



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE  
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MINUTES**

**TUESDAY, OCTOBER 20, 2015**

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

1 **Call to Order:**

2 **Co-Chair Keller:** it's 5:30, so we'll call the Tuesday, October 20th meeting of the  
3 Comprehensive Plan Update Citizens Advisory Committee to order. Could the secretary please  
4 call roll?

5  
6 Present: Filppu, Garber, Glanckopf, Hetterly, Hitchings, Jacobs, Keller, Kleinhaus, Kou,  
7 Levy, McDougall, Moran, Nadim, Peschcke-Koedt, Sung, Summa, Uang, Uhrbrock,  
8 Wenzlau, Fine, Emberling

9 Absent: Packer, Van Riesen, Titus, McNair

10  
11 **Robin Ellner:** We've got five absent.

12  
13 **Oral Communication:**

14 **Co-Chair Keller:** We have four cards. Are all these related to transportation or is somebody at  
15 Oral Communications? Who wanted to speak to Oral Communications?

16  
17 **Mary Anne Michael:** Mary Anne.

18  
19 **Co-Chair Keller:** Mary Anne Michel, okay, great. This is not related to transportation?

20  
21 **Ms. Michel:** It is related to transportation.

22  
23 **Co-Chair Keller:** Should we do that now? Why don't we ...

24  
25 **Co-Chair Garber:** We can , sure.

26  
27 **Co-Chair Keller:** We'll do Oral Communications for this and for the Transportation Element  
28 altogether. The first speaker is Mary Anne Michel, and you will have three minutes. Please  
29 come to the microphone. The next speaker is Phyllis Cassel.

30  
31 **Mary Anne Michel:** I'm Mary Anne Michel. I live in Palo Alto since 1959. Most of that time I  
32 depended on a car to get around. However, I lived on VTA 35 bus line and appreciated and  
33 used it many times. I had children that commuted to Foothill-De Anza by bus and bicycle. That  
34 was 30 years ago. Fast approaching my days as a pedestrian who depends on transit, I'm here



## COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE *MINUTES*

1 to tell you what would help me and others in my condition. Longer hours of the City shuttle. If  
2 it went later, I could even go to the City Council meeting on the shuttle. There are many other  
3 things that can be done around the City if the shuttle runs 'til 9:30 or 10:00. If the shuttle ran  
4 on weekends, many more activities would be available to those who do not have cars. Those  
5 who have cars might decide not to drive. Frequency, at least every 15 minutes. I do find every  
6 30 minutes on the shuttle a great improvement. Events that start at exact times, if you have to  
7 wait a half hour or an hour to catch the bus that was late or didn't get there, you've missed  
8 your meeting. You can't use it. Shuttles must be timed to meet trains and VTA buses. To get to  
9 the train station and find that the train is pulling out as you're driving up is a real  
10 disappointment. Bus stops, anybody seen one for the shuttle? How many of you have ever  
11 seen a shuttle bus stop? Well. If you rode a shuttle one day, you'd really learn about the  
12 shuttle. It's used by a lot of people who can't afford a car and people in my age group. Let's  
13 see. The benches at the stop have been well received, and I hope there'll be more. Locations  
14 of stops must be as convenient as possible to action. I have a suggestion here for the shuttle  
15 that stops at the Palo Alto Transit Center, and I think that you're looking too far into the future,  
16 so I'm going to take it to the shuttle department now. Transit is a hard sale for people with  
17 money, but there are many coming and going in Palo Alto without money. We need to keep  
18 the shuttle running and encourage, I hope, people to use the VTA and the train, but that's not  
19 in your group I guess. Anyhow, if we don't use more public transportation and the cars increase  
20 like they have in the 50 years I've been here, we're going to be stuck in gridlock. Let's hear it for  
21 transit. Thank you very much. Good luck to all of you.

22 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. The microphone is used for recording; the microphone is not  
23 amplified in this room. Phyllis Cassel is next, to be followed by Mary Holzer.

24 **Phyllis Cassel:** Yeah, and I might point out that accessibility requirements require that people  
25 can hear. This is a problem, I think, for a lot of people who can't speak up because their voices  
26 just don't do that and can't hear. I'm Phyllis Cassel; I live on Wellsbury Way in Midtown area.  
27 I'm speaking this morning for Ellen Forbes, who is president of the League of Women Voters of  
28 Palo Alto. The League of Women Voters of Palo Alto supports transportation planning  
29 measures included in the future planning Comprehensive Plan that promote efficient flow of  
30 traffic, minimize the use of the private automobile and encourage the use of alternative  
31 transportation modes. The League believes that the building of an effective transportation  
32 system recognizes that transportation solutions are interconnected and that no one, two or  
33 three solutions will resolve all the transportation issues. Each potential solution builds a  
34 platform for the next step and an integrated, efficient transportation system. The League of  
35 Women Voters supports measures that will reduce dependence on the automobile and  
36 encourages development of multimodal systems and use of public transportation, including  
37 subsidies where justified. Look up and lose your place. We support systems that are designed  
38 to reduce vehicle miles traveled and single occupancy vehicle use and that are efficient,  
39 convenient, cost effective, equitable, safe and accessible to people with disabilities.  
40 Additionally, Bay Area transit systems should be linked into a convenient and affordable



# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

1 regional transit network with attention to reasonable fares, reduction of travel times, extensive  
2 hours of service and good feeder service. Easily comprehended materials describing routes,  
3 schedules and transit hubs should be available in multimedia format and commonly used  
4 languages. A fair payment system that can be used on all systems, such as the Clipper card,  
5 should be easy to require, to get a hold of it. Good service is to be encouraged by monitoring  
6 the relative efficiency of various systems, maintaining transit options to mitigate interruptions  
7 in service and serving needs of people with special limitations. Transportation funding systems  
8 should be reliably consistent with transportation needs and long-term planning. The League of  
9 Women Voters of Palo Alto supports the transportation management agency, the TDM  
10 program, multimodal transportation options included in the Complete Streets concept,  
11 adequate funding to keep costs to users reasonable, improving options for special needs users  
12 such as youth, seniors and the disabled including expansion of services, expansion of hours on  
13 public transit throughout the City seven days a week. We support the Safe Routes to School  
14 and regional cooperation between cities and different transit agencies including cross-county  
15 regional services for buses and seamless service that crosses county lines. We support  
16 development along major transportation routes including residential units, and transportation  
17 services that are efficient, frequent and seamless enough to attract riders. We support taxes  
18 that further these goals and policies, a preference for alternative modes of transit over  
19 additional parking. We support efficient use of parking in retail employment and residential  
20 neighborhoods. Thank you.

21

22 **Co-Chair Keller:** The next speaker is Mary Holzer, to be followed by John Kelley who I have  
23 currently as our last speaker. Is Mary Holzer here? If you could please line up by the  
24 microphone. I guess Mary Holzer is not here. The next speaker is John Kelley. Are you here?

25

26 **John Kelley:** Here.

27

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

29

30 **John Kelley:** I get three minutes? Great. First of all, I'd like to thank you all for the—excuse  
31 me. I'd like to thank you all for what you're doing. I know this takes a tremendous amount of  
32 time. For most of you, this is probably a thankless task. I think this is really essential for the  
33 community, that we all try to talk with one another and understand what our different values  
34 are. I'm here as an individual. I'm not representing any institution; although, I really liked what  
35 the League of Women Voters had to say. I would like to associate myself with everything that  
36 was just told you. I want to make my values really clear. I don't think I'm the only one in this  
37 community who has these values, maybe. I will admit I am probably a very distinct minority,  
38 but I want you to hear what this viewpoint is. That is, I want to ask each and every one of you  
39 who serves on this committee to look deeply into your own personal whatever you want to call  
40 it; I won't be religious here. Look into yourself and just ask yourself are you willing to be



## COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

1 courageous as a public leader. Are you willing to spend some of your individual political capital  
2 and do something which is really uncomfortable for the community, but will be good for all of  
3 us and may indeed be good for the planet in the long term? What I primarily want to ask you to  
4 do is when you're thinking about transportation—that's what we're talking about today, but  
5 probably even more importantly about housing. Are you thinking about the how goals and  
6 decisions you're making with this forum are aligning themselves with the City's broader goals  
7 having to do with sustainability and climate change? Since I've got a minute 20 seconds left, I'm  
8 going to be very brief. That's the overall thing, and I would ask you to consider that. The City's  
9 got a Climate Action Plan. The City Council has adopted a price on carbon. The first and most  
10 important thing I can ask you to do specifically today is try to get this process in sync with what  
11 the City's doing to respond to climate change. That is the issue; that is the scientific problem  
12 that is a cultural, a political problem by which our generation will be judged by future  
13 generations. Secondly, I would ask you to think about doing something that does not require  
14 spending very much money at all, but does require spending a lot of political capital. Instead of  
15 thinking that apps or electric cars or something else is going to make the problem of  
16 transportation go away, think about what you can do with spray paint and taxes and  
17 regulations and changes in the way that we use roads. Gil Friend can tell you what an  
18 enormously large percentage of the sustainability and climate change gap is filled by  
19 transportation. I think it's around 64 percent in Palo Alto. 61 percent, okay, I was close. We  
20 can change that by doing things that encourage transit. I want to also speak about bicycles,  
21 particularly grade separation. We can also do things having to do with parking. We can get  
22 cars off the road and we can free up parking spaces if we do something innovative like put in a  
23 fee-bate system. There's no reason why we can't have a \$1 a day charge or something if you're  
24 parking your car in Palo Alto and a \$1 a day rebate if you're not, if you're riding your bike.  
25 That's something that's easy. We can also do grade separation; that doesn't cost a lot of  
26 money. That can basically be done with spray paint. Lastly I would ask you to seriously  
27 consider supporting a municipal carbon tax, one that is revenue neutral for the City. If we want  
28 to really show leadership for the world that scales for every country in the world, that's the best  
29 way to do it. Thank you.

30 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Our last speaker is Mila Zelkha, a new card. You'll have three  
31 minutes. I think that's it, unless Mary Holzer spoke. This is our opportunity to speak, so if you  
32 have any comments, please fill out a card. Thank you. Mila.

33 **Mila Zelkha:** Hi, everyone. I just wanted to share that I'm really excited about the emerging  
34 transit management association. I was really pleased to read the article in last Thursday's *Palo*  
35 *Alto Weekly*. I've been going to some of those meetings and observing the discussions there. I  
36 think that the transit management association is a good tool that we can manage trip caps and  
37 to help us shift our behavior around town. I think stable funding for the TMA is important. I  
38 encourage you in your conversation around transportation to think about TMAs in the future  
39 for California Avenue or other areas like Stanford Research Park or even San Antonio. I think  
40 the TMAs are a venue where we can try a lot of different things. Hopefully many successes will



# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

1 come out of them, but that it's also a safe group that can experiment and possibly have failure  
2 so we know what doesn't work. I think it's really promising to see many public and private  
3 stakeholders coming together to see what might be possible. I'm particularly interested in how  
4 it can help us with congestion relief, increase equity through access and help us meet our S/CAP  
5 goals. Good luck tonight. Thank you.  
6

7 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Are there any other members of the public who wish to speak?  
8 Thank you.  
9

## 10 **Staff Comments:**

- 11 1. **Update on Oct 5<sup>th</sup> Council Meeting**
- 12 2. **CAC Member Discussions at Meeting**

13 **Co-Chair Keller:** The next item is Staff Comments.  
14

15 **Jeremy Dennis:** Good evening. I'm Jeremy Dennis, the Advance Planning Manager for the City.  
16 As always, I'm joined by my boss, Hillary Gitelman.  
17

18 **Phyllis Cassel:** Can't hear.  
19

20 **Jeremy Dennis:** Speak up more, sorry. My name's Jeremy Dennis. I'm the Advance Planning  
21 Manager for the City, and I'm joined tonight by my boss, Hillary Gitelman, to my right. The staff  
22 who's supporting this effort; Andrew Hill with PlaceWorks, Elena Lee who's taking over for  
23 Consuelo, so this is her first meeting in that role, and Robin Ellner. I had a few very brief  
24 comments. First of all, I wanted to give an update on the October 5th meeting. If you'll give me  
25 the liberty, I also want to expand on the October 13th meeting that occurred as well. On  
26 October 5th, we asked the Council to take a look at two elements' goals and vision setting. It  
27 was the Community Services Element and also land use. They did not get to land use that  
28 evening; we moved that to November 2nd. I encourage you to come out if you'd like to see  
29 that in action. The Council did create a goal structure based on the existing Comp Plan, but also  
30 some of the work the PTC did a couple of years ago. It was essentially a hybrid. I do have  
31 copies of those, and I'll distribute those if you'd like to see what that work was. On  
32 October 13th, the Council had an opportunity to opine on high speed rail issues as well as the  
33 upcoming county tax measure. The result of that meeting was a couple of items. First of all,  
34 the Council did request in the strongest sense that the county tax measure include monies for  
35 grade separations. As you know, we had a study a couple of years ago looking at grade  
36 separations in the southern part of the City along the rail corridor. The hope is that the  
37 measure will include some dollars related to that effort. Also, the Council suggested that High  
38 Speed Rail Authority use something called CSS, which is context-sensitive solutions. It's a  
39 strategy that takes into the account the setting in which a transportation project may actually  
40 move through and working with the local communities about finding the best outcome for



# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

1 everyone involved. That's an effort not only they'd like to see the High Speed Rail Authority  
2 work on, but also something that the City will pursue themselves in conversations with their  
3 own community about this issue. That's that. Secondly, I had in the staff report under what to  
4 expect in the meeting, the third paragraph, I just wanted to emphasize this under the CAC  
5 member discussions at meeting. This is your opportunity not only to put out the ideas and  
6 concepts that are important to you, but also say you agree with what you're hearing or you  
7 disagree with what you're hearing, obviously respectfully. That's part of the process that we  
8 want to see happen here. It's not just we throw stuff on the table. You can take the  
9 opportunity to comment on what you hear. I really do hope that you do that. I also wanted to  
10 acknowledge that this has been a tough slog, because we haven't seen product yet. The next  
11 meeting is when you start to see product. The fruits of the labor here will come back to you in  
12 November related to a draft Community Services Element. That's coming together. We'll  
13 obviously have some conversation about that later related to subcommittees and such. One  
14 more meeting like this where we throw a lot of stuff out there, and then you get to start to see  
15 the good work that you've done. Appreciate your time tonight. Thank you.

16

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

18

19 **Agenda Items:**

20 **1. Action: Approval of Minutes**

21 **Co-Chair Keller:** The next item on the agenda is approval of minutes. Anybody have any  
22 comments on the minutes? We'll entertain a motion to approve them.

23

24 **Jeremy Dennis:** If I may, Co-Chair. Excuse me, I have a mouth full of cookie. The minutes we'd  
25 like you to take action on are a part of the at-places attachment that you saw tonight. It's the  
26 one-page draft action minutes, not the verbatim minutes. We know no one has read through  
27 all that yet.

28

29 **Co-Chair Keller:** That's the one-page action minutes of September 8th. Actually, it looks like it's  
30 two pages. Anybody have any comments? Yeah. Could you talk into ... It's on the thing that's  
31 on the places. It says at-places memo. It's got the black and white Our Palo Alto logo, and it's  
32 just inside the first page. Can we have a motion?

33

34 **Don McDougall:** I'll move the minutes, that we accept them.

35

36 **Co-Chair Keller:** Okay. Motion by Jim McDougall. Do we have a second?

37

38 **Co-Chair Garber:** Don McDougall.



## COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

1 **Co-Chair Keller:** Sorry, John, Don McDougall. Sorry, Don McDougall, sorry. And a second by  
2 Elaine Uang. Any comments? All in favor say aye. All opposed. Any abstentions? That passes  
3 unanimously.

4 **Jeremy Dennis:** Co-Chair Keller, may I interrupt just for a moment? I actually anticipated  
5 introducing someone. I hadn't seen the person come in, my apologies. I wanted to introduce—  
6 I'm going to mispronounce your name. I apologize. Tonja Aitamurto, Tanja—there we go—  
7 who's been helping Stanford University. Some of the information you've seen put together  
8 from the Summit activities, Tonya's involved in that. She had a very quick announcement that  
9 she wanted to make. If you could use the mike please.

