



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

**TUESDAY, January 17, 2017**  
Rinconada Library – Embarcadero Room  
1213 Newell Road  
Palo Alto, CA 94303  
5:30 PM TO 8:30 PM

1 **Call to Order: 5:30 P.M.**

2 **Co-Chair Keller:** Call role, please

3 **Female:** I apologize if I miss pronouncing anyone’s name. This is my first time doing it.

4 Present: Filppu, Glanckopf, Hetterly, Hitchings, Kleinhaus, Levy, McNair, Moran, Nadim,  
5 Packer, Peschcke-Koedt, Summa, Sung, Titus, Uang, Uhrbrock, van Riesen

6

7 Absent: McDougall,

8 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you and if you would just note in your minutes there that Arthur is just joining  
9 us.

10 **Oral Communication:**

11 **Co-Chair Garber:** Ok, we’ll start off with Oral Communications. We have two speakers. If there is anyone  
12 else that would like to speak, please give us a card. The first speaker is Rita Vhrel. You will have three  
13 minutes.

14 **Ms. Rita Vhrel:** (Inaudible) everyone. I just wanted to ask all of you who had voiced concerns about the  
15 topic about dewatering, to attend the 2/13 City Council meeting where the Public Works  
16 recommendations as modified by Policy and Services Committee, will be reviewed, discussed and  
17 implemented. We’re anticipating a very large number of properties will be dewatering this year and that  
18 also includes the property over at 900 N. California, which will be discussed on the consent calendar on  
19 1/23. This is a property that was divided – a 30,00-square foot property that was divided into three lots.  
20 Each one will have a very large basement and the water table is approximately 5-feet. The other thing I  
21 wanted to say was that I don’t see anything in here regarding fiscal responsibility and I’m wondering  
22 how fiscal responsibility can be separated from Business and Economic Elements. There’s been a lot of  
23 news in the paper lately regarding pensions and CalPERS calculations for our growth and with – I think  
24 it’s 343 million dollars this year of unfunded pension, I think that really needs to be taken into  
25 consideration and hopefully you’ll make a recommendation regarding that. Thank you.

26



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

1 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Our next speaker is Annette Glanckopf.

2 **Annette Glanckopf:** Hi, everyone. This is a public service announcement and we can think of it related to  
3 the Safety Element of the Comp. Plan. I just wanted to make sure that everyone knew that we really had  
4 a fascinating program happening next Thursday night, January 26<sup>th</sup>, next week in City Council chambers  
5 and it is an event for all of the emergency service volunteers and the public. We have an absolute  
6 fabulous speaker from the FBI on the topic of cyber terrorism and – which seems to be a lot in the news.  
7 Trump, even himself said that no computer is safe, even your laptops. There is a reception so come and  
8 have free food at 6:45. The program starts at 7:15 and the speaker will probably be on at 7:30. I have a  
9 couple of flyers if anyone is interested. I will leave them at the back table but hope to see some of you at  
10 the event.

11 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thanks, Annette.

12 **Staff Comments:**

13

14 **Co-Chair Garber:** Staff comments.

15 **Ms. Hillary Gitelman:** Thank you, Dan. Just a few opening remarks. First, happy new year to those of  
16 you I haven't seen. It's still January, the year is young. I'm filled with optimism. Just a few things coming  
17 up on the Council's agenda that I thought you would like to know. We've been holding January 30<sup>th</sup> as a  
18 placeholder with the Council for the Land Use and Transportation Elements that you recommended to  
19 them. Thinking that it would be pushed off to another date when they can spend more time. They  
20 haven't found another date so; the elements are going to the Council on January 30<sup>th</sup> and they're trying  
21 to move everything else off the agenda. So, we will see if they succeed in that but at the moment, if you  
22 are interested in following the trail of the Land Use and Transportation Element as it moves forward,  
23 January 30<sup>th</sup> will be the date and they're polling the Council to see if they can start early at 5 o'clock so,  
24 we'll see – that will – we should know that by the end of this week and the Staff should be up on our  
25 website – on the Clerk's website on Thursday afternoon. In terms of next steps after that, you should be  
26 aware that we are putting the finishing touches on our supplement to the draft DIR that analysis  
27 additional scenarios and that will be out for public review sometime in February. We don't have an exact  
28 publication date but those of you who are following the parallel EIR process to what we're doing on the  
29 policies will want to take note of that. Then, we will be looking for a date -- hopefully, sometime in  
30 March – to take the remaining elements Natural Resources, Safety and the one we're talking about  
31 tonight, Business and Economic back to the Council. Our hope is that between tonight's work, the  
32 subcommittee's work and your next meeting, we'll be in a position to have recommended those three  
33 elements to the Council and we can group them together and bring them through – bring them forward  
34 for the Council's review. Probably, sometime in late March. That's all I have although, moving onto the  
35 next agenda, I'm sure Joanna or Elaine will have something to say to introduce this evening's report.



# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE *DRAFT MINUTES*

1 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Just one item I'd like you all to celebrate with me, Arthur Keller's 60<sup>th</sup>, 29<sup>th</sup>  
2 birthday this weekend.

3 **Agenda Items:**

- 4 **1. Discussion: Business and Economics Element**  
5 **a. Introduction of Business and Economics Element**  
6 **b. Report from Business and Economics Element Subcommittee**  
7 **c. Discussion of Draft Element**

8 **Co-Chair Garber:** With that, let us go to the introduction of the Business and Economic Element.

9 **Joanna Jansen:** Thank you. Hi, happy new year everyone. We're excited to be here tonight and dig into  
10 the Business and Economic Element. I just wanted to start off as we usually do with an overview of  
11 what's happened so far and how we got to what you see in your packet and what the components of  
12 the packet are. So, we make sure that we are all starting off on the same footing. With this element, we  
13 followed what has been our typical practice for starting off a new element for initial subcommittee  
14 review. We started with the original element of course, and the first thing that we incorporated was the  
15 City Council direction from their motion on the vision and goals for the element. Then, in addition, we  
16 incorporated the PTC revisions or those PTC revisions that seemed relevant for the subcommittee  
17 consideration. Then, that was the packet that went to the subcommittee for discussion and they met on  
18 January 5<sup>th</sup> to discuss it. I think one of the very first things that we heard from the subcommittee at that  
19 January 5<sup>th</sup> meeting, was that there was – it seemed to me a pretty strong consensus among the  
20 subcommittee members that this element could benefit from substantial revision and reorganization.  
21 One of the major things that they addressed was some of the redundancies between the Business and  
22 Economic Element, in particularly, Goals 5 and 6 in the – more of the land use and character issues that  
23 were addressed under those Goals for the commercial and office areas. With the subcommittee, we  
24 discussed the reorganization of the element. We discussed the data needs that the subcommittee  
25 wanted to see to help inform the ongoing revisions to the element and then we discussed, kind of, Goal  
26 by Goal the policy concerns and the issues that the subcommittee members thought should be  
27 addressed. Then from that meeting we – Staff and Place Works took a stab at revising the element to  
28 reflect that input. As was noted in the Staff report, we have a really short turnaround time; just a few  
29 days between that meeting and the day that we needed to get the packet out to you, for your review.  
30 Rather – given the extent of that reorganization and overhaul that the subcommittee recommended --  
31 rather than a policy framework like you've you seen for other previous elements, we are presenting this  
32 in a format of an annotated outline with the left-hand side being the policy or in some case the vision or  
33 the Goal language. Then the right-hand side being noted suggesting what the subcommittee talked  
34 about related to that policy or that goal. We also – in your attachments, we have --- the first attachment  
35 Attachment A is just a one-page outline that shows the – excuse me – well, this is Attachment B – should



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

1 be Attachment A – the revised Goal structure; based on the subcommittee input. That’s one piece and  
2 then you have the annotated outline. One of the data pieces that the subcommittee requested is  
3 Attachment C, which is a map of principle employer that goes along with the list that’s in your Staff  
4 report of the top 10 employers. Attachment D was the minutes that’s provided as a link only and then  
5 Attachment E, which looks like a more of the traditional marked up policy framework that we’ve had  
6 from other – for other elements as the format that the subcommittee member Steve Levy used for his  
7 comments so that was that Attachment. That was the only set of written comments that we received  
8 from a CAC Member before the packet went out. (Inaudible)

9 **Co-Chair Garber:** Lisa, yeah.

10 **Joanna Jensen:** D – That is – that’s the packet and of course, in the Staff report, we did strive to respond  
11 to the data request that the subcommittee made. Just in general, a note on those – I won’t go through  
12 each one of the data points that are provided here but just a note on our approach – again, given the  
13 time frame and the constraints that were dealing with, we strove to provide this data based on existing  
14 data sources. The pie charts and the tables and the graphs and everything that you see in your Staff  
15 report are all pulled from existing City documents. We did not attempt to do any new analysis or new  
16 research to pull the Staff report together. All of this is pulled from information that was already available  
17 from various City reports or PTC Staff reports or City Council Reports and of course, we tried in every  
18 case to link you to those original sources and a lot of those sources have much more information. If you  
19 have time to take a look at those, there are many more tables and data that you can explore. This is a  
20 relatively short element and we have the full meeting devoted to it tonight; 3 hours. We have heard  
21 from Committee Members that this element needs a lot of work and that’s what we’re here to do  
22 tonight so we definitely welcome your input. Thank you.

23 **Co-Chair Garber:** Just before we begin, in conversation with Arthur, we would like to appoint Hamilton  
24 Hitchings to join the subcommittees conversations as a member of the subcommittee going forward.  
25 We have room on the Committee and welcome his input and thanks for making the offer. We have –  
26 what we’ll do is hear from the Committee Members that are here and actually, before I do that –  
27 (Inaudible) if you would also acknowledge – or mark on your minutes that Amy has joined us, Elaine and  
28 Mark and I think I’ve got everybody at this point. Thank you. The Members on the subcommittee are  
29 Mark, Don, Alex, Julia, Amy, Steve and Whitney. Mark, do you want to – where are you? Do you want to  
30 kick off with some comments before we open up to everybody else?

31 **Mark Nadim:** I didn’t attend the committee meeting because I was out of town actually. I just got back  
32 over the weekend but looking at the documents that were received. A couple of things that I wanted to  
33 talk about where the – talking about the proposed Goal names for Goals B-1, B-2, B-3. There were a  
34 couple options that were proposed. The first option is always a way too long; the wording. Personally, I  
35 do prefer some shorter wording options. For the online – online shopping is becoming a trend and it’s  
36 only going to increase when the delivery becomes faster. The way it was indicated in the document that



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

1 – basically, to defend or – I’m not sure why the City – what can the City do to stop that for the increase  
2 and the online business? For sure it is going to affect the retail business but like anything else, retail has  
3 to evolve with technology. We may have to help the – we may have to have the City help retail business  
4 leverage the internet shopping in ways that they have not considered or couldn’t afford to do. Basically,  
5 it’s not the online business – we can’t call it a threat because a threat can be stopped but it’s like a tidal  
6 wave which cannot be stopped. This is something that’s going to go on and on and increase in volume.  
7 For the – one of the items – the other items, the 24-hour dining, and services. I have a lot of concerns  
8 about that because they do sometimes – especially the after-midnight business like bars or whatever,  
9 they attract unwanted individuals who may commit – cause a disturbance to the neighborhoods that are  
10 in close proximity so I don’t know how – we need to limit that type of business very close – only close to  
11 downtown, away from residential neighborhoods. Then there’s the concern of having large businesses  
12 or businesses that have a large number of employees – employing a significant percentage of the  
13 downtown office space and the concern is if they decide to move to another location, the downtown  
14 businesses will suffer – the retail businesses will suffer until new businesses fill the available space. It  
15 would be much better to have businesses that occupy a small percentage of office space of the available  
16 office space. Then there’s the Fry’s Electronics fate which – basically, which generates a significant  
17 amount of sales tax. Nothing has been addressed yet and although the – with the online business, I  
18 don’t know if Fry’s will be able to continue for too long. That is something that we also need to address.  
19 That’s it, thank you.

20 **Co-Chair Garber:** Don is not here. Alex.

21 **Alex Van Riesen:** Good evening. I really appreciated being on this subcommittee. I thought it was a  
22 really interesting conversation. I think a couple of things that I came away with, some of which or most  
23 of which were raised on the topics raised by the subcommittee. I think the overarching thing that I was  
24 struck by and I can’t remember who was there from the Chamber of Commerce? Judy Kleinberg. I asked  
25 a number of questions about certain businesses. For example, I was thinking that restaurants in general,  
26 were doing fairly well, I assumed in Palo Alto because it’s so busy. She was saying that there is actually a  
27 number of them that are not doing very well. They are struggling. I think my general perception I  
28 realized, going into the time was thinking because of the City overall – this is true for a number of  
29 people I talk to, is doing well. I mean housing values are going up, people are doing well that – because  
30 of that, businesses are doing well but in actuality, what she said was that was the opposite is true. The  
31 businesses are not doing well and I think there is an appearance there and maybe in the discussion  
32 about maybe also housing but the nature of Palo Alto, that there has been a lack of attention paid to the  
33 business Community. I think this was particularly – I became more particularly aware of this by the  
34 language of the element and I think the element is fairly old; obviously 15-years in its original  
35 conception. What struck me is that the language is so combative and negative and what was interesting,  
36 was out conversation lead to what people like about the nature of Palo Alto? What people like is that  
37 they like it to be a vibrant and active City. Nobody in Palo Alto wants it to be Athert and if you don’t



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

1 have a vibrant business Community of some type – if there isn’t an interdependence and working  
2 together, you will end up with a bedroom Community and you will have Atherton. I was also – basically,  
3 I was struck by the benefit of a thriving business Community, where there is a partnership. I don’t think  
4 anyone here is looking for the business Community to overrun everything else that matters to Palo Alto  
5 but the language may be and the posture of the conversation needs to change. I also thought that – I  
6 think the statistics bear this out but it’s a huge thing to look at the companies that are employing people  
7 but also the role of Stanford in our Community. I think we probably – I think that needs to be considered  
8 much more strongly and I think the idea that tourism is – I think the question whether tourism is a value  
9 or is a ship that has sailed. I think all you have to do it go to Stanford on any given weekday and look at  
10 the bus loads of people that just come to that Campus and there’s nothing that we will do or anyone will  
11 do to stop that. That is going to happen because it is a world-renowned institution and those people  
12 come and those people buy lots of stuff as the graphs illustrate. I would think that’s something we need  
13 to accept, understand and figure out how to work with and appreciate in light of the other values that  
14 we have as a City. Thank you.

15 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Julia. She’s not here, I’m sorry. Amy.

