



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

**TUESDAY, December 13, 2016**  
Rinconada Library – Embarcadero Room  
1213 Newell Road  
Palo Alto, CA 94303  
5:30 PM TO 8:30 PM

1 **Call to Order: 5:35 P.M.**

2 **Co-Chair Keller:**

3 Present: Fine, Glanckopf, Hitchings, Keller, Kleinhaus, Kou, Levy, McDougall, McNair,  
4 Moran, Nadim, Packer, Peschcke-Koedt, Summa, Sung, Titus, Uang, Uhrbrock,  
5 van Riesen, Wenzlua

6  
7 Absent: Emberling, Filppu. Hetterly

8 **Oral Communication:**

9 **Co-Chair Garber:** Yolanda, have you completed? Have you completed the roll?

10 **Yolanda Cervantes:** Yes.

11 **Co-Chair Garber:** I count 16. I think that's right. We have a quorum. We will move forward. Now, is the  
12 time that we would have members of the public speak at oral communications. We have two cards. If  
13 you would like to speak, please present a card. The first speaker will be [Betty Jo Chang], followed by  
14 Esther Nygard. Betty Jo, you will have three minutes and yes, please use that speaker right there, thank  
15 you.

16 **Betty Joe Chang:** Good evening. Thank you for your efforts on this Plan Element. It's made a big  
17 progression since the last time I read it and I really appreciate the time you've put into it. I just had a  
18 couple of comments. I do have a handout with more of the reasons why. On item S-2.8.1, page S20, the  
19 flood immigration requirements. I'd like you to consider adding to this policy S-2.8.1, a recommendation  
20 that municipal code 16.2, the Cities flood hazard regulations be also applied to those areas on your map  
21 as 6 of sea level rise. In residential areas that are within that 55-inch sea level rise, should have the  
22 municipal code regulation 16.2 attached to it as well. This will have the effect of proactively reducing  
23 construction of resident basement dwellings in areas where we know we may expect more flooding  
24 during the practical lifetime of residential construction. This decoupled Palo Alto's health and safety  
25 concerns from often glacier responses of a property insurance mechanism, such as FEMA. We have to  
26 remember that FEMA is about property damage and this plan is about health and safety of our citizens.  
27 The second item, S-2.8.2, page S20 also. Thank you for continuing to participate in the Community



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

1    Waiting Program and for looking at perhaps, improving our rating one more notch because that may  
2    reduce the cost of volunteer health – flood insurance in these areas that are going to be prone to  
3    increased flooding as a result of climate change. Item S-2.8.3, also on the same page; partnering with  
4    appropriate agencies to expand flood zones is appropriate due to channel creek changes and sheet  
5    flooding, Nah Nah Nah. Please add – consider adding to that policy again. The recommendation that  
6    municipal code 16.2B be added to – applied to all those areas dedicated on your map as 6 for sea level  
7    rise. Program S-9 on page S21, prevent habitual basements as part of residential development in areas  
8    within the flood hazard zone. We have to remember that all of Palo Alto is in some risk of flooding.  
9    Please consider adding a prohibition of new habitual basements as part of the single family and  
10    multifamily residential neighborhoods within the sea level rise and dam inundation map areas on maps  
11    as 6 and as 7. Finally, program S-2.9, the study of appropriate restrictions on groundwater construction,  
12    where the groundwater is 14-feet or less to accommodate expected high water levels. Please consider  
13    adding a deadline for this study report of no later than 24 months from adoption to the Comprehension  
14    Plan. Time is of the essence in this regard. Thank you again, for your time and your contribution to the  
15    City.

16    **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Esther Nygard If there is anyone else that would like speak, please give us a  
17    card. Oh, I'm sorry Nygard, I apologize.

18    **Esther Nygard:** That's alright. Good evening everybody. I just wanted to bring to your attention the  
19    Water Energy Climate Nexus, which I believe is not mentioned in this plan so far. The Water Energy  
20    Climate Nexus is a major theme in climate change adaptation these days. California's water sector  
21    consumes nearly 20% of the State electricity and 30% of its natural gas and its needs are growing. The  
22    water sector uses – I'm done? The water sector uses electricity to pump, treat, transport, deliver and  
23    heat water. Expected increases in groundwater pumping, water treatment, and water recycling mean  
24    the energy intensity of water will grow but water does not only consume energy. It is an important  
25    player in the generation of power and heading into the future, we expect climate change will add  
26    additional stress on the availability of water for both portable use and energy production. For California  
27    and Palo Alto to meet its climate goals, we need to rethink the role that water plays as a significant  
28    electricity consumer and producer. Water and energy symbolically rely on each other to be produced  
29    and delivered and in the face of climate change, they are inherently impacted together and it becomes  
30    imperative that one cannot address without the other. Some possible goals to adapt to climate change  
31    and reduce greenhouse gasses, as suggested in the paper from Department of Energy include the  
32    following. First, optimize the energy efficiency of water management, treatment, distribution and used  
33    systems. Second, enhance the reliability and resilience of energy and water systems. Third, increase safe  
34    and productive use of non-traditional water sources. Fourth, promote responsible energy operations  
35    with respect to water quality, ecosystem, and systemic impacts. Fifth, explore productive synergies  
36    among water and energy systems. I believe Palo Alto already has some of these goals and/or some



# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE DRAFT MINUTES

1 programs that address some of these goals. However, in my opinion, the Energy Water Climate Nexus  
2 remains to be acknowledged more explicitly in our plans. Thank you.

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

## 4 **Staff Comments:**

### 5 **1. Recap of November 28<sup>th</sup> City Council meeting on the Draft Land Use Element**

6 **Co-Chair Garber:** Staff, I believe we have a recap of the November 28<sup>th</sup> City Council meeting on the Draft  
7 Land Use Element.

8 **Hillary Gitelman:** I really wanted to be brief here. I don't know how many of you were able to watch but  
9 some of CAC members were actually at the meeting. It was a long conversation with the City Council  
10 about the Land Use Element. Elaine and Elena were there, and Joanna was there to help give a brief  
11 presentation of all the work the CAC had done in putting together the Draft Element and also  
12 transmitting all of the comments that were in the Council's Packet. I think, safe to say that the City  
13 Council appreciated all of your efforts. They gave us a lot of comments. It was very diffuse. I mean they  
14 didn't get to the point where they could narrow down and sort of get to decisions yet but I think we set  
15 the stage for a productive meeting the next time we go to Council, which we're planning to do at the  
16 end of January; where we'll actually ask them to make choices between the options in the growth  
17 management area, the height limit area and the others that you articulated in the Land Use Element. I  
18 think we're well positioned for that discussion. It will be a meeting of where they – Council gets both the  
19 Land Use Element and then Transportation Element. So, they can also see the synergies between the  
20 two of them. We don't have a definite date yet. We're tentatively on the calendar for the 30<sup>th</sup> of January  
21 but I will let you know if that changes. We're actually kind of hoping they set aside a whole day for this  
22 discussion, instead of trying to cram it into a late Monday evening but we'll see if we can prevail on the  
23 new Council to make that happen. Then, just one more thank you to all of you for your efforts this year  
24 and not just to the Committee but to the Staff and consultants. We've all put in a tremendous amount  
25 of work and to the public, we have some religious attendees who have shared their thoughts with us  
26 throughout this year and I appreciate all of that. We put in a lot of work. I think we have a lot to show  
27 for it and we're getting very close to the end on this project. So, we have good momentum. It's been  
28 really terrific and of course, special thanks to Adrian, Lydia, and Doria, who are moving on to other  
29 assignments. Luckily, I think they will all be in a position to help us get this work done in their new roles.  
30 Hopefully, we will, in 2017 see a conclusion to this process. Anyway, that's all I have.

### 31 **2. 2017 CAC Schedule**

### 32 **3. Changes to CAC and Next Steps**

33

34 **Elaine Costello:** Ok, speaking of conclusion to this process and of – you know, we did this – this turn  
35 around was shorter because of the holidays so, there were a couple little glitches in terms of what went  
36 out. There was a page, I think it was page 7 that said the next steps, and it gives a colon and if you turn



# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE *DRAFT MINUTES*

1 to the next page, there were not next steps. That doesn't mean you're done. That just meant that At  
2 Places are that list of next steps and the list of appendices. Basically, what we're looking for is in January,  
3 we will be at the meeting on business and economics and we will be – we have been asking members of  
4 that subcommittee to let us know their availability for a subcommittee meeting on either January 5th or  
5 6th. So, that we can have a subcommittee meeting before we hear it in mid-January and the other dates  
6 that are on here as well. It's really quite – as Hillary said, it's quite a remarkable achievement that we  
7 had really pushed – a lot of you have worked really hard to get these two elements done tonight so, that  
8 we could have the majority – well, we could have almost everybody on the original CAC here for the  
9 final action on this. So, we only have one more element to go, which is business and economics and then  
10 we have some work on implementation and some work on governance and the user's guide and we will  
11 be done and it will move on. So, if you – both the schedule – the monthly schedule and this set of next  
12 steps, which was actually page 10, are at your At Places. Also, At Your Places – any questions on the  
13 schedule or how we're going to move ahead? Also, At Places are the comments that were received from  
14 CAC members and the comments that were received from Betty Jo. Betty Jo brought her comments  
15 tonight and the other comments are all staples together. So, that is what is at your At Places and with  
16 that, we were going to let Dan, who had some comments to make too.

17  
18 **Co-Chair Garber:** As one of the co-chairs, also wanted to add our special thanks to Lydia and Adrian,  
19 who are attending their last meeting of the CAC. I am so sorry for that. You would have such a better  
20 time here. Lydia is not with us but hopefully, she'll get the message but congratulations again and we  
21 will look forward to your good work on the Council. Also, thank you, Lisa. We also wanted to give a  
22 special thank you to Doria and this is her last meeting, however, we are hoping that she might come and  
23 visit us as a representative of the PTC in the coming year and we'll find out if that happens or not.  
24 (Crosstalk) Either do we but we're dancing to the rain gods here. Then finally, Heidi, who is not here this  
25 evening. We also wanted to extend a special thank you and hopefully, she will continue her participation  
26 as a citizen and through oral communications and the modes of communications that we have available  
27 to ourselves. Any case, thank you and I wanted to offer all of that.

28

## 29 **Agenda Items:**

- 30 **1. Action: Safety Element III**  
31 **a. Introduction to revised Safety Element**  
32 **b. Discussion of Draft Element**  
33

34 **Co-Chair Garber:** Let us get to our agenda items. We want to take action on the Safety Element. Does –  
35 and – one moment. I will do that in a second. Did Staff have any comments to lead us into Safety  
36 Element or do we want to go directly to – ok.

37 **Elaine Costello:** Do a brief presentation on where the status of the Safety Element (Inaudible)...



# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE *DRAFT MINUTES*

1 **Co-Chair Garber:** Ok, and then, just before we go I want to acknowledge that Whitney McNair joined us,  
2 to add to the list, thank you.

3 **Joanna Jansen:** Thank you, Dan. The first element on our agenda tonight is the Safety Element and this  
4 element is coming back to you. It has not gone to the subcommittee since the last time you saw it. This  
5 is an element that incorporates your changes that we discussed when we were here on November 15<sup>th</sup>. I  
6 think at – by the time of November 15<sup>th</sup>, we were pretty far along in this element due to the hard and  
7 very knowledgeable – hard work and knowledge of our subcommittee members and the participation of  
8 Staff from the Police Department and the Office of Emergency Services and Public Works and IT. A lot of  
9 upfront work went into getting the element into good shape. Enough that we were able to make a series  
10 of – for the most part, pretty minor cleanups and clarifications and additions based on your  
11 conversation last time. I think one of the most significant changes that you probably recognize was that  
12 this element was reorganized based on our discussion. I think the trigger for this was, the discussion of  
13 water-related policies. Previously, this element included a section on infrastructure and within that  
14 infrastructure section, there were sections on water, wastewater, stormwater, etc. and CAC pointed out  
15 that a lot of those policies were very closely related to the policies about creeks and water resources in  
16 the Natural Environment Element. We took a closer look at that and we were able to reorganize those  
17 policies and programs and combine a lot of the water-related policies and programs into the Natural  
18 Environment Element. That kind of dissolve our infrastructure as a whole so, we've moved the pieces of  
19 what used to be in infrastructure goal into various – other places. The section on power is now found  
20 under Community safety because that was really about maintaining a safe and reliable grid during  
21 emergencies. The section on solid waste has been moved to be a part of a goal about human-caused  
22 threats along with hazardous materials as has cyber security. With that, we kind of dissolved the  
23 infrastructure goal and the other piece that was moved within this element is that there use to be a goal  
24 5, about emergency management, which was really about specifically, responding and kind of this  
25 disaster response type of role and that has become now a part of Goal S-1, Community safety. Again, in  
26 response to the CAC discussion that we had last month. So, some reorganization here. I thought the  
27 element worked really well, once we made these changes. Hopefully, you guys feel the same. That's one  
28 of the most substantive things that we've done since the last time you saw it. Then, under – so, there  
29 are three goals in this element now. Just briefly, under each other of them. The Staff report details the  
30 changes but I will just mention some of them. Under Goal S-1, I think one thing that we didn't get quite  
31 right was this program about emergency drills. I think that should have been changed to be able  
32 emergency service volunteers and so, we can certainly clarify that in the next round and thank you, for  
33 those of you who pointed that out. We have added a little bit more about engaging the business  
34 community, not only in disaster preparedness but also in recovery plans. We've mentioned the use of  
35 urban design principles to increase safety and the role of block preparedness coordinators. One thing I  
36 wanted to note that's not mentioned in your Staff report, rather than an addition, was a deletion. There  
37 was a program last time about proactively identifying offenders before a crime has occurred and I think  
38 that made a lot of folks nervous about profiling as the appropriates of such a program and I think while



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

1 it might have had good intentions, we realized that that was probably flawed and that program is not  
2 here anymore. That's been removed in response to those concerns. Of course, there are still many  
3 programs about working with the Police Department and specifically, transparency and communication  
4 about police strategies as well as satellite police locations. Goal 2 is about natural hazards. Specifically,  
5 earthquakes and geological hazards and flood hazards, as well as fire hazards. These policies were  
6 changed to clarify seismic rehabilitation and some policies where the rehabilitation wasn't specified, a  
7 new policy to encourage or support neighborhoods that do want to pursue an effort to pool resources  
8 for seismic retrofit efforts. Clarifying the program about sunset dates for TDR programs that would  
9 incentivize seismic retrofits and add a reference to the Baylands Master Plan in terms of whenever the  
10 City is considering shoreline development as part of flood control or flood prevention projects. Finally,  
11 under human-caused threats, probably one of the major topics that we changed under this goal had to  
12 do with groundwater contamination and ongoing kind of refinements to the policies and programs  
13 about basements and basement construction. In addition, we made some changes to the POP program  
14 about telecommunications to replace maximum with the word high and clarify in the Program S-3.12.3  
15 about the Wi-Fi network. We removed the specific reference to off grid. Again, in my opinion, kind of,  
16 really rather minor changes in terms of the policies and programs themselves and defiantly interested to  
17 hear your comments on the Safety Element. Thank you.