10 **Tanja Aitamurto:** Sure, yes. Hello, everybody. Excited to be here. You have met my research  
11 assistant, Ahmed, before and Kai Ping, my student. I'm Tanja Aitamurto; I'm a post-doctoral  
12 fellow at Stanford University. I'm also a deputy director of the Brown Institute for Media  
13 Innovation at Stanford. We are working on a research project about this comprehensive City  
14 plan update. I've been studying and leading many (inaudible) policy making processes in  
15 different countries in the world and different cities in the United States, like the City of Vallejo,  
16 City of Chicago before. We are really fascinated about this project and the work that you are  
17 doing here.

18

19 **Male:** Could you speak up (inaudible)?

20

21 **Tanja Aitamurto:** Yeah. What we would like to ask you to do—we have sent out a survey to all  
22 CAC members. Most of you have already responded to the survey. What we would ask you to  
23 do is to fill out the survey, if you haven't already, so that we get an overview about your  
24 thoughts in the beginning of the Comp Plan Update Process. We are going to do another  
25 survey towards the end of the year so that we know your thoughts have maybe evolved and  
26 what might have changed over the course of the year. Another ask that I would have for you is  
27 we are doing a round of interviews with all the CAC members in the now early stage in the  
28 Comp Plan Update process. I'm going to stay here all night today. If you are interested in  
29 setting up an interview time, it takes about 15-20 minutes. We can meet up anywhere you  
30 want or you can come to the campus, if you want to, for a short interview to hear your  
31 thoughts about the process and what motivates you to spend, volunteer your time on this and  
32 what your thoughts are, like how the process could be changed in the next round and so on.  
33 Also for the citizen participants who are here, we have also a survey for you that we will be  
34 sending out shortly. If you haven't signed up, I think there's typically a email list here that you  
35 can use and leave your email there, so we will send out a survey for you so that you can share  
36 your thoughts about the process too. If you have any questions, I'm happy to answer any  
37 questions. Thank you.

38

39 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. We're starting the—anything else? Yes? Could you use your  
40 microphone?



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

1  
2 **Male:** Do we have some way to contact you other than at the meeting? Do we have an email  
3 or something that you can provide?  
4  
5 **Tanja Aitamurto:** Yes, I can send an email through Jeremy to all of you and we can sign up to  
6 the interview also through the email. Yeah, that's a good question. Yeah, absolutely.  
7  
8 **Co-Chair Keller:** Elaine.  
9  
10 **Elaine Uang:** Could you actually resend the survey? I think a few of us are confused about  
11 what this is and did not receive it.  
12  
13 **Tanja Aitamurto:** (inaudible) announcement.  
14  
15 **Elaine Uang:** What survey?  
16  
17 **Tanja Aitamurto:** It's a research project about, like, how we can do policy making online and  
18 also true civic participation. It's a very unique process that we actually going through here.  
19 (inaudible) while there has been only a few processes like this previously where citizens or  
20 residents of a certain area can so directly participate in official policy making process.  
21  
22 **Jeremy Dennis:** I will resend it for those who didn't receive it.  
23  
24 **Tanja Aitamurto:** Okay. There's enough.  
25  
26 **Male:** Another question was what's the purpose of the interview in addition to the survey,  
27 because you give a chance on the survey to write in things. What does it add to the ...  
28  
29 **Tanja Aitamurto:** Yeah, that's a good question. The survey is more of like—we get, like, a  
30 survey of your thoughts and also your background. The interview is more, like, we can dig  
31 deeper about your thoughts and ideas and we can talk more about those. We do a follow-up  
32 interview then later on when the process is almost complete, so then we can compare what  
33 might have changed over the course of the process. They're complementary.  
34  
35 **Male:** You're establishing a baseline.  
36  
37 **Tanja Aitamurto:** Yeah, yeah, exactly.





# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

1       **2. Transportation Element Discussion**

2       **3.**

3       **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. We are five minutes ahead, yay. That gives a little more time  
4 for our discussion. Let me give a preliminary process of how we're going to do this for those  
5 who may have not read the memo. We're going to go around, and each person will speak  
6 for three minutes, and that will be timed. That was done last time. This way people will get  
7 an equal amount of time to speak. It's more fair. Please remember at the beginning of your  
8 time to turn on your microphone and at the end of your time to turn off your microphone.  
9 We'll do that for the first round, going around clockwise. After, the next round, what you'll  
10 do is you'll put your name tag on in and please make it so that we can read it, so it's easier  
11 for us to see. I don't actually remember everybody's name; I'm very bad at names. I guess,  
12 Dan, you'll keep track of names. He may be better at names than I am.

13       **Co-Chair Garber:** I will manage the floor, and Arthur will manage the discussion.

14       **Co-Chair Keller:** Okay. We'll go around like that. Without further ado—by the way, we're  
15 focusing on Goals 4 and up. You can actually speak on anything you want in terms of the  
16 transportation. You get to use your three minutes as you wish. The thing to think about is  
17 that what we want to get out are ideas, new ideas or ideas that you think are important to  
18 express. It's also important to express ideas where you disagree with somebody. Some  
19 people complained that I made comments disagreeing with people; that's the point. The  
20 point is, if you disagree with something, you're not criticizing them. You're instead giving an  
21 alternative point of view, because we need to make sure that what comes out of this is a  
22 report that goes to Council about what the areas of disagreement are, so Council can make  
23 the decision as to which way to go with that teed up for them. This is all leading to keeping  
24 track of what things there are of difference. If you wish to use your time to say I agree with  
25 so-and-so and here's why, that may be fun but it's not as effective a use of time as coming  
26 up with a new idea or saying why you disagree with something. That's distinct from the  
27 action time where we actually will come up with pros and cons. Now, the purpose is to  
28 come up with the ideas and areas of disagreements and additional ideas. I just encourage  
29 you to focus in that way. Our first, I guess, Adrian, you go first.

30  
31       **Adrian Fine:** Thank you, Arthur. I think my mike is on. I don't like leading off, because I like  
32 to hear all your thoughts first, but I'll go for it.

33  
34       **Female:** Can't hear.

35  
36       **Co-Chair Keller:** The thing is the microphones are only for the purposes of recording. We  
37 do not have the room amplified. I don't know why that wasn't set up, but it wasn't  
38 amplified. Therefore, you need to do two things: turn on your microphone and speak into  
39 the microphone for the purpose of recording, and you need to project for the purposes of  
40 being heard. Use your outside voices, if you will, as a lot of parents would say.



# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE

## CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

### MINUTES

1  
2 **Adrian Fine:** You got it. All right. I'm relatively pleased with many of the goals and policies in  
3 this section. I think my two largest comments—the first is that there needs to be a system of  
4 prioritization. It seems a little incoherent to have a roadway network for all users, but then that  
5 may preclude land use decisions that encourage non-motorized transit. That's speaking to  
6 some of the earlier goals, T-1 and T-4. Having reviewed a lot of comprehensive and  
7 transportation plans, I'm often dismayed when I don't see metrics that are explicit and time  
8 bound. I think providing a goal and a time horizon for the City to accomplish these goals is  
9 pretty important in terms of measuring ourselves. I'd love to see kind of concrete metrics  
10 within the goals for things like SOV, thresholds for alternatives, high level of safety. There are  
11 lots of plans in the City that already float these numbers. Maybe we could incorporate them  
12 into the policies themselves. I somewhat disagree with Goal T-5 Policy T-31 which is slowing  
13 traffic in commercial areas. I'm not sure Palo Alto's businesses would be so enthused by that.  
14 One other goal, Goal T-8 which is about attractive, convenient parking, there are no policies to  
15 support attractive parking, whatever that may be. My last comment is a bit broader. I think  
16 one of the ways a city moves forward and actually becomes a better place for its residents is to  
17 be innovative and flexible. To that end, I'd love to see Palo Alto have a goal or a policy to  
18 encourage lightweight, tactical ideas that can show the City what may work or what may not.  
19 You don't really know it doesn't work until you test it and measure it. I'd love for some policy  
20 that encourages the City to experiment with new ideas. Things like closing streets for  
21 pedestrians. Someone in the audience mentioned spray paint. Spray paint can be used to  
22 make bike lanes for a week and see if they work out. Maybe we can run a time-bound  
23 expansion of the shuttle system or maybe we do congestion pricing Downtown for a week. You  
24 don't know which ideas work in this situation in this City until you try them out, and I'd love to  
25 see the City have an explicit goal to encourage lightweight, innovative ideas whether they're  
26 brought up or they've been tried in other places.

27  
28 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Doria.

29  
30 **Doria Summa:** In general I thought that the old version of the Comp Plan is fairly good. There's  
31 places that just need updates. Places where new dates need to be inserted and whatnot. In  
32 general, I had some observations. In T-4, I wonder if we shouldn't add a prohibition actually  
33 against use of streets for parking private buses, which is becoming a big problem around town.  
34 They're often much wider than the parking spot that's available width-wise. I saw this on Alma  
35 recently. They're kind of just all over town, so I wondered if we shouldn't add that. Under T-5, I  
36 think the PTC draft version really changes that one. The former one was more about protecting  
37 neighborhoods from traffic impacts. The new one is quite different. I think we need to go back  
38 to incorporating protecting neighborhoods from traffic impacts back into T-5. There was one  
39 particular, T-5.3—wait, let me find it. Let me move on. I wanted to make sure that in T-7—  
40 maybe this has already been incorporated into the Municipal Code, but there was discussion



# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

1 about designating for persons with disabilities special spots in front of their houses on-street  
2 parking where they did not have a driveway that allowed them to safely exit their car. I think  
3 that could be added in here. T-8, under parking facilities, I strongly feel that we should  
4 discourage single vehicle trips to Palo Alto bike commuters and encourage them to take  
5 alternate forms such as public transportation and biking and riding and even carpooling  
6 whenever it's available by having residential parking permit programs that do not allow for  
7 commuter parkers to purchase permits. That also ties back into T-1 with greenhouse gas  
8 emissions. The airport, I think that just needs to be updated a little to be accurate because  
9 that's the only change. I had this—the other thing that was specific was T-5.3 which introduced  
10 multimodal level of service as a measurement in the rating of performance of streets. I think  
11 that's nice to have that as a metric, but what it wouldn't show is, for instance, the aggregate  
12 level could be high but it might be the case that bikes and pedestrians are doing really well and  
13 cars are actually in gridlock. I would not be in favor of that kind of metric in the absence of  
14 capturing separately. Let's see. I'll just add something about the shuttle and buses. I took the  
15 time to look at all the buses and different shuttles and private ones and Stanford ones, the  
16 Marguerite, and it's actually amazing how many public transportation options there are. I think  
17 some of it needs to be optimized better so people can get to where they're going more  
18 efficiently. I think that needs to be taken—somebody needs to drill down and look at that  
19 specifically.

20

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

22

23 **Lydia Kou:** I'd like to start off with Policy T-4 in the Comprehensive Plan. Under that, I think  
24 that a program should be added to that under the "provide local transit in Palo Alto," where it  
25 should coordinate all public transportation to maximize efficiency and the ease of use. When  
26 you're coming off one line to go to another mode or another shuttle from a bus or a train, then  
27 there is that availability. At Policy T-7 in the Comp Plan, supports plan for a quiet rail system. I  
28 think instead of doing a new system where it involves funding and so forth and also time to  
29 implement, I think it's much better to support improvements to the existing systems that we  
30 have and to measure those rather than building. For T-15—I'm sorry. Going back, I note where  
31 the bus stops and all the waiting areas for public transit, I think that you should also include in  
32 there shelters from the elements, from the sun and rain. I'm sorry, wasting time here. Policy T-  
33 12 also the timing for public transit. It should go later than 10:00 p.m. because if I was to go to  
34 some function at 4:00 and I come home late and I miss that 10:00, then for certainty I would  
35 drive. I think that it should go until 1:00 a.m. or even midnight. Let's see here. Going to—  
36 sorry—Comp Plan again. In Program T-24, reducing traffic lane widths, I think that that's  
37 something that we need to also take into consideration how does it help the emergency  
38 vehicles' access into neighborhoods and into different areas in the City. We have a  
39 responsibility to helping the emergency responders work within their timeframe as specified.  
40 Then I have Goal T-4, efficiency of the roadways, Policy T-24, when constructing or modifying



# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

1 roadways plan for usage of the roadway space by all users with inclusivity when not  
2 appropriate can be dangerous and unsafe. It doesn't have to be visible and enforcement needs  
3 to take place. T-5, Goal 5 for transportation, while I understand that—I'm sorry. Moving to T-6  
4 in the Comp Plan. I think that there needs to be further education as well as enforcement for  
5 motorists, pedestrians and bicyclists. Thanks.

6

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

8

9 **Shani Kleinhaus:** Thank you. Some of the things I've been looking for is to see how programs  
10 or policies impact trees. I would like to see something that essentially does not allow for  
11 expansion of roads or taking away trees, mature trees, from our landscape. I'm not sure where  
12 that belongs, but it would be nice to actually have a policy that mature trees are not going to be  
13 removed and that roads should not be widened in general. Another thing which I found of  
14 concern is that in several places there is an expression of support for different regional plans.  
15 Well, we've already seen that some of the regional plans, where they actually come to Palo  
16 Alto, are not all that friendly to Palo Alto. High speed rail while it may be state, but other plans,  
17 they're not always good for Palo Alto. I wouldn't say support; I would say consider, evaluate or  
18 when appropriate, or something that gives a way not to support it should Palo Alto not support  
19 one of those plans. I'll go to some of the more specific things. I'm using the PTC document.  
20 Policy T-1.9, continue and enhance Palo Alto shuttle program, and then it says along routes that  
21 are of value to community. I would just remove that, those routes that are of value to the  
22 community. I think most routes would be of value to the community especially for people who  
23 are disabled or elderly. We should look at on-call or some other ways to make the shuttles  
24 ubiquitous, available always or almost, at all times, all days and frequent. The free shuttle that  
25 Google started in Mountain View is used primarily by seniors, and that kind of tells us that we  
26 need something like that too. T-1 19.3 program, update the City Bicycle Pedestrian or  
27 Transportation Plan every five years. I do think those plans need to be updated, but every five  
28 years prescribed may be too frequent or maybe not enough. I think that it could be expensive,  
29 and I don't know that we need to prescribe exactly when. In T-2, 1.1, transportation network  
30 replacing Complete Streets, road network typology, that's good but we do need to consider the  
31 trees. That is important to me. Policy T-2.8, avoid major increases in street capacity unless  
32 necessary to remediate severe traffic congestion. I think the time of increasing capacity should  
33 be kind of over, and we really should look at a lot more shuttles and alternatives. Every time  
34 we do programs like T-2 8.1, we get more congestion not less. I have more. I'll try and wait for  
35 later.

36

37 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Alex.

38

39 **Alex van Riesen:** Just a couple of comments. One question first of all. I may have missed it,  
40 but is there a metric of exactly how much, what type of transportation people are using each



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

1 day to come into Palo Alto? Like, how many people are using Caltrain, how many people are  
2 using cars, how many people are using bikes. Did I just miss that? Is that buried somewhere?

3  
4 **Hillary Gitelman:** I know we have some of that information in various places, but let us look  
5 back into the existing conditions report and see.