16 **Amy Sung:** I wanted to thank the Staff that really took in all the inputs from our subcommittee meeting.  
17 When we reviewed this element, it really struck, like Alex’s said that the language sounds like more an  
18 (Inaudible) language (Inaudible) instead of a business centered element. During the subcommittee  
19 discussion, a lot of good ideas were brought up, particularly Judy Kleinberg] gave us a very, very good  
20 insight into how a business is doing in Palo Alto. I remember she said that in our effort to support –  
21 wanted to preserve the retail in the City. The right way to think about it is to support our retail. The idea  
22 of a mandating the ground floor retail space is a good intention but it might have unintended  
23 consequences. I thought that one is very true because if you look at downtown, there are areas that  
24 (Inaudible) retail space but really, they – you know, on Alma, away from the core retail centers so that is  
25 one thing. The other thing is that the element – Business Element is in the very last chapter of the Comp.  
26 Plan and it is not even a required element in the Comp. Plan but if you think about it, most of our City  
27 services really come from the business revenues that afforded us all these wonderful services that we  
28 enjoy. Because of that, I wonder if this element deserves an earlier debut instead of being the last one.  
29 Yeah, that would my thoughts. Finally, it is the online business – I think that it is very important that we  
30 recognize and make it our Comp. Plan Business Element an adaptive document so that we keep up with  
31 the time. We should increase the pace of all things internet and e-commerce; that really is on the rise  
32 and so making sure that all policies are flexible and can be adaptive to the changing of time. Thank you.

33 **Co-Chair Garber:** Stephen and then Whitney.

34 **Stephen Levy:** Thanks to everybody. I was going to say right on when Alex finished but I might have  
35 been called out of order for that. I think the first thing we tried to do -- thank you to the Staff – was the  
36 idea that we, the Community and the Council should be informed by where the employment is, where





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

1 the revenue is, where the taxable sales come from, what are the trends in retail? If any element should  
2 be informed by – not determined by but informed by information, this was. If you look at the map, most  
3 of the employment is on lands managed by Stanford. Most of the taxable sales, the largest category  
4 comes from visitors. We've had both Chairmen Garber's Attachment to the meeting agenda but also the  
5 City commissioned Place Work to hire a subcontractor to look at the fiscal impacts of the Comp. Plan  
6 alternatives. Well, this is a Comp. Plan Committee and I think that information should be determined.  
7 One of the speakers talked about making sure that we take account, not make decisions only on but  
8 take account of the fiscal impacts. It's not just the revenue impacts; they're costs and I really want even  
9 more information to come before the Council. I'd like to see 20 employers. I'd like to see where the  
10 downtown employers fit into the list of 20. Ok? A lot of the revisions came from attention between the  
11 document that we were given -- that Jubly Kleinberg said felt unappreciative and negative but so have  
12 the other Members of the Committee. I went back to the City's adopted Economic Development Policy  
13 and the first line is that it's a policy of the City to create an environment that attracts (Inaudible) and  
14 encourages businesses to align with Palo Alto values. We had a long struggle; we're going to have a  
15 struggle here. This is not the Land Use Element. This is not the Growth Element. This is a Business  
16 Element. We've not believed in appreciating, encouraging, and finding rules that allow for businesses to  
17 do the things that we want, then I don't know why we are a discussion it here? There was and we'll all  
18 have to come to grips with it, this character of the City issue that the old Council wrote and I'd love to  
19 hear from Whitney. Looking at a Community that was in 1963 having a regional shopping center, a  
20 regional world cut Research Park, a World Class University, a hospital and medical center that is  
21 expanding and just paid us 32 million dollars and that's all not including the Campus. I think Alex said it,  
22 do this without thinking of our relationship with Stanford and the businesses they manage, seems to me  
23 to be a mistake.

24 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Whitney.

25 **Whitney McNair:** Thank you. I found the discussion we had at the subcommittee meeting just great. It  
26 was one of the best discussion I think, the CAC and a subgroup has had. This is being a required element  
27 but it is important to the health of the Community. There was a recognition in the last Comp. Plan to  
28 have a Business Element and I think it's worth continuing to have it in this one. There should be a  
29 recognition that the business Community – it is an important part of the Community. The business  
30 Community is important to Palo Alto. I have to say, I found it challenging throughout the whole process,  
31 there's no business Community representative on the CAC, which I find that – you know, that is  
32 disconcerting and Stanford's only representative is somebody who can't vote. I mean, to put it into  
33 perspective, it is a very important fiscal component to Palo Alto as a whole and I don't feel – I feel like I  
34 am the only person representing some of those perspectives as we go forward. A healthy business  
35 Community isn't just all about business. It's a well-maintained public transportation system and strong  
36 infrastructure and a diverse population and having a mix of uses and businesses at all stages and sizes;  
37 from start-ups to mature companies. Those are all needed components to a health business and having



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

1 that and having fair and predictable – predictably applied zoning codes are really necessary to the  
2 Community to continue. Flexibility to be able to make changes to meet market demands. Speed and the  
3 process and certainty with that process are key for business. I like the changes that Staff has made to  
4 the element; to the Goals and policies that are more proactive and positive in their language not just  
5 regulatory and punitive. I would push the group to consider taking a topic like retail or restaurants. I’ve  
6 heard that – and really encourage it and promote it and help foster it within the City. You know the only  
7 thing that’s within the plan that’s promoting retail right now is the fact that you have to mandate the  
8 space remain in a retail use but that doesn’t help a retailer who – or a restaurant who’s trying to come  
9 into the City. They want to know that, you know, you’ll help permitting, the entitlement, the  
10 construction process. Maybe you’re streamlining their process. Making it predictable. Each day that a  
11 restaurant or retail business can’t open, it hurts their ability to operate and even function. They don’t  
12 have that long ramp period. They need that – they don’t have the financial ability to go 9-months or a  
13 year and keep doing things over and over in order to open their business. If you want to encourage food  
14 service, have incentives to process it. Have an Economic Development Department that really tried to  
15 promote it, streamlines it and I think you would get it. It’s also a means by which you can get people out  
16 of their cars. I’m looking forward to the discussion and I like – I just will say, in the – there’s a few -- in  
17 the Goals, there’s a few options and call it Option B, I think in most of those is a more straightforward  
18 language and I put my – since I can’t cast a vote, I put my emphasis on those alternatives that have been  
19 provided by Staff.

20 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. We’ll now go around the room. Shani, do you want to start over there?  
21 Actually, why don’t we just start with Ellen. We’ll come back to you last. Can you – yeah.

22 **Ellen Uhrbrock:** Well, I took the opportunity to go to this subcommittee meeting and it was the most  
23 interesting discussion I have ever heard while I have been associated with this organization. Everybody  
24 had a thought and a place and a contribution. The guest all agreed that or the experts that the Staff  
25 brought in, that this was an outstanding meeting and we really were – it was a discussion, it wasn’t just  
26 a statement of I think this and you think that and it was really exciting. It was very fortunate that Judith  
27 Kleinberg was there because she was the one that pointed out and pointed us back to the fact that the  
28 businesses are there to make money and they have to be profitable in order to stay here and grow. It  
29 brought up some very interesting things for me and the Transportation Department because  
30 transportation is key. You’ve got to bring the customers to where the stores are and actually, we’re  
31 working on this very strongly with the senior population. Avenidas and now Channing House and one of  
32 the goals of City Council is to cut single occupancy vehicles (Inaudible) by 30% or so. I look at all these  
33 programs and I looked at them and I think well, how are they going to do that? I looked at that one and  
34 think how can seniors do it and they do it and we’re active – teaching them how to do online  
35 purchasing. Every time you’re online order a batch of something, it saves a trip there and we’re teaching  
36 them to use the Uber’s and the Lift’s and so forth and every one of those cars has three seats in it.  
37 We’re teaching them to offer to share those seats. That they don’t need a car in Palo Alto and you have





# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE

## CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

### *DRAFT MINUTES*

1 an opportunity always, to share transportation with somebody else. It's a change of culture but anyway,  
2 it started really at Avenidas, buying online. It will be continued on Saturday, where we're having a  
3 Transportation Fair at Channing House and we're having a demonstration of how to do it on – Amazon is  
4 a better fact but that's not the key. The key is to get the local merchants to have a way to deliver. It's  
5 the caring home of things that they can't do so the delivery is important to get it back to the home  
6 without taking the trip. Whether it's delivery or however it's done. Ask every retailer that you talk to,  
7 can you deliver it? Make it a – and every retailer should have a good – on their website, how you get  
8 there by transportation and where you park there? You can work together and make it a really exciting  
9 and thriving place to go shopping and open to everyone.

10 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you, Elaine. Hamilton.

11 **Hamilton Hitchings:** That was a great speech; hard to follow. Palo Alto unique location makes it a highly  
12 desirable place for innovative businesses. Palo Alto is at the heart of Silicon Valley, hosting and  
13 surrounding the world's best tech companies. It's located next to Stanford, the leading University on the  
14 West Coast. Both Yahoo and Google were incubated in Stanford and Stanford is currently working to  
15 help drive innovation in autonomous vehicles and A.I. Stanford Research Park hosts many of the leading  
16 techs. companies, including Tesla and VMware. Sand Hill Road with its plethora of VC firms sits next  
17 door. We are a leader in medicine and medical services with Stanford Hospital, Palo Alto medical  
18 foundation and the Veterans Hospital. Palo Alto is the most popular stop on Cal-Train between San Jose  
19 and San Francisco. In the proximity of an abundance of top engineers who live in and nearby our City.  
20 We have an ecosystem like no other and should embrace it through thoughtful policy that serves up our  
21 business needs while minimizing negative impacts. Just as we have micro-units for residential housing,  
22 start-ups and small businesses need smaller floor plans, shorter leases, and multi-unit office buildings.  
23 This can be accomplished through policies such as used permits and zoning changes. Start-ups that an  
24 afford Palo Alto desire hip attractive spaces like IDOs. Start---ups are part of our DNA and should be  
25 supported in this element. The ability to attract and retain top talent is often businesses number 1  
26 concern. Unproductive time commuting means less time at work and with families and hurts the ability  
27 to attract and retain talent. The University (Inaudible) CAL-Train stop draws companies who then grow.  
28 Sometimes they do not transition to Stanford Research Park, such as Palantir and SurveyMonkey. That is  
29 why Cal. Ave should be a bullet train stop and a shuttle running every 5-minutes during rush hour to  
30 SRP. It is also a good reason to widen Page Mill by adding a bus lane and ramp up the per. employing  
31 spending on buses similar to what Facebook and Google do. The trend towards online shopping means  
32 certain types of retail are no longer very viable except for customization is key, such as clothing and  
33 bikes. Likewise, retail proving local services will remain popular. Given the online pressure on retail, we  
34 should not be adding new retail spaces but rather trying to preserve existing retail in our core centers  
35 and stock Stanford shopping center. The plan to add retail to the new garage next to the Public Safety  
36 building is a mistake because it reduces the number of parking spots and hence customers for the  
37 existing retail while creating more competition for new retail. We should add a policy that encourages



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

1 businesses that support strong revenue generation for the City; including hotels and car dealerships in  
2 appropriate locations. Thank you.

3 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thanks, Hamilton. Len.

4 **Len Filppu:** Thank you. I guess my question is, listening to a lot of the comments tonight, is how far  
5 should the City go to make businesses successful? We all want, need and enjoy business but on this  
6 draft in general, I'm concerned that a lot of thoughts about balancing commercial needs with  
7 Community needs have been removed. For example, the opening vision statement, we've deleted  
8 something about the concept of balance so that neighborhoods are protected. Policy – another  
9 example, Policy B-1.3 suggests deleting mention of our tree system which is a hallmark of our natural  
10 environment, important to our Palo Alto brand; that appeals to business. Think tall tree and details  
11 about neighborhood centers. Important to any business and certainly important to Palo Altos. These  
12 are all redundant, they're deleted, they're – they can be referenced in different sections. Even though  
13 their relevancy in both places makes sense and certainly in the business area. I'm concerned that this  
14 draft reads more like a business proposal than a document crafted by the citizens of Palo Alto to explain  
15 our approach to living as neighbors with the robust enterprise. Our City is a host to businesses.  
16 Businesses enjoy our natural surroundings, our services, our spending power, our brand appeal. Without  
17 balance – balance I'm hoping to see in the next draft, we risk toppling. On a housekeeping note, I was  
18 originally on this subcommittee but I had to resign because I knew that I was not going to be able to  
19 attend and I let the Co-Chairs and Staff know about this and now I am delighted to hear that Hamilton is  
20 now appointed. The Co-Chairs might consider encouraging more new members to the subcommittee for  
21 the next re-write in order to help ensure balance. Thank you.

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

23 **Jennifer Hetterly:** Ok, I'm going to get more specific than – I love both your talks there. That was a little  
24 more cohesive thinking than I was able to do today. I hear what everybody is saying about the tone and  
25 being concerned about having a more welcoming tone that doesn't pick one interest against another  
26 interest and I think that's important to build into here. I don't think we quite succeeded with many of  
27 the proposals presented in the annotated outline. However, I think that the vision statement – I think  
28 it's a great idea to eliminate – delete competing and not set it up – it's that dichotomy but I think the  
29 balance that Len mentioned is really important to retain so my inclination would be to retain the original  
30 statement with minor – more minor corrections than they have here. Goal B-1, I think that the  
31 compatibility with residential character and natural environment is very important and I would not  
32 support replacing it with a vague and nebulous term of Palo Alto's values. I do like the idea that you  
33 tried to get at about healthy and stable – about the interdependence between neighborhoods and  
34 businesses. I would suggest revising that second sentence to say something like recognize healthy and  
35 stable neighborhoods contribute to a thriving business and environment which in turn can complement  
36 and support Palo Alto neighborhoods. I think that at every turn where you try to make it more



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

1 balanced, you went a little too far so I'd like to see it step back, not all the way back but step back.  
2 Policy-1.3, I would retain that first sentence about the trees. I think that it is perfectly appropriate to  
3 highlight the canopy as an economic asset in the Business Element and not only refer to it in the other  
4 elements. The thriving economy – I have a lot of comments here. I'm watching that yellow light  
5 (Inaudible) already. Goal B-2 I would retain the Council language. I think the moderating pace of growth  
6 is – job growth is critical to mitigating the jobs, housing and balance. I'm open to the other revisions but  
7 I don't really like the Community at large. I'd rather see local Community or even just Community would  
8 be better and I think enhancing the physical environment is important to retain in there. B-2.1 Policy, I  
9 liked the PTC suggestion of quality of life – adding quality of life so I would like to see that but I'm not  
10 entied to the exact wording. I'd be happy with something that would encourage businesses – new  
11 businesses that enhanced the livability of Palo Alto and meet the City's business and economic goals. B-  
12 2.2, start-ups and emerging industries I think are fundamental to Palo Alto's brands. I don't think that  
13 innovative is an adequate substitute so I think we need to keep looking for words that are going to  
14 properly define what is preserved as Palo Alto's brand that sets it aside from other Communities that  
15 also consider themselves pretty darn innovated, thank you. Policy 3.1...

16 **Co-Chair Garber:** Go ahead and finish your thought.

17 **Jennifer Hetterly:** Thanks. I'm ok with the concept of emphasizing the brand again but I think that the  
18 language in this Policy then immediately dilutes it. I would go back to emerging technology and other  
19 new businesses and if you want to expand beyond emerging and new, the suggestions that Hamilton  
20 had in his written comments for sort of targeting a start uppey kind of businesses in downtown and the  
21 more establish businesses in the Research Park. I think that was useful language that we might want to  
22 consider and I have several additional ones but I'll wait till the next go around. Thanks.

