



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

TUESDAY, February 21, 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 Garber:** Alright folks. Let's get started. Can I ask Staff to call roll?

3 Present: Garber, Filppu, Glanckopf, Hetterly, Hitchings, Keller, Kleinhaus, Levy, McDougall,
4 McNair, Moran, Nadim, Packer, Peschcke-Koedt, Summa, Uhrbrock, van Riesen

5
6 Absent: Sung, Titus, Uang, Nadim

7

8 **Oral Communication:**

9 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. We have three cards for oral communications. Peter Taskovich, if I am
10 pronouncing your name correctly, you'll have three minutes.

11 **Peter Taskovich:** Hello, my name is Peter Taskovich. I'm a lifelong resident of Palo Alto and I just want to
12 talk briefly about the City's Council decision (inaudible) aside from all programs from the new
13 Comprehensive Plan. This is simply put, a slap in the face of all of you on the Citizen's Advisory
14 Community, who worked so diligently for many, many months debating, developing and approving
15 these programs. A Comprehensive Plan with only goals and policies but no programs is a toothless
16 document and simply portrays its name. A Comprehensive Plan without any stated programs to
17 implement at stated goals and policies can hardly be called Comprehensive at all. Sadly, it's a bad joke
18 that unfortunately, a slim majority on our City Council appears to want to (inaudible) on the citizens of
19 Palo Alto. I, therefore, will support all efforts by the members of the Citizen Advisory Committee to
20 reinstate all the programs your committee has already approved back into the new Comprehensive Plan.
21 The programs along with the goals and policies are an essential part of a meaningful and well-crafted
22 Comprehensive Plan and they must be stored back into the Comprehensive Plan so we all can have an
23 updated Comprehensive Plan that all of us can be proud of. Thank you.

24 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Next is Rita Vrhel. Vrhel, Rita.

25 **Rita Vrhel:** Good evening. I won't put it as eloquently as the first speaker, that was lovely. My feelings
26 are the same. I was there at the meeting and I just couldn't believe how 7, 8- years of work including a
27 year and a half or so of your work, was just gutted. Some people have said in a fashioned maneuver that



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE *DRAFT MINUTES*

1 was predetermined. I wouldn't go that far because I don't know but I know at the City Council retreat a
2 few days before the City Council meeting on 1/30, there was a discussion of transparency and the very
3 low and discouraging number of citizens who believe in the City Council. For the last 2-years, anyone
4 who complained to me about the City Council, I would say no, actually they will listen to you. You have
5 to show up. You have to tell them your concerns but they will listen. You know, I 'm not sure that I can
6 say that anymore and in fact, I haven't. I know that this Committee or I feel this Committee is deeply
7 divided on the issue of whether the 1/30 episode was appropriate and what the long term meaning of it
8 is. I've taken the time to listen to the 1/30 transcript over and over and over again and I have handed
9 out something to Dan, which I think you have, and its part of the transcript verbatim because the 1/30
10 transcript from the City will not be ready for probably another month or so. It's my opinion that items
11 under H, which where the Land Use Element content based on Council Member's Comments on
12 November 28th and it has all the letters under the land use; I didn't give you that part. There was a vote
13 to discuss but then that vote was taken and transformed into a yes or no vote on the item. I have sent
14 this transcript to the City Attorney, to all Members of the City Council, to the City Manager, and to the
15 City Clerk and they have not gotten back to me yet but I, like the first speaker, would encourage anyone
16 on the CAC who believes that their efforts were short changed or anybody in the Community who is
17 listening who feels that a Comprehensive Plan has to have something in it beside the promise of items
18 coming up for later discussion. If items are going to be coming up for later discussion, I would encourage
19 everybody to press the City Council as to when they are going to be coming up and also, ask for a full
20 meeting that doesn't start at 6 o'clock at night and go on – I mean, I left at 11:30 and I think they hadn't
21 even started on transportation. Thank you for taking my comments seriously.

22 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you, Rita. Sheri Furman.

