



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

**TUESDAY, JULY 19, 2016**

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

1 **Call to Order: 5:33 P.M.**

2

3 **Co-Chair Garber:** Okay everybody, let's adjourn—start our meeting. We could adjourn it right  
4 now I suppose.

5

6 **Co-Chair Keller:** Convene.

7

8 **Co-Chair Garber:** Convene our meeting. Thank you, Arthur. It is 5:33 on the official Arthur  
9 clock. Will staff please call roll?

10

11 Present: Emberling, Fine, Garber, Glanckopf, Hetterly, Hitchings, Keller, Kleinhaus, Kou,  
12 Levy, McDougall, Moran, Nadim, Packer, Peschcke-Koedt, Summa, Sung, Titus,  
13 Uang, Uhrbrock, van Riesen

14 Absent: Filppu, McNair, Wenzlau

15 **Co-Chair Garber:** The first thing in front of us is the Consent Calendar, the approval of the  
16 revised draft Transportation Element. Just before I ask to hear a motion, I thought I would  
17 report some good news and the bad news. The good news is that we have a complete draft,  
18 and it's looking pretty good. The bad news is that the old Transportation Element had 52  
19 policies and 56 programs. We currently have 98 policies and 84 programs. May I hear a motion  
20 to—I'm sorry.

21

22 **Hillary Gitelman:** Do you want to go to the Oral Communications (inaudible).

23

24 **Co-Chair Keller:** Yes, Oral Communications.

25

26 **Co-Chair Keller:** Yes. I apologize. Oral Communications comes first.

27

28 **Oral Communication:**

29 **Co-Chair Keller:** We have one speaker. If there are any other speakers that would like to  
30 speak, please fill out a speaker card. Rita Vrhel.

31

32 **Rita Vrhel:** Hi. I'm Rita Vrhel. I'm here to speak—I don't know where my topic goes with what  
33 you're meeting on tonight. I know you're at land use and transportation. I don't know if



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

1 groundwater extraction has anything to do with ground use or whether it has to do with saving  
2 resources. I'm not exactly sure of the title. I'm one of the members of  
3 savepaloaltosgroundwater.org; although, I am speaking for myself tonight.

4  
5 Savepaloaltosgroundwater.org's primary goal is to secure City policies, rules, regulations and  
6 procedures which acknowledge the vital importance of our community groundwater and work  
7 to conserve and protect this groundwater. I believe current City policies neither value nor  
8 conserve our groundwater. The recent basement construction at 736 Garland Avenue was  
9 metered by the City for the first time and pumped out 30.3 million gallons for one residential  
10 basement. There was a water truck that came once a week as prescribed. Neighbors could use  
11 minimal amounts of the water for their own use. The majority of this water was shunted  
12 directly to the storm drain. There are four additional residential basements that are slated to  
13 be approved soon. Three of those are over on Garland, which is exactly in the same area. The  
14 pumped one was 736. There's 762 and 736. I think there's a different one. I have the wrong  
15 number here. There's estimated to be 12 sites for dewatering considered in Palo Alto for 2016.  
16 Last year 14 residential basements pumped out 126 million gallons. I don't know if including  
17 basement square footage in the floor area ratio is a way to handle this. Other ideas might be to  
18 limit the length of groundwater extraction; tighter construction schedules; limiting the amount  
19 of groundwater that could be extracted; having meaningful penalties for excessive groundwater  
20 construction; a revision of the City map so that areas such as Garland, where an old alluvial  
21 plain has groundwater very close to the surface, are included in the area of constricted  
22 groundwater extraction; or maybe an entirely different idea which your Committee will devise.  
23 Thank you for listening. I hope that groundwater extraction does warrant discussion by your  
24 group. Thank you.

25  
26 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. I am seeing no one else that would like to speak. We'll move on  
27 to Staff Comments.

28  
29 **Staff Comments:**

30 **Hillary Gitelman:** Thank you. I have actually just one thing. The Council's on break this month,  
31 so we're relieved of the responsibility to share with you anything that might have happened at  
32 their meetings. We are hoping to bring the Transportation Element to them that you're going  
33 to hopefully act on this evening at the first meeting back on August 15th. Just one other issue  
34 which is the issue—it's actually the next item on the agenda. I'll let the Co-Chairs talk about this  
35 with regard to subcommittee. It's meeting attendance. I wanted to let the group know that we  
36 did review attendance for all of the CAC members. There's something in our rules that calls for  
37 people to be in attendance at least 75 percent of the meetings or there's a standard like that.  
38 There are two members who have fallen below that standard. We sent them letters saying  
39 basically our rules say that you've effectively resigned if you don't hit that standard. Please get  
40 in touch with us, explain if there are any extraordinary or extenuating circumstances. I will



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

1 share with the group at or before the next meeting what the result of that is. There were also a  
2 couple of members who are getting to that threshold, who will get friendly warnings from us.  
3 We do, of course, want all of you to continue working with us if possible. I wanted to bring that  
4 section of our rules to your attention. Dan.

5  
6 **Agenda Items:**

7 **1. Meeting Attendance**

8 **2. Consent Calendar: Approval of the revised Draft Transportation Element**

9 **3. Action: Land Use & Community Design Element**

10 **a. Introduction of Draft Element Framework, Including Growth Management Policies**  
11 **and Programs (Staff)**

12 **b. Report from the Land Use Subcommittee**

13 **c. Discussion of Draft Framework**

14 **Co-Chair Garber:** We have several agenda items. Arthur, if you would address meeting  
15 attendance and other clarifications to our rules.

16  
17 **Co-Chair Keller:** The first thing is let me actually read Ground Rule 10. The last people saw this  
18 was probably a year ago, and we've probably all forgotten it. I'll read it exactly. Absence when  
19 decisions are made. When members cannot attend a meeting of the CAC, they should  
20 communicate their views to the Chair prior to that meeting. However, members must be  
21 present to vote on decisions. Failure to attend meetings on a regular basis will constitute a  
22 resignation from the Committee, and members will be replaced if they do not attend at least 75  
23 percent of regularly scheduled meetings. That's what the rule is. We'll be paying more  
24 attention to that in the future. A couple of clarifications. Dan and I have worked on this,  
25 although, it's a little—we'll clarify this and send out a memo. I just want to give a brief  
26 description. First of all, only the voting members present at the time of the vote will be  
27 recorded or those that are given in advance as described by Rule 10 will be recorded for votes  
28 in the future. Secondly, it's the Co-Chairs' responsibility to assign CAC members to  
29 subcommittees. The Co-Chairs at their discretion may also decide to remove members from  
30 the subcommittee. Reasons for removal may include but not be limited to subcommittee  
31 members being uncivil to other members in subcommittee and/or members of the public  
32 and/or disrupting the progress of the meeting. It is part of the Co-Chairs' responsibility to  
33 maintain a safe and respectful meeting place for the CAC members and the public to express  
34 their opinions. One of the things that we haven't talked about in the past and I just want to  
35 clarify is we haven't said that the subcommittees can elect Chair and Co-Chair. We've talked  
36 about this, and it is reasonable for subcommittees to elect Chair and Co-Chair if they wish in  
37 order to have an orderly process of the meeting. It doesn't have to be run by staff. You could  
38 appoint the Chair and Co-Chair if you wish. I just want to clarify that as a description. The  
39 members of the CAC and subcommittees that miss meetings cannot request special, unnoticed  
40 meetings with staff to discuss matters germane to the CAC or subcommittee business that



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

1 should be discussed with the entire CAC or subcommittee. However, any member can submit  
2 written comments to the staff to be included in distributions to the entire CAC and its  
3 subcommittees regarding any topic at any time. The next thing is that members of the public  
4 may speak at the beginning of CAC meetings for 3 minutes and subcommittee meetings for 5  
5 minutes. They may be asked questions by a CAC or subcommittee member during the meeting  
6 as appropriate. Just as is done, for example, Adrian and Dan and I are familiar with Planning  
7 Commission meetings. You would ask a member of the public a question if you want a  
8 clarifying comment or if somebody has expertise that you wish to avail yourself of. Members of  
9 the public will not sit at a table and participate in meetings but may observe the entire meeting.  
10 To avoid a Brown Act problem, only CAC members who are also members of the subcommittee  
11 may attend a subcommittee meeting. Other CAC members including ex officio members may  
12 apply to be a member of the subcommittee. If appointed by the Co-Chairs, Dan and I, they're  
13 expected to attend and participate in the subcommittee meetings. You're either a member or  
14 you're not a member. If you're a member of public, you can attend and speak at the beginning.  
15 If you're not a member of the public, if you're a member of the CAC, a voting member or ex  
16 officio member, you should only attend if you are appointed to the CAC to avoid a Brown Act.  
17 Appointed to the subcommittee, ex officio members can apply just as voting members to be  
18 appointed to the subcommittee. Yes?

19  
20 **Hamilton Hitchings:** What about nonvoting members like Stanford and PAUSD representatives?

21  
22 **Co-Chair Keller:** They are ex officio members. That's what they are. They can attend if they  
23 are appointed to the subcommittee. If they're appointed to the subcommittee, they can  
24 attend. If they're not appointed to the subcommittee, they should not be attending just like  
25 other CAC members who are not on the subcommittee. Basically they should be treated the  
26 same way in that regard, just that they're non-voting. Is there anything else that I should  
27 cover?

28  
29 **Co-Chair Garber:** I think that's it.

30  
31 **Co-Chair Keller:** I hope that's clear. In some sense we're clarifying the rules because things  
32 come up. We think it's important to make sure people are aware. Thank you.

33  
34 **Co-Chair Garber:** Our next items is the—I'm sorry. Ellen and then Don, or just Ellen.

35  
36 **Ellen Uhrbrock:** Can I have a copy of what you just talked about?

37  
38 **Co-Chair Keller:** I've read here from notes. I will send a version of that to staff that they can  
39 send out.



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

- 1 **Ellen Uhrbrock:** Thank you. I really want to know if on the subcommittee are we permitted to  
2 invite the public to come and speak.  
3
- 4 **Co-Chair Keller:** You're always invited to—you're always welcome to invite the public to attend  
5 and/or speak at CAC meetings and subcommittee meetings. In terms of the committee  
6 meeting, they speak at the beginning. At subcommittee meetings, they speak at the beginning.  
7 It's the discretion of the Chair of the meeting to invite them to speak. Members of the  
8 committee can, through the Chair, invite them to answer questions at other times. Also, if  
9 you're not a member of the subcommittee, then you shouldn't be attending the subcommittee  
10 meeting. I think that's clear. Otherwise, we'd have a problem about that. Thank you.  
11
- 12 **Co-Chair Garber:** Our Consent Calendar. We have a Consent Calendar today, our first time. On  
13 it is the approval of the revised draft Transportation Element. Is this about the previous topic?  
14
- 15 **Male:** (inaudible)  
16
- 17 **Co-Chair Garber:** About the Consent. I suppose the first question is does anyone want to take  
18 it off the Consent Calendar.  
19
- 20 **Hamilton Hitchings:** I have a comment I want to discuss.  
21
- 22 **Co-Chair Garber:** Please speak, Hamilton.  
23
- 24 **Female:** You've got to take it off the Consent first.  
25
- 26 **Hamilton Hitchings:** Do we have to take it off Consent first?  
27
- 28 **Co-Chair Garber:** I think that would be the rule.  
29
- 30 **Co-Chair Keller:** I guess we don't have any rules yet about taking things off Consent. I guess—  
31 what?  
32
- 33 **Hillary Gitelman:** Just accept the comments.  
34
- 35 **Co-Chair Keller:** Why don't we just accept the comments, and then we'll see if we need to take  
36 it off Consent. I think we could do that.  
37
- 38 **Co-Chair Garber:** Hamilton, then Annette, and then, was there somebody else? Lydia.  
39



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

1 **Hamilton Hitchings:** First I want to say I think the Transportation Element has come a long way.  
2 It looks really good. There's only one thing on it that still isn't there that I really want to see.  
3 That's something in there that will talk about—put a little bit of teeth behind Stanford Research  
4 Park improving the level of service at the intersections around it as they continue to grow. I  
5 personally would like to see Stanford exempted from an office cap, but have to essentially  
6 commit, as they continue to build, to actually improve the traffic. Those four intersections  
7 around Stanford Research Park are often at "E" or "F" during rush hour. It's bad for the  
8 employees at the Park as well as for the residents. There was language in there that was taken  
9 out. I don't know if there's a way to get a program or policy put back in. That would be my  
10 desire.

11  
12 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Annette.

13  
14 **Annette Glanckopf:** I actually wrote a couple of comments. I have a question about the  
15 procedure to take into consideration the comments for a draft version since I spent all my time  
16 reading it. I did add some editing kinds of things that I thought were important. In a nutshell, I  
17 think the overview is way, way too long and too many pictures and whatever. We really need  
18 to be much more crisp. That's true in all sections. Besides the questions or the small edits, the  
19 thing that I'm really interested in is the VTA shutdown. I just wonder if we should add some  
20 more meat to Section T-1.6.1 that will really speak to this whole issue of how we're going to do  
21 public transportation in Palo Alto. Plus, my concern is really since VTA routes are tied to the  
22 paratransit services, do we need to have a policy in that area. That's my major concern with  
23 the process. There's a couple of other bits and pieces about the rail corridors. I don't know  
24 why we just pick out two instead of all four of them. The rest are just picky little things.  
25 Besides that, I'm just curious when we have something on Consent, do these items get taken  
26 into consideration by staff or what happens to them?

27  
28 **Hillary Gitelman:** I guess I'd like to hold a response until we hear from everybody, how many  
29 comments there are and questions on this. A lot of work has gone into this. We've managed to  
30 get most of this right or at least okay as a draft to forward to Council. Let's see how many other  
31 people have additional thoughts.

32  
33 **Annette Glanckopf:** Back to you, the VTA thing is relatively new. That's relevant to think  
34 about.

35  
36 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Lydia. Was there anyone else? Don.

37  
38 **Lydia Kou:** Mine is mostly just little picky things. Goal T-5 on Policy T-5.1, the words "to be  
39 completely self-parked" was deleted from the paragraph. I think that was something that was  
40 very sticky for me. I wanted it to be back in there. On page T-55, Program T-5.10.1, association



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

1 and residents were deleted from that paragraph. I'd like to see that back in there. I think it has  
2 to do with RPP programs and including associations and residents in the discussion. Thanks.

3  
4 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Don and then Bonnie.

5  
6 **Don McDougall:** I too have comments that I submitted. I agree with Annette. Some of my  
7 comments included the VTA and the shuttle consistent with what Hamilton said. My other  
8 concern is, having had the experience of submitting one of these elements for Council  
9 comment, Council seems to forget that what you're presenting is a draft and might have holes  
10 in it. They very vigorously find the holes. I don't quite understand what the submission here  
11 might be. Could we make a submission that includes a preamble that says the VTA, the shuttle  
12 are things that we intend to beef up but then get the reaction from the rest of it, so that the  
13 next time around we can add more substance to it. I would be in favor of that approach as long  
14 as we could put up some defensive preamble as part of that. The same thing would go with  
15 Annette's comment on the narrative. I think that everybody agrees narratives might be too  
16 long or whatever. If they could be separated from the policies and programs with a comment  
17 that we're going to address all of the descriptive part of this at some later date. Let's not worry  
18 about that right now. That's not the meat. It's the policies and programs. Do we have enough  
19 and right or too many as we need to address? Based on that, I would go for consent on the  
20 basis of then we would get to discuss it with the Council.

21  
22 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you, Don. Bonnie, and then Ellen.