23 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thanks. Annette.

24 **Annette Glanckopf:** Is this on? Ok. A question of balance. Well, first of all, I am really in the camp more  
25 of what Jen and Len had to say and found some of Alex's and Whitney's comments really fascinating but  
26 that being said, I think this document does need a lot of work. First of all, I'd like to say I don't think that  
27 in the future if any attachment -- Attachment E should have been labeled as such as a comment and  
28 included and it was very confusing trying to read through this. That was not good. I feel – first of all, it's  
29 really fascinating looking at some of the comments and I appreciate – the good thing was that all the  
30 charts that were pulled together for this, that if you look at the sales and revenue by area. It's surprising  
31 to me that the greatest component was the – at 37% was the El Camino strip and the neighborhood  
32 centers; at least that's what it was noticed. We do need to preserve the right kind of retail. You know, I  
33 appreciate that a thriving business economy and a vibrate Palo Alto are where we want to go but to me,  
34 there really is a disconnect and reading through this element. There's really an unbalance between this  
35 drive for City revenue and encouraging high-tech businesses. Not that we don't want to do that but that  
36 seems to be the focus versus the quality of life for whatever we want to call it; for the neighborhoods. I



## COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE DRAFT MINUTES

1 want to give you some examples. The first one is Policy B-2.10 which originally said, attach vibrant  
2 business centers, each with a mix of use and distinct character. That was suggested that we eliminate  
3 that section with none of the other sections eliminated. Policy B-3.9, that has to do with the late hours -  
4 24/hours a day and Mark pointed out correctly that you don't want to do this next to a residential  
5 neighborhood or in neighborhood centers. That just doesn't make any sense at all and I could talk  
6 volumes of some of our issues in Mid-town with this. Policy – another example, Policy B-2.4. We talk  
7 about technologies solutions that benefit businesses. Why are we – I mean, this is a business section but  
8 I think that if we're going to focus on technology, it either should be in another section or try to balance  
9 it across all parts of the City. The City is too prescriptive – you know, we're talking about ground floor  
10 retail and Edgewood Grocery. Well, look what happens if you're not prescriptive. I do believe that we  
11 really do need predictability, that's absolutely critical. We don't want to do spot zoning but you end up if  
12 you're not too prescriptive with places like Alma Plaza and Edgewood which doesn't have a grocery so  
13 that really does bother me. On 5 – B-2.1, so we talked about businesses locating in Palo Alto and this is  
14 really a hot button of mine. I agree, that someone said earlier, that the City – is the City going to actually  
15 take a stand and try to encourage any business, whether it be locally serving retail or any other large  
16 company or tech. or innovation – let me just finish my point – to locate in Palo Alto. The City has never  
17 had a philosophy to help businesses to do that and to suggest they do as Policy B-2.1 suggests. I think  
18 they would have to define the current Policy of the Economic Development and if this Policy, B- 2.1 is  
19 included, I want to see the quality of life in the Policy. It's interesting, as a final comment before the  
20 second around, there were no Programs that I saw in this whole element. It's just Policies.

21 **Hillary Gitelman:** I'm sorry, can I just respond to that last comment? I think Joanna said in her opening  
22 remarks, we just didn't have time to get down to the Program level but we'll work with the Committee  
23 on that once we get all your input on the Policy framework here.

24 **Co-Chair Garber:** Ok, anything else Annette?

25 **Annette Glanckopf:** I just have one other comment that sort of fit in high. Some of the comments in  
26 where supposed to be taken out and put in the land use and it really concerns me that I don't know  
27 what that is going to look like when we take it out of here and put it into the land use and to bring that  
28 to Council without any kind of CAC review or Committee review just doesn't resignation.

29 **Co-Chair Garber:** Does Staff want to address that now before we move on or we can save it if you'd like?

30 **Hillary Gitelman:** I guess I'd like to see where we sort of end up.

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

32 **Hillary Gitelman:** This was sort of an overall comment that there was duplication between this element  
33 and land use and, so I think we all need to come to some agreement about how we handle that. Do we  
34 repeat things in both places or do we decide that some of these things go there or vice versa?



# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE *DRAFT MINUTES*

1 **Co-Chair Garber:** Ok.

2 **Joanna Jansen:** If I could just briefly add that I think a lot of places where we mentioned the Land Use  
3 Element, there may be some exceptions, but a lot of them are just a note that there is actually already  
4 something in the draft of the Land Use Element that's redundant. A lot of it is already there in the Land  
5 Use Element. It's not talking about adding a bunch of new stuff.

6 **Co-Chair Garber:** Alright, thanks. Lisa.

7 **Lisa Peschcke-Koedt:** Overall – I'll kind of start with the big comments and then go through some  
8 specific comments. I really do think it's important to have this as part of our Comp. Plan. I know it's  
9 there but even though it's not required, it's critical. As the same as Ellen said that we don't want to be a  
10 bedroom Community. We want to be a mixed, diverse area so I think it's critical to keep in there. The  
11 second part is, I definitely like the more balanced, meaning it use to be sort of anti-business in the  
12 wording, even though I don't think in practice we were. I also agree I think we went a little too far. I  
13 would come back more toward the middle and that includes – I'll mention in the vision and such but  
14 adding in that we definitely want to encourage and support in a sense the businesses. At the same time,  
15 we do want to protect the quality of life and some of the broader goals we have as a residential  
16 Community. I think that balance, I would bring it back a little bit more toward the middle. That – I'll  
17 come to specific comments but just overall. Third was kind of a question which I think right now the  
18 answer is no but we've seen in some other parts of the County, the answer would be yes, which is do we  
19 need to do something to support business or retail for example, below market retail space. Do we  
20 actually have to subsidize in order to have the environment we want? I think right now we are fortunate  
21 and we don't but I'm wondering whether we need to put something in that's at least an open door to  
22 that. If we really don't want to be the next Atherton and I don't, then someday that may become a  
23 problem. I think we're fortunate so far, it's not. Then going to kind of into specific comments. I have  
24 some kind of pages 1 -6 and then on page 11 and I'll try to do these. The vision statement, I would add in  
25 and someone else mentioned this. I think we should add the fiscal responsibility concept, the quality of  
26 life concept and I would include a cross reference in the sense that at the very end saying something  
27 like, including Land Use and Transportation Element so that it ties together. Especially, since we have  
28 taken some out so I can give actual language but it's more in that vision statement. I would add in the  
29 needs of the residents including quality of life. I would add in the fiscal responsibility of one of Palo  
30 Alto's goals and then at the very end, I would tie it to Land Use and Transportation Elements without  
31 going into detail about them. Policy B-1, I think we do need to keep some of the governance. This is one  
32 I think went a little bit too far toward the business friendly – that we – some sort of governance and  
33 regulation there. Page 2, Policy B-1.2, I would add in the – after the economic vitality, I would add in  
34 around the strong neighborhoods. I think someone else mentioned that and then Policy B-1.3 I would --  
35 also someone else said this, I would keep the trees. I think our trees and our canopy are really critical so  
36 I wouldn't leave that out. Page 4, B-2.4, this is a broader question, I don't – back in the days, I think this



# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE *DRAFT MINUTES*

1 was written probably for the fiber-optic work we were trying to do. I think the technology opportunities  
2 are much broader. There's healthcare, there's education – may I go a little longer? Is that ok? Sorry. I  
3 can skip my next round if that's better? I think we should add in here something about broader  
4 technologies advancements to leave that open. It's not just communication and the same would be for  
5 the business side of it. If I go to page 5, I'd prefer the new Goal – the Goal B3, the second one, I think  
6 that's a better way to kind of capture it. Page 6, Policy B-3.6, this might be just a typo where it says  
7 environmental sustainability, is that supposed to be economic? In the notes, it mentions economic. It  
8 was more of a – I think it's economic but anyway, does that make sense? It might just be a typo, at the  
9 very – toward the end of Policy B-3.6, it mentions the City's commitment and environmental  
10 sustainability but environment doesn't fit there. In the comment to the right it says economic, I think it  
11 just might be a typo but if not, I was going to ask someone to explain what it mean, that's all. B-3.8, I  
12 would echo what everyone's already said. I'm very much against the late night and the 24 hours. That's  
13 not what our Community – where I wonder though and it comes to one of the other things we talked  
14 about is, do we need something later at night for teens or something? I'm not talking bars. I'm not  
15 talking stuff open all right. I'm not talking crime ridden, hopefully, things but something for that I would  
16 be supportive of but the broader – it doesn't feel right. I think I just have one more, sorry. Page 11, this  
17 was a question we talked about earlier in the land use and I think the planned development – I'm  
18 forgetting the terminology. The PTC had suggested a new policy about the mix of small and medium  
19 retail business and grocery stores. I think we need to keep something like that to your point but the  
20 other one we had mentioned, across Palo Alto there are some areas that didn't have a local  
21 neighborhood business center. I think we need to put that back in as well. Me, I don't know the answer  
22 but there's a question of are there any sort of underserved, other than Edgewood Plaza maybe, where  
23 we need to look at adding something. Thank you for the extra time and as I said, I can skip my next  
24 round.

25 **Co-Chair Garber:** No need. You may find something to comment on. Elaine.

26 **Elaine Uang:** Thanks for the great work. I do actually think that the balance in this element is better and  
27 business – I guess I would subscribe to the philosophy that business is actually part of our Community  
28 and this isn't just about the big business but it's about the small business. The people who live here and  
29 make their living here in the City. I do echo Amy's thoughts in that I do wish that the business element  
30 had come to us earlier in the timeline because I think it informs a lot of the transportation especially,  
31 and land use pieces and I want to make sure that as it goes back to Council on the 30<sup>th</sup> that either  
32 Council is (Inaudible) or somehow there's a link to the information that was put forward in this. Notably  
33 the fact that the major employers are Stanford University – the Stanford University Health Care, the  
34 Packard Hospital, the Children's Veteran – or the Veteran's affair of the VMRSAP etc. and that when you  
35 look on page 9, 2014 jobs and where they are, 36% of the jobs are located in Stanford Research Park.  
36 That has huge implications on the transportation programs and policies that we would want to put  
37 forward. I think we asked – a lot of us asked for this kind of information up front in the Transportation





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

1 Element, it's a shame to see it now but I think there does need to be some revisiting or integration of  
2 our transportation policies and where – for example, a lot of the focus on TDM was for downtown but  
3 downtown constitutes 9% of the jobs, right? We really need to realign a lot of things based on what's in  
4 this element. The one things that I think people are all forgetting and I mean, I would sit on this  
5 subcommittee but I just don't have the time, but I think small business is lost. By small business I don't  
6 mean the retail business, I mean the small professional businesses and we've forgotten about them.  
7 They've all been squeezed out because of the rents and the rents are too high. There are a lot of  
8 professional services – try finding an accountant in this town. They're gone. They've gone to Santa Clara  
9 because they can't afford the rent here. Try finding an arts or cultural associations. The non-profits have  
10 been squeezed out so I think that's a group of businesses that we've completely forgotten and let out of  
11 this element in a way and we should really think about entrepreneurs. Don't just pertain to technologies  
12 entrepreneur. Somebody mentioned they pertain to food entrepreneurs and they pertain to a whole  
13 series of social services. On the retail issue, I have a real problem – as a lot of people have noted, retail is  
14 not going to be growing in the 15-years thanks to the online businesses. I have a real problem with the  
15 fact that we still ask to maintain ground floor retail. I think we really need to think about broadening  
16 that, especially as we make the link between business – sustainable economics and sustainable business  
17 and land use. We're really talking –what we're really talking about are third places. Nobody talks about  
18 third places but third places are a concept where you activate street level use and you're actually  
19 programming and populating that ground level with something interesting where people will go. I know  
20 Don McDougall likes to talk about gathering places, this is an example. I would offer in addition to third  
21 places or retail or restaurants, public facilities are important. Whether that's medical services or libraries  
22 or you know, Avenidas – you know having satellite Avenidas at ground flood level. Avenidas programs  
23 would be great. I think we just need to kind of change the language a little bit. It's not really about retail.  
24 I just want to add two more things because I'm glad to hear them. I do also want to echo the street  
25 trees. I think the connectivity between builds and the place making and the spaces that accompany land  
26 use is important so street trees – I'm glad Catherine Martineau wrote it in because when I saw that I was  
27 actually really shocked that we would take that out of the Business Element. That is a core part of what  
28 makes businesses want to locate here and I think that's important to retain. Again, yes, the tourism and  
29 the hotels are – I'm glad to hear that being brought up again because there was a big sort of oh, why are  
30 we permitting hotels? There is a need and we've seen that need for a long time. I think we need to  
31 recognize that there are uses that are outdated and that there are uses that are going to increase and  
32 also, yes, provide revenue for our City because god knows, thanks to Prop. 13, we're not really all going  
33 to get that from our residential single family properties.

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

35 **Bonnie Packer:** Hi. My comments are on a very macro level and I may not last through this whole  
36 meeting because are you can see I have a cold. Anyway, a couple things. As some of you know, I have  
37 this historical perspective because I was on the Comp. Plan about 20-years ago, and 20-years ago, from



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

1 a business perspective, this town was very different. When we – so, that’s why I really like the language  
2 that the subcommittee came up with because it’s flexible and it allows us to have a plan that looks  
3 forward for 20-years so flexibility and with concepts that could embrace things that we can’t even  
4 imagine happening in 10, 15-years in terms of retail or that kind of businesses. We have to think of that  
5 every time we look at the wording of a policy or even a program. When we come back at that level, I’m  
6 going to be thinking about is this going to work in 15-years so we have -- we should do that. There’s one  
7 whole area that has not been addressed in this element and that’s the fiscal health of the City. I was  
8 stuck by how much – we are so fortunate to the City utilities as our business that provides revenue for  
9 the City budget that helps us fund all these wonderful ideas that we have in the Transportation and Land  
10 Use Element and the Community Services Element. We need to say something I think, in this element  
11 that is a way that ensures the fiscal health of the City. That the utility part of the City stays strong and  
12 ways that we can do that. I don’t think we even mention that in the Natural Environment Element at all  
13 when we talk about the natural resources but maybe we should include that here because the healthier  
14 the City’s revenues are from all these sources. Then we don’t have to rely on – as much on other  
15 revenue generating businesses if they don’t fit what we want as a City. If you get my point? One other  
16 point, a lot of people have mentioned words or phrases like the quality of life and values. I understand  
17 where you’re coming from and I appreciate the sense of that but we should really be careful because of  
18 the quality of life to me, is different from the quality of life to my neighbor next door. What do we mean  
19 by that? Our vision statement in the beginning of the Comp. The plan talks about, we want this to be a  
20 vibrant, diverse Community. Words like that. I think that’s what we’re talking about. That’s more specific  
21 than just saying the quality of life. I don’t know what the words are that we use. I understand why you  
22 want to have them in there and I agree with that but I think we should use a word other than Palo Alto’s  
23 values. What’s that mean? What’s it means to you? What’s it means to me? It’s a little different. I don’t  
24 have an answer but something for us to think about when we do our word-smithing. (Inaudible) that  
25 means. One other thing as I come to end of my comments. I’m so glad you said what you said about  
26 retail and the streetscapes. The reason we like ground floor retail is it makes a street more like a living  
27 room. It’s a place – it makes it a place where pedestrian wants to walk when we have retail. We don’t  
28 like to see blank windows with just offices behind there but if the traditional retail is going out of the  
29 window, so to speak, other things like having below market rate retail for non-profits, for little  
30 educational – remember when SCORE use to be in Mid-Town and the kids would always be running in  
31 and out of the – you know little places where kids – what? Young Builders, you know, we could use the  
32 retail spaces for educational stuff. You know, expand in either the zoning code or land use what we  
33 mean by what can occupy the ground floor space below offices or below houses in a mixed-use  
34 environment. I think I’m beyond my time so I will stop. If I leave in a little bit, it’s because I’m tired and I  
35 have a cold. Sorry.

