



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
AT PLACES MEMO
Tuesday, March 21, 2017**

The following documents are attached for your review and information:

1. CAC member Don McDougall's comments
2. CAC member Jennifer Hetterley's comments
3. CAC member Annette Glanckopf's comments

CAC Member Don McDougall's Comments on Draft Implementation Plan Chapter of the Comprehensive Plan.
March 21, 2017.

Analysis including Safety	1998 Programs		Current draft Programs		change		x	POLI CIES	PRO GRAMS	Deleted	Routine	In Progress	New
Community Services	27	10%	40	11%	13	48%	COMMUNITY SERVICES						
Trnsportation	58	22%	75	20%	17	29%	C1 Efficient	23	21	2	10		15
Land Use	81	30%	56	15%	-25	-31%	C2 Quality	2	3		1		
Natural Environment	58	22%	106	29%	48	83%	C3 Parks maintained	6	3	2	2	1	1
Safety	24	9%	77	21%	53	221%	C4 Parks adapt	2	8	1	0	1	6
Business & Economics	18	7%	14	4%	-4	-22%	C5 Well-being	9	5		3		5
	266		368		102	38%		42	40	5	16	2	27
			102				TRANSPORTATION						
Analysis excluding Safety	1998 Programs		Current draft		change		T1 Sustainable	26	23	5	3	8	19
Community Services	27	11%	40	14%	13	48%	T2 Congestion	4	6		0	3	54
Trnsportation	58	24%	75	26%	17	29%	T3 Efficient Roadway	17	8	3	2	1	
Land Use	81	33%	56	19%	-25	-31%	T4 Character	3	3		0	1	
Natural Environment	58	24%	106	36%	48	83%	T5 Parking	11	14	1	1	1	14
Safety							T6 Safe	7	14	2	8	1	10
Business & Economics	18	7%	14	5%	-4	-22%	T7 Transit Dependent	1	3		2		2
	242		291		49	20%	T8 Region	12	4	1	3		3
								81	75	12	19	15	102
							LAND USE						
							L1 Attractive	18	8	14	1	1	6
							L2 Community	4	6				2
							L3 Hoods	9	3				3
							L4 Pedestrian Retail	10	11	2	4	1	6
							L5 Employment districts	4	1	1			0
							L6 Buildings	13	5	4	2		5
							L7 Historic	12	6	1	2		1
							L8 Cultural	1	0	4			
							L9 Public Spaces	13	12	1	3	1	9
							L10 Airport	3	6		3	1	4
								87	58	27	15	4	36
										85			
							NATURAL ENVIRONMENT						
							N1 Open Space	10	11	8	7		9
							N2 Urban Forest	12	18		8		13
							N3 Creeks	8	7			1	3
							N4 Water	16	30	1	11	4	22
							N5 Air	3	10		6		7
							N6 Noise	12	11		2	2	5
							N7 Energy	8	15		6		11
							N8 Climate Change	4	5		1		4
								73	107	9	41	7	74
							SAFETY						
							S1 Prepared	13	29		19		27
							S2 Natural Hazards	15	28	1	9	3	18
							S3 Human Causes	12	19		11	2	13
								40	76	1	1	1	1
							BUSINESS						
							B1 Economic Dev	1	1		2		
							B2 Compatibility	3	0				
							B3 fiscal responsibility	2	1				1
							B4 Retail	6	4			1	4
							B5 Regulations	1	5		2		
							B6 Vibrant retail	1	1				2
							B7 Employment districts	2	2				
								16	14	0	4	1	7
								339	370	54	96	30	247
							Total Routine or IP					126	

**CAC Member Jennifer Hetterly's Comments on Draft Implementation Plan
Chapter of the Comprehensive Plan.
March 21, 2017.**

Agree with Don – don't sacrifice qualitative value of programs on the altar of quantitative targets.

Only 15% completed is a very misleading metric. 185/368 programs in the draft are "ongoing" - those that are routine will never be "complete."

The 15% metric implies a failure by the City to implement the Comp Plan, when in fact, if this draft were adopted as is, we would start on day one with close to 50% of the programs already underway!

Prioritization is a fraught exercise. Dot activity oversimplifies the challenges.

1. By listing the programs without the policies (just what we told Council NOT to do) we can't see the inter-relationships. There may well be opportunities to integrate some programs into the policies (thereby eliminating such programs) or identify redundancies between policy and program (which may allow deletion of the program).

It also may be appropriate to add or revise programs to respond to Council's latest policy choices. For example, elimination of the Downtown CAP should not necessarily lead to deletion of program L1.16.6 to "Evaluate and adjust the zoning definition of office uses allowed in downtown and to consider ways to prioritize for small business and startups."

And Council's direction to exclude specific development requirements and community indicators in the Comp Plan (because they're not fully baked yet) does not mean we shouldn't have a more general Policy to measure and evaluate the success of policy incentives to increase housing affordability, reduce SOV use and manage the sufficiency and use of parking or monitor the impacts of development.

