



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY
COMMITTEE

Draft Minutes

Mitchell Park Community Center
3700 Middlefield Road
Palo Alto, CA 94303
September 8, 2015

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

Call to Order

Chair Garber: Folks, it's 5:35. We will start our meeting. I will call the meeting to order.

CAC Member Introductions:

Chair Garber: I would like to start by acknowledging our new members which are Shani, Len, Jennifer, Annette, Mark and soon to be Julia who is also joining us. We wanted to give them an opportunity to say a little bit about themselves. The recommendation has been that we all do that, so that they know who we are. I'll start, and then maybe, Arthur, you can go and we'll go in that direction. I'm Dan Garber. I'm the current Chair, about to be Co-Chair of this Committee. I live in Old Palo Alto, about five houses from Oregon Expressway, and have a wife, two kids and have lived in Palo Alto since '96. Arthur.

Vice Chair Keller: Thank you. Please make sure that when you use your microphones that they're close enough to you. Please also make sure to turn off your microphones when you're not using them; otherwise, we get feedback in the room. That's your public service announcement for tonight. I'm Arthur Keller, and I am Vice Chair, soon to be Co-Chair. I've lived in Palo Alto since 1977, originally as a grad student at Stanford and then I went away for two years to teach at the University of Texas Austin. I've lived here continuously since 1987, raised with my then wife, twin daughters who are now 22 years of age. I am a consultant; I advise startups and I serve as an expert witness on patent cases. I served on the Planning and Transportation Commission for eight years. I was on the subcommittee of the Planning and Transportation Commission that drafted the Transportation Element that we're going to be discussing tonight.

1 **Elaine Uang:** Can you hear me? Okay. My name is Elaine Uang. I live
2 Downtown North. I'm a residential architect by profession, and I have lived
3 in and out of the Palo Alto/Stanford area since, oh I don't know, a total of 11
4 years over the last 20-some years.

5
6 **Stephen Levy:** I'm Steve Levy. I live behind the farmer's market. I came
7 here to Stanford 52 years ago. Our kids went to school and graduated from
8 Paly. I'm a regional economist professionally.

9
10 **Amy Sung:** Good evening. My name is Amy Sung. I moved to Palo Alto
11 from Ohio after I worked at NASA for ten years. I came here with my two
12 children and a husband. My two boys went to Duveneck, Jordan and Paly.
13 I've been living here since 2001. I live next to the Main Library. I am now
14 working as a realtor serving great Palo Alto area.

15
16 **Bob Wenzlau:** My name's Bob Wenzlau. I came to Palo Alto in the '70s,
17 going to Stanford, grew three kids in the Palo Alto School District, worked
18 for the City, dropped out of Stanford for three years much to my mother's
19 enjoyment, but the goal was to start the City's curbside recycling program,
20 so we got that going. Since then, run a small business in Palo Alto involved
21 in land stewardship, called Terradex, and recently had worked on
22 composting issues in Palo Alto.

23
24 **Whitney McNair:** Hi. My name is Whitney McNair. I'm the Director of
25 Land Use Planning for Stanford University, and my office is in Palo Alto off of
26 Page Mill Road.

27
28 **Alex Van Riesen:** My name is Alex Van Riesen. I've lived in Palo Alto since
29 1998, did go to school here in the early '80s, Stanford, left and then came
30 back with my wife. I have three children. We live on Louis Road near Loma
31 Verde. I'm a pastor at a local church here in Palo Alto and glad to be on this
32 team.

33
34 **Don McDougall:** My name is Don McDougall. I'm currently on—is that any
35 better?

36
37 **Chair Garber:** Better.

38
39 **Don McDougall:** Good instruction. I'm Don McDougall. I'm currently on
40 the Library Commission, and I do work with environmental volunteers.
41 Other than that I'm basically retired.

42
43 **Jennifer Hetterly:** I'm Jennifer Hetterly. I grew up here in Palo Alto, and
44 after several years back east, moved back with my family. I've a freshman

1 and junior at Paly. I live in Midtown. I also spent several years as a
2 volunteer for the Greenmeadow Residents Association, and I'm currently in
3 my sixth year on the Parks and Recreation Commission and also was a
4 former subcommittee chair for the Cubberley Community Advisory
5 Committee.

6
7 **Julia Moran:** Hi. My name is Julia Moran. I've lived in Palo Alto for about
8 three years. My background is in finance, but I am now home with my two
9 kids. They're 1 and 3. That's about it.

10
11 **Adrian Fine:** Hello. My name's Adrian Fine. Is it on yet? My name's
12 Adrian Fine. I was born and raised here. I'm the youngest of six kids raised
13 here in Palo Alto. I also serve on the City's Planning and Transportation
14 Commission, so I'm here as a nonvoting member, but I'm excited to listen
15 and give input where I can. Professionally I work for nextdoor.com, kind of
16 in civic technology and partnerships.

17
18 **Jared Jacobs:** Hi. My name is Jared Jacobs. I grew up mostly in South
19 Carolina. I've been in this area since 2002. I have a wife and three kids.
20 The oldest is in first grade this year at Escondido. Happy to be here.

21
22 **Hamilton Hitchings:** Hi. My name's Hamilton Hitchings. I've lived in Palo
23 Alto for over 20 years. I have a freshman in Paly also. I'm an active
24 volunteer in the Emergency Services Volunteer Program, and professionally
25 I'm doing my own startup right now.

26
27 **Bonnie Packer:** My name's Bonnie Packer. I've lived in Palo Alto since
28 1974. I went to law school, commuted to San Francisco on Caltrain for 14
29 years, had two kids through the school system. I was on the Planning and
30 Transportation Commission for five years. Let's see, PTA Council. I'm on
31 the Board of the Palo Alto Housing Corporation, been a member of the
32 League of Women Voters, lots of stuff. I live in South Palo Alto near the "Y."

33
34 **Mark Nadim:** My name is Mark Nadim, and I live in Palo Alto Hills. I've
35 been living in Palo Alto since '86. My daughter just graduated from Gunn
36 this past June, and now she's majoring in engineering. I'm an engineer
37 myself. I was in high tech for about 35 years, and now I'm consulting.

38
39 **Len Filppu:** I am Len Filppu, originally from the East Coast. I've been in
40 Palo Alto since 1980. I worked a lot in high technology; now I'm writing and
41 consulting. I live in the Fairmeadow area, and I'm acting chair of the
42 Fairmeadow Neighborhood Association.

43

1 **Lisa Peschcke-Koedt:** I'm Lisa Peschcke-Koedt. My parents came over
2 and settled in Palo Alto in the early '50s. I was born here and went to
3 Addison School and Jordan and Paly, Stanford undergraduate, and then I
4 went actually back East for law school, worked in high tech my whole career,
5 still at Cisco. I was at HP and Agilent before that. I do finance and legal,
6 actually international and tax and customs. The reason I wanted to be here
7 was my mom was part of a plan 30 years ago or so for Palo Alto. I was
8 always so impressed and admired her of what she helped do for that. I
9 realize my piece will be much, much smaller, but it's a pleasure to get to be
10 a part of it.

11
12 **Ellen Uhrbrock:** I'm Ellen Uhrbrock, and I came to Palo Alto in 1954 as a
13 graduate student at Stanford. Since then, I have lived and worked and
14 especially keen on small business. I am looking forward to planning Palo
15 Alto for the next ten years.

16
17 **Lydia Kou:** Hello. My name is Lydia Kou. I'm a resident of Palo Alto,
18 actually here in the Bay Area for the last 27 years, first living in Mountain
19 View, then Los Altos and then Palo Alto. Started off here as a small business
20 owner, mom and pop shop. It was a video rental business in College
21 Terrace. Now I am a residential realtor with Alain Pinel here in Palo Alto
22 also. I started volunteering for the Palo Alto Emergency Services
23 group/program and help initiate a lot of the programs that they have right
24 now including teaching and training. That is actually what brought me to
25 interest in the City affairs, and so here I am today. I look forward to
26 working with all of you.

27
28 **Doria Summa:** Hi. My name is Doria Summa. I live in College Terrace in
29 actually one of the oldest houses in Palo Alto. I've been very active in my
30 neighborhood association, and I've volunteered for other committees such as
31 the Development Center Customer Advisory Group known as DCCAG, and
32 have a fond interest in these issues in Palo Alto.

33
34 **Shani Kleinhaus:** My name is Shani Kleinhaus. I live in Adobe Meadows.
35 I've been here for almost 20 years. Professionally I'm an ecologist. I work
36 for the Santa Clara Valley Audubon Society as an environmental advocate,
37 an advocate for birds and wildlife and habitat in cities and in open spaces. I
38 also work with many other environmental organizations in the area including
39 Sierra Club and many of the other local groups. I have reviewed many,
40 many CEQA documents, so I think that I can contribute a little bit. I've
41 worked with Whitney before on some projects, and many others here.
42 Thank you.

43

1 **Annette Glanckopf:** Hello everyone. Annette Glanckopf here. I'm another
2 Midtown resident, so I look forward to talking to you, Alex and certainly
3 Jennifer. I moved to California in the late '60s to work at medical research
4 at Stanford, so my background is healthcare, technology and a lot of
5 planning. As far as this effort right now, I'm involved with my
6 neighborhood, Palo Alto neighborhoods. I'm involved with Emergency
7 Services, and we have quite a few others so that'll be an interesting
8 element. As far as planning, I was one of the co-chairs for the future of
9 single family housing as well as led the effort to get ground-floor retail in
10 Midtown Shopping Center.

11
12 **Hillary Gitelman:** Thank you. I'm Hillary Gitelman, the Planning Director
13 of Palo Alto. I want to welcome you all and thank you all for doing this.
14 We're going to have a lot of fun. I've been a professional planner in the Bay
15 Area for over 20 years. Doing a General Plan or Comprehensive Plan like
16 this is one of the greatest things that you can do in a community, not just
17 because I anticipate we're going to have a fantastic product at the end of it,
18 but because the process of getting there is so instructive and important. It's
19 an opportunity for the community to come together, air the differences that
20 exist and find a way to structure a plan that is a consistent and coherent
21 vision for all of us moving forward. Welcome and I look forward to a great
22 discussion this evening.

23
24 **Jeremy Dennis:** My name is Jeremy Dennis. I'm the relatively new
25 Advance Planning Manager for the City of Palo Alto. It's good to see you all
26 here tonight.

27
28 **Gil Friend:** Hi everyone. I'm Gil Friend. I'm the City's Chief Sustainability
29 Officer, been with the City of Palo Alto for just about two years. Before that,
30 over the last 30 or 40 years, I've been working in the sustainability field,
31 advising governments and large corporations on how to embed sustainability
32 as a source of innovation and economic advantage. I'm leading the effort
33 here to develop our new Sustainability and Climate Action Plan which I'll be
34 talking with you about in a few minutes.

35
36 **Chair Garber:** Thank you all. I would also like to acknowledge our City
37 Manager, Jim Keene, who's joining us this evening, and our Mayor Holman
38 back there and two Council persons, Mr. DuBois and Mr. Schmid. Thank you
39 for spending the evening with us. Just before we get to Staff comments, let
40 me remind the public that we are taking cards for oral communications. We
41 currently have how many? Four? Four, so if anybody else would like to
42 speak, please bring your cards up to Arthur here. I'm going to remind you
43 that we had a couple of ground rules. Those were the shared leadership,
44 which we're about to enact. Transparency. I've made a personal

1 commitment to Arthur to share all of the communication that comes to me
2 with him and other members on Staff. This is a safe place for us to talk
3 about things. We are going to do our very best to make sure that all
4 opinions are aired and shared. With that, let me invite Staff to make some
5 comments for the evening.

6

7 **Staff Comments:**

8

9 **Jeremy Dennis:** Thank you, Dan. I'll try to keep my comments relatively
10 brief, because we have a lot in front of us this evening. First of all, I wanted
11 to start off with some additional introductions of my Staff. To your left, my
12 right, is Robin Ellner and Consuelo Hernandez. To your right or behind you,
13 Chitra Moitra and Andrew Hill from PlaceWorks who will be taking notes live
14 tonight. They'll be on the screen a little bit later. A few things. First, I
15 wanted to mention obviously the Council a week ago made a decision to add
16 additional members, and we're glad that they are here tonight. The second
17 motion that was made that evening was that this is the CAC that they
18 wanted. If I may read a portion of the motion. Affirm that the resulting
19 CAC is well equipped to fulfill its role with 22 voting members and 3
20 nonvoting members appointed to review all relevant materials, etc. I just
21 wanted to make that point. Secondly, I've appreciated over the last six,
22 eight weeks as I've gotten to know everybody and get your comments, keep
23 them coming. They're really helpful to our process, both related to what
24 we're talking about but also how to make this process better for you. We
25 will do everything we can to implement those, knowing full well when we
26 have 22 people who give us 22 different sets of comments, I can't get to
27 them all in exactly the way you may want, but we'll do everything we can.
28 If there's something though that we're missing, let me know and we'll try to
29 do that for you. Number three, taking a little personal exception for a
30 second. Consuelo Hernandez is leaving us. She is moving on to a new
31 position. This is her last CAC meeting. I don't know what I personally am
32 going to do. Our next CAC meeting is going to be a disaster because she's
33 leaving, but I wanted to let her know how much I'm going to miss her. I
34 know everyone else here will. She's done an extraordinary job keeping this
35 going, so thank you very much for everything you've done. With that, I will
36 turn it back over to our Co-Chairs.

37

38 **Oral Communication:**

39

40 **Chair Garber:** Okay. Let's get to oral communications.

41

42 **Vice Chair Keller:** Our first speaker is Mary Holzer, to be followed by Beth
43 Bunnenberg.

44

1 **Chair Garber:** You'll have three minutes.

2

3 **Mary Holzer:** Tell me when I'm done. I read this document, nice light
4 reading for my weekend. I was interested to discover that 90,000 people
5 commute into the city everyday which put in clear picture for me exactly
6 why we have a problem. I was dismayed to discover that there weren't any
7 numbers in there that projected forward what current development and
8 development in the pipeline will do to that number of people that are coming
9 in, but Jeremy reassured me that they are working on that and you will get
10 those numbers. I don't see how you can make decisions or proposals
11 without having a clear picture of exactly what's going on in the town and
12 where it's going with respect to growth and development. Second point is
13 this is a regional problem. If we aren't in close contact and work closely
14 with the cities around us, up and down the Peninsula, any decisions and
15 solutions that we come up with will be not particularly useful because it all
16 has to work together to solve this problem. The last thing is 90,000 people
17 put out an awful lot of greenhouse gases in addition to the greenhouse
18 gases that the City of Palo Alto residents put out when they travel around. I
19 think that needs to be very carefully considered as we look forward into
20 development in this community and how we fix this, because the climate
21 situation is not getting better. That is what I have to say.

22

23 **Chair Garber:** Thank you.

24

25 **Vice Chair Keller:** Beth Bunnenberg, to be followed by William Ross.

26

27 **Beth Bunnenberg:** I'm Beth Bunnenberg speaking as an individual tonight.
28 Thank you so much for this opportunity to talk about the Comp Plan. I
29 remember in some early discussions we talked some about historic sites and
30 districts and structures that very closely involved streets, roads and
31 highways. For years, train tracks, road construction projects, freeways have
32 been hazardous to historic properties. Probably our most endangered
33 property that's in hazard's way is our El Palo Alto tree, the symbol of our
34 town, and the railroad bridge that the tree has its roots kind of wrapped
35 around some of the concrete bulwarks. Of course, El Camino Real is also
36 very near. In my estimation though, downtown University Avenue is very
37 much in danger, and 27 University Avenue, that's MacArthur Park, is greatly
38 in danger. Please include—I think maybe at one point there was some
39 inclusion; I don't know what happened to it—but include either as a separate
40 bullet point or incorporated in the wording, as you talked about the different
41 important things to do, to strengthen policies on preservation of historic
42 structures and sites that are on the National Register, California Register of
43 Historic Landmarks and properties that are listed on the Palo Alto Historic

1 Inventory. I have attached a list for the Committee's examination. Thank
2 you very much.

3

4 **Vice Chair Keller:** William Ross, to be followed by Gabriel Lewis.

5

6 **William Ross:** Good evening. My name's Bill Ross. I spoke at the last
7 meeting. I would first like to comment on the draft minutes of your body at
8 the last meeting. I suggested at that time that there be a record of
9 proceedings. I think the minutes reflect the need for that. I don't think that
10 they fairly represent several things that went on at your meeting. I can use
11 my own comments as an example. I specifically referenced the General Plan
12 guidelines, the need for economic diversity, referencing representatives from
13 the Buena Vista project. I also referenced the issue of horizontal
14 consistency and how would your efforts be related to the currently two
15 required to be updated elements of a General Plan, Circulation and Housing.
16 I would like to comment on your consideration tonight of the Transportation
17 Element, suggesting that it be brought back after you consider Land Use.
18 Cases clearly establish under Government Code Section 65302(b) that the
19 Transportation or Circulation Element is to be correlated to Land Use.
20 Clearly they require that. Why? So that any change in demands on the
21 various roadways or transportation facilities as a result of changes in land
22 use contemplated by the plan are considered. Also, if the Circulation
23 Element is to be effective, for exaction it must be based on traffic studies
24 that are sufficiently detailed to link land uses and related demand for future
25 dedications. Respectfully, I certainly hope that you're not using the
26 Transportation Element to "back door" considerations for what land use
27 should be. The cases for over 30 years have indicated to the contrary. You
28 look at land use and then, because of the demands predicated by the
29 intensity of those uses, you then correlate the Circulation Element to those
30 uses. Thank you.

31

32 **Chair Garber:** Thank you.

33

34 **Vice Chair Keller:** The next speaker is Gabriel Lewis, to be followed by
35 Stacey Ashlund.

36

37 **Gabriel Lewis:** Good evening, everyone. My name's Gabriel Lewis. I grew
38 up here in South Palo Alto. Hello? Good evening. I grew up here in South
39 Palo Alto, and I'm working at Stanford right now while applying to econ
40 Ph.D.s. Anyway, I was reading the Transportation Element, and I came
41 across T-1.2.1 Program which has to do with encouraging the installation of
42 facilities that support alternative fuel vehicles by reviewing and amending
43 the Zoning Code where appropriate. That kind of sparks some more general
44 thoughts about our investments in supposedly beneficial innovations. I just

1 wanted to say that in those kinds of—well, we need to insert into the
2 language that we should be more sure that programs like this are actually
3 beneficial before we invest in them. Alternative fuels are not necessarily
4 better fuels. Innovation is not necessarily improvement. Some innovation, I
5 think, could be worth investing in, like electric cars. The data says that
6 those are pretty good ideas, but some are not. Ethanol is a good example of
7 something that is a relatively new invention, but it's actually a net energy
8 loss to produce it and it creates more carbon than gasoline. I think that we
9 need to be a little bit more careful about how we think about these
10 innovations and be a little bit more cautious in investing in them. Thank you
11 very much.

12
13 **Vice Chair Keller:** The next speaker is Stacey Ashlund, to be followed by
14 Penny Ellson.

