



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
LAND USE AND COMMUNITY DESIGN ELEMENT**

Tuesday, July 19, 2016

Mitchell Park Community Center, El Palo Alto Room

5:30 – 8:30 pm

DATE: Tuesday July 19, 2016

TO: Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC)

FROM: Elena Lee, Interim Planning Manager, Planning & Community Environment Department

TITLE: Land Use and Community Design Discussion and Transportation Element Consent

Background

To date, the CAC has had four meetings to discuss the Land Use and Community Design Element, and the subcommittee has met five times. On May 17, the full CAC met to discuss the Element and review the work that the subcommittee accomplished in early May. Previous points of consensus, such as on parkland acquisition and coordinated area plans, are summarized in the [May 17 staff report](#) and have been incorporated into the Draft Land Use Element Framework.

At the May 17 meeting, the full CAC provided feedback on options formulated by the subcommittee on Goals L-1 through L-3. A summary of the discussion is provided later in this memo. The purpose of this meeting will be to:

- Discuss the growth management (Goal L-1) options from the subcommittee
- Review the new policy and program on basements now located in Goal L-3.
- Continue the full CAC's discussion of this element, starting with Goal L-4 and ending with Goal L-10, the new Airport goal, which was shifted from the Transportation Element, as well as the narrative. The narrative has been shortened and includes background on growth management.

Following the meeting, staff and the consultants will refine the element further in response to CAC recommendations. The Sustainability Committee will review the Land Use Element Framework on July 26, 2016. Staff and the consultants will also be developing the growth

management cap numbers and will meet with the Land Use Subcommittee to discuss those numbers before the Land Use Element returns to the CAC for approval on August 16, 2016.

The Draft Framework incorporates recommendations on the key issues received from the full CAC at the May 17 meeting and the Land Use Element Subcommittee meetings that followed. For clarity, Attachment A shows the current version without displaying previous edits; Attachment B presents the original text of the Framework with all the edits made to date.

- Attachment A - Draft Land Use and Community Design Policy Framework (July 2016) - Clean
- Attachment B - Draft Land Use and Community Design Policy Framework (July 2016) – Tracked

Concurrent with the Land Use and Community Design Element discussions, the Transportation Element has been received substantial and detailed attention through discussion over four full CAC meetings, five Transportation subcommittee meetings, and one Sustainability subcommittee meeting. Most recently, the full CAC met on June 21 to review the Draft Transportation Element. The CAC reached consensus during this meeting on outstanding topics of parking and LOS/VMT, and directed staff to bring the Element back for consent at the July 19 before forwarding the Element to Council. In addition, the CAC requested that the redline version of the Element be corrected to accurately show all changes since the February 2016 version and this has been done

The updated draft of the Transportation Element is included in this packet in two formats - a tracked version showing all changes made since February 2016, and a clean version with all edits accepted. Both have the same content, the only difference is that the tracked version shows the original language plus all subsequent edits, while the clean version shows only the current, updated language.

- Attachment C - Revised Preliminary Draft Transportation Element (July 2016) - Clean
- Attachment D - Revised Preliminary Draft Transportation Element (July 2016) - Tracked

Note that new unique identifiers have been added to all new policies or programs. The unique identifiers, noted in square brackets at the end of each policy or program (ex [T1]), are meant to help CAC members refer quickly to policies and programs and also to help track the disposition of policies and programs from the 1998 Comp Plan, as well as new ideas recommended for inclusion in the update. The unique identifiers will be removed from the final version of the element, as they are utilized as a reference tool to quickly identify policies and programs during CAC discussion.

What to Expect At the Meeting

After roll call and oral communications, the staff and Land Use Element subcommittee will give a brief presentation on the outcomes of the June 24 subcommittee meeting. A focus of discussion at this meeting will be the Growth Management options discussed below. The CAC will then be invited to comment on the revised draft Land Use Element framework, with the objective of approving the edits, and with the understanding that there will be an opportunity to make final revisions at the August CAC meeting.

The Transportation Element is coming back to the CAC at the July meeting as a “consent” item. This means that the Element will not be discussed in depth unless a member requests specific discussion. Please review the Element ahead of the meeting to confirm that the revisions reflecting CAC input from June 21 have been accurately incorporated and that you are comfortable forwarding the Element to the Council as is.

