place like  
33 Evergreen Park, most of the cars parked on the street are actually residents and residential uses. Part of  
34 the parking problem we have to accept is borne on the shoulders of the residents who live there. It's  
35 not all quote/unquote commercial spillover parking. I want to just reinforce the fact that one size does  
36 not fit all. I don't think a Citywide RPP is the right solution. Downtown is a very special case. It might be  
37 applicable to, like I said, Cal. Ave. and Evergreen Terrace, because we have to also realize that most of  
38 the buildings in our downtowns predate any of the parking requirements that we put in. They never had  
39 any parking to begin with. What happens when those uses get intensified, like all those cute places like  
40 Cream and Sushirrito? I live kind of by HanaHaus and the old Varsity Theater. Those places never had  
41 parking period. No wonder we have spillover parking, because where are they going to park? The  
42 garages may or may not be enough. We just have to recognize that a lot of the impacts are not from  
43 necessarily the newer buildings. We're talking about 2 1/2, 3 million square feet of buildings



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

1 constructed before any of those garages were built. We've only had what, 300,000 square feet of office  
2 space built in the last 30 years? We have to look at the proportions. I do think we need to use the right  
3 tool for the right place. A College Terrace-style RPP might be more appropriate for a place like East  
4 Meadow. There are different parking ecosystems in our City, and we really need to consider that.

5  
6 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Amy.

7  
8 **Amy Sung:** I agree that RPP is not needed Citywide. In my neighborhood, I don't think we have been  
9 impacted by the parking. Downtown definitely is severely impacted by the parking. I also wanted to put  
10 in this idea that our City parking should accommodate more than just residents. We always welcome  
11 the retail spaces. Those people that provide services to the retail shops in Downtown all drive from far  
12 away. These other people who also need to come here by their cars and they need to park. That is  
13 something that we need to find out when we have this RPP program in place. The need doesn't go away  
14 just because we limit who can park and where. I just wanted to throw that in.

15  
16 **Co-Chair Keller:** Dan.

17  
18 **Co-Chair Garber:** I'm agreeing with all these comments. I want to come back to one thing that Jennifer  
19 said, which I think is spot on. I actually think it's the City's responsibility to take control and establish  
20 authority over this stuff. Granted it's expensive. The reality is that it's—the City North, most of that  
21 work is being handled by one guy. We all know him. He's charging us nothing to do this amazing service  
22 for us. The fact is he's doing a lot of work that somebody else should be doing. It also then gets out of  
23 the neighbor versus neighbor and somebody doing one thing and somebody doing the other thing, and  
24 gets us out of that sort of acrimonious condition that Palo Alto has a tendency to really enjoy. I would  
25 very strongly say this is not about coordinating with neighborhoods. It is about the City to step in,  
26 create criteria, create the models, do the studies, etc., and then coordinate that work with the needs of  
27 each one of the individual neighborhoods and those neighborhood groups to establish what those actual  
28 programs are going forward. That would be my suggestion.

29  
30 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. I actually have wording similar to what Jennifer described in my page 3.  
31 Where I said "gauge the need," that's kind of wishy-washy and doesn't have the definitiveness that I've  
32 expected from the trend of the subcommittee. There's actually wording on page 3 where you'd delete  
33 "gauge the need" and say "implement as needed." That's the first thing. The second thing is I think that  
34 there are a number of flaws, for example, in the Downtown, how that's been implemented. For  
35 example, the areas that have been annexed to the Downtown parking district, the RPP, should have had  
36 College Terrace-style requirements from the start. They never had a parking problem to begin with until  
37 it was pushed out from the neighborhood. The idea is that they are the consequence of the RPP district;  
38 therefore, there shouldn't be commercial cars parked in there. There is even around Downtown, around  
39 the outer ring, as you expand that out, that should be College Terrace-style, not permit parking for  
40 commercial parking. I think that the idea is to reduce the amount of full price commercial parking. I'm  
41 sympathetic with Amy's comment that we need to provide parking for the low-income, service and retail  
42 workers. That's the only commercial parking that we strive towards. Eventually we should eliminate all  
43 market-priced parking and have—in an RPP, the only commercial should be (a) parking for the low-