23  
24 **Bonnie Packer:** I'd like to make a motion that we approve sending this draft element to City  
25 Council. I want to say I spent a good part of this weekend—I wasn't here last month. I read the  
26 minutes, and I read the draft, and I read what was done. I just think this is really a good piece.  
27 There's a lot of good stuff. We can nitpick and nitpick and nitpick, but then this process will  
28 never happen, if we keep on doing that. Everybody will have a little thing that they don't quite  
29 like. There are going to be nine other people looking at it. They'll have little things that they  
30 aren't going to like. I say the issue with VTA, they've tried to do this before, cut service here.  
31 We responded. That's an immediate issue. We're talking about programs and policies for the  
32 next 30 years. If those programs and policies—when you look at it, do we say enough that it  
33 would cover traffic issues around the Research Park? Is there enough in the policy that would  
34 cover the issue that Hamilton raised? Is there enough in the discussion about regional  
35 collaboration or working with them that would cover the issues we're currently having with  
36 VTA? I think there is. At this point, this is a draft we're sending to Council to see how we're  
37 doing at this point. Let's not hold it up because of a few little—it might be important details,  
38 but details. Those can be reflected in the minutes that the Council reads regarding today's  
39 motion.





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

1 **Co-Chair Keller:** I'll second Bonnie's motion.  
2

3 **Co-Chair Garber:** Just before we take the vote, let's hear from Ellen. I think that's our last  
4 speaker.  
5

6 **Annette Glanckopf:** Can we also hear from Hillary?  
7

8 **Co-Chair Garber:** Yes. Thank you. Arthur would like to speak to his second. Heidi and Jennifer.  
9 Go ahead, Ellen.  
10

11 **Ellen Uhrbrock:** I am certainly going to vote yes to send it to the Council. We need their  
12 comments. It's appropriate timing. There is lots that can be done with the element to make it  
13 better and better for a long-term plan. I think it needs to also have an opportunity for the  
14 public to give their input on it. I've suggested, for example, that it could go back and take it to  
15 them and say, "Have the TMA involved in this." They can ask for their suggestions, because  
16 they're very interested in them. We want to make their goals. I love the fact that we started  
17 out with some really strong goals and challenges. How do you achieve them? They also include  
18 you need to start now. This is the start of the long-term plan. I vote yes.  
19

20 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Heidi and then Jennifer.  
21

22 **Heidi Emberling:** Thanks. Sorry I haven't been here in a few meetings. Meetings were  
23 scheduled for the same days as School Board meetings. That's where I was, having my own  
24 special meeting. I'm not sure if this was discussed in the Transportation Element, but I just  
25 found out about it from the school site. I thought I would share the unintended maybe  
26 consequence of the RPP program. I'm sure you've heard about this. Addison School was in the  
27 first RPP neighborhood online system. All of our teachers who can't afford to live here—they're  
28 commuting from out of Palo Alto—now don't have anywhere to park. We had a huge issue  
29 come up at Addison. Our principal had to get involved and work with the City around getting  
30 some exemptions to that. I don't know if that was brought up at all in terms of an unintended  
31 consequence for our teachers. I can just see, as RPP begins to expand to other neighborhoods,  
32 that this is going to be a problem at all of our schools. I don't know where to put that. Sorry. I  
33 wanted to bring it up.  
34

35 **Co-Chair Garber:** Got it. Thank you. Jennifer.  
36

37 **Jennifer Hetterly:** I don't have any objection to this moving forward on Consent. I do think  
38 there should be a mechanism for collecting the comments that were submitted today and  
39 integrating them later when it comes back for further revision. To that end, I have three brief  
40 comments that I think I raised last time that didn't make it into this latest draft. The first was





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

1 that Program T-5.1.2, universal number 109, spillover effects should be added to the list of  
2 metrics to be considered in performance standards for parking. Program T-5.1.3 about working  
3 with stakeholders in commercial centers and employment districts for timing reductions in  
4 parking requirements. I'd like to see nearby residents involved in that process. Finally, Program  
5 T-1.10.2 includes some language saying that Caltrain station parking lots should be used only as  
6 a last resort. I think that's counterproductive to the goals we're trying to achieve. If we want  
7 people to ride the train, we should want to make it easy for them to ride the train. I don't think  
8 that's where we want to head. Thanks.

9

10 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. With that, we'll go to Hillary.

11

12 **Co-Chair Keller:** I was next.

13

14 **Co-Chair Garber:** I apologize. Arthur, you'd like to speak to your second.

15

16 **Co-Chair Keller:** A couple of things. I think we should give staff discretion to incorporate the  
17 non-substantive, in other words editorial-type comments, that people have submitted. I'm  
18 assuming that's reasonable with the maker of the motion. Bonnie?

19

20 **Bonnie Packer:** Yes, that's okay. As long as they're non-substantive. I hear some of the  
21 comments that people are making, but I haven't had time to absorb them or respond to them  
22 to see whether they really reflect the sense of everybody. We don't have the time to do that  
23 here.

24

25 **Co-Chair Keller:** Exactly. I would suggest that we give staff discretion to correct typos and  
26 things like that, that people may have reported in their comments. I know I've reported some  
27 things that are non-substantive. Secondly, that staff collect the substantive comments and  
28 attach them as a list of comments with the Staff Report and the draft element to the Council, so  
29 they're aware of the issues that are still outstanding and that have not yet achieved consensus,  
30 including the comments made today. Maybe staff could give a deadline for any last minute  
31 comments that people want to include in the Staff Report that they just attach to that.  
32 Obviously time is limited. Maybe staff can tell us a little bit about that in their comments. In  
33 any event, I do think it should go pretty much as is other than these non-substantive changes.  
34 Staff should indicate that there are loose ends that can be tied up in the future. I appreciate  
35 the work of everybody on the CAC and the Transportation Element Subcommittee for bringing  
36 us to the stage where we have another element that is virtually ready to go to Council. Thank  
37 you.

38

39 **Co-Chair Garber:** Hillary.



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

1 **Hillary Gitelman:** Thank you. I want to concur with some of you, particularly Don's suggestion.  
2 It's actually a little strategic to send a version to the Council that says there are a few things  
3 that we still would like to work on. The VTA issue is one; it's recently come up. We could  
4 identify that as an example. We could indicate that there were some additional comments  
5 made at this last meeting that, at some point, we would like to incorporate. I would like to  
6 suggest that we basically send the element the way it is. We're a little bit out of time. For  
7 Council Staff Reports there's such a long lead schedule. Let the Council know that there were  
8 some additional discussion at this last meeting, and some big issues like this VTA issue that we  
9 may want to tackle at a later date, and that this is just a draft albeit a good work product from a  
10 lot of hard work by the CAC and the subcommittee. If that's okay, I think that's how we'd like to  
11 proceed.

12

13 **Co-Chair Garber:** With that, I'd like to call the ...

14

15 **Don McDougall:** (inaudible)

16

17 **Co-Chair Keller:** I think the motion is that we basically approve the current draft element and  
18 that we give the staff discretion but not the requirement that they can correct non-substantive  
19 issues. If there are any comments that they can incorporate within the amount of time for  
20 producing a Staff Report, they can provide that to the Council as well.

21

22 **Don McDougall:** The other thing you said was a deadline for incremental comments. I would  
23 like to suggest that we're at the deadline for incremental comments.

24

25 **Co-Chair Keller:** We're not doing any more comments. They're either now or the ones  
26 submitted before the meeting in writing. The staff can assemble those and attach them to the  
27 Staff Report. Does that match what your model of the universe is, Bonnie? She's nodding yes.  
28 Thank you.

29

30 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you, Don. Hamilton.

31

32 **Hamilton Hitchings:** I'd just like to propose that the amendment include the substantive  
33 comments. It wasn't 100 percent clear to me that that's part of the motion.

34 **Hillary Gitelman:** I think our intention...

35

36 **Hamilton Hitchings:** In a separate letter.

37

38 **Hillary Gitelman:** ... is to capture in a list in the Staff Report the substantive comments and  
39 suggestions that were made this evening.



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

1 **Bonnie Packer:** The maker of the motion, though, does not agree that—we haven't had a  
2 chance to vet the substantive comments as a group. They may be fine, but we haven't had a  
3 chance to discuss them and absorb them. If they're attached and it can be clarified that these  
4 were brought up but not discussed.

5  
6 **Co-Chair Keller:** At least brought up but not the consensus of the CAC yet. Thank you.

7  
8 **Co-Chair Garber:** All those in favor of the motion as stated, raise your hand and keep them up  
9 there for us to count. Eighteen for. All against. That would be zero. Any abstentions? Also  
10 zero. Thank you. Let's move to our Item Number 3, Land Use and Community Design Element,  
11 the introduction of the draft element framework including growth management policies and  
12 programs. Staff, will you please kick it off for us here and give us instruction for how we are  
13 going to get through these?

14  
15 **Joanna Jansen:** Thanks, Dan. I'm Joanna Jansen with PlaceWorks. I'm just going to give a brief  
16 overview of the land use policy framework that you have and the goals that we haven't  
17 discussed yet as a group. I think primarily tonight we're anticipating that we're going to be  
18 spending a significant chunk of time on the growth management options. Hillary is going to do  
19 a separate introduction and overview of those to put that into the context of the overall  
20 element. I wanted to remind you, first of all, that as of the previous conversations of the Land  
21 Use Element, the CAC as a group had identified several major issues that you wanted to work  
22 on in the Land Use Element. You've actually worked through most of those at this point. They  
23 are located throughout the element. I think when we started this, those were kind of clustered  
24 in the first four goals. Over time as the organization of the element has evolved, some of those  
25 have moved around. We don't quite have that neat division anymore between the first chunk  
26 of goals and the second chunk of goals. Your Staff Report kind of outlines where the remaining  
27 topics are. The biggest one, as I said, is really in growth management. That falls under Goal L-1,  
28 and we'll be spending time on that tonight. Goal L-2 is about an enhanced sense of community  
29 and sustainability. You've discussed that at your previous meetings. We don't have any  
30 additional changes or revisions to that goal to discuss tonight. Goal L-3 you've also discussed at  
31 your previous meeting. There's one change to that goal, which is the addition of a policy and  
32 program regarding basements. We've heard a little bit about that here tonight. You can talk  
33 about that more if you'd like to. The rest of the goals. L-4, I think you started your  
34 conversation but didn't really finish that. That's about commercial centers. The biggest thing  
35 we've talked about so far under Goal L-4 was the coordinated area plans, and we arrived at a  
36 set of policies and programs governing coordinated area plans. Those are recorded in your  
37 Staff Report. Since that time, we've also added some additional meat to the policies about  
38 bicycle and pedestrian connectivity and design in commercial centers at a variety of scales.  
39 We've removed some of the references that were previously there to housing, particularly in  
40 neighborhood centers and also in the Town and Country center. Under Goal L-5, which has to



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

1 do with employment districts, again made sure that there's additional content about pedestrian  
2 and bicycle connectivity and design and the importance of preserving open space in the  
3 Stanford Research Park in particular. This is also the location of new policies and programs  
4 about the East Meadow Circle concept plan. Goal L-6 has to do with urban design. I think an  
5 important change to be aware of here is that we have consolidated policies and programs that  
6 govern building design in this urban design goal. Some of them were under Goal L-1; some of  
7 them were under Goal L-2. As we started delving into this with the subcommittee, we realized  
8 that it would make most sense to consolidate these. They're all under L-6 right now. Goal L-7  
9 has to do with historic resources. A lot of new content had been added to that section based  
10 on the mitigation measures that are in the EIR. Those policies and programs were worded  
11 pretty strongly because of their provenance as EIR mitigation measures. A lot of subcommittee  
12 members—we heard feedback that those are really too mandatory, too strong, not really  
13 consistent with the wording and tone of other policies and programs in the Comp Plan. We  
14 have revised those quite a bit to try to make those fit a little better with other land use policies  
15 and programs but still stay true to the spirit of mitigating impacts to Palo Alto's important  
16 cultural resources. Goal L-8 has to do with civic uses. The most, I think, substantive change  
17 here has been your previous work on parkland acquisition. We know that obviously that is an  
18 important issue. The CAC has discussed that. You've arrived at consensus. That's in the Staff  
19 Report as well. Goal L-9 has to do with public spaces. That has not received a lot of extensive  
20 discussion yet. We have incorporated references to the Urban Forest Master Plan and the  
21 preservation of the Baylands. One new topic that's in there is shade impacts on public open  
22 space. Finally, the airport goal L-10. If you recall, you decided to move that from  
23 transportation into land use. The content of the policies and programs that were there when it  
24 was in transportation hasn't really changed. You can take a look at that goal now in more depth  
25 in its new home in the Land Use Element.

26  
27 **Hillary Gitelman:** Thank you, Joanna. Thanks incredibly to the subcommittee members. I lost  
28 track of how many meetings the subcommittee has actually had. It seems like hundreds. They  
29 made great progress. I know the whole committee hasn't been able to get all the way to the  
30 end of the goals, but the subcommittee did look at all of the policies and programs in all of the  
31 goals. The text that you have here, both in track changes and the clean copy, reflects that  
32 input. I wanted to spend some time on the growth management strategies. That's really where  
33 the subcommittee spent most of its time. I'm assuming that it is the area that's of most interest  
34 to the full group. Before we dive in wholeheartedly, just a little bit of background. You all know  
35 that in the current Comprehensive Plan, there's a policy, L-8, the famous Policy L-8, which  
36 provides a cumulative cap on nonresidential development that applies to monitored areas of  
37 the City. I know that's a mouthful. Currently, one of the primary growth management  
38 strategies is this overall cap on development in a subset of the City. That's kind of the baseline  
39 that we're starting with here. We also have in the context of that a cap again on nonresidential  
40 development in the Downtown. The Downtown cap nests within the Citywide cap in that Policy



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

1 L-8. We are required by the Plan to report on the nonresidential development that happens on  
2 an annual basis in the Downtown and Citywide in these monitored areas, which we do.  
3 Coincidentally, another set of requirements, we monitor not just the areas that are identified in  
4 Policy L-8, but the City as a whole to report to VTA, the congestion management agency. They  
5 require us to report on individual land uses, so office, retail, institutional. They use categories  
6 like that instead of lumping all nonresidential space together. This is the context in which we  
7 started our discussion of growth management strategies. There are five different approaches  
8 to this that I'm going to walk us through. Hopefully we'll get to talk about the policy language  
9 and the options that are recommended that we carry forward for the Council's consideration.  
10 First, let me make sure we understand. This material is presented four different ways in the  
11 Staff Report. We're trying to appeal to all learners here. There's a chart, which I'm going to use  
12 because I'm a planner. I love matrices. I make one of these for every vacation I go on and  
13 everything I do. There's also discussion in the Staff Report that presents a series of choices.  
14 Some people like that. In fact, that's the way the committee had a lot of its discussion, the  
15 subcommittee. It was really at the last meeting that the subcommittee said, "Why don't you  
16 put this in a chart?" The chart is our stab at that. Then, you have the policy framework both in  
17 track changes and a clean copy. We can work from any of these documents. What I want to do  
18 is walk first through the table, which I think is a good snapshot, and answer any questions. This  
19 is the first time the subcommittee has seen the table. As I mentioned, this was their idea to try  
20 and encapsulate this. I hope we've done it. There's one other interesting wrinkle that we've  
21 thrown in that I want to get to as we go through this. If you can find this, it's page 4 of the Staff  
22 Report, this little matrix. I'm going to start by just going across the top. The top row, the  
23 column headings basically, are the five different approaches to nonresidential growth  
24 management that we talked about at the subcommittee and that are to some extent or other  
25 reflected in the City's current policy or practice. The first column, just monitoring. Obviously  
26 we have to monitor because the current Comp Plan tell us to. We have to monitor because the  
27 VTA requires us to. The second column is about this annual—I'm sorry, the cumulative cap  
28 that's in Policy L-8 currently. Currently, it is a cap on nonresidential square footage all lumped  
29 together that applies to a subset of the City. The third column is about controlling the pace of  
30 development. We do that currently through an interim ordinance that the Council has adopted  
31 and wants us to evaluate as a tool going forward. It doesn't get to the total amount of  
32 development, but it sets a limit on the amount that can be approved each year. It's specific to  
33 office/R&D. It's not all nonresidential uses. The fourth column is that Downtown cap. Again, it  
34 nests within the cumulative cap for the City, and it's specific to the Downtown area. Currently,  
35 it applies to all nonresidential uses just like the Citywide cap, which applies to nonresidential  
36 uses in the monitored areas. We call it Citywide which makes it really complicated because it's  
37 not really Citywide. The last column is about performance measures and standards that we  
38 would hold new development to as a way to control the impacts of development rather than  
39 the amount of development. We think of that also as a growth management strategy. If you  
40 look down the column on the left, these are some of the options or variables that are available