18 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Can I have members of the subcommittee – the safety subcommittee  
19 speaks first. If you'd – if those that would like to speak would put their cards up. Hamilton, followed by  
20 Annette, followed by Don. Go ahead Hamilton.

21 **Hamilton Hitchings:** I think that the changes that the Staff made have actually worked out really well. I  
22 like the new organization. I think that was a big win. It feels denser and more organized. So, thank you  
23 on that. In general, the element looks good. There are a couple of little things that I think Staff can clean  
24 up after this meeting before it gets presented to Council but I don't see any reason to have another  
25 subcommittee meeting at this point. Do make 100% sure you correct S-13 because we brought it up a  
26 couple times before. Other than that, I think – and the diagrams still needs some work because I was  
27 looking at the flood diagram and then I'm like, there are whole neighborhood that was flooded in the  
28 (Inaudible) Francis and Crescent Park area that aren't covered in that diagram and that was only like a  
29 50-year flood, approximately. I know – I think it needs a little bit more and the map needs a little bit  
30 more detail and just, in general, the diagrams. The earthquake one was kind of confusing too but that  
31 was the first time we've seen the diagrams. They're the right subject matter, just a little bit more detail  
32 would be great. Again, I don't think there's any reason that these changes can't be handled solely by  
33 Staff. I feel like the elements really come together so, thank you.

34 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Annette and then Don.

35 **Annette Glackopf:** Well, my comments are going to echo Hamilton's but first of all, let me say thank you  
36 for our little goody and for dinner and for all the good work and the element is coming together. I would



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

1 echo the comment that was already made about the drills and I know Staff also responded to that. In my  
2 notes included some sample wording. On the topic of seismic and encouraging neighborhoods to pool  
3 resources. The City already does – or had a program to do that so, I think also the City could – we could  
4 also add – the City could be an agent that does the pooling; that’s sort of a note. When we talk about  
5 habitable basements, which is Policy S-2.9, rather than the word prevent new habitable basements  
6 within the flood zone. I think we should say prohibit. I think the Save Palo Alto Groundwater has made it  
7 very clear on that point. I’m not sure how you would do code informant on that, which has always been  
8 my button but I like the word prohibited rather than prevent. Then, on Policy S-2.1.5 of 15, about the  
9 Fire Department's efforts in education. Rather than support these efforts, I would use the word expand  
10 the Fire Department's efforts in public education. I know that is something they want to do but  
11 currently, the major focus is in the fire areas in the Foothills. With that, I think it really looks good. I also  
12 think the maps in this section and the natural environment section need to be tightened up. The  
13 graphics, the text need to be increased. I mean you have to use a microscope to actually look at them.  
14 I’m glad that we include all – many of the key maps that were included in THIRA, in that whole process;  
15 threats, analysis, etc. Ok. Thanks.

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

17 **Don McDougall:** The first thing I want to do is complement both of Annette and Hamilton for their  
18 leadership on this subcommittee. In fact, they did a tremendous job of reviewing everything in detail. I  
19 like what was done here. I think that there’s actually been more impact on this than is implied. The  
20 suggestion that this was, you know, tweaking it, I think that is a real interesting content and  
21 presentation. I think the idea not that it is safety and natural impacts and man mad impacts, really  
22 clarifies what we’re trying to deal with. I like the idea that we added prepare, mitigate and recover as  
23 opposed to just business continuity in the business section. I like the connection to the Bay Lands  
24 Master Plan, I think that was really important. I think Hamilton’s point about the hundred-year flood. I  
25 think there’s a map somewhere that shows the 100-year flood area and it’s different than this one. I  
26 think we need to deal with that and I would encourage – like Hamilton, I don’t believe we need another  
27 subcommittee but I would encourage the basement and groundwater – a review of that to maybe  
28 tighten it up. I think there’s still a great deal of and about that. There’s lots of good technology from  
29 [ISRE] and people like that with maps and I think relying on the fact that the maps look great when  
30 they’re in color but they don’t look so great when they’re in black and white. They look great when  
31 they’re on a 25x48 sheet but they don’t look so great when they’re on an 8 ½ by 11 sheets. There could  
32 be some focus on that; just for presentation purposes. Again, I’d like to thank and complement Hamilton  
33 and Annette.

34 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Are there other discussions from other members? If you would put your  
35 cards up. Bonnie...

36 **Co-Chair Keller:** Should we just go around? Why don’t we just go around (Inaudible)



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

1 **Co-Chair Garber:** I think we may only have one person that is interested in speaking. Bonnie go ahead.

2 **Bonnie Packer:** Ok, I have just a couple of very small things. Policy S-.6, protect the privacy and civil  
3 liberties, not just of residents but of all persons. With that in mind, last night around 10:30 at night, the  
4 City Council passed a resolution about inclusiveness and I can't get on the internet so I couldn't  
5 download my copy of it but I thought that would be a good thing. It's a general resolution. It's in  
6 reaction to the election and the concerns that people have but about ensure that people feel safe and  
7 that their human rights are being recognized and that there (Inaudible) process and a whole lot of things  
8 like that. I think it would be – somehow if we could fit it in somewhere under the community safety, that  
9 this is a safe Community for all persons. With respect to how the law treats them, treats people and in  
10 other ways and that it might be something to consider. Another thing that will be coming before the City  
11 that they may consider – the new City Council may consider is the concept of a sanctuary City. Again,  
12 we're talking about safety for all people and this may be an appropriate place to refer to that if not  
13 include that resolution. I had a couple of just grammatical point – oh, there's one other question I have.  
14 In the natural environment section, we talk about – sections called energy. I the safety, we call it power.  
15 I don't know what the difference is and in what context and whether we should be consistent in the  
16 words that we're using. I know the power grid is different from energy supplies like from natural gas. So,  
17 some clarification so, little definition to make a distinction there might be useful. That's a seismic issue. I  
18 love to raise seismic and also, I want to thank you for the lovely food and the little gift and thank you.

19 **Co-Chair Garber:** So, just to fair, we will touch on everyone and we'll go down the line here. Why not  
20 start over there? Amy, you don't have a card up. Is there anything you would like to add to the  
21 discussion?

22 **Amy Sung:** No.

23 **Adrian Fine:** Just really quickly, I think this is a really great section. Thanks Staff for including some urban  
24 design issues around safety and the environment. Two points. So, one on Policy S-3.11 about digital  
25 infrastructure and securing that. It sounded a little bit like the City was trying to go it alone and discover  
26 what is right for us. There may be some other Cities that we can learn from or other Cities we can teach  
27 in terms of providing a safe digital data infrastructure. The last one is on Annette's point about S-2.9,  
28 preventing or prohibiting basements in flood zone. That seems like a pretty specific policy. I mean, I'm  
29 just not sure this group really debated whether we're going to put that forward into the Comp. Plan. I'm  
30 just raising it as it is now. Otherwise, I think this is a great section, though.

31 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Don, you've already spoken. Ellen.

32 **Ellen Uhrbrock:** Well, I want to really thank the Staff for making the revisions of the – with the  
33 organization of this and I think it's fine. I have this one small comment except it's a new addition. You  
34 have an S-1 on Community safety. You refer to the plans for the elderly and people with special needs





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

1 and I wonder if you want to include another category and is people who work or live on the third floor  
2 or above in high rise buildings.

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

4 **Alex van Riesen:** I was also thinking about the point that Bonnie mentioned and I was wondering if it  
5 wouldn't be worthwhile to change the vision statement? I don't know if that's in stone but I notice that  
6 the language would – sorry – would lend itself to that because the very first line of the vision statement  
7 is, the City of Palo Alto is committed to the day to day safety of its entire residential, business and  
8 Community. It would seem like we could include a line that would accentuate that the risks or some of  
9 the hazards that we're concerned about are not just natural disasters or human disasters or toxic waste  
10 but some of the things that I think have been a growing concern in Communities. So, just a thought  
11 about where to put it.

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

13 **Jennifer Hetterly:** I think the element is shaping up really nicely. Also, most of my concerns were in the  
14 flood hazard and mitigation section. I think it needs to be strengthened somewhat. I didn't have time to  
15 write them up though but I have read this handout from Betty Joe Chang and I would like to advance the  
16 recommendations that she puts there. Particularly, the first 3 out of the 4. Other smaller issues are  
17 Program S -3.1.5, which is work with non-profit organizations to provide information to the public  
18 regarding pesticides and other commonly used hazardous materials. I'd like to add insecticides to that  
19 list. Pesticides and insecticides and other commonly used – that came up several times in the natural  
20 environment subcommittee as a concern so, I would love to see that added here. Just above that,  
21 Program S-3.1.3, about strengthening development review requirements has a second sentence that  
22 standards should be consistent with state and federal regulations. I think you can delete that second  
23 sentence because of course, they have to be consistent with state and federal regulations. The next  
24 page or to pages later, Program 3.6.2, about working with Caltrain and the Palo Alto Unified School  
25 District to educate students on the dangers of rail trespass and benefits of suicide support. I'd like to add  
26 the public; educate students and the public because it's not just students who are at risk. That was all I  
27 had for this element. Thanks.

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

29 **Doria Summa:** I'll be quick. Thank you, I do think it looks much improved and very close to being ready.  
30 Just too quick, I'll just associate my comments with Jen's and the Committee and speakers before, I do  
31 agree that the most important thing is probably strengthening the flood section. Thank you.

32 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Hamilton, you have already spoken, may I come back to you?



# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE *DRAFT MINUTES*

1 **Whitney McNair:** Thank you. I think the section is looking great. I just had a comment. There's an  
2 identification of critical facilities, which has a triangle symbol and it may be identified somewhere in  
3 another element but it doesn't have a definition within this element at all. So, I was having a hard time  
4 trying to understand what those represented. Then, I'm just working with the engineers at Stanford, just  
5 to make sure the dam inundation map is correct from the records that we have as well as the map S9.

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

7 **Jason Titus:** Yeah, I think it looks great. I've been – each of the points that I was wanting to make sure  
8 were included, seem included. It's great.

9 **Co-Chair Garber:** Ok. Lisa.

10 **Lisa Peschcke-Koedt:** I also think it looks great. I mean it's a huge, I think, development to get here. I  
11 have a couple things similar to what Bonnie said. Whether it's the vision that Alex mentioned or there's  
12 the human-caused threat section, is to add something about the inclusive and protecting everyone. The  
13 diversity is there, which is great to see and I think where every that policy or program goes, probably  
14 should also include something about the bullying – the children or teen issues that I think we've been  
15 seeing as well as part of the human-caused threats. I think it belongs somewhere in safety but I may  
16 have missed it. Is that – I may just have missed it.

17 **Joanna Jansen:** Sorry, if I could. That has been mentioned before and I think it's in the Community  
18 Services and Facilities Element.

19 Lisa Peschcke-Koedt: I thought I had seen something somewhere but I might (Inaudible) something in  
20 safety as well; given that there's this human cause section in a sense and that would I think, pick up on  
21 what Alex and Bonnie said as well. Then, to go to a little bit on the flood hazards which is the Policy S-  
22 2.8, because the programs now include existing, not just new development. I think the policy just needs  
23 to be slightly expanded so that, you know, it's something – minimize exposure to flood hazards by  
24 maintaining and enhancing existing flood and reviewing proposed development. It's just because the  
25 programs have to do with existing as well. Then, this is one – a little bit what Adrian said on the  
26 basements. I'm not convinced we need to prohibit them and the way it's written, I – this is more of a  
27 small technical thing. It happens that the neighborhood I live in, is generally speaking in the flood hazard  
28 area or flood zone but our house is actually not in the flood zone. We have a map amendment, we're  
29 not in the flood zone. There are a few other houses there. The way it's written, I think it – we're not  
30 planning to build a basement so, it's not a personal issue but I think the way it's written, since it's saying,  
31 prevent the basements in the neighborhoods within the flood hazards, rather than that property within  
32 the flood hazard. It shouldn't be a neighborhood constraining a house that is not in the flood hazard. If  
33 we keep this basement provision which, I would actually say, I'm not sure we should but if so, then fine.  
34 Beyond that, I just want to echo, I think it's just been – oh, sorry, one other thing, going to your point  
35 too. There are several places that it mentions elderly and people with disabilities and such I'm



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

1 wondering if, given the other discussion we had, we should also include children. Just in general because  
2 it tends to be – I mean, I think we’ll naturally protect children before anyone else but it probably works  
3 having them in there because it is kind of a special need in a way. That would be consistent throughout,  
4 not one particular section. That was it. I thought it was awesome and thank you also for the lovely meal  
5 and gifts and the great year.

6 **Co-Chair Garber:** I hear we may be seeing more of you?