6  
7 **Alex van Riesen:** Okay. The reason I ask is it strikes me that part of the larger system, it seems  
8 to, it seems like we talk a lot about cars, and it's like cars on one side, bikes on the other. It  
9 seems to me that it's unlikely that Palo Alto is going to become a city that is predominantly  
10 bike-oriented, if it's predominantly a residential area. I've heard people talk about how bikes  
11 can become more utilized in our daily life, but the reality is I have three little kids. When I try to  
12 take my kids somewhere, that was fun initially. Now, it's hard to haul them around. If I put  
13 them in some kind of carry thing in the back, I'm toting 200 pounds. It just reaches certain ways  
14 that it doesn't seem feasible to me. On top of the fact that your kids start going to different  
15 locations. I also have a career that when I get to work, I'm not there the whole day. I realize  
16 we talk about people with, like, point of destination jobs, where they're there all day. They ride  
17 a bike to work, they're there, and then they go home. I have a job where I'm out during the  
18 day. It doesn't work for me to have a bike. I guess, the reason I ask about the metrics is it  
19 seems like coming at this by looking at some of the ways that we are currently coming to Palo  
20 Alto because clearly the vast majority of people are coming in, and how do we think about how  
21 to meet those needs and respond to those proportionally based on who's coming in. I just  
22 don't think, given the area we live in, people are going to stop using cars. They're going to keep  
23 coming in cars, and so I think we're going to need—I'd heard the suggestion possibly of  
24 something like at Foothill and Page Mill, some kind of, like, transportation station where people  
25 could off the 280, there could be a park and ride but also a bus thing that would sort of work  
26 Stanford or the Research Park and then part of Palo Alto. It seems to me that something in  
27 there needs to involve both of those for a residential town. I also just wanted to see something  
28 on the shuttle metrics. My experience is—I live on Louis Road. As I watch the shuttles go by,  
29 most of the time they seem completely empty. I'm confused by this. Either (a) I'm just at the  
30 wrong place at the wrong time or they're not being utilized or they're not working together or  
31 they're not on the appropriate routes. It seems like there needs to be some specific analysis of  
32 the shuttle system. It's just not being very efficient. Finally, I had two ideas possibly for how to  
33 maybe integrate some things. I thought it'd be interesting to see for people like at Avenidas or  
34 other places who don't have cars, aren't driving anymore, is there a way to provide Uber  
35 vouchers, ways that they could have something given—a way we could provide from the City  
36 for their movement. The other one that's a little out there was I thought it'd be great to  
37 negotiate with Google while they're test-driving their driverless cars, why don't we turn them  
38 into shuttles?

39  
40 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Hillary.



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

1 **Hillary Gitelman:** Thanks. Through the Chair, I just wanted to respond to one thing. Alex, we  
2 do collect data on shuttle ridership. That data is in the existing conditions report, and we  
3 report on it annually through our performance system. We are right now undertaking a review  
4 of the shuttle system to look at potential enhancements, and there's a survey online. If you  
5 haven't taken the survey about the shuttle system and you have ideas for it, please do. It's on  
6 our website—look. Elaine is holding up a copy of the flyer. Super.

7  
8 **Alex van Riesen:** That was one of the attachments. Okay.

9  
10 **Hillary Gitelman:** Please take the survey. Those ideas will help us design a better shuttle.

11  
12 **Co-Chair Garber:** If I may, Alex?

13  
14 **Alex van Riesen/Co-Chair Keller:** Yes.

15  
16 **Co-Chair Garber:** You might think about your comments as a planner might, which is what I'd  
17 like to—I mean, this is just a suggestion. It would be good for the City to undertake a program  
18 to understand how to better use the City shuttle. Or to test and evaluate whether a remote  
19 parking site has valid and value to the community, we then could incorporate a bunch of the  
20 questions that you're trying to get and institutionalize that into the document, if you follow me.  
21 In any case, next Don.

22  
23 **Don McDougall:** Many of these comments I've submitted in writing, but just to go through in a  
24 quick summary. My first comments on the current plan is that we need to be careful about  
25 what's a program and what's a policy. I think there are many things that are being defined as  
26 programs that maybe could be defined as policies. There's things that we could have goals  
27 associated with that should be programs. I agree with what Alex was saying in terms of  
28 whether there's enough measures there, but I think very specifically one of the things we need  
29 to do within transportation is have programs that are measureable and that are reported  
30 frequently and easily accessed. In terms of programs and the timeframes that Shani  
31 mentioned, there's one in there about reviewing the timing of the lights at various intersections  
32 every five years or whatever. I would happen to believe that the technology's available today  
33 that they could be evaluated in real-time or on a weekly or monthly basis and that the  
34 technology's available to optimize that. In terms of sustainability, Goal T-1, I think having a goal  
35 that we have more parking is totally contradictory to sustainability. I think that we should be  
36 finding ways to eliminate parking. I believe that bikes should be a separate topic from  
37 pedestrians. I think those are two separate topics that address different issues. I believe that  
38 one of the policies that we could ask for is that there should be some amount of policing that's  
39 done on bikes to make that more visible and to encourage biking. In terms of the efficient use  
40 of streets, I think that this Committee should embrace very deliberately and aggressively



## COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

1 embrace Complete Streets. In terms of the neighborhood, efficient neighborhood, I think we  
2 should embrace the clustering of services within various areas. I've already said no to parking.  
3 In terms of safety, I think safety is really an issue that measuring and reporting, and I think  
4 things like the Safe Route to School should be multiplied. I think that the City should be—we  
5 should have a policy or program in place that encourages the library, the shopping districts,  
6 whatever to find safe routes, safe routes to park, safe routes to the library and so on, that there  
7 should be several partnerships that way. In terms of congestion, the Council added T-9 which  
8 was congestion which is really consistent with or complementary to or redundant with T-1  
9 which is sustainability. I think that the solutions to both are the same. I suggest that this body  
10 embrace congestion in a way that was very deliberately consistent with what was suggested  
11 earlier, that T-9 reducing congestion should be all about innovation, technical innovation,  
12 practical innovation, line striping innovation, whatever it may be. It should be ways that we  
13 don't take ten years to approve Arastradero, but do things very quickly.

14

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

16

17 **Ellen Uhrbrock:** I'd like to ask you to remember top of the list of what I'm going to say tonight  
18 is that the shuttle program ought to be extended to seven days a week particularly for seniors  
19 and for other citizens that are stay-at-home during the week. They still have transportation  
20 needs over the weekend. Hello? Can you hear that?

21

22 **Jeremy Dennis:** Yeah, go ahead.

23

24 **Ellen Uhrbrock:** Seven days a week ought to be woven into our report and action taken. I have  
25 spent a good part of the last five years as a volunteer working with Avenidas on transportation  
26 problems. I began with introducing to the Marguerite. It was amazing to me as I did this that  
27 the community as whole in Palo Alto, most of them did not know that there was a free  
28 Marguerite. They did not know that they could ride on it. It was introducing them to a new  
29 opportunity there. My goal on introducing people, seniors in particular, isn't to give them a  
30 nice hour sightseeing trip; it's to show them what is available with the hope that they would  
31 know that they could go again themselves another time. If they couldn't do that, at least when  
32 it comes up in conversation, they could say, "Do you know at the Cantor Art Museum, there is a  
33 wonderful new exhibit, and there's the Marguerite that will take you door to door?" Not  
34 exactly door-to-door, but from the Palo Alto Transit Center it will. It just widens the world for  
35 people to know what is accessible and what you can do. The other thing, when I look back on  
36 Goal Number 1, single occupancy car, reduce the numbers of people who are driving alone, I  
37 think we could start right here. We've got 40 people who came here, and I would suspect there  
38 are almost 40 cars parked someplace here. Your first speaker tonight from the public had that  
39 problem tonight. She wanted to ride her bike there. I told her I didn't think it was safe, that  
40 she might get out too late and it'd be dark. A lady of 80 shouldn't really be riding a bicycle at



## COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE *MINUTES*

1 night without the lights on. She finally drove her car. Now, when you're wanting to get single  
2 drivers off the road, I'd start with the 80-year-olds. Anyway that was the only solution of why  
3 she would come, and I urged her to come because she's an advocate for transportation. I think  
4 we all can be. Let me talk a little more about seniors. Seniors are the group, are also  
5 handicapped. They're digitally handicapped. You cannot look up schedules, you can't use apps.  
6 You are really handicapped in trying to use any kind of public transportation. You become the  
7 helpless person that you have to take old Great Aunt Ellen, you have to pick her up. What  
8 happens when you reach that stage, you get dropped out of the loop. You don't want to be  
9 dropped out of the loop with your community which you've loved. I did want to make one  
10 more comment to stick with you. That last one on the airport ...

11

12 **Co-Chair Garber:** May I suggest, we'll come around again. Will that be all right?

13

14 **Ellen Uhrbrock:** Okay.

15

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

17

18 **Bob Wenzlau:** I wanted to speak to the airport. We have Goal T-8 which is maintain a local  
19 airport with minimal environmental impacts.

20

21 **Co-Chair Garber:** Bob, could you turn on your microphone?

22

23 **Bob Wenzlau:** Yeah, the mike's on too. Now, you're using my time.

24

25 **Co-Chair Garber:** I'm sorry.

26

27 **Bob Wenzlau:** Okay. As John invited us to be a little brave, while the CAC can't change the  
28 goal, I frankly wanted to introduce that the 110 acres that compromised the airport would  
29 probably be better used towards recreational and housing that could offset the transportation  
30 impact and generate a huge sustainability benefit for our community. It provides 110 acres of  
31 land that right now is used by airplanes. Under the goal, there is one policy which speaks to  
32 maintaining the airport. Let's just recap on the goal. The goal says maintain a local airport with  
33 minimal offsite environmental impacts. My first observation is Policy 8.1 actually seeks to  
34 broadly enlarge and enhance the airport as opposed to maintaining it. I would ask that the  
35 policy be scaled back or trimmed to insert concepts, for example, without significantly  
36 increasing the airport's intensity and also to remind that it needs to maintain consistency with  
37 the Baylands Master Plan. Right now, the programs actually ask that the Baylands Master Plan  
38 be subordinate to a to-be-written Airport Master Plan, which I think is upside down. The other  
39 component of this goal that I've observed is that there's no policy developed towards  
40 minimizing environmental impact. I would ask that a policy be generated to basically





## COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE *MINUTES*

1 accomplish this portion of the goal, which is minimizing environmental impact. Just as  
2 background, the FAA which ostensibly controls the airport has no environmental interest. It  
3 comes to the City to manage the issues of noise and pollution. We know that this is of  
4 significant concern. I was asking for us to consider new programs that would add noise  
5 monitoring at the Palo Alto Airport, a new program that would ask that the airplanes use  
6 transponders, because right now the small craft cannot even be identified. I would ask for a  
7 program that monitors low-flying aircraft; there's no program. There's no program right now  
8 that forbids the use of leaded fuels, so we know that from the standpoint that we're dropping  
9 lead across our community. We shouldn't do that. We need a program of metrics, and we also  
10 need to create a program that creates an airport and community commission. Again, there's no  
11 forum given that the FAA has no interest in the environmental impact at the airport, so we  
12 need a community forum that would take the measurements and allow the development  
13 additionally of a complaint system so that essentially like SFO where you can register a  
14 complaint about noise. We have no program in Palo Alto about that. I've listed several  
15 programs and suggested a new policy. Thank you.

16

17 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Jared.

18

19 **Jared Jacobs:** Hi. I wanted to speak mainly to trying to reduce single occupancy use vehicles  
20 for inbound commuters. I used to commute on the Caltrain myself, and I work with a number  
21 of people who commute today by car, even though I work within a few blocks of the Caltrain  
22 station on Cal. Ave. It's a three-legged trip to get anywhere from your home to work, for  
23 example. I think as one of the documents I read last time said, the biggest program may be  
24 outside our City. For people who are coming here to commute, we may want to look into  
25 programs that sponsor basically private transit to connect people to the Caltrain from their  
26 homes in other cities, either by bike or Uber or whatever it takes or to the bus lines. Also  
27 within the City, I think we might want to consider programs that help with bicycle safety  
28 education. That could probably be staffed by volunteers. There's a lot of people interested in  
29 getting more bicyclists in the City. We might want to consider programs that basically give  
30 people loaner bicycles as they make a decision whether to purchase their own or pay people  
31 back for their bicycles as long as they keep them and use them, using apps to scan or whatever  
32 way we can use to give those credits. Also just studying the population, studying for each auto  
33 trip, like asking people why it is that they chose the auto in this, either at places of work or  
34 places of commerce, actually just serving people as they drive up in their car to get more data  
35 on what the problem is, what problem we're really facing. Thanks.

36

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

38

39 **Jason Titus:** One area that I thought that has come up from a few different folks is for the  
40 existing shuttle system and public transportation we have that seems to keep recurring is



## COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE *MINUTES*

1 awareness. It's not just awareness of existence as to whether or not people even know that  
2 there are such shuttles, but even having a sense of the schedules, availability, all of these  
3 things. When you don't know, you're not going to bet on it. If you have to get some place,  
4 you're not going to say, "I'll just go find a shuttle and work it out." I think that's—of all places in  
5 the world, Palo Alto should be one of the best at being able to provide a data-driven, very, very  
6 simple—I should walk up to any shuttle stop and see what are the next four coming. If I want  
7 to be able to say, "I'm going to this location," I should be able to say you'll go here, have a ten-  
8 minute wait for the other one, and that'll get you over to Stanford. None of this is rocket  
9 science. It is exactly the thing we excel at and it is something that we can drive from a metrics-  
10 based policy of essentially doing surveys of awareness, how many people know the different  
11 transits, as well as ridership, how many blocks are you using the transit systems. If we do a  
12 good job of it, we should be able to then also gather—certainly if we have opportunities for  
13 people to be able to tell us where they're trying to go, we can then see where are we failing. If  
14 the answer is that again and again folks are from Downtown trying to get to Stanford mall and  
15 we tell them walk, then we should probably figure out how to solve that problem. I think as a  
16 policy we should say awareness of public transit is a policy problem that we should be  
17 addressing and we should be tracking as a metric such that by 2030 all Palo Altans or 80  
18 percent of them should know that there is public transit and have a sense of how they would  
19 use it for their own needs. That's one general area. A second thing would just be around  
20 creating safe spaces for pedestrians and bicyclists. I think we should really consider as part of  
21 transportation—I know this touches on use—having areas like University Avenue or California  
22 Avenue that we do close to traffic. If you look at cities that have done things like this, you  
23 create an area where people will go as a destination with their bicycles or as a destination when  
24 they're walking, because you can take your family and you can know that you don't have to be  
25 driving place to place to place if you have an open area that is safe to move around on, on a  
26 bicycle or on foot. That has been seen in a number of cities. Certainly, I don't think a lot of  
27 people are making efficient transit down University Avenue at this point.

28  
29 **Co-Chair Keller:** Amy.

30  
31 **Amy Sung:** Thank you. I am going to say I agree with Jason (inaudible) that every big city has to  
32 have a city center. I think University is the area where we can stop all the traffic and make it a  
33 pedestrian area only. I have been thinking that ways that the traffic, the issues that we have, I  
34 think that we need to look at how we reduce traffic by looking at how we live. Therefore, I  
35 think that when we consider doing the Downtown area or Cal. Ave. or along El Camino, that we  
36 want to think of a supporting ecosystem such that people can live and work and entertain and  
37 social all within reachable, safe distance and, therefore, that reduce the need to drive. Also, I  
38 think that we talk about many, many shared economy. We talk about ride share. We talk  
39 about the airbnb, share the home, your rooms. I think that maybe we should talk about car  
40 share as part of the future planning. Specifically, I wanted to talk about many of the policies



## COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE *MINUTES*

1 (inaudible) that it talks efficiency and safety. I think that we also need to have an element that  
2 says ease of use. Many of the policies look at as an area. I think that forget that we are the  
3 end-users, and so I think it's very important component, to add that ease of use or convenience  
4 as a part of the goal. For example, we see all the traffic lights. You park your car, wait and then  
5 the traffic will turn green, red and orange for you. We're asking the bicyclists and pedestrians  
6 to go up there, push a button and then I think that is an example of we need to remember the  
7 center is the user, the end user. Also, I wanted to talk about the bicycle parking. I think bicycle  
8 parking should be as easy as you would deposit your dry cleaning. There should be kiosks set  
9 up in the corner of the street, and there should be something, like, underground. Like the dry  
10 cleaning, they have all those conveyor system, you go up there, you check your bicycle in, a  
11 machine spits out a ticket for you, and an automatic system takes your bicycle down  
12 somewhere magically. When you come back, you deposit your ticket in. I think this is  
13 something—technology is advancing and I think that we shouldn't be asking people to bike and  
14 walk while the infrastructure is lagging behind. That's all I have.