23 **Sheri Furman:** Good evening everyone on this rainy night. I'm Sheri Furman and a Co-Chair of Palo Alto
24 Neighborhoods and I'm speaking on behalf of our executive Committee as empowered by the
25 organization itself. I first want to say that we support the issues raised in recent letters we've received
26 from several of your fellow CAC Members and I really hope I am preaching to the choir here. First the
27 definition of Comprehensive: Complete, including all or nearly all elements or aspects of something.
28 Removing programs surely weakens the idea of a Comprehensive Plan. Decoupling programs from their
29 related policy and placing them outside the body of the element weakens the policies whose programs
30 are supposed to support. Policies indicate what is to be achieved and programs provide how. Without
31 the specifics of programs to inform decisions and measure impacts, policies are simply wish lists that can
32 be interpreted and implemented in any number of ways depending on who's doing the interpretation.
33 Both residents and those doing business in the City will have no clear idea of what to expect. Finally, the
34 process. 5 people should not have the power to undo years of work with no discussion nor input from
35 you, the Staff and the public. The idea that programs will only move forward if a Council Member or
36 Staff suggests these should, is absurd. Staff is far too busy with the current issues (inaudible) and
37 program initiation should not be subject to the political make-up of the Council. The January 30th action



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE *DRAFT MINUTES*

1 by the bare majority of the Council and the way it was done belies a commitment to an inclusive and
2 open City government. We urge you to do two things. First, discuss the pros and cons of removing
3 programs from the Land Use and Transportation Elements and placing them in an appendix or separate
4 document. Council and the public need to understand whether and why such a move is or is not a good
5 idea. Second, petition the Council to agendaize and restore the programs to the Comp. Plan. Thank you.

6 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thanks, Sheri. Betty Jo Chang to be followed by Annette Ross. That's our last speaker
7 unless somebody else would like to speak and if so, please hand in a card.

8 **Betty Jo Chang:** My name is Betty Jo. I fully support the open letter to the Council from CAC Members
9 requesting that the Council reconsider its high-handed and foolhardy action. Stripped implementation
10 programs from the Comp. Plan with neither consideration nor debate. A plan without programs can't
11 even construct the paper that it's written on, much less provide the guidance needed for our City to
12 navigate the challenges we face. The Council wholesaled its positions of these programs. Rejects out of
13 hand without public debate. Years of work from dedicated City Staff and citizen volunteers to develop a
14 proactive plan to address the issues of greatest importance to our citizens. The manner in which this
15 decision was made also dismisses the value of collaborative and consensus-driven government. This is a
16 democracy and we ought to stand up for it. I fear both Council and community will live to rue the day
17 when such cavalier disrespect for both democracy and its citizens, drives away those volunteers who do
18 so much to make this a community in which we wish to live. I know how much effort has gone into this
19 CAC work. I thank you all for your service and I value the quality of the work product you've produced. I
20 want and expect the Council to respect it as well. Thank you.

21 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Annette Ross and that's the last card I have.

22 **Annette Ross:** Good evening. My name is Annette Ross and I'm here just as myself. I'm not representing
23 any particular group of people. My remarks concern what Council did on the Land Use Element at its
24 January 30th meeting. Even if you like the outcome, it was arrived at wrongly and that is critical. This CAC
25 was not formed as some sort of random good idea. Rather it's formulation response precisely to the
26 public participation statutory requirement that is set forth in the State's General Plan Guidelines. You all
27 did your job. By removing the programs and disallowing discussion on the action, Council not only undid
28 your work, it violated several provisions of the government code that apply to the General Plan. A
29 document that is regarded as a Constitution for land use development and as former Mayor Pat Burt
30 pointed out, what Council did was a tremendous departure from this City's established approach to
31 thing – to such things, excuse me. It appears that our Mayor and those who supported him in this are
32 banking on residents not paying sustained attention to what goes on at City Hall. It also appears that
33 there is an absolute disregard for the opinions of those not aligned with the majority on Council. Rather
34 than engage and discussion for the purpose of identifying common ground and reaching a workable
35 compromise in areas where there are differences, as you all did, the Council majority made the
36 unprecedented move of unilaterally eliminating the very programs that provide substance and guidance