7 **Lisa Peschcke-Koedt:** Yes, I’m not leaving, sorry.

8 **Co-Chair Garber:** Yeah!

9 **Co-Chair Keller:** Yeah!

10 **Lisa Peschcke-Koedt:** Instead I have decided to retire from my day job. (Inaudible)

11 **Co-Chair Garber:** Alright, thank you. Bonnie, we’ve heard from you. Julia.

12 **Julia Moran:** I don’t have too much to say. The major concerns I had the last meeting have been solved  
13 so, thank you and clearly, the Committee has done a huge amount of work. Thank you so much for all  
14 that. Thank you for the gifts. I would just concur with Alex and Bonnie and Lisa about adding something  
15 regarding the Human Safety Element where ever everyone deems it best fit.

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

17 **Elaine Uang:** Yeah, thank you again. Great gifts, great meal, great everything. I’m glad that Alex pointed  
18 out the vision in the City of Palo Alto being committed to the day to day safety of its entire residential,  
19 business and visitor Community. Just looking through this in a cursory exploration, it seems like while  
20 there was some language put into sort of talk about and recognize the business Community, I think  
21 there need to be a few additional references to the business Community. If you think about Palo Alto  
22 during the day, Monday-Friday, 8-6 or whatever, I mean, the population almost doubles and so, that’s a  
23 significant portion of the people. I think we need to explore the Safety Element through the lens of the  
24 number of people that it impacts and which policies impact the most folks. So, I think the inclusion of  
25 business, especially, under the emergency management section, is critical. Adding that to the seismic  
26 and the flood hazard issues are -- the earthquake geological hazards and flood hazards and mitigation is  
27 important too but I think what we would find by enlarging, in anyone of these events, during the  
28 business hours, we do need to have some attention to the volume of people who are in our City under  
29 that function and they’re not necessarily residents. In similarly, I would just call out, I appreciate Lisa and  
30 Adrian’s mention of the suggestion to prohibit basements. I think, you’ll find that overall and across the  
31 City, the number of people who are affected by habitable basements is relatively small compared to the  
32 overall number of people who are in our City during the business days. I also just – in thinking ahead  
33 about implementation, we’ve always been looking at these as paper documents. I think the average



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

1 person is going to use this online. We haven't talked much about cross referencing but you know, the  
2 note – the idea of making sure that everybody feels physiologically safe and if that's in the Community  
3 services and facility, we need to recognize that within the Safety Element. I've also noticed, in just  
4 thinking about orders of magnitude and where safety occurs. I think, what you'd find is actually  
5 vehicular safety or vehicular incidents, traffic incidents and safety through vehicular and pedestrian or  
6 vehicular and bike incidents are probably going to be higher than say a really violent crime within the  
7 City of Palo Alto. As we think about the hyperlinks and coordination between elements, I'd like to see  
8 some language – where did I highlight this? Referencing – ok, so, Adrian mentioned S-1.3.1, coordinating  
9 or us of urban design principles. I'd also like to see streetscape design and coordination with Visions  
10 Zero, which I think was mentioned in the Transportation Element because that's going to be – probably,  
11 the core effort that the City undertakes to really reduce any sort of life, safety, health issue within the  
12 City. Just think ahead, we haven't talked a lot about the intersections between elements but hyperlinks  
13 and if you look at San Jose or other general plans, they have all of these links to different programs and  
14 different elements and I think we just need to, you know, make ours a little bit stronger by creating  
15 those links.

16 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Stephen. No comments? Let us note that Lydia has joined us and I think  
17 you missed our thank you and grand send off to your new position that you'll be stepping into. We will  
18 miss you but we suspect that you'll be having a lot to do with our topics here in the coming months.  
19 Anyway, comments about the Safety Element?

20 **Lydia Kou:** Well, thank you and I'm very sorry I missed it. Thank you for all the food and it smells lovely  
21 and the presents. As everybody said the element is coming along really well. I notice that the  
22 introduction for the Natural Element, the preservation word is put back in with the addition over here  
23 with the At Places, that was one of the things I was going to mention. Then, besides some random  
24 letters throughout the element, itself – there's random letters, 's's and 'r's that are by themselves.  
25 Besides that, it looks fine. I did want to ask about, in – let's see—Policy N-1.1, Program N...

26 **Co-Chair Garber:** Lydia, we're actually on the Safety Element.

27 **Lydia Kou:** Oh, you're on the safety...

28 **Co-Chair Garber:** Yeah.

29 **Lydia Kou:** ...Well, safety is great under Annette and Hamilton and Don's hands. Thank you, I'll go back  
30 **later then. Thank you.**

31 **Co-Chair Garber:** Hamilton, we missed you, if you want to speak again and then we'll go to Arthur.

32 **Hamilton Hitchings:** Yeah and these are just comments on your comments. I wanted to start by following  
33 up on Bonnie's comment. I was a little shocked when you said it because we work really hard to get the



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

1 civil liberties and privacy in and we did not limit it in scope to the residents so, I almost had a heart  
2 attack when she said it was also limited to residents. I want to make very sure that Staff and Place  
3 Works changes the language in Policy S-1.6. We were focused on the Program S-1.2 which has the right  
4 wording. It says protect the public's privacy rights and civil liberty and then either Place Works or Staff  
5 extracted it out for the policy. On the policy, S-1.6 it needs to say public, not all residents because we  
6 want to make sure our Police Department is looking out for everybody who's in the City boundaries. So,  
7 please make sure that's in there before it goes to City Council. I just had a couple other comments. You  
8 know, we want to continue to strengthen basement groundwater at a level that's appropriate for the  
9 Comp. Plan. I think so of the comments in here are a little bit too specific. I don't think we're putting  
10 implementation dates, for example, at this level but I think that's important. I do think that Lisa's point  
11 about being in the flood zone, not the neighborhood because all flooding is based on the flood  
12 designation of your property, is really important. You shouldn't be penalized if you happen to be in a  
13 neighborhood with a lot of houses but not within the actual flood zone. I think that was a really good  
14 point. I agree with Elaine that the number one hazard in the City is actually vehicular. That should be  
15 covered in the Transportation Element and I don't know what the right way to link it is. I think we want  
16 to avoid doing duplicate programs but at the same time, make sure that it's referenced. Maybe it could  
17 even be referenced in the introduction as well but absolutely, vehicular safety as covered in the  
18 Transportation Element is absolutely critical. Those are my comments. Thank you.

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

20 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. The first thing I'll talk about is the flooding issue. If you look at S-2.11.2, this  
21 is worded in a strange way; work with regional state and federal agencies to determine if sea levels in  
22 the San Francisco Bay warrant additional adaptational strategies to address of flooding hazards to  
23 existing and new development and infrastructure and etc. The answer is yes, you don't actually need to  
24 do anything to study that and there for, the issue is not to work with them to determine it but work with  
25 them to determine what's needed. So, really, it should be work with regional blah blah blah agencies to  
26 develop adaptation strategies – to develop additional adaptation strategies to address flooding hazards  
27 blah blah blah, with respect to sea level rise in the San Francisco Bay. I think that that's the way it should  
28 be worded. You know, it's a forgone conclusion, like our water – regional water treatment control –  
29 regional water quality control plant is going to be affected by sea level rise unless we do something and  
30 so, the question is not if, it's when and how and what we do about it. This thing should be revised to  
31 actually do something. The second thing is with respect to habitable basements. Federal government  
32 FEMA regulations currently prohibit basements in flood zones, period. No, if, and's or but's. The question  
33 is if somebody is just outside of a flood zone because they used a level of map amendment or a LOMA or  
34 LOMR, those are two things. Then, what happens with those things is if they're just outside the flood  
35 zone, then when you – if you build a basement, you're going to hit groundwater really quickly and  
36 you're going to cause a big problem. The issue is, while it's not corrected, it should be residential  
37 neighborhoods within the flood zone because the neighborhood is either completely within or partly



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

1 within or not within so, that wording is awkward, in terms of 2.9. It really gets in terms of Program 2.9.2  
2 where we talk about the idea of groundwater levels 14-feet or less. Now, what I'm wondering, is 14-feet  
3 or less measured from what? I'm assuming that's 14-feet or less measured from an ambient ground  
4 level nearby. You know, whatever the existing ground level is and it doesn't actually say that. Doesn't  
5 actually say what 14-feet or less is from. So, that's where we need to deal with it because essentially,  
6 where you are in an area that would be inundated by flood zone – by flooding, including with sea level  
7 rise. That's an area in which we should not have basements and this 14-feet is another way of  
8 measuring that. The idea of expanding the flood zone restrictions to other kinds of building restrictions,  
9 there actually much more problematic. One restriction is the restriction on basements and that's – I'm  
10 fine with the idea that you should not put new basements where you're at a current flood risk or  
11 incipient flood risk but if somebody is living outside the flood zone and their house burns down. What  
12 happens is – let's say they have a fire but not all the house is burned, just have a fire in their kitchen and  
13 kitchens are expensive and as result of that, when you have to rebuild the kitchen, you then have to  
14 rebuild the whole house. Jack up the house above the base flood elevation which is what FEMA  
15 regulations require in the flood zone. Requiring that outside the flood zone does not seem to make  
16 sense. Therefore, that regulation that requires jacking up the house when you rebuild it outside the  
17 flood zone, I wouldn't – that's to owners restriction if you have a kitchen fire for example. The issue is  
18 basements, expensive regulations on that, that makes sense. Expensive regulations of other FEMA  
19 regulations outside the flood zone doesn't make as much sense and so, we need to think about what  
20 you do there. For example, minor additions to square footage and having to have that above base flood  
21 elevation while – instead of the existing grade, the level of the height of your house. You know, there  
22 are things like that, those subtleties which I would not expand that in terms of this. However, on the  
23 other hand, if you scrape your house and build a new house, that should be above base flood elevation  
24 because it makes sense for that to be above the revised base flood elevations, taking into consent sea  
25 level rise. I think that some new auneses are appropriate here. Finally, the issue of S-3.1.2 on hazardous  
26 materials. This is written into weak of way; minimize the risk of biohazards in Palo Alto, including level 4  
27 biohazards. No, bio level 4 biohazards should be prohibited. No ifs, and's or but's. Limiting any of the  
28 other things – minimizing the other things, yes. Level 4 biohazards, prohibiting, we should not allow  
29 introduction into our City and so the wording of that is awkward and incomplete. Similarly, the City has  
30 gone on record with the removal of high levels of hazardous materials at the regional water quality  
31 control plant, particular chlorine was removed and in terms of CPI removing hazardous materials there.  
32 The City has gone on record, that policy of limiting – prohibiting high levels of hazardous materials,  
33 according to whatever the hazardous requirements are. I'm not sure what the standards are for that but  
34 that should be a policy under human-caused threats and it's not there as far as I can tell. That the rule –  
35 and the City has gone on record of that and so, it should be captured in here somewhere. So, those are  
36 the things I'd like to bring up and I would like to add my thanks to everybody for participating in this for  
37 the last year and a half and continuing hopefully. Thanks to those of us who are nothing going to be  
38 continuing in their current capacity or at all because of elevation to elected office.



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

1 **Co-Chair Garber:** Ok. I see a couple of other cards up here. Annette, did you have something further to  
2 add? Then Jennifer, did you also?

3 **Annette Glackopf:** Well, this is really short. I'm not going to go back to the basements again, although I  
4 have some thoughts. I agree with Elaine, that we really should in the document have links and there's  
5 not any that I can see in there. I'm not sure everyone is going to be looking at it online but that would be  
6 very useful. So, that's one but my real comment is that I'm very concerns or interested in the comments  
7 that Betty Joe Chang and Esther Nygard made and a couple of us have resigned to their comments.  
8 Although we didn't respond directly to them, I think they are all very, very good. I think Esther's might fit  
9 in the natural environment section; the Nexus of water and energy which is really fascinating. We really  
10 haven't talked about that but the ones that Betty Joe mentioned, I think are very, very reasonable and  
11 so, I would agree with Jennifer that we should include them in the Comp. Plan, in the places that are  
12 indicated here. So, that's it. I don't know if anyone else wants to raise their card and resignedwith that  
13 and also agree with me or raise your hand if you agree with me. Staff, take that into consideration.

14 **Co-Chair Garber:** Alright, thank you. Jennifer.

15 Jennifer Hetterly: I don't want to overly belabor the basement flooding issue but I do want to have some  
16 clarification because my understanding is that all flood zones are not created equal. There is more than  
17 one flood zone and the FEMA requirement only prohibits basements within the FEMA special hazard –  
18 special flood hazard area. As I also understand it, there are several parts of the City that the City deems  
19 prone to flooding that are not within that special flood – that singular special flood hazard zone. I do  
20 think that it's worth providing for flood mitigation policies within the City's government to protect the  
21 homes that are in those high flood prone areas. I had another point. No, I forgot it. I'll have to come  
22 back if I remember. Thanks.

23 **Co-Chair Garber:** Arthur.

24 **Co-Chair Keller:** I'll just elaborate on that Jennifer said. There are two main flood hazard zones in the  
25 City's special flood hazard areas and one of those is from the creek flooding from the San Francisquito  
26 creek and the other is title flooding and there are some houses and proper parcels that are actually  
27 subject to both flood zones. Therefore, have whichever – they have both restrictions applying essentially  
28 and those restrictions include no basements. They also, the restrictions include when a new house is  
29 built, if it's a tear down, that the base flood – that the finished floor of the lowest level be above the  
30 base flood elevation and that if an improvement is/or rebuild is made exceeding 50% of the current  
31 value of the home, then that requires essential, jacking up the house over base flood elevation. If you  
32 added an addition to it or a remodel to it, you can generally do that within 50% but if you have a – some  
33 sort of calamity like a kitchen fire, which diminished the value of the home, then when you go above –  
34 then the 50% above that is actually fairly easy to reach and gets to problems. Which is why when I want  
35 to put in a plug for the idea of ordinance or law coverage, if you can get it on your insurance because



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

1 that will pay for bringing your house up to code, including jacking it up if necessary in the event of a  
2 rebuild, if necessary in the event of a covered claim.