15

16 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Elaine.

17

18 **Elaine Uang:** Okay. On the topic of—I guess this is T-1 and T-2. Just on the topic of biking,  
19 transit and walking, I guess I hope we don't see that as an opposition to driving but as  
20 complementary. I think that—actually somebody gave me this really interesting T-shirt idea. I  
21 don't know if he's actually executed it. Every person we can encourage to ride a bus or a  
22 shuttle or use a bike is actually one less person driving in front of you. For those people who do  
23 choose to do that, can we consider those options for them? Of course, obviously for many  
24 things, lugging groceries around, pulling things from Costco, those are all really important  
25 things that a lot of times we have to use a car for. I think active transportation is really  
26 important to pursue. It kind of goes along with, I guess, a Healthy City Healthy Community  
27 initiative that's been pushing forward this year. I think it's just important for people of all ages  
28 just to maintain health. Thinking about our roads and our streets for that is important. In the  
29 PTC draft, there was something about street design standards and using best practice street  
30 designs. There was not specificity for what that is, but I'm just going to throw out a suggestion.  
31 The NACTO, National Association for City Transportation Officials, published a couple of guides,  
32 the Urban Street Design Guide and the Bicycle Street Design Guide, both of which I think are  
33 really good resources and maybe something for the City to consider as a policy direction. I also  
34 want to—getting into some of the T-4 and onward goals, I agree with Don that in a lot of ways  
35 T-9, traffic congestion, is kind of redundant and complementary to sustainable transportation.  
36 A lot of these things, traffic congestion, parking, we can think about a little bit better and more  
37 holistically in pursuing things like precise plans, especially in the core Downtown areas,  
38 Downtown, Cal. Ave. and even along El Camino. I think a lot of things have been said about  
39 creating destinations and places. When we create destinations and places, I think we can  
40 aggregate a lot of our transportation solutions in a better way. The TMA is an example of that, I



## COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE *MINUTES*

1 think. A lot of folks have been talking about the TMA and audience support for that. It's really  
2 hard to do a TMA and coordinate transportation demand management if you're not  
3 coordinating for an area. Creating those places and those destinations to coordinate all those  
4 things, I think, is important. Precise plans are a very useful tool for that. A lot of our  
5 neighboring cities are using them for this precise reason, integrating parking strategies,  
6 reduction of single occupancy vehicles, planning for transit and creating more walkable,  
7 bikeable integrated routes. The rail corridor, I just want to touch on it really quickly because I  
8 think there's some complementary ideas we can present. If we're going to sort of—if the  
9 trench is the preferred option, I think that captures a lot of space for us to do some interesting  
10 things around transportation. Support local transit above, whether that's a shuttle, a circulator,  
11 a really cute street car, or a bike-pedestrian recreational paths, I think those are all important  
12 things to consider as an opportunity. Public space and parkland is another really important  
13 opportunity, and capturing some of that for just collective human and fauna habitat. Also, oh  
14 my gosh. That's it. I'll come back.

15

16 **Co-Chair Garber:** Good timing. Heidi.

17

18 **Heidi Emberling:** We're on the edge of our seat. Okay.

19

20 **Female:** Hold it straight up like an ice cream cone.

21

22 **Heidi Emberling:** Right, like an ice cream cone, got it. Okay. My comments as usual are going  
23 to be related to the schools and to childcare as well. Can I ask you, the transportation  
24 management association, does that have any School District representative? No?

25

26 **Hillary Gitelman:** I don't know the answer to that. There are public meetings. You know what?  
27 I think actually the superintendant is invited to participate, but I don't know that he's been  
28 attending.

29

30 **Heidi Emberling:** Okay, might be useful because we have 18 school sites around Palo Alto. We  
31 have 1,500 teachers and staff that come here to work. We have 12,500 students. We have  
32 probably with each of them and their parents contribute to about 30 to 35,000 people here.  
33 It's not a small amount of people. Probably anything that has to do with transportation should  
34 probably also have school representatives in it. Just a reminder for that. Kids have a lot of  
35 afterschool activities. I'm sure you've noticed. They go back and forth around town. No one in  
36 my area which is west of El Camino in the Barron Park area can access the shuttles. They try to  
37 ride their bikes, but all of us parents think that riding on El Camino would be not very safe.  
38 Yeah, so then there are a lot of parents driving them everywhere. We have to figure out what  
39 to do about that. I think in terms of the congestion issues and, of course, there's a lot of  
40 congestion around school start and end times. School leadership needs to be involved in terms



## COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE *MINUTES*

1 of staggering start times and staggering end times. Sometimes those decisions can be made  
2 within the School District without consulting with City schools' traffic, safety committees and  
3 other times they do. I'm just making sure the lines of communication are open when we're  
4 talking about transportation, I think are important. To that end, love the idea of sort of bike  
5 maps or apps with maps in terms of students being able to access maps of what's the best bike  
6 route for me to get from here to my afterschool activity or from here to my friend's house or  
7 from here wherever, so workable City maps that could be in app form would be great, or bike  
8 or transit kiosks where you could enter—someone else mentioned enter where you're going  
9 and it would help you figure out how to get there. I wanted to talk about childcare. I think  
10 overall I would encourage the City to consider promoting and incentivizing development and  
11 enhancement of childcare services as a traffic congestion mitigation philosophy, particularly  
12 near employment hubs. Parents, especially of very young children, do not want to drive far  
13 away from their kids, especially if they're breastfeeding moms or if they have to drive to their  
14 preschools to nurse or pump during the day, then they need to have their kids nearby. Anyway,  
15 it's a win—sorry, just last sentence here. If you have childcare located near your work, it will  
16 cut down on travel road usage, improve employee morale, cut down on employee sick time,  
17 promote healthy families. Win, win, win all around. Thank you.

18

19 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Julia. Julia, also welcome. This is your first official meeting.

20

21 **Julia Moran:** Thank you.

22

23 **Co-Chair Garber:** I'm sorry we didn't acknowledge you earlier.

24

25 **Julia Moran:** Great to be here. A few things that have—echoing some things other people  
26 have said. I think we need to be data driven with how we prioritize transportation changes.  
27 Just looking at the PlaceWorks memo that we received, it looks like 3 percent to 6 percent,  
28 depending upon how it's looked at, of the traffic is internal to internal. When we're looking at  
29 the impact that the programs we're going to put in place have, whether that's parking or other  
30 things, how much of an impact that's going to have compared to who's using that type of  
31 transportation. Also, increased visibility and accessibility for our public transportation, I'm  
32 looking forward to hearing what the shuttle survey comes out to be. I assume we'll get the  
33 results of what you see. Like other people have said, I think it's extremely important to make  
34 communication and awareness a top priority, especially with working within the region and not  
35 just the City, both by having perhaps a program would be having a kiosk not just at the Caltrain  
36 station but in Downtown Palo Alto for those that don't use the Caltrain, by the fountain,  
37 mailings. I mean, I know personally the information that's gone out about composting has been  
38 so thorough to me and I would think to others. I think that we clearly can get information out  
39 to everyone when we want to. I think that we should be working with existing private apps and  
40 programs instead of just focusing on developing our own. I did a quick app search and found



## COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE *MINUTES*

1 one called Nimbler; I'm sure there's many others that is already in the San Francisco area that  
2 uses some of our transportation but not all of it. I think that there's an easy way to piggy back  
3 off of things that are already happening. Also, along with what Adrian said and some others,  
4 we should put in that we should be doing some quick tests. Things like what people have said  
5 about closing down University Ave. or California Avenue, we can easily—I don't know about  
6 easily, but we can do that on a temporary basis and we should be doing more programs like  
7 that before we implement any long-term, official changes.

8

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

10

11 **Annette Glanckopf:** Thank you for the mike. I sent in many of my comments, so I won't  
12 address all of them. I would like an official reading on which document that we should be  
13 commenting on, whether it be the Comp Plan or the PTC revision. I think addressed a little bit  
14 earlier, Doria said, I also agree the current Comp Plan is good; it does need tweaking. Looking  
15 at the PTC version, there's a lot of very, very good points. I'm concerned about Comp Plan  
16 bloat. This was also true in the community services and, because some of the items proposed,  
17 I'd almost like to see it be more of a area plan. For example, a community services plan or a  
18 parks plan, etc. I think we really need to prioritize. It seems to be obvious that the highest  
19 problem in the next ten years is going to be high speed rail. We need to add a lot more bullets  
20 to this. This will be absolutely the big issue, and so we really need to beef it up. Second—we all  
21 talk about this—is getting the 90,000-plus employees in and out and maybe parked. I know I  
22 commuted for many, many years, and public transportation was a godsend. I think everyone  
23 should be taking it if they could. TMA—we all think it's wonderful—Is underfunded and it's  
24 under-focused. It really needs to be Palo Alto centric, if not regional. That's the only way we'll  
25 get more bang for the buck. The third, we can, I think, look at the examples out there to be  
26 more effective in reducing single occupancy vehicles and commute trips. The third huge area is  
27 students. We talked a lot about that. There's a lot of good work that's been done, and I agree  
28 with a lot of the suggestions, but we absolutely need enforcement of a lot of the bad habits,  
29 running stop signs, speeding, riding abreast. It makes you absolutely crazy. Even if you're a  
30 pedestrian, it's really a problem. It was touched on, I think Elaine said it. At some point, we  
31 just—this is the elephant in the room. We really need to recognize that we'll reach a saturation  
32 point of getting people out of cars. When you look at the surveys, quality of life surveys, we, I  
33 think, are going to get low marks about that. There is a saturation point. Finally, I've been  
34 thinking about the air space, and I want to make sure we talk about drones. As far as the  
35 airport, this is absolutely a critical resource for Palo Alto to have from a public safety standpoint  
36 and healthcare. Stanford uses it all the time. If we ever have a big one, it'll be absolutely  
37 critical. I do agree that it should fit into the Baylands Master Plan. One comment about Uber. I  
38 originally thought this was going to be a great idea for public transportation, but it does double  
39 the trips. Although, it does remove the problem of parking. My final comment, I'd like to  
40 emphasize that when we think about some of these issues, let's think about signage. Currently,



## COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE *MINUTES*

1 I think, there's much too much signage. I know on my creek, there's 14 signs right on the creek.  
2 It's too much visual clutter. I'd much prefer that we get the messages out with apps or  
3 something that was more graphically, visibly attractive. I think that way people just get lost in  
4 the mass of too much information.

5

6 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Mark.

7

8 **Mark Nadim:** I sent my comments earlier, but I will touch on some highlights. One of the  
9 things that I think is very important is coordinating all the shuttle bus systems in Palo Alto,  
10 between Marguerite, the Palo Alto shuttle and the VTA buses. Of course, we still do need more  
11 frequent runs of buses. I looked at the data that was submitted. The Palo Alto shuttle, one of  
12 them has a frequency every 30 minutes, and the other one is once an hour. That doesn't make  
13 it usable. People want to have a bus system that they depend on every ten minutes, no more  
14 than 10 to 15 minutes. The other thing is people need to know when the buses are going to be  
15 coming in, I mean arriving. There are a lot of displays that would tell the user when the bus is  
16 going to be in and which bus is going to be coming in in the next minute or two or five. The  
17 other thing is traffic. Looking at traffic, I would like to—personally I think that traffic can be  
18 broken down into local and commuter traffic. Local traffic is basically for people who drive  
19 around in Palo Alto or bike or walk. That can be alleviated with the—for the people who don't  
20 want to bike and walk—with the bus system that, again, is more frequent. Also the buses  
21 should not be more than two blocks away from any location. Right now, between Middlefield  
22 and Alma there is no bus line, between Middlefield and further and 101. That makes it  
23 unusable. I also noticed the—I looked at the buses, the 88, 88L and 88M in the morning for  
24 Gunn High School specifically. There is only one bus. If the student misses that bus, they're  
25 going to drive to school. We need more buses that are more frequent. Now, as for as bikes  
26 and safety, I think we need to have more safe routes. For example, the overwhelming majority  
27 of the bikes that go to Gunn, they go from Georgia Street through a path to the Gunn parking  
28 lot. We need a lot more of these paths that would go through neighborhoods and get kids  
29 more safe routes. Instead of narrowing down Arastradero and Charleston, I think it would be a  
30 good idea to have a separate lane that is physically separated from the other lanes, that can be  
31 used for bikes. Then there's the commuter traffic which is basically the culprit and majority of  
32 the traffic backups in Palo Alto. That has to be done with a regional bus system or regional  
33 coordination. Thank you.

34

35 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Len.

36

37 **Len Filppu:** Yes, thank you. This is a much better procedural way to get a lot of thoughts out. I  
38 commend the decision to do it this way. A lot of good ideas. I'm definitely enjoying it. My  
39 neighbors—I'm part of a neighborhood association—complain primarily about traffic. One of  
40 the things is early morning rush hour and evening rush hour in the south Palo Alto



## COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE *MINUTES*

1 neighborhoods. They're saying that commuter traffic is beginning to cut through the  
2 neighborhoods. They're doing short cuts, and they're speeding through neighborhoods. Some  
3 of our neighbors wanted to figure out how can we find out about traffic calming efforts. What  
4 can we do as far as contacting the City? They've sent letters in, and they've begun the process  
5 and began searching through the variety of information available to the City. It's a very time-  
6 consuming kind of thing. There's the sense that you send a note into the City and it goes into a  
7 black hole. I'm not saying that's the case; there's that sense. The public citizenry, the taxpayers  
8 get the sense that no one can hear them. They don't know what to do. I would hope that  
9 there's some way just to make the process of neighbors looking into specifics, such as traffic  
10 calming, more transparent, easier to find and that they get responses from the City. I  
11 sometimes feel in this town as though I serve two masters. I have children going to the Palo  
12 Alto Unified School District, and then we live in the City. We try to follow activities that both of  
13 our elective bodies do, the City Council as well as the School Board. Sometimes—and other  
14 parents have talked to me about this—it seems like they're not talking. This follows up a little  
15 bit, augments what Heidi was saying. There needs to be—these decisions need to be informed  
16 by communication between these two bodies. If there's greater housing, then it doesn't  
17 happen in a vacuum. There's going to be more kids; there's going to be more traffic; there's  
18 going to be requests for additional school buildings and measures to fund those. From a citizen  
19 point of view, it's all connected even though you have your own silo. I commend Heidi and her  
20 comments to make sure that we have communications going between those two organizations.  
21 The high speed rail, let's remember that when we're talking about Eastmeadow, Charleston and  
22 Churchill—wow, that went fast. Those are school routes. When you get traffic backed up with  
23 lots of trains, schools don't go, commuters don't go, nothing happens. Thank you.

24

25 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thanks. Jennifer.

26

27 **Jennifer Hetterly:** I'd like to start with echoing Heidi's comment about childcare near  
28 employment centers. I think that's hugely important. I think mixed-use development was a  
29 previous program that got dropped in the revision. I think that should also be included as  
30 something that's targeted to employment areas. For my specific comments, I want to start at  
31 the end with the airport. I agree with Bob—I think it's Bob—that there are some problems with  
32 the PTC amendments. The first one in particular. I think he called out that the previous Policy  
33 T-57 was more protective and that it prevents significant increases in intensity or intruding on  
34 open space areas. I would restore that as the first sentence of that policy. Program 8.1.3 which  
35 is about maintaining landscaping and security fencing to visually screen the airport, it  
36 purportedly is a revision of the original Program T-57 that called for providing a planting strip  
37 and a bicycle and pedestrian path adjacent to Embarcadero Road that's consistent with the  
38 open space character of the Baylands. The one is about putting up a fence and having pretty  
39 plants on the inside of it. The other is about conserving the character of the area. I think we  
40 should restore Program T-57. On program T-8.1.4, it's about relocating the terminal building





## COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE *MINUTES*

1 and constructing a new building at a reasonable distance from the natural habitat area  
2 surrounding the harbor in accordance with federal law. I would like to replace "reasonable"  
3 with "appropriate," because that's not such a big difference. I also want to add "and best  
4 ecological practices" after "federal law." It will be "in accordance with federal law and best  
5 ecological practices." Finally, Program T-1.8, I think Bob mentioned this. The airport plan  
6 should be consistent with the Baylands Master Plan, absolutely not the other way around.  
7 Going back to—I don't know how I'm doing on time here—the shuttle issue. It seems there's a  
8 lot of interest in doing something more about the shuttle, and I think that's right. I think one  
9 thing we should do is add a program here to collaborate with the School District and the  
10 community, especially seniors, to identify new routes and expanded schedules that will  
11 accommodate peak demand and coordinate with transit connections. We might want another  
12 policy that explores routes that will provide shuttle access within a 10 to 15-minute walk of  
13 most neighborhoods. I think Bonnie mentioned that the last time we were here. Let's see. To  
14 parking, I agree with Doria that we should restore the original Policy T-47 about protecting  
15 residential areas from the parking impacts of nearby business districts. There's several  
16 mentions of the Bike and Pedestrian Transportation Plan, where it's specifically referenced to  
17 follow the planning here, follow it here (inaudible). I think that's a great plan, but I think we  
18 should be careful about tying our hands to it. It wasn't perfect as no plan ever is. Times  
19 change; it's already three years old. While I think it should be referenced, we shouldn't lock  
20 ourselves in.