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

1 in each of the five approaches to growth management. The first row, the desired approach,  
2 that just means you do it or you don't do it. That's a toggle, on or off. The second one is the  
3 geographic area within which that strategy would apply. The next one, uses affected, gets to  
4 this issue about whether we should be monitoring and regulating all nonresidential uses in one  
5 big bucket or whether we should separate out and really focus on the uses we care about. If  
6 we care about office/R&D and that's what we're all about, why are we messing around with all  
7 the other nonresidential uses, some of which we might actually like to encourage, like retail.  
8 The baseline row, that's about what are we measuring from. Our current Comprehensive Plan  
9 was from 1998 to 2010. It used as a baseline a land use study that was prepared in 1989. Does  
10 it make sense to carry that baseline forward or are we going to shift to a baseline that's  
11 concurrent with this Comprehensive Plan Update, which is supposed to go from 2015 to 2030?  
12 The next line is about reevaluation. At which point should the growth management strategies  
13 be reevaluated? The last one is kind of a catch-up provision, like other issues that have come  
14 up. I just want to go a little deeper into this. I hope I haven't lost anybody yet. What we tried  
15 to do at the subcommittee—I didn't do the multiplication, but if we had to multiply all of the  
16 options here, we'd be over 100. We'd probably be at 150. Someone can probably do the math  
17 in their head. We tried at the subcommittee to really reach consensus where we could, where  
18 there was one obvious option that we liked and forget all the rest and everyone was likely to  
19 agree with us. That got a checkmark, consensus reached. Where we thought on this  
20 committee and on the Council and in the public generally there were going to be differences of  
21 opinion, and that it was going to be the Council's role to resolve, we put a bullet point and  
22 basically said those are options that should be carried forward for the Council's consideration.  
23 Where there were options that we thought were crazy, we don't want to carry them forward,  
24 we put a little X. In most cases, those are actually—some of the options that we said don't  
25 carry forward are things that we currently do, that we said just doesn't make sense anymore  
26 and a reasonable person is going to agree with us. I'm going to go a little deeper into this and  
27 see if you follow me. Let's talk about the cumulative cap. This is the second row. Obviously we  
28 thought we should carry forward these options, like have a cumulative cap, don't have a  
29 cumulative cap. Those are obvious. We're going to find people who want one and people want  
30 the other. Let's let the Council decide. In the next cell down, we decided that the way it  
31 currently works, where it applies to these monitored areas on one map in the Comprehensive  
32 Plan is crazy. Let's not carry that forward. In the future, let's either make it Citywide or let's  
33 make it Citywide minus the hospital complex. The reason for exempting the hospital complex  
34 was that we've already entitled such a great amount of square footage there. If we included  
35 that, it kind of screws the numbers of that we've been using all these years. There was some  
36 thought behind that. The subcommittee or we on staff can answer any questions you have  
37 about that. Just going down to the next cell about the uses affected. Right now we monitor all  
38 nonresidential uses in a big lump. If you take a retail space and you convert it to office, it  
39 counts as zero because you haven't added a square foot of nonresidential space. The  
40 subcommittee's suggestion is that we reject that option, and we monitor what we want to





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

1 monitor, and we apply the cap to what we want to cap which is office/R&D. Some of the  
2 subcommittee members said we don't just want office/R&D, we want hotel too. There are two  
3 options, office/R&D and office/R&D plus hotel. No one wanted to carry forward the crazy "let's  
4 lump it altogether" approach we have now. In terms of the baseline, everyone agreed, we  
5 reached consensus. 2015 should be the baseline; that's what our Plan baseline is. In the next  
6 phase, the subcommittee is going to help us come with the numbers. It means we're going to  
7 have to adjust the actual numbers that go with these approaches, because we want them to  
8 build on or be consistent with the numbers we've been using all these years, just use 2015 as  
9 the baseline. I'll talk at the end about what some of the adjustments might be that we'd have  
10 to make. The next down. We talked about reevaluating all of these strategies after 10 years,  
11 and then they could either go away, stay, be modified, whatever was needed based on how  
12 they were doing. We talked about including some programs in the other category that talks  
13 about what happens when you get close to the cap and how we make sure that the number we  
14 have in the cap is consistent with our zoned capacity. That's another issue we can get into at  
15 greater depth. After the fact, I realized we didn't really talk about what would be exempt from  
16 this cap. We do have some exemptions in the current rules. I guess our assumption was if we  
17 didn't talk about it, it would just stay what the exemptions are. For example, right now public  
18 facilities are exempt from that cumulative cap. That's a biggie. I'm not going to go through the  
19 Downtown cap because that's very similar. In fact, the subcommittee talked about that one  
20 nesting in the other one. I can go into more depth into these other things if you like. I've been  
21 talking for a long time, and there's one more important issue that I wanted to get to, the issue  
22 in the last column about performance measures to promote sustainability. The subcommittee  
23 was fantastic in helping us identify the topics to be addressed by performance measures. You  
24 see that in the bottom, right-hand cell of the table. It's traffic, parking, canopy, open space.  
25 We included habitat, water, energy, displacement and these kind of development issues, glare,  
26 noise, shade. I think we all agreed on that. We all understood that we're going to need to work  
27 a little hard to identify exactly what those performance measures are. Those are the issues we  
28 wanted them to address. We understood that these are going to be most effective if they are  
29 attached to projects at the time of project approval, so they can be made conditions of  
30 approval that can be monitored and enforced over time. That was a consensus of the group. If  
31 we go with this performance measure approach, there would be these performance measures  
32 applied as development standards. What happened is as we were putting this together, we  
33 realized that is fantastic, but if we're interested in making progress towards sustainability  
34 issues, those development standards may not be enough because the amount of development  
35 we're going to approve is so small compared to the amount of development that already exists.  
36 In addition to applying these performance measures to new development, we should have  
37 some things that we're measuring over time that shows not just how well we're doing with  
38 those development standards, but how well we're doing as a community in addressing these  
39 other issues. That's what shows in Table 2 of the Staff Report. Table 2 on page 5 of the Staff  
40 Report has in the left-hand column the performance that the subcommittee talked about, that





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

1 we think should be applied to new—they need to be refined and developed a little more. They  
2 would apply to new development in some way and be enforceable like conditions of approval.  
3 In the right-hand column, we've made some suggestions about things that relate to the  
4 community's well-being and sustainability that we would want to monitor. Again, this is in the  
5 left-hand column or it should be in the left-hand column, monitoring development. We would  
6 really be monitoring the City's progress to these things over time. All of this would go into this  
7 10-year reevaluation that we talk about in all of the growth management options. We would  
8 be looking at performance measures. How are these doing? Are projects implementing them?  
9 Are they complying? Are we doing a good job of enforcing? Then, we'd be looking at  
10 sustainability measures or metrics. How are the next projects doing? Also, how are we as a  
11 community doing when it comes to these issues? Everything from greenhouse gas emissions  
12 consistent with the Council goal for the S/CAP, also vehicle miles traveled per capita which is a  
13 metric that the State is putting forward as something we have to measure as part of our CEQA  
14 process on plans and projects. The percent of commute trips by SOV, this is something the  
15 Research Park and Downtown is already measuring, that they want to monitor over time. That  
16 would be a good one. The jobs/housing balance expressed as we do as a ratio of jobs to  
17 employed residents. Obviously, we want to make progress on that, so that's something we  
18 should monitor regularly. The last one we said, "Let's come up with some measure of  
19 community diversity, whether it's income diversity or other kinds of diversity." That's to be  
20 discussed. Both of these columns obviously need more definition. We're hoping tonight that  
21 this whole group will help us land on the options that we present to the Council. We want to  
22 know if you agree, disagree, want to add, subtract from the options that are defined here in the  
23 table as the checkmarks and the bullet points. Then, after this meeting, we've committed that  
24 the Land use Element will be the subject of one discussion by the sustainability subcommittee,  
25 and then we'll go back to the Land Use Subcommittee and then come back to this group again  
26 next month. In that period, I hope we're going to be able to work with the subcommittee on  
27 what the numbers are that go in the blanks. If you've gotten to the policy language at the end,  
28 you see we've translated all these options and dots into policy language, and there are big  
29 placeholders for the numbers. That's the work we have to do with the subcommittee between  
30 now and when this comes back to you next month. Long introduction. I apologize. It is  
31 complicated. I'm happy to answer questions.

32

33 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. What we're going to do now is...

34

35 **Female:** (inaudible)

36

37 **Co-Chair Garber:** Here is our thought. If we entertain questions, we're likely to be here for  
38 another 20 or 30 minutes.

39

40 **Co-Chair Keller:** We can ask questions as part of the (crosstalk).



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

1 **Co-Chair Garber:** What we thought we'd do is we'd go around and...

2

3 **Female:** (inaudible)

4

5 **Co-Chair Garber:** How many of you would like to ask questions? Five. Let's see if we can hold  
6 it to five. Bonnie, you'll go first. Forgive me, who are the others? Lisa and then Alex.

7

8 **Bonnie Packer:** I want to ask some questions that will help all of us think about this. They're  
9 not questions I need an answer to. They're questions I think we need to think about. One I do  
10 need an answer to. Have we ever reached the cumulative cap that's on the books now?

11

12 **Co-Chair Garber:** If I can just provide some guidance here. If you can make your questions  
13 clarifying as opposed to framing that would be helpful for us.

14

15 **Bonnie Packer:** I don't think we have reached it. The other thing I just want to ask about. This  
16 (inaudible) thing is called managing growth. There's one thing to manage, and there's one thing  
17 to monitor. There's another that's a totally different concept, to put a cap, a lid on growth.  
18 That's not necessarily managed—you can monitor it to address it. The other thing I want to say  
19 is that I think because we have—each of these zones has zoning regulations and FAR limits,  
20 those in a sense have a way just in our Zoning Code of managing growth in certain areas.  
21 Another thing for us to think about when people are thinking there's so much growth we have  
22 to put a cap on it, I want us to ask what are the problems that we want to solve when we're  
23 saying we either want to manage growth or limit growth. Let us think about the problems we  
24 want to solve and go forward with that discussion. That's the question I want to put out here.

25

26 **Co-Chair Garber:** Let's try and focus on more clarifying questions, and then we're going to ask  
27 members of the subcommittee if they have comments. We have Lisa and then Alex. There was  
28 somebody else over here. Lydia.

29

30 **Lisa Peschcke-Koedt:** It's just an understanding question. When we talk about it being  
31 office/R&D and maybe hotel, what's not included in that?

32

33 **Hillary Gitelman:** What would not be included in that would be retail, then warehouse and  
34 industrial that's more like warehouse and not R&D, warehousing, institutional uses, schools. I  
35 can look right here. Those are the main categories.

36

37 **Lisa Peschcke-Koedt:** In the annual limit, it says apply—one of the options under uses affected  
38 is apply to office/R&D. Did the subcommittee not want to include hotel in that on purpose or is  
39 that just an oversight? Under the cumulative cap column, there's two options, apply to  
40 office/R&D or office/R&D plus hotel. Annual limit column, it says only office/R&D.



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

1 **Hillary Gitelman:** Actually I think the subcommittee just said office/R&D because it was based  
2 on the current interim ordinance.

3  
4 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Alex, Lydia, then Steven.

5  
6 **Alex van Riesen:** A quick question based on reevaluation. I noticed that it's 10 years. In all the  
7 bullet points, there was an A-B option here, but there wasn't an A-B option. I was curious  
8 should be this be a checkmark, was this unanimous. If so, how was 10 years decided as the  
9 evaluation point?

10  
11 **Hillary Gitelman:** Really good question. I think we probably should have put a checkmark  
12 there, but I'll let the subcommittee members comment on that. I think as usual we start with  
13 them when we get to comments. Maybe we'll pose that question to the members of the  
14 committee.

15  
16 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Lydia and then Steve.

17  
18 **Lydia Kou:** I wanted to ask Hillary. In the performance measures, the schools, do you work  
19 with the schools in order to figure out if that's impacted?

20  
21 **Hillary Gitelman:** Thank you for that question. We did get that suggestion from the  
22 subcommittee. We took it back, thought about it. We've talked to our City Attorney a number  
23 of times. We just think it's really problematic to monitor—certainly to treat that like a  
24 performance measure, like these things in the left-hand column. In terms of the sustainability  
25 measures, we think of that as something that the School District does on a regular basis. We  
26 didn't see a way that we could be adding anything of value to that. Now that we've come up  
27 with this sort of left-hand column, maybe we think about that again. It was really with regard  
28 to the right-hand column that we were sort of precluded from doing that. We can give that  
29 some thought.

30  
31 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Steve.

32  
33 **Stephen Levy:** What are the rules you guys propose for—when we had the—I guess it was the  
34 height limit question, there was a vote, the vote was recorded, all the options. Hillary  
35 mentioned some options might get thrown out. That's not what we've done before. I'm  
36 interested in what we're going to do. Are we going to go around the room and vote and then  
37 pass the votes on? I'd like to know the rules before we spend a lot of time.

38  
39 **Hillary Gitelman:** Our hope is that everyone agrees with the options that have been outlined,  
40 and we move all of these forward. The first thing we'd like to do is hear from the



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

1 subcommittee members about how this has been presented, how this does or doesn't reflect  
2 your work thus far. A lot of thought went into this. Then, hear from the rest of the group  
3 about whether you agree where this is headed. At the end if it looks like we're going to have to  
4 vote on things, we can do that. I'd like to get that far first.

5  
6 **Co-Chair Garber:** With that, I'd like for those members of the subcommittee that would like to  
7 speak to this—that would be Doria. Anyone else? Steve. I'm sorry?

8  
9 **Annette Glanckopf:** What are we doing? Just talking about this little matrix and the options or  
10 are we talking about the entire Land Use Element?

11  
12 **Co-Chair Garber:** I'm sorry. You can speak to anything you'd like on land use. However, we're  
13 hoping that you're going to focus on this in particular because this is apparently one of the key  
14 items that the subcommittee has really focused on. We're trying to get some input onto that.  
15 If you want to speak about other things, you can certainly do that as well. We're going to go  
16 around the table once. Our policy has been to let the members of the subcommittee speak  
17 first. I've got Doria, Hamilton, Steve, Jennifer and Amy and Annette. I would have—and Shani.  
18 If one or more of you can speak, I just have one question I would like to ask of you. If you could  
19 highlight in the reevaluation pieces where there is—I know 10 years has been used for a  
20 number of the different options, but there are also options which don't use 10 years. If we  
21 could have a little bit more conversation around anything about those, that would be helpful at  
22 least to me. Doria.

23  
24 **Doria Summa:** Starting with the list on page 5, Item F, displacement, no net loss of dwelling  
25 units. I don't think of those things, the two things. When I think of displacing people who live  
26 in current inexpensive apartment buildings, there could be as many units or more units  
27 provided in new buildings, but they won't necessarily be able to afford them. I'm still  
28 concerned about displacement. I don't think it's necessarily associated with keeping the same  
29 number of dwelling units. I know that we talked a long time about adding park and school  
30 impacts. I'm still in favor of doing that. I think that we could find a legal way to do it. Schools  
31 are such a big issue in this community, that not taking into consideration growth impacts on  
32 them doesn't make sense to me. I'll just go through some of my other comments. In the  
33 definitions, single-family residential, a maximum of 14 units is added which I don't think is  
34 appropriate. I'm not sure we want childcare in neighborhood...

35  
36 **Hillary Gitelman:** I'm sorry. Could you say where you are, Doria?

37  
38 **Doria Summa:** In the definitions.

39  
40 **Hillary Gitelman:** Do you have a page?