36 **Co-Chair Garber:** Shani, I think I passed you up there so let's come back to you.

37 **Shani Kleinhaus:** Thank you.



# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE *DRAFT MINUTES*

1 **Co-Chair Garber:** Stephen has already spoken.

2 **Shani Kleinhaus:** I have a whole bunch of things but I think I'll start by saying that I support a lot – all of  
3 what Jen said and some of the other things that other people have said and I'll try to keep my – I'm sick  
4 too so I'll try and keep my thoughts together. The issue of fiscal responsibility is critical. Other Cities that  
5 have an economic part to their general plan have a fiscal responsibility to go with it. If I look at the City  
6 of San Jose they have a goal of fiscally sustainable ways to management – fiscally sustainable because  
7 they have a water pollution control plant. We have utilities. We have to look at that. We have to look at  
8 how those things are managed. They have in their fiscal sustainability headline, which is a whole chapter  
9 with about 10 pages, City Operations. Provide a full range of City services – this is one of their policies –  
10 at levels consistent with the safe convenient and a pleasant place to live, work, learn and play. Plan  
11 growth consistent with the revenue available to sustain those services. Manage San Jose's future growth  
12 in an orderly planned manner to reduce service cost, maximize utilization of existing and propose public  
13 facilities and enhance City revenues. Identify and maintain reliable ongoing funding sources for the City  
14 services and infrastructure. Those things are important and we just don't have anything about that. The  
15 thing that's going to be even more important is when we don't get any more federal funding for any of  
16 those things, potentially, so we need to think about that. The quality of life, before you leave, to me  
17 means clean air, clean water, trees, a lot of things that are not (Inaudible) is it vibrant or not vibrant? It  
18 really is the basis of our City and those things are going to be eroded with the new administration. They  
19 already said they're going to erode them. We are not going to have guarantees of the Green Water Act  
20 to make sure that we have clear water and that we don't have something that comes subverts that. We  
21 have to have those words in there and I don't see compatibility and quality of life as some kind of a dirty  
22 word, I just don't. I think, you know, there was a word that really puts out conflicts as the focus that we  
23 can take out but we really need to go back to something that doesn't look here as if the Chamber of  
24 Commerce wrote it. I don't have an opposition to having a strong economy in the City. I totally agree  
25 with Elaine that small professional services are gone but there is a conflict between those smaller  
26 accounting services and the innovative stuff that we all want. If you want to have the VCs and the ideas  
27 and all of these guys, then there is no room for the accountants and the HR managers and all those little  
28 offices of different people that have small businesses. I don't know how we can have all of that. Maybe  
29 we have to face the fact that maybe we're not going to have accountants here. Just like we don't have a  
30 lot of – unless we support that in some way. Maybe we need to realize that yeah, retail is going away  
31 and (Inaudible) foods – food is going away. If you look at those new economies and the big companies,  
32 the provide everything. They provide breakfast, dinner – lunch and dinner. They provide washing  
33 services. All these other things and as these (Inaudible) – now there's the new fashion, it's all over the  
34 news – like the advertisement that people can get boxes delivered with all their foods and you just have  
35 to put it together and stick it in the microwave. We're going to lose a lot of retail at every level so I think  
36 we need to think about that. I had specific things that, you know, I think that – again, other than the  
37 very specific highlights of conflict, the previous language was more acceptable to me. I would take out  
38 the things that really try to stick residents against business but keep the compatibility intact, keep the



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

1 trees, keep the quality of life and really look at how do we work these things gently and not just push  
2 over the edge from one side that was not all the hospitable to business to one that's not very hospitable  
3 to people. Really need to look at that very carefully. Thanks.

4 **Co-Chair Garber:** Ok, great. Arthur.

5 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Firstly, in terms of moving policies and programs, sometimes they get  
6 deleted from one place and they don't get inserted somewhere else. I know that that happened with the  
7 Community services comment about the requirement for looking at impacts of schools on zoning  
8 changes. That seems to have been deleted with the intention of putting it somewhere else but it never  
9 appeared somewhere else so I have concerns about that process. We had BMR retail, we tried BRM  
10 retail for non-profits in 101 Lytton. Little did we know that the BMR Lytton for a – the BMR retail for a  
11 non-profit turned out to be for the Chamber of Commerce, which is a 501C6, I believe. So, it is a 501C  
12 but it's not a 501C3. When you think about non-profit, think about what kind of non-profit you're  
13 actually taking into account. Also – let's see. The next thing is – in terms of moving policies around, look  
14 at the difference between Policy B-5.7 that's been deleted and the proposed land use Policy L-4.8. B-5.7  
15 talks about (Inaudible) development turning the district California (Inaudible) to regional shopping area  
16 or intruding it in the residential neighborhoods. There's nothing about that in 4.8 so there not the same  
17 thing. Maybe that thing could be moved to 4.8 but we're not going to get land use back to be able to do  
18 that. They're not the same. I think that – I don't understand – I agree with Bonnie about – I don't know  
19 what Palo Alto values means? It's very vague but I agree with Shani that quality of life makes sense and  
20 other people have spoken to that as well. I think start-ups are part of the culture of Palo Alto and the  
21 increases of rents have – and large businesses have taken over downtown and squeezed them out. I  
22 think that that's disconcerting to me. It's also disconcerting to me the idea that professional services are  
23 being squeezed out. Why are we squeezing out the professional services – I think it's 2600 El Comino, I  
24 think that's the address with the tall building with Bank of America on the ground floor. Why are  
25 allowing that to be torn and being replaced by some large research and development office space  
26 instead of professional services which are what it's zoned for? It's not zoned for large office space.  
27 Neither is the building on Sherman. That's not zoned for large office space which is occupying it. We  
28 need to enforce our zoning and make sure that we are – that there's space for professional services.  
29 That we are not squeezing them out. That's an important consideration that needs to be here. I agree  
30 with Elaine Uang in terms of the 9% for downtown and 36% for the Stanford Research Park. We need to  
31 put a lot more emphasize on reducing driving, reducing transportation management for the Stanford  
32 Research Park and I'm glad that Whitney is talking about commitments to do that. I think we need to do  
33 a lot more and we need to put a lot more emphasize on that than we are for the Stanford Research Park.  
34 Also, in terms of professional services, not only are we losing accountants, we're losing phycologists and  
35 psychiatrists. Look at 550 Hamilton, there was an outcry about replacing that with yet another office  
36 building. How is that square with Project Safety Net? Last two comments. One is 24-hour businesses.  
37 Well, where are you going to put them? Are the 24-hour businesses going to be downtown and if you



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

1 put more housing downtown, does that mean that the people complain about noise because of 24-hour  
2 businesses? I think we need to think carefully about where we encourage business environment and  
3 what the hours we encourage business environment and where we put housing and the compatibility of  
4 those. I know that there are businesses located on East Meadow Circle for years, for decades and then  
5 two, 75-unit each housing complexes went in on East Meadow Circle. They were townhouses and they  
6 complain about deliveries that happen at night that happened before they were there. Before the  
7 residents were there. The businesses were there first. The residents weren't told about night time  
8 deliveries from Loral. They're there so we need to understand more about that compatibility in terms of  
9 businesses and retail. Also, I'm not sure if I mentioned that Goal B-1 and B-2, I prefer the first option to  
10 the second option. I think this first option is much clearer. Thank you.

11 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thanks. Some very general comments and then I'll come back in the second round but  
12 I did want to start off with some sympathy to Whitney. Not only are there some large commercial  
13 entities not represented but it's something that I noted in months past the previous Comp. Plan had  
14 quite a number of large commercial property owners, it had contractors, it had architects, it had land  
15 use attorneys. I'm not a very good proxy for the full gambit of professional services. Any rate, a pet  
16 peeve of mine. I am in total agreement with, I think everyone here, who has recognized the language  
17 from 15-years ago, doesn't quite meet my expectation of what this element is about. I think Alex was  
18 talking about the old language being combative. Len was talking about balance. You know, as I just even  
19 glance through the titles to the varies goals and programs, there's this bipolar dichotomy that's really  
20 emphasized between businesses and neighborhoods. You know, it's this sort of (Inaudible) server  
21 concept that one is really serving the other for the benefit of one over the other. In my mind, what this  
22 element should be about is the City as a single organism. That it – in order to be what we want it to be,  
23 it needs all of these pieces and they are self-sustaining in a synthetic and integrated whole. This gets to I  
24 think, Bonnie's comment about the overall City's fiscal health. The point there – I want to be careful  
25 with balance because balance is, you know the – one of the images in our head is that that's a balance  
26 between two things and you're trying to get the scale to be level. The reality is that we're balancing lots  
27 of different things. I had – sort of the last minute, suggested to or I had offered to share this report that I  
28 did two years ago – two years ago mind you, not – so, it's two years out of date but I was very curious to  
29 figure out where the sources of income were coming into the City and how they benefitted the City's  
30 general fund because it's the general fund where we get all the money to provide the services to our  
31 Community. That money does not come from utilities and Bonnie is already gone but in the '70s, the  
32 State law prohibited monies that were generated by utilities from being redistributed back out through  
33 the general fund. They can only benefit the utilities and that's why the City stopped its building  
34 campaign because when they were benefitting from the new utility services that they were providing  
35 Stanford. They generated millions of dollars and created City Hall, the Art Museum and I don't know,  
36 half a dozen other buildings around town but that all stopped in the '70s. The City is now getting more  
37 than half its revenues from its real estate. One of the interesting facts that I was very surprised by is that  
38 of that, 2-years ago, 54% of the funds coming into the general fund. A third of that comes from lands



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

1 which are not business or commercial. It comes from single family homes. It comes from our  
2 neighborhoods through the transfer taxes. That's a third so revenue sources aren't just from business  
3 lands. They're from all the lands and you know, to create or single out just businesses or the commercial  
4 properties, just isn't the way the world is organized. It is really important for us to recognize, in my  
5 mind, through this element that the City is an integrated whole and that each contributes and each  
6 relies on the other to create a quality of life, however you want to define it. For me it is the services we  
7 all enjoy because Palo Alto has – I think most of you are aware, a level of service that is significantly  
8 higher than the surrounding Communities and costs a tremendous amount more. The last thing I want  
9 to do because I've got only a year or two more before I'm going to be joining Ellen over there – talking  
10 about SOVs and how I'm going to get around and not driving. I don't want to be paying higher taxes and  
11 I want the City to find ways to be able to continue to support that through the use of its various revenue  
12 sources to the degree that it can. Anyway, those are some very general comments. Let's open it up to  
13 some additional comments. Does anybody else want to talk? Alex, Hamilton, Lisa, Shani, Stephen,  
14 Mark...

15 **Co-Chair Keller:** You just want to go around?

16 **Co-Chair Garber:** Ok. We can go around. We'll just go around because everybody's got their tags up.

17 **Co-Chair Garber:** If they don't want to talk they can pass.

18 **Co-Chair Garber:** Yeah, that's right. Why don't we start at the other direction? Stephen, can we start  
19 with you and we'll go that way?

20 **Stephen Levy:** On many important issues, we are a divided Committee. Our process to date when there  
21 have been divisions have to bring to Council a variety of options representing the viewpoints, diverse, on  
22 the Committee. That's what the Staff and Joanna did. That's why they gave alternative big picture  
23 wordings on the Goals. I'm sure at another subcommittee meeting we can word-smith those but I think  
24 they should go forward as competing different views. Committee Members can come to the Council. I  
25 think that's the process we favored. I obviously and many of the subcommittee members favor the  
26 alternative language that's been set forth by the Staff. Second, on two really important issues. I've lived  
27 here 50+ years and what I don't want is to have a retail policy in the City completely divorced from the  
28 realities of how people are spending and what is possible and who provides the revenue. The second  
29 thing I don't want is to try and provide first class services where the entities that provide the revenues  
30 for those services are discouraged. The third thing I don't want to is to have all the things that we want  
31 to be divorced from having enough customers to support them and as Ellen said and others, having  
32 access for them to get to the places that we want them to spend their money. I see a lot of that so I  
33 hope we can find some agreement around that. The word, Arthur, Palo Alto values came from the first  
34 paragraph of the City's adopted Economic Development Policy. I find some of the languages in the





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

1 existing element ambiguous. I think all of these terms quality of life, residential, character, Palo Alto  
2 values, are ambiguous but I don't think one is more or less ambiguous than the other. I hope the  
3 Committee can appreciate that when Judy Kleinberg or any business person comes into the room and  
4 the very first line of the very first policy they see says, use a variety of planning and regulatory tools  
5 including growth limits. That was the very first Policy line in the existing element. Then the second goal  
6 had moderate the rate of job growth – it's 7 o'clock. Don't charge me for the time. I'm happy to try and  
7 find some balance. I'm happy to find another place to put street trees in but not before the businesses.  
8 Other people have seen anything about supporting them because that's where street trees were in the  
9 element as written. Does that mean my time is up? Do I get charged for the time when the lights were  
10 out?

11 **Co-Chair Garber:** Go ahead. We've been being pretty liberal about our three-minute limit. Finish up.

12 **Stephen Levy:** Yeah, I mean for the people who want it like it was, appreciate the almost near unanimity  
13 that you heard from subcommittee members. Only one of which, Whitney, could in any sense be called  
14 a business person but she's not because of Stanford University while they have land that businesses are  
15 on, it's not a business. The last comment, I really don't like a business because I'm interested in a non-  
16 profit organization that has employers and has a role in the City and I don't know where to go with that  
17 but all of the organizations that employ people and provide services here are not for profit businesses,  
18 including Stanford University.

19 **Co-Chair Garber:** Forgive me just for definition, you're saying – when you say you don't like businesses,  
20 you don't like the word business, the name? How its...

21 **Stephen Levy:** (Inaudible)

22 **Co-Chair Garber:** I understand.

23 **Stephen Levy:** (Inaudible)

24 **Co-Chair Garber:** Yeah, employers, maybe something.