21

22 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Hamilton.

23

24 **Hamilton Hitchings:** Lots of great comments. I really enjoyed ...

25

26 **Co-Chair Garber:** You're fine.

27

28 **Co-Chair Keller:** Go ahead. Make sure (inaudible) microphone on.

29

30 **Hamilton Hitchings:** Yeah, it is. Lots of great comments. I really enjoyed it. I'm going to give  
31 some new ones that haven't been mentioned tonight. First, let me frame the problem. Over 94  
32 percent of the car trips every day are in and out of the City, but we have fixed roads and, with  
33 only one or two exceptions, no ability to expand the capacity. The majority of commuters come  
34 in and out, but not ability to expand car capacity. What have other cities in our area done?  
35 Well, Menlo Park, Mountain View, Sunnyvale, Cupertino and Stanford have all implemented car  
36 trip caps. Stanford's a great example of this. For Facebook, their deal with Menlo Park is they  
37 have driveway sensors, and they have caps not only for toll cars in and out, but for certain—  
38 during rush hour with a \$50 per day fine for exceeding those caps. We have an opportunity  
39 with the Stanford Research Park to cap vehicle trips. I think we also should consider for mid-  
40 and large-size-employers. We also need to—with financial penalties, once you do that it allows



## COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE *MINUTES*

1 you to put a lot of pressure on funding and using alternate transportation. We also need to  
2 improve the connections between Caltrain with a Shuttle to Stanford Research Park. Stanford's  
3 number one way they reduced commuters was with Caltrain and the Go Pass. I was just  
4 listening to Adina's video from 2013 and Elaine's. We should consider seriously subsidizing Go  
5 Passes for Caltrain, especially for Downtown and California Ave. We also should cap number of  
6 cars per the parking provided for office buildings. I think we should not be subsidizing office  
7 building parking. We should only be subsidizing retail. The key is we need to subsidize retail  
8 both in terms of their employees and also in terms of visitors, but not office. I don't think we  
9 should be issuing RPPs to office buildings unless they paid in-lieu of fees, so that they're  
10 responsible for their own parking and capped at what they have onsite or have paid for. I think  
11 that street and residential parking should be limited to Downtown employees, retail and  
12 residents. I also believe "pay for it by plate" is an important concept that can significantly  
13 improve parking spot utilization. It allows for incremental parking such as X number of days per  
14 month, allows you to move your car, and it's easy to enforce via scanners as long as you provide  
15 sufficient privacy. Those are my comments. I'm going to stop right there.

16

17 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Steve.

18

19 **Steve Levy:** Thanks also to Dan and Art for this format. I find it very collegial and helpful. I  
20 have a short memo in the packet. There are four statements that I'd like to see in the  
21 Transportation Element when we get to that point. Three of them have to do with the  
22 economics of sustainable transportation and travel demand practice. One is a value statement.  
23 Two of them have to do with land use. There are a number of comments about Goal T-1 in the  
24 packet that talk about the connection between location of new development and the reduction  
25 of the associated travel and parking demand. We all know that experimentally. The folks that  
26 work Downtown take a lot more transit for their commute. The folks that live Downtown or  
27 around Cal. Ave., like Nancy and I do, do an enormous number of walking or biking trips for  
28 everyday chores. Non-commute trips are still trips. Those locational decisions, bringing land  
29 use into the transportation sustainability goal are really important. There's a hidden benefit,  
30 that if we have locational policies that say for whatever development we have, put it near the  
31 activity centers. We're supporting retail. That's my first one. Make locational decisions for  
32 new development that maximize the chance to reduce travel and parking. The second one is—  
33 associated with that, Hamilton talked about it a little. There are a lot of other things that we  
34 can do in prioritizing developments or negotiating with developers to have developments that  
35 are car lite. I'm not sure I agree with the trip cap, but the idea of incentives. There's a letter  
36 from Stanford in here about all of the things they're thinking about, that they might do at the  
37 Research Park. Making priority decisions for projects that reduce travel demand. The third one  
38 is gradually implement parking pricing and parking incentives in Palo Alto. This one may be  
39 controversial. John Kelly said go for it. When parking is free, you have more parking than if  
40 parking is charged. Parking costs developers to build. Parking costs the house where I live. If



## COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE *MINUTES*

1 it's free, you over-use it. I think gradually—we all pay to go to sporting events now. We pay  
2 when we park in San Francisco. We pay when we park at the airport. You pay when you park  
3 at Redwood City or Burlingame. Parking pricing. The fourth is a value statement around the  
4 Council's discussion on grade separation and Caltrain. I believe in paying for what we ask. I  
5 also think it's good politics, as we are a small city in a big regional transportation. I want us to  
6 commit for paying our share of any grade separation.

7

8 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Lisa.

9

10 **Lisa Peschcke-Koedt:** Thanks. I would say overall I very much agree with the plan and the  
11 program. There are no huge changes, but more going to what Adrian said at the start and  
12 several others. If I look at what I think are the highest priorities, I start at—that's really from—  
13 we can't do it all and what would we want to dig deeper into and probably do first, in that  
14 context. I sort of go from the big picture down to the—the big regional part down to my home  
15 kind of. The regional—I think the most important is what will we do collectively with the  
16 regional authorities including paying our share of it whether it's Caltrain; whether it's getting  
17 BART all the way here. Electrifying Caltrain, high speed rail, does it go underground, what do  
18 we do there, I think is the most critical regional priority, and it affects everything else. If we can  
19 get that solved, I think we get so much more energy for the rest of it. That's number one. The  
20 second then is all the connectors and the arteries across town. I mean all parts of town  
21 including Barron Park, right, just everywhere. There, I think, eventually I'd like to see a muni  
22 line. Run it down El Camino. Run it down Alma. Run it down the main arteries. All the things  
23 we talked about on shuttles, a lot of great ideas here. I would love to see those connectors  
24 where the shuttles go to all the key areas across the whole town and it's only a five or ten-  
25 minute walk to each and they happen frequently, they're electric, they're dependable. Then  
26 everybody can use them, right, school children included possibly. It definitely goes to what  
27 several mentioned, the land use. You mentioned it too, Steve. Design our land use around  
28 certain centers, and then make sure that the transportation lines up to that. That's the second  
29 piece. The third one is kind of getting to my home, which is at some point I'd like an on-  
30 demand, whether it's the driverless eventually, whatever it is. I'd like something if I need a car  
31 trip and I don't want to drive, I'd like to go and just order it. I can use the app, but even if I  
32 couldn't, something that's easy. Biking and walking, I love that. I'd propose what we do across  
33 Palo Alto is kind of like what we have on Bryant and a few others. I would have roads that are  
34 designated for cars only, and I would have roads that are designated for bikes only. I would  
35 have them cross, so every two or three or four streets are just for bikes and pedestrians, and  
36 the other streets are for cars. Block off University; I think it's a good trial. Connect to Alma,  
37 connect Sand Hill to Alma, all the things that will make cars flow better, but then protect those  
38 and get lots of different criss-cross where bikers and walkers, pedestrians can safely get around  
39 town. I think that needs to be where we go given just the density of our population. Those are  
40 the main ones. Big, regional; the connector arteries; my house; and then biking and walking. I



## COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE *MINUTES*

1 definitely like the separation, the safety. A few miscellaneous that I didn't fit in anywhere else.  
2 Agree with Hamilton on the parking stuff. I also think we should have that parking app, where  
3 it shows how many open spaces are there are and you know before you come Downtown if  
4 there's an open space. I also think that the idea of closing off University Avenue—someone  
5 mentioned—I actually like that idea, but then make sure that everyone coming in connects very  
6 simply to the next part of it which is probably Alma or wherever they need to connect in a way  
7 that doesn't all back up. Those are to me the main. I love this new format of how we're going  
8 around. Thank you.

9

10 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Dan. Several comments echoing the structure of Hamilton and  
11 others here. Thank you. The Transit Element does not have any polices that relate and/or  
12 coordinate the work of the City with Stanford or the major business and major employers.  
13 There should be policies that do that for coordination, data collection ideally.

14

15 **Female:** Can I ask you to hold it up close?

16

17 **Co-Chair Garber:** Even closer?

18

19 **Female:** Yes. (inaudible)

20

21 **Co-Chair Garber:** I'll talk as closely as I can. Major business employers, major traffic  
22 generators. I also think that as important it is for us to reach out regionally, it may be helpful  
23 for us to coordinate more locally with our immediate neighbors, Mountain View and Menlo  
24 Park. Specifically in terms of coordinating data and making sure that we're using the same data  
25 sets to be able to evaluate congestion, parking, traffic, etc., which we don't currently do. That  
26 is a very important activity. There is no explicit policy that ties the City with the schools. Not  
27 that we are telling the schools what to do, but we need to be able to create that policy so that  
28 we can refer to it here. Hierarchy of streets. We need to be able to—there should be a  
29 program that identifies the scale-appropriate mode share on each of the different types of  
30 streets that are identified in Policy T-2.1 in that larger streets, local streets have for instance  
31 higher mode shares of bicycles. Obviously those that are expressways do not. There's a scale  
32 that should be applied to that. It seems to me that there could also then be a program  
33 developed around greenhouse gas allocations to each of those mode shares depending on  
34 where they are in the City and what type of street they're using, etc., which would be an  
35 interesting way to create goals around the performance of those streets. Where developments  
36 do require parking, I think there should be a program that creates incentives to incent high  
37 density parking. Parking that occurs in any of the number of six, seven, eight, nine, ten  
38 different types of machines now so that we are prioritizing the ground plane for people and  
39 getting parking off of the ground plane. That's it for me. Arthur.

40



# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE

## CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

### MINUTES

1 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Firstly, as we transition from single occupancy vehicles to the  
2 alternative, we should do that by improving the efficiency and timing of the alternatives, not by  
3 deliberately making commuting horrible. Secondly, in terms of parking, I think that new Policy  
4 4.6 which says that all new development should be completely self-parked is important under  
5 whatever definition of self-parking is. I think that the idea is that they should not push their  
6 impacts on others. In terms of the congestion goal, I think that that's actually an important  
7 goal. It ties to things such as level of service. Also ties in multimodal level of service. I see this  
8 as alternatives, not one replacing the other. Level of service is important for reducing  
9 congestion. Multimodal level of service is important for considering all needs and not just  
10 vehicle miles traveled. I think all those need to be considered. The transportation  
11 management association, as people talked about, needs to be throughout, especially in the  
12 other business districts. The Stanford Research Park currently has the lowest alternative use  
13 with the highest single occupancy vehicle. I'd like to see—start with the Stanford Research  
14 Park, do a survey of commuters and how they get there and where they come from, and figure  
15 out whether there are ways of improving that. I think that Stanford seems to be interested in  
16 that. In terms of Caltrain, I think we should do it underground and trench both south of Oregon  
17 Expressway and north of Oregon Expressway including going under the San Francisquito Creek  
18 into Menlo Park, into Atherton and basically going. I think that we need to continue that. We  
19 need four tracks at the stations; otherwise, you can't have passing expresses. You don't need  
20 four tracks elsewhere, but we probably should have a four-track four-station, a station for each  
21 track at University Avenue because that's a major hub. In terms of shuttle costs, shuttles—I  
22 know you all want to increase shuttles. Think about the cost versus availability. In particular, it  
23 costs right now \$2 per shuttle trip. Our budget for that is over a third of a million dollars. The  
24 expansion that you're talking about would double or triple that cost at least. I mean, just  
25 expanding the cross-town shuttle to running multiple hours and running all seven days a week  
26 probably will triple the cost of that shuttle, especially if it runs much more often. I'm not sure  
27 we have the money for that, so we need to figure out how we cost-effectively increase  
28 transportation. I agree entirely with no new car trips on developments. Some other cities have  
29 done it. Menlo has done it through notional offsets. We have to do it through real offsets. In  
30 other words, the only way to increase your trips is to get somebody else's car off the road. In  
31 particular, a good place to do that is with trips of kids going to school. If we can basically get  
32 those kids off the road, that's a good thing. One thing we need to do especially in this case that  
33 deals with congestion is coordinate traffic lights. It's a shame that the traffic lights on El Camino  
34 are not coordinated in Palo Alto. They're coordinated in Menlo Park. Do you know that the  
35 Stanford Shopping Center traffic light at Sand Hill Road is actually coordinated with Menlo  
36 Park? No other traffic lights in Palo Alto are coordinated. That's dumb. We need to have all  
37 our traffic lights coordinated. Thank you.

38  
39 **Co-Chair Garber:** Okay, we're going to enter round two here. Arthur, you want to give us a  
40 heads up as to how we're going to do this?



## COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE *MINUTES*

1 **Co-Chair Keller:** Sure. First, we have a few remarks from staff, and then we're going to have  
2 two-minute sessions. If you want to talk, put your card on end, and Dan will figure out who has  
3 their card on end. Then you'll have two minutes which will be timed. First, a word from staff.  
4

5 **Gil Friend:** I'm Gil Friend. I'm the City's Chief Sustainability Officer. I'm coordinating the  
6 development of our new Climate Plan and the integration of that plan with the Comp Plan. I  
7 spoke last month, so I'm not going to go into much detail about what we're doing. I just  
8 wanted to offer a couple of comments. I'm very impressed at what you've all said, both the  
9 range and the quality and in particular the direction of your comments, which seem to be very  
10 much aligned. Three thoughts. First of all, more important than figuring out is it bikes or is it  
11 shuttles or is it buses or is it Lyft or what is it is not for us, I think, to decide the specific  
12 technologies in a world that is moving very quickly, but to have a pivotal design question. I  
13 think it's this: how do we make it more convenient for anybody anywhere at any time to not  
14 have to drive. There's not banning driving necessarily, but give people better choices than that.  
15 Although, just in now Oslo is going to ban cars from the city center within four years. A  
16 thousand residents, 90,000 people commuting and similar numbers to ours. I think that's the  
17 pivotal question. Second, there is an explosion of both apps and services in this mobility field.  
18 We've tracked more than 50 so far, and they're adding every day. That suggests that our best  
19 leverage might not be only to provide services, but to provision services or create the situation  
20 in which we can invite that innovation to come to town. It's moving fast. I think one of our key  
21 jobs is to not slow it down. Third, I think a couple have mentioned this. This is an opportunity  
22 for experimentation. Nobody knows exactly what the right answer is. If we can find ways to try  
23 many things quickly and see what works on the ground rather than sit in our meetings and try  
24 to figure out what's perfect, let's test things in the marketplace. Finally, this has also come up a  
25 bit. When you look at the success of the Stanford engine in taking their single occupancy  
26 vehicle rate down from high 70 percent to high 40 percent, they've paid for what they've done  
27 by pricing parking. When using parking charges to pay for—to your question of where do we  
28 find the money for expanded shuttles and other things, there's a combination here that could  
29 be put together that potentially could pay for the things that we are looking to do. With those  
30 comments, I'll pass it on to Hillary.  
31

32 **Hillary Gitelman:** Thank you, everybody. I am just so impressed by all of your remarks. We're  
33 getting incredible content out of this format, and I hope it'll continue. I hope I don't have to  
34 carry back to City Hall the message that we're closing University Avenue. Other than that,  
35 we're doing great. Even that idea, hey, let's test it. Let's test it some evening when we can  
36 walk up and down and enjoy the restaurants in that area. Thanks so much. If you go into round  
37 two, I'm actually hoping to the extent that you can make your remarks specific to policies and  
38 programs, that would be terrific. It makes it that much easier to ensure that your comments  
39 are taken into consideration as we draft text and get it back to you. In addition to bringing back  
40 text—you'll see this next month—we're bringing back a matrix that outlines all the comments



## COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE *MINUTES*

1 we've received and tries to tell you where those comments have been addressed, if they have  
2 been addressed. If they haven't, why not. As specific as you can be, that'll help us achieve that  
3 goal.