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

1 **Doria Summa:** Page 1 of 41. Page 2, neighborhood commercial. I worry we should limit  
2 childcare, because it could take over—childcare and tutoring could take over retail, because  
3 there's so much of that growing. Policy L-5, I would like to add back in "avoid land uses that are  
4 overwhelming and unacceptable," etc. Policy L-5. No, I'll use a new number, L-3, page 5. Let  
5 me skip some of these. One that I'm really concerned about is the tree stuff on page 38, urban  
6 forest. I think we need—there's language about protecting large, mature oaks somewhere. I  
7 think we need much better definitions of trees that we're going to protect. For sure we want to  
8 add in redwoods. I think we should protect all mature trees. I still think we need to better  
9 define gathering spaces under public spaces, page 37. I want to make sure that we make a  
10 distinction that these won't be counted as parks. New program under Goal L-8, L-143, explore  
11 opportunities to dedicate City-owned land as parkland. I would just say dedicate City-owned  
12 land as parkland, knowing that we're not going to dedicate anything that's not a park. Those  
13 are some of my concerns. Under Stanford Shopping Center, L-23, identify strategies to reuse  
14 surface parking lots while preserving adequate parking to meet demand, L-67. That just seems  
15 kind of contradictory and silly. On page 20, L-63, facilitate reuse of existing buildings  
16 particularly Downtown. I would just stop at "existing buildings." I don't know why you'd want  
17 to do that particularly Downtown. I believe what we had talked about were two coordinated  
18 area plans, one for Fry's and one for South El Camino. I'll leave it there for now.

19

20 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Hamilton and then Steve.

21

22 **Hamilton Hitchings:** Our goal for the subcommittee was not to push a specific agenda, but to  
23 lay out the minimum set of choices that capture the different opinions in this committee for the  
24 Council to decide. I have a couple of comments on possible opportunities to further streamline  
25 it. First of all, I want to thank the Planning Department. I really like this table, Hillary. We had  
26 talked about it in the subcommittee; this is the first time I've seen it. What we're trying to do is  
27 give a simple framework for the City Council Members to be able to make these decisions  
28 where it's clear what they are. I also like the performance measures tables as well. A couple of  
29 possible opportunities to reduce the number of choices. If we look at the cumulative cap, I'd  
30 like to see us narrow it down to just apply it Citywide minus the Stanford Medical Center. The  
31 Stanford Medical Center has like a million square feet of building that's already been approved.  
32 I think any of these other measures, it gets very hard. Imagine you're having an office cap; you  
33 can't really do that while Stanford is building. You've sort of allocated space for them to build  
34 just like with Stanford Research Park. I hope we could agree for the applicable area for the  
35 cumulative cap to just apply Citywide minus Stanford Medical Center, so they can do their  
36 thing. Another opportunity to eliminate a choice—I'd love to hear what other people think.  
37 When we talk about the Downtown cap, whether you support it or not, one of the questions is  
38 should it be office/R&D or office/R&D plus hotel. I actually haven't figured out which one I  
39 support. I think the tradeoffs are do we want to cap hotel. On the other hand, we already have  
40 essentially enough hotels in Palo Alto. I think there's a little concern that we may be



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

1 overbuilding hotel capacity. That's not the most important thing. The most important thing is  
2 actually housing for the people who are working in the Bay Area. It'd be nice if we could figure  
3 out if we wanted the plus hotel or not. I guess I'd lean against it right now. The advantage of  
4 hotels, it does generate a lot of revenue for the City. Another one is on the last column,  
5 halfway down under uses affected, performance measurements. It would be great if we could  
6 agree to apply it to nonresidential development plus market rate housing. This is about how do  
7 we grow sustainably forever. If we're only growing office sustainably, but we're not growing  
8 residential sustainably, then that doesn't make sense. The other thing is even if you're for all-  
9 out growth, it's actually in your favor to support the performance measures for residential. By  
10 establishing that the performance measures are actually applying to residential, it gives you  
11 more justification for continuing to add more residential in the future. You're like they've been  
12 fully mitigated, there's no reason why we shouldn't build more. If we could agree on that, that  
13 would eliminate—the more choices we can eliminate for Council because we all agree on them,  
14 the better. A couple of other comments. I agree with what Doria said. I have two other  
15 comments about the Land Use Element. We talked a lot, and staff has incorporated those  
16 changes. The first is the subcommittee was not in agreement on L-10, which is to allow  
17 neighborhood retail stores like 7/11 in residential neighborhoods. There have been numerous  
18 armed robberies, including one in the last month and a half at the 7/11 in Midtown. If you look  
19 at the crime maps in Palo Alto, you'll notice that the crime is centered around the retail. I don't  
20 have any problem with the retail. I'm very supportive of our neighborhood centers. I just don't  
21 want to expand those into R-1. The other thing is we ought to be cautious about converting  
22 housing to other uses. We have a serious housing shortage. I think it's wrong for us at this  
23 time, when people are having trouble finding housing, to convert it to retail. The other thing  
24 that I want to—I'm going to channel Len, who's not here, but I'm going to channel him. On the  
25 airport, I think we should have stronger language in there about noise abatement. I was just  
26 out at the airport getting a tour for the Leadership Palo Alto program. They're like, "We run  
27 24/7. We can land whenever we want." The noise abatement is optional and voluntary. I'd like  
28 to understand what we can do legally without violating any FAA or federal rules about  
29 eliminating or at least substantially reducing night flights between 10:00 p.m. and 6:00 a.m.  
30 There's a lot of residents who have trouble sleeping and are significantly affected by the noise.  
31 While I'm not one of them, I'm very sympathetic to their needs. They are very vocally active.  
32 I'd like to see something there. The last thing is L-1.31, parking exemptions for historic  
33 buildings. I think given the severe parking shortage, we should not do that. I do oppose that in  
34 the current one. Thank you for listening to my comments.

35

36 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Steve and then Jennifer.

37

38 **Stephen Levy:** I appreciate where Hamilton started. I think the committee and the staff have  
39 brought forward a set of options that were favored by some but not all of the subcommittee  
40 members. We had and still have disagreements. I don't think it's our role here or our role in





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

1 the subcommittee to pursue those disagreements. They are Council decisions. I feel  
2 comfortable that the options I personally favor, which are the least restrictive ones, are  
3 included and appreciate that the people who wanted the more restrictive options have theirs  
4 included as well. I find it hard both philosophically and practically to have a group of people  
5 sitting in a room in 2016 thinking they should be or could be telling people who are here in  
6 2025 or 2030 how to live. I don't like that philosophically. When I came here 53 years ago,  
7 nobody told me I couldn't live here or get a job here. Yet people like me and most of you and at  
8 least eight of nine Council Members could not live here if they had to live here the way they  
9 were when they did come here. That would not be possible. We're losing a whole group of  
10 people. The practical reason is that a Council in 2025 is going to do whatever they want. I don't  
11 want to spend too much time thinking we're going to bind people effectively. In fact, the  
12 Council in 2017 may do what they want. I worry that we have maybe one renter on this  
13 committee. I tried for myself to speak for people not like me, who might be here in 2025 or  
14 2030, and to repay the enormous debt that was given to me by people like Aggie Robinson and  
15 Ray Bacchetti and the Councils who built all the stuff that Nancy and I and Becky and David  
16 love. I'd like to carry on that tradition, but that's my personal thing. I do thank the staff and  
17 the committee for bringing forward all the options. Thank you.

18

19 **Co-Chair Garber:** Jennifer and then Amy.

20

21 **Jennifer Hetterly:** One thing that we haven't talked about in this committee or really much on  
22 the subcommittee is Governor Brown's build by-right proposal which seems to be barreling  
23 forward. As I understand it, that severely limits the ability of a city to review individual  
24 developments going forward if they have any affordable housing in them. I have to confess I  
25 don't really understand all the details of it. As I understand it, from a community perspective it  
26 may well make things like height limits, cumulative caps, annual caps in a Comprehensive Plan  
27 the only way that a city can have any influence on future development. I'd really love to have a  
28 briefing for the CAC from staff on what exactly the implications are for Palo Alto before we put  
29 forward any recommendation that would either add or eliminate a cap or a height limit that  
30 currently exists in our Comprehensive Plan. I want to throw that out there. I think that's pretty  
31 important for us to understand. Certainly for Council to understand. As far as the chart, I like  
32 the chart. I think staff did a really great job capturing what was a complicated discussion with a  
33 million different options. The reevaluation row, I did have an issue with. I don't really love that  
34 you would adjust up or down depending on sustainable community measures, didn't really say  
35 anything to me. I think what we want to do is make an adjustment up or down depending on  
36 the success of the performance measures. That to me means not only the success of a  
37 development meeting its target, but also the success of the targets in maintaining the quality of  
38 life or the community well-being that we want. As I see it, the performance measures are sort  
39 of direct, applied to each development. The community sustainability metrics, I'd like to see  
40 sustainability come out of there, but community metrics are more of a cumulative impact, what





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

1 does this mean more broadly for the community. Is that what everyone else understood it to  
2 be as well? Anyway, I think reevaluation should include not only whether we're meeting those  
3 targets, but also whether the targets are the right targets to be looking at. I had some  
4 comments about the specific items listed under those various measures and metrics. I  
5 understand that's a work in progress, so I'll just let those speak for themselves. The residential  
6 design, Goal L-3, there's a new policy about basements not negatively affecting adjacent homes  
7 and overall neighborhood character. I would like to add canopy at a minimum to that because  
8 that, as I understand it, has been a significant impact of basements, the effect of water  
9 deprivation to trees on neighboring properties. It seemed like if you're going to evaluate the  
10 policy of excluding basements from FAR, shouldn't the zoning revisions listed in L-48 include  
11 considering whether or not to eliminate the exclusion? That seems to be missing. Just to go  
12 back to a settled issue, parkland acquisition, Goal L-8, the last new program—I think Doria  
13 referred to this as well—about dedicating City-owned land as parkland. That should really be  
14 "City-controlled" land as opposed to "City-owned" land. For example, now the Stanford playing  
15 fields, El Camino Park, those are both owned by Stanford, but the City has a long-term lease,  
16 and it is dedicated parkland that secures that use for the City as long as we're using it. I'd like to  
17 change "owned" to "controlled." That's all I have.

18

19 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Hillary, did you have any immediate thoughts about the State  
20 requirements?

21

22 **Hillary Gitelman:** Yeah. I can add a couple of things about the Governor's by-right housing bill.  
23 Some of you may not be aware, but as part of the State budget process the Governor proposed  
24 a bill that would require local agencies to approve by right certain housing developments if they  
25 met certain conditions. The bill ended up not going through with the budget, but the Governor  
26 put a lot of money in the budget for affordable housing contingent on this bill passing by the  
27 end of the session. It's still subject to discussion and debate at the legislature. They're  
28 probably going to take it up in August. I expect it'll be adopted sometime this fall. The way it's  
29 trending, it's going to apply to housing projects only; although, they could have some  
30 component of retail. It would not apply to a mixed-use project that had office. It would be  
31 mostly all housing projects or housing with ground-floor retail if they met certain affordability  
32 requirements and if they were 100 percent consistent with local zoning and general plans. The  
33 bar is a little bit higher than just like any housing project. We're still going to evaluate it as it  
34 moves forward. I don't think it's particularly relevant to these growth management strategies  
35 which are focused on nonresidential development except if you wanted to regulate retail for  
36 some reason. I think the subcommittee's discussion has mostly been to focus on office/R&D.  
37 That would not be affected by the bill the way it was proposed by the Governor.

38

39 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Amy and then Annette.



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

1 **Amy Sung:** Hi, good evening. It's Amy. I am the member of Land Use Subcommittee, but I was  
2 unable to attend the last two meetings. I'm a little bit surprised to see that the basement is a  
3 part of the agreement. I'd actually like to go through some of the items that I jot down. First of  
4 all, great job and congratulation to Elaine and Elena for this matrix. It's amazing. I remember  
5 looking at this, and I think that we must have visited it so many times that now I can recite it in  
6 my dream. I looked at Goal 1, and it is beautifully worded. We spent so much time in Goal 1  
7 managing the growth, and there's not a word reflected in Goal 1. I actually thought that maybe  
8 Goal 1 should be a (inaudible) the City providing dynamic growth management so that really  
9 reflects that 90 percent of our time talking back and forth and back and forth about this growth  
10 management. I really appreciate, Hillary, that you started off by telling that actually the new  
11 project approval is a minute portion of approval. Did I understand it correctly? For the  
12 nonresidential uses, is that the correct understanding?  
13

14 **Hillary Gitelman:** I'm sorry. Is your question the growth management strategies we're focusing  
15 on are about nonresidential development?  
16

17 **Amy Sung:** Right, the nonresidential.  
18

19 **Hillary Gitelman:** That's correct.  
20

21 **Amy Sung:** The approval of the nonresidential is a small percentage of the overall growth  
22 management that we are looking at. Is that what I understand?  
23

24 **Hillary Gitelman:** What we're talking about today is growth management that really only  
25 applies to nonresidential development. Obviously there's some years in which we see a lot  
26 more nonresidential development than housing. In fact, that's been the trend for a number of  
27 years.  
28

29 **Amy Sung:** Thank you. I think that we all hear that we have abandoned office space, and our  
30 focus really is in the housing. I think that presenting all these options to Council, I am really in  
31 favor of not having a cap. I understand that like Bonnie was mentioning, we are managing the  
32 growth or that we are monitoring the growth. If we have a performance measure—I think that  
33 in this age of big data the City's already being required to collect all this data in the metrics  
34 annually. Having a cap—a cap is a high ceiling that is designed to be reached and then broken.  
35 If we have a set of metrics that we are measuring and we constantly reflect on where we are  
36 going, what our goal is, especially in our area is a dynamic area. It has growth; it has new  
37 commerce coming in. Having a cap in addition to measurements, I'm just puzzled. That is  
38 basically what I'm thinking. We have good use of technology and data points, and there is  
39 explosive development in the big data. I really, really believe that we have enough information  
40 to really guide our growth and our future direction. That is the point that I really wanted to



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

1 bring up about my passion, about why we should look at management with a new lens. Maybe  
2 a cap is not all that necessary. I see in Policy L-3 that reads maintain the scale and character of  
3 the City. I think that's great. I'd actually like to add to that so that it reads "maintain the scale  
4 and character of the City relevant to population growth," so that we understand we are  
5 designing a city not based on historic data but reflecting the current population and that  
6 population's desire and idea.

7

8 **Co-Chair Garber:** You can revisit them. Later we'll have another chance if you like.

9

10 **Amy Sung:** Thank you.

11

12 **Co-Chair Garber:** Annette and then Shani.