Key Issues to Address on July 19

Growth Management (Goal L-1)

The land use subcommittee met several times and discussed options for the “Managing Non-Residential Growth” subsection of Goal 1. We have proposed a revised title for this subsection: “Cumulative Growth Management & Monitoring,” and have been working with the subcommittee to delineate various options for the CAC and the City Council’s consideration.

The policy and program options relate to a series of choices, which were discussed by the subcommittee at length. The summary diagram of options and choices below will be new to the CAC, but represents the outcome of the various CAC and subcommittee discussions. The cumulative growth management options and choices diagram presented below does not yet include numbers related to the amount of development under the cap. The July 19 discussion is focused on policy issues related to growth management. The cap will be a subject of future CAC discussion and staff will develop and come back to the CAC with specific numbers.

There were some subcommittee members who preferred using performance measures only to promote sustainability, others who preferred an “all of the above” approach to monitoring and growth management strategies, and still others who suggested using an annual limit plus performance measures would be the right way to go (i.e. no cap).

There was general agreement, however, that any growth management or monitoring system should use 2015 as the baseline (even if there’s a cap that derives from the 1989 land use study and the current cap), and majority support for applying any cap or limit to office/R&D and possibly hotel uses, rather than all non-residential uses

Table 1: Diagram of Cumulative Growth Management Options and Choices (For Non-Residential Growth)

	Monitoring Development	Cumulative Cap (Amount of Development) *Numbers subject to future CAC discussion	Annual Limit (Pace of Development)	Downtown Cap (Amount of Development)	Performance Measures to Promote Sustainability (Impacts of Development)
KEY: ✓ = Consensus reached • = Option will be carried forward ✗ = Option will not be carried forward					
Desired Approach ➔	✓ Monitor non-residential development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement a cumulative cap • Don't implement a cumulative cap (Use performance measures instead) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement an annual limit • Don't implement an annual limit 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain a downtown cap • Don't maintain a downtown cap 	✓ Establish performance measures to promote sustainability
Applicable Area ➔	✓ Citywide	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apply citywide ✗ Apply to the nine monitored areas on Map L-6 • Apply Citywide minus SUMC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apply citywide ✗ Apply to the areas in the interim ordinance • Apply citywide minus SRP 		✓ Apply citywide
Uses Affected ➔	✓ Use categories monitored for the CMP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✗ Apply to all non-residential development • Apply to office/R&D • Apply to office/R&D plus hotel 	✓ Apply to office/R&D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✗ Apply to all non-residential development • Apply to office/R&D • Apply to office/R&D plus hotel 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apply to all non-residential development • Apply to all non-residential development plus market rate housing
Baseline ➔	✓ Use CMP data set (goes back to FY2001)	✓ Build on the 1989 land use study but use 2015 as the baseline and update it for current situation		✓ Build on the current cap, but use 2015 as the baseline and update it for the current situation	
Re-evaluation ➔		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • After 10 years, the cap could be eliminated or go up or down depending on sustainable community measures 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • After 10 years, the cap could be eliminated or go up or down depending on sustainable community measures 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Re-evaluate the effectiveness of performance measures after 10 years and adjust as necessary
Other ➔		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Address what should happen when cap gets close ✓ Address zoned development potential 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exempt small offices • Eliminate TDRs or use them for residential square footage only ✓ Address what should happen when cap gets close ✓ Address zoned development potential 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Topics addressed by performance measures (applied to new development) should address traffic, parking, canopy/open space, water, energy, displacement, and glare-noise-shade

There was also general agreement that the caps should be re-evaluated after 10 years for adjustment or removal, along with the effectiveness of the sustainability performance standards. Many of the measures proposed by the subcommittee will be most effective at promoting sustainability if they are imposed on new development at the time of approval (whether through changes to the zoning ordinance or standard conditions of approval). However, addressing sustainability and quality of life issues will require more than just placing conditions on new development. It will also necessitate efforts by existing businesses, institutions and residents to create a more sustainable Palo Alto. These efforts will involve changes in behavior, new technologies, etc., over the planning period. Based on the discussion and concerns raised by the CAC and subcommittee, staff is suggesting that the Land Use and Community Design Element monitor a group of “community sustainability metrics” in addition to applying the suggested performance measures to new development as summarized below. These community sustainability metrics would be used in the 10 year evaluation when the city would decide whether development caps should be raised, lowered or eliminated.