15
16 **Stacey Ashlund:** Hi, I'm Stacey Ashlund. I'm a resident of Barron Park for
17 about 20 years. I have two children, one at Terman and one at Gunn. I'm
18 an advocate for inclusion of people with disabilities, and this includes
19 children all the way to the elderly, and I'm also ending my first term on the
20 Parks and Rec Commission. I wanted to speak about transportation from
21 the point of view of people with disabilities. The majority of the
22 conversation about transportation relates to cars. Obviously there are
23 environmental problems as well as traffic problems. The second thing we
24 hear most often is bikes, bike paths and Safe Routes to School. What is
25 blatantly missing from the conversation is safe pedestrian access. I'm not
26 going to detail by any stretch all of what the ADA requires for safe
27 pedestrian access, but there are a number of people that cannot drive or
28 ride bikes due to mobility impairments, vision impairments and even things
29 such as anxiety and Asperger's disorders. The sidewalks in Palo Alto, the
30 majority of them are not wide enough nor clear enough. If you walk on
31 Arastradero, you have less than 3 feet of space and the majority of that is
32 encroached upon by bushes and trees from private property. If you try to
33 use a white cane on there, as a visually impaired person does, you'd actually
34 be better off in the street in the bike path, because the sidewalk is in such
35 bad shape. The sidewalks are also not lighted. Barron Park, my
36 neighborhood, is one of those prime examples that is unsafe for pedestrians
37 due to that. The crossing lights, press to walk buttons are not at the
38 majority of our intersections. When they are installed, they need to have
39 audio as we have in Midtown, so it tells you when it is safe to walk. The
40 curbs need to be painted to increase visibility, or they're not safe for visually
41 impaired residents. We had yellow curbs painted at Terman Middle School,
42 and my son attended there, so that he wouldn't trip over them. A couple of
43 years later that paint has worn off. I hate to say that I'm not at that school
44 anymore advocating that paint needs to be refreshed if the curbs are going

1 to be safely visible to the visually impaired. The majority of people with
2 disabilities are not just mobility impaired, so just know that it takes a wider
3 lens when you're looking at what ADA covers. It does tend to focus on
4 mobility, but vision is obviously another equally important aspect. Lastly,
5 public transportation. We have VTA and Marguerite shuttle from Stanford.
6 We do have the Palo Alto free shuttle. All of these are wonderful, but they
7 have very limited routes. We already have driverless cars where you don't
8 have to stay awake. It's called buses and trains. Many people don't use the
9 public transportation because we don't have a very extensive system. On
10 the other hand, we don't have a very extensive system because it's not
11 heavily used. We can solve this chicken and egg problem by enriching the
12 public transportation system and the safe pedestrian access for the disability
13 community, but also for the environment, that it affects all of us. Lastly, I
14 encourage the Comprehensive Plan to include an ADA review of pedestrian
15 access more often than on a 20-year basis, perhaps even five years or less.
16 Thank you.

17
18 **Vice Chair Keller:** Thank you. Our next speaker is Penny Ellson, to be
19 followed by David Cole.

20
21 **Penny Ellson:** I'm Penny Ellson, and I'm speaking as an individual tonight.
22 First of all, I just want to comment that we have a pretty good
23 Transportation Element right now. I mean when our Transportation Element
24 was written, it was visionary for its time. As I was reading through it last
25 night, I thought "wow, a lot of this never got implemented." I would like us
26 to look backward, and I would like us to look at the Bicycle and Pedestrian
27 Transportation Plan that was approved unanimously in 2012 and make sure
28 that the good things that are in that plan, that were in our last
29 Comprehensive Plan get implemented as we move forward. I like that we're
30 talking about alternative forms of energy. All of that is great, but I really
31 think we need to put a large emphasis on transit. I think our City needs to
32 start working with transit authorities with the other cities to put pressure on
33 them to start working in a more cooperative way. I think our biggest
34 problem is not enough money is getting to Palo Alto, and I thank Joe
35 Simitian for shedding a lot of light on that recently. I think we need to start
36 cooperating with some other cities to get more resources down to this end of
37 the county and also to get the various transit agencies cooperating with each
38 other. Caltrain and VTA, they're not sharing money; they're not sharing
39 resources. They're competing with each other in our community, and
40 they're not just doing that to us. My husband sits on a transit group in
41 Sunnyvale; the same thing is going on there, and the businesses there are
42 frustrated with it. I think our community needs to start working with these
43 other communities who are having the same problems with the transit
44 authorities; otherwise, that bit is going to be out of our control for a long

1 time. I'd like us to address that somehow. Then I was interested to read
2 some of the language in here. It talks about—in the old Comprehensive
3 Plan, its talks about considering the economic, environmental and social cost
4 issues in local transportation decisions. I'd like that policy to change to
5 address those things and add the word "safety" in there which is really, I
6 think, critically important to the people who are the foot-powered
7 commuters and the people that Stacey Ashlund was just talking about.
8 She's done a lot to educate me about what kids in these groups need on our
9 school routes. I'd also like to see some transit management organization of
10 businesses in Palo Alto contribute some money to funding that would provide
11 City Staff that could do some work. I'd like us to take a page out of the Safe
12 Routes to School book and apply it to our businesses and to the adults in our
13 community. I hear grownups all the time telling me, "I'm not comfortable
14 riding a bicycle on Palo Alto streets. I don't have the skills." We've been
15 teaching kids those skills, and they're learning them, and they're doing it in
16 very large numbers, thousands of them every school day, and they get to
17 school. We've had some accidents; I think it was something like 83
18 accidents last year total including all the adults and the kids. Right? Those
19 are pretty good numbers. We can do this with the grownups, so let's see if
20 we can get something like that in there.

21

22 **Vice Chair Keller:** Our final speaker is David Cole.

23

24 **David Cole:** My name is David Cole, a 30-plus year resident of Palo Alto.
25 In reading through some of the material here, I was very glad to see a lot of
26 mention of climate change. Paraphrasing the Governor of Washington state,
27 he said, "We're the first generation to experience climate change, and we're
28 the last ones to do anything about it in terms of really making a difference."
29 I'm glad to see this in the plan. I think there needs to be better numbers. A
30 lot of the goals are increase the good stuff and decrease the bad stuff, but
31 some real numbers would be good in terms of mode shift, in terms of
32 greenhouse gas reduction. Perhaps we'll see this with the S/CAP
33 presentation. We have some pending State legislation that's going to be 50
34 percent reduction in gasoline use potentially. If that's not somehow taken
35 into account in this plan, how are we going to know where we are? Thirty
36 percent mode shift out of single occupancy vehicles, for instance. I'd like to
37 see a cap and trade on single occupancy vehicle trips Downtown. We can
38 measure this with a survey. Cap it right now. Stanford's done fine with a
39 cap. Then reduce that cap over time, and we have all the different options
40 listed in the plan of how to do that. Some real numbers will give some real
41 goals and some real objectives to work toward instead of increase the good
42 and decrease the bad. We could do 1 percent on each, and we'd make all
43 our goals. I agree with Penny Ellson on a lot of those things. We have a lot
44 of good plans sitting on the shelf, but they're not getting implemented and

1 we don't have the money to really do the good job on the Bike and
2 Pedestrian which is probably the cheapest, fastest way to reduce single
3 occupancy trips. The other thing she mentioned is the kids riding to school.
4 That's a mode share of about 40 or 50 percent on bicycles. If we could only
5 get their parents to do the same thing, we'd be done. Thank you very
6 much.

7

8 **Chair Garber:** Thank you. I think that's it. No more cards?

9

10 **Vice Chair Keller:** No more cards.

11

12 **Chair Garber:** No more cards. We're going to go to our agenda items.

13

14 **Agenda Items:**

15

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

17

18 **Chair Garber:** The first agenda item is action, the approval of minutes. I
19 think before we do that, we need some discussion about that. There's
20 several of us that have comments. Jeremy, do you want to start us off?

21

22 **Jeremy Dennis:** Yeah, very briefly. I know that some members of the CAC
23 had some questions about the use of the action minutes and what they were
24 seeing. There's actually two sets of minutes that we're preparing. We
25 prepare the meeting notes that you see in front of you as a way just to
26 capture very, very high level information. Those are the notes that we ask
27 you to take action on. We are developing in-house a much more substantial
28 meeting note system. It's essentially an Excel spreadsheet with everything
29 that we hear. It requires us, though, to go back and listen to the meetings
30 to make sure that we're getting everything, so some of the things that we
31 heard tonight. We are doing that. It's our hope to have something ready
32 for prime time in the next couple of weeks, so you can see related to the
33 Community Services, and then we'll develop other meeting notes accordingly
34 after that. It'll be part of any deliberations moving forward under the items
35 that you have. Thank you.

36

37 **Chair Garber:** Thanks. Are there any other Committee Members that need
38 to speak to the minutes? Yes, Doria.

39

40 **Doria Summa:** I'm happy that we're taping and audio and also visually
41 tonight. I think that's going to be a big improvement. It's no criticism at all
42 of Staff, because I do know how hard they've been working, but I can't
43 really consider those five bullet points minutes, so I will not be able to

1 approve them. If we're going to get them next time, we can do that next
2 time maybe.

3
4 **Chair Garber:** Jeremy, are there plans for adding the items that you just
5 mentioned?

6
7 **Jeremy Dennis:** We're still discussing exactly how to do it. At some point
8 it's a public document that we want everyone to see. It wasn't our intention
9 to bring them forward for action. We didn't see them in that vein. We just
10 saw them as another resource. We wanted to capture, again, the high level
11 points related to these draft minutes you see before you in each meeting,
12 and then bring forward those other ones at an appropriate time. Do you
13 have anything you wanted to add?

14
15 **Hillary Gitelman:** If I can just interject. Our thought all along, and I think
16 this was reflected in the rules, is that we would do very high level meeting
17 summaries, trying to capture in most cases just the actions and kind of the
18 topics that were discussed. When there's a minority opinion, we would
19 capture that as well as the majority opinion in these meeting summaries that
20 you see. Separately, as Jeremy indicated, we are developing a comment
21 matrix, so all the comments we hear from the public, all the comments we
22 hear from the CAC members, are being captured in this matrix. Our thought
23 was that that was not going to be an extension of the minutes, but it's going
24 to be a tool that's available to you. When you actually review a draft
25 element, you'll be able to have this matrix in your hand that lists all of the
26 comments we've heard during the discussions and compare that to the work
27 product that you see. They're really two different things. If you'd like
28 slightly more expanded minutes, I think we could accommodate that, but
29 the more time we spend on minutes, the less time we spend on the
30 comment matrix and all of the other materials we're preparing for you. It is
31 a fine line.

32
33 **Chair Garber:** Let me ask a slightly different question. At some point, your
34 comment matrix, which is capturing the comments that the Committee
35 Members have made, I think at least for me what's important is validating
36 the things that are said in the Committee are actually recorded and people
37 are taking action on them. I can imagine where those are coming to us not
38 necessarily for action, but for recording and for the opportunity for the
39 members of the Committee in one form or another to respond to them and
40 say, "yes, that is" or "no, they're not." Doria, do you have a suggestion one
41 way or the other to action those?

42
43 **Doria Summa:** I think there should be real minutes. These five bullet
44 points to me don't reflect, do not capture comments made by this group

1 even for us to look back on them, but certainly for the public. I've never
2 seen something so brief and general being presented as minutes. I'm not
3 sure the best solution and I would leave that up to staff.
4

5 **Chair Garber:** Actually, let me just ask if there's other suggestions. Alex.
6

7 **Alex Van Riesen:** My suggestion would be—it seems like we need to have
8 all that data back for when we have the actual discussion about—it seems
9 like if we had that—I mean we're the ones that will be taking action on those
10 comments. Right? We'll be coming back to them and discussing the relative
11 merits of them. It seems like that's the important point, is that at that point
12 they're on the table.
13

14 **Chair Garber:** Bob.
15

16 **Bob Wenzlau:** There was a section of the meeting that was at the end
17 where basically it was sort of process related. You recall for example, I'd
18 asked about the use of subcommittees. I'm wondering why a whole kind of
19 element of the agenda where we spoke—my suggestion would be that the
20 minutes should capture when we're at that end of the meeting and bringing
21 up discussion points that at least the topic should be identified.
22

23 **Chair Garber:** Arthur, a motion possibly.
24

25 **Vice Chair Keller:** Well, let me give an example. At the last meeting, I
26 mentioned that the Program C7 required an assessment of school impacts
27 prior to the approval of development projects. They require legislative acts
28 including General Plan amendments and zoning changes, which was slated
29 to be deleted from the Comp Plan according to the PTC draft is actually not
30 properly a program but is actually properly a policy that should continue.
31 With that as a case in point, I'm wondering how that input gets to be
32 included in the process for determining what to do about the Community
33 Services and Facilities Element. I'm not sure what we're talking about next
34 meeting, because I have two copies of the agenda that are both dated
35 July 27th, so I'm not sure if on October 20th, we're talking about
36 Transportation Element or we're talking about the Community Facilities
37 Element. Maybe it's Transportation. At some point in time, presumably
38 there will be a subcommittee that may be formed on Community Services
39 and Facilities, and that subcommittee will need input such as the one I
40 provided. We need to make sure that that input is provided, and it's not
41 clear whether that input should be part of the minutes, should be part of
42 some other document, and if there's some way of making sure that we
43 capture all the input and make it going forward. With respect to that, I
44 believe it was Council who suggested that as much as possible the

1 comments that we receive be attributed. The document that we received a
2 week ago for this meeting had a bunch of comments in the last few pages in
3 landscape mode that were not attributed; they were anonymous. I'm sort of
4 wondering how we will capture that, how we'll make sure that we capture all
5 the comments, and how we'll be able to hand that off to, assuming that
6 that's what was proposed later on in the meeting in terms of Community
7 Facilities and that there's a subcommittee looking at it, how they'll be able to
8 do that. Presumably, we don't have that input for them today for
9 Community Facilities to get going. I'm sort of wondering how that affects
10 our timing of the subcommittees.

11
12 **Chair Garber:** One moment. Then we have Shani, and then we have
13 Elaine.

14
15 **Jeremy Dennis:** The current schedule has the Community Services
16 Element being heard back by this Committee on November 17th. Presuming
17 that there is an action tonight related to creating a subcommittee that looks
18 at that particular element, we can move to get the notes from the
19 Community Services, get them completed as quickly as possible. We've got
20 about 80 percent done, but it does require us to go one more time back
21 through and listen to the meeting, so it'll just take some time. I'm happy to
22 commit Staff resources to making sure that those are done based on what I
23 hear tonight related to an action on a subcommittee, if that addresses your
24 concern, Arthur.

25
26 **Chair Garber:** Let me—I know that there is a lot of conversation here. Let
27 me try making a motion. That motion would be that we direct Staff to
28 assemble the Committee's comments for input to subcommittee review and
29 prior to the subcommittee convening to discuss the topic. We can create
30 other opportunities for a discussion among the larger group if we need to,
31 but we need to find a way to get those back in. Staff can refine that if they
32 like. Then I will also make that as a part of my motion, that we also then
33 approve the minutes as they are right now. I'm not exactly sure that's quite
34 grammar but yet. Does the concept make sense to the group? Apparently
35 not. Shani first, and then Elaine, and then we have Linda.

36
37 **Shani Kleinhaus:** I also would like to have the comments attributed of the
38 public as well as the ones that are coming in oral communications. In this
39 minutes, there is Gabriel Lewis provided specific comments on policies, this
40 and this and this. It doesn't say what that was. I think that's important to
41 know. Any oral communications should be included with the person who
42 provided that information. Thank you.

43
44 **Chair Garber:** Thank you. Elaine.

1 **Elaine Uang:** I also wrote to Staff with some concern about the minutes
2 not reflecting a significant portion of the discussion from the last round. I
3 personally would also feel comfortable seeing some measure of detail for
4 that. I might suggest or propose an alternate motion, which would just be
5 to—well, two things. Can we delay the approval of this minute until we
6 receive the update, and then also request that the next meeting we do see
7 comments and details minutes from this session for approval next time?
8

9 **Chair Garber:** That's fine. Do I hear a second?
10

11 **Annette Glankopf:** I'll second it.
12

13 **Chair Garber:** That would second that. All those in favor? Is someone
14 counting here? I'm assuming there are sixteen.
15

16 **Hillary Gitelman:** Dan, if I can interject. I just wanted to acknowledge the
17 direction. We're happy to do that, so we'll do a very high level summary
18 and we'll attach the comment matrix. I just wanted you to be aware we're
19 working with short Staff here. We may not be able to turn these around in
20 the month between meetings. It may mean—if you want the detailed
21 comments attached to the action minutes, it may mean that it'll have to
22 come back another month or two later, but we'll do our best.
23

24 **Chair Garber:** I think we understand that, at least until you can talk
25 Consuelo back into her job. Doria.
26

27 **Doria Summa:** Just another quick question. Are the digital recordings of
28 this going to be available on the Midpeninsula Media website like all other
29 meetings?
30

31 **Chair Garber:** I don't know, but there is a moment of order here. My
32 subchair, somebody's pointing at me.
33

34 **Vice Chair Keller:** (inaudible) yes.
35

36 **Chair Garber:** What?
37

38 **Vice Chair Keller:** The media guy's nodding yes.
39

40 **Chair Garber:** Oh, he's—the answer is affirmative to your question, Doria.
41 I did not ask who was opposed to that motion. Are there any opposed?
42 One, two. Any further conversation? Bob, then Don, and then Lisa.
43

1 **Bob Wenzlau:** In the motion, the only thing for me that was missing was
2 just some recognition of when we have also sort of process discussions at
3 the end, that those be added to the minutes. These past minutes were
4 silent on that, and so I think that procedural deliberations should be
5 recognized. They were not in the last. I don't know motion-wise—it would
6 just be that the deliberative comments at the end of the meeting also be
7 summarized. I somehow lost my agenda for this meeting, so I don't know
8 what that last element of the meeting is called, but we ...

9
10 **Chair Garber:** Feedback for continuous improvement?

11
12 **Bob Wenzlau:** Feedback for continuous improvement. I'd ask that any
13 feedback for continuous improvement be recorded into the minutes.

14
15 **Chair Garber:** Okay. Thank you. Don.

16
17 **Don McDougall:** I have a feeling we're losing track of minutes of the
18 meeting versus all the details of the suggestions and records that we're
19 trying to keep. I would prefer the minutes be not much more than we have
20 here with the inclusion of what Bob's talking about, so that they would have
21 process issues, they would have actions and they would have schedules, and
22 they would appear two weeks after this meeting. Things that came out of
23 this meeting that said we're going to have this subcommittee, we're going to
24 meet then, we're going to do this, they would be in the minutes. I would get
25 them two weeks later. They would be in draft format, but at least I'd have a
26 record to confirm what my notes were about when we were going to meet or
27 do something next. I'm happy to wait for a much more detailed analysis of
28 all of the suggestions. I didn't vote for this because I'd really like to see two
29 separate items. One of substance and one that records the process.

30
31 **Chair Garber:** Without having to reopen the vote, I suspect we could get
32 Staff to issue draft minutes that do not include all the comments in a two-
33 week timetable.

34
35 **Hillary Gitelman:** Yes, I think Don is articulating what our proposal was or
36 what we were attempting to do. If we missed some individual comments,
37 like Bob's, my apologies. That was kind of the method we were going
38 towards. We're open to changing that. As I indicate, the more detailed you
39 make these, the longer they take to produce.

40
41 **Chair Garber:** Sure. Good. I'm going to close this item unless we've got—
42 sorry. Lisa.

43

1 **Lisa Peschcke-Koedt:** The summary version with the key action items
2 would be enough. For the detail, I like the idea of having it sort of for the
3 record, but frankly since I was here to hear it, I may never read it. There
4 are lots of really good software translation. If we have an audio recording of
5 it all, just have that translated, and it's 80 percent good enough and not
6 worth the time or Staff's time, I think, to make it perfect. It just captures
7 the main ideas. If we have the summary with the key action takeaways or
8 next critical things and then the long sort of transcript almost of it, for me as
9 long as it's roughly right, I wouldn't spend anyone's time on it. I'd just have
10 a software translation.