3 **Co-Chair Garber:** My comment – oh, Amy.

4 **Amy Sung:** I see that basement construction seems to generate a lot of interest so, I think that we might  
5 want to put in a request for the study of what is an appropriate policy that should be set for basement  
6 constructions. Especially, that the land is very scares in Palo Alto and in the interest of making sure that  
7 the land can be put into the best of use. I heard that that was 14-feet, I'm not quite sure, did I hear that  
8 correctly about – I heard a number about 14-feet – ok, so I – you know, with technology advancing so, it  
9 might be time that the City do some studying to find out, you know what would be the very best way so  
10 that that we can conserve the water in regarding to the dewatering of the basement excavation. Thank  
11 you.

12 **Hillary Gitelman:** I just want to add one thing to the conversation. I am not at, at all well informed on  
13 flood hazard issues so, I will not speak to that specifically, but Arthur's comments on the hazardous  
14 materials used raised for me this issue that we're working on a general plan here, not a set of  
15 regulations. We have regulations in our code specific to CPI and other hazardous materials users  
16 including the bid hazards and so, those things are already regulated by our code and intention here in  
17 Policy S- 3.1 and the programs that follow were to create a framework, that supported those regulations  
18 and their perpetuation. We didn't actually want to repeat the regulations and I think the same can be  
19 said about flood hazard issues. I think we want policies that support the Community's interests and  
20 minimizing flood hazards and precluding development that would accentuate or expand those hazards  
21 and that's sort of what we've been shooting for without getting to the point of actually putting  
22 regulatory language in what is a general plan. I hope that helps.

23 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Not that we need to talk more about basements but I am not actually going  
24 to talk about content. However, I will just simply mention that this isn't the only venue where  
25 basements are being discussed and tomorrow evening there is the Policy and Services subcommittee  
26 meeting of the City Council where Keith Bennett, the head of Save Palo Alto's groundwater and I are  
27 making a presentation and Esther and others will be there. It's the – the scope is very specific to the  
28 techniques of construction and the strategies relative to conserving our groundwater, where we are  
29 talking at the regulatory level as oppose to the Comp. Plan level but it's you're interested, you can either  
30 come and join us or you can read the minutes afterward and that may or may not go to the Council later  
31 next year. Ok, if there is no more conversation about that. I would love to entertain a motion to  
32 recommend the draft go to the Council. I'm hearing that motion being made by Annette, do I hear a  
33 second?

34 **Hamilton Hitchings:** Well, I'd like a friendly amendment.

35 **Co-Chair Garber:** Please.





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

1 **Hamilton Hitchings:** Just that Staff has an opportunity to incorporate a couple of these clean up  
2 provisions in there.

3 **Male:** And I'll second.

4 **Elaine Costello:** Yeah, I would actually support that. There were just some things that we just missed.  
5 WE wouldn't change policy where there are differences of opinion. We would continue with our practice  
6 of showing options so, we're not going to go in there and rewrite the policy from what you saw tonight.  
7 People pointed out some wording things that we know we were intending to make and they just  
8 somehow didn't get in there but they will. I agree completely that that's a good amendment.

9 **Co-Chair Garber:** Arthur.

10 **Co-Chair Keller:** As it is our practice of late, anybody that has any additional comments that they wish to  
11 go into the packets that go to the Council, can do so, until one week from today?

12 **Elaine Costello:** Yes.

13 **Co-Chair Keller:** Then that will go into that packets. So, they basically – the Council will get the – let me  
14 refer to it as the corrected Safety Element, the minutes of today's meeting, the attachments and the  
15 handouts from today's meeting. As well as additional notes submitted by members of the CAC or  
16 members of the public to Staff by a week from today.

17 **Co-Chair Garber:** Alright. Does the maker of the motion except for the amendment, offered by the  
18 seconder?

19 **Annette Glackopf:** Absolutely.

20 **Co-Chair Garber:** Alright, then I think we can move forward with the motion as amended. All those in  
21 favor, raise they hands and say aye. Those not voting in favor? None. – thank you – those opposed. Any  
22 abstentions? I think it moved unanimously then by the members that are currently here.

23 **Commission Action:** Motion: Forward the draft Safety Element for City Council review with  
24 comments from the CAC and minutes. Staff is to clean up minor items that do not change policy as  
25 discussed. Motion made by Commissioner Glanckopf, seconded by Commissioner Hitchings, motion  
26 passed unanimously.

27 **2. Natural Environment Element IV**

28 **a. Introduction of revised Natural Environment Element**

29 **b. Report from Natural Environment Subcommittee**

30 **c. Discussion of Draft Element**



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

1 **Co-Chair Garber:** Let's move onto our next topic, the natural environment chapter. Does Staff want to  
2 make some introductory comments?

3 **Joanna Jansen:** Yes, thank you Dan. Oh, before I forget and also since it's kind of at the front of the  
4 element. I want to make sure that you guys had a chance to see this piece that was provided At Places.  
5 This is from Staff and this is a revised first page of the element. I know Lydia already picked up on this.  
6 There was a couple of changes to the vision and the introduction that were not captured in the version  
7 that you got. So, I wanted to make sure you saw this. A few words but they're important words in the  
8 vision and introduction components are important so, I want to make sure you had an opportunity to  
9 take a look at that. Just like we moved things out of safety, of course we moved them into natural  
10 environment. You probably notice some changes in the overall organization of the element. Primarily,  
11 within the goal for water resources goal and also another change at the organizational level was to  
12 move Goal 3, which is about creek – with now Goal 3, about creeks and riparian corridors; to put that  
13 with the water resources goal. Lots of important synergy between these two goals in terms of things like  
14 storm water or water quality, etc. So, those two goals are next to each other now and means that creek  
15 and urban forest kind of switched places. Just to back up a step about the kind of history of this element  
16 since the last time you saw it. We did talk about this element on November 15<sup>th</sup> when we were last  
17 together and then since that time we had another natural environment subcommittee meeting to go  
18 over the CAC's comments and kind of have one final review of this element. We had a great discussion  
19 with the subcommittee and joined by a number of departmental experts from the Urban Forestry, Public  
20 Works, City Manager's Office, Community Services and Utilities to help us with the refinements to the  
21 Natural Environment Element. We made the changes to the vision and introduction that I just pointed  
22 out. Under the urban space goal, we've continued to kind of make sure that we're really emphasizing  
23 this theme of connectivity and interconnectivity and specifically by referencing the figure that we are  
24 pulling in from the parks recreation trails and open space master plan that has the natural systems map,  
25 linking corridors and open spaces and urban parks, into really a kind of holistic view of open space and  
26 habitat and ecology in Palo Alto. We are continuing to flush out the language about review of special  
27 status species and the appropriate sources of what species could be considered. So, we have a program  
28 to update the CEQA's – the City's CEQA thresholds about special status species analysis. We carried over  
29 an idea that's already in the urban forest section where the urban foresters are involved in reviewing  
30 City projects to make sure that we do a similar type of review for project that could impact open space.  
31 That's part of City practice already but we wanted to acknowledge and memorialize that. Again, as  
32 Hillary was saying, kind of provide some basis for that as an ongoing practice. I wanted to point out in  
33 both this goal and the urban forest goal. There was some redundancy that we identified between the  
34 Land Use Element and the open space – excuse me, the Natural Resource Element. The Land Use  
35 Element Council draft that the Council just reviewed has a section on park land acquisition. As you recall,  
36 when we were talking about the Land Use Element, that was a very important topic that we spent quite  
37 a bit of time on. As we moved into the Natural Environment Element and talked about open space  
38 expansion, acquisition, etc. We noticed some overlap there so, we're proposing to consolidate those



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

1 policies and programs about acquisition so, that they're all in one place. I think as practitioners, we see  
2 that you've got a much greater chance of people noticing, understanding and acting on those programs  
3 if they're all in one place, rather than if they're sprinkled throughout. Again, it gives us chance to make  
4 sure that the document is internally consistent as well. I'll get to the similar kind of issue in urban forest  
5 in just a second. Then, we did add a little bit more about the development criteria for the Foothills area.  
6 This is a case in Policy N-.19 which you probably recall a lot of detail since the time of the existing Comp.  
7 Plan, a lot of detail has been incorporated into the zoning designation for the open space zone but we –  
8 rather than kind of lose all that entirely and say, well that's taken care of in the zoning now. We wanted  
9 to retain some of the more important features of those development requirements and so, we've added  
10 – rather than taking all of that out, we've gone back and put a little bit more back in there to make sure  
11 that it's really clear what the goals of those development criteria are. Moving on to urban forest, we've  
12 incorporated the changes from canopy as we discussed at our last meeting and I think we've gotten  
13 those down at this point. We tried to be responsive to all of those requirements or excuse me, requests  
14 from canopy and including policies about avoiding net loss of tree canopy at the neighborhood level and  
15 mentioning the urban forest in the visions and the introduction. We talked at the subcommittee level  
16 about tree removal and a new program expanding the ability of Community members to appeal tree  
17 removals. Urban forest is another place where there was some overlap with the land use section. The  
18 land use section actually has a whole subtopic on the urban forest. I think it's an important topic and  
19 when we -- earlier on, when we talked about land us, we hadn't really gotten to urban forest yet and we  
20 were all really anxious to talk about it and make sure it was in there. I think now that we're looking at  
21 natural environment that has an entire goal about urban forest, we're seeing that is a logical place for  
22 the policies and programs about the urban forest. So, we pointed out in your Staff report and in the  
23 element some places where those can be kind of consolidated and made sure that they are internally  
24 consistent again. Some of them were almost exact duplications. Goal 3, creeks and riparian corridors, I  
25 think one of the big things here to point out is that there are options in terms of these backs for natural  
26 creeks, which are defined as those West of Foothill, for either a 100-foot setback or a 150-foot setback  
27 and your element includes a map of where that setback would apply. Those are two options that we  
28 anticipate would be carried forward to Council. Under Goal 4, water resources. We had Public Works  
29 Staff present who help to clarify the procedure for groundwater management in California. It's not really  
30 done by the City, it's done by groundwater management agency. In this case, it's the Santa Clara Valley  
31 Water District so, at our last meeting we discussed adding some policy language that had to do with  
32 managing and planning for groundwater. That's really going to be the role – the purview of the water  
33 district so, we changed that from making the programs and policy sound like the City was going to be  
34 doing that planning, to make sure that the City is going to have a very strong, active, kind of advocacy  
35 role with the district as they do their planning and that the City is a very strong participant in that but  
36 not leading that effort. An idea kind of, that was added to these goals was, we had already policies and  
37 programs about minimizing impervious surfaces. At the subcommittee, we talked about yes, it's good  
38 that when something is going to be paved, it could be impervious or maximize impervious surfaces but



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

1 that the first step should be to try and minimize that area that is paved, even if it's going to pave with  
2 impervious surfaces and that site design. A new development should be kind of approached with that as  
3 a goal, rather than just pave everything as long as it's impervious. So, a little bit of refinement to that  
4 language. We did add a reference to insecticides as Jennifer already mentioned and we also added some  
5 specific references to the City's recycled water ordinance. There is a recycled water ordinance in place  
6 that has a lot of detail about where and when and how much dual plumbing is required in new  
7 development for toilet and urinal flushing. We didn't try to repeat all of the detail of that but just refer  
8 to the ordinance itself. Under air quality, we just expanded the program we had already put in about  
9 idling to include schools as additional source of places where people idle and make sure that to the  
10 extended that that issue is addressed or enforced that schools are included in those educational efforts.  
11 There was a previous policy – there's an existing policy about mitigation of odor that had been, I think in  
12 a previous version of the element, formatted as a program that was corrected back to a policy  
13 consistent to what is currently in your current Comp. Plan. The Noise Element or excuse me, noise goals  
14 haven't changed too much. One thing that was important to the subcommittee members is changing a  
15 reference to requiring certain types of review for projects that are subject to CEQA. To clarify that that  
16 review should take place when the project is subject to the City's development review, in response to  
17 concerns that, which projects are subject to CEQA might change over time and so, this really puts that  
18 regulation kind of, in the City's court, rather than letting CEQA determine which projects do and don't  
19 get that level of analysis. We deleted the words from large commercial from Program N-6.11.2 so that –  
20 which references participating regional forums to address noise impacts from airports. That it's not only  
21 large commercial airports but any airports. Goal 7 is about energy and again, we were joined by the  
22 City's Chief Sustainability Officer and also Staff from the Utilities Departments. Based on their input we  
23 made some changes to several policies and programs on this in this sections. We did delete the program  
24 regarding the use of carbon offsets, urban renewable credits, not because the City doesn't want to  
25 pursue that but because that should be complete as of January. So, that program is already going to be  
26 completed by the time this moves forward to Council so, that's recommended for deletion. Then, just  
27 some refinement of the language about implementation and incentives and prioritization in this section.  
28 Also, I just wanted to mention that a change that's happened in this – under this goal, had to do with  
29 transition from natural gas to electric. That was something that our subcommittee discussed in some  
30 detail. Natural gas use does have GHG emissions associated with it and the S-CAP takes a relatively  
31 aggressive approach towards phasing out the use of natural gas. In the Comp. Plan, we're not quite as  
32 strong as some of the strategies that are in the S-CAP but we do support the S-CAP strategies of  
33 exploring that transition and continuing to figure out the best and almost most cost effective feasible  
34 ways to move – phase out natural gas and move toward electrification but the water has – excuse me,  
35 the language has been soften somewhat. Finally, Goal 8 is about climate change and climate adaptation.  
36 We've strengthened the wording of the policy, instead of 'seeking' to reduce greenhouse emission in N-  
37 8.2, we are just going to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. We're not going to seek to do it, we're just  
38 going to go ahead and do it. Consistent with the Council's action in approving the S-CAP policy framework,



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

1 since the time that we met on this element in November. We also reworded the program about  
2 protecting the municipal services center and other facilities from the impacts of sea level rise, including  
3 the waste water treatment plant. We refined the wording of the Policy N-8.4, that wants to balance  
4 responses to sea level rise with protecting the natural environment so, that we don't respond to sea  
5 level rise by building a bunch of new infrastructure that's going to damage the delicate Bay front  
6 ecology. Then, finally, I just want to note that at the subcommittee level, we did discuss the idea of a  
7 policy that would have prohibited the City from obtaining power or electricity from a specific type of  
8 solar energy called a concentrated solar thermal. This was due to concerns at the subcommittee level  
9 about potential impacts on birds, in particular. The utilities Staff has said that this is not part of the  
10 power portfolio right now, it wouldn't be a major constraint right now but just being able to be flexible  
11 and responsive as technology changes and as costs of electricity change in the future. They felt  
12 uncomfortable about adding a specific prohibition on a specific type of alternative energy projects. So,  
13 that policy is not the version that you have before you tonight and that's it, I think.