Table 2: Summary of Performance Measures and Community Sustainability Metrics

Performance Measures (Measures applied to new development to promote sustainability)	Community Sustainability Metrics (Metrics that are monitored over time to gauge Community Sustainability)
a. Trip reduction: a specific percentage reduction from typical SOV commuter trips	1. MT of greenhouse gas emissions & progress towards the SCAP goal (80% below 1990 emissions by 2030)
b. Water conservation: meeting a per capita water use target at or below existing per capita average	2. Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) per capita
c. Resource conservation: achieving a specific green building or energy conservation standard.	3. % of commute trips to employment centers by SOV
d. Urban forest, open space, and habitat: preserving or increasing canopy cover or a percent landscape/open space areas	4. Jobs/housing balance (expressed as a ratio of jobs to employed residents)
e. Parking & loading: meeting demand without providing excess parking that will encourage auto trips	5. Community diversity (metric TBD)
f. Displacement: no net loss of dwelling units	
g. Glare, noise, shade: avoiding significant impacts	

The choices considered and options delineated by the subcommittee are summarized below.

Resulting policy and program language is included in the draft Framework attached.

CUMULATIVE GROWTH MANAGEMENT & MONITORING

Choice #1 (Applicable area): Should the cumulative cap and/or performance measures apply Citywide, to the nine monitored areas shown on Map L-6, or Citywide minus SUMC?

There was Subcommittee majority support for monitoring development and applying performance measures to promote sustainability and/or a cap Citywide or Citywide minus SUMC.¹

Choice #2 (Uses affected): Should the cumulative cap and/or performance measures apply to all non-residential development, or only to Office/R&D and Hotel?

- *Subcommittee Option 1: Apply the cap and/or performance measures to Office/R&D only.*
- *Subcommittee Option 2: Apply the cap and/or performance measures to Office/R&D and Hotel only.*
- *Subcommittee Option 3: Apply the cap to Office/R&D (and possibly Hotel), but apply performance measures to all new market-rate development.*

Choice #3 (Baseline): If there is a cumulative cap on non-residential development, should it continue to count from a 1989 baseline, or re-start from 2015?

There was Subcommittee majority support for using 2015 as the baseline, presuming the numeric cap itself derives from the 1989 study and the current cap.

Choice #4 (Cumulative cap or no cumulative cap): Should we preserve a cumulative cap on non-residential development, eliminate the cap and use performance measures to promote sustainability instead, or adopt a hybrid approach with a cap and performance measures?

- *Subcommittee Option 1: Eliminate the cap in favor of performance measures to promote sustainability.*
- *Subcommittee Option 2: Retain a cap and apply performance measures to promote sustainability; review in 10 years and adjust if the performance measures are/are not working.*
- *Subcommittee Option 3: Eliminate the cap in favor of an annual limit and performance measures; review in 10 years and adjust if performance measures are/are not working.*

¹ SUMC is currently exempted from Policy L-8 and including it in a citywide cap would necessitate adding its 1.3M square feet to the current balance of 1.8M square feet if all non-residential uses are affected. Other adjustments to the numbers will be required if the uses affected are changed. The subcommittee will discuss the numbers once the full CAC has landed on policy options.

Choice #5 (Performance measures): What sustainability performance measures should we include?

Subcommittee majority support for the following:

- a. Trip reduction: a specific percentage reduction from typical SOV commuter trips
- b. Water conservation: meeting a per capita water use target at or below existing per capita average
- c. Resource conservation: achieving a specific green building or energy conservation standard.
- d. Urban forest, open space, and habitat: preserving or increasing canopy cover or a percent landscape/open space areas
- e. Parking & loading: meeting demand without providing excess parking that will encourage auto trips
- f. Displacement: no net loss of dwelling units
- g. Glare, noise, shade: avoiding significant impacts

Note 1: the subcommittee asked about setting a performance measure for schools and parks. Staff does not believe these are possible (schools) or meaningful (parks) given state law and impact fees.

Note 2: the subcommittee also asked about an “adaptive growth management” approach that would allow development when external (i.e. non-project specific) criteria are met. This is addressed above by re-evaluating performance measures and growth caps/limits after 10 years.

Note 3: Performance measures are most effective (i.e. enforceable) at promoting sustainability when applied to new development at the time of entitlement, so they do not need to replace or repeat development standards or mitigation measures. If performance measures are intended to express a numeric goal for the City as a whole, then they should be framed accordingly and a monitoring and implementation program should be provided. This approach is summarized in table form above.