11
12 **Hillary Gitelman:** I just wanted to clarify one thing in response to that.
13 The reason we're organizing all of the detailed comments into a matrix is, at
14 the end of the day, we'd like to be able to show where those comments have
15 been addressed, if they've been addressed. If they haven't been addressed
16 in the Comprehensive Plan Update, why. That's why we're taking a little
17 more time to get the comments down and attribute them and kind of put
18 them in a format so we can do that exercise later in the process.

19
20 **Chair Garber:** Thank you. I think with that we'll move on.

21
22 **2. Action: Amendment to CAC Rules and Schedule**

23
24 **Chair Garber:** Action Number 2 is amendment to the CAC rules and
25 schedule. You have all read that. It talks about four primary things, going
26 from a Chair/Vice Chair organization to Co-Chairs; the addition of the new
27 members. It talks also about subcommittees which we'll get to in a
28 moment, and then the revision to schedule. Does Staff want to talk briefly
29 about this before we move forward with some action and/or discussion about
30 it?

31
32 **Jeremy Dennis:** Nothing really additionally, other than to suggest one
33 small change to the rules, which is in item Number 3, the page 1 of the
34 rules. It should have said third Tuesday of the month, not second Tuesday.
35 We would recommend that addition as well as part of any motion please.
36 Thank you.

37
38 **Chair Garber:** Again, which page was that? I'm sorry.

39
40 **Jeremy Dennis:** The first page of the amended role and ground rules of
41 the Committee.

42
43 **Chair Garber:** In Item 2.

44

1 **Jeremy Dennis:** That would have been page 3 of that Item 2.
2
3 **Vice Chair Keller:** It's the first line. This thing (inaudible) meeting dates.
4
5 **Chair Garber:** Yeah, thank you. Yes, Arthur.
6
7 **Vice Chair Keller:** I assume you also want to change it from Mitchell Park
8 Library to Mitchell Community Center at least for the time being.
9
10 **Jeremy Dennis:** We could do that, but then I think we'd have to bring
11 them back again for further change.
12
13 **Vice Chair Keller:** It actually says "or otherwise noticed in advance." We
14 know we're not going to fit the Mitchell Park Library.
15
16 **Jeremy Dennis:** We'll entertain any suggestion you want. It sounds like
17 you have a little earlier draft of that, Arthur. The packet included an
18 amended version.
19
20 **Vice Chair Keller:** I get your point. I see.
21
22 **Jeremy Dennis:** Yeah. I think you're referring to a little earlier version,
23 Arthur.
24
25 **Vice Chair Keller:** Okay, thank you.
26
27 **Chair Garber:** Alex.
28
29 **Alex Van Riesen:** What exactly is the date on the most recent version that
30 we should be looking at?
31
32 **Chair Garber:** I have September 2.
33
34 **Alex Van Riesen:** I see one that says July September 8.
35
36 **Jeremy Dennis:** That's the correct one. September 8th. At the bottom of
37 that, you should see a redline July.
38
39 **Alex Van Riesen:** It's in red, correct?
40
41 **Chair Garber:** September ...
42
43 **Jeremy Dennis:** September 8th.
44

1 **Vice Chair Keller:** We have September 2 July 8th.
2
3 **Alex Van Riesen:** Yeah. I think there's a lot of versions floating out there.
4
5 **Jeremy Dennis:** In the packets that was sent out to everyone, on the top
6 of your packet there were three loose pages. We did not have time to
7 include them back into the packet. In the email that was sent out to the
8 group on, I believe it was Thursday of last week, we said that your packet
9 was coming. It was being delivered that evening, and that we included a
10 few extra pages that we asked you to replace with—I'm sorry for the
11 confusion. We didn't have an opportunity to go back in and pull them apart.
12 We caught that after they'd been printed. Everyone's packet included those
13 extra pages. I apologize if you don't have them.
14
15 **Alex Van Riesen:** Two questions. On that version, on Point 3, it says
16 actually Rinconada Library at 2013 Newell, so that's where the meeting ...
17
18 **Jeremy Dennis:** Got it. That's the—yes.
19
20 **Alex Van Riesen:** That is the new location?
21
22 **Jeremy Dennis:** That's the new location for the next meeting, correct.
23
24 **Alex Van Riesen:** (inaudible) okay.
25
26 **Chair Garber:** May I just have a show of hands of who's looking down at
27 their paper ...
28
29 **Female:** (inaudible)
30
31 **Chair Garber:** May I—raise your hand if you have something that says
32 September 2nd on it. How many have July 8th? Now, how many have
33 September 8th? Okay.
34
35 **Jeremy Dennis:** You have both. We'll talk through this again. If you did
36 not pull your packet apart, what's in your packet is the older version. The
37 packet that was delivered to your house had on top of it three extra pages
38 that replaced the rules and replaced the timeline.
39
40 **Chair Garber:** Forgive me, Jeremy. For those of us that have the
41 September 2 date, is it possible to identify what changes are in that?
42

1 **Jeremy Dennis:** I don't know that I can do it from memory unfortunately.
2 I think the most significant changes were in the subcommittee section, but I
3 don't know if it's worth ...

4
5 **Chair Garber:** The subcommittee—if that's true, Jeremy, perhaps what
6 would be helpful is to talk specifically about the subcommittees and ...

7
8 **Jeremy Dennis:** Sure, and I can read through it ...

9
10 **Chair Garber:** Yeah, exactly. You can read through it.

11
12 **Jeremy Dennis:** ... for the sake of those who did not get the replacement
13 pages. We're looking at page 5 of Item 2. This would be under participant
14 roles in Number 3, subcommittee. I'm going to read this verbatim. I think
15 the majority of you have it, but if it doesn't look like you have it.
16 Subcommittees shall be created by action of the Committee and shall be
17 made up of fewer members than a quorum of the full Committee.
18 Subcommittees can elect to invite outside experts to their meetings to
19 inform their particular discussions. Subcommittees shall agendaize their
20 meetings and invite members of the public to watch and participate. All
21 subcommittee work shall be submitted to the Committee for review prior to
22 the meeting and shall be part of the agenda for said meeting. The Co-Chairs
23 shall appoint the membership of subcommittees based on interest and input
24 from the Committee. Subcommittees are not empowered to make decisions
25 in place. The rest of that actually is the same. Sorry, let me read that.
26 Subcommittees are not empowered to make decisions in place of the group
27 as a whole, but rather to frame and refine issues in a form needs for
28 resolution by the CAC. There's a deletion. Then subcommittees are limited
29 duration groups that only exist as long as they're necessary for them to
30 accomplish their tasks. I think the things that I would point out is that the
31 subcommittees are created by the whole of the Committee, but the power to
32 appoint is related through action of the Co-Chairs. Everyone follow that?
33 Okay.

34
35 **Chair Garber:** Related to the topic of subcommittees ...

36
37 **Vice Chair Keller:** (inaudible)

38
39 **Chair Garber:** Thank you. Arthur, I think we also need to talk a little bit
40 about—yep, okay. The Council had also asked the Committee to talk to
41 several members of the previous Comp Plan and how they utilized
42 subcommittees as well as the IBRC committee, which was another advisory
43 committee that convened recently on public infrastructure. Arthur and I
44 have met with Mark Michaels on the IBRC committee, and we've met with

1 Yoriko Kishimoto and Bern Beecham and Annette Bialson on the '98
2 Comprehensive Plan to get their understanding of how they utilized the
3 subcommittees. Some significant differences occurred. There are some
4 significant differences between what those two groups—how they were able
5 to utilize subcommittees than what this one can. Both of those advisory
6 committees had meetings in people's personal homes, which meant that
7 essentially the public could not participate. That would be a significant
8 difference between what we want to have happen for transparency's sake
9 here versus those advisory committees. The second thing was that with the
10 '98 Comprehensive Plan, they had significantly more time. They had years;
11 we have months. That was another large, sort of determiner for how they
12 were to use the subcommittees. In the conversations that Arthur and I have
13 had, we've imagined using the subcommittees to do, excuse me, to do is in
14 the sequence that Staff has set up, the visions and goals for each one of the
15 elements will be discussed by the Council to give guidance to this
16 Committee. Then we will have a meeting on that particular element and
17 create, as we did in our previous meeting, a forum for which to share all the
18 different ideas of things that should, should not be in, things that should be
19 revised, where emphasis should be, etc., but the opportunity there is to get
20 everything out that can possibly get out. At which point, there's the
21 opportunity to create a subcommittee that essentially supports Staff in the
22 synthesis of all those pieces into an organization that will eventually form
23 the element. One of the things that we learned from both IBRC as well as
24 the '98 advisory committees is that the chairs were not typically in the
25 subcommittees. They stayed out of them. They have to be of a certain size
26 so that we do not run afoul of the Brown Act issues. What we are likely to
27 do and we will hopefully save 10 minutes at the end of the evening to talk a
28 little bit about what some of the subcommittees are that we might want to
29 pursue. Then after this meeting, we'll send out an email list to all of you
30 indicating what interests you may have on which committees. Our
31 expectation is that there's likely to be a subcommittee for each one of the
32 elements, but there are some opportunities obviously for subcommittees to
33 be formed around topics that cross the elements. We want to save some
34 time at the end of the evening to talk about some of those different things,
35 so that we can put together a list that's comprehensive. Arthur, anything
36 else that we should talk about relative to our conversations?

37

38 **Vice Chair Keller:** Well, I think that we'll have the topic on the actual
39 discussion of subcommittees later. I think that in the interest of moving on,
40 I think the people understand enough about what's happening with respect
41 to the role and ground rules, so maybe we can go ahead and vote on this as
42 amended.

43

44 **Chair Garber:** I'm going to take that as a motion. Do I hear a second?

1 **Vice Chair Keller:** There's comments still.
2
3 **Female:** (inaudible)
4
5 **Vice Chair Keller:** No, that's fine. Yeah.
6
7 **Chair Garber:** Yeah. I'll entertain some discussion on the motion. Steve.
8
9 **Stephen Levy:** I think I'm the only one in the room that was actually on
10 the IBRC. It is on; I'm just klutzy.
11
12 **Chair Garber:** I apologize. We didn't speak to you about it; you were out
13 of town, so we talked with Mark Michael. I apologize.
14
15 **Stephen Levy:** They were dramatically necessary and helpful. There would
16 without them have been an overwhelming lack of division of labor. People
17 had very different interests, but very different backgrounds. I knew nothing
18 about the police and the fire station. Actually we had three Marks. We had
19 Mark Michael and Mark Harris and Marc Berman and a whole bunch of other
20 people. I don't see how we do this efficiently without allowing people to
21 congregate in their areas of expertise and interests. I mean, I don't know
22 about any of the rest of you, but I'm a really good reader, and I'm inundated
23 by this one element and the 400 policies and programs and all of that. My
24 experience would strongly support him. I know nothing about how it would
25 work here, but it was absolutely necessary for the IBRC.
26
27 **Chair Garber:** I tend to agree with you here as well. There's a lot of
28 material to get through. There's going to be a tremendous amount of
29 comments. For a large group to do that is next to impossible without taking
30 all of our time just doing that. Any other comments before we vote, or a
31 discussion? Amy.
32
33 **Amy Sung:** While we are at this subject of subcommittee, I continue to feel
34 so inadequate. I sometimes feel that if I discuss it with a couple of
35 neighbors, then that will violate the rules of the Brown Act. On the other
36 hand, I hear people ask like but how do you adequately represent like the
37 so-called neighborhood concerns. Then I say you have to go to this public
38 commenter and voice your concern. I feel that a lot of voice gets lost
39 without having a small group discussion. That's just my feedback.
40
41 **Chair Garber:** Perhaps Staff could provide a little instruction.
42
43 **Hillary Gitelman:** Thank you. I just wanted to clarify that you should feel
44 free to assemble a group of neighbors or members of your community and

1 people that you would like to receive input in. If that would help you bring
2 forward their ideas to the Committee, that's absolutely a great idea. You
3 can also encourage folks that you know to participate in the online digital
4 commenter thing. You shouldn't feel that that's exclusively where the input
5 should be gathered. The concern about the Brown Act really comes into
6 when you're meeting with other members of the Committee. That's where
7 we need to be careful not to meet more than one member either in person
8 or communicating by email, not more than a majority. Thank you.

9
10 **Chair Garber:** Anything else? Alex.

11
12 **Alex Van Riesen:** This is the motion agreeing about the amendments, er,
13 the (crosstalk).

14
15 **Chair Garber:** About the new set of rules. There's four large topics there.
16 One of which is that there will be Co-Chairs, Arthur and myself. The second
17 of which is that the new members that have been added by the Council.
18 We've been given auspice by the Council to convene subcommittee. Then
19 there's the schedule revision which adds frankly to the time that we have to
20 do all this.

21
22 **Alex Van Riesen:** Could I add just two quick. Just for clarity's sake over
23 this. I just noticed that there are three different times listed as how long
24 these meetings go. On the agenda tonight, it says 'til 8:00. On Point 3, it
25 says 'til 9:00, and on Point 11 it says 'til 8:30. Just of having good
26 expectations, I was just wondering how long should we expect to be here on
27 any given meeting.

28
29 **Chair Garber:** I'm not touching that one.

30
31 **Jeremy Dennis:** Depends on how late the library's open I think. Most of
32 what you just described is the issue that we're having about bringing
33 forward a set of rules that are happening at the same time that we're trying
34 to find a better location. There's a little bit in there, I know, that doesn't. I
35 appreciate the confusion there. Tonight, we do have an opportunity to go a
36 little bit later than we normally would. I think 9:00 is probably fair. The
37 previous room was only open 'til 8:00. We anticipate a room that we get in
38 the future will be open 'til 9:00, but it's about locating the appropriate
39 facility. Not meant to confuse anyone; it's just we're in the middle of
40 changing things, so there's not going to be—not everything is going to be
41 reflected in the rules as we'd hoped.

42

1 **Alex Van Riesen:** Appreciate that. Last thing was just can we get an
2 updated list of everyone on the Committee and maybe even contact
3 information, if we would want to have further conversation?
4

5 **Chair Garber:** Yeah.
6

7 **Jeremy Dennis:** Yes.
8

9 **Chair Garber:** Thank you. With that, may I call the question. All those in
10 favor of accepting the amendment to the CAC rules and schedules raise your
11 hand. I've got 19. All those opposed. That carries with 19. Thank you.
12 Annette.
13

14 **Annette Glanckopf:** (inaudible) technology. Did we decide on a stop
15 time? Did we as a group understand—we had this long discussion about we
16 were going to be flexible depending on the facility that we're in, but I'm not
17 sure that we voted on an actual stop time. I would like to do so.
18

19 **Chair Garber:** What was in the actual rules?
20

21 **Hillary Gitelman:** We're suggesting 9:00 p.m. be our target start time
22 which is not to say we have to (crosstalk).
23

24 **Chair Garber:** As an end time.
25

26 **Hillary Gitelman:** End time, yes, sorry. End time.
27

28 **Chair Garber:** Annette.
29

30 **Annette Glanckopf:** I'd like to propose that 8:30 will be the stop time,
31 because obviously we're not going to stop exactly at 8:30 and conversations
32 will continue. That's 3 1/2 hours. That would be my motion to make the
33 stop time 8:30.
34

35 **Chair Garber:** Let's do this. Let's do our very best to end by 8:30. We
36 can't stay longer than 9:00 because the doors are going to close. If that's
37 okay with everybody, we will not revisit the motion. Lisa.
38

39 **Lisa Peschcke-Koedt:** I think I would actually propose the same as you, is
40 we officially set it as ending at 8:30. If we don't set it that way, we'll always
41 go 'til 9:00 happily. I think three hours, it's also more energy and such,
42 right, I mean after we've all had long days, right. I think three hours is
43 probably reasonable. What do you think?
44

1 **Chair Garber:** I think that's (crosstalk).

2

3 **Jeremy Dennis:** As long as I don't have to bring the rules back a third
4 time, that's totally fine with us on staff.

5

6 **Lisa Peschcke-Koedt:** Could we just—would it be all right to just ask now
7 for votes either 8:30 or 9:00? There are only two options on the table, and
8 see which one has the most votes.

9

10 **Chair Garber:** Everybody okay with 8:30, just a raising of hands here. I
11 think we won't even—that's perfectly fine. All right, thanks.

12

13 **Hillary Gitelman:** We will reflect that change in the rules.

14

15 **Chair Garber:** Thank you.

16

17 **3. Transportation Element Discussion**

18 **a. Introduction to the Element**

19 **b. Gil Friend, Chief Sustainability Officer**

20 **c. CAC Discussion: Policies and Programs**

21

22 **Co-Chair Garber:** All right. Let's get to the main event here, the
23 Transportation Element discussion. Now that we are officially Co-Chairs,
24 congratulations Arthur.

25

26 **Co-Chair Keller:** Congratulations Dan.

27

28 **Co-Chair Garber:** We are going to switch roles. If you recall, last time I
29 ran the conversation and Arthur kept order. This time, Arthur is going to
30 run the conversation, and I'm going to keep order, so catch my eye when
31 you want to talk. I will keep a list and keep that running. With that, Arthur,
32 here you go.

33

34 **Co-Chair Keller:** I have my own mike here.

35

36 **Co-Chair Garber:** Oh. I'll take this back.

37

38 **Co-Chair Keller:** All right. We're talking about tonight about the
39 Transportation Element. Why don't I defer the conversation about the
40 Transportation Element, and let Staff give their presentation.

41

42 **Jeremy Dennis:** Sure, and I will keep this extremely brief because of the
43 amount of time that we have left to have the substantive conversation. I
44 just wanted to make a few points, and hopefully I'm not confusing anyone

1 here. There was a change between the time that the Staff report was put
2 together and Council direction on the structure of the goals before you. In
3 the digital commenter, we had the goals related to the existing
4 Transportation Plan. We also structured most of the discussion in the Staff
5 report, the meat of it, based on the existing Transportation Plan. The
6 Council last Monday then (inaudible) direction and adopted a revised set of
7 goals based on the PTC's revision and some other changes that they made.
8 We wanted to recognize that upfront. It's a little difference. The nice thing
9 about this is that it actually doesn't really change the substance of a
10 conversation related to the policies and programs. If you wish, you can
11 actually take Goals 1, 2 and 3 in the existing Transportation Plan and just
12 moosh them together and that's your new Goal 1 in what the Council has
13 approved. I just wanted to put that out there. We also had a few slides that
14 we put together here. I'm going to go through these. We'd like you to refer
15 back to these if you want to use these as any part of your discussion.
16 Andrew, go ahead and start here. The Transportation Element. There's a
17 few pieces that we wanted to make sure you were aware of. Must address
18 complete street issues, must also have relation to the Land Use Element.
19 Next one. There were some—the staff report didn't have existing mode
20 share, so we had this slide put together. This just shows the mode share
21 changes from 2000 and to 2013. Next slide. Again, you can call on these if
22 you want to use them during your discussions. Go back.

23

24 **Co-Chair Keller:** You're not on the microphone, so we can't hear you. It's
25 being broadcast, so you ...

26

27 **Don McDougall:** Palo Alto residents commute mode in 2000 and 2013.

28

29 **Co-Chair Keller:** This is Palo Alto residents commuting out of Palo Alto, not
30 workers working in Palo Alto, commuting into Palo Alto.

31

32 **Don McDougall:** Right. Palo Alto residents commuting to where they
33 work. Some of them may work in Palo Alto. Yes, you're correct it does not
34 include people from outside Palo Alto.

35

36 **Co-Chair Keller:** Right. There are about 30,000 employed Palo Alto
37 residents, and somewhat on the order of three times that many who are
38 employed in Palo Alto and live anywhere. This figure, as I understand it, is
39 of those who are a resident in Palo Alto and employed anywhere, of which I
40 think about a third of people who live in Palo Alto actually work in Palo Alto.