25 **Stephen Levy:** (Inaudible)

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

27 **Elaine Uang:** On that point, I kind of agree with Stephen on that. Business may not be the right name.  
28 Don McDougall, in his notes, made a comment about how maybe it should be business – the Business  
29 and Retail Element. I do actually think that we might want to consider renaming it something like the  
30 Sustainable Economics Element or something like that so that we're encompassing a broader scope and  
31 the fiscal health that Bonnie mentioned of the City. Ensure that we have the multiple uses and services  
32 that we need to support everybody, not just residents but the broader Community. I do also – back to



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

1 prescriptive uses and non-prescriptive, again, I just want to emphasize my own personal pet peeve  
2 which is that very, very overly prescriptive uses are not going to serve us well. The whole grocery store  
3 de bocal; yes, it's probably good to have grocery stores in certain areas but when you can't sustain that  
4 kind of business in a location and that building just goes to waste. I think it's not going to serve our  
5 Community well. You know, why do we have to say this can only be a grocery store? Why can't it be a  
6 climbing gym or why can't it be a play house for birthdays or something like that. I just – I think we're  
7 missing an opportunity for Community members to make a living or to serve the broader Community by  
8 not allowing certain uses in a place. I also just want to support – this goes back the connection between  
9 the businesses or this particular element and the Land Use Element. I think that layered uses are an  
10 important consideration and that doesn't mean that they have to be incompatible. I understand the  
11 concerns with respect to noise so 24-hour establishments and housing or light commercial next to new  
12 housing. I think you can solve those problems. You obviously don't want to put incompatible uses next  
13 to each other but I think a layered use can actually support a much more vibrant and richer ecosystem  
14 of businesses. I think – I don't know necessarily think that Facebook wanted to leave downtown, Palo  
15 Alto. I think there's a reason why Palantir tries to stay in downtown Palo Alto. It's because they have  
16 access to lots of restaurants and this sort of really rich dynamic environment and they don't have to go  
17 out and create all of these new services just to serve their employees while they're there. I think the  
18 single use model of the building, which was – dates back to the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, it's just totally  
19 outdated. I think people like downtowns. They like the mixed uses. They like the layering and the  
20 convenience of being able to go from one place – you know go to school, to the drug store, to the  
21 restaurant, to the toy shop or whatever, in a very easy fashion and I think that actually create an  
22 opportunity to serve a whole host of smaller businesses. I think in a way by saying, ok, only retail can go  
23 here and nothing else around it, is doing that business a disservice because of you suddenly lose that  
24 access to customers. Whether that's office workers or people who live nearby or you know, other  
25 community members. I personally just want to put out – put it out there that – again, this is just going  
26 back to the need to relink the policies in this element to land use. We really need to kind of, you know,  
27 think about what we want from a sustainable economic perspective and how to get the land uses to  
28 support that. One last thing, I actually really liked just looking at the policies and not the programs. I  
29 made it a lot easier to read and just kind of a heads up, even though this is the last element. It kind of  
30 helps you get your head around the bigger picture without getting bogged down in the minutiae and I  
31 actually thought that was really helpful.

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

33 **Mark Nadim:** I thought it was interesting to hear Alex saying that the businesses aren't doing as well in  
34 Palo Alto. I thought the downtown especially, was very vibrant and people are making good money of  
35 there but it seems I was wrong. It would be beneficial to know why that is? Is it because the rents are  
36 too high because the customers are there, so what causes them not to be able to make good profits?  
37 How can the City help? What to include in this element that would address that? That's one thing. The



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

1 other one is the office space in downtown especially. We know Palo Alto is an exclusive address for  
2 start-ups. We need to provide start-up space in downtown rather than having one large company that  
3 occupies 50%-60% of the office space. This lowers – basically when you have one uniform type  
4 company, it lowers diversity of businesses and then also, large companies can afford to provide services  
5 like lunch and dinner or laundry services or whatever. Small start-ups cannot afford to do and that will  
6 basically support the local businesses, so start-ups have a lot more to offer than just products and  
7 employees. That’s what I wanted to mention. Thank you.

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

9 **Lisa Peschcke-Koedt:** Thanks. Couple more comments. One goes to the same thing about the retail and  
10 the mix of retail and the growth of the online shopping and stuff. It seems to me as a part of our – this is  
11 the next level on the plan so it’s kind of the program; is to look into what types of businesses, whether it  
12 services, whether it’s retail, whatever, are really needed by our local residents and also local workers --  
13 local employees. That’s most like to not go away with online. The second is I really like Ellen’s idea of  
14 how do we get a more – maybe a – or at least this area, a delivery system for the local retail. We do  
15 want to keep it so that not everyone needs to travel but I think just tying that together is kind of part of  
16 the future of it. Then I had – this is more of an administrative question is, I thought but I don’t know that  
17 online sales, the sales tax go to the address and so Palo Alto would still get our fair share of online sales.  
18 It’s more of an issue of how do we want to use our space rather than it’s necessarily undermining our  
19 risk as such. Is that true?

20 **Hillary Gitelman:** We do get a piece of online sales but not as much as...

21 **Lisa Peschcke-Koedt:** Not as much as local sales. Alright, so it’s part of the next there. Then the last, was  
22 I think you and someone else mentioned I like the new words about the innovative business that we  
23 (Inaudible) but I actually think we should also keep start up because it’s just a commonly used word and  
24 it really – I mean it’s even in the movies and stuff, right? I think it just gives it part of the flavor of it and I  
25 don’t see a downside of keeping it. You can kind of add to it but that was it. All my main comments –  
26 you gave me the time earlier, thank you.

27 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thanks. Annette.

28 **Annette Glanckopf:** I’m going to pick up some pieces and as far as changing the name, I’d be fine with  
29 economic vitality. Please don’t use the words sustainability. It’s just too confusing being very direct. Just  
30 a couple of pieces. The delivery systems which of course, I think is a great idea. It’s now called Google  
31 express. Anyone can get it and it’s pretty easy to use. I think that Elaine expressed the concept to trees  
32 just beautifully. I’m to support Catherine Martineau’s reasoning for keeping it in. Again, predictability is  
33 very, very important for zoning and it seems like that’s not really what’s happening. I mean every new  
34 business wants something that a little bit beyond the envelope, so code enforcement, sticking to rules is  
35 like premo. on my list of things. I agree the process has to be absolutely easier for the new businesses



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

1 especially, for the small businesses. It's not really in here any were but I would really prefer to go back to  
2 the time when we did the large development of a commercial property would go to the PTC first and  
3 land use would be approved before it ever went to the ARB and everyone had their mind made up about  
4 oh, I have the right to develop this. I'd like to go back to the retail component and I do agree that it is  
5 changing and we don't know what it's going to be in 15-years. In neighborhood centers that are exactly  
6 what they are. The three neighborhood centers – I would like to make a case that we need to have  
7 ground floor retail. We need to protect it and we do need to be prescriptive about the uses. You go to  
8 any center in Palo Alto and you can't even find parking. People are out there smooshing in cafes. They  
9 want ice cream. They want coffee. They do want local services. Maybe not Downtown and I think that's  
10 an element or maybe not even long El Comino but I like to go to one place and shop and get everything  
11 done. I'm not maybe going to go browse for dresses or something like that in a shopping center but I  
12 don't want to have to drive to another City to do some of my shopping. Now I know grocery shopping  
13 could be done via Amazon or even a local delivery but you know, somehow you like to have the personal  
14 touch. A number of years ago, when Dena Mosser was Mayor, there was a task force that really wanted  
15 to do shop local which I think is really an issue for any retail whether it be small, large, whether it's  
16 changing or not. One of the interesting factors is sort of retail begets retail. If you just have one tiny little  
17 retail place there and then a couple of other offices or whatever and then another retail. People don't  
18 go there. They don't have the foot traffic. Back to another comment, I really think that if we want to  
19 maintain some form of retail, whatever that happens to be at the time as it changes, that the City does  
20 need to play a better role. Which they don't, they just sort of – this not critical it's just been a policy  
21 where we sort of monitor and track and analysis but if a small business came to the City, to economic  
22 development and I've had experience with three businesses that tried to do this. They would say, I've  
23 got this great new idea for a business model. You know, where should I locate, etc.? Can you help me?  
24 Even though there is someone in the Development Center that could possibly act as a mentor to go  
25 through all the processes. There's no one that really helps that little small business decide where the  
26 best place is and what the best market might be for the business and I think that's something that we  
27 need to consider. Maybe not in the Comp. Plan but I do think the City could play a role and I also think  
28 Council Members could play a role. For a while back, Council Members would sort of informally and  
29 given – this has to do with even large businesses. How you maintain large businesses or any store in the  
30 City. They would just go visit them periodically. We don't ask how businesses are doing. We track them  
31 and monitor them but we don't really do the customer service kind of thing. My final point is I also agree  
32 that we're losing some of these valuable small, little businesses like PCAs and accountants and  
33 whatever; notary republics. In my observation, at least in Midtown and this is probably illegal but these  
34 little businesses although they don't – because of rent, do not exist in the retail centers. They are  
35 moving to their homes and so, I don't know if that's good or bad but we might want to either  
36 accommodate that with some sort of policy. I mean there is some informal things if you don't have very  
37 much parking, you have one client at a time, it's so bad but that's where they are going. I don't know if  
38 that's the right direction or not. I'll pass the baton here.



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

1 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Jen.

2 **Jennifer Hetterly:** I actually also – like Elaine mentioned the annotated approach. I thought it was really  
3 helpful to have the notes explaining why this was the proposed change. One of the things I wanted to  
4 comment on came from that in fact, Policy B-3.6, the notes suggest that the subcommittee was really  
5 looking for some – make something more clear about diversity and revenue generation being critical  
6 together. I don't think this language really gets at diversity, as side from saying all businesses should  
7 contribute to sustainability. I'd rather – I think it can be easily corrected with language that wouldn't be  
8 controversial. We could say a diversity of businesses that generate revenue for the City are crucial for its  
9 fiscal sustainability because it's not just the revenues that they bring in but it's the mix of revenues that  
10 allow you to weather the highs and the lows. So, it's actually the diversity that is critical not just the  
11 revenue that's critical; as well as Community well-being. Businesses of all kind should be called upon to  
12 advance the City's commitment to Community and environmental sustainability. Lisa had asked, did you  
13 really mean environment instead of economic. I thought you actually did mean environmental because  
14 that diversity is key, not just to the fiscal sustainability but also to the quality of life as well as the  
15 environmental. I'd love to see a change like that, that I think would meet everybody's needs. Policy 3.8  
16 about small businesses being vital to the economy. It seems to me and I wasn't in the meeting to get  
17 Judy's blurb about business but it seems to me that we have lots of large and medium size business in  
18 Palo Alto and what's at greatest risk are the small and independent business. This policy seems to focus  
19 on supporting small businesses but also, at the same time wants to support them as they grow into  
20 bigger businesses. It isn't putting a limit on how big that is. I'd like to see it split into two pieces so that  
21 the first one is just about the small business and says, small and independent businesses are vital to a  
22 diverse and innovative economy. The City will encourage retention through policies that preserve their  
23 access to suitable, viable and affordable locations as opposed to what's in here about helping them find  
24 a location. I think the City plays a critical role in creating a regulatory regime that assures the existence  
25 of suitable locations for small businesses that won't happen with the free market. I'd like to see that  
26 change and then a separate policy that gets at the growth – as the retention of those businesses as they  
27 grow and change. Not every small business wants to grow so we want to retain them even if they're not  
28 growing and we don't want Facebook or I don't want to Facebook, a company of that size to be located  
29 in Palo Alto. I think that is very unsustainable for us. I'd rather that piece focused on medium size and  
30 kind of put a handle on it a little bit. The – recognizing the growing online threat to retail. A lot of people  
31 have talked about that today. I'm not sure we need a policy that we're going to recognize that growth. I  
32 think it would be much more useful to look at either if we want to preserve something in the face of that  
33 threat, then we ought to have policies and strategies identified here that would do that. If or  
34 alternatively, maybe what the purpose that was intended was just that that's how we justify abandoning  
35 efforts to support certain kinds of retail. We have to decide what it is we're trying to say here and I think  
36 it's not clear the way it is written now. I'm sorry, that was B-3.4. I just have a few more, sorry. B-5.4, it  
37 deletes – what was happening here? Oh, recognizing that downtown office workers support the  
38 downtown retail. Seems to be that a significant addition here and I don't see any clear substance of



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

1 connection between that statement and the rest of the policy. If the CAC wants to include recognition of  
2 downtown office workers supporting retail, then I think the data needs to be better flushed out than it is  
3 in the Staff report so far and that it should be in a separate policy or program that also addresses the  
4 types of retail by user and considers tools to achieve the desired mix. That's going to expand the uptake  
5 across user's groups as opposed to just a recognition that doesn't accomplish anything. I do not support  
6 the option in the notes there to acknowledge ground floor retail will only be viable in the commercial  
7 core. I don't think the data is sufficient to establish such a black and white conclusion. Particularly, in  
8 this extraordinary period of demand that we're in that, may or may not continue and creates  
9 extraordinary rents along with it. Policy 6.5, I would retain the language about working to address  
10 changing needs within the context of the City's planning goals and policies as opposed to just a blanket,  
11 we're going to do everything we can to help Stanford Medical Center do whatever they want to do. I  
12 think it helps to sort of pull back a little bit and put in context what we have control over or interest in.  
13 Finally, Policy B-6.6 is the deletion about actions that increase the cost of business space. It seems like  
14 the rewrite completely changes the intent of the policy away from a cost containment idea towards a  
15 blanket redevelopment which is ironic, likely to raise the cost of doing business. I don't think those two  
16 concepts go well together in a single policy and I'm not sure that they can even be reconciled in the  
17 same element. I think we should figure out what exactly we want to say about that in that area. Finally, I  
18 think – I liked Annette's mention of, in the predictability of the importance of the consistency of  
19 enforcement as well as the risk – dangers posed by – sorry – by spot zoning; that all goes together under  
20 the umbrella of predictability. It's not just for businesses to anticipate what they can or can't do. It's also  
21 for residents to be able to anticipate what they will or won't do. I think fiscal health is – was mentioned  
22 by Rita, is something that needs a little more – added here. I'm not sure what exactly but I would love to  
23 have suggestions that take that further. I think there should be something in here that talks – maybe it  
24 will come up in the discussion of programs that strengthens the office of Economic Development which  
25 is sadly neglected and not Staffed and that includes a recognition that those efforts should cross over  
26 into public-private partnerships around quality of life and investments as well because of the same  
27 interdependence that we're talking about here. Economic development is not just about building  
28 thriving businesses. It's about building a thriving Community and then the business in the Community  
29 thrive together. That's all. Thank you for the extra time.