Choice # 6 (Annual limit): Should the City regulate the pace of development by maintaining an annual limit on Office/R&D square footage, or not?

- *Subcommittee Option 1: there was majority support for keeping an annual limit and performance measures.*
- *Subcommittee Option 2: eliminate the annual limit in favor of performance measures.*

Choice #7 (Annual limit - affected area): Should the annual limit apply within current boundaries, or Citywide?

- *Subcommittee Option 1: Apply the annual limit Citywide.*
- *Subcommittee Option 2: Apply the annual limit Citywide, but exclude Stanford Research Park and apply a trip cap to Stanford Research Park instead.*

Choice #8 (Performance measures – uses affected): What types of projects should be required to meet performance measures?

There was Subcommittee majority support for applying performance measures to promotes sustainability to non-residential and market-rate multi-family residential projects. (Standards may need to be different for residential vs. non-residential.)

Choice #9 (Downtown cap): Should the City eliminate the Downtown cap and use performance measures? Or retain a cap of some kind?

- *Subcommittee Option 1: Monitor non-residential growth downtown and apply performance measures.*
- *Subcommittee Option 2: Monitor non-residential growth downtown, apply performance measures, and retain a cap on Office and Hotel square footage, similar to the new citywide cap.*
- *Subcommittee Option 3: Same as option 2, but exempt small offices.*
- *Subcommittee Option 4: Same as option 2, and prohibit the use of TDRs (or allow them for residential square footage only).*

Choice #10 (Implementation programs required): What happens when development approaches the cap and how will we ensure consistency between any Comp Plan limits on non-residential development and the development capacity allowed under the City’s zoning regulations?

If the Comp Plan is going to maintain a cumulative cap and/or a downtown cap, there must be a program(s) indicating what should happen when development approaches the cap, and/or a program(s) to reduce commercial development capacity or convert it to residential capacity.

Residential Design (Goal L-3):

The full CAC has already reviewed the majority of Goal L-3. However, the subcommittee has added a new policy and new program addressing concerns about basement design and the impact of large basements on neighborhoods.

NEW POLICY: Ensure that new basements do not negatively affect adjacent homes and overall neighborhood character. [L47]

NEW PROGRAM: Evaluate the City’s policy of excluding basements from the gross floor area and maximum floor area ratio limits in the zoning ordinance and consider zoning revisions to limit basement size and increase basement setbacks from adjacent properties. [L48]

Commercial Centers (Goal L-4)

The policies and programs under this goal guide development in three different kinds of commercial centers: regional centers, multi-neighborhood centers, and neighborhood centers. New programs and policies regarding coordinated area plans were added under this goal, as described separately below.

In addition, the subcommittee discussed rewording some policies and programs to clarify expectations for bikeable and pedestrian-friendly design. References to support for small businesses were added in several locations. References to housing in Town and Country Village and in Neighborhood Centers have been removed. A proposed new program to consider the feasibility of prohibiting street parking in front of new development that includes retail uses has been removed as inconsistent with the current draft of the parking policies in the Transportation Element.

Employment Districts (Goal L-5)

The policies and programs under this goal focus on guiding future growth within the city's four employment districts in a manner that encourages transit, pedestrian and bicycle travel, and reduces that number of auto trips for daily errands.

Policies and programs have been updated to call for preservation of some open space in Stanford Research Park, to plan for attractively designed potential residential or mixed-use projects along the El Camino Real edge of the Park. Consistency with and implementation of the East Meadow Circle Concept Plan is now specifically identified, and an antiquated reference to development at Stanford Medical Center has been removed.

Urban Design (Goal L-6)

The policies and programs under this goal focus on promoting high quality, creative urban design that is compatible with existing development and public spaces. Policies and programs guiding building design, which were previously spread throughout the Element, have been consolidated under Goal L-6.

Policy changes so far include revisions to encourage design that promotes neighborhood character, public health safety, and active lifestyles. New policies call for preservation of cottage cluster housing, and developing guidelines for bird-safe design.

Historic Resources (Goal L-7)

The policies and programs under this goal focus on encouraging both public and private maintenance and preservation of historical resources in Palo Alto.