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE *DRAFT MINUTES*

1 to the City's Comp. Plan. Council Member Wolbach encouraged this, saying it's simpler the document.
2 This is despite the fact that the law says that the plan must address building an [inaudible] and
3 population densities. Think about this, some documents work best when the details are clearly defined.
4 That's what programs do for General Plans. Said differently, it is the programs that make such plans
5 comprehensive. Removing the programs from the Land Use Element is both wrong and short sighted.
6 Council Members come and go. This Committee will disband. Plans endure, at least they should. That is
7 how we achieve consistency and smart planning. Without the programs, this City will develop according
8 to the whims of Staff and whoever holds the majority on City Council. This time around, you may be ok
9 with that. Next time, maybe not. We need to look no further than Washington for merit examples of
10 what happens when tides shift. I urge you to come together with a uniform voice and asked City Council
11 to reconsider their actions of January 30th. Thank you.

12 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. That's the last card we have. Before we get started, I would like to
13 acknowledge a couple of folks. Doria Summa, who has joined us, who wasn't here last time think but
14 congratulations on joining the PTC and now being our ex-officio member and representative of that.
15 Susan [Monk], I understand that you have been recently elected or appointed to the PTC, welcome and
16 former Mayor Pat Burt, thank you for joining us.

17 **Staff Comments:**

18

19 **Co-Chair Garber:** Staff, you have come comments to start us off?

20 **Hillary Gitelman:** I do. Thank you. First, for the Committee, I'm sure you noticed that Joanna and Elaine
21 are not here this evening. They are both on well-deserved vacations so Elena, Greg, Ashley and I are
22 here to fill in for them as best we can. I also just had one housekeeping item before we launch into the
23 discussion – the next discussion item on the Comp. Plan programs and organization and that related to
24 Brown Act Compliance. If you remember at the beginning of this process, we talked about the Brown
25 Act and we adopted some guild lines. One of the core principles of the Brown Act is that we must hold
26 meetings in public with proper notice and when members of the Committee post comments online or
27 contribute letters to the editor and all that, we start to run the risk of a non-noticed meeting. If – let me
28 just spell out how that would happen. It would happen if more than a quorum of this group were to
29 participate in the same forum and exchange ideas through that forum. It only becomes a problem when
30 it's more than a quorum but it's the first person who starts it and then the second person and third
31 person so everybody kind of has to be careful not to let this happen. It's happened a few times because
32 passions are running high, I understand that but I'm asking for your forbearance for the remainder of
33 the CAC process. If you have important things to say, send them to Staff. We'll distribute them in the
34 packet. We'll talk about them here at the meeting but if you could please reframe from the media
35 conversation, which could turn into a noticed meeting. That's the only housekeeping. Should I launch
36 into the first item?



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 **Co-Chair Keller:** Just a clarifying question? If one person posts something and a majority of the
2 Committee read it, is that a violation?

3 **Hillary Gitelman:** That is not a violation. The violation happens when more than a quorum are
4 participating but we as a group agreed that we wouldn't do this because it's not fair for the first person
5 to get to use the public forum and then the 9th person doesn't get to. I'm just reminding everybody of
6 the rules that we agreed on in the very beginning.

7 **Co-Chair Keller:** Ok because I thought that – I thought it one person post and even if everybody reads it,
8 that that's a – it's called a serial meeting. Anyway.

9 **Hillary Gitelman:** Should we move on?

10 **Agenda Items:**

11 **1. Discussion: January 31, 2017 City Council Meeting**
12

13 **Co-Chair Garber:** Yes, let's go to agenda item number 1. Discussion of the January 31st – 30th actually,
14 2017 City Council meeting and Hillary I believe have come comments to open up this item.