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

1 income, service workers and retail workers, and (b) commercial parking for the commercial businesses  
2 that happen to be located in that district. For example, there are some commercial properties in  
3 Downtown North and Downtown South. If they get parking, if they need commercial parking, it makes  
4 sense to put that commercial parking in the district because that's where they're located. They're not  
5 eligible for parking permits in the garages. I think that's an important distinction. I also think that part  
6 of the problem with Downtown is that we now have these zones. I think the zones are great in order to  
7 distribute the load of commercial parking. The 2-hour parking should be district wide. You should not  
8 be able to move from zone to zone to zone for 2 hours here and 2 hours there and 2 hours there. Two  
9 hours daily, once a day. That's it. We have this color stuff Downtown where people play musical chairs  
10 with their cars. We don't need that in the RPP, especially with lots of zones there. Not a good thing.  
11 You park there for 2 hours as a visitor; you're a visitor. If you're a retail parker, typically come there for  
12 lunch or dinner or retail, you're going to be there for 2 hours. You're not going to be there longer. If  
13 you're going to be there longer, then park in a garage, not move your car every 2 hours. I think that's  
14 another thing that needs to happen. I think there is consensus around at least modifying "gauge the  
15 need." Actually, "implement" is needed. I think there's consensus around that, because the other  
16 wording is surprisingly wishy-washy. I think the other stuff we talked about is really implementation and  
17 doesn't really belong in the policy. It might be something that could go in the narrative. I don't think it  
18 has to go in a policy. Does anybody disagree with that notion?

19

20 **Jennifer Hetterly:** I would like to see the language strengthened about the role of the City as opposed  
21 to the role of the residents.

22

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

24

25 **Annette Glanckopf:** I'm not 100 percent. Maybe we can talk about this a little bit, that it should be a  
26 City role. I'd like to go back to models. I think there could maybe be a third model. It's great for the City  
27 to carry the whole load, but in many cases the City—I can think of one or two cases; maybe I shouldn't  
28 really illustrate those—tries to make a demand on an area or a neighborhood that the neighborhood has  
29 no desire for. Maybe I'll give you an example. Bathrooms at Eleanor Pardee Park was an example. I like  
30 the idea that Jennifer said of the City carrying the whole load and making sure it's fair and equitable to  
31 everyone surrounding it. I really do think that neighborhoods or residents many times bring up the  
32 need. I think there needs to be a process where people can raise their hand and say, "How about us?  
33 How about this quadrant?" rather than the City. Then, the City carries on and does everything that we  
34 said. I don't think the City should impose "we've done this one, that one; who can we do next." That  
35 would be my distinction in what Jennifer said. I don't mean to disagree with you, but again I've just seen  
36 too many times where the City comes out with a policy and people say, "We didn't ask for it." Maybe  
37 the two-way streets, Homer and Channing, is an example of that. I don't know.

38

39 **Jennifer Hetterly:** I agree with you. That's not what I was going for at all. I want to keep the  
40 neighborhoods in the process, but I want the City to be the lead. The neighborhood can say, "We have a  
41 problem here." Then, the City takes responsibility to document the problem and figure out the solution.

42

43 **Co-Chair Keller:** Any other comments? Lydia.



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

1 **Lydia Kou:** When I said that the Downtown RPP program was not working, I apologize; I want to  
2 rephrase that. It's working so well that it's pushing all the problems to a neighboring neighborhood.  
3 While I agree with what you said in terms of the outlying areas should have the College Terrace RPP. In  
4 terms of use in Downtown, what Elaine said is right. There are buildings that were built prior to these  
5 parking issues. However, uses in Downtown have changed also from retail. A lot of it has become office  
6 space which has increased population and growth there. I actually feel that in terms of places like  
7 Evergreen and Mayfield, etc., California Avenue today is mostly low density and hasn't grown to the  
8 potential that the City is planning for it. Therefore, neighborhoods like Evergreen and Mayfield should  
9 not have to suffer the consequences of what's going to happen on California Avenue. That's why I  
10 really, truly believe neighborhoods should have stringent RPP programs such as College Terrace.  
11 Thanks.