41

42 **Jeremy Dennis:** Next slide.

43

1 **Don McDougall:** Just to be clear. Does that mean that (inaudible) going to
2 work from Palo Alto (inaudible) 100,000 people (inaudible).

3 **Hillary Gitelman:** If I can interject. I don't think it's irrelevant. I don't
4 think it's anywhere near the full picture or necessarily the most interesting
5 data set that we're showing. What we put together is a sampling of slides.
6 You have a lot more information in the existing conditions report sections we
7 produced. This is just—I actually think has a couple of really interesting
8 takeaways. One is that we've actually managed to achieve something of a
9 mode shift when you look at this population in the time since the last Comp
10 Plan to today. A lot of it has to do with people who are working at home.
11 We've managed to shift by using new technologies, alternate work schedules
12 and getting people out of their cars that way. There may be other
13 takeaways from this. Really, Jeremy is running through some slides that we
14 thought of as kind of a palate cleanser. Let's try and get past the nuts and
15 bolts we've just talked about, get you in the mindset of transportation. If
16 you have a more detailed questions about the data in the Staff report or the
17 packet you got, we can get into that later in the evening.
18

19 **Jeremy Dennis:** This is not meant to be remotely comprehensive in any
20 way. These are just a few things we threw together to transition us.
21

22 **Co-Chair Garber:** Why don't you finish your presentation, and then we can
23 take the conversation (crosstalk).
24

25 **Jeremy Dennis:** Thank you. Another just interesting fact related to the
26 increase in the number of high school students we see riding to school
27 between 1999 and 2014. A very quick slide that we put together related to
28 trends in transit use. You can see some significant changes related to
29 Caltrain. We wanted to show you this is the three-pronged approach the
30 City's taking on parking and transportation-related issues. On the left hand,
31 parking management. Most people, I think, are familiar with the RPP
32 program coming into place. Number 2, transportation demand management
33 where, I think, again the piece that most people are hearing about is this
34 association that's being created to help with that. Then on the third slide,
35 we've got some parking supply measures that we're trying to put in place.
36 Next slide. We're going to go back to this, but we have the draft vision
37 statement and the draft goals that we'll have up on screen moving forward.
38 That concludes what I wanted to say, and then we can move to Gil.
39

40 **Co-Chair Garber:** Mark and then Adrian, you had your hand raised. Mark.
41

42 **Mark Nadim:** Do we have any count of vehicles coming into Palo Alto from
43 101 and 280?
44

1 **Co-Chair Garber:** Gil or Jeremy.

2

3 **Jeremy Dennis:** Yes, we do. There is some information in the draft
4 existing conditions report that should refer to some of that. There's also
5 going to be a set of information that we're developing related to the Draft
6 EIR that we'll include that. We don't have that in the memo.

7

8 **Hillary Gitelman:** If you look at the existing conditions report that was
9 attached to the packet, there's a table of average daily traffic volumes on
10 selected roadway segments. It's page 12-32. It's just a sample of some of
11 the streets in Palo Alto and some of the average daily volumes we're seeing,
12 in addition the volume to capacity ratio and the level of service on those
13 links. That's just a kind of snapshot of where we are. There's other data in
14 this report that I think is worth spending a little time parsing through, and it
15 might inform the group's deliberations going forward.

16

17 **Jeremy Dennis:** Do remember that was a snapshot in time when we
18 collected the data. The Draft EIR is going to actually have some of that
19 updated.

20

21 **Co-Chair Garber:** Adrian, then Shani, then Len and Steve.

22

23 **Adrian Fine:** I just wanted to say I think in general Staff does a really good
24 job of attributing data to the correct source, and that helps promote validity.
25 It's on. Staff normally does a really good job of attributing data to the
26 correct source. That promotes validity and helps orient the Committee. I
27 think it'd be helpful to do that in the slides as well, if you would just give a
28 source or a table. I'm guessing a lot of that came from the ACS, which is
29 publicly available. Just let people know where it came from.

30

31 **Jeremy Dennis:** Thank you.

32

33 **Co-Chair Garber:** Shani.

34

35 **Shani Kleinhaus:** In Goal T-1 of the old plan, it said on a typical day in
36 1995 600,000 one-way car trips were made in the Palo Alto/Stanford area.
37 An additional 150,000 daily trips were made by carpools. I'd like to know
38 how we compare to those numbers now if possible, because that's a lot.
39 That's 750,000 trips a day, and that's 20 years ago.

40

41 **Hillary Gitelman:** We'll make sure to get that comment and that request
42 down and provide a response at a later date.

43

44 **Co-Chair Garber:** Len.

1 **Len Filppu:** Yes, thank you. The slide went by real quick on bikers to
2 school. I think it said 1,700 bike to the two high schools. Do you have
3 numbers on then how many walk and how many drive or are driven to the
4 two high schools? Thank you.

5
6 **Hillary Gitelman:** We have much more data than we showed on that slide.
7 This is a subset. We'd would be happy to provide the full data set if it's not
8 already in this packet. We just showed you one age group. The point of the
9 slide was to show the trend line. We've been incredibly successful as a
10 community in Palo Alto in shifting school trips out of cars and into alternate
11 modes, primarily bicycle and walking. We're happy to provide you with a
12 fuller picture of that, but I hope everybody was suitably impressed by the
13 trend line there.

14
15 **Co-Chair Garber:** Steve.

16
17 **Stephen Levy:** Hillary, on the existing conditions report, Table 1211 on
18 page 12-35, I wrote you about it. It appears to say that virtually all of the
19 VMT related to in and out is people coming in. It's an overwhelming
20 number. You responded to me that you were going to update the table. It's
21 on page 12-35.

22
23 **Hillary Gitelman:** Thank you. Stephen is inquiring about the tables on
24 page 12-35. I think we did in an email communication indicate to the group
25 that these tables need to be updated. We have used an updated and what
26 we think is a better, more defensible methodology to recalculate vehicle
27 miles traveled and slice it into trips that are internal to Palo Alto versus
28 internal/external and external/internal. I apologize. We didn't get it
29 together to bring the table with us this evening. We will transmit that to you
30 separately.

31
32 **Stephen Levy:** Does it change the basic conclusion that the vast
33 proportion are coming in?

34
35 **Hillary Gitelman:** it is quite a change. If I'm remembering back to the
36 updated data, it has a much higher percentage that is internal/internal. We
37 actually generate quite a bit of vehicle miles traveled internal to Palo Alto,
38 because of the character of the community and just we have a lot of traffic
39 within the city.

40
41 **Stephen Levy:** We'll have that before the next meeting, right?

42
43 **Hillary Gitelman:** Pardon me?

44

1 **Stephen Levy:** We'll have that before the next meeting?
2
3 **Hillary Gitelman:** We will have it for you before the next meeting.
4
5 **Stephen Levy:** Thank you.
6
7 **Hillary Gitelman:** My apologies.
8
9 **Co-Chair Garber:** Lisa and then Arthur, er, did someone have their hand
10 raised over there? Elaine, okay. Go ahead Lisa.
11
12 **Lisa Peschcke-Koedt:** This is more of a proposal. I'm hoping that we can
13 actually get to the substance of the different proposals here. This is my
14 personal take. I think we have enough data to get to the substance of it.
15 Then if we find that there's a particular place we need more data, maybe we
16 could save and dive down into the data there. What do you guys think? Is
17 that okay? I'd suggest that.
18
19 **Stephen Levy:** I disagree, but I'm happy to take that up in my comment.
20 I actually strongly disagree, but it depends on what part of the element
21 you're talking about.
22
23 **Co-Chair Garber:** Elaine, and then Don. Then I would like to get to the
24 first goal, so we can talk about that.
25
26 **Elaine Uang:** Well, I was just going to make one additional data request,
27 which is a complement to the mode share tables. If you have the data for
28 Palo Alto residents and their outbound commutes, if there's a way to get the
29 inbound commute mode share into Palo Alto that would be extremely
30 helpful. If there's another process for us to request data, I would—for the
31 interest of time, it'd be good to move in that direction.
32
33 **Co-Chair Garber:** Don. Then Gil needs to leave us sooner rather than
34 later. We will go to, after Don, Gil and then we will get into the substance of
35 our meeting here. Go ahead.
36
37 **Don McDougall:** Quick comment. I would support the fact that we plain
38 and simply don't have enough data. I would like to see the whole
39 Transportation Plan be more data driven. I think there's a propensity to
40 want to make good decisions based on data. I think we can discuss it. I
41 don't think we can make conclusions without better data.
42
43 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Gil.

1 **Jeremy Dennis:** Just a quick comment to Elaine's point. We will take
2 requests on data anyway you can get it to us, call, email, whatever you
3 want. Just it's very difficult for us to put anything together particularly in
4 the last couple of days before we're putting out a memo. As long as we ask
5 a little patience, if you can give us some lead time, we're happy to try to get
6 it to the next thing. If it's just a few days before we're coming to this
7 meeting, staff reports already out, we don't have time to do that, but we'll
8 try to do it for the next one. Thank you.

9

10 **Co-Chair Garber:** Gil.

11

12 **Gil Friend:** Thanks Dan. Once again, I'm Gil Friend. I'm the City's Chief
13 Sustainability Officer. Hillary and Jeremy have asked me to talk with you for
14 a few minutes to orient you to the Sustainability and Climate Action Plan
15 that we're in the process of developing, and then talk in a bit more detail
16 about the perspectives on transportation that are an important part of that
17 plan. As you may know, the City created a Climate Protection Plan in 2007.
18 This was one of the first of any city in the United States. Next slide please.
19 Since that time, the world has gotten a lot hotter. The West has gotten a lot
20 drier. That's some of the context in which we're operating. Next slide
21 please. We've done a lot in the intervening years. I'm not going to read
22 this slide; I'll just leave it up for you. There's been an enormous amount of
23 creative action from the City and the community in a variety of realms,
24 public policy, investment, actions, policy, mandates, education, incentives
25 and community initiative, lots more in the pipeline. Next slide please.
26 We've done an enormous amount. We've reduced our emissions about 33
27 percent against the 1990 baseline. This is really stunning, and I think one of
28 the best records of any city in the United States. It's a long way from there
29 to the 80 percent reduction by 2050 goal that Governor Brown has set out
30 for us. You see our challenge very clearly. The column on the right is our
31 2014 numbers, and you can see where the remaining emissions are. The
32 red bar is transportation, road travel into and out of and through the City as
33 we have been discussing. The blue is natural gas. Those together represent
34 more than 85 percent of our remaining emissions. A much higher ratio than
35 other cities, because you'll notice there's a yellow bar on the left. That's the
36 emissions from our electricity. We've zeroed that out with our carbon
37 neutral electricity. Now our challenge. If we're going to achieve the
38 Governor's goals or perhaps something more dramatic than that, we have to
39 transform transportation and transform our relationship with natural gas.
40 That's just very clear from this chart. Next one please. The Sustainability
41 and Climate Action Plan is asking what future do we want. The red line
42 shows the trajectory from 1990 to the Governor's goals by 2050. We are
43 arguably on track to do that. If we can maintain the record of the last ten
44 years, we can probably hit that target 35 years out from now, but we're also

1 in the Climate Plan looking at two other possible scenarios: hitting the
2 target by 2030, the target year for the Comprehensive Plan; and what we're
3 terming a California moon shot, getting to be a carbon neutral city in ten
4 years or less. Now it sounds like an outrageous goal, but Copenhagen,
5 Melbourne and a number of other cities have set that goal. The question
6 we're raising here is to develop three scenarios and road maps to ask what
7 would it take to achieve each of those goals, and then bring those three
8 options to the Council and community for deliberative discussion, a
9 grounded discussion grounded in data and facts and investment estimates to
10 decide what do we want to do. Any of those is a pretty creditable strategy
11 to take. There's no shame in any of them. Eighty by 50 is not slow and it's
12 not easy, but we have a long trajectory of being out in front on sustainability
13 initiatives. One of the decisions for you all and the community and the
14 Council to make will be do we want to do that now. Just by way of context,
15 we've just received the administrative draft of the plan from our consultant.
16 Staff is reviewing it now; we should have that done in the next couple of
17 weeks. I anticipate late September, early October, we should have a draft
18 available to share. We're also looking to schedule a sustainability and
19 climate summit probably somewhere around mid-November, so there'll be
20 details on that to come, so a much broader and engaged community
21 discussion on this. Next one please. To just give you a summary of what's
22 in it. We're not going to go into detail tonight, but you can see here some of
23 the elements that we are focusing on. Transportation of course, and energy,
24 buildings, water, City operations. In these chiclets are some of the key
25 themes that have risen to the top in each of those areas. A more detailed
26 discussion about this another time. Next one please. Other areas, personal
27 choice, ecosystems, adaptation and resilience in relation to climate risks,
28 how do we pay for these. I'll call your attention to the right-hand column
29 just to point out that this is not just about reducing carbon; this is about
30 doing this in a way that enhances quality of life and builds prosperity and
31 strengthens resilience in this community. This is not a tradeoff of
32 environmental benefit at the expense of quality of life or the things we care
33 about. It's looking for how do we innovate and generate all of those goals
34 together at the same time. Next slide please. Let me talk a bit about
35 transportation. Transportation is expensive. This is from our colleagues
36 from Rocky Mountain Institute, estimating a \$3 trillion cost in the U.S. alone.
37 What's notable about this is that it's a trillion in direct expenses and 2 trillion
38 in indirect expenses. A lot of the cost is not visible to us. Making that
39 visible, I think, is an important part of thinking about how we should move.
40 Next slide please. I think what's important to note is that things are
41 changing very rapidly in the transportation environment. Technology and
42 costs are shifting very rapidly. The chart on the right is the projected cost of
43 electric vehicles with a 200-mile range, dropping very quickly. You've seen
44 the price declines on Tesla. The next vehicle from Tesla is a 200-mile range

1 car at \$30,000 soon and a \$20,000 car a few years out. You see that curve
2 shape, and you see that for electric vehicles, you see it for the cost of
3 photovoltaics. You see the same shape for the cost of battery storage. You
4 see the same shape for self-driving cars, for sensors and a number of other
5 technologies. The convergence of these trends will likely drive a sea change
6 in transportation in the next 10 to 20 years. I think one of the big
7 challenges that this Committee has is—we generally plan based on the past.
8 We extrapolate from past trends. Past performance is no guarantee of
9 future performance in this case, so we have to figure out how to plan for a
10 future that may be extremely different than the path that we have been
11 used to. Next slide please. The demographics of transportation are
12 changing as well as the population. Automobile purchasing from people 18
13 to 30 years old peaked in the United States in the 1980s; it's been coming
14 down. Millennials are not buying cars; many aren't even getting driver's
15 licenses. Some people seem to have figured out that having the second
16 largest investment in your life sitting idle 95 percent of the time may not be
17 a good use of capital. There's interest in other modes, and we're seeing
18 that. The graph on the right is showing the traditional "business as usual"
19 projections of vehicle miles traveled, and we're seeing them start to bend
20 down. What does that mean for how we think and how we plan? Our
21 traditional approaches to transportation have tended to focus on build more
22 roads and build more parking capacity. Unfortunately, both of those
23 engender more of the problem. They provide the incentive for more travel,
24 more congestion requiring, therefore, more roads and more parking. The
25 question we're raising, the challenge we're raising, is what if we stopped
26 incenting the behavior that we don't want. Our 1998 Comp Plan talked
27 about reducing reliance on the automobile in Palo Alto. Great principle, yet
28 we provide free parking and other incentives that encourage automobile
29 driving. Many of the things you're grappling with are looking at how to shift
30 that. We think that's one of two key elements in grappling with this issue.
31 The other is how do we make more convenient what we do want. Not just a
32 "raise the cost" approach, but make it easier for people to access what they
33 need to access and help. Take the next slide please. In fact, the driving
34 design question as we see is how do we make it more convenient for anyone
35 anywhere at any time to not drive alone or not drive at all. For us that
36 becomes the test question for all the strategies we're looking at. Does a
37 strategy solve that problem or not? Anyone means anyone; young, old,
38 firm, infirm, worker, commuter, student, large family, single mother, kids,
39 whatever. How do we design a system that really makes that possible?
40 Absent that, I think we don't get the shift that we want. Next slide please.
41 Around the world people are thinking about mobility in a different way. The
42 phrase mobility as a service we learned from our colleagues in Helsinki who
43 have set a goal to be a car-free city in ten years. Looking at the notion of
44 mobility as a seamless, interconnected bundle of services available on

1 demand. This is your next car. Just as with your phone, you're buying a
2 bundle of services, voice, text, data, broadband and so forth, for a monthly
3 subscription fee. The Finns are proposing a transportation system that's like
4 that. You buy a bundle of services. Your bundle might be different than
5 yours and different than mine. Based on your needs, you do the
6 combination of VTA, bike share, Uber, Lyft, taxis, shuttles, what have you.
7 Mobility friendly cities, this is to the land use point that a number of you
8 raised. Urban form and our land use planning drives transportation needs.
9 How do we think about them together in the most efficacious way? The
10 right vehicle for the job. It's not a matter of thinking of what car do you
11 need to own for your life; it's what car do you need for today or for the trip
12 right now, so the on-demand services become a much better way of
13 allocating resources to that need. Of course, self-driving cars you've heard
14 plenty about. They're on their way. They will change many things about
15 what we do, how we plan and how we deploy resources. Next slide please.
16 We are working with partners at Joint Venture Silicon Valley, the VTA, other
17 cities in the region, to look at how can we start to articulate this sort of
18 system here. It's clear that Palo Alto can't solve its transportation problems
19 by itself. It's part of a commute shed of millions of people in a region that
20 has the second worst traffic in the United States. By the way, speaking of
21 interesting metrics, probably more transit agencies per million people than
22 anywhere else on earth which makes the challenge of coordination
23 particularly tough here. We're looking at working with at least some of
24 these regional organizations to start to build a pilot. RideScout, one of the
25 mobility service companies in the United States, is trying to build out an app
26 that would provide this capability for us. Couple with that, pushing for
27 interoperable data between transit companies and services companies so
28 that we can have the network effect that comes from that data sharing.
29 Next one please, Andrew. The other component goes to the pricing question
30 that I talked about before. We think there's a very interesting model here in
31 Stanford which, under its general use permit, raised its parking fees and
32 invested that parking revenue in the Marguerite and the various other
33 transportation alternatives. Notably, they took their SOV rate down from 77
34 percent to 48 percent. Pretty impressive. Really striking is they saved \$107
35 million in parking structures that they haven't had to build, because the
36 demand wasn't there. Lo and behold, they get to use that money and that
37 land for things like classrooms and laboratories and things that a university
38 should be spending its money on. You can see some of the other SOV
39 numbers. Downtown Palo Alto is doing pretty respectably at 55 percent.
40 Hillary, I don't think we know yet what the overall number for the City is.
41 Do we have an overall SOV number for the City total? Okay. We've got that
42 there, and we've got a Council resolution from, I think, 2012 calling on us to
43 drop our SOV rate 30 percent. That's one of the specific numbers on the
44 table. We'd like to experiment with small carrots and sticks. Do small,

1 rapid-learning experiments, because frankly we don't know exactly what
2 works here. We're going to learn by doing, so let's find ways to do that.
3 Next slide please. Some of the transportation levers that we've identified in
4 the Sustainability and Climate Plan were four main topic areas: expanding
5 non-auto mobility options; creating the right financial incentives;
6 implementing land use development approaches that engender less, not
7 more, demand for personal vehicle travel; reducing the carbon intensity of
8 all of the elements of those systems. Behind each of these, there's a lot of
9 analysis as well as modeling, looking at what is the potential impact on VMT
10 and greenhouse gas emissions of bringing these strategies on at different
11 rates. In fact, we have some interactive tools; we'll probably use these at
12 the summit so you can toggle strategies on and off, speed them up, slow
13 them down, and see what kind of impact they have and then find what
14 seems most suitable. Next slide please. People often say to me, "Gee, Gil,
15 that sounds impossible." I have to keep on remembering where we are and
16 this is the place where we do impossible. That thing on the left is a 5
17 megabyte memory array from back in the days of Pan American Airways
18 which some of you may remember. Thirty-two gigabyte in the middle. One
19 hundred twenty-eight gigabyte on the right. I just got today, but didn't
20 have a chance to paste it in, something that was 512 gigabytes, four times
21 the memory, same size, cheaper. That's what we do here. Saying
22 something is difficult or impossible by itself isn't interesting enough. So,
23 okay, like why do you think that? What are the challenges? How do we
24 design for them? How do we build something to the criteria that we really
25 care about? Next slide. I think I'm just about out here. That's the quick
26 orientation. We'd love to know what you think, not just in this meeting but
27 ongoing. As I mentioned, we'll be putting together a summit in November.
28 We should have the dates nailed down and the locations nailed down in the
29 next couple of weeks. In the meantime, we have an interactive survey at
30 the link below. If you'd like, come take a look at that. It'll give you a
31 chance to express your current preferences on some of the ideas that we're
32 considering. That again feeds back into the conversation and the summit.
33 Let me stop there and take any questions if we have time for that.