14 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Are there members of the subcommittee that would like to speak to this? If  
15 so turn your cards up. Don, Jennifer, Doria. Let's go in that order. Don, you're first.

16 **Don McDougall:** I think I have a miss mash of comments. Complementary and disagreement and detail  
17 in general. First off, I think that once again, the organization is – the changes in organization are  
18 important because they create interesting structure and they do a better job of sending the message  
19 across. I do want to compliment Staff – our Staff, if I can refer to them that way for participating but I  
20 think also, the fact that they got so many other Staff from other departments to come and participate in  
21 those meetings needs to be complimented and I know that wasn't easy to do and I appreciate their  
22 time. Under the vision statement, right from start. I like the fact that we're no longer saying that this  
23 natural environment is all about beauty and appearance and we've added health and I think that that's  
24 really important. In the vision statement, I do wonder why we say even in built up areas as opposed to  
25 just simply say, in built up areas or whatever. I'm not quite sure that even doesn't detract from what  
26 we're trying to say. In terms of details, I think that people should be complimented for adding so much  
27 of the stuff about insecticides and pervious surfaces, idling and I think the challenge will be whether we  
28 have the will and ability to enforce those things. I think Shani, who's not here, should be complimented  
29 on her contributions to that. I like the idea that in general, we're talking about preservation and not  
30 management. I think that's a really important concept. I think when this was written 20 years ago,  
31 management was probably the issue; I think preservation is today. I think that – I'm not sure we're  
32 strong enough with the public appeal process or ability relative to tree removal. I think that we might  
33 want to strengthen that. I really like the fact that we've added the concept of smart energy grid but I  
34 think there's more opportunity for smartness in the whole natural environment and data collection that  
35 we do. I think over the next 15 years, the length of this plan, the transition from natural gas probably  
36 will be a higher – of higher importance than it appears today and the fact that we're dealing with carbon  
37 offsets, I would object that we're removing that from here. The idea that there should be carbon offsets



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

1 as opposed to just simple illuminating the problem and not having offsets. The same thing with solar  
2 thermal, I worry that we're removing that because we're worried about the economy of this and I'm not  
3 sure in their natural environment section, we should be worrying about the economy as opposed to the  
4 environment. Solar thermal is well known to be hazardous. As was mentioned, I really like the idea that  
5 we're being positive, we're not 'seeking' to reduce greenhouse gas, we're going to reduce it. In the map  
6 N3, I do want to mention that the fact that map shows regional habitat connection, I think the  
7 connectivity of our habitat is really, really, important and I think that the fact that that got called out, I'd  
8 like to thank you for that. Thank you.

9 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you, Don. Jennifer and then Doria.

10 **Jennifer Hetterly:** Yeah, I think this element is coming along – has come along great. I really appreciate  
11 Staff and Place Works work on this. They really transformed it a lot in terms of how it's presented and  
12 how the content comes across. I just have a few comments, Program N-1.10.2 about dedicating publicly  
13 owned recreational open space and conservation areas as parkland. I'd like to say publicly controlled  
14 and not publicly owned. We currently have quite a bit of dedicated park land that is under long-term  
15 leases. We don't own it as a City but we've nonetheless dedicated it as park land to preserve that  
16 function for the life of the lease so, I'd like to be changed to controlled. Same program, for some  
17 examples of things that we ought to consider dedicating as rental wetlands and Gamble House. I believe  
18 the rental wetlands is dedicated park land already. So, a different example would be good there like  
19 Rinconada Community Gardens, would be one that's not dedicated parkland but is clearly a park like  
20 use. Policy N-2.2 under the urban forest, that's where I think you consolidated the land use policy about  
21 the urban forest as infrastructure into this Natural Element policy. I actually think the urban forest – I  
22 think we ought to retain that original land use Policy L-9.11 in the land use sections as well. More than  
23 parks and preserves and other open space, the urban forest infrastructure is really impacted by all  
24 developments and all land use decisions so, I think it has broader concerns and ought to be elevated in  
25 both elements. Next comment – oh, the groundwater regulation, I understand that the water district  
26 has regulatory authority over that. I know we previously had a program that called for looking into  
27 setting use fees for groundwater extraction. I assume that that came out because we don't have the  
28 authority to do that, is that correct? If it's not correct, I think we should put it back in. If it is correct,  
29 then I think we ought to be really cautious about – we ought to be looking for other ways to control the  
30 groundwater impacts of excavation.

31 **Joanna Jansen:** Jennifer?

32 **Jennifer Hetterly:** Yeah?

33 **Joanna Jansen:** Sorry, I don't know if this is what you're thinking but under N-4.7.1, there is still a bullet  
34 point that says an approach to metering extracted groundwater. Is that?



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

1 **Jennifer Hetterly:** I don't know if metering means charging a fee or if it just means monitoring how  
2 much is extracted? So, I think where it was before was in Program N-4.8.2 and that program needs some  
3 editing anyways, it's not a complete sentence. So, I'd love to see fees back in there if it's allowable; if  
4 not, I get that but we ought to be looking for other ways that the City can reduce dewatering beyond  
5 regulation of the dewatering and one of those ways is to control underground construction. Next – this  
6 is my last comment I think – is also about water. <sup>1</sup>Program N-4.1 and 3.1 is about a standardized process  
7 for evaluating the impacts of development on the storm drain system, including point source discharge,  
8 base flow, peak flow, etc. I would like to add to that something about exploring opportunities for cost  
9 recovery – increased cost recovery based on those evaluations. It doesn't really get us very far to just  
10 evaluate the impacts if we don't have a strategy for doing something about it. I would like to add a cost  
11 recovery element to that program. That's all I had.

12 **Elaine Costella:** I'm having trouble finding that number.

13 **Alex van Riesen:** I think it's N.13.1

14 **Jennifer Hetterly:** It's page N33, N-4.13.1, sorry.

15 **Elaine Costella:** Thank you, I just missed (Crosstalk)

16 **Alex van Riesen:** You said 1.3.1

17 **Jennifer Hetterly:** Oh, my bad. (Crosstalk)

18 **Elaine Costello:** No, no, that's fine, I just want to make sure we have it, that's all. Thank you.

19 **Doria Summa:** I also wanted to thank Staff for including such a broad range of experts from other  
20 departments. That was very helpful. Especially, given the very technical nature of the energy section and  
21 in general, I had a concern that the energy section as Director Gitelman says, to be overly regulatory,  
22 instead of general enough. I think there is a couple thing where it does lean a little that direction  
23 because I think there's likely to be so many new technologies and changes in the years to come. If  
24 anything seems to regulatory versus broad, I think it could be made more general but I do think, based  
25 on what I learned at the subcommittee meetings, I would be more comfortable if concentrated solar  
26 power was called out. It wasn't just for birds, it was for a lot of other species and it has a lot of negative  
27 – really profoundly negative effects. That's not to say that if 20-years from now, it was the only way we  
28 could get energy, we wouldn't be able to rethink it but I think it belongs in there at least as a cautionary  
29 thing if not outright prohibited. Wait, I have to put on my glasses. Oh, I agree with Jen about 1.10.2 and  
30 that about pursues dedication of – and her change, publicly controlled but I would like to get rid of the  
31 word pursue and says dedicate. That just needs to get done and I also agree with her comments on the  
32 urban forest and then, finally in the groundwater policy we were just talking about. I had a concern



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

1 about contaminated groundwater from sites migrating, that you guys addressed in the Safety Element  
2 so, thank you very much. I wonder if there shouldn't be a correlating bullet under 4.7.1, that sort of  
3 strengthens the idea that it should be – that those things need to be looked at and addressed because  
4 what we find that there are assumptions of where the plume goes and where it doesn't and there's  
5 recently been some testing in certain neighborhoods. I would just think it would be good for it to be  
6 tested and once and for all that could – or it could be – it should be tested regularly, but on a reasonable  
7 basis but I think there needs to be a bullet there to address that. Thanks.

8 **Co-Chair Garber:** Ok, why don't we go around the table. Lydia, would you start us off?

9 **Lydia Kou:** Mine is pretty short. Policy N-1.1 under program – in the programs, I was wondering if  
10 Program N-11.2, promote and support ecosystems protections and environment education programs in  
11 Palo Alto. Since a lot of our ecosystem touches the other – there are other Cities that it touches, I'm  
12 wondering if we should have another program to include adjoining Cities, such as East Palo Alto or  
13 Woodside, etc. The Cities that adjoin and then, on page N17, in one of the bullets it says – and I don't  
14 understand this – it says, be clustered or closely grouped in relation to the areas surrounding to reduce  
15 conspicuousness. Minimize access roads. I wonder if the 'ness', that word is there – too much additional  
16 wording in there but (Inaudible). Page N17 (Crosstalk) and then it starts again. So, those are just a  
17 couple of things and then also, like I said earlier, the random letters in different areas. Thank you.

18 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Stephen.

19 **Stephen Levy:** Pass.

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

21 **Elaine Uang:** Couple of, kind of specific wording comments. Policy N-1.1, I think there's – sometimes  
22 there are a tendency to suggest that everything that's landscaped is natural and I just want to make a  
23 suggestion for the second sentence of the policy, respect the role that natural and constructed  
24 landscapes play within the urbanized part of the City because not everything that is green is actually  
25 natural. Every lawn or grass lawn that put out there is actually not native landscape necessarily. On the –  
26 Oh my gosh, there's a lot of little things. I'm glad to see the urban forest and understory as a category,  
27 right before Goal N2 but I'm wondering if we can also include the word understory as part of Goal – the  
28 language in Goal N2. So, thriving urban forest and understory. The understory – I think while the urban  
29 forest is primary and the trees really provide the bulk of the ecosystem benefits for both the open space  
30 and the urban areas. I think the understory plays a strong role especially, in things like storm water  
31 management and drainage. So, I'd like to see the understory also put back in. Especially, like under  
32 policy N 2.2, recognizing the importance of the urban forest and understory. I think there's also some  
33 language that I find a little bit loose. The appreciation of natural systems, I think maybe something that  
34 could be stronger and is actually a concept – a strong scientific concept is the term ecosystem services  
35 and so, maybe instead of appreciation of natural systems, we can kind of make that stronger and really





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

1 recognize the actual services that the natural landscapes and connected ecosystems provide for our  
2 City. Let's see creeks and riparian areas, Goal N3. Again, just a few – there's – I've pushed in the past for  
3 separating the natural creeks from the channelized creeks and I think that the language here is still kind  
4 of conflating those things. I'm not sure that we would necessarily want to push for conservation of all  
5 the channelized creeks. If there's room to make improvements to the channelized creeks in the future,  
6 I'd like to see the language, you know, be open to that. I might suggest conservation of natural creeks  
7 and riparian areas as open space amenities, ecological habitats and elements Community design and  
8 then also, make separate – the mention of maintaining channelized creeks so, that -- because I think  
9 they're very different – they're highly – the channelized creeks are highly constructed and very different  
10 and don't provide the same services as the natural creeks. Then, in – I think there's a mention of map  
11 N4, illustrating where the possible 150-foot setbacks are and that's just not very clear in the draft that  
12 was sent out. Maybe that shows up better in the big map but it's not very clear from the small – and I  
13 also am just not – and maybe this is something that Staff can provide later but I'd like to understand  
14 where the suggestion of 150-foot setbacks come from? Like if there's a strong – is there strong evidence  
15 or recommendation from another agency or best practice because it's not clear to me why 150-feet as  
16 opposed to 100 or 125. Then – oh, just one more thing. On climate change, I think there's a reference to  
17 sustainable Community strategy which I think is a mandate from SP375. I mean, the core of the  
18 sustainable Community strategy is really being to integrate land use transportation and housing and N-  
19 8.1.1, makes reference to a whole bunch of other things that it's important for; climate change,  
20 greenhouse gas, water supply, sea level rise but really the crux of, you know the mandate for  
21 sustainable Community strategy is to integrate land use transportation housing for those climate change  
22 and greenhouse gas reduction. If there's a way to kind of reference that and again, tie this piece, this  
23 Natural Environment Element back to land use, back to transportation and further this links, I'd like to  
24 see that happen.

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

26 **Julia Moran:** I just have one little comment. Thank you, subcommittee and thank you for meeting with  
27 all those experts. This is clearly, very detailed section and I appreciate the work you guys have done.  
28 Program N-2.9.3, I think there's someone who mentioned this last meeting. I'm just concerned –  
29 expanded opportunities for Community members to appeal the removal of trees and in private  
30 residences. I don't know, I – maybe it's ok – it makes me a little uncomfortable. It's something to  
31 consider that there was someone last meeting and I also concur that – I'm not sure about that language.

32 **Co-Chair Garber:** Did Staff understand that? I wasn't – if you point, forgive me for asking?

33 **Julia Moran:** My point is...

34 **Co-Chair Garber:** That...