12  
13 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. I'll just add one thing which I think there was a lot of consensus on, but it's  
14 not explicit. That is the notion that new projects, since they're supposed to be self-parked, should not  
15 be eligible for RPP permits. That is something that's not prohibited by current regulation and should be.  
16 For example, 101 Lytton, that project is supposedly fully parked. Nobody in that project should be able  
17 to park in the surrounding neighborhood and get an RPP permit. I think that there's a comment about  
18 Homer/Channing. Maybe we should deal with that. Could we just have any sense if anybody—what?

19  
20 **Female:** (inaudible)

21  
22 **Co-Chair Keller:** I know, but I want to do that. I just want to deal with his Homer/Channing, because  
23 that's very quick. Let's have a show of hands. How many people think that keeping one-way on  
24 Homer/Channing is reasonable?

25  
26 **Male:** What was the question?

27  
28 **Co-Chair Keller:** How many people think that keeping one-way on Homer/Channing is reasonable and  
29 that we shouldn't make that two-way? It seems like that's a pretty—how many people think it should  
30 be made two-way?

31  
32 **Co-Chair Garber:** I would just say I don't know why it's one way or the other. What's the criteria? I  
33 don't understand.

34  
35 **Co-Chair Keller:** It is now, and I don't see that there's a groundswell of support for changing it. I think  
36 the consensus is to eliminate that as a program.

37  
38 **Co-Chair Garber:** I guess what I would want to ask is why was it suggested and what's the benefit. I  
39 don't understand.

40  
41 **Elena Lee:** Chair? If I may.

42  
43 **Co-Chair Keller:** Yes.



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

1 **Elena Lee:** That actual question was brought up during a subcommittee meeting. There may be other  
2 CAC members that want to ask that question.

3  
4 **Elaine Costello:** It was given as an example by a member of the subcommittee who's not here tonight.  
5 It's been taken out, and they asked that it specifically be put back in again. It's just an example. It had  
6 actually been deleted and then was re-added as just an example.

7  
8 **Co-Chair Keller:** Who here thinks it should be kept? Who here thinks that the program—I think it's a  
9 program, right—to change Homer/Channing to two-way should be kept?

10  
11 **Annette Glanckopf:** Arthur, to me, you've got to have a reason for doing that. Potentially one reason is  
12 that bicycle underpass thing really goes the wrong way on Homer. That's the dumbest thing in the City.  
13 Maybe that's the reason. I would like to see a very specific, staff-driven or maybe a CAC member reason  
14 for making that happen. We have so many other issues in our City, that to me—I'm very neutral on the  
15 idea. I just think that it's going to be very expensive to fix this. What problem are we trying to solve  
16 when we have so many other priorities?

17  
18 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Anything—Hamilton, quickly.

19  
20 **Hamilton Hitchings:** I just want to say I actually go through that intersection. Every time I come to  
21 Downtown, I go through the Channing and, I think, Guinda intersection. I am not in favor of changing it.  
22 I would probably be—if there was some benefit, I'd probably be the biggest benefit. It's not a big deal.  
23 You just take a right on Guinda and a left on Forest or Hamilton. If you want to go the other way, you  
24 take a left on Guinda and go down that way. I could imagine that if you made it two-way, it might slow  
25 down the congestion on Middlefield. That stretch of Channing is very narrow, by the way. If it's going  
26 both ways, it's going to get a little bit tricky. I just don't see the benefit of changing it.

27  
28 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Good input.

29  
30 **Elaine Costello:** Can I take it out?

31  
32 **Co-Chair Keller:** Let's deal with parking pricing. Adrian, do you want to kick us off?

33  
34 **Adrian Fine:** Most parking in the City, particularly our commercial corridors, currently is free with time  
35 limits. Should we pay for it? Parking is a huge give-away, and it encourages some really bad behavior in  
36 terms of land use and transportation decisions, greenhouse gases, all that kind of stuff. There's no  
37 explicit policy in here that talks about demand management. One of the best ways to manage demand  
38 is by pricing it.

39  
40 **Co-Chair Keller:** Any other comments? We have Hamilton.