34

35 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you, Gil. We are down to 7 minutes per goal if
36 we're going to get out of here at 8:30. Let's—I'm sorry?

37

38 **Co-Chair Keller:** I think we're doing the first five.

39

40 **Co-Chair Garber:** Just the first five today? Thank you. Double that, 14
41 minutes. Let us start, and then we're going to add your comments into the
42 first discussion here as ...

43

44 **Female:** (inaudible) first five of the whole nine or (inaudible).

1 **Co-Chair Keller:** All nine.
2
3 **Co-Chair Garber:** Excuse me. I had Ellen. I had Bonnie. I had Don.
4
5 **Don McDougall:** I just have a quick question. How do we get copies of
6 this presentation?
7
8 **Co-Chair Garber:** Gil, you can make this available to the Committee?
9
10 **Gil Friend:** I'll make it available to Jeremy through the (inaudible).
11
12 **Co-Chair Garber:** Great. Bob. There is somebody else over there.
13 Jennifer, was it you that had your hand raised? Okay. We're doing it by
14 goal. Arthur.
15
16 **Co-Chair Keller:** Yes. We're starting with Goal T1. I just want to make a
17 preliminary remark that may set this in context for people. That is the
18 Comp Plan, we're going—it was supposed to have started in 2010. We're
19 late, but we're going through 2030 which is 15 years from now. I'll
20 (inaudible) an interesting statistic that people may wish to compare it with.
21 That is nationally the small vehicle, the regular passenger vehicle fleet turns
22 over in 15 years nationally. Typically, 15 years from now, we're essentially
23 going to be dealing with a completely replaced vehicle fleet for Palo Alto.
24 When you think about that, what's going to be in 15 years is going to be
25 completely different from what we see now. We're beginning to see
26 beginnings of trend lines, but there's going to be a considerably different,
27 even if we just stay with regular passenger vehicles. The technology will be
28 completely different, and they'll be all new vehicles. The first one, Goal T1 is
29 less reliance on single occupancy vehicles.
30
31 **Co-Chair Garber:** Ellen, then Bonnie, then Bob, then Hamilton, and then
32 Jennifer. Ellen, go ahead.
33
34 **Male:** I did. I asked my question.
35
36 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Ellen.
37
38 **Ellen Uhrbrock:** Well, long ago, I just wanted to add that I would like very
39 much for the Staff to provide us with a glossary of all these acronyms of the
40 different programs. It's too hard for a newcomer to follow it when you're
41 mentioning different things. Just a one-page glossary would be enormous
42 help. Then can I say something about Goal 1? Yes?
43
44 **Co-Chair Garber:** Yes.

1 **Ellen Uhrbrock:** Okay. On the first one, I think the real immediate
2 problem that we can start and have a long-range plan is to educate people
3 to where they are living in the community, what their options are, every
4 single residence, and have it noted on the house how walkable it is and how
5 accessible to transit things. The other thing is that every business in town
6 ought to know where they are located close to transit. If you walk down El
7 Camino or University Avenue today and go in and ask any clerk, "Where is
8 the nearest bus stop," they do not know. The answer is, "I drive a car."
9 Make this an educational requirement that employers teach all the people
10 who have contact with the public to know what the situation is and what
11 their options are to come and be a customer and where the parking is and
12 where the transit is. That could be done in all sorts of ways, but I think it's
13 essential that you know. Otherwise, people think, "This is not for me." I
14 have my plans, and they don't know what the alternatives are.

15
16 **Co-Chair Keller:** Let me take a moment. The suggestion was that the
17 Council has combined the first three goals into one goal, so let us deal with
18 that goal. I'm going to read it for people. That is sustainable
19 transportation. Create a sustainable transportation system that emphasizes
20 walking, bicycling, use of public transportation and a mix of uses and other
21 methods to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and by reducing single
22 occupancy vehicle trips. That is the first three goals combined. We can take
23 a little bit more time for that. If you could ...

24
25 **Jeremy Dennis:** I was going to say, Arthur, if you would like to follow
26 along with the goals, the new goals, it's Item 3. The main Staff report, it's
27 page 4 and 5. We can also do one of two things. We have up on the screen
28 right now, you see we're doing meeting notes. We're trying to do that live.
29 We could do that or we could put the goals up, whatever you prefer. Right
30 now, we're going with meeting notes. We figured that was more important,
31 but either way. The goals are on page 4 and 5, Item 3. The new goals.

32
33 **Co-Chair Keller:** The new goals. Also, would people like to see the
34 comments up there as they're being typed or rather would people like to see
35 the goals up there? How many people want goals? How many people want
36 comments? Okay, so most people want to see the goals up there. As
37 Jeremy said, we're going to be using this, the comments, as we are here.
38 That corresponds to T1 through T3 is the purview for tonight, and then next
39 time we'll look at T4 through T9. If you could make sure your microphone is
40 close, so that you can be heard. It's a lot easier to pick it up and get the
41 notes and get it broadcast. Make sure that your light is on. Some people
42 have green lights; some people have red lights depending on what it is.
43 Make sure your microphone is close enough so that you can be heard. If

1 you're like me and you can project in a room, then put it an appropriate
2 distance. Thank you.

3

4 **Co-Chair Garber:** Ellen, thank you. Bonnie, you're next, and then Bob.

5

6 **Bonnie Packer:** I've been waiting to say this. I'm not going to speak
7 directly to the goal, because what I think should be the first goal is an
8 emphasis on regional planning. I think Gil spoke to that and how important
9 that is, because we're not going to get to where Goals 1, 2 and 3 want to get
10 to unless we get a metropolitan transportation authority, something stronger
11 than the MTC, the Commission or whatever that is. I think Palo Alto,
12 because it receives 90,000-plus drivers into our city everyday and they're
13 coming from places that don't have good transit options, which is why
14 they're taking the freeways. Unless we can work regionally with those other
15 places, we're not going to get effectively to T1, 2 or 3. I'm suggesting that
16 when Staff comes together, or the subcommittee or whatever, and rewrites
17 this element, that the first goal be an emphasis on regional cooperation. We
18 can have lots of different policies under that. That's why I wanted to sort of
19 put that framework. Everything that I've read in the Staff report, everything
20 we heard from Gil, it's just begging for that. It's just what it's saying, all the
21 data, everything we're hearing. We're not living in a bubble here. I mean if
22 we reduce greenhouse gases just over our little 5 square mile city, what
23 good is that going to do unless they're doing it in San Jose and Sunnyvale
24 and Cupertino? I hope the summit that you're planning, Gil, is a regional
25 one. Maybe what Palo Alto does could be a template for other cities. We
26 should be leaders, because we're such an employment center.

27

28 **Co-Chair Garber:** Jeremy, you had a brief comment?

29

30 **Bonnie Packer:** That's my little speech for today.

31

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

33

34 **Jeremy Dennis:** I would say two things very quickly. Number one, the
35 goal structure has been adopted by the Council as you see on page 4 and 5.
36 Number two, more importantly to your point, Bonnie, the new T7 and the old
37 T-9, I think, speak directly to what you're referring to. That is something
38 that we hope you discuss as part of your deliberations.

39

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

41

42 **Bob Wenzlau:** My questions, Dan, are just a little bit more initially process
43 oriented as we're participating in this. When we again get the packet and
44 we work deliberatively to address the questions in the packet, and there

1 were many of them and they were well formed. I get confused because
2 while we're addressing and giving input to these questions that are raised in
3 the packet, it's hard to know if that is in fact becoming the input that you're
4 seeking as Staff or whether you want our—my concern is that the existing
5 Comp Plan is written in goal, policy and program. Because the questions
6 you ask are not necessarily rigorous to policy and program, I get concerned
7 that we are—I don't want to say being taken for a ride in the Transportation
8 Element here—maybe we're spinning our wheels, but maybe we're off point.
9 I was wondering if you could maybe help me understand how these
10 questions come into your process to inform, to be helpful for you as opposed
11 to just generating a bunch of commentary.
12

13 **Jeremy Dennis:** Sure. First of all, the questions are not intended to be the
14 end of any discussion at all. We hope that the questions help begin a
15 discussion if they're helpful. We hope that they, in your own heads, cause
16 you to ask additional questions. It's a starting place. When we on Staff talk
17 to one another about the goals that we see, these are the kinds of questions
18 we ask ourselves. Where do we think—what will a new draft look like
19 related to these issues? Some of them are—complete streets is something
20 we need to consider because it's required, so we put those kinds of things in.
21 Otherwise, we come up with questions because we think it'll help inform a
22 fun, interesting discussion for people. I think what we said in the last
23 meeting was you can use them, you cannot use them. It's really up to each
24 individual. If it's helpful for your process moving forward, then look at them
25 and see where that takes your imagination. If it's not, it's not necessarily
26 required to help inform what you're saying to us.
27

28 **Bob Wenzlau:** Well, I guess just to clarify it. Obviously in the packet,
29 everyone will see that I amongst a few of the team took the bait and hit all
30 of your topics with as much rigor as we could. Because I put that energy in,
31 I just wanted to commensurately understand whether it provides input to
32 you.
33

34 **Jeremy Dennis:** Yes, it does.
35

36 **Bob Wenzlau:** Or whether you're trying to get the juices—beyond getting
37 the juices flowing, the questions are not informative, er, the responses are
38 not informative. I think what I hear you're saying is that by spending the
39 time responding to your questions and those questions that you've written,
40 that it is the type of input you want from the CAC, so that you will be, I
41 don't know, putting it in the database. That's what I'm trying to understand.
42

43 **Jeremy Dennis:** I don't want to parse it out too hard. It's not intended to
44 be the only place that you're providing us input. It was never the intention

1 of the questions. We never expected that the input would be necessarily
2 driven from CAC members that you'd have to answer the questions that we
3 put in. They were intended to provide a starting place for your thinking. We
4 fully expected that some members may not look at the questions in the
5 same way. There's no directive related to the questions. Any input we
6 receive from the CAC is vital to the process that then we subsequently use
7 related to drafting something. If it's the questions that give us input, that
8 help inform drafting the element or if it's something else, I see them equally
9 as important.

10

11 **Co-Chair Garber:** Let me interrupt just briefly. We should expect to see
12 Bob's comments, for instance, in your comments matrix. That would be ...

13

14 **Jeremy Dennis:** Correct, absolutely.

15

16 **Co-Chair Garber:** ... a part of the deliberative material that we would see
17 there.

18

19 **Jeremy Dennis:** Absolutely, absolutely.

20

21 **Bob Wenzlau:** Is it okay to ask one more question? It's more ...

22

23 **Co-Chair Garber:** Of course.

24

25 **Bob Wenzlau:** Okay. I'm really into this. This is really fun. We had the—
26 the Planning Commission did some great work on this. Then we were
27 directed by Council to use as the baseline the '98 work, which is broadly
28 confusing because you've got one, the '98 version which I guess is
29 authoritative, but then you have all this great work by the CPCC or whatever
30 to improve it. As a Citizen Advisory Committee member, how do you want
31 us to communicate to you, "Hey, I like what the CPC"—I mean broadly I like
32 what they did. I'll tell you that right there, but I didn't know—aside from
33 taking all this time talking right now—what the best way to inform you to
34 carry the CPC work, to say, "yeah, that looks good," or "that doesn't look
35 good." I don't even know how to write a note, because the numbers are so
36 bizarre between the two.

37

38 **Jeremy Dennis:** I mean, I hope that the first place you've shared the
39 comments are here at the meeting so they're a part of the public record and
40 that there's something that we can then incorporate. We encouraged CAC
41 members, at the last staff meeting, that as long as you can get some
42 mention of what you want to talk about, but then provide maybe some more
43 specifics later on, so our meeting doesn't go down to some minute level of
44 detail that isn't productive. As long as you're telling us some basic

1 information about what direction you like that it's going and there are some
2 points that you'd like to make are meta-level issues, and then subsequently
3 follow up with us in something that we then put into our matrix and make
4 part of the public record and then put into our process, that's fine. Does
5 that answer your question, Bob?
6

7 **Bob Wenzlau:** Yeah, I think—well, we'll get there over time. I do think
8 what I'm hearing is that writing comments in, even if they don't get
9 vocalized here tonight, is in some respects the same thing because when
10 you come back ...
11

12 **Jeremy Dennis:** You're going to see everything.
13

14 **Bob Wenzlau:** ... somehow everything's going to come back. That's where
15 we're going to get the "forest through the trees" view. I just want to know
16 how to—because I don't want to—even though at this one moment I'm
17 taking a lot of time, I didn't want to feel like obligated to create airtime on
18 every point I wanted to make and that the written form is just as effective
19 getting it.
20

21 **Jeremy Dennis:** It is. The purpose of this meeting, other than to provide
22 feedback to what will be a draft that you see again, is also to make sure that
23 we're capturing the differences of opinion that will exist in some of the more
24 substantive sections here. I mean, we encourage everyone to say whatever
25 they feel like they need to say, and that may engender a debate, a
26 discussion, and then we'll understand both what a majority opinion is and
27 then we want to preserve all the minority opinions and make sure those go
28 back to the Council. We want to provide as many different avenues for you
29 to get that information out. We prefer that it starts with the public vetting
30 and then you can follow up with us to get more specific information, and
31 then we put that in. You've then see it all back.
32

33 **Bob Wenzlau:** Thank you.
34

35 **Jeremy Dennis:** Sure.
36

37 **Co-Chair Garber:** Arthur, did you have a brief comment?
38

39 **Co-Chair Keller:** Yeah. We'll be talking about subcommittees later. My
40 expectation is that the subcommittees will be doing some synthesis on all
41 the comments, whether they are from all the comments that are deltas from
42 the '98 Comp Plan. That means the PTC inputs, the comments made by the
43 public, through the commenter, at the meeting, comments made by the CAC
44 at these meetings and in writing. Certainly if you agree with, for example,

1 the PTC comments as you mentioned, it's worthwhile putting that in writing.
2 I'm not sure we want to spend a lot of airtime talking about that. Certainly
3 put in writing that you agree with some things or disagree with some things
4 certainly makes sense. In terms of these meetings, I said something at the
5 last meeting, and I think that is worth repeating. That is that the purpose of
6 this meeting from my perspective is to get the ideas aired. If you agree with
7 somebody, you don't have to say, "I agree with so-and-so" on something,
8 because we really want to get the ideas out. However, if you disagree with
9 something that somebody says, then in order to get that idea that there's a
10 point of disagreement, that's important to bring out. If you agree with
11 somebody's disagreement, that's unnecessary to say, if you understand
12 what I'm getting at. We want to get basically a range of opinion brought out
13 there in whatever form, whether it's writing, whether it's orally or whatever
14 form, to try to capture that. In the synthesis process, we can bring that
15 together and try to see what the range of opinions are and see where there's
16 consensus. Thank you.

17

18 **Co-Chair Garber:** Hamilton, Jennifer, Alex. Hamilton.

19

20 **Hamilton Hitchings:** Thank you. I thoroughly reviewed the PTC
21 Transportation Element, and thought it was a significant improvement over
22 the original element and much more up-to-date. I would recommend that
23 we use that as the baseline. I'm going to make a couple of comments about
24 T1 which are relative to the PTC version. The first is that mixed use is an
25 important concept that has been widely embraced in Palo Alto. That was
26 actually removed from T1. I would like to see that in T1 for this element.
27 The second is we've been talking a lot about mobility as a service, which
28 enables point to point on-demand driver services for a subsidized fee in Palo
29 Alto. This reduces the need for car ownership and parking. I think that
30 there's been a lot of talk about it, and I hope it makes it into this section.
31 Finally, I was really happy to see in the PTC version the section on the rail
32 corridor, which I think is really important that we do trench Caltrain and
33 specifically at a 2 percent grade, because it's half the price and the project
34 has a much higher success of completing closer to on-time and on-budget
35 and being a successful outcome. The last point I'd like to make on the rail
36 corridor is that it should have a park and a bike path to be built above the
37 Caltrain. I think that would be a big asset to the City. Those are my
38 comments.

39

40 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Jennifer.

41

42 **Jennifer Hetterly:** I hate to belabor the process question again. I'm still
43 trying to figure this out. I agree with Hamilton.