13

14 **Annette Glanckopf:** Looking at all these measures again, I think the chart is really good. I  
15 would eliminate all those options which I got really bogged down in, trying to distinguish the  
16 fine points. I agree with most everything that Doria and Hamilton said. I'm really fascinated by  
17 this idea of including a multiunit market rate housing in some of the cap. I believe in the hybrid  
18 method which would use the cap, especially the annual cap, and performance measures. I  
19 really question this community diversity one. I think that's almost impossible to measure.  
20 Looking at some of the other comments. In the definitions on page 2, really we have to take  
21 childcare out of the permitted use in the neighborhood centers—it's not desirable—and replace  
22 it with personal services. Under the cumulative growth management policy, L-10, there's this  
23 thing about positive, managing change to benefit the community. I think this is all really using  
24 subjective words. What's positive to one Council Member might not be positive to another. In  
25 Goal 3, there is this thing that's—it's L-33, preserve residential and retail uses from conversion  
26 to short-term vacation rentals. Why would a retail site ever be converted to a short-term  
27 vacation rental? I don't understand that. In Policy—the new one—L-39, this is retail in  
28 neighborhoods. I think Hamilton said it directly. If we're talking about some of those little  
29 places in Downtown, maybe we should be specific, but I don't think retail belongs in an R-1  
30 neighborhood. As far as basements, we did add one policy not on FAR. I really do think—  
31 maybe this goes into the safety and environment section. I think we need to have a new policy,  
32 which I had in the notes, to adapt for groundwater level rise due to climate change and mitigate  
33 future flooding, prohibit building basements in areas with a rainy season groundwater level of 6  
34 feet or less. I'd be interested in hearing comments on that. In Policy L-67, which refers to the  
35 Stanford Shopping Center, there's something about reusing parking. There's not enough  
36 parking there now. I personally don't believe in 10 years the population is going to all of a  
37 sudden just bike and walk over there, especially since it's a regional draw. I would suggest  
38 eliminating Program L-23 or the new L-67. In Goal 6, L-6 which is the new L-105 which talks  
39 about changes between commercial and residential. This is really a big bug of mine. I think  
40 there really needs to be some scrutiny, changing zoning looking at our architectural standards,



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

1 to really look at this intersection with scale, size and effective neighborhood character, so  
2 streetscape. There is a new program, L-112, to review permitted and conditional uses in  
3 neighborhood centers. Again, please eliminate childcare from the three neighborhood centers.  
4 They don't belong there, neither does any medical use, even if it's holistic, as much as I enjoy  
5 that. Personal services should be there. Along with this, I would really encourage staff to find a  
6 way to discourage conditional uses. When brokers can't rent at their exorbitant prices, they fall  
7 back claiming the only tenant they can get is a conditional use one. I think if we hold firm—this  
8 is not in the Comp Plan—and they couldn't get a conditional use approved, maybe they'll drop  
9 the rent which will preserve our local retail.

10  
11 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Shani, and then we'll start our regular rotation with Lydia.

12  
13 **Shani Kleinhaus:** Thank you so much for the tables. They're very helpful. It would be good to  
14 clarify that they're not all mutually exclusive, and there could a mix. I would personally support  
15 the cumulative cap. I don't really believe in the performance measures. I've said that before,  
16 and I'll say it again. The 10 years, somebody asked if that was unanimous. I'm not supportive  
17 of 10 years because I don't think that the results will be evident in 10 years. I think it will take  
18 longer if we're going to do that. To me, actually the community metrics are more interesting  
19 than the sustainability of the performance measures that are applied per building or per  
20 permit. I would prefer to call them quality of life metrics and to include parks per person,  
21 parkland per person, in them and canopy overall. There will not be a reduction in canopy.  
22 Displacement, I agree with. I think it was Doria who said that as we build more, there are more  
23 displaced. If new housing units is a measure of displacement, then the relationship is direct and  
24 not the other way. These are the things I would like to see. I like the idea of looking at how  
25 impacts are in the City overall, but I do not believe that we will see a huge impact of the  
26 mitigation measures or the sustainability measures within 10 years. I know what you explained  
27 with the 10 years is the intent that we don't get into the 15-year life of this general plan and fall  
28 into another one, but maybe that's a better way to do it, just this general plan will have this  
29 combination and then we can see what happens next. To me, the issue of community  
30 sustainability or community quality of life must include the parks and the canopy. That would  
31 also be a way to look at parkland without directly competing with the fees that a developer has  
32 to pay for parks. You said we couldn't both charge fees for park development and monitor  
33 parks. If we look at it Citywide and not as per project, then we can. I wanted to say something  
34 about the airport. I think the goal is the airport will be viable and minimize impacts to the  
35 community. The impacts are becoming really substantial. Maybe we need to reevaluate what  
36 trumps what. Maybe I'm with Bob on the need for the airport. He kept saying we should  
37 eliminate it. I wouldn't like to build high-density housing over there, but I'm not sure that the  
38 airport should trump all other considerations. Other than that, a lot of people said many of the  
39 things I had to say. Thank you.

40



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

1 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thanks. Lydia and then Mark.  
2

3 **Lydia Kou:** I do support the cap, L-13 or L-15 either one. In terms of the annual limit options,  
4 (inaudible) L-20, Downtown cap, L-23. There is on page 10 a new program; growth  
5 management option 3-b has been eliminated. I wanted to know if it's either to retain it or to let  
6 me know where is it mentioned elsewhere. This has to do with identifying optimal, achievable  
7 thresholds, establish goals for declining traffic congestion, spillover neighborhood parking, etc.  
8 I would like to know where is it elsewhere. If not, then I would like to retain it. Page 11, retain  
9 the new program, monitor new residential and nonresidential development to proactively  
10 address its adverse effects including traffic, parking, air quality and noise. Goal L-3, page 14,  
11 Policy L-13, it's corresponding number is L-40, not within a residential neighborhood, eliminate  
12 this policy. This has to do with retail in neighborhoods. Goal L-4, page 17, L-51, I want to retain  
13 the crossed out wording "at an equal level of detail." Page 21, cross out from Program L-26, is it  
14 somewhere else in the Land Use Element? It has improving public park space and protecting  
15 views of the Foothills by guiding building heights and massing. Page 21, Policy L-26, that's L-66  
16 corresponding number, infill development on surface parking lots especially at Stanford  
17 Shopping Center, it should not be encouraged at all. We don't have enough parking spaces as  
18 is. I think a really good example is the Performing Arts Center that is at Paly, and that's already  
19 displaced parking. Every time you build on a surface parking lot, something's going to happen  
20 somewhere. Page 21, Policy L-28, that's L-70, I want to better clarify what office center means.  
21 Perhaps it should be service retail, small business. Goal L-6, page 27, I want to add into that  
22 paragraph "and compatible to neighboring buildings and neighborhood." Goal L-7, page 33,  
23 corresponding number is L-131, there shall not be any parking exceptions for historic buildings  
24 to encourage rehabilitation. That's a no-no. Goal L-8, page 35, L-4.14, while we want the parks  
25 over the Caltrain tracks if the tracks were to be moved below-grade, there should also be  
26 consideration for a bike boulevard above it too from the north to south, vice versa, on that  
27 surface. Goal L-10, page 41, L-175, take out the words "to the maximum extent feasible."  
28 That's for the airport also. I don't think that's necessary, and they are just weasel words. Thank  
29 you.  
30

31 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Mark and then Ellen. Mark, go ahead.  
32

33 **Mark Nadim:** Looking at the clean draft for the policies. I support Policy L-14 for the City cap  
34 minus the Medical Center. For the annual limit options, I support L-21 which is the Citywide  
35 annual limit with the exemption for SRP. On the Downtown cap, Policy L-23 supporting  
36 retaining the Downtown cap. On Program L-36 on page 10, basically trying to add a fee for  
37 changing rentals into ownership housing units, I don't think that's a good idea. Home  
38 ownership should not be taxed by a fee or any other nomenclature. Basically property rights  
39 should not be infringed upon. If somebody wants to change the type of property, as long as it's  
40 within the zoning limits it should be allowed. New Program L-50, basically having some



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

1 selective, small-type businesses, it's very questionable to specify exactly the type of business  
2 residents want. Regulations can't guarantee the success of a small business. It's a market  
3 driven-type requirement. For Program L-17, page 13, providing public restrooms, this becomes  
4 a service nightmare. It's very hard to control, becomes a haven for drug users, graffiti artists  
5 prostitution and all that stuff. It's very hard to maintain the cleanliness. It's going to be a  
6 nightmare. That is basically what I have. Thank you.

7

8 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you, Mark. Ellen and then Don.

9

10 **Ellen Uhrbrock:** I'll pass.

11

12 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Don and then Adrian.

13

14 **Don McDougall:** The first thing I want to do is repeat what people have said. Hillary, thank you  
15 for the table. In fact, clearly it's a three-dimensional table, which makes it even more  
16 interesting. I will comment on the 10-year issue. We've had people mention big data, lots of  
17 data available. We've had people—I know it was mentioned that maybe in 10 or even 15 years  
18 we might not know things. The technology is what Shani mentioned. I understand that, but  
19 there are technologies and the concept of predictive analytics that would allow us, if we pick  
20 the right measures, that technology would predict what direction the measures are going. I  
21 would suggest that we should be looking at the measures more frequently, maybe 5 years or 7  
22 years. We may not have the exact answer or a conclusion, but we're going to get some  
23 predictions. In terms of the measures, I obviously like the idea of the measures. I think noise,  
24 which is the left-hand column in your columns, Hillary, should really be in the right-hand  
25 column. At least separate the concept of glare and whatnot that comes from new buildings,  
26 which might be in your left-hand column, from noise from the airport, both PAO and SFO.  
27 That's clearly a big issue with citizens today. I agree that schools could be added in there. I  
28 guess the challenge of having measures is if we can define the right baseline. I've submitted an  
29 awful lot of other comments, but I'll talk just briefly. Goal 1 talks about resiliency. I'm not sure  
30 what resiliency really means as opposed to what I would define as sustainability. In terms of  
31 quality of life, I think sustainability is really quality of life for Palo Alto. I think quality of life is  
32 really sustainability. We have to be careful with what we mean by sustainability. Is it  
33 perpetuation or is it environmental or is it economic or is it social? I would argue that in many  
34 cases where we use sustainability, we should be qualifying it in terms of what kind of  
35 sustainability we mean. I agree with the comment that gathering spaces maybe shouldn't be  
36 included in parkland. Even parklets and pop-up parks should be part of the goal. I think the  
37 recent experiment with pop-up parks was well received by the citizens. Pages 22-26 of the  
38 unedited or un-redlined draft, there's a total list of programs and policies in there that, I think,  
39 cumulatively would cost you billions. I really think that we need to be really careful about  
40 coming forward with—we're at a point now where I can't get the trees in front of my house





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

1 replaced because we don't have staff or money to replace the trees they cut down 2 years ago.  
2 I talked to them today about that. To put in all these other things that we should do on top of  
3 all those things, we need to be very careful with editing that. In terms of the airport, I would  
4 almost suggest—not almost. I would suggest that maybe there ought to be a subcommittee of  
5 the subcommittee or a separate subcommittee that should address the airport in terms of what  
6 it's intended for, whether it's a place to respond to disasters, whether it's sustainable  
7 economically as well as environmentally. I'll mention other things later. That whole airport  
8 thing is not well addressed here, but I do believe it's in the right place, not in transportation.

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

11  
12 **Don McDougall:** Thank you.

13  
14 **Co-Chair Garber:** Adrian and then Bonnie.

15  
16 **Adrian Fine:** Thank you. I kind of want to couch this by starting to say that there's a couple of  
17 ways of managing growth. On the one hand, you can think of managing growth as limiting it.  
18 On the other hand, you can think of managing growth as making sure that our growth supports  
19 the future development of the City and the things we want in it, whether that's parks,  
20 transportation, things like that. Generally, I'm a bit worried about some of the new regulations  
21 proposed for growth management here, particularly those that expand it Citywide or include  
22 hotels, without research. Those are really big changes which we should look at first or at least  
23 have Council look at. I do like some of the inclusion of performance measures, because I think  
24 that actually address the impact. I think that's kind of the growth management style I prefer.  
25 We can add new housing; we may be able to add new retail spaces, but we need to address  
26 those impacts through performance measures. On choice number 8, I'm generally in  
27 agreement with Hamilton. I think we should actually include single-family homes. They have  
28 impacts as well, and we should be able to measure and mitigate those. To go through a couple  
29 of the other high-level goals. On L-1, I was a little surprised to see that we're removing office  
30 from mixed use. Although, I know the City has some issues with office, I've often thought of  
31 office as an integral part of mixed-use development. They support residences, and they  
32 support the retail beneath. On Goal L-4, I was a little surprised. Why are we removing Town  
33 and Country and neighborhood centers as sites for housing? I just didn't really see the impetus  
34 there. I think it's important for us to keep our options open and flexible. Just a few more small  
35 points. Goal L-5 was talking about attractive parks and housing on El Camino where it touches  
36 SRP. Maybe we should think about all of El Camino. Maybe we want attractive parks along all  
37 of El Camino and attractive housing along other parts of El Camino. L-10, this is actually kind of  
38 echoing Don's point. It may not be for the CAC to evaluate the airport. I thought it was really  
39 weird to see that the airport's supposed to be economically viable and minimum environmental  
40 impacts. I have no clue what that means. The City has a lot to do in the airport area. Finally on





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

1 Goal L-8, it was talking about new parkland via developments, developers giving land to the City  
2 for parkland. That's Planned Community zoning inasmuch as I could read it. I think that has a  
3 pretty shredded history in Palo Alto. We have to balance that. Is that something we really  
4 want? The last part of Goal L-8 was talking about dedicating in-lieu fees towards parkland.  
5 Which in-lieu fees? There's a whole range of them across the City. I have some more  
6 comments, but I'll probably email them to staff.

7

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

9

10 **Bonnie Packer:** I'd like to speak a lot to the options about growth management. I agree with  
11 Amy. I don't think it's necessary to call these ways of managing. Call it a cap. I think we'd be  
12 better to call it a trigger, a trigger to look into something else. In other words, I think we all  
13 have the same goals for wanting to manage growth. I think the performance measures that are  
14 suggested are a great way to deal with it. I would hope that the wording in the Comp Plan says  
15 ensure that the Zoning Code reflects these performance measures as development standards or  
16 architectural standards, however we do it, to ensure that people who are developing, who plan  
17 to develop know what's expected of them, and it's in the Code, and it's somewhere that they  
18 can look for it, so it's there. This idea of calling this a cumulative cap, let's call it a cumulative  
19 trigger instead of it looking like Palo Alto is opposed to growth. I don't think we are. I think we  
20 want to manage growth so that the growth, as Adrian says, promotes the best quality of life for  
21 all of us and for future residents and future employees that come here. It looks like what  
22 you're suggesting is that this committee sends up choices to the Council rather than having the  
23 committee vote on the choices. If we were to vote on the choices, I would vote no on  
24 something called a cap, but I would wholeheartedly endorse the performance measures that  
25 we would use to ensure that we reach the quality of life that we think we want. I also have a  
26 couple of other things. I think Mark mentioned that there was a policy about supporting efforts  
27 to preserve rental housing units in existing neighborhoods. I don't think that's enforceable. If  
28 somebody has a house, you can't make them rent it or not rent it. You have to look at some of  
29 these statements and see whether you can actually do it. This is something I raised in the  
30 Transportation Element, design in parking lots and in the neighborhood commercial centers.  
31 The safety of the pedestrians and the bicyclists in these places, right now you take your life in  
32 your hands whenever you cross any parking lot. If we can change some of the parking lot  
33 designs, have striping, put that in here somewhere. There was one other. I have this in my  
34 written comments. We talk about preserving the character of the City. Character is a loaded  
35 term. It means one thing to me, and it means something else to Adrian and something else to  
36 Alex. We should be careful when we say things like that, maybe talk about the varied character  
37 or the varied neighborhoods. Character can also be used—when you say preserve character, it  
38 could be shorthand for redlining or keep those people out of there because they're different  
39 from the character of our neighborhood. Look again when you're drafting to take away these  
40 loaded words that could be misused. Thank you.