4  
5 **Co-Chair Keller:** Great. As we mentioned, we'll give everybody two minutes. Elena will be  
6 running around and giving people a microphone. We will be stopping at 8:00. Can people send  
7 in their comments afterwards, if they ran out of time?

8  
9 **Jeremy Dennis:** (inaudible)

10  
11 **Co-Chair Keller:** You can send them to Jeremy, and then they'll be recorded. If you run out of  
12 time, you'll be able to do that. I think this is a good opportunity to respond to other people's  
13 comments, to disagree if you disagree or to expand on their comments, but not necessarily to  
14 echo them because we want to be time efficient.

15  
16 **Co-Chair Garber:** Jason, you're up, followed by Steve.

17  
18 **Jason Titus:** To the point of being able to actually create the substrate, the environment where  
19 innovation can happen around this, given that a number of things are happening in the  
20 transportation space, I think we should have a policy that clearly states that the City will work  
21 with open data standards and agree with how we measure and track traffic, how we  
22 communicate our transportation schedules. Essentially for all the survey data, we go to the  
23 greatest extent possible of both coordinating regionally on how we track these things, as well  
24 as going for hopefully as many broad standards as possible, such that it's very easy for anybody  
25 who's doing a communication application or a system or whatever to suck up our  
26 transportation patterns, anything around—if you want neighborhoods to be able to understand  
27 what the traffic patterns are, if we have sensors, we make that data available as far as how  
28 many cars per block at what time. Those are all the kinds of things that will then allow us as  
29 technology changes for people to leverage that data and make improvements. That should just  
30 be something built into the plan, saying going forward as we add new data, we track it and we  
31 make it available.

32  
33 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Steve.

34  
35 **Steve Levy:** Okay, following up with Gil's let's try some experiment ideas. Let's experiment  
36 with some studios and micro-units and see if the people own fewer cars and take fewer trips.  
37 Let's experiment with some creative zoning along El Camino to build up the density to support  
38 the bus system that people want. Let's experiment with some real parking pricing and see  
39 whether that reduces the demand for parking and makes it more efficient. Let's experiment  
40 with mixed uses that combine housing and retail, since retail is a big priority here. Let's



# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

1 experiment with ideas that do not cost the billions and billions and billions of dollars that we've  
2 talked about for extending BART, extending Caltrain, trenching in Palo Alto. Let's either put up  
3 the money or try some low-cost experiments first. Let's try one or two shuttles that run every  
4 ten minutes. Maybe we have extra school buses; they could run up and down El Camino or  
5 through the neighborhood before we commit to it. Let's follow what Gil said and experiment  
6 like hell. Who's next?

7

8 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Doria, followed by Adrian.

9

10 **Doria Summa:** Thanks. A couple of things. I wanted to agree with the comments made about  
11 the Baylands. Really it's the job of the airport to fit in as well as it can with the Baylands Master  
12 Plan. I don't think it's a good place for housing because it's near a protected wildlife area. Also,  
13 sea level rise and flood zone impacts there aren't going to really be good for that. Somebody  
14 made a point about drones being dealt with in the Comp Plan. I think that was a good point. I  
15 wanted to speak to a couple of specific policies that—one is in the Goal 3. There's policies  
16 about creating better circulation for pedestrians and bicycles particularly in the Research Park,  
17 because there are those giant super blocks. I feel it's too bad that those have been sort of  
18 ignored in the process. I would encourage those to be maintained and emphasized. There's  
19 also a policy, T-29, that regulates truck movements in the City. I didn't see that as being  
20 retained, and I think that's a very important one to retain, especially since there's so much  
21 construction and it's just so much impact from trucks. I just wanted to mention one time again  
22 that College Terrace's RPP which does not allow any non-resident parking except for two hours  
23 really helped contribute to Stanford's success with their reduction of single vehicle trips, since  
24 we were their preferred parking spot. That's it.

25

26 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Adrian, and then Shani.

27

28 **Adrian Fine:** Thank you. I really appreciate hearing from everybody. Just a few quick notes. A  
29 couple of folks have touched on the TMA and how it's starting out, but maybe isn't successful  
30 enough yet. I'd love to see either a policy or a series of policies to fully fund and expand the  
31 TMA to the whole City or areas that are heavily affected, Cal. Ave., El Camino, Downtown. As  
32 Gil mentioned, we have a couple of great example of places like Stanford, other local cities.  
33 Emeryville has a pretty successful TMA. This is something a few people touched on, and I think  
34 it could be made pretty explicit, whether that's in Goal T-1.4 or 1.5, charge for parking. We can  
35 experiment with it to begin with, but in my opinion the City really needs to start charging for  
36 this. The long-term parking is terribly expensive, and we're giving it away for free. There have  
37 been a couple of comments about how most of the commute trips in Palo Alto are from outside  
38 of Palo Alto. Personally, I'm a little uncomfortable with the notion of treating these folks  
39 differently. Palo Alto relies on people to come here and work, come here and shop, come here  
40 and use our parks also. I think we need to be careful about treating in-commuters different





## COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

1 from commuters within Palo Alto or people who live here. Finally, there seems to be a much  
2 bigger topic here, of course, land use interactions and transportation. I think that touches on a  
3 lot of policies, so I don't have a single policy. Director Gitelman, I'm sorry. I think it's something  
4 we should definitely be aware of, and we should all keep it front of mind as we look at any of  
5 these transportation policies. Vice versa, when we get to land use, we should be thinking about  
6 transportation.

7  
8 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. If you would turn your tent down. Shani, you're up and if you  
9 would pass that mike down to Ellen who's next.

10  
11 **Shani Kleinhaus:** Thank you. I'm still looking for an answer to my question last time about 750  
12 single car trips in 1995 and how that compares to what's happening today. It's here, and I'm  
13 hoping to get an answer to that question. I wanted to talk about the trees. One thing is the  
14 trees are extremely important for pedestrians, may not be as important for bikers. For  
15 pedestrians who want to walk along a street, if trees are there or not, it's really critical. I think  
16 that's somewhat of a difference between the need for bicycles or for pedestrian infrastructure  
17 and amenities. I think it would be really good to integrate the—or to refer or somehow have  
18 maybe a program that looks at the Urban Forest Master Plan in connection with parking and in  
19 connection with the street trees and the bicycle and pedestrian. It's really important to put the  
20 Urban Forest Master Plan in here. About the airport, I generally agree with what was said. I  
21 think T-57 should be retained. Back to the trees for a second. T-35 from the old plan is  
22 important to retain. It does talk about planting more and potentially narrowing streets and  
23 putting more trees in. I think that's really important to retain. I'm a little confused about some  
24 of the—well, it has here about the airport, because it still talks about Santa Clara County. I  
25 think Santa Clara County is no longer involved, so it would be good to kind of update that a little  
26 bit and figure out how Palo Alto can really defer to what we need. There is an old T-55 that is  
27 now T-7.10 about San Antonio, to have an exit onto 101 from San Antonio. I go there a lot; it's  
28 a mess. I don't know whether such exit will improve or make things worse. I don't know who  
29 does, but I think before we make that into some kind of a policy or program to support that, it  
30 would be good to have some kind of study to know whether that's a good idea or not, and not  
31 just bring it from the previous plan into this plan. Last (crosstalk).

32  
33 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you.

34  
35 **Shani Kleinhaus:** MTC is taking over ABAG. This is something that we need to consider when  
36 we're looking at what's happening here and supporting MTC on things that may be—well,  
37 they're trying to anyway.

38  
39 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Elaine, followed by Hamilton.



# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

1 **Elaine Uang:** I want to follow up on a couple of points. Program T-5.7 in the PTC draft. A lot  
2 has been said about Safe Routes to School. I think PAUSD is mentioned, but it's not the only  
3 school entity in town. I think we should consider partnership with early childhood education  
4 centers and private schools, because there are quite a few of them in the community too. It's  
5 also been mentioned regional cooperation or regional coordination with major employers. I  
6 think a policy about safe routes to work or something like that and connecting that to the  
7 regional cooperation would be helpful along with safe routes to shop. I think somebody  
8 mentioned this earlier, Charleston center, Midtown center, Town and Country, Stanford mall,  
9 working with these groups too. Goal T-6 in the PTC draft is about special needs. I think that—  
10 we might want to just do away with special needs. The principles that apply to special needs, I  
11 think, apply to everybody, right. I found this really interesting, an AARP fact sheet linking  
12 transportation and housing solutions for older adults. There was a series of frameworks that I  
13 thought were really useful. The five A's, availability, accessibility, acceptability, affordability  
14 and adaptability. Just thinking about how these elements apply to people of all abilities and all  
15 needs. I don't think we need to, like, single out a special need. I mean, transportation should  
16 be applicable to everyone. I just want to kind of consider that. They also link housing—sorry,  
17 land use with transportation quite bit. The fact that many of our uses are still segregated really  
18 just towards a lot of integrated transportation solutions that we could be prioritizing. I also  
19 want to just support Steve Levy's comment about locational solutions. I did kind of sketch out  
20 for myself after I submitted comments, but I think it's pretty clear when you look at the map.  
21 This is El Camino and you see Downtown, you see the train line, you see Cal. Ave. and you see  
22 San Antonio. We have some major pressures. SRP is down here; it's this big, fat thing down  
23 here. It's so far away from any train station, and it's just really important. We haven't been  
24 looking at any graphics, but I think it's really important to keep this sort of diagram in mind as  
25 we consider transportation and land use next time.

26

27 **Co-Chair Garber:** Hamilton, followed by Lydia.

28

29 **Hamilton Hitchings:** Thank you. I was talking to the director of transportation demand  
30 management of Pallantir. He said one of his biggest challenges to getting people out of cars is  
31 that parking is so heavily subsidized. From a cost perspective, it's just cheaper for people to  
32 drive and park. When we look at—one of the big concepts here is that companies and  
33 institutions have a much larger sphere of control in terms of managing getting people out of  
34 their cars than government. A lot of times we're sitting around thinking what can the City do to  
35 do it. When in reality an employer can say everybody's going to work at home on Tuesdays or  
36 we're going to give you, like Stanford does, we're actually going to give you cash back if you  
37 don't drive or we're not going to charge you for parking if you carpool. There are many things  
38 that employers can do. This concept of shifting from the City trying to do everything  
39 themselves, like, putting the burden on the employers both in terms of parking. For example, I  
40 really like Arthur's statements about all new development should be self-parked and no new



## COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

1 car trips for new developments. Also, we need to raise the price of parking for these  
2 employees, because our surveys have showed—many of the surveys have showed that if we  
3 increase the parking fees and then essentially put that money directly into the TMA to fund the  
4 TMA, a lot of people, like over 25 percent I think, have said they would actually switch to public  
5 transportation because all of a sudden it's becoming cheaper to take public transportation. I'm  
6 not implying we should tax and keep the money. I'm just saying we should subsidize the  
7 behavior we want instead of subsidizing—right now we're subsidizing the behavior we don't  
8 want which is we're subsidizing single vehicle trips by giving essentially every person who parks  
9 a \$3,000 subsidy for example in Downtown. Another comment was Lyft did a nice presentation  
10 to the Chamber of Commerce, where they mentioned that first mile coupons—this is  
11 something San Francisco does to get people to Caltrain—makes a big difference. The last, I  
12 have a very specific point. It's on Policy 2.9 from the PTC proposal. I like that, but I would like  
13 to strike the following language, "a project that contributes to the LOS of E or below at an  
14 intersection but provides clear benefits to the community that outweigh the impact." I don't  
15 think we should allow projects that have an LOS of E. Thank you.

16

17 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Lydia, and then Don.

18

19 **Lydia Kou:** I agree with a lot of people that mentioned about the measure matrix and so forth  
20 in terms of traffic. I really believe that to encourage that we have a traffic analysis, a  
21 comprehensive traffic analysis throughout the City. It's not only just to create the baseline, but  
22 also to understand how traffic movement is for all modes of transportation. It should be  
23 included into the general plan. The traffic analysis should also discuss traffic forecasting as well  
24 as to determine the amount of anticipated traffic and predict the levels of service at each of the  
25 intersections. I noticed in—in doing that, naturally it is also necessary in order to take into  
26 consideration the Land Use Element so that we understand what kind of projects are going to  
27 be in the pipeline, what is going to be proposed, etc., etc. Residential streets under the PTC  
28 draft, T-3 goal, Policy T-3.1, it talks about minimizing noticeable increases and finding a way to  
29 analyze traffic impacts on residential environment. It should also include a Citywide TIRE. Then  
30 moving to parking in residential districts. I think that Policy T-4.5, it's too weak, and it really  
31 shouldn't be there. The original policy that is in the Comp Plan should be restored.  
32 Additionally, parking technologies, T-4.3, I want to emphasize that please to include uses for  
33 the elderly and the disabled in this policy as well. Lastly is T-5 goal, under Policy T-5.3,  
34 introduce multimodal level of service as a measurement in the rating of performance streets. I  
35 think that doesn't take into—it takes too broad of a measurement of all the different modes of  
36 transportation and not looking at each single one of them. I think that that needs to be  
37 reevaluated.

38

39 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Don, followed by Bob.

40



# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

1 **Don McDougall:** Relative to a couple of specific things that have been said.

2

3 **Jeremy Dennis:** Mike's off.

4

5 **Don McDougall:** I think we should explore trip caps. Nobody else mentioned it, but Hamilton  
6 did. I think that that has proven successful with Facebook in Menlo Park. I think that should be  
7 explored, should be a policy on that. I think that relative to the comment about open data, I  
8 think it's really important that we provide not just the data, but the APIs to make the data  
9 accessible for people to build applications. I think somebody said something about ease of use.  
10 I think anything we talk about, the shuttles or whatever, ease of use and availability of access,  
11 there should be a policy specific to that. In terms of policies, Hillary, I really think there should  
12 be a policy that we close down University Avenue for at least a week, maybe a month. Arthur,  
13 in terms of Number 9, I think I implied that Number 9 and Number 1, congestion and  
14 sustainability, were very similar. They are. In fact, I think at some level that's the risk. I agree  
15 with you that congestion is really important. Therefore, I think that the policies that go into the  
16 congestion part of it need to be of the experimental, move fast, do something deliberate,  
17 measure it and move on category. I think many of the things in sustainability have already been  
18 written such that they're not that fast to implement. I think the congestion one should be  
19 specifically written to be fast to implement.

20

21 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Bob, followed by Ellen.

22

23 **Bob Wenzlau:** I'd like to speak to Policy T-14 which is the walking and riding. In the current  
24 policy, in the '97 version, it says improve pedestrian and bicycle access. The aspiration is really  
25 big, just make it slightly better than what it is now. I actually hardly drive, and I do my shopping  
26 on the bike. We don't use a car. What I would like to see the policy shift towards is rather than  
27 improve, it would say "prioritize pedestrian and bicycle access over vehicle access between  
28 local destinations." What this would accomplish is if I try to go from Town and Country to  
29 Edgewood Shopping Center, a bicycle is relegated to Channing Avenue. They cannot use  
30 Embarcadero, so they basically are made a second-class citizen. When I try to ride my bicycle to  
31 Town and Country, I have to contend with rapid, high moving cars on Embarcadero, accessing  
32 Alma or Central Expressway. There's a complete incongruity with the current prioritization of  
33 vehicle traffic over what we aspire to in bicycle traffic. That's my comment as to just Policy T-  
34 14, to cause a tipping towards new modes of transportation.