44

1 **Co-Chair Garber:** That's okay.
2

3 **Jennifer Hetterly:** I thought that the PTC version reflected a lot of really
4 good work and a lot of important ideas that ought to be considered by the
5 whole group. I'm a little concerned about just working off of the '98 version
6 of the Comp Plan, because I think that limits us to saying we like this policy
7 program, we don't like this policy program, we think this new one should be
8 there. We're starting from scratch in that perspective, when we have a lot
9 of work already done that we can say we like what they did here, we don't
10 like what they did here, we want to restore this or we're okay with getting
11 rid of that. I find it a cumbersome way to progress and maybe not the most
12 efficient way. I also agree with Bob about the review questions and how
13 best to use them in this group. I think it would be helpful, if you're going to
14 break them out into sections, to have just the ones related to that particular
15 topic in each section. We had topics all over the place in various sections.
16

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

19 **Jeremy Dennis:** Jennifer, I just wanted to say in the end you'll have all of
20 these different resources in front of you. Part of the reason we try to direct
21 people to one or the other is so we have a common starting place of the
22 conversation. That shouldn't preclude you at any point from saying, "I
23 prefer this. I prefer that." Just starting from the existing Transportation
24 Plan programs and policies doesn't mean that you can't go to the PTC's
25 version and say, "I prefer this. I prefer that. Let's bring it in." It's just that
26 we found in our first meeting and the (inaudible) on the Staff that we made
27 it incredibly confusing because we were combining a bunch of things into
28 one. You were all here; you remember what that was like. We wanted to
29 try to make that much less complicated. That's really the intention. Please,
30 any points you want incorporated send them our way.
31

32 **Co-Chair Garber:** Jennifer, anything else?
33

34 **Jennifer Hetterly:** No. I think I have to reorganize my thinking about
35 things, and I will come back around. I also will submit my comments that
36 were in a different format.
37

38 **Co-Chair Garber:** Alex.
39

40 **Alex Van Riesen:** I guess I wanted to say that it seems to me from the
41 conversation tonight that there's some need to identify what the main issue
42 is in the Transportation Element, particularly in these three main points
43 condensing into the first one. If it's reducing the single occupancy vehicle, it
44 seems like the biggest issue is those who are coming to work here in Palo

1 Alto. It seems like that's one big issue. The other issue is the
2 transportation within Palo Alto itself and how it serves the residents of Palo
3 Alto. It seems to me that we would in addressing that, the incoming traffic
4 issue, that that would be the place to start or to focus especially if we're
5 trying to reduce the carbon emissions and all that. It seems like how to
6 divide or break down that conversation into those two elements would be
7 helpful. I was struck in terms of the transportation within Palo Alto by the
8 Table 12-4 in the transportation and traffic handout that we received. I just
9 wanted to say I was—I think it's, oh, sorry. It's 12-2, Table 12-2. Is that
10 right? Did I get it right? Well, I think I mixed it up. It was the one that had
11 to do with the fact that—oh, sorry. It's Table 12-4. I was struck by the Palo
12 Alto shuttle total ridership in all categories is decreasing from 2012 to 2014.
13 I was struck by that. It seems to me that there's something that may be
14 fundamentally either not working or certainly not attractive about the
15 current Palo Alto shuttle system. I just want to draw our attention to Figure
16 12-2 which is on page—I don't know if we even have pages here. Figure 12-
17 2, and it's a graph of Palo Alto. I think the thing that struck me was if you
18 look at Palo Alto as four quadrants, you see that—in a diamond fashion—you
19 have the Marguerite over there on the left. I think people have all argued
20 that the Marguerite is incredibly efficient and has served the University well
21 and actually is quite a good economic solution to their problem. If you look
22 over at the other quadrants, what's striking to me is that there isn't
23 something in those three that mirrors that. It occurred to me that there
24 could be some solution there to either pattern after the Marguerite in the
25 other three quadrants of Palo Alto or—I appreciated some of Elaine's
26 drawings and her handout that she handed out tonight about some of this
27 direct point destination. It made me think how could we create a hub even
28 in Palo Alto which four quadrants would come together to serve, so that
29 people could move through the city. I think when you just look at the table,
30 it's striking that the rest of Palo Alto doesn't look anything like the
31 Marguerite. I think we could take a lesson from that. My last question is, is
32 there current data on the SOV coming into Palo Alto each day? Did we
33 already discuss that or do you have that? Sort of what that number is.

34

35 **Hillary Gitelman:** (inaudible)

36

37 **Alex Van Riesen:** Okay.

38

39 **Hillary Gitelman:** (inaudible) the packet, but we do have good data on
40 Downtown, and we have estimates for the City as a whole for workers
41 coming into Palo Alto. We have good data on residents of Palo Alto.

42

43 **Alex Van Riesen:** I guess my last statement would be if that's such a big
44 part, and I assume that number's fairly large, maybe not as large as Steve

1 was noting from the table. It's not 80 percent. If it's huge, it would seem to
2 me there's some immediate things that we could do to de-incentivize people
3 coming in and parking in Palo Alto. We should do that.
4

5 **Co-Chair Keller:** I just wanted to point out that the Table 12-4 that you
6 talked about, 2014 is only half a year obviously. If you take the cross-town
7 shuttle, you'll notice that ridership is actually up. Half a year for 2014 is
8 about 90,000 people, which is up from 2012 and 2013. The Embarcadero
9 shuttle is somewhat down. I notice also that there was discussion about
10 increasing—that part of the discussion about the satellite parking for
11 Downtown being on Embarcadero Road, there was a suggestion that that
12 satellite parking actually be parking for Embarcadero Road, for that area of
13 business. It seems to me that if ridership is down, there's something broken
14 there, and we should encourage them to use the Embarcadero shuttle rather
15 than trying to increase parking so that we're actually increasing the single
16 occupancy vehicle at that location. There's some disconnect in respect to
17 the east Embarcadero and shuttle use and Caltrain use. That should be
18 studied. Rather than enhancing parking there to make it worse, we should
19 try to fix that.
20

21 **Jeremy Dennis:** Thank you.
22

23 **Co-Chair Garber:** Alex, anything else? If not, Whitney and then Steve.
24

25 **Whitney McNair:** In Gil's presentation, he talked about some of the
26 companies that have the lowest SOV rates are near the Caltrain stations.
27 Palantir being one in the Downtown; Stanford being another. What I don't
28 see in this goal or in this policy are anything addressing the Cal. Avenue
29 station, in looking at trying to have Palo Alto promote working with Caltrain
30 to improve the stops at the Cal. Ave. station. In some cities, say in I think
31 San Mateo, they split the baby bullet stops between stations, so that some
32 are going to one station and some are going to the other. If the goal is to
33 try and get people out of their cars, the biggest employment center is the
34 Stanford Research Park, which is more directly connected to the Cal. Ave.
35 station. Having, say, a component of baby bullet stops stop there and
36 having a direct shuttle into the Research Park, you would be able to capture
37 that—you'd be able to capture more people or incentivize people to take the
38 train a lot more than you do in having them go to the University Avenue
39 stop. I would really want to see that promoted or have Palo Alto take a
40 bigger stand in doing that. The other thing is there was a question in some
41 of the reading material about the level of service as a calculation. A lot of
42 the new regulations are moving towards looking at vehicle miles traveled as
43 a different way to measure sort of the impacts on the environment. Gil
44 talked a lot about the VMT—that's the vehicle miles traveled—going down,

1 and that is a sign that if you're reducing greenhouse gases. I do see in the
2 policies that there's some language in here about changing from an LOS to a
3 multi-modal LOS standard, which is one way to consider that, especially for
4 transit and bikes. I would just say that if you're going to go that route is to
5 really identify are there particular streets or types of streets where you
6 would prioritize bikes and peds over cars and maybe really highlight those
7 are the routes to schools or particular places where that is a priority rather
8 than just blanketing it across the City as a whole. That's pretty tricky when
9 it gets into the CEQA analysis and doing sort of your environmental review in
10 the future. Lastly, just in Policy T-1-1, it does say that the City's goals for
11 greenhouse gas emissions by 2020. That may be just because this is an
12 older document. I would think that the City has a 2035 goal or something
13 else, because by the time this gets to 2020, we're going to hit that pretty
14 quickly. Lastly, there was one just as—it didn't quite seem to fit in the
15 railroad section. It was RC Policy 5.1, and I just wanted to make note that
16 it's about parks and recreation improvements. I'm not sure; I think it just
17 might have gotten in here for some different reason.

18

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

20

21 **Stephen Levy:** I have one very nitty-gritty proposal and three shorter
22 questions and comments. For the early part of my career, I worked on
23 transportation studies including as a consultant for the high speed rail.
24 Don't kill me, please. I have children; I'm about to be a grandfather. To do
25 mode shift, which is really what this set of goals is about, you need—Bob
26 wrote eloquently in his comments to us—you need data about where people
27 are coming from and where they're going to, origin and destination data. I
28 know someone said we don't need enough data, and maybe we don't need
29 any more data to talk about safety or bicycles or safe neighborhoods. If
30 you're talking about mode shift, I'd really like to have a specific program
31 request that we ask all of the employers in the City, the ones that are
32 signing up for the Business Registry, to anonymously give us the residence
33 addresses of their employees. Second, I'd like to replicate what the Palantir
34 and SurveyMonkey and other folks did Downtown at the Research Park. We
35 talk about Caltrain, getting people to and from Caltrain at Cal. Ave. We talk
36 about the Page Mill Expressway. At the heart of that is the Research Park.
37 I'd love to have a survey of those folks, so we have a better idea of what's
38 realistic. I'm a data person. I can't do goals without testing them with
39 numbers, so I'd really like to get that information. Three quick comments.
40 One, I'd like to echo one piece of what Elaine wrote, and I think others have
41 said. I'm all for the investments that Gil talked about. I think we should
42 have something explicitly in the Transportation Element that we're willing to
43 pay for it and have identified funds, whether that's Caltrain trenching or
44 shuttles or something. I think investments without us putting up the money

1 doesn't seem right to me. I hope I read what Annette said correctly. If not,
2 please correct me. There's so much to read. I read this perhaps
3 unintentionally as disrespectful to the people who need and use cars. Okay.
4 I've never been able to drive in my life, so I'm not talking for myself. I'd
5 love to see mode shift, but I want to do that in a way that gives people
6 options, not makes drivers villains. I think we can do that. It's a little heavy
7 here. The last point that I think is a little heavy is I read a lot about
8 greenhouse gas reduction. Okay. Which can be done without affecting
9 driving. You can double mileage standards; you can have clean fuels; you
10 can have clean cars. Okay. You can address greenhouse reduction
11 substantially without affecting driving. I see the word mobility once or
12 twice, and that's mobility for people with special needs or mobility as a
13 service. I don't see what used to be the number one thing about a
14 Transportation Element, that we were helping people and businesses move
15 goods and services, people. Whether we do that in cars or not, mobility in a
16 growing region is really important for the economy. I don't see enough
17 emphasis on the basic element of transportation of moving people and
18 helping businesses and people get around. If they can do it without cars,
19 that's okay. That's not the only way to me. It felt a little bit heavy. The
20 last point is a question. I'm confused about how we're handling land use
21 and transportation. I think all of us know that land use can affect the need
22 to drive. My wife and I live Downtown behind farmer's market. Whether or
23 not I could drive or not, I don't have to drive to go to the grocery store, to
24 go to Caltrain, to go out to dinner, to get shopping at Walgreens or CVS. I
25 don't have to drive because of the land use decisions. I don't know how
26 they're related in our work through this process, but I don't see enough
27 talking about land use as a way to reduce single occupancy vehicle at least
28 in the materials I've seen.

29

30 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Elaine, then Amy.

31

32 **Elaine Uang:** Okay. I want to just throw out one kind of big organizational
33 suggestion which is—Gil alluded to this earlier—combining T1, sustainable
34 transportation, with T8, providing attractive parking facilities both for cars
35 and for bikes. I think that parking is kind of at the crux of a lot of the
36 transportation issues. It's often an incentive to drive and to increase SOVs,
37 because it becomes the more convenient way to get around. I think that
38 thinking about those things together, a lot of the programs seem to be
39 redundant, especially with transportation demand management. If we really
40 want to reduce demand, I think we need to be serious about integrating
41 sustainable transportation with parking. I did also just want to highlight, I
42 think that the, on my handout, the image. This is Jarrett Walker, who's I
43 guess a transit consultant, calls this the image that pretty much explains
44 almost everything. The image is of 60 people and how much space it takes

1 to fit in a bus, on a series of bikes or in 60 vehicles. That, I think, is just a
2 very good, compelling graphic that transportation—I mean think about all
3 the GHG and the fumes that come off these three scenarios. It's a spatial
4 problem as well. I think that we need to really consider that. It takes over
5 a lot of our space on the streets, a lot of space; cars do. Not to vilify, but
6 this is just a geometry problem, and I think we need to be aware of that. I
7 want to get to some people have mentioned land use and transportation. I
8 think that it's really important to consider district level transportation
9 management and aligning land uses to those districts. A case in point, I
10 think the Downtown area really needs a precise plan. We have parking
11 assessment districts. We have a Downtown CAP area, which don't exactly
12 correspond to each other. Then we also have functionally where people are
13 doing work and coming into work; those don't align. In our parking
14 strategies, we're actually going to leave people out in the cold because the
15 only people who can access the garages at the moment are the people who
16 happen to work in the Parking Assessment District. If you happen to work
17 two blocks away and your office is not in the Parking Assessment District,
18 you've got to park on the street and that's all you've got. If we're really
19 going to talk about any sort of future development, whether that's housing
20 or anything, we have to really think about those boundaries and draw those
21 boundaries in tandem with each other. Two more things. There's been a lot
22 of things spoken about bikes tonight. I think that I agree with a lot of the
23 comments and the audience. I bike a lot. I might be a little bit of a crazy
24 biker. Today was a Spare the Air Day, so I did bike here. Implementing
25 that Bike Plan from 2012 is really, really important. I think it's also
26 important to think about going beyond that. We're going to do a plan until
27 2030. Copenhagen has a bike mode share of 50 percent. We're at 9. We
28 have better weather. We can ride most days of the year. I think we should
29 really push that. I would like to see us push that. I think we need to do
30 safe routes to work, safe routes to shop, and last time we talked about safe
31 routes to play, go to the park, the library, the community centers like this
32 one. I spent a lot of time this weekend biking up to the Baylands. There is
33 no flipping good way to get to the Baylands on your bike, especially if you've
34 got kids and you're hauling them in your trailer. It sucks. Those are just
35 some things to think about, I think, going forward. Oh, and one small, last
36 piece. Metrics. I think that we probably need to not rely on a single, sole
37 metric. I think VMT is probably a good starting point. It's going to measure
38 transportation impact a lot better. In my packet, I included a presentation
39 that I saw from Chris Ganson who is the project manager from the Office of
40 Planning and Research in Sacramento, and he's the guy responsible for
41 allowing VMT to be considered as a measure for transportation impact. The
42 State is moving away from LOS and trying to move towards VMT. He kind of
43 explains a little bit about why that's important. I think thinking about VMT
44 per capita is important, maybe thinking about VMT per trip. On the parsing

1 of trips coming into Palo Alto as one category, maybe VMT per capita is a
2 better measure. On the parsing of trips within Palo Alto, maybe VMT per trip
3 is a better measure. Maybe we think about ways to incentivize non-auto use
4 for those one, two-mile trips. I do think that absolute measurement of
5 vehicles, just basic traffic counts, is probably a good measure. I think
6 Stanford does that pretty regularly to determine whether or not they're
7 violating their terms of agreement. They haven't. I think we need to kind of
8 bring to bear a lot of different metrics.

9

10 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Don, and then Bonnie, and then Lisa. Oh,
11 I'm sorry. Was there ...

12

13 **Female:** (inaudible)

14

15 **Co-Chair Garber:** I'm sorry. Amy. Amy, then Don.

16

17 **Amy Sung:** Is this on? I have a couple of thoughts as I was reading
18 through the document. I wanted to start from this sustainability and then
19 here with the presentation we just heard from Gil. He talks about in the
20 future then we would have all this interoperability like in mobility. We will
21 see a lot of cooperation across the city boundary, but how do we get from
22 here to there? I thought for right now how we reduce the single occupant
23 vehicle, is it because really hop into your car is so convenient and easy.
24 Every time I'm thinking about biking to Safeway, and I'm thinking, "How am
25 I going to get all my grocery home?" If you think about—if you are going to
26 buy something more substantial like from Ikea, how are you going to bring
27 those home with public transportation? I really think that we need to focus
28 on the last mile. Maybe there should be some apps that you purchase, and
29 then there'll be something separate public transportation that brings your
30 grocery home or something. That is my first thought. We talk about young
31 people. They grew up with this bike to school. They don't really want to
32 own their own vehicle. They don't take the driver's test. My own son grew
33 up in Palo Alto school system, and he's really exercising that. He is 19 years
34 old; he doesn't want to have a driver's license. Here is the issue. He is
35 coaching in Los Altos, and he needs to find a way to get there. You take
36 various buses over there; it takes hour and a half. He doesn't have that, so
37 he's going to do his planning. At the last minute he's going to say, "Would
38 you please take me there?" Then I was thinking like how do we reduce the
39 incentives for us to own homes. I think that we need to start with our
40 permit, because right now we still ask that every family to accommodate the
41 two-car parking. I don't know if I'm right about that. I think maybe moving
42 forward, do we need to decouple the need of housing and the need of having
43 cars parked within our boundary. I thought of that, because a friend of mine
44 told me that in New York, when you buy a house, you buy a house. You

1 want to buy parking, you buy parking. I thought maybe that is something
2 for us to think about. How do we reduce the use of vehicles? I grew up in
3 Taiwan. In Taiwan, we seem to move around easily with public
4 transportation, because the streets are too crowded for me to drive. It's
5 just too dangerous. I cannot compete with bus drivers and taxi drivers. I
6 think maybe we need to have more frequent. Back in NASA when I was
7 working in the big campus, we drive to work and then, in order not to lose
8 that precious parking spot, the center provides shuttles all around. I go
9 from building to building, to lunch and everywhere with shuttle. There are
10 also bicycles provided, so I can just take a bike from one building and then
11 drop it off at destination and not worry about I need to come back with that
12 same bicycle. That's just my ideas.

13

14 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Don, and then Bonnie.

15

16 **Don McDougall:** I hate to go back to the issue of are we going by the new
17 program or the old program or whatever but, Jeremy, you suggested that
18 what we should be doing is talking about single occupancy vehicles, excuse
19 me, public transportation and walking and biking, which are the first three in
20 the old one, and considering them as one, which is sustainability and
21 greenhouse and gas and by the way maybe reducing SOV. There's not a
22 real connection. With all due respect to Council, they didn't make it any
23 easier because they added Number 9 to the new one even though they
24 recommend that we go by the old one, so I don't know why they didn't add
25 Number 11 to the old one instead of Number 9 to the new one, which is
26 congestion. What are the solutions to congestion? They're going to be the
27 same, public transportation, walking and biking and whatever, that we're
28 dealing with in terms of reducing SOV. Other than just a rant, my
29 suggestion is that we look at this Number 1 and Number 9, that we should
30 group those two together. We should take single occupancy vehicle
31 reduction—public transportation should be divided into public transportation
32 in and out of the city versus in the city. When you look at this, it's mixed
33 up. You're talking about the Marguerite at the same time you're talking
34 about can you take a bus from San Jose. I think those two public
35 transportation elements should be broken apart. I also think that walking
36 and biking should be broken apart. I think there's an awful lot of emphasis
37 in here and rightfully so. I totally support it on biking, but biking is solving a
38 different problem than walking was. When the plan was made in '98, yeah,
39 walking and biking were sort of maybe solving the same problem or they
40 were just simply not motorized, and so you put them together. I think today
41 walking and biking are very, very different. I think biking is a deliberate
42 solution to a problem; whereas, walking is a necessity particularly when you
43 start talking about special needs. At the last meeting we talked about do we
44 have enough representation of old people, whatever you want to call us, and

1 they're the walking crowd. I think there's not enough in here about walking.
2 We could separate those two. What you've done in the structure of the new
3 one is you've got goals and policies and programs, but then you've got
4 subheadings. The subheadings aren't anything other than helping you sort
5 out what the heck you're looking at. I would suggest that under this new
6 combined "1" and "9," because they're fundamentally the same challenge,
7 you use those subheadings broken up as I've suggested, public
8 transportation in and out and local, and walking and biking separate.

9
10 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thanks. Bonnie, then Lisa.