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

31 **Len Filppu:** Yes, thank you. On fiscal responsibility, I think it would be real important to discuss this in  
32 some way for an example, one of the things that could be done; Palo Alto is continuing a trend to  
33 outsourcing services such as garbage and operation of the Rinconada Pool and other things like that. It  
34 would be interesting to see how those increased contract services and cost for that. As they go up, do  
35 salaries and benefits go down? Those kinds of items that are of interest to all of our stakeholders  
36 especially, the citizens. I think it's a good area to pursue. On the – I just want to be wary of making  
37 decisions on policies and procedures or programs based on antidotal information such as downtown





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

1 business profitability based on input from the Chamber, which is a lobbying organization. I think we  
2 need to have real clear verifiable data on that. I have no idea whether the information passed around  
3 tonight is correct or not. Having worked in Washington I know you often get lobbied, always, on  
4 everything, all the time. I really urge us to continue the process of providing a range of options or  
5 options to the Council where there is disagreement. I don't really hear a lot of disagreement on things  
6 tonight. I hear kind of the middle way is the best way to a lot of these things but where there is  
7 disagreement which is the right of a large group of people like this. I think we should provide those  
8 options to the City Council. Thank you.

9 **Co-Chair Garber:** Hamilton. Thanks, Len.

10 **Hamilton Hitchings:** So many great comments tonight. I'll try and limit my thoughts to 3 minutes. I'm  
11 going to start directly with that last comment. I don't believe on this element we should be presenting  
12 multiple choices to the Council. What's that really saying is we're going for a 5/4 vote and we're not  
13 basically, coming together as a Community and building our differences. This isn't like the height limit or  
14 the office cap. These are essentially non-substantive policy statements so it's – there's not a lot to be  
15 gained by a 5/4 vote on Council. I believe and I know we can work together to get a language which will  
16 encompass a lot of the good themes like less confrontation, more cooperation. You know this is also  
17 partly a marketing document. I totally agree with Stephen that order matters and you know, while I  
18 think some of those things incompatibility should stay in. Probably not the best thing is the opening  
19 statement. We should be telling about how we love our businesses and we're doing a lot to support  
20 them but I think it should be in there somewhere – like the trees for example. When I read this, I didn't  
21 feel it was pro-business enough because it wasn't addressing the core concerns of our major businesses;  
22 like the fact that somebody's not going to take a job at SRP because they don't want to wait on Page Mill  
23 for 20 minutes every morning or that startups – you know I just got 15 million dollars in funding from  
24 Andreessen Horowitz, so I got plenty of cash to put down for a nice space on University Ave. but there  
25 aren't any small units because everybody knows they can get more per square foot if they go to a  
26 10,000-square foot block for the entire floor rather than partitioning it up into smaller units and that's  
27 why zoning and things like use permits – we really want to – we have – I think – my personal opinion is  
28 we have enough large business and so we should really be thinking about making changes to policies to  
29 try and make these smaller spaces like this one we were talking about on El Comino or if there is a  
30 replacement for 550 Hamilton, we should really be – basically requiring to make smaller space for  
31 professional, VC offices, startups. It's fine to be high end. It should be very attractive but they should be  
32 the smaller spaces. I feel like this element should go further in terms of pro-business. On the other hand,  
33 I feel like we do – we shouldn't strip all language about minimizing the impacts on the residential  
34 neighborhoods. We don't have to lead off with it in the first sentences or anything like that but  
35 somewhere in the element we should just be talking about how we want the businesses to be sensitive,  
36 especially to the residential neighborhoods and there was nice language in there about that and I think  
37 that still should be in there. I liked Elaine's ideas about – you know she had to leave, right? About



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

1 renaming the title. For example, business and retail, if you look at the revenue from sales, retail is a  
2 huge part of sales or economics but I think we really – I don't feel this element does enough for retail  
3 and Stephen and I agree that you know, essentially retail needs to be a little more concentrated. I think  
4 especially around the (Inaudible), it might – if you look at where North Face was, that might not be the  
5 best place for retail but you do want concentration and density of retail and we want to protect and  
6 foster those areas. I have some more stuff. I don't think is the element to relitigate the land use. One  
7 comment on Edgewood – I really wish Elaine was here. Edgewood was a deal where in exchange for  
8 agreeing to pop up a grocery store, they got 30 million dollars in condos. The property that they owned  
9 was not zoned for – they swore up and down that it was no problem prior to building and selling those  
10 condos and then as soon as they got them sold and they hadn't been able to sub-lease it above what  
11 their last leasee had done, they claimed it wasn't feasible and it's very unclear whether the contract  
12 they wrote with their subleasee will allow them to comply with the rules of the City. I think Elaine  
13 essentially miss characterized that specific situation and furthermore, in this specific element we don't  
14 talk about specific uses so essentially, it's not relevant but it rubbed me the wrong way so I had to –  
15 because I live like right next to it and I can't shop there. The last thing I wanted to talk about was Dan's  
16 things and as an engineer, I love data. A couple of comments on it. It tells us how important retail is to  
17 our City revenue and as Dan pointed earlier, we can't use the utility revenue for other things than  
18 utilities. A couple other points. First of all, sales tax is greater than occupancy tax. Single family property  
19 tax is great, at least it was in 2013, then commercial property tax. I don't think you can – there's one  
20 kind of decision you can lump sale tax, hotel tax, and office space but if you look at office space by itself,  
21 it actually not that – it's actually less office space – office space generates less than single family  
22 property. I think the big take away there is occupancy tax and sales tax are very important to City services  
23 and that's why I like to continue retail. The last thing I'd say is with Palantir they do have that cafeteria,  
24 I've actually eaten in it. It's quite nice but it is pulling a little bit of revenue away from the local  
25 businesses. While I feel like the element needs a lot of work. I do feel like we can get there. The last  
26 thing I'll say is I made a lot of specific comments that I do not want to go through in this meeting but in a  
27 subcommittee, you know, we can go through them point by point. I'm hopeful.

28 **Co-Chair Garber:** So am I, Hamilton, so am I. Ellen.

29 **Ellen Uhrbrock:** I was on the transportation subcommittee and I would like to ask that we have another  
30 meeting and review the whole transportation thing because I want to examine it from the point of what  
31 the programs are and how they are going to be done. How they affect the customer? How they affect  
32 the citizen and how they can participate in the growth or change and except the new things for  
33 transportation. I think it would be worth an afternoon to look through and see what did we do and does  
34 it have in the forefront the customer. Everything basically is a business, you know, you talked about you  
35 don't have a business people here. Well, I earned my living for 40-years at a small business and anybody  
36 that's been paid a paycheck, is in a business, you know? I really have always had a hard time  
37 distinguishing between profit and non-profit because you don't want to be a non-profit business. You



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

1 want to use your assets and facilities to the maximum by – so that it is a viable business. I think we need  
2 to review. I'd like you to ask to have the transportation subcommittee to go over and see, now is this  
3 really what we think is best for Palo Alto for the next 30-years. I certainly want to do that before the  
4 January 30<sup>th</sup> where you're going to toss in the Transportation Element along – playing tag on the – this  
5 element and hope that they'll pass it as is. This is kind of a last chance and I really appeal to you to set it  
6 up so we can do a final review and say yes, this is a good job.

7 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you, Ellen. Amy.

8 **Amy Sung:** That sounds very much like a parent that once your children have grown, you feel like if time  
9 could go back, here's what I would have done differently. I wanted to bring back – I felt that I'm really,  
10 really fortunate to be part of the subcommittee in this Business Element and after our meeting, I felt so  
11 good. I felt that we have encompassed everything that needs to be included. Just to be a little bit  
12 surprised that you find out that a lot still has to be done. Trees, I hear some member mentioning the  
13 trees. I think that Elaine also felt that oh, yeah, it would be so good to have trees mentioned in the  
14 Business Element. We have talked a lot and I think trees really, really should be and has been discussed  
15 in the land use and that is where it belongs. I remember at the subcommittee meeting Stephen  
16 mentioned that in Palo Alto, we are really, really fortunate that we have the world-renowned University.  
17 We have world renowned hospitals. The world-renowned Research Park and the world-renowned  
18 shopping centers. When we talk about business, it's more than just retail business. Just think about Palo  
19 Alto, it's the second busiest stop in the Cal-train, only second to San Francisco. Business is only  
20 successful when there are customers and when we look at our customers – I think there was a chart  
21 there – that the customers are visitors, they are employees and they are residents. We also recognize  
22 that our habits are changing. The work schedules are changing. People do not work from 9-5. There are  
23 all sorts of different work hours and our consuming habits in such that we are seeing online shopping.  
24 For our local retail and local businesses to thrive, we have to think outside of a closing at 7 or 10 or 11  
25 because people work at different hours. That could be a need that you match -- the changing habit of  
26 consuming time frame and how businesses are scheduled. It could be you know, change that you match  
27 that need. I do want to talk about the particular grocery location. I think you mentioned Edgewood  
28 Plaza. That really, really brings us to – we have to adaptive and flexible with the policy to meet the  
29 reality. That location – we have tried – I think a long time ago that was a grocery store that went out of  
30 business and then this new Fresh Market came. It wasn't making money but it was for other reasons  
31 that they closed it but I think that the fact – can I finish? The fact that there are no other subsequent  
32 grocers – it's taking up that space and that tells us that that could be a miss match of what the use  
33 permit is and what are the customers looking for because if there is a strong customer base, there are  
34 no shortage of grocery stores that would love to do business in Palo Alto. If at that location is not viable  
35 for a grocery, I think that another use – this is one of the examples that we need to look at, the use  
36 permits should be flexible and adaptive and I don't believe that a use permit is part of the Comp. Plan. It  
37 is part of some other plans, I would think. That's all I have. Thanks.



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

1 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you, Amy. Shani.

2 **Shani Kleinhaus:** When I look at the other fiscal responsibility in other Cities, it's either part of land use  
3 as an (Inaudible) part where they have – they discuss economic development and fiscal stability.  
4 Mountain View has fiscal stability policies aimed to – for fiscally sustainable government and then the  
5 first goal is to fiscally sustainable City government that preserves and enhances the quality of life; the  
6 bad word. I think we need to develop those. When I look at those graphs, I think we need to have in  
7 those – we need policies about reducing debt and we need to have policies about not assuming new  
8 debt and we potentially need some planning for anticipated increase in benefits that we have to pay. All  
9 that should be part of the general plan. Fiscal responsibility on many, many levels needs to be there.  
10 Also, when I look at this graph, it looks like even though they've – utilities are the biggest income-  
11 producing tool for the City. We're focusing on – I'm not saying that we don't need to focus on  
12 businesses but really, we need to think about what happens – I mean we have that but there are  
13 possibilities that some of those things will stop generating as much. If some of the other Cities sign those  
14 agreements where they can have purchase agreements through other mechanisms and they don't go  
15 through us. I mean, I don't see any planning in terms of the fiscal sustainability of what we have, both in  
16 terms of our utilities and in terms of our debt. 4% on debt services. I don't know everything but that's a  
17 lot of money; it's 22 million dollars almost and maybe we could do something else with it. I think we  
18 need to have – to develop and we could look at other Cities and we could think about it ourselves but  
19 we need to develop a fiscal responsibility section. The issue of predictability which is in Goal 4, flexibility  
20 and was added predictability. Usually, it's predictability for the developer so that – what happens is that  
21 instead of having all sorts of varies discretionary review, you would not just have some kind of a table  
22 and you do check, check and you go your predictability; go ahead and develop. I don't think that's what  
23 you were seeing in there and I hope it's not because predictability needs to be for us to so various types  
24 of projects that have been discussed and especially large projects should not surprise the residents and  
25 maybe should not even move forward. In terms of the different goals, Goal B-1, I support. I really think  
26 the residential – the compatible with Palo Alto residential character and natural environment should  
27 stay. I don't think that the alternative with the Palo Alto values is good. With B-2, again, I would keep  
28 the existing language, the one that City Council recommended. Same with B-3 and I would definitely  
29 consider that B-4 needs to be very clear. If the word predictability is there, what does that mean for  
30 residents and for developers because most of the arguments over the last few years over CEQA where  
31 that CEQA is something that does not provide predictability because oh, somebody can sue me and  
32 then, you know, I did all this work and I get sued. I don't think we have a lot of need to reach that stage  
33 in Palo Alto but predictability has various aspects and I would not even have that there. Flexibility I think  
34 is important and having a clear process that a developer knows what's to expect and it goes with the  
35 PTC and is public review and I think we need to change some of the public reviews. In other Cities, if you  
36 have a big project, they do this big meeting and people are invited. Kind of like what the JPA for San  
37 Francisco is doing as a scoping – in Palo Alto it's part of the planning commission where you can come –  
38 it doesn't work that way. You don't see everything the same way. I think that needs to change. The



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

1 process on how scoping comments for projects are done. I don't know if that's where you want to put it  
2 but somewhere in there, you may be able to add that. One of the things that I find is – again, I wasn't on  
3 this Committee and not my best shape today but I think we have been losing things that people really  
4 care about in services. We lost a lot of trees in the drought. We lost – there was a discussion of changes  
5 to the animal shelter. There's a lot of costs that we suddenly cannot afford and there seems to be a lot  
6 of new things that we could potentially afford and I haven't seen enough that says that things like the  
7 animal services are really, really critical for the City and we should not give them up. Even if it's  
8 (Inaudible). Maybe there is some kind of question of what Palo Alto values are but I don't want to lose  
9 those services and I see more and more. Now the pool and now the Interpretation Center in the Bay  
10 Lands was closed. There's environmental volunteers that provide a little bit of that but it uses to be  
11 open all the time and now it's closed all the time except for maybe a little bit on the weekend. We lost  
12 services over time and this erosion will continue unless we really look at what we have and I don't know  
13 where the place to do that. Maybe we need some kind of a policy and a – maybe – San Jose just did a  
14 beatification survey and they got thousands of people who responded and told them what they think is  
15 most important to them in their City in terms of trash and you know, shopping carts and whatever else  
16 was on that list. Maybe we need something like that. What do you really value? Maybe we need –  
17 overall, people in Palo Alto are pretty happy given the State of the City surveys. Maybe we don't need to  
18 change all that much. Maybe it's ok? That – I'm not sure I'm completely coherent today but (Inaudible)  
19 forgive me on that. I had on another thing if I can find it. I do think – I don't know – other people spoke a  
20 little bit about the fiscal responsibility thing but I think it needs to be more than one sentence or just –  
21 there's got to be a goal in there with policies and programs and – oh, I know what I wanted to say, sorry.  
22 There is definitely (Inaudible) between having a thriving innovative economy and retaining all those  
23 other types of things – the services that we want and we can't just say oh, we want the innovation and  
24 oh, we'll figure out what to do about the little businesses. I think we may want to do what Hamilton said  
25 and say ok, we want to encourage small office spaces and we want to retain those and maybe there is a  
26 policy that we can't turn those little offices to something else if it's not zone for it and doesn't zone for  
27 it. We are losing those services because it's so expensive. It's much easier to be – even startups cannot  
28 afford it anymore so who can? We have a problem and we haven't really dealt with them. Anyway,  
29 alright. Thanks.

30 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you, Shani. Alex.

31 **Alex Van Riesen:** I wanted to start off with a couple questions. One is, I thought it would be interesting  
32 if we could add to our data sampling, which I want to say thank you for. I thought the data was really  
33 helpful and really good. What's the percentage of Palo Alto businesses that are owned and operated by  
34 Palo Alto? I'd be interested – is there a way to find that out?