41  
42 **Hamilton Hitchings:** First of all, I think that's an excellent comment by Adrian. I also want to give a  
43 shout-out to Elaine, who has helped educate me on paid parking. I was completely against it; now, I'm



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

1 very much for paid parking for full-day parking. My concern around the proposals for 2 and 3-hour paid  
2 parking are its impacts on retail. Palo Alto did have paid parking in Downtown, and they ripped it out  
3 because everybody started going to Stanford Shopping Center. It was devastating on the local retail  
4 back in, I think, the '70s. We've already failed once with short-term paid parking in Downtown. If the  
5 paid parking Downtown did substantively benefit the retail businesses Downtown, I would be for that.  
6 I'm very worried that it may significantly hurt them and shift people's shopping patterns. I think we  
7 want to be very careful about short-term paid parking. I'm strongly for full-day paid parking. I also think  
8 these zones—it's so obvious that they're a total failure by the City for these different color zones. I'm  
9 not clear why that problem hasn't already been fixed. I really hope it will be, because it should just be 2  
10 or 3 hours in one spot for the day, and then you're d  
11 one.

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

13  
14 **Annette Glanckopf:** I'm not totally against the idea of permit parking. I think it's sort of interesting.  
15 Paid parking, short-term parking, it doesn't have to work Citywide. For example, I think the point that  
16 Hamilton made about retail is really, really critical. Maybe it makes a lot of sense Downtown because so  
17 much of the retail business has sort of disappeared and gone to office. I'd really hate to see parking in  
18 Midtown, for example, or Charleston or maybe even Edgewood. There are places that you would have  
19 to consider it. The other thing that really worries me is—we talked about the retail—the cost of parking.  
20 If you look at the train station, it's \$5. If you look at City Hall parking for a day, it's \$18. What uses, what  
21 social uses, what community-building uses are we trying to really incentivize? If I were going Downtown  
22 in a car to a meeting of the CAC, more than 2 hours, it's not clear I'd want to pay \$18 every time to park  
23 in the City garage. I think that if we did permit parking—that's just me talking. Maybe other people feel  
24 differently. If we really do want to build community and we really—there are exceptions to this. I think  
25 the cost exactly needs to also be considered as well as location.

26  
27 **Co-Chair Keller:** Whitney.

28  
29 **Whitney McNair:** I agree that the location needs to be considered. It shouldn't just be a blanket. It may  
30 be appropriate in some locations. In some locations, it might not be. It is one of those tools, a TDM,  
31 Transportation Demand Management, tool to pay for parking. In places like the Research Park, it might  
32 not be appropriate. What I don't want to see is something like what's in the EIR right now, which talks  
33 about a requirement to pay for parking for any business that has over 50 employees. That becomes  
34 really difficult to implement when you're in a building that has some businesses in it, a multiple-tenant  
35 building where some tenants have less than 50 and some have more than 50. The implementation  
36 piece of some of these requirements is very difficult if not done right. That's when you get spillover  
37 parking if you require one business to pay for parking and next door you don't have to. That's when you  
38 get spillover onto the streets. It's something to consider. It should be a TDM measure that maybe is put  
39 into the list of things that's considered or in appropriate places like Downtown. The City should be  
40 looking at opportunities to pay for parking, but not to put it as a blanket requirement across the City.

41  
42 **Co-Chair Keller:** Elaine, and then Amy.





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

1 **Elaine Uang:** One specific suggestion would be in Policy—I think it's 5.2 to make a mention specifically  
2 of parking pricing as a tool in addition to TDM measures. It is, to back Adrian's point up, important to  
3 actually call that out as a policy that we want to pursue at a Comprehensive Plan level. Another little  
4 tidbit for you, Hamilton. Parking pricing was invented in 1935 by an Oklahoma City businessman who  
5 couldn't figure out how to open spaces for his customers in front of his store. He put in a meter, and  
6 people could—this was 1935. There was a traffic problem then too. I think the idea of—I don't think  
7 parking pricing is a one-size-fits-all thing as well. The good news is so many other cities have been  
8 experimenting with so many different parking pricing schemes, and there now are better technologies.  
9 One thing we should also look at is dynamic pricing. There are times when really the parking crunch is  
10 more significant than others in the Downtown area, because there are now so many restaurants.  
11 Evenings and lunches, especially on Cal. Ave., lunch with the SRP set, that's a really big parking crunch  
12 there. I think setting the right price at the right times is what's going to really free up those parking  
13 resources and get the right distribution. We don't want to discount that. The biggest benefit of all that  
14 we haven't talked about is really taking the funds from parking pricing, whatever we do get, and pouring  
15 that back into TDM measures and really reinvesting in the sustainable transportation measures. Maybe  
16 it funds shuttles or maybe it funds something else. We really need to think about that as a source of  
17 revenue for our City to do some of the other programs that we have lined up.