11
12 **Bonnie Packer:** I'm really enjoying everybody's comments, because I
13 agree with so many of them. One of the things that we learned in the past
14 couple of weeks was this wonderful statistic that the people coming to
15 Downtown use Caltrain, because they're coming from San Francisco where
16 there is good transit. All the other people who are driving are coming from
17 the south where there isn't good transit. Why isn't there good transit?
18 Because it's suburbia, like we are. Like the quadrants, Alex, you were
19 mentioning those white areas in Palo Alto where you don't see any lines.
20 Maybe there's a shuttle that goes on a weird route somewhere once an hour
21 and doesn't do anybody any good. I had kind of this dream. We have all
22 this great technology. We have Zip cars. We have this ability to learn
23 where buses are coming from or whatever. One of the comments on the
24 digital commentator said, "Wouldn't it be great if there was a goal that it
25 took no more than ten minutes to walk to a transit option?" Ten minutes to
26 walk to the shuttle. If I live on Ross Road, like it's 15 minutes to walk to
27 Middlefield to find wherever the shuttle is. It goes down Waverley. It's a
28 mile away, so how can I take the shuttle anywhere? If we had a system
29 that was a combination of maybe smart golf carts that you knew were going
30 up and down Louis Road or up and down Ross Road every so often to
31 connect with wherever our shuttle is, then people would more likely use the
32 transit and wouldn't have to use their car. The reason we use our cars is
33 because we can't get to the good transit because we live in suburbia, many
34 of us, not everybody. The young people who live in San Francisco can hop
35 on Muni or whatever and go to Townsend and pick up the train and they're
36 here. It's easy. The people who live in San Jose, what are they going to
37 do? How many places does light rail go to? BART doesn't go anywhere near
38 here. That's what I would like us to have a policy of no more than ten
39 minutes to walk to transit. If you have good transit, then you can really try
40 for parking. All these ideas—and I love the idea that we're really going to do
41 a paid parking study because that's what we really need. You charge for
42 parking, then people will choose transit because they don't want to pay for
43 parking. That's what we do when we go to San Francisco, right? We take
44 the train so we don't have to park. All these things, I think they have to be

1 done together. If you have a fee for parking but you haven't improved the
2 local transit, it's not going to work. Something should be said in these
3 policies that these have to be done as tandem projects in order for it to
4 work.

5

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

7

8 **Bonnie Packer:** The other thing I wanted to say about pedestrians versus
9 bicycles, where we can we should separate the uses. A lot of places do that.
10 They have this is where the bikes go, and this is where the people walk. It's
11 really unsafe, especially for older people. They're walking on the streets.
12 On the sidewalks, I mean these kids riding on the sidewalks; they should not
13 be doing that with their bikes. It's dangerous. These are safety issues that
14 when we get to the safety section, I might raise again. Thank you.

15

16 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you, Bonnie. Folks, I've got Lisa, Annette, Shani,
17 Jason, Lydia, Julia, Mark, Len. Then hopefully ...

18

19 **Female:** Doria.

20

21 **Co-Chair Garber:** And then Adrian, and then Doria. Stephanie (inaudible)
22 I'm sorry. And Jared. We're going to get through all these comments in five
23 minutes, so we can save ten minutes for the conversation on
24 subcommittees. In our dreams. Let's go with Lisa.

25

26 **Lisa Peschcke-Koedt:** There's so many good ideas in here, right. I think
27 we have to, by the time we're done, cover all of it from basically the
28 airplanes to the walking, right. You start from the big and go to the small. I
29 think one thing, and it goes a bit to what Bonnie said before. If I could look
30 forward maybe ten years, what would solve so many problems? I think if we
31 had an underground kind of BART, call it subway, call it whatever you want,
32 but electric, fast transit from San Francisco to San Jose, underground, safe,
33 electric, right. It hits so many of the things we're trying to do. That would
34 solve so many of the issues that we're dealing with. It would solve a lot of
35 the safety issues, right, some of the things we talked about last time on the
36 suicides and all that. It would definitely help on the greenhouse gas. It
37 would help a lot of the people that are coming in to work in Palo Alto. If that
38 were a frequent, easy, relatively cheap, fast and reliable, you've seen how
39 Caltrain with the baby bullet has gone up. I think this would solve it. I hate
40 the old politics of why BART didn't come through. I think it's time to revisit
41 that. Palo Alto needs it. If we solve that and then we add within Palo Alto
42 transportation, which several people mentioned, frequent shuttles on
43 frequent routes that you could rely on, no more than the ten-minute walk. I
44 think it would solve so many issues. I think that first comment is sort of my

1 big picture view of where we need to go. I know it'll be expensive, and it'll
2 take a long time, and we can't do it ourselves. We'll probably come back to
3 it when we talk about the T7, the regional leadership. When I was reading
4 through all the different goals, that just seemed like it solved so many of the
5 issues we're trying to solve. If we could just tackle that. It might even
6 allow the high—I mean I don't really care whether we have high speed rail.
7 If we're going to do that, it would also solve—it's going to have to go
8 underground. The last part, just to add on that—sorry, this will be the last
9 comment. When we talk about land use, I also think that would free up all
10 the space that currently is Caltrain, because now we're talking about it all
11 being under. We'll need access and all that, but think of what those areas
12 could be used for, whether it's housing, whether it's bike lanes, whether it's
13 whatever. We're very land constrained in the main corridors. That would
14 also open up that.

15

16 **Co-Chair Garber:** Great, thank you. Annette, and then Shani.

17

18 **Annette Glanckopf:** That's on? Okay, good. Well, I just wanted to say
19 first of all as far as the regional transportation, I go one more. I think we
20 need a whole Bay Area coordinated plan. It's greater than the region. It's
21 ridiculous to have all these different transit agencies and each one doing
22 their own thing and competing for resources. Looking at the Comp Plan
23 itself; however, I think the biggest impact in the next period of time is the
24 high speed rail. We need to really add to that section on the impacts in Palo
25 Alto, because I they're going to be significant. Undergrounding, obviously, is
26 very key. When I look at what I've seen of the Comp Plan and this element,
27 I see a lot of emphasis on commuters and bicyclists. I think that is certainly
28 fine. I support a lot of the policies and programs to get people out of their
29 cars. When I was traveling to San Francisco every day, I would have loved
30 to have some sort of subsidy, and that would have definitely gotten me out
31 of my car. When my employer cut off my parking fees, that got me on the
32 train really fast, and I was converted. It really is a sea change. As far as
33 bikers, I don't think we should have any more emphasis. I agree with what
34 Penny said. Let's just make what—we've already gotten policy and
35 programs, let's make that happen. What I see really missing is more
36 emphasis, a more robust section for our residents, especially the seniors and
37 those that have some sort of mobility problems. This is a group that's not
38 early adopters, so the future is going to be different. I think that all of us
39 are getting used to services on demand, and I think we should have in our
40 Comp Plan some way to support some of these things like Uber or Lyft or
41 other ways that seniors or those with any kind of impairments can get
42 around to their satisfaction. I would support parking fees, either in parking
43 lots or even parking meters. If traffic really gets bad, we could go to the
44 London/Singapore model of charging people to actually move into a certain

1 area and charge them for the trips in. I think incentives will do a lot to get
2 people out of the cars, but I'd like to see more on high speed rail and areas
3 for seniors and those with mobility issues.

4
5 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thanks. Shani, then Jason.

6
7 **Shani Kleinhaus:** Okay. I agree that the shuttle program is not working
8 well. It needs huge reinforcement, and I would like to see a lot more of
9 that. I want to go over a few things that others haven't mentioned. In the
10 PTC document, Policy T-1.1 and T-1.2 should be merged. It's almost the
11 same thing. One of them has programs; the other doesn't. Those could be
12 merged together. Program T1, encourage infill, redevelopment and reuse of
13 vacant or underutilized parcels. I think the time for use of vacant green
14 fields for infill is gone. Now we need every one of those remaining infills for
15 parks in the city, because our population is increasing. The time for looking
16 at every piece of land as infill should be passed; we already got that, or
17 most of it. The next thing I wanted to mention is something that Penny
18 Ellson mentioned. In Policy T2 in the old version was changed in the new
19 version to T-1.5. The language in the previous one says "address" as Penny
20 mentioned rather than "strive to balance." I support adding safety but also
21 health to this policy, or maybe just scratch it altogether because we have to
22 do all these things anyway. In Policy T-1.8, there is a policy and then a PTC
23 report, survey the community regularly to measure the effectiveness of the
24 city's transportation network to make better decisions on transportation
25 issues. I think this is very, very important, but it's a program, not a policy,
26 because they are going to survey and do something. It's a program. The
27 opposite is for T-1.19.7 which is support the development of Santa Clara
28 countywide bicycle system and other regional bicycle plans. That's a policy.
29 Palo Alto is not going to develop these things; that's not a program. Did I
30 have any—I have a lot more, but I think I'll let other people speak.

31
32 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Jason, then Lydia.

33
34 **Jason Titus:** All right. I'll just be real quick. I had heard—one thing I
35 thought that Steve and others said that was really important was about
36 being data driven. The idea of saying that we actually should add to the
37 survey of companies or the registry of companies to actually have some—I
38 would actually argue annual or a biannual process by which we say rather
39 than perhaps actual all employee addresses, at least saying like employee
40 ZIP Codes, and being able to say we will track, have some survey that says
41 employee ZIP Codes and method of transit, and just actually use that as a
42 driver of saying when we look at regional leadership and things like that.
43 Actually knowing where people are coming from and how they commute will
44 tell us if we have a huge portion of San Francisco Caltrain, okay, there's an

1 area where we're doing well. If we have a huge portion that's Morgan Hill
2 and driving, then that might guide us on where should we be focusing on. I
3 feel a lot of times generic transportation solutions end up with empty buses
4 and confusing routes. Whereas, if we could say here's the four hotspots that
5 if we could partner well for transportation, we could help the city. That
6 would be more beneficial.

7

8 **Co-Chair Garber:** Great, thanks. Lydia, then Julia.

9

10 **Lydia Kou:** First, I want to say thanks to Stephen for bringing up that the
11 Comprehensive Plan at this point looks a little bit heavy, leaning towards one
12 group of people and trying to eliminate a method of transportation. It is a
13 Comprehensive Plan, so I think that we should be looking at how to engage
14 and how to encourage everybody to use different modes of transportation.
15 Encouraging and giving more frequency services, education along with
16 enforcement. I think that's one of the most important things, especially
17 since there is—it's a safety matter as well. I think that enforcement is one
18 of the things that we need. Secondly, I did want to say that there's a lot
19 of—this is a safe place to talk, so I just want to bring the elephant from
20 under the table up. There's a lot of talk about GHG; however, you also have
21 to take into consideration that there are services included. Is your level of
22 service going to go down? Is your infrastructure not going to be looked at
23 just because we're trying to have more emphasis on reducing greenhouse
24 gases? I think that that's something that we need to kind of review. Steve
25 also brought up another point that I had, which was in regards to land use.
26 I think transportation is very closely related to land use. There is a whole
27 slew of projects that are in the pipeline that are still going through ARB and
28 PTC before it reaches Council. I just want to kind of say if we don't know
29 what the capacity of what our land use or our zoning for each parcel is here
30 in Palo Alto, how do we even go into a viable or even sensible way of
31 transportation? We're just kind of feeling in the dark over here. I think that
32 having a map stating parcels and what the zoning is currently, and then on
33 top of that let us know what the capacity could be based on that zoning,
34 then we can have also better idea of what we're looking at in terms of
35 transportation. Going to T-13 in the PTC draft about make land use
36 decisions to promote infill, yada, yada, yada. Seventeen years this Comp
37 Plan has been there; 17 years. We have seen the policies being abused. I
38 mean, look at how much density we have now. I mean, this is insanity. I
39 think that this policy, especially T-13 really needs to be better considered
40 and constrained. T-14 in the PTC draft, locate higher density near transit
41 corridors. First and foremost, I didn't see a map in terms of where the
42 transit corridors are. Also, I want to know the definition of transit corridors.
43 Also, this language in this policy, T-14, is very restrictive. It just seems that

1 you're eliminating other locations for consideration for development,
2 especially for housing. I think that's it. Thank you.

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

5
6 **Lydia Kou:** Oh, I'm sorry, one more.

7
8 **Co-Chair Garber:** Go ahead.

9
10 **Lydia Kou:** Just one more. While we're talking about VMT and LOS, I think
11 that also we need to have ideas of what they actually mean. I mean, you
12 can just kind of throw out all the acronyms and you can tell us what the
13 words actually are for these acronyms, but I want to know what is behind
14 each of them and how do you use it to evaluate the streets, the
15 intersections, etc. Thank you.

16
17 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thanks. Julia, then Mark, and then Len.

18
19 **Julia Moran:** Just in regards to deterrence's from more parking and paid
20 parking, I'm all for that. I just want to make sure that we're very thoughtful
21 with the way that we put together those programs, especially for non-
22 commuters. My two concerns are, one, we are within a region where people
23 go to other cities. If we have paid parking here, does that mean residents
24 just go to Los Altos? That doesn't solve any real environmental issues.
25 Second, we also live in a very wealthy city. I am concerned that the parking
26 lots will be filled with Teslas and Porsches, and those that are socio-
27 economically disadvantaged will then be pushed out of Downtown. I want to
28 make sure that those are thought through with paid parking.

29
30 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Mark, and then Len.

31
32 **Mark Nadim:** Once thing I didn't notice here in the document, not that
33 mention of using technology in transportation. I mean, for example, there
34 are these apps that allow us to know when the bus is coming in and some
35 on-demand transportation. These are things that I didn't notice in these
36 documents. Another thing is the congestion that all the traffic that is coming
37 into Palo Alto. Again, it was mentioned earlier and I want to emphasize on
38 it, is without regional transportation plan we will not be able to resolve the
39 congestion on our streets. I live west of 280 and, if I go out of town in the
40 morning, I can't come back home until after 10:30. There is a quarter-mile
41 backup on both exits of 280 on Page Mill. I mean, it's ridiculous to look into
42 this type of congestion. The regional transportation is one thing, then we'll
43 need to have more routes on our shuttles. The shuttle, looking at the map
44 that I saw in the document here, it's just insufficient. I mean, people are

1 not going to walk that much to get to a shuttle that goes maybe every 30
2 minutes, so we need more frequency and more shuttle coverage. Bicycles is
3 a great idea. The only issue is we have an older generation that are not able
4 to use bicycles for transportation. Lane diet was one of the solutions that
5 was presented some time ago to make drivers get out of their cars. The
6 problem is if we don't provide an alternative for the drivers, they're not
7 going to get out of their cars. I mean, look at the roads that we narrowed
8 down, like Arastradero. The backup's still the same. People don't enjoy
9 sitting in their cars behind traffic lights for several minutes. Also, that
10 generates more greenhouse gases. We need an alternative for
11 transportation narrowing our streets. Then there's the high-density housing
12 that was also one of the solutions that was presented. A lot of people move
13 to Palo Alto not to work in Palo Alto, but to have their kids go to schools in
14 Palo Alto while they work somewhere else. This is really not going to solve
15 the issue. Also, when people want to get married and have a family, they
16 want to have a dog and a cat and a backyard, so that's why a lot of people
17 are moving away from Palo Alto and then they drive, come back to work in
18 Palo Alto. That's what I wanted to say. Thanks.

19

20 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Len, and then we have Adrian, and Doria,
21 and that's it. I've got two comments I'll add at the end, and then Arthur.

22

23 **Len Filppu:** Real quick. Just one point. I did have two, but I'm going to
24 just make one now. I talk to people all over Palo Alto, neighbors and
25 friends. They complaint about traffic; it's traffic, traffic, traffic, traffic. One
26 practical thing, I think, that could be done with the increased enrollment in
27 the schools, that's why I wanted to dig down a little bit deeper on the
28 numbers. It is excellent, the number of people who are biking. I just
29 wonder how many are not biking, how many are being driven. My
30 understanding is there's huge numbers still of traffic, and it's right at the
31 time when people are coming into work and trains are going. There's
32 backup; the frustration gets higher. It might be time for the City to take a
33 look at shuttles or buses, maybe as a joint venture with Palo Alto Unified
34 School District, to see if there are ways to go deeper into the neighborhoods,
35 make it more convenient, more quick; so that if you miss a bus, you don't
36 have to miss your start of school to catch a next one. Just some of those
37 things. Palo Alto Unified might be open to some kind of thing like that.
38 Thank you very much.

39

40 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thanks so much. Adrian, then Doria.

41

42 **Adrian Fine:** Thanks. I've really appreciated everyone's comments. Just
43 three quick ones of my own. There's a bit of talk about how this plan might
44 be anti-car or against traveling by vehicle. I think maybe we could be a bit

1 more specific in our goals, policies and programs about actually addressing
2 the externalities of these vehicles and single vehicle trips. I think that's
3 actually the bigger issue rather than being against cars in general. In
4 general, I'm not in favor of breaking apart transportation by residents and
5 visitors. Many different people participate and use the city and deserve to.
6 The rub is that residents and visitors have different travel demands and
7 different supplies. I think that's how we actually have to think about these
8 issues. That gets back to Bonnie's point and a few others that these are
9 inherently regional issues. I think we really should consider that. Finally,
10 there's been talk about land use driving transportation decisions. One of the
11 members of the public had a comment on that, warning us against it or
12 warning us against doing it the other way. Maybe Staff could give us a quick
13 primer on that in a future presentation.

14

15 **Co-Chair Garber:** Great, thank you. Doria.

16

17 **Doria Summa:** Sorry (inaudible). I've whittled my list down, but I did
18 want to point out that the new vision statement that Council wrote includes
19 very strong language about protections for residential streets from
20 congestion and that they should be attractive and designed to enhance the
21 quality. It was up there a little while; I won't read the whole thing. I think
22 we need to emphasize that. I don't see—to quote Gil, our sustainability guy,
23 don't build parking capacity. I don't see how that's consistent with some of
24 the current policies the City has, especially the new Downtown residential
25 parking, Downtown North and South. I think that should be maybe looked
26 at. I also wanted to point out that since there's a new goal, T9 about traffic
27 congestion that we need to create some policies under that goal. That just
28 hasn't been done yet. Just really quickly, I think level of service for
29 congestion at intersections is a very important tool. I understand the State's
30 moving to VMT, but I think for our own purposes we should surely retain
31 level of service. It gives us a lot of information. I'm a little concerned
32 about—unless I don't understand it correctly—that the multi-modal level of
33 service as I understand it—if I'm wrong, you can tell me—it'll mix all the
34 uses together. I think they should be pulled out separately, so you can still
35 say overall it's working better for cars, pedestrians and bikes, but the cars
36 maybe are still too high or whatever. Those are a few quick comments. I'll
37 just leave it at that. Oh, I have one question though. If we bring materials
38 for the group that we put at places, shouldn't they be provided for the public
39 also? Just a clarification, I think, would be helpful. Thanks.

40

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

42

43 **Jeremy Dennis:** Any materials we receive are provided; although, there's
44 a little bit on timing. If we get anything from CAC members before a certain

1 time before our meetings, it's available to people. Hopefully you pick those
2 up. Actually Elaine brought a copy of her own, but we will bring you those.
3 If they come from other sources, they may come at a little different time.
4 Like the matrix, we'll be putting those in. We'll be putting those types of
5 comments into the matrix. It kind of depends which ones you're talking
6 about and when, but even they're all part and available to you.
7

8 **Co-Chair Garber:** Two quick comments from myself. I think we've got
9 everybody. I'll add my two, and then Arthur can close us out. We are, I'm
10 afraid, ten minutes over time here. Is everyone willing to stick around for a
11 few more minutes to talk about subcommittees briefly? You ...
12

13 **Female:** I've got a commitment that I'm (inaudible).
14

15 **Co-Chair Garber:** I would never hold you up, so of course you can be
16 excused. Two comments. One, I think it's clear that there needs to be a
17 program that drives the creation of a data collection, monitoring and
18 reporting organism within the City. That needs to be in the Comp Plan.
19 That's just the program for it; it doesn't address necessarily what all that
20 data is. It's clear that it needs to be funded, supported. My sense is that
21 it's an organism that probably bears some similarity to our audit service that
22 currently exists, just in terms of it being a one-off, separately funded sort of
23 activity. Second of which, my second comment really has to do with the fact
24 that all of the transit organisms rely on a specific tie to land use, and that is
25 the multi-modal center that's at University Avenue and El Camino. That
26 multi-modal center is woefully inadequate to current needs and demands,
27 and it's why the buses stack themselves up along the exit ways on El
28 Camino during the day and during the evening. It is not positioned or
29 anywhere near what is needed for the capacity that is projected for the next
30 30 years. If there's anything that requires attention, it is that area. As part
31 of the specific plan, that Elaine had also mentioned, it needs to include that
32 as a tie-in. If there is any one thing that would affect service in all parts of
33 our community, it is how that operation works. There's a second piece to
34 that which has to do with actually just safety as well as continuation of the
35 various mode paths, pedestrian, bike, vehicle, bus, train—what have I
36 forgotten—that all come together right there. There is significant
37 infrastructure in terms of storm drain, in terms of high voltage electric and
38 gas, that all comes through there that needs to be coordinated in order to
39 create those improvements. That's something that needs to come into the
40 Comprehensive Plan. Whether it's a part of transportation or the land use,
41 I'm not exactly sure. Maybe parts of it are shared between both. That, in
42 my mind, is a very critical portion that will bear fruit and is important for the
43 entire community. Arthur.