35 **Co-Chair Garber:** I'm one.



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

1 **Alex Van Riesen:** Ok, good. We'll we're at 1% so or maybe .001 but if we could have that. I guess it  
2 would be interesting because I have a feeling that more and more there's less and less businesses  
3 being operated by Palo Alto residents. I don't know how that effects the conversation but it would be  
4 interesting to know. I just want to say that I agree with Len completely. I certainly don't want to be  
5 prevailing falsities tonight and I did not fact check earlier before the meeting but is there a way to find  
6 out how the restaurants are doing, in particular, downtown retail. Maybe something about what  
7 percentage is making money or thriving? What percent are just surviving or going under? I do have a  
8 concern in this too that I've noticed that as we are redeveloping, it's all been predominantly, in my  
9 sense, upscaling. When I look at California Avenue, I've noticed a reduction in affordable eateries but a  
10 dramatic increase in more high-end eateries and places that I and people like me cannot afford. One of  
11 the things I just wanted to say to those of you looking at those on the subcommittee as tree haters.  
12 We're not tree haters. I just wanted to say we took the trees out because it seemed like it was a rather  
13 random resource to have in the Business Community Element and it's not that – I think hearing you guys  
14 tonight, I'm very open to it and it sounds like the trees are – I'm not sure I'm convinced that the trees  
15 are something that businesses go, that's why I want to go to Palo Alto because they've got trees. Maybe  
16 they do, well maybe so. Shani's friends but in my sense, was there was a lot of proximity to other vibrant  
17 resources as well. There's proximity to Sand Hill Road. There's proximity to Stanford. There's proximity  
18 to University Avenue so it felt like maybe we need a resource section in which trees are listed as some of  
19 the things that are attractive. As it stood by itself, it seemed rather random; which I think raises another  
20 concern I've had in this is that it feels like as we go through the elements, sometimes what I feel like we  
21 are trying to do is use every element to bolster whatever some of our preexisting biases are towards a  
22 quality of life or whatever in Palo Alto. I think actually the best way, my personal conviction, in how to  
23 assemble this Comprehensive Plan is to have every element be stand alone and vibrant in itself and let  
24 the people who are seeking to implement it, figure out how to do that. I think we're over engineering  
25 this. I think the dream of a Comprehensive Plan is what do you want to be? Who do you want to be?  
26 What would you like your businesses to look like? I don't think we need to defend the environment or to  
27 defend certain things in the Business Element. I think we've spent hours doing that and I'm very positive  
28 about the things that we've done but I think each of the elements should be more distinct and I think  
29 I'm not as convinced that all the overlapping is necessary. In the raw form, I just want to say that some  
30 points of this element looked like a Land Use Element. The very last half of it was all stuff that had been  
31 said before and so that was part of the reason we were eager to even cut come of that. I think we will  
32 keep that, given what you said and – let's see if that was it. I still would throw in – I'm not sure what the  
33 quality of life is in a Business Element but it seems that what the quality of life should be is really what  
34 we're saying in each element, cumulatively put together, that that's the quality of life. It's not any one  
35 element or anything in an element, it's all the elements put together.

36 **Co-Chair Garber:** Sorry. Whitney. Thank you, Alex.





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

1 **Whitney McNair:** Thank you. I respectfully disagree with an earlier comment that this is not a  
2 substantive component of the Comprehensive Plan and it also shouldn't be treated as or thought of as a  
3 marketing document. I find that a little offensive that it really discounts the language in the element  
4 before it's even written or it's implemented. All the Goals and Policies should be held to an equal  
5 standard. They all have equal weight and they are all equally important. They may not – people may not  
6 think of them that way but they should all have sort of an equal standing in the eyes of the Community.  
7 It is a valid component of the Comprehensive Plan. If the Committee wants to move forward with the  
8 tone that's supportive of business, then maybe we should consider options that go forward to the  
9 Council. I don't think you can always assume companies are happy with the City and won't ever leave  
10 the City. The City's policies and treatment of any of the businesses both small and large, really do  
11 matter. You don't always just want to rest on your morals and you know, markets may soften and it may  
12 impact the City's fiscal resources. One could argue that the whole rest of the Comp. Plan really does  
13 promote residentially and there might be something to add into this element here but I don't agree that  
14 it should be the focus and so I would want to put forward something that doesn't have that as the  
15 primary component of what is a business or whatever we end up calling it. I also don't agree that  
16 predictability is not just a checklist. It's a standardized process where ones know what to expect with a  
17 set process and some sense of a timeline. It's an important concept to keep in the element so it's  
18 flexibility, a clear process, timeliness, and predictability, they're all important to the business  
19 Community. There is a – in Goal B-2, in the policies, it says that moderate the pace of job growth. You  
20 know that doesn't really – then the second part of the sentence talks about contributes to economic  
21 vitality. I don't really believe those two things – the moderating the pace of job growth doesn't really  
22 contribute to economic vitality in my opinion. Policy B-3.8, there's a statement in here that says small  
23 businesses are vital to a diverse and innovative economy and the City will encourage their retention as  
24 they grow into larger more established businesses by helping them find suitable locations. It's that last  
25 part that – by helping them find suitable locations, the City doesn't find suitable locations. The City  
26 creates policies that provide an environment where companies well welcome and supported. They  
27 create policies that allow for an environment where a company can find space to either move to an  
28 existing building or build space suitable for their growth in a predictable and timely manner. That can all  
29 be done without any additional square footage. You can – that's not talking about growth in square  
30 footage but you could redevelop a building or move to another building. The PTC had some good  
31 language that they had considered which was foster an environment attractive to new businesses and to  
32 that I would add existing businesses as well; it's not just new businesses. I just have a couple more  
33 points. I wouldn't use the term 24 hours. I think that in the subcommittee that really wasn't the intent.  
34 The intent was to have options for all age groups of all different hours. I always think of in my zoning  
35 days as 24 hours are tattoo parlors and things like that. I don't know if you really want to promote  
36 something that says 24 hours. Then there was a question under Goal 6 about including some programs.  
37 There are some that are in the existing Comp. Plan. B-15, which is to revise zoning to be responsive to  
38 changing market conditions. There may be some opportunity to put that back into here or it may be



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

1 better suited for the Land Use Element; either one works. Then, I'd like to keep in the idea that's in B-16  
2 which is the idea of transfer development rights. I gave an example at the subcommittee and it was the  
3 idea that within the Research Park, there is some development potential that's scattered around the  
4 Research Park and maybe you want to preserve the idea that you unlock some of that development  
5 potential and put it in a more transit-oriented, appropriate location, say along El Comino Real and a  
6 transfer of development rights may allow for something like that to happen in the future. Then perhaps  
7 there could be a program that foster's a stronger pedestrian, bike and transit connection between the  
8 Research Park and the Cal. Ave. at no loss to FAR for any of those sites. Maybe it's developing a transit  
9 hub or something like that that really does better connect those two things together but I just wouldn't  
10 – maybe that's in a program or something like that, either here or in the Land Use Element.

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

12 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. One of the things about going nearly last is I have lots of comments on what  
13 other people have said. There's a comment on whether there was a business representation and I think  
14 that there are a lot of small businesses being represented in this body here, such as Dan. Also, I agree  
15 entirely with the comments of Hamilton regarding Edgewood Plaza Grocery store. If we basically allow  
16 people to make – allow developers to make promises that we somehow say that's no longer a promise,  
17 then promises aren't worth anything and that's a big problem. I also agree with what Jen said about, it's  
18 a good thing Google and Facebook did not try to expand in Downtown Palo Alto and the Research Park  
19 or nothing else would fit here and we'd have more problems from that. I agree with Elaine and other  
20 people who commented on the annotative version as very useful, however, it's missing what's missing.  
21 We don't know what was taken out and so we can't identify those. In other elements, there were things  
22 – they were struck out – showing what was taken out in terms of policies. We don't even know what  
23 policies are missing here exactly but I'm not sure how all – whether there are any policies that are  
24 missing but it that's all there then that's fine. All there, thank you. Also, Alex talked about upscaling. Yes,  
25 we have a problem with upscaling. In particular, Jennifer talked about Policy B-6.6. That talks about  
26 upscaling in more of the more affordable spaces for businesses in our City. Now we're saying that  
27 affordable space for businesses in the City mainly, the corner over by San Antonio Road and Charleston  
28 and West Bay Shore, that that should be replaced by upscale businesses and get rid of that services.  
29 That's – we have to think about what we're retaining and what we get rid of. Whitney talked about  
30 substantive, I agree with that that this element is a substantive element. It's an important element. I  
31 think moderate job growth is associated with economic vitality. If you have excessive job growth, you  
32 choke on your traffic, you choke on your fuses and economic vitality gets lost because people can't get  
33 to their jobs from where they live. That means that you essentially get to something called negative  
34 margin utility and as we expand, we're getting there. Lisa talked about startups. I entirely agree that  
35 startups should be included there. In the first go around, Shani talked about compatibility, I think that  
36 that's good language. Ellen talked about the idea of e-commerce versus driving. Her comment about  
37 Amazon is opposed – is a contravention of the idea of promoting retail and although there was some



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

1 comment about the idea of promoting delivery services. I think that's a lot – delivery services – if this  
2 Google Express hands a certain number of local business but not very many and therefore, to the extent  
3 that we say ok, you don't have to get Downtown in order to be able to – or get to our local businesses in  
4 order to be able to shop at them. Well, that's true but the issues are, if you're going to shop online,  
5 people are generally shopping for the lowest cost and that doesn't mean a local business in Palo Alto.  
6 We have to be very careful about making Palo Alto so that we – our businesses so that we can't get to  
7 them and we can't shop at them and the problems with that. I agree with Jennifer's comments about  
8 business and retail. In particular, the idea of Palantir has its own cafeteria so it's not clear how Palantir is  
9 promoting restaurants and it's not clear how many people who work at Palantir and don't live in Palo  
10 Alto, are shopping at the other businesses Downtown. Finally, one of the things is that I'd like to talk a  
11 little bit about the loss of retail since 2009. We've lost a fair amount of retail since 2009. One of the  
12 reasons for the loss of retail in 2009 is instead of giving conditional use permits for getting rid of retail –  
13 ground floor retail in certain areas near – around Downtown, we de zone them. We got rid of Zibibbo and  
14 replaced it with American Express offices. We got rid of Rudy's Pub and – which was perfectly viable. It  
15 had been there for decades – because of a miss guided attempt to say well this place is no longer viable  
16 for retail and therefore we don't need to preserve it and the justification for it was because of the Gate  
17 Way – GateHouse Restaurant may or may not have been viable for retail and because of Gate House, we  
18 basically got rid of a lot of places that had existing retail. I think that that was a mistake about getting rid  
19 of that existing retail. I think we have to be careful about getting rid of other existing retail that is  
20 actually there; occupied by retail and continues to be, ok? Think about – there are some businesses that  
21 are not in the core Downtown and are not on California Avenue. For example, Homer Street has some  
22 retail businesses on it. Now, maybe they are attracted by Whole Food but I'm not sure how many  
23 people shop at the dress stores on Homer Avenue because they shop at Whole Foods or they just go to  
24 the dress stores because they have cheaper rent and therefore more ability to have services. I think that  
25 in order to have a mix of retail, you also need retail that is not focused exactly on Downtown; that  
26 people can get to. The loss of Addison Antiques was because the rent was raised dramatically and they  
27 were not – they were basically not given corporation in terms of extending their lease and so now that  
28 place is vacant and they say well, we don't have the ability to be there. We don't have the ability to rent  
29 it. Well, you had something that was viable there before that you got rid of, ok? I'm a little more  
30 sympathetic to the idea where the Anthropology was because that moved to Stanford Shopping Center.  
31 I always wondered by it wasn't there, to begin with, but you know, we do need to think about what  
32 kinds of retail places make sense and where they make sense and realize that not everything has to be  
33 Downtown. That thing do – can be in other locations so that retail locations that can attract their own  
34 clientele can actually thrive because they can get cheaper rent. Thank you.

35 **Co-Chair Garber:** My comments in the first round were really focused on trying to use this element to tie  
36 the – is for the plan to recognize that land is one of the great economic engines of this City and that  
37 some of the things that are important to us, which is our services, are supported by that and  
38 understanding that relationship helps us understand the values of both of those things. That was in my



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

1 first comment and one of the things that I would ideally like to be able to see and understand as I read  
2 this element in its new form. I think the most salient question for me this evening, was Lisa's when she  
3 said what's needed? That is directly related I think to Whitney's comment about finding flexibility. One  
4 of the things that I am – as you've heard me speak about before – very concerned about is the plan has  
5 a tendency to put things in concrete and it's going to exist anomaly for 10-years and if it's like the last  
6 one, significantly longer. It's going to last through a variety of economic cycles as well as a variety of  
7 different Council Members. It needs to be able to be flexible enough for different Councils and different  
8 markets to be addressed without having to trip over themselves. It would be, I think, a good thing for  
9 the subcommittee to consider in terms of developing programs that allow us – allow the City to have  
10 closer and not truly real time but the closer connection with those that are affected by those  
11 marketplaces. We've talked about some of the pressure points; retail, professional services, Stanford,  
12 restaurants, offices, there may be others but I think it would be worthwhile to think about very specific  
13 programs that are not, here's what we're going to do with retail but it's programming dialogs that  
14 happen over the course of that 10-years. I don't know if it's a 2-year schedule or 1-year or whatever that  
15 is and if it is a group of stakeholders in those roles and understand what's happening in the marketplace  
16 and how those – how the marketplace is impacting their businesses so the City can find better ways to  
17 modify it or focus or emphasize ways of using the City's property and their zoning. I think it's worthwhile  
18 for this plan to create programs that allow that closer connection between the marketplace and the City  
19 because there's nothing really that addresses any of that in the current language and I think that's key  
20 for the overall health because we talk about that all the time, even this evening, with great depth. We  
21 haven't – we don't have language that anchors that connection in there yet. Alex, I wanted to thank you  
22 for talking about your concept to overlapping of taking a variety of different elements – I shouldn't say  
23 elements, a variety of different ideas and this is something that Shani and I have had a long going –  
24 ongoing debate about. I actually don't think that in this element we should be talking about air and  
25 water and the rest of that because I think those are not fundamental to business and business  
26 opportunities. Those are fundamental human requirements that the City needs to – their prerequisites  
27 long before we talk about business vitality and I do think that what we are creating here is an element  
28 that needs to be read as a whole. We don't have to recreate the key pieces in each one of the elements.  
29 I'm very sensitive to that. I'm very happy you brought that up because I do support a clearer, more  
30 concise element so that we can focus in on the individual pieces but recognizing that those are in fact  
31 elements of a whole. I think I will – perhaps not be the first but I would like to support the Annette  
32 Glanckopf honorable economic vitality officer being created in the City. The new name for the  
33 development officer that's there now. I like that only because it doesn't talk about just you know,  
34 creating a business but it creates it within the context of what it is the City needs overall. I'm being  
35 playful but I do think that is an important concern that I was getting out of many of your concept – much  
36 of your comments. Then finally, I will add and end with supporting Hamilton's feeling that I think we can  
37 get to language that makes us all happy and can pull together a bunch of this stuff. I look forward to the



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

1 subcommittee's next iteration of all this. I see Shani has something else and Jennifer. Shani why don't  
2 you go ahead and then Jennifer. Amy and Stephen, I'm sorry.