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

1 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Alex, then Julia.  
2

3 **Alex van Riesen:** Just two comments. One on the 10 years, I did find in Jennifer's notes that  
4 you had the answer to my question. It could possibly be less than 10 years if they were paying  
5 attention to the effects of the changes and let that trigger the evaluation. It seemed liked the  
6 10 years was a suggestion, maybe an outer limit. I like that window idea. I do think it may  
7 warrant more discussion on an automatic trigger at an earlier time, just given the importance of  
8 some of what we're talking about. The second thing I want to mention is I wanted to go back to  
9 something Hamilton said. I'd like to see with the time that we have tonight—I appreciate the  
10 comments where we seem to be saying what we're for or what we're against. It seems what  
11 would move the ball forward in this would be if we could have either some kind of straw poll on  
12 the A-B options that Hillary has listed and ask are there any of these A-B options that we could  
13 eliminate in our sending it to the Council, just to clarify where we are. Maybe we can't. If there  
14 are some in which we're in all agreement, that would simplify and clean-up the matrix. I'd like  
15 to—I don't know if it's move or suggest that we curtail the comment section and move to  
16 something that may yield better fruit.  
17

18 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you, Alex. Julia and then Lisa.  
19

20 **Julia Moran:** With regards to the cap versus the performance measures, like Amy and Adrian  
21 and a few other people, I would also be in favor of performance measures. That doesn't mean  
22 you're going growth crazy. I think it's just a much smarter, more strategic way of growing. I  
23 agree with Hamilton when it comes to applying the Citywide minus the Medical Center and also  
24 in terms of the R&D or R&D plus hotel. I see the benefits of doing it both ways. To be honest,  
25 I'm not sure which one is better. This is a question; I don't really have an opinion on this. With  
26 regards to using 2015 as a base year when it comes to sustainability and water, are there any  
27 issues that that's 3 years into a drought and we have issues with we haven't been watering our  
28 trees enough and they're dying? I don't want to be anti-green, but it is a dip year. Just  
29 something to think about. With regards to basements in general, the woman who spoke about  
30 basements and the water usage there, it looks like that's something that I would be for adding  
31 into the basement policy in regards to the program. I don't know if it makes sense to put just  
32 this one specific FAR as a program that makes sense for the policy that we have there. There  
33 was a lot of potential policies listed. I think that needs to be fleshed out more. I guess I was a  
34 little confused about Annette and Doria's issues with childcare. Having childcare in our  
35 neighborhoods is directly associated to how affordable this area is. People can't live here  
36 without two incomes. I think we need to make that available and close. Maybe I'm  
37 misunderstanding that. If you could explain, that would be great. I think it was Heidi who told  
38 us that, although our grade schools are extremely highly ranked, our daycares and early  
39 childhood care is extremely low in this area. I would hate to do anything that would harm that.  
40 Thanks.



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

1 **Co-Chair Garber:** If you have a brief answer, that'd be fine.  
2

3 **Annette Glanckopf:** I think childcare is critical. All I was saying is the three neighborhood  
4 centers should be reserved for retail uses. There are plenty of great childcare facilities  
5 throughout the neighborhoods. I wasn't saying don't put them in the neighborhoods. I was  
6 saying don't put them in the three neighborhood centers. There's this other concept about  
7 multiuse neighborhood centers. I'm not worried about that. It's just the three centers,  
8 Edgewood, Midtown and Charleston.  
9

10 **Co-Chair Garber:** Lisa. Are you done, Julia? Lisa.  
11

12 **Lisa Peschcke-Koedt:** Overall I think Alex and a couple of other people mentioned—I do think  
13 we should try to do a vote to go to City Council in the sense of saying here are the options. Like  
14 the height thing, I think it'd be helpful to say more than half were in favor of this one and only  
15 20 percent were in favor, whatever. I think that gives them some indication of what's useful. I  
16 would suggest we do that this evening. As far as the overall, I can save my votes until then. I  
17 think the options laid out in the chart and the matrix are very good. I have my own views of  
18 them. I don't know if it's helpful to share that. As far as the approach in general, I think we've  
19 narrowed down for the growth the key choices. There are details and nuances within it, but I  
20 think it's all here. As we've said already, it's do we want to cap or do we not want to cap. I  
21 don't actually think it's useful to discuss it more. I think we've done enough of that. It's what's  
22 the view. I do have a question on the basement thing. I thought one of the public speakers—  
23 something I've been worried about too is the groundwater. I think it would be a good idea to  
24 include something about basements. I'm actually not personally against them. I don't think it  
25 hurts whatever the character is of the neighborhood. It gives good space without going up too  
26 high and taking too much. I feel very strongly about all the wasted water. I think it has to fit  
27 into the neighborhood. There are exceptions, as I understand it, for if you're sort of in the flood  
28 zone but not really and then you can do that. I think there should be a requirement that no one  
29 can build a basement unless they capture all the groundwater that otherwise would be wasted.  
30 That's not the current rule as I understand it. More broadly, I think actually we've made a lot of  
31 progress on the land use. I think the subcommittee's done a really good job. I didn't have  
32 major—some of the other ones, I liked the idea of having more discussion on the airport. I  
33 came in thinking it'd be good to use the airport for something else. Someone said you really  
34 can't. Some of it is data for me, because I actually don't know. Could we do anything with that  
35 or would that make no sense at all? It'd be helpful just to get to ground on it. I'm certainly not  
36 the expert on it, but it'd be helpful if we had some view on the airport side. I think that's really  
37 it. Can I ask, are we going to do a vote? Otherwise, I'll give my views on the key points.  
38

39 **Co-Chair Garber:** Once we get through here, Hillary has some suggestions for us. Thank you.  
40 Elaine and then Jason.



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

1 **Elaine Ung:** On the nonresidential growth items, for choice number 2 I would favor  
2 office/R&D only. I'm saying this because adding hotels to this will actually put further pressure  
3 on the housing stock and make housing much more attractive for short-term rentals. I actually  
4 disagree with some of the comments earlier. There is a hotel shortage. Anybody who has had  
5 visitors coming in from out of town will understand that it's really difficult to find a hotel,  
6 especially on weekdays and certain weekends. There is a big need for short-term rental space,  
7 and that's why you do see a proliferation of Airbnb. I would like to see more housing for people  
8 who need to live here. I would favor office/R&D only in that cap. On Option 3, I just want to  
9 make a comment. Three and nine are kind of tied together. 1989 versus 2015, we're talking  
10 about the two baselines. That's 26 years of time. In that 26 years of time, which is about 22  
11 percent of the time Palo Alto's been in existence—we were incorporated in 1894—22 percent  
12 of that time we've only built 6 percent, 6 percent of our square footage. Really, 1.5 million  
13 square feet in the City of Palo Alto between '89 and 2015 is only 6 percent of the total square  
14 footage in the City. That's actually not that much for 22 percent of the time we've been in  
15 existence. The same with the Downtown cap. I would actually ask staff to include the  
16 Downtown cap numbers and the overall cap numbers. I don't think we had that reference, so  
17 it's hard to parse that out. I've requested that specifically. For the Downtown cap, between  
18 1989 and 2015 only 300,000 square feet of nonresidential square footage was added out of 3.5  
19 million. That's 8 percent of the Downtown area, 8 percent and then the 22 percent of time that  
20 they were in existence. For Number 4, I'm in favor of eliminating the cap for performance  
21 measures. What we really need to talk about is how do we cap the impacts, not necessarily the  
22 square footage. The square footage by itself doesn't drive the traffic. It's the jobs industry, the  
23 opportunities that we set forward in those places. With Number 5 on trip reduction in  
24 particular, I don't think a percentage SOV reduction is enough. We really need to think strongly  
25 about a trip cap, which is what Stanford was required to do with the 2000 GUP. They've been  
26 successful. They've added—I forget what the percentage of square footage is that they've  
27 added. They've kept cars coming in at the same level and even less and reduced the number of  
28 parking spaces demanded. On sustainability measures, I applaud the desire to have urban  
29 forest, but I think urban canopy, if you think about it natively, is not a native ecosystem. We  
30 also need to consider grasslands, wild flower ground cover, not just urban canopy. I think  
31 landscape is a much broader category that we should really think about, not just trees.  
32 Landscape and grass scape, ground cover in particular, has huge storm water retention  
33 infrastructure management capabilities. I do agree with Hamilton on sustainability metrics to  
34 all development would be applicable.

35

36 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Jason and then Arthur.

37

38 **Jason Titus:** I'll just be quick. The idea of saying that we have performance management and  
39 not just caps is pretty valuable. If we actually put something in that says rather than after 10  
40 years we'll review this, but a model that says on some more recurring basis we'll evaluate and



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

1 we have performance metrics and we watch how they're doing every 2 years or something.  
2 Based on that, that would allow some sort of recalibration. It seems like a much more—you  
3 could respond more quickly. I just think if you wait 10 years—if you either set a cap or just wait  
4 10 years, you're going to either slam into a cap and then have to figure out what to do or 10  
5 years later say, "I guess we should have done things differently." To Don's point, we have the  
6 data. We can be seeing what is the impact on traffic, what is the impact on availability in  
7 schools so that maybe we can track that. I think just getting some sort of—every 2-year interval  
8 or 3-year interval doing an evaluation would be good. I guess I understand the revised thing  
9 around childcare and residential. I feel like that is something we should be kind of clearly  
10 supporting, saying we want to have childcare intermingled in the overall City. Certainly the  
11 places that do childcare well, like Scandinavia, that's a lot of the model. The last thing we need  
12 but we already do have is people dragging kids all around town, which is more drivers, less foot  
13 traffic and unhappy parents  
14 . That's it.

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

16  
17 **Co-Chair Keller:** Firstly, you can't manage what you don't measure. You can measure things  
18 that you are using for observation, but not necessarily manage it. I do think it's important for  
19 us to include a measure of looking at schools. It is the crown jewel of our community. If we  
20 don't measure schools, we are missing the boat. Performance measures should include quality  
21 of life. I disagree with the notion that sustainability equals quality of life. For example, if you  
22 basically say that traffic congestion is shot to whatever, then that will promote public transit  
23 and alternative uses. It certainly destroys the quality of life for a lot of people. That shows that  
24 quality of life and sustainability can be at odds with each other. We need to actually measure  
25 both very carefully. In fact, the mini sustainability metrics that have been defined are  
26 sustainability. We need to actually add to those quality of life measures like level of service,  
27 which is congestion, school capacity, parkland per capita, loss of rental housing. I'm not talking  
28 about rental housing in R-1 neighborhoods. If you tear down a moderate-density apartment  
29 building and replace it with high-density for sale housing, then you're essentially losing rental  
30 housing. I think that's important. If somebody builds a second dwelling, an accessory dwelling  
31 unit, in a single-family, residential neighborhood, and then somebody comes along and tears it  
32 down and replaces it with a big home, that's loss of a rental housing unit. I think we need to  
33 think about that. If we allow accessory dwelling units and then you take it away later, that's a  
34 loss of a housing unit. That should be taken into account. There's an important distinction, and  
35 I think this is captured partly in Table 2 between performance measures that we can apply on  
36 individual development and performance measures that we apply Citywide for evaluation. The  
37 Citywide ones especially need to include quality of life issues. In particular of some things, the  
38 annual limit, pace of development, that's where we should be doing every 2 or 3-year  
39 evaluations, not in the overall cap. We should have an overall cap, and we should have an  
40 overall cap Downtown. It's the annual limit. There's a slot missing with reevaluation. That's



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

1 where you need to evaluate the annual limit up or down every 2 years based on looking at that.  
2 That's the right way of measuring that. The overall cap is basically a gross measure for the  
3 overall growth management of the City. In particular, one of the growth tools that we have not  
4 taken advantage of for Downtown—because we have transferrable development rights  
5 Downtown, suppose we take the amount of development that's available in the Downtown cap  
6 and allocate it all to the historic, one-story buildings. They basically can retain those buildings  
7 by selling their development rights to people who want to develop. This way you're actually  
8 allocating that out. You're creating a market-based force for dealing with development. The  
9 cap is meaningful. Otherwise, it's a race to whoever gets to the Development Center first to  
10 grab within their measure. One last thing about this is that you have to think in terms of the  
11 fact that when you are approaching a limit—for example, when you think about congestion on  
12 streets, a little bit of extra development has an outsized effect on congestion. Although, I  
13 appreciate Elaine Uang's numbers about that, realize that a little bit of extra development  
14 causes a lot of spillover traffic and a lot of spillover parking and can cause a lot of congestion.  
15 It's not simply linear. It can be super-linear. It can actually be that you passed a critical point,  
16 and that's a problem. Thank you.

17  
18 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. A couple of quick comments. There are few things I like better  
19 than large trees. I noticed the one policy on oak trees as well and noticed that it didn't include  
20 redwoods. However, having recently been asked by Canopy to lead two or three community  
21 (inaudible) with an arborist two weekends ago, I've learned—I guess I've known for a while—  
22 that redwoods are not native to the flatlands in Palo Alto. However, there is one that is, and  
23 that's the El Palo Alto. It's because it's right beside the creek. Redwoods apparently require a  
24 tremendous amount of water, and they often need to be irrigated with a tremendous amount  
25 of water as well. Canopy has not been recommending that they be planted. I think there is  
26 some study that needs to be done there. I don't know exactly what that is. I didn't see in the  
27 description of the area plans—I would argue that this group should recommend to Council that  
28 the area plan where the Transit Center is today, between Alma and El Camino, be designated a  
29 place for an area plan. That's primarily because it is so critical to our transit infrastructure and  
30 does not serve it well today. If we are interested in long-term transit options, we are the key in  
31 that transportation chain that goes up and down. That is an extraordinarily important and  
32 influential piece for us to have and manage as well as to leverage against our various transit  
33 providers up and down the Bay. On the matrix, I think it would be helpful to see some more  
34 options underneath the reevaluation. There actually are some more that are in the pages as  
35 opposed to the matrix. Seeing some more bullet points there. The reason I'm focused on that  
36 is because, as I've spoken before, land is the largest contributor to our City's general funds,  
37 more than 50 percent. For us to support future City Councils and give them the flexibility they  
38 need to address market forces, to address changes in climate, etc., there should be more  
39 opportunities for them to choose from for how they want to be able to manage that on an  
40 ongoing basis in a world that we don't know how to plan for exactly. I agree with a number of





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

1 Hamilton's comments in particular about Stanford and pulling them out of a variety of these  
2 different measurements for not only the reasons that Hamilton had mentioned—I'm talking  
3 about the Research Park as well as the Medical Center. I'm agreeing also with the reasons that  
4 Hillary mentioned in her presentation as well. There's another reason to do that. Palo Alto  
5 suffers from having many small parcels that are owned by many different property owners.  
6 That is one of the largest constraints about change and creative change in our community.  
7 Stanford is the one property owner that owns vast sections of the City. I believe that we can  
8 get more out of developing specific development agreements with them directly than we can  
9 out of the Comprehensive Plan to address our overall needs. I will come back and talk about  
10 basements, on which I have put a memo on each of your places, next time around. Hillary, you  
11 want to give us some things that we could possibly vote on.

12  
13 **Hillary Gitelman:** Sure. Just listening to all of you. Thanks to Hamilton and to Alex for this idea  
14 that maybe there are a few things we could vote on to narrow down the options in the chart.  
15 Heidi, do you have a question? We didn't get around to Heidi.

16  
17 **Co-Chair Garber:** I apologize. Maybe you were standing up when I was writing down my notes.  
18 I apologize. Heidi, go ahead.

19  
20 **Heidi Emberling:** I thought, "She missed a meeting or two, so now she doesn't get to  
21 comment." I'm just kidding. Thank you. I really appreciate this matrix. Just to echo that.  
22 Thank you so much. Let's do this always. I agree with many things that have been said.  
23 Bonnie, I love that comment, growth that protects the quality of life. A really nice way of  
24 putting that. I like the idea of a trigger, not a cap. In Elaine's comments, the thoughts about  
25 thinking of these areas as area plans, looking at it in terms of how do we improve and  
26 strengthen development in this area and again protect quality of life. We don't want to limit  
27 our governing body's hands in figuring out how to reflect the needs and wants of the  
28 community. I like Jennifer's comment about are these targets the right targets to achieve the  
29 desired results. I think that's good thinking around these performance measures. I like these  
30 performance measures. I think there's a way to partner with PAUSD. Maybe something about  
31 aligning performance measures. We do have sustainability measures within the District as well.  
32 Left hand talking to right hand things are always helpful. Aligning those performance measures  
33 would be an appropriate thing to put in the plan. I think the schools, Arthur, do partner well  
34 with the City in terms of looking at numbers of new housing coming online. We tend to plan  
35 our schools accordingly. There's another issue about reflecting the needs and wants of the  
36 community. We used to have 22 elementary schools; now we have 12. We have larger  
37 elementary schools. Some folks are okay with that. We're always surveying our families to say  
38 what is the quality of your experience within a school. We have two schools that are way too  
39 large, but that's a conversation we have at the District all the time in terms of whether we want  
40 to open a new school, keep schools smaller, bigger, how are we going to expand. I think the





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

1 City already partners with the School District well around advanced planning in terms of that  
2 need. We have our internal discussions as well. One thing I didn't notice, and maybe you  
3 talked about it in your subcommittee meeting, was a coordinated area plan for Cubberley. I  
4 don't know if that came up. It's in yours as well. It seems to have fallen off the City Council's  
5 priority list. We're discussing it at our School Board retreat in August. It would be nice to have  
6 joint use thinking around Cubberley considering the tremendous work of the community and a  
7 committee like this one that served for 16, 18 months to come up with five large books guiding  
8 this process. Now, we really don't know where we are on that. I would love to see a  
9 coordinated area plan around Cubberley developed with the schools. I just don't know if that  
10 came up or not. I'm out of time.