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

1 **Julia Moran:** So, it expands the opportunities for Community member to appeal the removal of trees  
2 under private residences and I'm not that... (Crosstalk)

3 **Co-Chair Garber:** Increase it to something that is – sorry. (Crosstalk)

4 **Julia Moran:** ...Community members should – increasing what's already there is there.

5 **Co-Chair Garber:** Ok, thank you.

6 **Co-Chair Garber:** Forgive me, anything else?

7 **Julia Moran:** No.

8 **Co-Chair Garber:** Ok. Bonnie.

9 **Bonnie Packer:** Thank you. I think the element has really been put together very nicely. Most of my  
10 comments are for the purpose of clarification. Even though this is not a regulatory document, I want to  
11 make sure that it's good – what you mean to say is really well understood. So, like in N-1.1, you talk  
12 about managing private open space and I'm not really sure what private open space is? There are other  
13 references to residential back yards and that private open space and it's nice to tell residents about nice  
14 ways to keep your backyards and there's nothing very regulatory about what is said but I'm not sure  
15 what is meant by private open space. Do you mean all the land that people have their – that is in the  
16 open space zones, that's private or what? I just – a little definitional clarification – little paraphrase or  
17 something that would add to that. You mention that you put in a lot of the – in the bullet points under  
18 N-1.9, which is a lot of the development requirements in the open space zone. Maybe you should just  
19 say that that comes from the zoning code for the development standards for building in the open space  
20 zones in that section. Policies – I think it's N-.11, where it talks about working with Stanford, Santa Clara  
21 County, and the water district, I would add San Mateo County because so much of Stanford is also in San  
22 Mateo County. We might as well – they're right across San Francisquito Creek, we should be working  
23 with them, who knows. In the urban forest area, I have no problem with the intent but I think there's – it  
24 isn't clear what a street tree is. I know or I understand a street tree to be those trees that the City  
25 planted in the City's rights of ways and that isn't defined well here. So, that Policy N-2.7, that says  
26 require new commercial, multi-unit, blah blah blah, to provide street trees. It's so vague, like where?  
27 When? What do they need to provide? I have in my comments submitted, alternate language that  
28 would specify that if you remove a tree or if there are no trees in the right away, in front of the property  
29 that you're developing, then you do something about it. I'm just asking for explicit language in that area.  
30 The creeks, I just have one question. One of the – in the setback requirements, it says that ensure that if  
31 you're going to have a trail along the creek, it can only be on one side and I'm thinking of Fern Canyon in  
32 Foothills Park. There's a beautiful trail that goes up one side of the creek, crosses over and goes down  
33 the other side. So, you want to be sure that it – that there – that some trails it may be appropriate to  
34 have it on both sides of a creek or maybe if it's high up, it doesn't matter. Water resources, I suggest in



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

1 my written comments, mostly grammatical changes for clarification and also, under air quality. In the  
2 noise section, Policy N-6.1, you have a whole, huge long thing about decibel levels and it doesn't belong  
3 here. I mean, you said earlier you wanted to keep this on a high level and not be regulatory. So, that  
4 whole section, it goes for about a whole page. I can't find – oh, here it is. On page N35, if you can just  
5 refer to the guidelines for maximum outdoor noise levels and interior noise to some document and not  
6 repeat it here in the Comp. Plan, it would be more consistent with the broad scope that we're trying to  
7 do. That's it, thank you.

8 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Yes, Hillary.

9 **Hillary Gitelman:** Just one note on that last comment. This is a crazy section where the State guild lines  
10 actually, require some excessive detail on interior and exterior noise level. So, we'll look at it. If there's a  
11 way to simplify it, we will.

12 **Bonnie Packer:** If you got to do it, you got to do it.

13 **Co-Chair Garber:** If you go to go. Lisa.

14 **Lisa Peschcke-Koedt:** I actually have nothing to add. I thought that the new programs and the new  
15 policies were awesome and I love especially, the extra protection for our trees and the urban canopy but  
16 I didn't see anything major and some of the others have been mentioned.

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

18 **Jason Titus:** Yeah, I was generally really impressed and was actually, really proud to be a Palo Alton. Just  
19 reading through this and seeing the stuff that we're promoting and planning for. There were a couple  
20 things. One on the non-concentrating solar thermal, I didn't know if there was a particular reason why  
21 we didn't say that we wanted to do solar water heating. I mean, it is real in Hawaii. Other places it is  
22 actually mandated that every new home has to do it. If we want to reduce natural gas usage in a place  
23 that's sunny the vast majority of the time. Seems like we should probably – at least encourage it and  
24 potentially even just say, new construction, you should incorporate solar water heating of some sort.  
25 Then, also, on water usage. There was – we had something in 4.16.3 saying that we wanted to  
26 investigate ways to use non-traditional water sources. Including things like gray water and such but it  
27 seems kind of wimpy for something that's supposed to be looking way, way out – 20-years in the future.  
28 Lots of places use gray water now so, why wouldn't we say we want to encourage the usage of gray  
29 water and say, this is – there is a lot of water that is going to waste that could be used for irrigation and  
30 houses and all that right now. I just want to be stronger there.

31 **Co-Chair Garber:** Great. Thank you. Whitney.

32 **Whitney McNair:** Thank you. I just want to – I have two comments. One is map N-1, I believe that the  
33 map is been created from the bike and pedestrian plan that was adopted earlier, I think in 2012 and so,



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

1 built upon that are these pollinator pathways that do seem to be getting some traction and as a  
2 concept, I think it's an interesting and supportable concept. I would just want it to be – just identify that  
3 the lines that are drawn on the map, look as though they follow a very specific course and it ma – it  
4 should just be a conceptual diagram because the lines do go through existing property. They don't really  
5 follow the right of way, they go through parking lots and buildings. I know in particular, through the  
6 research park they do so, it doesn't really follow what one would think of as a natural pathway, where  
7 you would have landscaping. So, I just wanted to identify if the idea is conceptual, the map should sort  
8 of reflect that point. If it's not, then really where they're drawn should be looked at a little more. Then,  
9 Program N-2.12.3, this one is – I think it's a little overreaching. It's about cooperating with different  
10 entities, including Stanford and Caltrain and PG&E and what not, to ensure that tree planting removal  
11 and maintenance practice are consistent with City guild lines. Throughout the document, I really want to  
12 make clear, if it's meant to be applying to Stanford University, we'll talk about that. If it's meant to apply  
13 to Stanford – the lands that Stanford owns that are within the research park that are – then I think that  
14 distinguishing needs to be made. Those Stanford-owned lands, that are within the research park,  
15 already have to meet City regulations but if it's really intended to be Stanford University as it's written –  
16 Stanford already has to comply with County regulations and there's regulations for landscaping and tree  
17 removal and replacement and also, Stanford has the ability to do a vegetation management plan, where  
18 they holistically look at the whole of the campus; to look at the trees and the landscaped areas for all of  
19 the lands within Santa Clara County. That is different and more comprehensive than just an identified  
20 parcel and the tree that's on that one sort of, regulated parcel, where they are doing a building. So, it's a  
21 way to – that one might be preserving more trees in the long run if you're looking at it comprehensively  
22 and so, I just think that the way that it's written is not appropriate. It's overreaching and Stanford has to  
23 comply with other guild lines that might be more apply.

24 **Female:** What number is that again?

25 **Whitney McNair:** It's N-2.12.3.

26 **Elaine Costello:** Ok, thank you.

27 **Whitney McNair:** It may be that the language ensures inconsistent with City guild lines but that needs to  
28 be softened in some way.

29 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you, sorry. Annette.

30 **Annette Glackopf:** Don't we wish we had a plan like that in Palo Alto. I basically agree with some of the  
31 comments – most of the comments that Doria and Jen made. A couple of comments, on Policy N-14,  
32 Program 4.1, it calls to review a CEQA thresholds of significance regarding special status species but it  
33 leaves us sort of hanging. So, it's fine to call for a review but what is the action on that? Maybe reports  
34 status to the agencies listed. The one goal that I'd like to see added, that I've asked three times already,  
35 is I would like something probably a new program into 12 to explore the feasibility and locations for a



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

1 memorial park to commemorate citizens who have contributed significant public services to the City of  
2 Palo Alto. I've talked to Canopy about that. It's sort of ongoing things and I think it would nice if were in  
3 the Comp. Plan. Program N-3.4.1 addressed creek stewardship and this is sort of currently on-going with  
4 Actera and so, I think we need to address that. At least I get an email everyday referring to this so,  
5 maybe the word develops – replace the word develop to enhance or expand, would be worthwhile.

6 **Joanna Jansen:** Annette, I'm sorry. Can you restate which one you were looking at there?

7 **Annette Glackopf:** Ok, I sent you actually some of the notes.

8 **Joanna Jansen:** Oh, ok.

9 **Annette Glackopf:** Program N-3.4.1 addressed creek stewardship and Actera seems to have a lot going  
10 on in that so, you should at least address that. Another thing is, I would like -- a little further on under  
11 Policy N-4.15, to add a new program. I think Doria or Jen referred to this and certainly the storm – the  
12 Palo Alto – Save Palo Alto Groundwater has talked about this; something to the effect of considering  
13 prohibiting water from new construction for basements to flow into storm drains. So, consider  
14 prohibiting water from dewatering to go into storm drains and they'll talk about that tomorrow night.  
15 Then, sort of a funny one on this Program N-5.2.2, I think it either needs to be omitted or reworded. I  
16 understand the philosophy of addressing cars idling for more than 3-5 minutes and I can certainly see  
17 that in a driveway but you know, with our traffic jams, that certainly is a possibility on City streets. We  
18 need to sort of – we can't really regulate cars getting stalled in traffic for huge amounts of time. Finally,  
19 the only other thing I'd like to mention at this time is Bonnie was talking about City trees in the right of  
20 way. I think the City needs to do a lot of work about – in this area. I think that street trees should be  
21 mandatory; they're not. It's sort of voluntary and if someone right now dumps a tree – takes it down,  
22 which they do all the time. Whether it's in the front of their property or a City-owned tree, there's no  
23 code enforcement or regulation for them to put it back and a lot of (Inaudible) trees, even in City right  
24 away areas, is controlled by, what I consider a very fickle rule in that you have to plant at a certain  
25 distance from driveways and utility outboxes. Which if you planted the right species of trees, that  
26 wouldn't be a consideration. I agree with Bonnie that there needs to be some work there but we also  
27 need to really look at zoning and what we can do in that area. I have some more comments but it's sort  
28 of in the notes that I sent to Staff.

29 **Co-Chair Garber:** Ok, we can come back to you if you like in the next round. Hamilton.

30 **Hamilton Hitchings:** I wanted to commend the subcommittee on a very thorough and thoughtful  
31 modernization of the element. It really looks in good shape. I just want to go through quickly, I've been  
32 focused on the Safety Element but I want to make a couple comments on people's comments tonight.  
33 On Don's comments really resonated with me, as did Annette's. I want to second Elaine's mention of  
34 distinguishing channelized creeks. You know, that ship has sailed and I understand some people are not  
35 happy but they were channelized for very good reason and they are very different than something like



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

1 the San Francisquito Creek, which has not been channelized and it's important to distinguish between  
2 them. In terms of Julia's comment about not expanding the appeal of removal of trees. It wasn't meant  
3 to go so far as to allow neighbors to prevent you from removing them but merely to notify. So, I think  
4 within that context, it is appropriate to expand and so, at least you can be notified that your neighbor is  
5 about to remove a tree. I really agreed with Bonnie's comments about the need to clarify what private  
6 open space means. Is it your back yard or is it like space within the private open – we need a clear  
7 definition of that along with what a street tree is within the element. I want to second Jason's  
8 recommendation on encouraging gray water. I just want to go into – reinforce a couple of things that  
9 Annette said including the memorial public park. We really need to prohibit dewatering into storm  
10 drains. I absolutely agree with that. The street trees, we really need code enforcement to replace them.  
11 I had a neighbor across the street – who I like a lot by the way – but they remove their tree and you  
12 know, I don't know if it will ever be replaced but I mean it was a very key location. So, I think it is  
13 important that we have mandatory street trees and that they be enforced. It's really part of the  
14 character and part of the preservation of our urban forest. I'd love to see at least a little bit of  
15 strengthening of language in that. Again, I want to thank the subcommittee for a great job.

16 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Doria, we've heard from you and Jennifer. Alex.

17 **Alex van Riesen:** My comments, I appreciate the extensive nature of this element. I just have a couple  
18 comments on the urban forest section and understory. I was struck by – it seems that there's an  
19 emphasis within the Goal N2, particularly to protect the urban forest from development. That comes up  
20 newer house times which seems appropriate in ways but I guess the other thing we talked about before  
21 that there's a – either the imminent threat of drought and flooding. You know one or the other, the  
22 feast and the famine and the water. I realize you have N-2.6.2 which is a mention of drought but it  
23 seems to me that there's something missing in terms of a plan or who's thinking about what happens to  
24 the trees if the drought continues or if – as the other chart show – flooding continues and what's the  
25 impact. I don't know if that would be true in other areas as well but it seems like there almost would be  
26 another section or under protection and expansion some greater mention of drought and flooding with  
27 regards to the trees since that's a significant portion of the City. The other thing I thought about is in  
28 Program N-6.2.1 under noise and I was just – it says to continue working to reduce noise impacts  
29 created by events and activities taking place in Community adjoining Palo Alto and I couldn't think of  
30 anything other than a Stanford football game or Shoreline – No, I was getting there. Wow, you people  
31 are on top of it, man. I couldn't even get to number two. The thing is, I've lived here 15-years and I've  
32 noticed no change so, the word continue has no meaning for me there so, I wonder if there's a way to  
33 toughen that up. Maybe it's happened but I've heard nothing about – sometimes you'll hear nothing  
34 and then you'll hear it likes its crystal clear. Especially, in South Palo Alto. I wonder if there's a way to  
35 toughen that up so, that – can we actually make some changes because it's not my understanding that  
36 Mountain View has done anything to change Shoreline – erect a wall in the back, you know, as some



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

1 other theaters have done but my feeling is nothing has changed. That program feels destined for not  
2 working unless it's beefed up.