35

36 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Ellen, followed by Len.

37

38 **Ellen Uhrbrock:** On Goal T-8, the airport, add to the policy, this is T-8.1 about respecting the  
39 open space and residential areas (inaudible). Identify and establish at the Palo Alto Airport a  
40 school for drone pilots. It is becoming a career that you have to be licensed by the FAA. It is



## COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE *MINUTES*

1 becoming something where all pilots are going to have to have a license, and they're going to  
2 need to take lessons. I'd like to establish a school for drone pilots at the Palo Alto Airport.

3  
4 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Ellen—excuse me, Len, and then, Jennifer, you put your card  
5 down? Followed by Amy.

6  
7 **Len Filppu:** Thank you. Two quick things. One is we have to remember to have adequate room  
8 on sidewalks for pedestrians and for space for trees and livable pedestrian environments.  
9 Really, we've got to watch these developments that come right to the curb, cut down the trees  
10 and leave little room. The other thing is on the shuttle. I was surprised to hear so many people  
11 mention the shuttle. Funding is going to be a decision that the City Council or the City budget  
12 makes. I want to make sure that the comments about expanded shuttle get through to City  
13 Council, because there were a number of people who talked about it. I think it would alleviate  
14 a lot of morning rush traffic if they could go through, deeper into neighborhoods and pick up  
15 those kids who are not yet bicycle (inaudible) or having other transportation. Thank you.

16  
17 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Amy.

18  
19 **Amy Sung:** I just wanted to revisit some of the bicycle and parking ideas that I started already.  
20 That's specifically to Goal T-6, it says a high level for safety for motorists, pedestrians and  
21 bicyclists on Palo Alto streets. I would add "ease of use" to that goal. Also on the draft that is a  
22 bicycle parking there, and specifically this is T-4.13 policy, increase the number of safe,  
23 attractive and well-designed bicycle parking spaces available in the City. I would like to see that  
24 it will incorporate with some apps and the (inaudible) of technology that makes it ease of use  
25 for all people. For the Program T-49, that there's implement a comprehensive program of  
26 parking supply and demand management strategies for Downtown Palo Alto. I heard a lot  
27 about, some comments about the employment center and the (inaudible) trips. I looked  
28 around the room and thinking that there's no business representation in this room. I just think  
29 that we need to be mindful that our City comprises of residents and visitors and business. We  
30 want to make sure that we (inaudible) that is also business friendly. That's all I have. Thank  
31 you.

32 **Co-Chair Garber:** Alex, and then Julia.

33  
34 **Alex van Riesen:** I just had one brief comment. I just noticed off of Ellen's comments about it  
35 seems to be important for us to be aware of the digital divide in some of the progress that's  
36 being made in transportation with a large part of our community that's not as digitally able to  
37 do that. One of the ideas that occurred to me was a program or some way to invest in the  
38 schedules or the data that we have for the shuttles to be created so that they're actually voice  
39 or sound activated at each of the stops, where it's not a complicated thing to read or to access



## COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

1 or even an app. Possibly even something they could press a button and hear when the next  
2 buses were going to come.

3

4 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Julia.

5

6 **Julia Moran:** Just responding to, I think, it's T-2 for the parking fees. I touched on it last month  
7 as well. I just want to make sure that as we're looking at parking fees, we're doing it  
8 strategically and looking at its effect holistically and not just how many cars it's reducing  
9 Downtown, but also the effect it has on retail and the traffic on side streets in Downtown. If at  
10 all it has an effect on the make-up of who uses Downtown and making sure that people from  
11 south Palo Alto are continuing to use Downtown as much as people who can live in the more  
12 walkable, more bicycle-able areas of the City.

13

14 **Co-Chair Garber:** I'm not seeing anyone else, so it's just Arthur and myself. I have one quick  
15 comment. I would voice an abundance of caution around the closing of University Avenue.  
16 This is a topic that has come up many times over many, many years. When I was on the  
17 Planning Commission, it came up at least twice during those six years. In studies of other  
18 communities that have tried to do this, there's not a lot of data that supports doing it. If you  
19 stop street traffic, you stop retail sales at which point the street dies. Even the communities  
20 that have been able to do it successfully, like Santa Monica, it took several hundred millions of  
21 dollars to eventually make that work in 20 years. It's also a community that's three times the  
22 size, i.e., a larger economic base than Palo Alto has. That said, it is great fun. I would say that if  
23 we do experiment with it, it needs to be more than a week or a month, because the real thing  
24 that you have to track is retail sales. Knowing where that goes takes longer than a short  
25 amount of time.

26

27 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. A few comments. First, there was a comment about the cost of  
28 undergrounding. We should expect that Caltrain, high speed rail, Santa Clara County, the state,  
29 wherever pay for the cost of the cheapest way of doing grade separations that is fully costed,  
30 which means that if it involves replacing houses or whatever, that they pay for the cost of  
31 removing those houses and that we pay the incremental cost of doing it right, that we bear that  
32 cost. We should not bear the entire cost of undergrounding Caltrain within our midst.  
33 Secondly, with respect to San Antonio Road, if you look at the congestion on 101 south, a lot of  
34 that congestion happens up through where Charleston enters and then the congestion eases up  
35 afterwards. That's because it's a mess. Data shows it's a very dangerous intersection. More  
36 accidents occur there than anywhere else between Highway 85 and the San Mateo  
37 County/Santa Clara County border. If you have an entrance on San Antonio Road, you can have  
38 an auxiliary line all the way to the Charleston entrance, to the Rengstorff entrance/exit and that  
39 would considerably ease traffic. About baselines, we should have baseline car trips, should be  
40 based on actual uses, not theoretical, based on fully occupied stuff, no BS, actual measured,



# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

1 current car trips. Measurement within the last couple of years. I've seen estimates say, well, if  
2 it was fully occupied, blah, blah, blah. BS. The other thing is with respect to T-4.5, the intent  
3 there was to protect residential areas with a residential permit parking program. I don't think  
4 that the replacement should be going back to the previous policy, but in fact combining them,  
5 was that to create residential permit parking. By the way that was carefully worded. It's not  
6 residential preference parking; it's residential permit parking as in like College Terrace. That  
7 was the intent. Anyway. In terms of University Avenue, I think that the issue is we should think  
8 about timing Lytton Road towards Middlefield, so that you can stay on there. I'm sorry. Louis  
9 Road—sorry. Lytton Road towards Alma and Hamilton towards Middlefield, so that you can  
10 follow around. If you take the loop on High and Middlefield or Cowper, you do that and you  
11 avoid a lot of traffic. I think that would make traffic more efficient. Then you can experiment  
12 with the idea of closing down University Avenue for pedestrians. Unless you get the traffic  
13 around there and used to it and realizing it's fast to go around, you're not going to be able to do  
14 it.

15

16 **Co-Chair Garber:** We have exactly a few minutes before 8:00. Joyce Beatty has submitted a  
17 card to speak even though we have—our public speaking—does she know that you're here?  
18 Never mind then. Okay. We are ...

19

20 **Co-Chair Keller:** We can read her comment.

21

22 **Co-Chair Garber:** Did she have a comment card?

23

24 **Co-Chair Keller:** Yes. She said something about a left-turn barrier proposed at 455 East  
25 Charleston Road. I'm not sure where that is, but let's put that in the record.

26

27 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you.

28

29 **Female:** Is it Stevenson House?

30

31 **Co-Chair Garber:** Stevenson House.

32

33 **Female:** It's part of the left-hand turn issues (inaudible).

34

35 **Co-Chair Garber:** Okay, thank you. Arthur take us into the last 30 minutes. Annette, go.

36

37 **Annette Glanckopf:** Arthur provoked an idea. I'm very concerned about retail in Palo Alto.  
38 People can certainly walk to retail if there's more of the neighborhood commercial centers. We  
39 all know about the demise of Alma Plaza. It'd be great if we could find some other area, maybe  
40 near south Palo Alto on El Camino, etc., that we could make a commercial area that people



# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

1 could walk to. The comment that I'd really like to make though is a concern that's been  
2 expressed by quite a few people is in the retail centers, Cubberley, Mitchell Park, etc. Many of  
3 the folks that have disappeared from Downtown because of the RPP, anecdotally we hear they  
4 may be parking in some of these free parking areas. I'm just concerned about that. It's not  
5 really a policy or program, but what we do in one part of the City, squeezing the toothpaste, it  
6 sort of moves to the next area.

7

8 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. We are—Lisa, did you want two minutes?

9

10 **Lisa Peschcke-Koedt:** (inaudible)

11

12 **Co-Chair Garber:** Oh. Okay, we are one minute ahead of schedule. Arthur, the next 30  
13 minutes.

14

#### 15 **4. Subcommittees**

16 **Co-Chair Keller:** I'm not going to take the whole next 30 minutes. Basically, this is introduce  
17 the topic of subcommittees. If you see on the at-places memo, it's approximately page 8, is the  
18 initial list of assignments. We have three committees that we're kicking off. One is on  
19 community services and facilities, so we're doing that. This is the one that we did before. This  
20 is the element that we had recently had, and that's going to the Council. This is the opportunity  
21 for a subcommittee to work with staff to position that for how that goes to the Council. Then  
22 we have the transportation subcommittee, and that's going to be a standard element  
23 subcommittee using more of a process that I'm going to describe in a moment. Then we have  
24 the sustainability subcommittee. The sustainability committee, we're going to operate this in  
25 the following sequence. The sustainability subcommittee will meet to propose policies and  
26 programs for each of the elements that come up, before the discussion item. Before the  
27 discussion item, the sustainability committee will meet and talk about proposals for policies  
28 and programs involving that element for sustainability. That then goes to the input for the  
29 discussion item, where discussion meetings, there's one or two meetings on the discussion  
30 meetings. That input along with the input from the public, the input from the PTC draft and the  
31 original Comp Plan as well as the CAC member comments flow through that. After the last  
32 discussion meeting of a element, then the element subcommittee comes along. What the  
33 element subcommittee does is essentially put together the issues in a way where we have sort  
34 of a matrix that says here's an issue and here are the alternatives regarding that issue. An issue  
35 may be a program; it may be a policy; it may be higher level. Essentially what the idea is, is to  
36 arrange that so that the action item that we have when this comes back to us for action, we  
37 have the issues keyed up for us to have that discussion. At the action meeting, what we will  
38 then do is we will elucidate these alternatives, and sometimes another alternative will come to  
39 the fore, sometimes there will be controversies that we didn't originally understand, that may  
40 be people realizing in reviewing the materials that came out. The main purpose of the action is





## COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

1 to really elucidate the pros and cons so that we can tee that up for the Council. During the  
2 action meetings, we will discuss the pros and cons of the various alternatives. Then the  
3 subcommittee will then use that input and add to it to produce the pros and cons for each of  
4 the issues for each of the alternatives. That is then fed to the Council so that they can choose  
5 among the alternatives for each of the issues, and then that feeds back. After the Council  
6 meets and makes their decision, basically to come up with the choices that they want in terms  
7 of the direction the City should go, then the sustainability committee will meet again and create  
8 an index of the sustainability policies for an eventual cross-reference. The idea is eventually the  
9 Comp Plan will be—there'll be cross-references; there will be a hypertext document and cross-  
10 references and all that. It makes sense for the sustainability committee to produce that index  
11 for the sustainability parts of the various elements. The reason the sustainability committee is  
12 sort of at the beginning and the end and the element committee is in the middle is to avoid a  
13 Brown Act problem. That essentially means that you can't really have extra people who are  
14 members of the CAC going to the committees because we want to make sure that there's not a  
15 majority of the committee being there. We've limited it to nine people, because there are 22  
16 voting members of the committee. It makes for a nice odd number to do that conveniently. In  
17 terms of the community services and facilities subcommittee, if anybody else wants to add to  
18 that committee, please let us know. We already know that Heidi Emberling has asked to be  
19 added to that committee. In addition, if anybody wants to add to the sustainability committee,  
20 that's certainly welcome. If you want to swap with somebody on the transportation  
21 committee, that's possible. Essentially that's balanced and has a number of people on there.  
22 Shani, you'd like to add to sustainability?

23

24 **Shani Kleinhaus:** (inaudible)

25

26 **Co-Chair Keller:** Okay, great. That also helps with north/south balance. With that, I'll entertain  
27 comments and questions if people understand what's going on. We're trying to feel our way  
28 through this process, and hopefully it'll work. I think, Bob, you—go ahead.

29

30 **Bob Wenzlau:** First, I wanted to compliment you both for taking on this committee approach.  
31 It sounds like you came out with a well-thought plan. The problem, I guess, I had was I didn't  
32 quite follow everything you were saying, Arthur. I was hoping maybe at one point this might be  
33 written as an email or a note that basically—maybe perhaps it's in here, the subcommittee  
34 process. How could we learn a little bit more about what you just said?

35

36 **Co-Chair Keller:** Yes. What I said is actually on numbered pages 6 and 7. Right before the  
37 subcommittee assignments is a memo that I essentially summarized. It's in the at-places  
38 memo. If you look there, the first page is a table of contents, then a blank page, then minutes.  
39 The next page, the third sheet is a CAC meeting process followed by the subcommittee memo  
40 followed by the subcommittee assignments.



## COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

1 **Jeremy Dennis:** If I could add, this was provided Friday to the committee as well. This was an  
2 email that I sent out the next day. It wasn't like (inaudible) separately because we didn't want  
3 it to get mixed up with everything else.

4  
5 **Co-Chair Garber:** Bob, it also occurs to us that it may be helpful for the two Co-Chairs to attend  
6 the first subcommittee meeting for a brief amount of time to go through and answer more  
7 specific questions at that time. Basically, what we've tried to do is define what the deliverables  
8 are and when the beginning and ends of these are. Then the rest of it's up to how the  
9 committee wants to organize themselves. Elaine.

10  
11 **Elaine Uang:** How should we proceed with the Transportation Element, since we've already  
12 discussed that? It sounds like you wanted the sustainability subcommittee to look at it.  
13 Another question, do we just also self-organize our meeting times?

14  
15 **Co-Chair Keller:** The first thing is that unfortunately the sustainability stuff, it's kind of hard to  
16 do that for the transportation, because we already had the meetings. Also hard to do for  
17 community services and facilities. That's because we're learning our way through the process.  
18 For the transportation subcommittee, staff will put together materials to summarize what we  
19 have from the results of our meeting that'll be input to what the subcommittee has. I think that  
20 staff wants to say more. Jeremy.

21  
22 **Jeremy Dennis:** Thank you. The first thing I want to say is that, as it says in the memo that  
23 came from the Co-Chairs, the staff concurred with the—it was part of the process to help put  
24 this together, so we're fully onboard. Our instructions were primarily to make sure that we  
25 don't disrupt the timeline that we already have. That cannot change. There's limited resources  
26 related to our ability to help be part of this. I mean, it's myself and Elena; you're looking at the  
27 entire Comp Plan team for the City. We have to be noticing these meetings per your rules.  
28 They're public meetings. Based on what was prepared, we felt as though that this would work  
29 really well. In fact, I concur with the sustainability aspects of this. I mean, I think there's asks  
30 that probably—we could get some of that in, but we already have a draft of the Community  
31 Services Element, because we weren't sure if we were going to have committees or not. I  
32 welcome some participation related to that committee, but it's going to look radically different  
33 than what subsequent committees will look like. We've got time to do the work that you see  
34 detailed in the memo. That's an offline conversation we can have related to community  
35 services.

36  
37 **Co-Chair Garber:** Whitney, and then Bob.

38  
39 **Whitney McNair:** Thank you. I recognize that as a non-voting member there may be  
40 limitations on our ability or my ability or the three of us who are non-voting members to



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

1 participate. It was decided that we wouldn't be part of the subcommittees. Is there any  
2 opportunity for the non-voting members to participate in those subcommittees? I could see  
3 wanting to participate in some of these as we go forward.