2. Dot exercise encourages folks to pile on for their own, or most high profile priorities – leaving programs for lower profile, though critically important interests neglected.
3. Again, passion for quantification (dots for 10% of programs in each element) distorts qualitative priorities.
 - a. The total number of programs in each element has NO bearing on the relative importance of individual programs across the board. I would argue that based on the Land Use policies, programs in CSF, T, S and

NE should have relatively more dots as that's where all the impacts of ramped up growth can be measured and mitigated.

- b. Furthermore, even by that approach, the number of dots are not equitably distributed. If you want 10%, make it 10% - LU should not get 10 dots for 56 programs.

- 4. A single meeting is insufficient.

CAC Member Annette Glanckopf's Comments MARCH 21, 2107

BUSINESS ELEMENT:

- DESCRIPTION B10: REVISE SOME OF THE SUH DEVELOPMENT ACCOMPLISHED OR IN PROGRESS. (NEW HOSPITAL, CLINIC, PARKIGN STRUCTURE AT HOOVER) DOES IT BELONG IN COMP PLAN?
- ELEMENT AFTER POLICY B3.4.6 PRORAM B4.6.3.
- KEEP: MAINTAIN DISTINCT NH SHOPPING ARES THAT ARE ATTRACTIVE ACCESSIBLE AND CONVENIENT TO NEARBY RESIDENTS. NEEDS TO BE IN BOTH PLACES (FITS BETTER UNDER GOAL B6)
- OFFICE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: NEED POLICY DECISION FROM COUNCIL POLICY B5.3 ALSO POLICY WON'T BE ANY GOOD W/O STAFFING

COMMUNITY SERVICES:

- C1.14.1 WHY DOES PAUSD NEED TO KNOW ABOUT EVERY DEVELOPMENT DON'T THEY JUST NEED TO KNOW JUST THE ONES FOR YOUTH.
- C1.19.1. REPLACE WORD SENIOR WITH ADULT
- C1.19.2 AFTER SENIOR SERVICES, ADD "IN MULTIPLE LOCATIONS"
- GOAL C.2
 - C.2.21 TIE PERFORMANCE REVIEW TO PERFORMANCE INCREASES
 - C.3.21. DOESN'T FIT IN THIS SECTION.
- C.5.1.1 WORDING IS TOO FLUFFY.
- C5.6.2: TO ME, IT IS LOW VALUE TO TRY TO EDUCATE VISITORS ON HEALTH AND WELL-BEING, WHEN WE HAVE SO MANY OTHER NEEDS
- C5.91. INDOOR GARDENS ?

LAND USE

GOAL L-1

- PROGRAM L1.3.1 WRONG ORDER. ESTABLISH POTENTIAL SITES FIRST, THEN WORK WITH STAKEHOLDERS
- PROGRAM L.1.71. ADD AFTER REGULATORY TOOLS "SUCH AS FINING"
- L.1.12.3 ADD MIDTOWN AND CHARLESTON PLAZA (HOUSING SHOULD NOT BE PERMITTED)
 - NOTE: ANY DEVELOPMENT WOULD DEVASTATE LOCAL BUSINESSES AND MAKE PARKING WORSE

GOAL L-2

- PROGRAM L2.2.1 OMIT. I DO NOT THINK SMALL RETAIL FITS IN RESIDENTIAL ESPECALLY R1
- PROGRAM L2.3.1. DO NOT REMOVE SAN ANTONIO FROM HOUSING SITE POTENTIAL. THERE IS HOUSING THERE ALREADY WITH GREENHOUSE, PALO ALTO GARDENS, AND THE JCC/ALTAIRE AND ALTURA
- L.4.4.2: QUESTION: EXISTING WORK WITH PRIVATE ENTITIES FOR RESTROOMS?
-

- L.4.4.3 QUESTION: WHO IS WORKING WITH CN MERCHANTS? NOT THE CHAMBER , IF PLANNING, DO THEY TAKE ACTION ON CITY COMPLAINT, OR HOW DO THEY PRIORITIZE? CN SHOULD NOT BE FORCED TO HAVE BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT DISTRICTS. THE SMALL MERCHANTS CANNOT AFFORD AN ASSESSMENT.
- L.4.5.1: KEEP LOWER FAR
- L4.6.2: OTHER AREAS NEED A COORDINATED PLAN BEFORE DOWNTOWN.....FRYS'S FIRST (MENTIONED ALTER) THEN EL CAMINO ARE HIGHER PRIORITY.
- L.4.10.1 EAST WEST CONNECTION OMIT WORDING "TO BRING NEIGHBORHOODS TOGETHER"
- L.6.13.1 INCLUDE WIDER SIDEWALKS
- L9.4.2 WHILE A WORTHY GOAL, IT ISN'T IMPRACTICAL. IN MY EXPERIENCE MOSTLY DOESN'T WORK
- L9.8.1 OMIT WORDING (OR RE-WORD) "PUBLIC BUILDINGS". WHY SHOULD WE BUILD PUBLIC BUILDING IN GATEWAYS?
- L.9.13.1 HOW CAN THIS BE RE-WORDED SO THAT THE CITY DOESN'T PUT DOWN IMPROVEMENTS LIKE RE-TARRING STREETS AND THEN PUBLIC WORKS COMES ALONG AND TEARS UP. NEED TO INCLUDE COORDINATION BETWEEN DIFFERENT UTILITIES AND BUILDING.
- L.10.3.1 IF THIS IS EXISTING AND IS PLACE, CAN WE OMIT ?