3 **Shani Kleinhaus:** When Mountain View did their General Plan a few years ago, they looked at changed  
4 areas and they left out the area on Old Middlefield, with all its kind of dilapidated in stuff – all sorts of  
5 little car shops and storage areas and all sorts of things like that. When I asked them, why didn't you  
6 look at that as part of where you want to change. They said well, we need room for that too and that  
7 relates to what Arthur said about the area on East Bay Shore and San Antonio. We need to have some  
8 place where you don't have to have this reimagining of modern areas and maybe we can learn from  
9 Mountain View on that. There has been change in that area but -- they set aside and did not include as a  
10 change area but it's slow and those types of services and like the little Palo Alto theater, I think  
11 (Inaudible) -- all sorts of little things that can still survive there because it hasn't been zoned for  
12 (Inaudible). Maybe we want to think about that in the General Plan, leave an unchanged area. The other  
13 thing that I had here was that there was something about encourage developments to include space for  
14 non-profits as a Community benefit. Now, I totally support the idea of providing space for a non-profit  
15 organization; I work for one but I'm not sure I want that to be part of public benefits because it kind of  
16 prioritizes that over maybe some other public benefits that the City may want. It kind of in the General  
17 Plan and we already prioritizing certain types of public benefits. I'm not sure that's the right thing to do.  
18 Maybe we can just be a little more general. That's all.

19 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Jen and then Amy.

20 **Jennifer Hetterly:** I just wanted to talk briefly about the name of the element. I actually would not  
21 support changing it to business and retail. I think the beauty of the current terminology, business, and  
22 economics is that it indicates not only that we're concerned about the success of the business but we're  
23 concerned about the economics Citywide. I think that's why, for me, trees and moderating job growth  
24 are relevant items for this element because trees – we're not talking about how much we love them and  
25 how much we want to save them. We're talking about them here as an economic asset. That they have  
26 potential revenue generation. That they increase property values. That they attract business visitors,  
27 residents, to create the thriving economy that we enjoy. I see them as an (Inaudible) economics of the  
28 City of maintaining our unique canopy. As for the job growth, I don't – hard to imagine -- well, for me it's  
29 quite clear that the contribution of jobs to our jobs/housing imbalance. Job growth impacts housing  
30 imbalance such that it's created or significantly contributed to our current housing affordability crisis  
31 and how you can say that's not an issue of economics, I don't get. I think it's critical that moderating job  
32 growth or addressing job growth in some way is part of the economic considerations that this City  
33 undertakes as part of its General Plan and I think that economic heading also encompasses the fiscal  
34 health – fiscal responsibility piece. Part of the economic in the City involves getting ahold of our  
35 unfunded liabilities and all those other – whatever the debt burden other people raised that were



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

1 concerned about the City Government fiscal health. I think all those pieces fit in here we just haven't  
2 flushed out the policies to address them and I hope that we will.

3 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Amy and then Stephen.

4 **Amy Sung:** Thank you. In the subcommittee meeting I remember we were asking, do we need to talk  
5 about the fiscal stability and also the business economic issues and I remembered we were (Inaudible)  
6 that there's a purpose of separating the fiscal because it belongs to the different subject, am I correct  
7 there? That there is a purpose of not to bring the fiscal into this element. Am I, right?

8 **Joanne Jansen:** I think we said that in a lot of the policies that were in this element especially, Goals 5  
9 and 6 address the fiscal form of an employment district or shopping center and that those types of  
10 issues had been addressed in the Land Use Element; policies that are specific to each one of these types  
11 of centers.

12 **Amy Sung:** Thank you. Because of that and – I think that therefore this is Business Element should really,  
13 really focus on the business itself and I heard a lot of ideas about incorporating the trees and the animal  
14 shelters. I think these are very important and that comprises what makes Palo Alto wonderful and  
15 unique but I think it really belongs to other elements and not this one. I also wanted to apologize  
16 because I arrived late and did I hear that there is going to be a new member of this subcommittee?

17 **Co-Chair Garber:** Yes. We've appointed Hamilton. (Inaudible)

18 **Amy Sung:** And can I ask why? Is that because there are not enough members or?

19 **Co-Chair Garber:** Yeah, we had room on the Committee. We've – I think we limited to – it couldn't be  
20 more than the Brown Act requires which is 10? Right, and Len had dropped off. We are putting Hamilton  
21 back in there.

22 **Amy Sung:** Oh, ok, thank you.

23 **Co-Chair Garber:** Is that it? Anything else? Ok. Stephen and then Alex, who is our final speaker unless I  
24 see another flag.

25 **Stephen Levy:** Hillary, we've talked in so many meetings that about at this point, we were going to write  
26 about the connections and that's always seemed fragile to me – I want to – Dan if you could stick for a  
27 minute. We heard two connections to me that are -- three actually, that are really powerful. The first  
28 one was Ellen's about the connection between transportation, between access to retail, between  
29 transportation and the ability for businesses to thrive and have employees. The second one, Dan and  
30 others and I have been saying that land use policies have fiscal implications. I don't want to redo the  
31 budget. I don't want to talk about pensions. I don't want to talk about what programs are there. I do  
32 want the Council to understand and be informed by the kind of material that Joanna and Elaine have put





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

1 into this element so they can themselves, puzzle out how varies land use policies relate to fiscal. We  
2 have EIR fiscal report that was done in March that we never talked about that said growth was slightly  
3 positive and more growth was even more slightly more positive with a large emphasis on slightly, ok?  
4 We will have one for 5 and 6. I'm not an expert in any of this stuff. If I want to know about retail, I want  
5 to know what the retail consultant for the City said. I don't know what all of the use said. If I want to  
6 know what works for Stanford, I want to ask Whitney. I don't want to tell Whitney what works for  
7 Stanford. If I want to know what makes small businesses tick in Palo Alto, I'd ask Judy Kleinberg. I want  
8 to make really sure that Judy Kleinberg not only come to our next subcommittee meeting but we make  
9 some time. I've heard some stuff here about people being prejudice about the Chamber of Commerce.  
10 Well, I've got a lot of stuff you've all said that I'm prejudiced about too but I'm willing to listen to you  
11 and you ought to be able to listen to someone who represents small businesses. I am tired of hearing  
12 businesses and small businesses conflated with developers. Very few businesses in Palo Alto and almost  
13 no small businesses are developers. That's different. We're talking here about supporting businesses,  
14 not supporting developers. It just bothers me. The reason I wanted 20 employers was I'm tired of  
15 hearing about Palantir. I wanted to see how far down on the list I had to go to get Palantir on the list of  
16 top companies. I'm pretty sure that Palantir doesn't account for 50% of anything Downtown or 40% or  
17 30% or 20%. I think it's 10%. I'll ask the Staff, I think it's about 1,000 employees out of 10,000? Right?  
18 What? Well, we should know that because the only company that gets regularly mentioned in the blogs  
19 in this room is Palantir and they aren't even on the list. Ok? People should really know where Palantir  
20 fits in. Talk about debunking stuff that's not true, I'll go with whatever the facts are. That's why I wanted  
21 the list to be expanded. I wanted to see where Palantir fit on the list.

22 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Alex and then Arthur and then Hamilton.

23 **Alex Van Riesen:** (Inaudible)

24 **Co-Chair Garber:** No, that's ok. Go ahead.

25 **Alex Van Riesen:** I guess one of the things that struck me – this is sort of off the topic so permit me a  
26 little license but I guess one of the things I've realized going through these meetings and I can't even  
27 remember how many there have been. It's often disturbed me in the process that – with few  
28 exceptions, there – we seem to fall along party lines in these things. Residentialists and I don't even  
29 know what the other term is, non-residential and we draw lines to make the language more defensive or  
30 definitive that reinforce our position. I guess the thing that I want to say is we're all residents and no  
31 one here cares more about the City more than anyone else, I don't think. I feel like there is something  
32 that – it would be (Inaudible) that – I'd like to hear even more opportunities and I think tonight's  
33 actually been pretty good. Where people have said, I like that idea or I like this. Oh, yeah, I think we can  
34 do that but we can do that. I think I've found myself – I get worn by the sort of – maybe that's just the  
35 way it is. Being a new guy to this, maybe that's just the way it is; that it is an adversary in nature. I would  
36 love to see as we think about the future, have to be more collaborative. Where I think certain things



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

1 that were said tonight really did refine my perspective and position and I think we should affirm that  
2 and be about to say that and that the tone would be more collaborative like I said than adversarial.  
3 We're all citizens, we're all residents. I think we want to do good for our City...

4 **Co-Chair Garber:** And to some degree, we're all business persons.

5 **Alex Van Riesen:** True enough.

6 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you for those comments. I didn't mean to cut you off.

7 **Alex Van Riesen:** No. That was it.

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

9 **Hamilton Hitchings:** Thanks. On the – I just have two follow-up comments. The first is I think it is good to  
10 have the top 20 businesses. I'd also like to know the top 3 businesses in Downtown. Stephen, I think that  
11 everybody mentions Palantir and by the way, I mentioned a bunch of other businesses like Tesla and  
12 VMWare that I have a lot of respect for as well, is that Palantir the largest downtown. Last, I've heard  
13 and I have heard this from Palantir employees as well, it's like 800 people, 15% not 50%. It's trending. It  
14 might get up to 20% eventually but 15%. So, it is a significant portion but it's certainly not like 50% but  
15 we do want – if Staff comes back, I also want to know what – where Palantir is on the Downtown  
16 businesses because I think they're number 1 and Amazon is number 2 but maybe HP is in there  
17 somewhere. The second thing is when I was talking about marketing, a lot of people said they made the  
18 changes for the purpose of tone. That's what I was talking about when I said we want to open with a  
19 positive tone to this document that makes it clear to businesses. I think a lot of that language is useful  
20 but it's not what we want to open with. You want, as a business, read this and get the sense that we're  
21 really – they're an important part of the Community and that we support them. The reason I support  
22 trees in there is because I just want you to look at every single City logo and you'll notice a big tree on it.  
23 It's our marking symbol. When I'm in a company, we're talking about our icon, our branding. It's our  
24 branding. If Palo Alto wasn't tall tree and it wasn't our symbol, yeah, you know, it's just sort of an  
25 environmental thing but branding is important. We're a high-end brand. Environmental is a core part of  
26 it so that's why I think it is appropriate. Maybe we need to tweak the language a little. We should be  
27 trying to put in things that are redundant but I just wanted to make that last comment.

28 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thanks. Arthur.

29 **Co-Chair Keller:** About trees, I noticed that while walking University Avenue, there are – it's a tree lined  
30 street with lights on the trees and there was a far outcry when all the trees suddenly got cut down on  
31 California Avenue, so Emphasis on trees is not misplaced. I remembered that during the Vietnam War,  
32 which was a highly contentious time but I'm going to bring up a quote which is, 'We had to destroy the  
33 village in order to save it.' Some people feel that may have – what may have been – to save – what



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

1 happen to Alma Plaza. That it wasn't saved. It was replaced by something else that is not a retail  
2 shopping center and the Edgewood Plaza, I think had to hope for something else and I think we still have  
3 hope for a grocery store being in there and it's actually coming across as a pretty good shopping center  
4 that will be improved by having anchor tentative grocery store which the developer of that, as Hamilton  
5 has talked about, pitched it in terms – a bitch to redevelopment of having a grocery store in exchange  
6 for putting in those condo – the townhouses. I think that Hamilton is right about that. However, we have  
7 another shopping area that is up for ferment or change and that is the Midtown Shopping Center. That  
8 place has been sold but a chunk that development – that development has been sold and we saw the  
9 first act was to cut down all of the Community gardens that were behind the retail stores there. We  
10 don't know what's going to happen there and I just hope that what replaces – that we still have a  
11 vibrant retail center in Midtown when this is all changed and I'm hoping that there will be some  
12 deliberate process that involves the citizenry in that. Thank you.

13 **Annette Glanckopf:** This is an area that I'm just restraining myself from trying to respond to all these  
14 comments but the garden was taken down because of drug deals and a lot of other crime ridden areas  
15 and there is a huge area for parking. The garden was under used. Anyway, forgetting about that, this is a  
16 major, major (Inaudible) Midtown Resident Association. We're meeting with the developers and so we  
17 have a very, very strategic plan in place to work with them and of course Hillary if need be. Please, I  
18 wouldn't spread any kind of rumor about this. They have said they are not going to do anything in the  
19 short term and that's the focus of their business. I just really want to start/stop any rumors from just  
20 spreading.

21 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. I hope that this is successful and that we retain Midtown as a vibrant  
22 shopping center as you indicate.

23 **Co-Chair Garber:** I think – does Staff have any final comments before we adjourn?

24 **Hillary Gitelman:** You know, I just want to thank everybody for their comments. We will work with the  
25 subcommittee and endeavor to take all of this and merge it into one set of goals and policies. If we have  
26 to preserve options in a few instances, we will but hopefully, with the subcommittee's help we'll bring  
27 you back, at your next meeting a consolidated version that speaks to these comments.

28 **Feedback for Continuous Improvement:**

29 **Future Meetings:**

30 Next meeting: February 21, 2017 – Rinconada Library (Embarcadero Room)

31 Topic: Natural Resources Element II

32



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

1 **Elaine Costello:** I think we have sent out – we’re sending out a doodle poll for the 31st –  
2 January 31st and February 2nd for a subcommittee meeting. So, if those of you who are on that  
3 list – I think it might have gone us during this meeting but – or it will go out shortly after this  
4 meeting but we’ve set those two possible dates. So, if people on the subcommittee can get  
5 back to us we can get that setup. Yes, we said the afternoon of the 31<sup>st</sup> or the afternoon or  
6 early evening of the 2<sup>nd</sup>. So, if you can all just get back to us, then we can get that scheduled.

7  
8 **Co-Chair Garber:** May I hear a motion – excuse me.

9 **MOTION**

10 **Alex Van Riesen:** No, I’ll move to close the meeting. I just want to know, will someone alert if anarchy  
11 breaks out between now and our next meeting. Will we not have another CAC meeting because we’ll  
12 have a new president in 5 days.

13 **Co-Chair Garber:** Well, I don’t know if you’ve noticed but he’s going to become subcommittee member.

14 **Elaine Costello:** He’s been tweeting about us.

15 **Co-Chair Garber:** (Crosstalk) So, Alex as had a motion to adjourn. A second?

16 **Annette Glanckopf:** Second. Second.

17 **Co-Chair Garber:** From Annette. We are adjourned. Thanks so much. We are at 5:30 – 8:30 exactly.

18 **MOTION PASSED**

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