18  
19 **Co-Chair Keller:** Amy.

20  
21 **Amy Sung:** Thank you. Actually I was just going to ask if we are charging for parking, where does the  
22 money go to and what is the purpose of collecting the funds. I think that when we collect the funds, it  
23 has to have a specific purpose and accountable for that kind of collection. The other one is paid parking.  
24 Are we charging the business or are we charging the retailer as a visitor, an individual? I think that this  
25 is, like Elaine says and Whitney says, not a one-size-fits all. It really depends on which area we are  
26 looking at and also who are we taxing, who are we asking to pay.

27  
28 **Co-Chair Keller:** Dan.

29  
30 **Co-Chair Garber:** I'm really supportive of a lot of these comments. I'm a proponent of not necessarily  
31 paid parking, but having the technology in place at the parking spaces, so that you can manage that  
32 price. I believe it is dynamic, and it gives a tremendous amount of flexibility to the City and a way to  
33 nuance parking demand in a way that it simply doesn't have right now. If we were all going—if we had  
34 that technology in place, granted this is very technology-based here or dependent I should say. Rather  
35 than having to pay \$18 to come to this meeting—we would probably pay \$15 maybe max to come to—  
36 we could actually go to our meter—I am joking, just for the record. We could go to the meter and you  
37 put in your code, and we are paying nothing to be here. The City could do that. Those sorts of benefits  
38 occur as well as trying to figure out—the City could recognize that there's nobody parking on a particular  
39 day or during certain hours. You can implement that across the entire system. No, I don't think it's  
40 Citywide. Yes, I think it is at places where you have specific densities. No, I don't think it makes any  
41 sense in the Stanford Research Park, etc.

42  
43 **Co-Chair Keller:** Jennifer, I think you haven't spoken yet.



# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE DRAFT MINUTES TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT

1 **Jennifer Hetterly:** I also like the idea of dynamic pricing. That's the only way that makes sense and  
2 using technology so you don't need a meter at every single spot. When I think of paid parking, I'm not  
3 thinking about making employers charge for their employees to use onsite parking spots. In fact, I don't  
4 want them to charge for the use of those spots, because I want those employees in those spots. I'm  
5 talking about the public parking on the street and in public lots.  
6

7 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. I'll weigh in, and then we'll go to the next round. The first thing is that we  
8 need to understand what problem we're solving. The first problem we have to solve is get rid of those  
9 color zones. They just cause musical chairs. Essentially, you park once; if you want to park longer, you  
10 park in a parking garage. There should be some option between parking all day and parking for 3 hours.  
11 Maybe that's a way of dealing with the consideration. If you want to park for 4 hours, do you have to  
12 pay for an \$18 permit or are you encouraged to move your car? That's kind of crazy. The color zones  
13 just are a failure and actually increase congestion. I think if you got rid of the color zones and you got rid  
14 of the musical chair parkers, you'd actually have more parking available Downtown for people who are  
15 visitors to restaurants and shopping and the like. The next thing is what is worthwhile is exploring  
16 pricing for parking, in particular pricing for public parking. I don't think it's a policy yet. I think it's a  
17 program that's a study. It's a study of the potential for charging for parking in certain areas and take  
18 into consideration the impact of that program on retail. One of the things that should be considered  
19 and maybe also should be considered in the current environment is the idea that you can buy—if you do  
20 pricing, retailers may say you buy something, we will give you your parking back, we'll give you a token  
21 that you can use the next time or we'll pay for your all-day permit if you're at a meeting, for example, all  
22 day. Things like that that add flexibility, I think, are worthwhile considering. I don't think that we're  
23 ready for a policy level; I think we're ready for a program that talks about studying this. We'll go to  
24 Whitney who is next, and then Hamilton.  
25