NATURAL ENVIRONMENT

- N2.1.1 ADD ADOPT THE URBAN FOREST MASTER PLAN (WORDING DELETED FROM ANOTHER ELEMENT)
- N2.2.1 ADD ESPECIALLY FOR CONTRUCTION
- N3.3.2 COMBINE WITH N.3.3.1
- N4.7.3 COMBINE WITH N.4.7.1
- N4.7.4 COMBINE WITH N.4.7.1
- N.4.11.3 COMBINE WITH N4.11.1
- COMBINE N4.13.1 AND N4.12.2
- N4.13.2: DO WE NEED THIS? COMPLETE IMPROVEMENTS TO STORM DRAIN MASTER PLAN...SINCE IT IS ONGOING AND WILL BE DECIDED SOON IN BALLOT?
- COMBINE N.4.14.1 AND N.4.14.2
- COMBINE N4.16.1 AND N4.16.3

SAFETY ELEMENT

- S.1.5.1 ONGOING PROGRAM. ADD OES TO DEPARTMENT
- S.1.10.1 IS ONGOING. DOES THIS NEED TO BE A POLICY?
- S1.10.3 IS ONGOING. DOES THIS NEED TO BE A POLICY?
- S2.7.1 REWORD
- S2.7.3 COMBINE WITH S 2.5.2
- S2.8.2 SHOULDN'T THIS BE ONGOING?
- S.2.9.2 CONSIDER RE-WRITING AND COMBINING WITH S.10.1
- S.2.12.2 COMBINE WITH S.2.13.1. IN S,2,12,2 ADD "FOOTHILLS"
- S.2.13.5 COMBINE WITH S2.15.1
- S.3.6.2 DOESN'T BELONG IN THIS SECTION " SUICIDE PREVENTION"

- S.3.1.5 COMBINE WITH S.3.1.6

BUSINESS AND ECONOMICS

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

- B.1.1: IS THERE A POLICY?
- B.4.6.3: STUDY SHOULD INCLUDE – “WHAT MAKES GROUND FLOOR RETAIL VIABLE” AS WELL AS WHAT TYPE OF BUSINESSES FIT IN WHAT TYPE OF AREA? D’TOWN, CAL AVE, MIDTOWN, EL CAMINO ETC

TRANSPORTATION

- T1.2.4: NEEDED? WHAT OTHER MAJOR CITY FACILITY WILL BE BUILT AFTER PUBLIC SAFETY BUILDING
- T1.5.1 REMOVE WORDING “ FOR LOCAL ERRANDS” LOCAL ERRANDS AND COMMUTING ARE APPLES AND ORANGES
- T.1.11.1: VTA SERVICES.. IS THIS A VERY SHORT TERM PROGRAM THAT IS NOT NEEDED IN COMPL PLAN?
- T1.19.5 I SUPPORT SAFETY FEATURES AS ENHANCED LIGHTING, BUT NOT INTREPRETATIVE STATIONS ESPECIALLY IN PARKS. SEEMS LIKE THIS SHOULD BE 2 SENTENCES. ONE FOR PARKS (ISN’T THIS IN PARK MASTER PLAN) AND ONE FOR THE BIKE/PED ROUTES. I SUPPORT STREET TREES AND LIGHTING. CONCERN OVER NEIGHBOHOOD SEATING AND INTREPRETIVE STATIONS
- T3.10.1 COMBINE WITH T.3.10.3
- T.3.10.4 RATHER AN UNDERPASSING DOWNTOWN, WE NEED ANOTHER IN SOUTH PALO ALTO ESPECIALLY NEARFOR SCHOOL CROSSINGS
- T.5.1.2 I DO NOT SUPPORT REDUCED PARKING FOR RETAIL AND RESTAURANTS
- T.5.1.4 I DO NOT SUPPORT THIS PROGRAM – UNBUNDLED PARKING
- T5.2.3 ADD CONSIDER SPECIAL PARKINF RATES FOR PALO ALTO RESIDENTS
- T.5.4.1 COMBINE WITH T.5.7.2
- T.6.1.2 MAKE MORE GENERIC. REMOVE CONCEPT OF PAPER MAPS.
- T6.2.1 WHY THIS AREA? IS THIS MORE OF A PROBLEM THAN ANY OTHER AREA? SAY MIDTOWN AT TOWLE? OR CROSSING AT SAFEWAY?