Substantial new policies and programs were added to this section to reflect the mitigation measures from the Comp Plan EIR that are intended to avoid or reduce impacts to historic

resources and archaeological resources in Palo Alto. Several CAC members commented that the new policies and programs under Goal L-7 were too mandatory, too specific, and too draconian, and, while they may be appropriate for an EIR, they are not appropriate for the Comp Plan. Some wording changes have been made in response to that concern.

Civic Uses (Goal L-8)

The policies and programs under this goal encourage public life in neighborhoods that do not have a commercial center nearby by promoting the use of existing community facilities and creating new gathering places. Policies and programs under this goal have linkages to the Community Services and Facilities Element.

The most significant change under Goal L-8 thus far has been the addition of a new policy and four new programs addressing **parkland acquisition**. (See below for discussion.)

Public Spaces (Goal L-9)

The policies and programs under this goal focus on creating an inviting and welcoming public realm through urban design.

A new Utilities and Infrastructure section includes two new policies and two new programs that reference, among other topics, the work of the Infrastructure Blue Ribbon Committee. Other new policies and programs address:

- Incorporation, by reference, of the goals of the Urban Forest Master Plan
- Alternatives to surface parking lots, especially between buildings and street frontage
- Shade impacts on public open space
- Preservation of the Baylands

Airport (Goal L-10)

This goal, to “[m]aintain an economically viable local airport with minimal environmental impacts,” has been moved into the Land Use and Community Design Element from the Transportation Element. The policies and programs should be reviewed and revised to ensure they are appropriate to their new location and to consider whether any new policies or programs that are specifically focused on land use compatibility issues are needed.

Summary of Past CAC Changes to Land Use and Community Design Element

Following the initial Land Use discussion at the March 15 CAC, five key issues were identified for in-depth discussion at the April and May meetings. As of the May 17 full CAC discussion, the subcommittee and full group have identified a path forward on four of the five issues:

- Height limit
- Fostering mixed use
- Coordinated Area Plans
- Parkland acquisition
- *Dynamic growth management tools – to be discussed July 19*

These past agreements are presented below.

Height Limit (Goal L-1):

The subcommittee and full CAC discussed height limits extensively. At the May 17 meeting, the full CAC discussed and voted on a range of four options created by the subcommittee in their May meetings. The CAC utilized “approval voting,” meaning members could vote for as many of the options as they felt they could support. The votes did not include input from non-voting CAC members. In addition, staff solicited votes from the voting CAC members who were not present on May 17 via email. The final approval votes, including emailed votes, were:

8 votes	<i>OPTION 1 - Keep the current building height limit</i>
4 votes	<i>OPTION 2 – Incorporate flexibility in building regulations to foster better design</i>
8 votes	<i>OPTION 3 – Allow the possibility of building heights up to 65 feet in specific areas to encourage a more diverse and affordable range of housing options.</i>
11 votes	<i>OPTION 4 - Allow the possibility of higher building heights in specific areas to encourage a more diverse and affordable range of housing options.</i>

The revised draft policy framework (Attachment A/B) includes all four options, along with the vote tallies.

Promoting Mixed Use in Appropriate Locations (Goal L-1):

The full CAC did not have comments on the proposed new program in the May 12 draft, so it remains in the current draft.

NEW PROGRAM: Update the municipal code to include zoning changes that allow a mix of retail and residential but no office uses. The intent of these changes would be to encourage a mix of land uses that contributes to the vitality and walkability of commercial centers and transit corridors. [L109]

Coordinated Area Plans (Goal L-4):

The full CAC did not have comments on the proposed new policies and programs in the May 12 draft, so they remain in the current draft.

NEW POLICY: Use coordinated area plans to guide development in areas of Palo Alto where significant change is foreseeable. Address both land use and transportation, define the desired character and urban design traits of the areas, identify opportunities for public open space, parks and recreational opportunities, and address connectivity to and compatibility with adjacent residential areas. [L51]

NEW PROGRAM: Prepare a coordinated area plan for the South El Camino corridor from Curtner Avenue to West Charleston Road, as shown in the diagram below. The plan should articulate a vision for the corridor as a well-designed complete street with an enhanced pedestrian environment including wider sidewalks, increased building setbacks, public open spaces, safe pedestrian crossings at key intersections, trees and streetscape improvements. Mixed use residential and retail development on shallow parcels should be encouraged to support a more walkable and bikeable environment along the corridor, with appropriate transitions to the surrounding single-family neighborhoods. The plan should also foster improved connections to surrounding destinations. [L52]