11  
12 **Co-Chair Garber:** Hillary, back to you.

13  
14 **Hillary Gitelman:** Thank you. Looking at the chart, I think there are three things we could  
15 potentially vote on to try and narrow the options. I'll just run through them. If you agree, the  
16 Chairs could take us through that. The first one is if we retain a cumulative trigger or cap and a  
17 Downtown trigger or cap, should they apply to office/R&D only or to office/R&D and hotel. It's  
18 a choice. We could vote on that. Similarly, if we retain a cumulative trigger or cap, should it  
19 apply to the City as a whole or the City minus SUMC? As I said, there's a reason it would make  
20 sense to exempt SUMC. It's entitled to square footage already, and it's big. The third thing we  
21 could vote on is if we have an annual limit, should it apply Citywide or should it apply Citywide  
22 minus the Research Park, which is one of the choices here. That seems to me like Door Number  
23 1 or Door Number 2. I think we could vote on those three things to try and narrow the options.

24  
25 **Co-Chair Keller:** In terms of whether the cap applies Citywide or the Stanford Research Park,  
26 there was a comment in there about whether there was trip caps or the equivalent on that. If  
27 we choose excluding the Stanford Research Park, I'd want to understand that that exclusion is if  
28 we can actually do a trip cap. I have concerns about that, because Stanford has a trip cap very  
29 well because it's got clear boundaries. The Stanford Research Park is much more permeable,  
30 and there's a lot more flow-through the Stanford Research Park. It might be harder to measure  
31 a trip cap. If you could actually figure out a trip cap, that's one thing. That's a concern that I  
32 have.

33  
34 **Hillary Gitelman:** We did talk about that at the subcommittee. Initially the option was  
35 Citywide or Citywide minus discrete areas that have trip caps. We sort of thought that was too  
36 complicated, and we got to Stanford Research Park. It could go either way.

37  
38 **Co-Chair Keller:** I'm assuming if we exclude the Stanford Research Park, it's because it has a  
39 trip cap. That's the idea? Thank you.



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

1 **Hillary Gitelman:** As you mentioned, it's still an idea that we'd have to explore to make sure  
2 that it's doable.

3  
4 **Co-Chair Garber:** Lydia.

5  
6 **Lydia Kou:** Does the Stanford University Medical Center have a TMA in place?

7  
8 **Hillary Gitelman:** It was the subject of a big Environmental Impact Report, and they had an EIR.  
9 They have to monitor and report to us on an annual basis their transportation characteristics.  
10 There are TDM requirements.

11  
12 **Lydia Kou:** Is there a penalty involved if they don't meet that, that goes to the City?

13  
14 **Hillary Gitelman:** I don't recall. I know they monitor to us annually. We get a big report, and  
15 we report to the Council.

16  
17 **Co-Chair Garber:** Bonnie and then Hamilton.

18  
19 **Bonnie Packer:** I have a question about the annual limit. I'm not sure how that works. If  
20 there's an annual limit, let's say it's 100,000 square feet and we haven't reached it. Does the  
21 balance go forward? What does it mean and how does it relate to the cumulative, whatever  
22 you're going to call it, cap or trigger? It would make more sense if it was another monitoring  
23 with a trigger. If you reach a certain amount, it means we have to do X as opposed to stopping  
24 all development.

25  
26 **Hillary Gitelman:** Currently, the annual limit idea is completely distinct from the idea of a  
27 cumulative cap. It really is focused on the pace of development rather than the amount of  
28 development. It has a limit for each year. If you don't hit that limit, then things are just as they  
29 are. If you hit that limit, then only the best projects will be approved. If there's any unused  
30 square footage, it does not roll forward. It has the effect of—if you look at growth over time,  
31 we have peaks and valleys. It has the effect of cutting off some peaks. Over the last 10 years, I  
32 think we had 4 years that were above the current limit. Those years would have been slightly  
33 reduced.

34  
35 **Co-Chair Garber:** Hamilton.

36  
37 **Hamilton Hitchings:** Arthur, on your comments about porousness, I'm not sure I agree it's that  
38 porous. The specific project I'm thinking of is there was just a project approved in Stanford  
39 Research Park. They agreed—it's on Page Mill. Do you know the one? 1050 Page Mill.  
40 Stanford agreed to reduce traffic impact by 30 percent below its current amount as a condition



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

1 of doing that particular project. I'm fine with whatever we do to reduce traffic. There's  
2 multiple ways to slice the cap. That's an example of something that just passed and was agreed  
3 to by Stanford. Every time you're approving these new projects with additional capacity,  
4 they're having to subtract more car trips than they're adding capacity. That way, whenever you  
5 give them something, you're getting a little bit of benefit back in terms of traffic mitigation. I  
6 think something like that is a very reasonable approach, and it has just worked in the last 6  
7 months.

8  
9 **Co-Chair Keller:** I just want to say that you may be able to do that on a per project basis, but  
10 it's hard to measure cumulatively. That's the point I was making. I don't object to the idea of  
11 trying to have mitigations that actually clear things up, make things better as opposed to just  
12 keeping the status quo. It is easier to have an overall trip cap at Stanford than it is in the  
13 Research Park. That's the point I was making.

14  
15 **Co-Chair Garber:** If there are no other comments, I'd like to entertain these three different  
16 votes. Shall we try them?

17  
18 **Co-Chair Keller:** Sure.

19  
20 **Co-Chair Garber:** Hillary, will you restate the first question? We'll raise our hands pro and  
21 con—ask for those that support to raise their hands, etc. Wait, we have one more question  
22 over here. Annette.

23  
24 **Annette Glanckopf:** I just have to make this comment. It's really been bugging me. We're  
25 talking about all this stuff, about cumulative growth and caps and whatever. My point is that  
26 the quality of life—even though we could build, build, build and we would have no cumulative  
27 impacts, which of course is not possible. There is an impact of the quality of life, the density,  
28 the overcrowding, the streetscape, the change in character. Arthur mentioned that maybe we  
29 should have some sort of performance measure on quality of life. I just wanted to really  
30 strongly say that I don't think that this really measures everything. The more we develop, if we  
31 develop especially with some of these architectural problems, which I call problems, it really  
32 does affect the quality of life with the density and the energy and the fighting for resources,  
33 schools, parks. It's been bugging me, so I said it.

34  
35 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Hillary.

36  
37 **Hillary Gitelman:** There are two possible choices here. That means not a yes or no; there are  
38 two choices. If we retain them, should the cumulative trigger or cap and the Downtown trigger  
39 or cap apply to: Door Number 1, office/R&D only; Door Number 2, office/R&D and hotel?



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

- 1 **Co-Chair Garber:** Who would support Door Number 1—you're only allowed to vote for one—  
2 which is office/R&D? I'm sorry?  
3
- 4 **Hillary Gitelman:** Office/R&D only is the first choice. Office/R&D plus hotel is the second  
5 choice.  
6
- 7 **Co-Chair Garber:** Who would vote to support office/R&D? I'm sorry. There's a comment from  
8 ... I'll add her vote when we get there. Would you ...  
9
- 10 **Hillary Gitelman:** Office/R&D only.  
11
- 12 **Co-Chair Keller:** The polls are for voting members.  
13
- 14 **Co-Chair Garber:** Eleven.  
15
- 16 **Hillary Gitelman:** I got 12  
17 .
- 18 **Elaine Costello:** I got 12.  
19
- 20 **Hillary Gitelman:** Can you keep your hands up please? Office/R&D only. Thirteen with one of  
21 the Co-Chairs. The next choice is office/R&D plus hotel. Five.  
22
- 23 **Co-Chair Garber:** Doria, she wants it with R&D and hotel. That would be six.  
24
- 25 **Male:** (inaudible)  
26
- 27 **Co-Chair Keller:** We said that the—the notes said that you can be present or you can give your  
28 stuff in advance to the meeting.  
29
- 30 **Adrian Fine:** Does it say anywhere in the notes about what votes non-voting members can vote  
31 on? I'm just wondering. I thought we were allowed to vote in straw polls but not on  
32 procedural items in the agenda.  
33
- 34 **Co-Chair Keller:** Our rule is that non-voting members have the floor but cannot vote.  
35
- 36 **Adrian Fine:** Where is that rule?  
37
- 38 **Heidi Emberling:** I heard that straw polls we do get to vote. In straw polls but not actual votes.  
39



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

1 **Co-Chair Keller:** I think that there's no specific rule about that. We have decided to allow the  
2 non-voting members to have power of the floor. When I was on the Rail Corridor Task Force, I  
3 was relegated to have my comments along with the public at the end of the meeting. I thought  
4 that was a travesty. I thought that the non-voting members voting even on straw polls was not  
5 appropriate.

6  
7 **Co-Chair Garber:** Let's do this. We're going to note that you would vote for that. Elaine's going  
8 to check and see if we have any other—fine. Annette, and then we'll go back to Hillary.

9  
10 **Annette Glanckopf:** Can I explain my vote. I think that if you have any kind of cap and you  
11 decide to add or subtract categories, the baseline of the cap will depend on what you include.  
12 To me, it's sort of academic which way you vote.

13  
14 **Hillary Gitelman:** I have a slightly different point to make. We all sort of expressed our support  
15 one way or the other, but we didn't actually end up eliminating any options. Maybe I phrased  
16 this incorrectly. Maybe I should have ...

17  
18 **Co-Chair Keller:** I think it's fairly likely that we won't eliminate options, because I don't think  
19 we're going to achieve consensus very much. It's helpful to get an idea of where people stand.

20  
21 **Co-Chair Garber:** You want to try another one?

22  
23 **Hillary Gitelman:** I do. Bonnie has a ...

24  
25 **Co-Chair Garber:** I'm sorry. Bonnie.

26  
27 **Bonnie Packer:** Arthur said he didn't think we could eliminate options. In the discussion in this  
28 past hour and a half, I heard a number of people say they prefer performance measures to  
29 caps. I think that's—the overall question is whether we have caps, triggers, whatever you call  
30 it, versus performance measures. Then, we go into the details.

31  
32 **Hillary Gitelman:** Actually I was going to do it the other way around. What I'd like to do is  
33 these three questions, and then we can talk about how to phrase a vote on the larger issue.  
34 The next question I had is if we retain a cumulative trigger or cap, should it apply to the City as  
35 a whole or the City minus SUMC? I guess we should just ask for a show of hands for those who  
36 believe a cumulative trigger or cap should apply to the City as a whole.

37  
38 **Lisa Peschcke-Koedt:** Sorry. One clarifying question. I think that assumes that the cap couldn't  
39 have something specific to Stanford, to the hospital. Is that ...



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

1 **Hillary Gitelman:** In practicality, we probably would need to have something special about the  
2 hospital to just explain its status as an approved project already. You're right in the sense it's a  
3 little bit semantics.

4  
5 **Co-Chair Garber:** We have one more clarifying question. Arthur.

6  
7 **Co-Chair Keller:** I'm assuming if we exclude the Stanford University Medical Center, we are  
8 excluding the currently entitled project and not necessarily future entitled projects there.

9  
10 **Hillary Gitelman:** That would be my assumption. I guess I would look at how the map currently  
11 delineates that area. That's how currently we exclude it, the way it's shown on the map.

12  
13 **Co-Chair Keller:** The issue is we could—in some sense we could either say that we allocate the  
14 Stanford University Medical Center and pre-allocate them within the cap and say that they're  
15 entitlement and therefore they reserve that much or we say that we exclude it entirely.  
16 Effectively, it's just a numbers play.

17  
18 **Hillary Gitelman:** You and Lisa are absolutely right on that. Maybe this is a false choice.  
19 Maybe we're all kind of in agreement that this is—there's one answer here. It's just how we  
20 phrase it.

21  
22 **Co-Chair Keller:** You just adjust the number accordingly depending on what you want to do.

23  
24 **Hillary Gitelman:** Excellent. Let's move on to the next choice.

25  
26 **Lisa Peschcke-Koedt:** Propose what goes forward is Citywide, but there may have to be  
27 something carved out, say we've already approved that, that doesn't count. It's more practical  
28 of how you apply it Citywide.

29  
30 **Hillary Gitelman:** How we treat the Medical Center as being already entitled.

31  
32 **Lisa Peschcke-Koedt:** Especially what's already been approved. That's stupid to bring it in  
33 again. You're right. We're not trying to undo that.

34  
35 **Hillary Gitelman:** We'll work with the subcommittee about how to phrase that one. There's  
36 another one here. If we have an annual limit, should it apply Citywide or Citywide minus the  
37 Research Park? You'd be deferring to the subcommittee to think further about this question of  
38 a trip cap. Right now, I guess we're looking for your thoughts about whether an annual limit  
39 would be better blanket, Citywide or find some way to exclude the Research Park and work on  
40 the trip cap concept.





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

1 **Co-Chair Garber:** Sorry, Don. Would you use your microphone? I apologize.

2

3 **Don McDougall:** Could we read that differently? It's Citywide or Citywide minus SRP if a trip  
4 cap can be sufficiently implemented.

5

6 **Hillary Gitelman:** We can phrase it that way with the understanding that we're going to have  
7 to explore that concept a little more.

8

9 **Don McDougall:** Exactly. That's why the "if."

10

11 **Hillary Gitelman:** I think first we should have a show of hands for those who want Citywide.

12

13 **Co-Chair Garber:** Citywide only versus ...

14

15 **Hillary Gitelman:** Annual limit Citywide. Two. Citywide minus the Research Park presuming we  
16 can get a trip cap or similar.

17

18 **Co-Chair Keller:** I assume you mean Citywide minus the Stanford Research Park provided that  
19 there is a trip cap that can be implemented.

20

21 **Hillary Gitelman:** Yes.

22

23 **Co-Chair Keller:** If there's no trip cap, then it's Citywide.

24

25 **Hillary Gitelman:** Right. Subject to working on that concept further. Thirteen. We had some  
26 abstentions.

27

28 **Co-Chair Garber:** Elena just clarified that in fact our ex officio members cannot vote on the  
29 straw polls. If you're not present, your vote even if it's provided beforehand cannot be  
30 counted. However, the views will be made a part of the minutes. We should subtract one from  
31 the first vote.

32

33 **Hillary Gitelman:** I don't think we counted that vote, so I don't think we have to subtract. The  
34 larger, umbrella issue, you're going to have to help me here. I think there are three choices.  
35 One is that we have a cumulative cap or trigger Citywide and potentially for Downtown. It  
36 could be with or without the annual limit and performance measures. That's the first choice.  
37 The second choice, we have no cumulative cap or trigger Citywide and potentially none in  
38 Downtown, but we have performance measures. That's the other end of the spectrum. In the  
39 middle is that we have no cumulative cap or trigger Citywide and potentially Downtown, but we  
40 have an annual limit and performance measures.