26 **Whitney McNair:** I would just say I completely agree with what you said as well as the dynamic pricing.  
27 That is the best opportunity to not only look at the revenues, look at the parking but the distribution of  
28 parking as you can move people to park in places that they don't typically park now, like in the upper  
29 floors of a garage. Where you have to walk a little farther, maybe you pay a little less. The only reason  
30 why I brought up the employee parking is that isn't showing up here in the Comp Plan, but it is showing  
31 up in the environmental analysis that's being considered. If the Council chooses to go in a direction  
32 where they want to pay for parking, I wrote a comment letter that said that should just be one of the  
33 tools. If the City is really considering that, I think there's concerns, because I think it would push it out  
34 into the neighborhoods. I think if it does come back to us to look at in some way, we should be looking  
35 at the flip of it. Instead of paying for parking, maybe it's a cash-out. For those people who take  
36 transportation, you give them an incentive rather than a penalty to pay for parking. That's how that is a  
37 better tool, the same sort of results applied in a different situation. If you just have a straight mandate  
38 to pay for parking, you don't have that flexibility to look at it a different way.  
39

40 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you, Whitney. I also think that unbundling parking may have the same kind of  
41 consequence. Hamilton, why don't you take us out.  
42



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

1 **Hamilton Hitchings:** Sure. I wanted to agree with Whitney. I think it would be a little draconian to  
2 require companies to pay for their employees to park on their own property. I think a cash-out is a  
3 much better policy. I want to throw my support behind that. I also think we need to get to language on  
4 this parking that we can hopefully do a straw poll on. I support Arthur's two proposals. One, a program  
5 to remove the color zones. The second is—I think we're already doing a parking study, but we should  
6 have it in there to study dynamic pricing where needed for public parking. Since I'm not going to get  
7 another chance—I've been cut off before at these meetings—I'm going to bring up a different issue. We  
8 don't have to vote on it this time, but a lot of people are putting a lot of time into this committee.  
9 There's at least one individual who just isn't showing up for meetings. We've had multiple individuals  
10 who couldn't make the commitment, and they've voluntarily dropped out. I think at some point, if your  
11 absentee rate is above 50 or 60 percent, unless you have a very, very good excuse, you should either  
12 self-recuse yourself or be recused from the committee. It just doesn't make sense if you're not making  
13 60 or 70 percent of the meetings to still be an official member of the committee. I'd like to propose at  
14 the next meeting that we have a vote if somebody doesn't meet some certain threshold specifically.  
15 There's one specific individual I'm thinking of, just because it just doesn't make sense to have them on  
16 the committee in that case. There's nothing personal or anything like that. They're just not showing up.  
17 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. How many people are in favor of eliminating the color zones Downtown?  
18 I'm just trying to get some idea, because that might be a program, to study getting rid of the ...

19  
20 **Male:** (inaudible)

21  
22 **Co-Chair Keller:** That might be a program to study getting rid of the color zones, which is not there now.

23  
24 **Female:** (inaudible)

25  
26 **Co-Chair Keller:** I'm going to do next. I'm dealing with the time. How many people are in favor of  
27 eliminating the color zones—studying getting rid of the color zones Downtown? Study. Study getting  
28 rid of the color zones Downtown.

29  
30 **Male:** (inaudible)

31  
32 **Co-Chair Keller:** Studying the potential for getting rid of the color zones Downtown.

33  
34 **Male:** (inaudible)

35  
36 **Co-Chair Keller:** Evaluating the effect. Staff will figure it out. Staff will figure out the language. How  
37 many people want to study the color zones and whether they're effective? There's eight out of ten. The  
38 next question is how many people want to have a program to study parking pricing? You had language  
39 there, Hamilton. Could you give your language?