4

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

6

7 **Jeremy Dennis:** In a word, yes. In fact, it would not be through a voting capacity, but we  
8 absolutely welcome participation because there's input that, I think, the non-voting members  
9 can provide related to particular subcommittees. We can work out those details.

10

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

12

13 **Bob Wenzlau:** Could you reiterate the—maybe it was the statement that the sustainability  
14 committee would not be touching the Transportation Element. I thought I heard that, and I  
15 would disagree because I feel that transportation is such a core element of our climate impact.  
16 It sounded like I heard that that was water under the bridge.

17

18 **Co-Chair Keller:** Unless the transportation subcommittee as a subcommittee can't provide  
19 input to the process before the discussion meetings, because the discussion meetings have  
20 already taken place. To the extent that there is overlap between the sustainability  
21 subcommittee and the transportation subcommittee—I think there are at least several  
22 members in both. To the extent that there are, if there are meetings among the sustainability  
23 subcommittee on the Transportation Element and there are also meetings among the  
24 transportation subcommittee on the Transportation Element, that presents a Brown Act  
25 problem. What I would suggest is—unfortunately, we're doing this in learning as we go  
26 process. I'm not sure how to better handle that. The consideration is we have to stay within—  
27 we were told we're a Brown Act committee, so we have to stay within the limits of not having a  
28 majority which essentially will be 11. I think that there's overlap between the committee right  
29 now.

30

31 **Co-Chair Garber:** Let me—too many microphones. Let me make a suggestion to run by. We're  
32 doing this real-time guys here, Jeremy and Arthur. We have both of these things. I think it  
33 would be valuable for the transportation committee to meet. Maybe what we could ask to  
34 have happen is that the sustainability committee meets before the transportation  
35 subcommittee meets, so that they could put together recommendations that are then  
36 transferred by report, and then that activity is ended. Then the transportation committee  
37 starts.

38



## COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE *MINUTES*

1 **Co-Chair Keller:** I think that that would only work if there's a CAC meeting in between and  
2 there's a separation. Essentially, otherwise, you have 11 people meeting in concert which  
3 doesn't work. Lisa.

4  
5 **Lisa Peschcke-Koedt:** Just a proposal because I'm looking at the sustainability committee has  
6 four people. Only Bob isn't on the transportation. What if we combined it and did the  
7 sustainability as part of transportation and Bob took my spot? We're in the same  
8 neighborhood; I don't mind ceding my spot on the transportation to Bob. Then you have all the  
9 sustainability on the transportation.

10  
11 **Co-Chair Garber:** That is a very rare and wonderful suggestion. Anybody else? I don't see any  
12 problem with that.

13  
14 **Co-Chair Keller:** No, just as long as we do that without having any extra people on  
15 sustainability who are not on transportation until the other elements meet. With respect to  
16 transportation for sustainability, yes, that works. With respect to sustainability for other things,  
17 we'll do that in a different manner. In particular, it will be for land use with potentially other  
18 members.

19  
20 **Lisa Peschcke-Koedt:** Bob, are you okay with that?

21  
22 **Bob Wenzlau:** Yeah. I think we'll ride the Marguerite or drink the margarita.

23  
24 **Co-Chair Garber:** Don.

25  
26 **Don McDougall:** Different question. You said subcommittees can build and do it the way they  
27 wanted to. Can a subcommittee create a subcommittee?

28  
29 **Co-Chair Garber:** I believe the answer is no.

30  
31 **Jeremy Dennis:** We have very limited time and resources. These meetings do need to be  
32 publicly accessed and publicly made available and noticed and the like. I would suggest that we  
33 try to do as much work within the subcommittee structure as possible. We believe that the  
34 schedule as it is allows for that. Our feeling is that subcommittee work between elements can  
35 happen in one good, substantial meeting because of the way that it's been structured related to  
36 bringing out the issues of—we called it the three Cs. I'm blanking on what it was. Issues of  
37 controversy and consensus.

38  
39 **Co-Chair Keller:** It's issues of consensus and controversy, the two Cs.

40



## COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE *MINUTES*

1 **Jeremy Dennis:** Two Cs, I added a C. The way that it's structured, we believe that in the  
2 timeframe of a couple hours that the subcommittee can accomplish its goal and inform the full  
3 committee.

4  
5 **Co-Chair Keller:** Similarly it would be the second after the action meeting, it's coming up with  
6 the pros and cons which is a somewhat subscribed process that would then go to the Council.

7  
8 **Bob Wenzlau:** I just have one question.

9  
10 **Co-Chair Keller:** Bob.

11  
12 **Bob Wenzlau:** On the sustainability committee, is it possible that we could tap into Gil Friend,  
13 given his role? Secondly, could we have a copy of the draft Climate Action Plan as long as we  
14 don't—I know that's Gil's space. I just wanted to voice that we need that data, because I think  
15 part of our role is to connect these two things. Thank you.

16  
17 **Co-Chair Garber:** Darn, I wanted to answer that, but here's Jeremy.

18  
19 **Jeremy Dennis:** I've already had a conversation with Gil, and he's made a commitment to align  
20 what he's doing with what the sustainability committee is doing. He's excited about that  
21 opportunity, and we've already talked about it.

22  
23 **Hillary Gitelman:** I can't resist adding one thing, which is we're going to try this out. We'll see  
24 if it works. I think everyone would agree we will revisit as we need to. I mean, we've  
25 outlined—the Co-Chairs and Jeremy have done a great job putting down in that memo what is  
26 kind of a complicated set of concepts. Let's try it out and talk again if we need to.

27  
28 **Co-Chair Garber:** I will add that I think the place—this first set of meetings that the  
29 sustainability group will have, as well as the other subcommittees, this is the opportunity for  
30 you to bring in other—I mean there's any number of reports that are going to deal with either  
31 transportation or land, sustainability, etc. This is the place to make sure that those things are  
32 coordinated or a part of the overall view that the CAC should be dealing with. The embedded  
33 objective of that first set of meetings is for the subcommittee to come to the meeting where  
34 the CAC is to take action, meaning we need to have the discussion around the things that are  
35 controversial and air all of those issues. We're looking for you to tee up those topics for us, so  
36 we can have focused discussion around those things. To do that, you're going to have to have  
37 as much information as you need or want prior to coming up with that agenda.

38  
39 **Co-Chair Keller:** I'd like to—I'll give the microphone to Steve in a moment. I'll take the  
40 opportunity to respond to something that Annette brought up earlier, which is about the—



## COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

1 which were we using, the original Comp Plan, '98 Comp Plan, versus the PTC. My  
2 understanding is we're using the original Comp Plan as a base, as modified by the goal structure  
3 that's changed by the Council. The PTC proposals have the weights as public comments, CAC  
4 comments, the other kinds of documents that people submit. They all have the same weight in  
5 some sense. Then what happens is we look at that in terms of alternatives. For example, if  
6 the—just to come up with an example. Suppose somebody says I believe buildings should be  
7 colored. Somebody says one alternative is to make them red, one alternative is to make them  
8 yellow, and one alternative is to make them green. If red is in the original Comp Plan, and  
9 yellow is in the PTC draft, and green is a comment from the public, maybe blue is from the CAC  
10 member, then they'll all be listed. The issue is what color should buildings be, and those are the  
11 alternatives that are laid out. Then what happens is if there's a consensus that says that the  
12 people think that the—for example, on a particular issue, if everybody agrees that really the  
13 other issues don't make sense and they should all be yellow, then that's the consensus that  
14 comes back which the CAC as a whole may agree with or disagree with. If there's controversy,  
15 then it goes forward. Sometimes there are edits that are pretty clear should be made, and that  
16 will come forward as a consensus. Some changes there will be controversy about and,  
17 therefore, that controversy should be identified and elucidated by the subcommittee. Steve.

18  
19 **Steve Levy:** That was my question essentially. We've had—this is the fourth meeting. You  
20 keep saying disagree with everybody; that's how we get the issues out. The meetings I've heard  
21 have been very collegial. I guess my question is are you serious that these committees should  
22 bring out differing point of views? It's not what the nine people on the Transportation Element  
23 committee think are good ideas. Their task is explicitly to come back and search out possible  
24 areas of controversy; otherwise, we haven't had them, so they won't get here unless the  
25 committee brings them to us.

26  
27 **Co-Chair Keller:** First of all, collegiality does not mean that there aren't disagreements. One  
28 could disagree without with being disagreeable.

29  
30 **Steve Levy:** I'm telling you what I heard in the room.

31  
32 **Co-Chair Keller:** I also heard that there were points where people did agree and points where  
33 people did not agree. I think as they go through the elements, they'll find that out from the  
34 comments that were put together. There are actually a number of different comments that can  
35 be synthesized. Where there's agreement, that's great. To the extent that there is consensus  
36 and the subcommittee identifies that there is consensus of opinion and that things should  
37 change in a certain way or stay the same in a certain way, that's great. We don't want more  
38 controversy than there actually is.

39



## COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE *MINUTES*

1 **Steve Levy:** That's not exactly an answer to my question, but that's okay. My question was, is  
2 the committee supposed to bring the disagreements that they heard or are they supposed to  
3 vote that the nine of them agree on something? Even though there were disagreements in the  
4 room, they all agree.

5  
6 **Jeremy Davis:** Let me try to answer that question. We had a pretty substantive conversation  
7 about the role of the subcommittee, what that would look like. One of the things that we  
8 wanted to avoid was the subcommittee simply being the same version of what we're doing  
9 here. That is not what the subcommittee's going to do. It's not nine people sitting around,  
10 sharing their own opinions and ideas in the same way that they're doing here. They're working  
11 on behalf of the committee to identify what they heard at these meetings, putting together a  
12 document that identifies areas of consensus and areas of contention. Then bringing that back  
13 for the—bringing that back in tandem with the draft element based on what we've heard as the  
14 accompanying document to have that major discussion. Frankly, it'd be a waste of time to have  
15 a subcommittee that just did the same thing that we're doing here. That's not what we're  
16 doing.

17  
18 **Hillary Gitelman:** If I can piggyback on that, which was a great point. I am filled with optimism  
19 after the meetings that we have had, that there are not significant areas of disagreement.  
20 There are areas around the edges. There are maybe priorities that some of us would think  
21 should be a little different than others of us. I think we're going to find as we go forward that  
22 there are going to be very few issues that we have to, like, put a knife in the table and say this is  
23 something we really have to discuss as an area of controversy. It's more going to be identifying  
24 those areas where there's a little bit of discussion that needs to happen before we can coalesce  
25 around a set of policies or programs to achieve what I think we all are working towards. A lot of  
26 commonality in the room.

27  
28 **Co-Chair Garber:** Don.

29  
30 **Don McDougall:** As an area of controversy, Arthur, are we saying that this document is not the  
31 document we're going by and the original plan is the document we're going by? I mean, the 15-  
32 year-old plan.

33  
34 **Co-Chair Keller:** My understanding is that the direction from the Council is to start with the  
35 Comp Plan, the '98 Comp Plan, and to use the PTC changes as proposed changes along with all  
36 the other proposed changes.

37  
38 **Don McDougall:** I would ask Hillary to—if she might have an opinion on this. Sitting through  
39 that whole meeting, the Council meeting the last time, with Council Member DuBois, for  
40 example, now I understand their confusion because this is a mess. They're all dealing with



## COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

1 whatever, and so let's us agree to deal in this. That's where we ended up with T-9 as being  
2 something different. They didn't say let's add congestion as T-11, onto the ten. They said let's  
3 add it as T-9 onto the eight. That was the point at which, I think, they all agreed, my God, this is  
4 a mess. Let's consolidate on this one. That's what I heard.

5  
6 **Hillary Gitelman:** Thanks for the question. I think it is going to vary a little bit by element.  
7 Each time the City Council has been asked to weigh in on the vision and goal structure, they've  
8 taken a slightly different approach. They've come up with a kind of amalgam or hybrid of the  
9 '98 plan and the PTC version. It makes it that much more challenging for us. There's nothing  
10 we can do but refer to both documents as we go along. We'll see what the Council does on the  
11 upcoming elements, if they continue that practice of trying to blend them. I think what Arthur  
12 is suggesting is we really all have to be familiar and conversant with the existing '98 plan. That's  
13 the plan we're trying to update. The PTC recommendations are a great resource, and the  
14 Council is drawing from those goals and that work as they give us direction on the structure. I  
15 think there's no way around it. We have to be conversant on the '98 plan, and we have to have  
16 some familiarity with that PTC recommendation so we can draw on it when we need to.

17  
18 **Co-Chair Garber:** Elaine.

19  
20 **Elaine Uang:** Question on timing. It says something about the subcommittees have to make  
21 recommendations no more than two weeks prior to the next CAC meeting. Does this mean  
22 then the transportation subcommittee has to give staff recommendations by November 3rd?

23 **Co-Chair Keller:** It's by the CAC meeting that's the action meeting on that element. Similarly,  
24 it's by the Council meeting that deals with that element. The reason there's three weeks there  
25 is because of the fact that the staff report, the CMR, has to be out a certain time in advance of  
26 the Council meeting agenda for that item. That's why. It's not November 3rd; if you look at the  
27 schedule, it's sometime from now.

28  
29 **Elaine Uang:** It's when?

30  
31 **Co-Chair Garber:** We can share a—for those of you that are interested in a Gantt chart or a  
32 diagram of this because it's all filled out.

33  
34 **Co-Chair Keller:** Just to respond, I think that the Transportation Element—since we're doing  
35 that in January and because of the holidays, we're probably expecting that the transportation  
36 subcommittee will do its work before the Christmas holidays or seasonal holidays, whichever  
37 ones you celebrate.

38  
39 **Co-Chair Garber:** (inaudible)





## COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

1 **Lisa Peschcke-Koedt:** Kind of a question for Hillary. Going to Don's point about which plan,  
2 would it work if we used the City Council's updated revise as sort of the master and then looked  
3 at the other two—looked at the original, looked at the Planning Commission's, but use that so  
4 we had sort of one source of truth. Would that be all right? At the end of the day, Council has  
5 to agree, right? Then we'd all be looking at one document, but obviously referring to the others  
6 because they inform it. Right? Would that work or we really have to start with the old one?  
7

8 **Hillary Gitelman:** No, no. If I'm understanding your question, I mean, the whole point of going  
9 to City Council for guidance on the visions and goals is they're going to give us guidance. That's  
10 what we should be following, and that's what we'll try and reflect in your staff materials. It will  
11 draw from both the '98 plan and the PTC version, because that's what the Council's been doing.  
12

13 **Lisa Peschcke-Koedt:** I think Don's question was which document do we kind of start with for  
14 edits or questions. I think we use the Council document.  
15

16 **Hillary Gitelman:** The Council document. The Council really is weighing in on just goals and  
17 vision statements. They're not getting to the level of policies and programs. To look deeper  
18 into policies and programs, I don't think there's any way around starting from the '98 document  
19 and being familiar with what's in the PTC version.  
20

21 **Co-Chair Garber:** Folks, we've made a promise to adjourn by 8:30, which is one minute from  
22 now. Lydia, I'm afraid I'm not going to be able to get to you.  
23

24 **Lydia Kou:** (inaudible)  
25

26 **Co-Chair Garber:** Apropos.  
27

### **Feedback for Continuous Improvement:**

28 [No discussion of this item.]  
29  
30

### **Future Meetings:**

31 **Co-Chair Garber:** Our next meeting is November 17th in this room, I believe.  
32  
33

### **Adjournment:**

34 **Co-Chair Garber:** May I hear a motion to adjourn?  
35  
36

37 **Female:** So moved.  
38



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

- 1 **Co-Chair Keller:** I'll just say quickly. If you have any follow-up comments, please send them to
- 2 Jeremy within one week from today. We don't have this open-ended process. The meeting is
- 3 adjourned.
- 4
- 5 **Co-Chair Garber:** So moved by Alex and Lisa and someone. And a second. We are adjourned.