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

- 1 **Male:** (inaudible).  
2  
3 **Hillary Gitelman:** Pardon me? Those are the three choices.  
4  
5 **Shani Kleinhaus:** I have a question.  
6  
7 **Male:** We can vote for multiple?  
8  
9 **Co-Chair Garber:** Arthur, why don't you make your suggestion? That may help out some of  
10 these other questions.  
11  
12 **Co-Chair Keller:** I suggest that we do the annual limit separately, to vote whether we have an  
13 annual limit, rather than having those as the three choices.  
14  
15 **Hillary Gitelman:** I just think there might be some people who would say no to a cumulative  
16 cap if in lieu of that there was an annual limit. It's a different approach to managing growth.  
17 One is a total cap, and one is managing the pace.  
18  
19 **Co-Chair Keller:** Maybe we should vote on an annual limit first.  
20  
21 **Co-Chair Garber:** We had two other clarifying questions. Shani and then Hamilton.  
22  
23 **Shani Kleinhaus:** If we vote for no performance measures, the performance measures would  
24 have an equivalent in the mitigation measures of the EIR, right? They already do.  
25  
26 **Hillary Gitelman:** I don't think there's any option in which we won't have performance  
27 measures. That was in all three of them. The question is really cap or performance measures  
28 or cap or annual limit plus performance measures.  
29  
30 **Shani Kleinhaus:** I think you need to say those again.  
31  
32 **Female:** (inaudible)  
33  
34 **Hillary Gitelman:** That would be easy. We could do cap or no cap, annual limit or no annual  
35 limit, performance measures or no performance measures. We might get to the same place.  
36  
37 **Hamilton Hitchings:** I agree with Bonnie on this.  
38  
39 **Co-Chair Garber:** Hamilton.



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

1 **Shani Kleinhaus:** Again, no performance measures, does that mean that there will be  
2 equivalent to the performance measure as mitigations? If you don't have performance  
3 measures, then you have to implement mitigations for the same things.

4  
5 **Hillary Gitelman:** I think we're going to end up with performance measures. Hold that  
6 thought.

7  
8 **Co-Chair Garber:** Hamilton, you had a clarifying question? Elaine and then Jennifer.

9  
10 **Elaine Uang:** I don't need to speak. Your second approach is fine.

11  
12 **Co-Chair Garber:** Jennifer.

13  
14 **Jennifer Hetterly:** I'm confused about why we're having these votes at all. I thought we were  
15 going to put forward these options as iterated unless we could eliminate an option. It seems  
16 clear we can't eliminate any options. Why are we trying to sort out what the vote would be?

17  
18 **Hillary Gitelman:** I think there was a suggestion that in conveying this to the Council, we could  
19 give them some sense of the group's feeling on this. That's up to the committee if you want to  
20 vote on these options or not. I think you're right; they'll all be presented to the Council. The  
21 question is whether you want to present them with some sense of support.

22  
23 **Lisa Peschcke-Koedt:** That would be helpful. It's similar to what we did on the height. Just give  
24 an indication of where we're falling. If something is 50/50, it doesn't help the Council at all. If  
25 it's a clearer delineation, then maybe that helps the Council. They can still choose whatever  
26 option.

27  
28 **Co-Chair Garber:** Arthur, a suggestion.

29  
30 **Co-Chair Keller:** I think it is helpful to get some sort of sense. If it is completely lopsided in one  
31 direction or another direction, that may give input to the Council. Essentially the decision is  
32 going to have to be made by the Council. We're not going to make the decision. I think there  
33 are essentially two votes. One vote is whether or not there's an overall cap or trigger as some  
34 people call it. The second question is whether or not there is an annual growth limit. The issue  
35 of performance measures, we're going to have performance measures anyway in order to  
36 determine what is the—we're going to be measuring that anyway. What we do with the  
37 measure depends on the effects of the cap and such.

38  
39 **Co-Chair Garber:** Can we vote more than once?



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

1 **Co-Chair Keller:** You can't vote—there are two separate questions, so why would you vote  
2 more than once?

3

4 **Co-Chair Garber:** They're just separate questions.

5

6 **Co-Chair Keller:** Two separate questions.

7

8 **Shani Kleinhaus:** We had so much discussion at the subcommittee on these. There were so  
9 many explanations that people who are going to vote on this tonight do not have. I feel that it's  
10 premature to vote on this question. The other two made sense. This one to me is way  
11 premature. People should probably have a lot more opportunity to learn about the differences  
12 before any vote is taken.

13

14 **Hillary Gitelman:** One of the advantages of doing it at the next meeting is we could do it when  
15 we're actually looking at the policies instead of at the matrix. I'm still focused on the matrix. By  
16 then, hopefully everyone will really have had time to review the policies that the committee  
17 helped us draft to express these options. That's where we could do our votes, if we do it at the  
18 next meeting.

19

20 **Elaine Costello:** It'll give us more time to organize how to do it.

21

22 **Co-Chair Garber:** Don, Bonnie, Arthur.

23

24 **Don McDougall:** Hillary, could you explain the concept that if you have performance  
25 measures—you're going to have performance measures even if you have caps. What are the  
26 performance measures going to measure if the cap is 50,000 square feet or whatever? I'm  
27 sorry. I don't ...

28

29 **Hillary Gitelman:** The way we've been thinking about performance measures is they are  
30 measures that would apply to new development as it's approved. It would require them to  
31 perform in certain ways. We would want to monitor that over time even if we're still well  
32 below the cap. That's the concept we've been talking about. We added this idea of  
33 sustainability metrics. I know we have to work on the name of it. The idea is it's something  
34 more community-based, kind of a community condition that we would monitor periodically just  
35 to see how we're doing, how are we as a community doing.

36

37 **Don McDougall:** I totally agree with the concept. In fact, even in the idea of sustainability, you  
38 could have some of those measures have triggers and some of those measures be measures.  
39 Some of them could be early warnings. They could be the predictive numbers that you could



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

1 look at. I'm all for it. I just didn't really understand if you had a cap, how much time are you  
2 going to spend measuring things that ...

3

4 **Hillary Gitelman:** It kind of gets to Bonnie's point that a cap is only really—it's like the ceiling.  
5 Hopefully you're never going to get to the ceiling, but you want to have performance measures  
6 that apply all the way along.

7

8 **Co-Chair Garber:** Bonnie. Thank you, Don.

9

10 **Bonnie Packer:** I really appreciate Shani's comment that we don't really fully understand what  
11 you've been talking about, those of us who haven't gone to the subcommittee. My vote would  
12 have been based on whether you called it a cap or a trigger. I don't like the idea of a cap  
13 because it seems draconian. A trigger is organic. You have something you're working towards.  
14 The same with the annual thing. I would rather call it a trigger than a limit, or call it some other  
15 word that says a warning, we're growing too fast and we need to adjust. These are possible  
16 things we could do to adjust. If you prepare a narrative for us to study for the next meeting  
17 that explains some of that and uses some words that we haven't thought of yet but explain  
18 what we're trying to do and give an example. If something happens, whatever you call it, on an  
19 annual level, then the City could do X, Y and Z. It's related to the performance measures, and  
20 so each of the performance measures might have a trigger or a data point at which we do  
21 something. Something a little bit more fine tuned that gets to the quality of life issues that  
22 we've been talking about.

23

24 **Co-Chair Garber:** I'm going to move us forward. Thank you, Bonnie. Arthur and then Shani.

25

26 **Co-Chair Keller:** Firstly, let me separate out the issue of performance measures applied to  
27 individual projects versus broader measures of the community overall. Performance measures  
28 applied to individual projects are simply that. You look at an individual project, and it tells  
29 whether that project is meeting its desire for not having impacts on the community. They don't  
30 affect cumulative impacts. We see that with traffic. It's a little drip, drip, drip and suddenly you  
31 have a flood. The cumulative impacts are actually Citywide measures which are more quality of  
32 life measures overall. It's these overall measures for the community as a whole that should  
33 affect the annual growth limit as the City Council has decided. That should continue as in our  
34 current structure, but it should allow that annual growth limit to go up and down. It isn't  
35 merely a monitoring thing. At least the annual one is a hard and fast rule, and you do a beauty  
36 contest basically, picking the best projects within that limit. In terms of 10-year growth limits  
37 and things like that for the overall City or 15 years or permanent ones, that is a little bit less  
38 critical. The issue is that's based on the overall measurements, not on measurements of  
39 individual projects. We need to keep that distinction clear. Finally, I have a proposal that I've  
40 made in terms of how to handle Downtown, which involves picking a growth limit and



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

1 allocating out that growth. Then, you're naturally within that growth using market forces. I  
2 think that should be considered. In particular, the thing that's missing for the annual limit is  
3 this idea of adjusting that up or down after 2 or 3 years. I think there was support for that as  
4 being a near-term thing and that being an annual limit according to the way the current  
5 ordinance for the City Council works.

6  
7 **Co-Chair Garber:** I need to move us along here. Forgive me, Shani. What I'd like to do is pull  
8 this—not vote on it, pull it into the subcommittee. They can recast the discussion for our next  
9 meeting. A brief comment from Shani, brief comment from Stephen.

10  
11 **Shani Kleinhaus:** In terms of the performance measures, I'm not clear on what the difference is  
12 between a regular mitigation and monitoring plan that has some triggers attached to it like they  
13 did for North Bayshore and a lot of other projects, or Facebook or other projects. They look at  
14 it and say these are the mitigation measures and you cannot develop certain things or this  
15 trigger is involved in meeting those, and there is a monitoring program. I don't see why it has  
16 to be different. I just want more explanation. Kind of a comment that East Palo Alto had to  
17 curtail all development because they have no water. The cumulative issues are critical to  
18 consider. It's not one project that ran out of water; it's the City. I think that's really important  
19 to continue.

20  
21 **Co-Chair Garber:** Steve.

22  
23 **Stephen Levy:** I'm happy to keep going to subcommittee meetings, but I don't think this is a  
24 subcommittee issue. I think it's an explanation issue from the staff of what the implications of  
25 some of these things are. I follow what Bonnie said. I'm not completely clear on what will  
26 happen if. I don't want to have another lobbying meeting. The subcommittee's met. I think it's  
27 a 5-2 subcommittee. I don't think we need to do that, but I'd love to hear from the staff and  
28 maybe Joanna what some of this stuff actually means. I think the conversation with Lisa and  
29 Arthur sorting out whether it meant anything to include the Medical Center or not, I'm  
30 interested in that. I don't think that's a subcommittee issue. I think we should have some  
31 learning, not some arguing, if we're going to move forward on this.

32  
33 **Co-Chair Garber:** Hillary, any final comments (crosstalk)?

34  
35 **Hillary Gitelman:** Yeah. I guess I'd just say this has been a fascinating conversation. I  
36 appreciate all the input. I think what the subcommittee will help us do is refine the policy and  
37 program language. We'll maybe leave the matrix behind and focus on the policy language. At  
38 the next meeting, the staff will come prepared with a proposal for how to structure a vote if we  
39 choose to vote on the policy options by looking at that document. Thank you all. You've been





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

1 very patient. This is a complicated subject, and we got some great feedback from you this  
2 evening.

3  
4 **Co-Chair Garber:** Just before we finish up here, I wanted to touch just briefly and mention to  
5 you that I've given each of you a probably too-long memo on the new policies that have been  
6 proposed for basements. I think some of you are aware that I've been working with Keith  
7 Bennett who created Save Palo Alto's Ground Water. We are writing alternative Code language  
8 that we're going to be proposing to the City Council hopefully later this summer or early this fall  
9 to address a number of these issues. The way that the policies were currently drafted in the  
10 notes that were handed out to us don't really get at what the issues he and I understand are  
11 really at the basis of the community's concerns. He and I didn't have a long opportunity to craft  
12 a joint memo. He's in Japan, so you'll see a memo from him, and you're going to see my memo  
13 which tries to incorporate some of his as well. Basically talking about basements, there are a  
14 lot of tangled different topics. I'm making a recommendation that some of them exist and are  
15 addressed in the Land Use Element. Quite a number of them exist in the Natural and Urban  
16 Environment and Safety Element. Just to answer Jennifer's comment. In an interview with five  
17 prominent arborists that do work in the City and have worked in the City for the last 35 years as  
18 well as interviewing the City's arborist, none of them can site an instance where the  
19 construction of a basement actually caused a tree to die. That is primarily because, as I have  
20 learned, 90-95 percent of the roots of a tree, even the tallest oaks and the tallest redwoods, are  
21 all within a foot to a foot and a half of the surface. The roots rarely go beneath 4 or 5 feet  
22 deep. With few exceptions, there are very, very few species that actually get down deep  
23 enough to touch the aquifer. However, what does happen and happens with great frequency is  
24 that trees on properties as well as neighboring trees benefit from the irrigation that goes on.  
25 That gets stopped during construction. As a result, there are a lot of instances where there has  
26 been a failure of means and methods to keep those trees alive. Just because we're running out  
27 of time, I'd recommend taking a look at this or the subcommittee taking a look at this and read  
28 through both Keith's comments as well as mine. Maybe we can talk more about that later.  
29 Arthur, a final comment.

30  
31 **Co-Chair Keller:** Yes. I think we need a mechanism to deal with when policies and programs  
32 are moved from one element to another as it happens to make sure that they don't fall on the  
33 ground. I know there have been some policies removed from transportation or actually  
34 community services that were supposed to go to land use. I just want to make sure we have a  
35 mechanism for making sure that they don't disappear and that they do get incorporated. I'd  
36 like to thank, once again, the subcommittee for their work. Both subcommittees on their work  
37 on the transportation and land use. I'd like to thank staff especially for the summary and for  
38 the chart. I think that was very helpful. I hope that the subcommittee when it's looking at this  
39 looks at how to enhance that and take into account the comments that were made in order to



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

1 figure out how to frame the discussion better for us the next time we meet. Thank you very  
2 much.

3

4 **Heidi Emberling:** I have a question about future meetings.

5

6 **Co-Chair Garber:** I'm sorry. Who's speaking? There you are, Heidi.

7

8 **Heidi Emberling:** Hi, over here. I know we've gone beyond the original matrix of meetings for  
9 this group. I didn't ...

10

11 **Co-Chair Garber:** How can you tell?

12

13 **Heidi Emberling:** I didn't get a new email reflecting all the new meetings and how long we're  
14 going to go. We just set all of our Board meetings. I already know that at least October and  
15 November, maybe December we conflict. I don't know if those are already set or if you're going  
16 to take a look at the Board meetings.

17

18 **Hillary Gitelman:** I can commit to have a schedule for the next meeting. Our next meeting is  
19 going to be on August 16th. We will go to the Council on August 15th, the day before, with  
20 your transportation recommendations. For both meetings, we'll have a schedule that will be  
21 available for discussion.

22

23 **Co-Chair Keller:** I thought we moved from the second Tuesday to the third Tuesday in order to  
24 avoid School Board meetings.

25

26 **Heidi Emberling:** The problem is things like Thanksgiving and other things move our meetings  
27 around. Whenever we move our meetings around to accommodate holidays, we're on the  
28 same Tuesday. That's happening throughout the fall. It's just if you want the school's voice  
29 represented, you might want to think about ...

30

31

32 **Hillary Gitelman:** You can come on the 16th?

33 **Heidi Emberling:** Yes, I can come on the 16th. That's not a problem. We haven't started  
34 school.

35

36 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Amy briefly, and then we're going to conclude.

37

38 **Amy Sung:** I also wanted to touch upon the basement. I was caught by surprise; I didn't know  
39 that it made it into the goals. (inaudible) to City of Palo Alto's old documents in the database  
40 and I found there was a memo that was put forward by the staff (inaudible). That was back in



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

1 September 2008. It was a really, really extensive report that provided input from the geological  
2 survey and also Silicon Valley Water District and also some of the experts. That involved issues  
3 from the discharging water volumes and impact on the neighboring properties, on the trees  
4 (inaudible) and the stability of the environment. Maybe we could have that report provided to  
5 us. I saw there was also a strengthened Code ordinance that is involved in the basement  
6 construction. I think those are the information that's really important to let everybody know  
7 when we drafted the policy and the programs, what are we talking about. Thank you.

8

9 **Feedback for Continuous Improvement:**

10

11 **Future Meetings:**

12 August 16, 2016 - Rinconada Library - Embarcadero Room

13 Topic: Draft Land Use & Community Design Element

14 **Adjournment: 8:33 P.M.**

15 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. May I hear a second?

16 **Co-Chair Keller:** Second.

17 **Co-Chair Garber:** From many parties. Thank you and good night. It is 8:33.