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

4 **Alex van Riesen:** Sorry.

5 **Ellen Uhrbrock:** I am quite in awe of the knowledge and the ability of the subcommittee and the  
6 committees but I really want to know, what is the distribution of this plan? When it's published and it's  
7 approved by the Council. Who do you expect to read it and use it and have it as a reference? Could you  
8 answer that for me, please?

9 **Hillary Gitelman:** This is envisioned of a plan that will be used by the City decision makers, Staff and the  
10 public in reviewing development applications, legislative changes, capital investments. It's intended to  
11 be a broad policy framework that will be available to inform those decisions and allow everyone to  
12 balance our goals and priorities.

13 **Co-Chair Garber:** I can just add, I would use it professionally, at least a couple times a week. Anything  
14 else? Done?

15 **Co-Chair Keller:** Don already went.

16 **Co-Chair Garber:** Oh, no I said done not Don. Adrian, go ahead.

17 **Adrian Fine:** Alright, overall, I really agree with a lot of folks. This is a pretty good document. 3 points; I  
18 also want to echo the gray water thing. It does seem conspicuous now that you guys both mention it.  
19 Policy N-5.2 about supporting behavior changes to reduce emission particulates from automobiles.  
20 That's a really big goal. I think everyone would agree with it. There's not much meat underneath it. It  
21 related pretty heavily to our transportation element. It might be related to incentives for EVs. I just  
22 seemed pretty thin for such a large policy. The last thing I was wondering about, just a suggestion.  
23 There's a lot of new finance mechanisms for clean energy, clean water, cleaner utilities so that residents  
24 can do it locally; even solar share programs. There might be something here in terms of the City  
25 promoting or identifying or working with residents on new clean power and clean water initiatives.

26 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Amy.

27 **Amy Sung:** I think this is an amazing element. I first thought that it was pretty boring but after I read  
28 through it, I admit, I was totally wrong. I wanted to focus on energy use because we are now at 40% of  
29 our energy consumption and it's really in residential buildings. I was looking at the energy use  
30 particularly, in Policy N-7.7 and it says explore a variety of the cause of effect ways to reduce natural gas  
31 to – in the existing new buildings in Palo Alto. I think (Inaudible) talks about the existing buildings, we do  
32 have a lot of homeowners who are not interested in remodeling instead of selling their houses. This



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

1 might be an area that we really capitalize on harvesting some of the energy and reduce the energy use.  
2 Maybe in the programs, we could have something, like provide incentives for the existing homeowners  
3 that are wanting to upgrade their energy use. For example, the Program 7.7.1, talks about the carbon  
4 neutral and natural gas supply. Something I think that something we talked about incentives. That might  
5 be something we can consider. The other is Policy N-7.6; it has a very specific language talking about  
6 solar photo (Inaudible) panels. This is like a particular – a clean energy that we wanted to promote but  
7 for example, you know, (Inaudible) is just talking about the incorporation of a solar panel into roof tiles  
8 as we advance into technology. Here you talked about this Comp. Plan is really to be high level and for  
9 the broad language. Maybe this specific reference that you (Inaudible) solar panel, might be just too  
10 specific. Instead, you maybe want to talk about the clean energy or solar energy or something really  
11 high level. I have a question about Program N-7.6.3 says, it promoted solar energy in individual private  
12 projects and I'm not quite sure, what does that mean, individual private projects? Does that mean new  
13 buildings, single family homes or garage or what? It's just not very clear on that (Crosstalk)

14 **Co-Chair Garber:** Amy, what number was that? I'm sorry.

15 **Amy Sung:** Program 7.6.3, page 54.

16 **Male:** She's looking at the track change version, maybe you're looking clean, improvised version.

17 **Amy Sung:** Anyway, I just thought the energy section, when it touches on the existing homes at that part  
18 of the area, we can focus on. Thank you.

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

20 **Co-Chair Keller:** I've been listening to this and I have a few comments on which are on other comments  
21 that people have made. Firstly, I wholeheartedly agree with Don McDougall about the need to improve  
22 the tree removal appeal process. Currently, if a private owner wants to remove a tree, they do appeal –  
23 they basically apply for it and then the City approves it or denies it and the neighbors who may be  
24 affected by that removal because of enjoyment – all people nearby see the tree, enjoy the tree. They  
25 have no rights currently at all. Maybe they get notified but can't do a damn thing about it and therefore  
26 a strengthening that to allow an appeal. Particularly, for protected trees but even nonprotected trees,  
27 wherever there's an appeal process – that is for an application. If there's an application, the neighbors  
28 should be able to appeal. The City decided, just like any other development going on. With respect to N-  
29 2 – by the way, that's to respect to N -2.9.3. With respect to 2.12.3, I think that this should be referred  
30 to within the City of Palo Alto. I agree with the idea of Stanford University lands within the City of Palo  
31 Alto. I don't think it should be weakened at all and I believe it should specifically include this City of Palo  
32 Alto utility because our utilities have been butchering trees, not consistent with City guidelines. I agree  
33 entirely with the comments of Elaine Uang, with respect to channelized versus natural creeks. The ship  
34 has sailed. We are not going to remove channelized creeks, the channels there. If anything, they are  
35 potential for raising the heights of the channels in order to have sea level rise dealt with. They aren't





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

1 going away and don't expect them to go away and create regulations that are consistent with them  
2 staying. The issue with respect to extracting groundwater. The water district does have regulations in  
3 terms of extracting groundwater basically, in terms of wells but other than that, they have no  
4 regulations with respect to that. So, expecting that to be reliant on this – on the water district  
5 regulations means that there are no regulations. Regulating pumping into storm drains is something  
6 reserved to the City. The water district has no say on that and so, that's something in which it does make  
7 sense for us to be regulating. The next thing is with respect to N-4.5 – sorry—N-5.2.2, I assume that the  
8 way to handle this, which is idling, it idling while parked and if you simply add the phrase while parked, it  
9 makes perfect sense and works fine. With respect to N-5.3.3 which is health impacts of particulate  
10 emissions and providing information about the steps that (Inaudible) remove, reduce particulate  
11 emissions. Isn't this being handled by the air district? I notice there's things deleted on the next page on  
12 N-37 on the track changes version about wood fire – wood burning stoves and things like that. So, I'm  
13 wondering if some reference to the air district makes sense or if this policy is still something that we're  
14 doing? Going up a little higher, with respect to N-5.3, there's a mention of leaf blowers. People seem  
15 to be all up in arms about the particulate matters of the leaf blower machines and completely ignoring  
16 the fact that leaf blowers blow dust from the dirt, from the ground and that dust is as much as a  
17 problem. Whether the leaf blowers are electric or gas – or fossil fuel powered, that dust that lingers in  
18 the air and is a hazard in and of itself. Finally, with respect to concentrated solar thermal. The issues  
19 with respect to concentrated solar thermal are not mirror affecting wildlife. There is a current large  
20 project of concentrated solar thermal, I think it's called Tonopah. I may not have the name correct but in  
21 particular, this is touted as being solar power and as such, it basically says, it is greenhouse gas free. That  
22 is not correct. It heats up during the day and at night it has to stay warm. They use natural gas to keep it  
23 heated overnight so, that in the morning when the sun comes on, it can heat up and use – generate  
24 power. This is not the kind of greenhouse gas free energy that the City of Palo Alto should be buying and  
25 therefore, I would suggest that we do include the prohibition for concentrated solar thermal unless and  
26 until, it is truly greenhouse gas free, without the use of fossil fuels to create heat during night time  
27 hours. I think that that's something that we should do because if we're going to have 100% greenhouse  
28 gas-free electric utility, buying concentrated solar thermal power, does not generate greenhouse gas-  
29 free power. Also, one final thing is there was a mention of various kinds of things in term of -- I think it  
30 was Amy Sung mentioned about various incentives for retrofits. It is interesting that the City of Palo Alto  
31 utilities incentive program seems to be very targeted. You get incentives for doing an X or you get  
32 incentives for doing a Y. Where those are specifically targeted for what it is. You get incentive certain  
33 times for putting in solar thermal water heaters but you don't get incentives for putting in solar – for  
34 improving a certain water—heating—for example, if you use solar thermal water space heating, you  
35 don't get incentives for that. That's kind of silly. In PG&E territory, they have this idea that you measure  
36 the energy usage of the home before you retrofit. You measure the energy usage of the home after the  
37 retrofit and if your improvement exceeds a certain threshold, you get a lump of money. That's a much  
38 better strategy, I think that our approach which is targeted in vulcanized ways and I think we should



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

1 explore what other electric and – what other (Inaudible) utilities do in terms of their incentive programs  
2 and think about copying some of that in that regard. I also think that we need to, in order to promote  
3 solar power, we need to think about a time of use metering. And solar power works with time of use  
4 metering and we explored it but not for those – we explored time of use metering for those with electric  
5 (Inaudible) but not if you have solar power but if you have solar power and (Inaudible) you can get time  
6 of use metering and invest in our utilities in PG and E territories. I think we should include that and  
7 consider that because that I think will promote energy efficient and if you think about when the wind  
8 blows, were buying more and more wind power. The wind blows at night and therefore we want to  
9 promote energy use at night and energy saving during the day. Notwithstanding the duck's belly chart –  
10 people have seen that. Anyway, thank you.

11 **Co-Chair Garber:** Doria, did you have something else? Oh, I'm sorry. Stephen and then Doria.

12 **Stephen Levy:** If it's red, I guess it's on. I wanted to follow up on what Elaine said way back at the  
13 beginning. It's on N-34, it's 8.1.1. It's about what the sustainable Community strategy means. I don't  
14 need to the change the language at this point but it does go to something that we talked about way  
15 earlier in the process. That at the end Hillary, I hope, were going to write about how elements are  
16 connected. I work for three regional planning agencies and two air quality agencies, I think I have this  
17 right but Elaine and Joanna and Hillary, if I mark it up, jump in at the end, please. The suitable  
18 Community Strategy has two pieces. It sets regional greenhouse gas emission reduction targets and it  
19 requires that within each region, enough housing is provided to match the job and population growth.  
20 It's that other meaning of sustainability. That doesn't mean a lot per say but what Elaine said is really  
21 important because land use and transportation, housing and transportation, in the right place – for  
22 every agency that I work for is one of the major greenhouse gas emission and climate change adaptation  
23 policies. It's not some abstract thing and it anybody on Council doesn't get that, if we don't  
24 communicate that through the document, for example, by understanding that the Land Use Element  
25 and the Housing Element are part of a greenhouse gas reduction policy, along with the Transportation  
26 Element. I think that's a mistake. So, I really want to support what Elaine said. That confers with my  
27 professional knowledge. If you see if any different, please jump in because it is more important to get it  
28 right but I think sometimes people see that and think it's only about greenhouse gasses. It's only one  
29 way, it's only regulation or stuff and I think it really is housing and transportation also.

30 **Co-Chair Garber:** Doria.

31 **Doria Summa:** Just very quickly, I wanted to respond to some of the comments and we tried to  
32 distinguish between channelize creeks and natural creeks but we wanted to make sure that we  
33 maintained the concept of even the channelized creeks provide habitat for animals. On creeks, again,  
34 the 150-foot setback for creeks is actually the County standard and that's why it was added as an option.  
35 Somethings that a couple people have mentioned, specific technologies and practices. We didn't include  
36 because they're part of the green building code which will evolve as things evolve and change. I agree



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

1 with Whitney, that we need to make it clear that we weren't trying to tell Stanford what to do on the  
2 whole entire campus. That wasn't our intention and getting back to her map comment. I think, in  
3 general, it's hard to evaluate the maps because they're so small so, I hope at some time, we could get a  
4 full-size version. Arthur was absolutely right, it was stopped cars, it was not idling cars in traffic. We  
5 didn't think we could do anything about that. I appreciate the comment about strengthening street tree  
6 protection and urban forest. I also agree that we should prohibit concentrated solar thermal. That's it.

7 **Co-Chair Garber:** I have a couple comments and Arthur also wanted to talk. I wasn't going to speak on  
8 this but – oh and Don, alright. Trees, I agree that street trees should be essentially required. They are  
9 very important for the character of our neighborhoods, for our streets. They play a very important part  
10 in the identity of our town. I have a slightly different take, which I think is more aligned with Julia's  
11 relative to trees that are on my personal property. I have talked about this before, where I think in the  
12 residential neighborhoods, the weight on the scale should be in favor of the individual homeowner and  
13 so, I have a hard time giving my neighbors appeal power over my decision of what I do with my trees on  
14 my property. I'm not saying about the trees that are protected but just in general. That much said, let  
15 me move on to my other topics. Tomorrow night, in addition with the Services and Policy Committee,  
16 we're also going to lay out very briefly a policy framework for thinking about the conservation of  
17 groundwater. If the goal is ultimately the conservation of groundwater, then there are several policies  
18 that I think the City should think about pursuing. This is not to compete with the County obsess over  
19 these issues but I think the City can do a number of things to support that goal. For instance, reduction  
20 of extraction sources. There are many in the City. They are from underpasses and building primarily but  
21 that is something that we can control and that we can legislate and regulate. Reduction of groundwater  
22 depletion due to construction. That includes buildings and additions to single family homes. Utilization  
23 of surface groundwater, where groundwater is surfaced, we should make out best efforts to utilize that  
24 in a beneficial way and not simply pour it down the drain and back into the Bay. There are a variety of  
25 ways that are being explored but we should be more proactive about that. We should also be exploring,  
26 presumably with the County and others, is groundwater recharge. We've talked about a number of  
27 those issues in here but there are at least 4 or 5 different programs. I can imagine that would directly  
28 support those sorts of activities. Then there's, of course, the coordination with (Inaudible) etc. but I  
29 would actually look to slightly reorganize the groundwater Policy N-4.7 and start with, at the top our  
30 goal of conservation of Palo Alto's groundwater and then, let everything else fall under neither that. I  
31 am comfortable with Policy 4.8 because I will be talking about that in much greater detail at the  
32 regulatory level tomorrow and we'll have other things. There may be some learnings that come out of  
33 that, that can influence the Comp. Plan later but that can be added in, you know, at the Council level or  
34 even by us if we wanted to. Then finally, under water quality and storm water management. One of the  
35 things that we've learned in the work that – and the calculations that Keith and I have been working on,  
36 is the degree to which soil absorption of water, how important that is to our environment. It acts as a  
37 buffer for flooding and it's one of the key things that helps use mitigate that. It operated very much the  
38 way that wetlands do and that is something that should probably find its way into Policy 4.9. We don't



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

1 understand entirely how those soils work but we do know there – we have a rough idea of their capacity  
2 and their ability to buffer the impacts when there are storm surges etc. That’s it. Arthur and then Don.  
3 Don, please.