40  
41 **Hamilton Hitchings:** Yeah. From what I heard, dynamic, we want to include the word dynamic, and we  
42 want to include for public parking. Short term. I didn't mean short term; I just meant in general. I just  
43 didn't have short or long term, so it wouldn't be exclusive.



# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE DRAFT MINUTES TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT

- 1 **Co-Chair Keller:** You want to suggest that we study parking pricing including dynamic pricing where it's  
2 appropriate for public parking and consider parking technologies and potential impacts on retail and  
3 service businesses and how we can ameliorate them.  
4
- 5 **Hamilton Hitchings:** It should include both short and full-day parking.  
6
- 7 **Co-Chair Keller:** Part day and full day. Adrian.  
8
- 9 **Adrian Fine:** I'd also say we could look at the potential benefits to other programs such as TDM or  
10 things like that.  
11
- 12 **Male:** (inaudible)  
13
- 14 **Co-Chair Keller:** I don't see this as a policy. I see it as a program to study. How do you make a policy to  
15 study something?  
16
- 17 **Male:** (inaudible)  
18
- 19 **Adrian Fine:** Can I speak to this quickly? I think the reason is it's such a wide range of things, looking at  
20 technology and dynamic and short term and long term and how it might backfill TDM. At that level, it  
21 kind of is a policy more than a single program.  
22
- 23 **Co-Chair Garber:** The policy might be to study establishing dynamic parking demand and supply.  
24
- 25 **Co-Chair Keller:** I think a study is a program. A policy is to implement. If the policy is to do TDM ...  
26
- 27 **Male:** (crosstalk) to implement.  
28
- 29 **Co-Chair Keller:** Let staff figure it out. How many people are in favor of sort of the ...  
30
- 31 **Co-Chair Garber:** Of that.  
32
- 33 **Co-Chair Keller:** ... of that thing? Staff will try to figure out what the appropriate mix of policy and  
34 program is there. We started a little bit late. Do you have anything, Lydia?  
35
- 36 **Lydia Kou:** (inaudible)  
37
- 38 **Co-Chair Keller:** You're not on mike.  
39
- 40 **Lydia Kou:** I just wanted to say that it's a most enjoyable discussion today. Thank you.  
41
- 42 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Amy.



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

1 **Amy Sung:** Could I just add one thing? We talked about technology, and there was one thing I wanted  
2 to bring up during our meeting time. It's about use of the technology. There is one place it says there  
3 will be a push button at wheelchair level. I thought when we drive a car, we do not ask the driver to  
4 come out of the car to push, so that you can pass the traffic light. For the pedestrians and the people  
5 that are disabled, there's always that every time you cross somewhere you have to come out of your  
6 bike, come out of something and then you push a button. The technology should be able to have a  
7 sensor or whatever to sense that there is traffic coming and then communicate with the traffic light such  
8 that you do not require the driver or the operator or the pedestrian to actually push a button. This is  
9 where technology comes.

10  
11 **Co-Chair Keller:** I think that's very interesting. I hope we don't loiter on the street corner. With that,  
12 staff.

13  
14 **Elaine Costello:** I can't get—I got that one to work. I would suggest at this point that with the kinds of  
15 changes that have been made, I don't think we need to go back to the subcommittee. I think we could  
16 go—with the indulgence of the subcommittee member who is here, I think we could make these  
17 changes and bring it back to the CAC.

18  
19 **Co-Chair Keller:** Yes, I think that makes sense.

20  
21 **Elaine Costello:** How that will affect the rest of the schedule, we just have to regroup and think about  
22 that. If you want to see it again, I think we could make these changes, because they're not so extensive.

23  
24 **Co-Chair Keller:** I would like to see it again, particularly since it also gives us an opportunity to give a  
25 little feedback on it and comments that could go to the Council. Thank you.

26  
27 **Elaine Costello:** That will be our plan. Thank you very much.

28  
29 Feedback for Continuous Improvement:  
30 None.

31  
32 Future Meetings:  
33 Next meeting: July 19, 2016 – Mitchell Park Community Center  
34 (Topic: Draft Land Use & Community Design Element)

35 None.

36  
37 Adjournment: **8:37 PM**

38 **Co-Chair Keller:** In that case, the meeting is adjourned at 8:37. Thank you very much.