NEW PROGRAM: Prepare a coordinated area plan for the Fry's site and surrounding area. The plan should describe a vision for the future of the Fry's site as a walkable neighborhood with multi-family housing, ground floor retail, a public park, and an interconnected street grid. [L54]

NEW POLICY: Encourage broad community involvement in the planning process for proposed development, including the participation of neighborhood associations, particularly for developments proposed in the South El Camino Real corridor and the Fry's site and surrounding area prior to completion of coordinated area plans. [L55]

Parkland Acquisition (Goal L-8):

The full CAC did not have comments on the proposed new policies and programs in the May 12 draft, so they remain in the current draft of the Framework.

- NEW POLICY: Facilitate creation of new parkland to serve Palo Alto's residential neighborhoods, as consistent with the Parks, Trails, Open Space and Recreation Master Plan. [L139]
- *NEW PROGRAM: Encourage dedication of new land for parks through regulations and incentives for new development and programs to solicit bequests of land within the city. [L140]*
- *NEW PROGRAM: Pursue opportunities to create linear parks over the Caltrain tracks in the event the tracks are moved below grade. [L141]*
- *NEW PROGRAM: Explore ways to dedicate a portion of in-lieu fees towards acquisition of parkland, not just improvements. [L142]*

- *NEW PROGRAM: Explore opportunities to dedicate City-owned land as parkland to protect and preserve its community serving purpose into the future. [L143]*

Summary of CAC Changes to the Transportation Element

The June 21 CAC discussion of the Draft Transportation Element focused on the issues of parking and LOS. The outcomes of that discussion and the resulting changes are summarized below:

Parking (Goal T-5):

For the June 21 CAC meeting, the policies and programs under this goal were updated based on the work of the Transportation subcommittee. The subcommittee arrived at a phased approach of optimizing the use of existing parking spaces and conducting needs assessments in each of the city's commercial centers and employment districts in the near term, then recalibrating parking supply in the mid- to long-term, as it becomes easier and more convenient to walk, bike, rideshare and use transit, and as the effectiveness of parking management programs can be measured. The full CAC refined this approach. The parking policies and programs under Goal T-5 have been revised, clarifying the overall direction which provides sufficient but not excessive parking, and shared parking; the concept of parking pricing is introduced as well. Policy T5.1 [T107] states that all new development projects should be consistent with existing parking regulations and meet parking demand generated by the project without the use of on-street parking, while programs T5.1.1 through T5.1.3 describe the phased approach to reduce parking requirements over time if TDM and technological changes demonstrate a reduction in parking demand. In addition, the topic of parking pricing has been introduced as a new program T5.2.3 [T114] which supports implementation of a comprehensive suite of parking supply and demand management strategies citywide.

Traffic Congestion (Goal T-2):

Goal T-2, addressing traffic congestion for all modes of transportation and transportation infrastructure improvements, is the location of the City's level of service (LOS) policies. In the June 21 discussion, the CAC wanted to ensure that the City maintains a policy of using conventional vehicular LOS in addition to a program to develop new multimodal LOS standards addressing other modes of transportation. Vehicular LOS, previously included as a program, has been included as new policy T-2.3 [T59] and program T2.3.1 [T60] in order to retain the use of vehicular LOS as a mechanism, along with multimodal and VMT standards, to evaluate the potential impacts on traffic congestion as a result of new development. These policies and programs were moved from T-3, Streets, to T-2, Traffic Congestion, since LOS is specifically aimed at addressing congestion. These policies and programs are designed to complement and advance the City's commitment to Complete Streets principles. To that end, this Goal includes the concept that the City will continue to prioritize the safety of school children over the free

flow of traffic in street modification projects [T89]. Traffic calming to reduce speed is also prioritized over reducing congestion [T99].

Next Steps

The draft Land Use Element will be revised based on the CAC's recommendations. It will then be reviewed by the Sustainability Subcommittee at their July 26 meeting. The draft Land Use Element will go back to the Land Use Subcommittee for a final review once the growth management numbers are available, and return to the CAC for your final review during the August 16 meeting.

The Transportation Element will be forwarded to the City Council for review and discussion following the July 19 CAC meeting. The Council meeting is tentatively scheduled for August 15.