4 **Don McDougall:** Just quickly, on the tree on private property issue. I’m sort of between should you,  
5 shouldn't you. I think the elephant in the room is Castilleja, coming out and saying we’ve got 168 trees  
6 were going to get rid of and is that on private property or not on private property and huge Redwoods  
7 and should people have the opportunity to speak out about that or not. Therefore, I lean in the direction  
8 of allowing some sort of appeal, especially if it’s any kind of protected tree. I think the other issue about  
9 that and I’ve mentioned this before, is the issue of transparency. We’ve talked a lot about trees being in  
10 public – on the public divides and so on. The City took out three trees in front of our house a year and a  
11 half ago. I have no visibility of whether they’re ever going to plan on replacing those or not. Since my  
12 neighbor won’t fix his irrigation system and he irrigates the mud every day, it’s a problem. I want to  
13 mention Shani again. I think she had a really positive impact with this and her experience with other  
14 Communities up and down the Bay, that was why the 150-foot. She knew that that was a County  
15 regulation, number 1 and she was also aware of what places like San Jose were doing, even with  
16 concrete creeks and the importance of that. The same thing with the pollination routes and that map.  
17 Whitney mentioned, it looked like it went through buildings and parking lots and I think the pollination  
18 route was not necessarily a creek route or something. It was a concept to where pollination would  
19 happen. I was to reinforce what Stephen said about the sustainable. People heard me say sustainable  
20 enough during the campaign over and over again but it’s sustainability and connectedness of things. It’s  
21 the connection of the various kinds of sustainability. In fact, if there comes down and we haven’t done a  
22 business one yet as to what – are the three E’s, is the social equity and the economy and the  
23 environment that are connected and I hope in the end that we can, as a Comprehensive Plan, connect  
24 all three of those. I think that would be really important. Thank you.

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

26 **Hillary Gitelman:** I just wanted to make sure, everyone knew that Shani had sent her apologies. She was  
27 going to have to go to the San Jose City Council this evening to represent the Audubon Society so, she  
28 wasn’t able to make it.

29 **Co-Chair Garber:** And Arthur.

30 **Co-Chair Keller:** So, firstly, I think that Don McDougall is right about the need for being able to appeal to  
31 trees. Don understands the idea why somebody should not be able to appeal a tree on private property  
32 when they can appeal individual review second stories on private property. They can review all sorts of –  
33 appeal all kinds of other things on private property developments. What’s special about trees that they  
34 should not be able to appeal that? Makes no sense to me. If they can appeal anything, they should be  
35 able to appeal the removal of trees, especially, protected trees. I also agree with Don McDougall’s point



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

1 about street trees. I had a tree removed from the front of my house, street tree because it died and I  
2 said, good. Dig out the stump and put a new one in and the City said, no, we can't because it's within 5-  
3 feet of a water meter and water line. So, put some other tree in there. Now, notice that I can actually  
4 put a tree – I'm the part of Palo Alto that has rolling curbs and therefore, this tree is behind the curb and  
5 then there's a property line with a fence there and then on my side of the property line, I can feel free to  
6 put a tree in, exactly two feet away from where the City refuses to put one in. That's kind of crazy and  
7 that needs to be improved. We need to think about better ways, after all, [Dave Doctor] has this idea of  
8 structural soil. Why can't we use structural soil kind of techniques for being able to dig out the stump  
9 and put it in so that the tree roots go down, away from the water meter? Finally, I appreciate Stephen  
10 Levy bringing up sustainable Community strategy and SB375. I heard him talk a lot about transportation,  
11 land use, housing, I didn't hear him talk anything about jobs. What seems to me, accepting the idea that  
12 the housing needs to be created in order to satisfy the needs for jobs.

13 **Stephen Levy:** I didn't say that.

14 **Co-Chair Keller:** Well, in the event, well...

15 **Stephen Levy:** So...(Crosstalk)

16 **Co-Chair Garber:** Well, hang on, hang on.

17 **Stephen Levy:** ... you're the Chairman, you don't get to miss quote.

18 **Co-Chair Garber:** Well, (Inaudible) (Crosstalk)

19 **Co-Chair Keller:** I'm sorry, I missed...(Crosstalk)

20 **Co-Chair Garber:** Finish your comments (Inaudible)

21 Co-Chair Keller: I'm sorry if I miss quoted you. I think that you mentioned the idea of creating housing  
22 but I don't think you mentioned the idea of limiting jobs. One of the things about this is that I know that  
23 Stephen has lived here for decades and so, have I. I lived here seeing a recession, boom, recession,  
24 boom and we've had a pretty much a boom for a lot since the last recession in the early 90's. What  
25 happened in previous booms is that we've had expansion within Silicon Valley and those expansions  
26 have involved relocations out of the valley is what's happened. We had disc drives, used to be created  
27 here and now disc drives have moved in construction elsewhere and now they're overseas. We had the  
28 construction of Silicon – generating manufacturing equipment and then that was moved elsewhere out  
29 of the valley. Now, we have a boom in terms of software and the software is being created here and  
30 we're basically more and more intensification within Silicon Valley and we don't have the same kind of  
31 thing about relocating so, that expansion happens elsewhere. So, where we're winding up with, the  
32 Cities – for example, Menlo Park said, oh, well all the other Cities are expanding jobs, we want to have  
33 our share of expanding jobs and so, what's happening is they're expanding jobs fast and sure, they are



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

1 expanding housing but they are expanding jobs faster than they are expanding housing. The same thing  
2 with Mountain View. Mountain View is expanding housing but they're expanding jobs in terms of what's  
3 going on with Google and LinkedIn and whatever. Faster than they are expanding housing. The issue  
4 that in some sense, what we need to think about is yes, we do need to create more housing but as a  
5 region, we need to basically say, we need to slow down on creating jobs and yes, companies, you need  
6 to create some of these jobs elsewhere and figure out – spread the wealth in other Communities. I think  
7 that that's part of the issue of what we need to do in terms of sustainability Community strategy. It's  
8 balancing transportation, housing and jobs and that means not simply putting your foot on the scale of  
9 jobs, which is what we've been doing much too much, especially in the last few years in Palo Alto but  
10 moderating on jobs and increasing them and basically, increasing housing. That's the kind of balance I  
11 think we need to do. Also, in terms of transportation, our transportation infrastructure is not keeping up  
12 with this either. Thank you.

13 **Stephen Levy:** So...(Crosstalk)

14 **Co-Chair Garber:** Hang on, Bonnie is first. Then you, Stephen. I'm sorry, she was (Inaudible)

15 **Bonnie Packer:** I want to say that I think that the last few comments of our Co-Chair were rather out of  
16 line and not part of what the subject matter of this element. It would just – anyway, I'm not going to go  
17 into the reason why. I totally disagree with your concept about jobs. I do want to underscore what  
18 Elaine and Stephen said about cross referencing. I did say in my written comment that in the  
19 introductory part about climate change, refer to the Transportation Element and yes, the Land Use  
20 Element to because we do talk about locating a concentration of people, whether its jobs or housing  
21 near transit because that has another effect on (Inaudible). I mean it's all interrelated. Going back to the  
22 minutia of street trees, I hope that whole issue of appeals is not worked out here in this Comp. Plan.  
23 That's an issue for the City Council and a larger group of people to weigh in on and a public hearing. I  
24 just think consider it and that's it. It isn't our job to decide what's appropriate or not appropriate as far  
25 as appeal process. I might recommend, since I did bring up the issue of defining street trees that maybe  
26 the City have more education about street trees, what the City's role is and what a private person's role  
27 is because it's totally confusing. There isn't – the City's done a poor job in that communication of that  
28 area. So, communication about respected responsibilities with regard to our urban forest might be a  
29 useful high-level program/policy kind of thing, in the Comp. Plan because we should keep it high level.  
30 Thank you.

31 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Stephen.

32 **Stephen Levy:** Hillary, I remember way back when you said at the very end – I don't know – the Staff I  
33 guess would write about the connections between the elements. As I look down here, unless that's  
34 somehow in the intro or the user guild. I don't see any place in the upcoming steps and I think a number



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

1 of us think that some of those connections are really important. Is that something you're planning to  
2 do?

3 **Hillary Gitelman:** Yes, that's a good point. We had already – always anticipated that that conversation  
4 would start in our review of implementation because we're going to look at all the programs from all the  
5 elements and then, the last meeting where we have talked about... (Crosstalk)

6 **Stephen Levy:** Ok, I just wanted to make sure.

7 **Hillary Gitelman:** ...sort of taking stock, we'll talk about what those relationships are.

8 **Stephen Levy:** Look, I suspect that Arthur and I have very different visions for the region. I was trying to  
9 share what I know, asking the Staff to step in about what the law and the implementation of the  
10 sustainable Community strategy means. If Arthur disagrees with that, that's his disagreement. I was  
11 trying to do an explanation and I think I'm correct, ok? So, in our region, we have – we're about to have  
12 an adopted plan by [ABEC], that actually increases the targets for jobs in population because that's what  
13 the experts – and I didn't go this one – that's what the experts think is happening. In that plan, the  
14 integration of housing and transportation is absolutely critical to the reduction of greenhouse gas  
15 emissions and the protection of the climate. That's all I'm saying. If Arthur wants the region to grow  
16 differently, as Bonnie said, that's a different topic than what I was talking about and again, I'll ask Hillary  
17 and Joanna and Elaine, have I said anything wrong because I kind of does this for a living?

18 **Hillary Gitelman:** Let me weigh in, I think going back to Elaine's original comment and I think that was  
19 right now. We've reference the sustainable Communities strategies here and it was – in this sense of  
20 trying to talk about climate change and climate adaptation but the regional agencies think about this, it  
21 about the integration of land use and transportation and so, we can try and draw out that theme in this  
22 reference and be more complete in our program here.

23 **Stephen Levy:** Thank you.

24 **Co-Chair Garber:** Ok. Thank you all. I'm not seeing any more cards up.

25 **Female:** Dan?

26 **Co-Chair Garber:** Yes.

27 **Female:** I'm sorry. If I may, I just wanted to provide a little clarification on the tree issue. Just basically to  
28 state that we draw designation between trees on single family lots versus anything else. So, for any type  
29 of development commercial, industrial, or multi-family, we do regulate trees. So, the removal of a tree  
30 would be a modification to an approved landscaping plan so that is something that is regulated. We  
31 issue permits and that is appealable through our process. What is different for single-family lots is that  
32 we do not regulate nonprotected trees within back yards. I think that's the question that was being



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

1 discussed by the subcommittee so, that would the specific change that would occur if this was further  
2 explored by the City Council and also, I wanted to mention that the City does regulate street trees and  
3 we do require street trees as part of developments.

4 **Co-Chair Garber:** I'm sorry? Ok. Are we good to go? I would love to hear a motion to move this element  
5 going forward by one of the subcommittee members. You so move, is there a second? Doria seconds.  
6 Are there any friendly or unfriendly amendments that might be offered? Bonnie.

7 **Bonnie Packer:** (Inaudible) A friendly amendment as we did with the Safety Element, that was we send  
8 forward would include the relevant comments and the changes that were recommended by...

9 **Co-Chair Garber:** By the Committee.

10 **Bonnie Packer:** ...by what you sensed was a consensus of the Committee.

11 **Co-Chair Keller:** Also, the minutes of the meeting and people can submit comments to a week from  
12 today.

13 **Co-Chair Garber:** Hamilton, did you have a comment there?

14 **Hamilton Hitchings:** Yeah, I was just going to add the word corrections but Bonnie got it covered.

15 **Co-Chair Garber:** Ok. With that, would those that support the motion, please raise their hand and say  
16 aye. All opposed? None, showing. Any abstentions? No, abstentions. It passes unanimously. Thank you  
17 very much.

18 **Commission Action:** Motion: Forward the draft Natural Environment Element for City Council  
19 review with comments from the CAC and minutes. Staff is to clean up minor items that do not  
20 change policy as discussed. Motion made by Commissioner Summa and seconded by  
21 Commissioner McDougal, motion passed unanimously.

22 **Co-Chair Garber:** What else do we possibly have to talk about this evening?

23 **Stephen Levy:** Thanks for the food.

24 **Co-Chair Garber:** Yes, thank you for the food.

25 **Hillary Gitelman:** Please, note the next meeting date, January 17<sup>th</sup> and we'll send out a calendar  
26 reminder for all of the 2017 meeting. So, January, February, March, April.

27 **Co-Chair Garber:** Alright folks (Crosstalk) Yeah and if anyone is not able to join us on those dates, please  
28 let us know but with that, we are adjourned.

29 **Feedback for Continuous Improvement:**





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

1 **Future Meetings:**

2 Next meeting: January 17, 2017 – Rinconada Library (Embarcadero Room)

3 Topic: Natural Resources Element II

4

5 **Adjournment: 8:30 p.m.**