1 **Co-Chair Keller:** Let me make a few comments that are responses to some
2 of the things people said, just to think about things. There was a lot of
3 comments about grouping of the goals in different ways. As far as I
4 understand, that's handed down from the Council. You can think about
5 different ways of grouping them, but essentially it's a design issue.
6 Underneath you're going to have policies and programs. Probably if they're
7 grouped a different way, they're probably the same policies and programs;
8 they'll be just grouped differently. I think we don't really need to spend that
9 much time thinking about redesign. We should spend most of our time
10 thinking about how those policies and programs should be structured.
11 Within this structure, it's not going to change that much with different
12 architecture. The second thing is that we can think about policies and
13 programs that might make sense in different environments. If I lived in
14 Manhattan, I wouldn't have a car. I don't live in Manhattan; I live a few
15 blocks from here. I drive a lot of different places, walk a lot of different
16 places. The notion of what makes sense in terms of decoupling housing
17 from parking in Manhattan or even in San Francisco is different from what
18 makes sense in Palo Alto. After all, even in walkable Downtown Palo Alto,
19 they're talking about wanting permits for people who live there, residential
20 parking permits. Why would they have residential parking permits if we're
21 going to decouple parking? If you decouple parking, they're going to park
22 on the street. Is that fair? There's something broken about that. A regional
23 transit agency sounds like a great idea, but we are a wart on VTA as far as
24 San Jose is concerned. San Jose is the big, 800-pound gorilla for VTA that
25 controls it. We get the crumbs; they get BART. Joe Simitian showed that.
26 If we had a regional transit agency, would we be the wart on San Francisco,
27 Oakland and San Jose? Who knows whether that would mean that we'd get
28 anything anyway. I don't think the regional transportation agency is a
29 solution. It may be better things, but I think that we have to think carefully
30 to make sure that instead of being 6 percent of the sales tax revenue for
31 VTA, where we have more say perhaps, where a somewhat smaller percent
32 of the all nine county, and then we have even less say. In terms of VMT
33 versus LOS, VMT vehicle miles traveled is greenhouse gas reduction. That
34 means that you want fewer cars going shorter distances. If they all go in
35 front of my house, I'm going to be pissed. If they all go in front of the street
36 that I want to take to get to my shop or get to my office or get to my school,
37 I'm going to be pissed. LOS talks about congestion. In some sense, people
38 talked about adding things to the traffic congestion. I think there already
39 are policies and programs that are sprinkled throughout, that can be
40 collected into T9. I think initially that's not too hard of an exercise. In
41 terms of covering Caltrain, don't think of it entirely covering. You can't do
42 that. You have to have gaps for safety and for letting exhaust out. Think
43 about lattice cover instead, like lattice cake, in from either side, because
44 they have to have gaps there. Not all of it can be used. We have more

1 leverage in terms of commuters and in terms of trying to get commuters to
2 use public transit, than we have in terms of our residents. In terms of
3 residents, the biggest leverage is in terms of bikes and pedestrians. In
4 terms of our commuters, we have other things we can do to try to promote
5 that. I'm glad to see that Stanford is interested in terms of things with the
6 Stanford Research Park. The data that I've seen is that the Stanford
7 Research Park has the highest drive-alone rate of any business district in
8 Palo Alto. I talked about VMT in terms of congestion. I think that that's a
9 place to go. In terms of multi-level of service, I think this is an experimental
10 thing to think about. I don't see it as a single number. I really see multi-
11 modal level of service as a number for each different mode. Then you put
12 them together and combine them together in terms of trying to balance
13 them. At least you measure what is the mode for bicycles, what is the mode
14 for pedestrians, what is the mode for buses, what is the mode for cars.
15 Then you have a better picture. In any event, we'll be back here in a month
16 to deal with more of this stuff. I'll close that out. The next topic is
17 subcommittee formation.

18

19 **4. Subcommittee Formation (if needed)**

20

21 **Co-Chair Keller:** We can talk about subcommittee formation. Let me kick
22 that off, if I may.

23

24 **Co-Chair Garber:** Sure.

25

26 **Co-Chair Keller:** We talked about the idea of having subcommittees on a
27 per element basis. In particular, I think that there was a separation in terms
28 of—I believe that the Safety Element is being separated from the Natural
29 Environment Element, so that's another one we have to think about. Let's
30 assume that as a given that we have subcommittees for each of the
31 elements of the Comp Plan. Then what we need to think about is the extent
32 to which there are subcommittees for cross-cutting issues, for example,
33 sustainability or S/CAP or that kind of thing as topics that people have talked
34 about. In particular, one comment about sustainability I'll bring up is that
35 the PTC some years ago asked the question, posed the question of whether
36 there should be a sustainability element. The decision was made not to
37 have a sustainability element but instead to have sustainability sprinkled
38 throughout the other elements where they're integrated in and have a
39 section on sustainability where all the policies and programs related to
40 sustainability are collected together and then addressed in one place as sort
41 of a cross-reference. That was what was thought about there. As Dan
42 mentioned earlier, what we will do is we will be circulating out to all the
43 members of the CAC a list of all the subcommittees that have been
44 identified, and then you'll sign up for all the ones that you're interested and

1 then sign up for how much time you have, whether you want to be on three,
2 four, one, two subcommittees. Also, if you don't have time to be on any
3 subcommittees, indicate that because these monthly meetings are all the
4 time they have available, so indicate that on your thing. Dan and I will try
5 to balance out the interests and needs and try to balance to try to achieve
6 some level of participation that's balanced. Then I'll (inaudible) back in.
7

8 **Co-Chair Garber:** Looking for a conversation around two topics. One,
9 what the subcommittees are going to do. We described that as essentially
10 supporting Staff, synthesizing and organizing to bring back an element for
11 discussion to the Committee. Two, suggestions for the subcommittees
12 themselves. Hamilton, then Bonnie. I'm sorry, forgive me for a moment.
13 Jeremy, did you want to add to that?
14

15 **Jeremy Dennis:** Yeah, I just want to make two quick comments, sort of a
16 recommendation I suppose. One, any subcommittee that is formed, it
17 probably would make sense to form it right around the time you're talking
18 about that particular issue, so no forming the noise or the safety one today.
19 There's no point to do that. We do it kind of in conjunction with when we're
20 meeting. Secondly, we think it makes some sense to have the
21 subcommittee do its work between the time the CAC completes its
22 brainstorming, but before it comes back for the Round 2 when you guys
23 actually get to review a draft.
24

25 **Co-Chair Garber:** Yeah. The list is to identify your interest, then we'll put
26 it together. Obviously the Council has an interest in having geographic
27 distribution, and so that's going to be one of the prime criteria for Arthur and
28 I to pay attention to. Bob, you're Number 3. Hamilton, Bonnie and then
29 Bob.
30

31 **Hamilton Hitchings:** I think the subcommittees are a good idea. My only
32 concern is with the land use. If we have a majority of people, I'm sorry, a
33 minority of people who want to be on it, if there's a majority of people on
34 this Committee who want to be on land use, which I think is a reasonable
35 possibility, then I think that's a problem. I think that's the big elephant in
36 the room. I think most of us agree on most things. Only the real major
37 point of contention in the room is probably the level of growth over the next
38 15 years. I would actually propose, if there is that level of interest that I
39 anticipate there will be in the land use subcommittee, that instead we hold
40 an entire additional group meeting to discuss that. That's my comment.
41

42 **Co-Chair Garber:** That's an excellent point. One thing that I might solicit
43 some more conversation about is there opportunities to create multiple
44 subcommittees that address specific issues of land use, again, so that we

1 can try and distribute the workload some. You're welcome to come back.
2 Let's go to Bonnie, then Bob, and then Steve.

3

4 **Bonnie Packer:** I just have a suggestion. When you do send out the list, if
5 you could identify approximately what time of day these subcommittees
6 would meet and what days would be available. That would help people
7 decide how to manage their time.

8

9 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. The subcommittees themselves will be self-
10 governing. They will have to establish their own chairs, co-chairs, their
11 schedule, where they want to meet and all the rest of that. They'll be
12 working with Staff to work that out. There isn't a prescribed day or
13 whatever. Hillary.

14

15 **Hillary Gitelman:** I just want to interject. We did make the commitment
16 to the Council that the subcommittees would meet in public and you'd post
17 an agenda in advance. We have limited Staff support, so we're not going to
18 be able to staff every one of these committees if there are more than a few
19 of them. We're going to rely on the membership of the subcommittees to
20 help us make sure that the meetings are happening in a public area. We can
21 help arrange facilities, meeting in public, noticed in advance, so anybody
22 who wants to attend can from the public.

23

24 **Co-Chair Garber:** Probably with minutes as well. Thanks, Bonnie. Bob,
25 Steve, and then Shani. Go ahead, Bob.

26

27 **Bob Wenzlau:** One subcommittee I would hope that we would form or that
28 I'd ask that be formed would be one on climate change. The reason I feel
29 that it needs to be formed is not so much—there was some discussion about
30 the passion or the importance of climate change, but it was more that it has
31 this cross-program impact that we need to decide. What I would like to see
32 is the subcommittee could come back with an examination of what other
33 Comp Plans have done on climate. This subcommittee could research the
34 issue of metrics. I kind of view that—the reason I was bringing up the
35 subcommittees is that this process right here is like a mile wide and an inch
36 deep. The subcommittee allows a group to come back to this Committee not
37 so much—I would suggest making the types of recommendations that are a
38 form of advocacy, but more the examination of the experiences and best
39 practice. One ask out of my remarks is that we do form a subcommittee on
40 climate. I did disagree with the notion that these subcommittees should be
41 occurring between the two meetings. This comes back to my own concern
42 which was in the area of the environment. I had had the opportunity to
43 have some discussions with different people in the City to realize that there's
44 a lot of plans and programs that inform the Environmental Element. The

1 notion of jamming perhaps a subcommittee between what I think is a one-
2 month period, if I had it right. Maybe you could clarify. Is that the window
3 that you were thinking this would operate in? I feel like we need more time
4 to be effective.

5
6 **Jeremy Dennis:** The revised schedule that I believe most of you have is at
7 the end of Item 2 shows a separation typically lasting a couple to three
8 months between the time that the CAC finishes its brainstorming and the
9 time it comes back for review as a draft.

10
11 **Bob Wenzlau:** My request—we're brainstorming; I don't know the answer.
12 If I were to think of the world I might want it to be would be that if we were
13 to opt to do a subcommittee approach that maybe it might actually get
14 commissioned a little bit earlier, a little bit before the meeting. I feel like
15 when we jump into these topics, like transportation, we don't really—I don't
16 want to say we don't understand it that well, but we don't get a little bit of
17 the bigger picture. It might actually help if the subcommittee were to look
18 at it a little bit and maybe stand and talk to the group for five or ten minutes
19 as to just kind of what their take on this topic is. I think ...

20
21 **Co-Chair Garber:** To become experts that the group could use as
22 resources?

23
24 **Bob Wenzlau:** A little bit, yeah, but without again—with the nuance that
25 they aren't pitching. As an environmental professional, even though I have
26 concerns about the environment, I think I can do the arm's length to try and
27 frame the issue. I feel like our process lacks that. Again, my ask would be,
28 when we form it to—I have two things on the table. One is let's do one on
29 climate, and the other thing is, where we can, kick it off sooner. In
30 particular, climate we should get going sooner than later because it touches
31 every element. I'll stop there. That's my ...

32
33 **Co-Chair Garber:** I will just add; one of the things that the IBRC
34 committee did—Steve, you can maybe help there—is that they had
35 subcommittees that were formed around their goals. Then they ended, and
36 they reformed subcommittees that sort of were more synthesis. That was
37 also a way—it was not the same group of people. That was another way to
38 distribute the load, for instance, that we could utilize in particular for the
39 land use, potentially for transportation as well, which I thought was an
40 interesting strategy. Steve, go.

41
42 **Stephen Levy:** This is for Jeremy and Hillary. I'm now looking at the
43 schedule and, as I read the schedule, we have a joint meeting on the fiscal
44 draft and the EIR draft, both of which I think would be really important for

1 the land use discussion, one day before our first land use meeting. Are we
2 all supposed to go to both meetings? Will there be a summary for those
3 who can't? That's the first question. Then there's a joint meeting on the
4 Housing Element which the Council and the Staff pledged to revisit. I don't
5 see the Housing Element coming back to us even though it is now open for
6 discussion again. That would raise a question of whether there would be a
7 housing subcommittee or an EIR subcommittee. I'm a little confused by the
8 schedule, and it's late at night.

9
10 **Hillary Gitelman:** Thank you for that question. Stephen, we've tried in the
11 schedule to anticipate when would be an appropriate time for the Committee
12 to meet jointly with the Council on these two big issues. One being the draft
13 EIR and the fiscal study that'll be ready in January for public review. We
14 think it'll be an important moment in this Committee's work to meet jointly
15 with the Council and have a presentation on what the preliminary findings
16 are and to start to be able to provide some input on those important
17 analyses. The second, we've tried to anticipate shortly after that where the
18 Committee and the Council can jointly have this discussion about whether
19 we want to reopen the Housing Element that was just adopted at the end of
20 last year. It's really a question that's going to be up to the Council and
21 whether they want to charge the Committee to go off and do some updates.
22 We're going to have to wait and see. Let me just say one more thing with
23 regard to subcommittees. I'm making a plea, I think, for you to keep these
24 within reason. We cannot have just so many committees that we lose track
25 of what we're doing here. We can't offer the kind of support that I think this
26 process needs, particularly if the role of the Committee is to take the ideas
27 that come in from the digital commenter, the two versions we have, the
28 existing Comp Plan and the PTC version, and then the brainstorming work of
29 this Committee and synthesize it all. That's a lot of work, and I think you
30 will, with Staff there to help, turn that into policy and program language.
31 We just cannot support umpteen million of these subcommittees. If you can
32 keep your focus as narrow as possible, I'll reiterate—I hate to disagree with
33 Bob, but I reiterate our suggestion, our strong suggestion is that the
34 committees be formed after the first brainstorming Committee by the full
35 Committee, just so you all have a sense of what all the issues are before the
36 subcommittee is charged with going off and trying to consolidate or
37 coordinate what's being said into a coherent package of policies and
38 programs. Thank you.

39
40 **Co-Chair Garber:** Shani, Don, and then Amy, and then we need to wrap
41 up.

42
43 **Shani Kleinhaus:** I think I generally agree with that, that we need to keep
44 these extra committees that are broad to a small number. I think we might

1 be able to get there if we were allowed to add and suggest policies and
2 programs to existing elements so that if somebody wants to add
3 sustainability or health or other things that are important on a broad
4 spectrum, they can add them to existing elements. I think that the issue of
5 climate change fits well and sustainability already represented. Throughout
6 this plan, I think things that are missing and health and sea level rise.
7 Those are important issues; they're connected to sustainability and to
8 climate change, but I would not necessarily want to see a proliferation of too
9 many committees. Maybe just opening it to adding sustainability proposals
10 into existing elements would be easier.

11
12 **Co-Chair Garber:** Don, and then Amy, and then we need to wrap up.

13
14 **Don McDougall:** What I thought I heard from the Council meeting was
15 when and where appropriate, please feel free to use subcommittees. What I
16 hear us getting into is let's divide up and have subcommittees on every
17 element and every program and every policy and whatever. I see Hillary
18 sitting there –the usual line is "I'm from the government, and I'm here to
19 help." That should scare you. Now, we're saying, "Hillary, we're from the
20 CAC, and we're here to help." I don't see why we can't just as we go—I
21 understand the Chair's interest in making sure that everybody gets a chance
22 to participate or has the obligation to participate, whichever way it may be.
23 You could keep track of that as you go. People's interests over the next 18
24 months—I think that's what we've got or more than 18 months now—or
25 their availability or whatever may change. I'm not sure that filling out a
26 form now saying, "I want to be on this subcommittee" when I'm not even
27 sure there should be an airport subcommittee, for example.

28
29 **Co-Chair Garber:** Point taken. Part of our interest in just sending out a list
30 for the interests is to see if there are any blank columns in that way. Don,
31 now Amy. Amy, where'd Amy—oh, did you have some comments?

32
33 **Amy Sung:** About this subcommittee, what kind of a format are we going
34 to talk about? Are we going to have a small group to discuss about, for
35 example, the housing and then this group come back and give the entire
36 Committee a presentation? Then are we going to discuss any further? I'm
37 not really clear about what is the role. Would this subcommittee have a
38 really in-depth discussion and then the rest, we'll have a high-level
39 summary? That would be my question.

40
41 **Co-Chair Garber:** Jeremy.

42
43 **Jeremy Dennis:** the rules were written in a way to allow some flexibility in
44 how they should be constructed and makeup other than being less than a

1 quorum. That's all we really suggested. We do think that structurally what
2 it may look like, the subcommittee does its work and then comes back and
3 makes some sort of presentation in tandem with the draft being presented.
4 They're part of that conversation so people can understand why they made
5 certain decisions that they made available for questions, that kind of thing.
6 Does that answer what ...

7

8 **Co-Chair Garber:** Arthur, and then ...

9

10 **Co-Chair Keller:** One of the purposes of a subcommittee is to synthesize
11 the comments of the Committee and to basically create a coherent
12 presentation of that in terms of a draft, if you will, of the policies and
13 programs and then the goal structure. That is when we get to the action
14 part of our schedule. There's also the potential for that subcommittee to
15 continue its work where there is identified controversy. Part of the purpose
16 of the subcommittee is to see where there is controversy and to identify that
17 and bring it out to the Committee as a whole. Where there's identified
18 controversy, for the subcommittee to coherently write down the pros and
19 cons of the various positions and to tee that up for Council action, Council
20 decision. I think is also a good use of the subcommittee, because they've
21 done the groundwork on that. Proceeding along that makes sense as well.
22 In terms of the cross-cutting committee, I think that in terms of
23 sustainability that one might exist for a longer period of time with
24 sustainability, climate change, sea level rise, sort of all different (inaudible)
25 ball of wax, looking at it from a different point of view. That one might
26 continue over some period of time, but typically a subcommittee for an
27 element is a defined thing. I wouldn't expect that there would be one for
28 just airports. It would be one for transportation as a whole, a subcommittee
29 for transportation as a whole, looking at all the various issues related to
30 transportation and synthesizing that. Thank you.

31

32 **Feedback for Continuous Improvement:**

33

34 **Co-Chair Garber:** Folks, if you have comments to improve the way that we
35 do our work for the continued improvement, please would you please email
36 Jeremy and then we'll hear about it.

37

38 **Jeremy Dennis:** No, we can talk about it right now, Dan, if you want.

39

40 **Future Meetings: October 20, 2015, Location TBD**

41 No discussion.

42

43 **Adjournment**

1 **Co-Chair Garber:** Unless there's anything else, we're adjourned. Thank
2 you.