15 **Hillary Gitelman:** I do, thank you. I hope everybody had a chance to read our short memo. It's actually --
16 the Staff memo actually touches on two items that we wanted the Committee to be aware of. One is the
17 availability of a supplement of the Draft EIR. Those of you that have been paying attention know we
18 published a Draft EIR that analyzed forced planning scenarios. The Council asked us to analysis an
19 additional two so that supplement is now available for those who wish to dig in deep on the details.
20 We're in the public comment period so anybody who wants to can either submit oral comments at one
21 of the public hearing that's coming up or written comments by the close of the comment period and
22 there's a notice that I provided in your packet with the dates and deadlines for that. I have a quick
23 question?

24 **Shani Kleinhaus:** (Inaudible)

25 **Hillary Gitelman:** Yeah, it makes it clear in the notice that I provided. We're excepting comments on the
26 supplement to the Draft and the original Draft. Anything you have, either come to one of the public
27 hearings or submit those comments in writing.

28 **Don McDougall:** (Inaudible)

29 **Hillary Gitelman:** Public comments on a public – that – no. You'll submit those to Elaina and we will
30 collate them and it will be fine. Ok. The item de jure, getting beyond that issue was the Council's
31 direction to Staff on January 30th and included in the packet a copy of the action minutes so you can kind



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 of read through the motion, amendment, vote, all of that stuff and in the memo, we also tried to
2 summarize in bullet points what the Council's direction was. I'd be happy to answer any questions about
3 the specifics there but the direction to us that has gotten the most attention is the one about the
4 organization of the document and the suggestion and direction by a majority of the Council to place
5 programs in a separate document or an 'appendix' to the plan unless they are 'legally required'. It was
6 clear to me that we would need – we as Staff would need to follow up with the Council to understand
7 what it is exactly they were asking after we had an opportunity to assess that questions of what is legally
8 required. We have been doing some thinking about this. We, of course, have been reading your
9 thoughts and getting input from you and from others on this question. I liked – I don't know – I always
10 try and find the middle path so there's a spectrum of possibilities here. One end of the spectrum is pull
11 all those puppies out of the plan, put them in a separate document, put it on the shelf and never look at
12 it again. The other end of the spectrum is leaving it exactly the way it is, with all the programs built into
13 the plan, exactly as the CAC has delivered to the Council. I think there's a middle approach and we will
14 be exploring this approach and providing a recommendation to the Council on March 20th. That's the
15 next time we have an opportunity to agendize with the Council a discussion of this issue. All of their
16 agendas are jammed packed so that's the soonest we can get back to them. It's the same day we're
17 going to have the public hearing on the EIR that I just spoke about. It's going to be a Comp. Plan
18 appaloosa of an evening. I'll tell you just a little bit more about how we're exploring this middle path and
19 I hope that we will enjoy your support by the time we define this. Basically, our thought is we can
20 achieve the objectives of the majority of the Council to be just a little – play with the organization of the
21 document and be a little explicit that we can't possibly accomplish all of these programs but put them in
22 a format like the Implementation Plan in the current Comp. Plan. If you have seen the Implementation
23 Plan in the current Comp. Plan, it's terrific. We would put the programs in that kind of format. Maintain
24 the linkage to the policies so they would maintain their numbers and their linkage and they would have
25 a relative priority in that setting. Now, we are going to need some help from the subcommittee of the
26 CAC in crafting just what that would look at and I understand that the Chairs have formed the
27 membership of that subcommittee and we have a meeting scheduled with them next week to start that
28 work. Our thought is that we will discuss with the subcommittee, then with the Council and then with
29 this full group at your next meeting on the 21st. This kind of middle approach where we have an
30 Implementation Plan in the Comprehensive Plan update. Includes all the policies that you've help to
31 develop with the changes that the Council has wanted. If you have been paying attention, they've added
32 some, they've subtracted some and that I'm expecting that your subcommittee is also going to want to
33 help us add and subtract a little because there's a lot of redundancy in there. Once you see them all in
34 one place, you'll see that we can do a little trimming. In that context, we would try and prioritize. Just a
35 little piece of background, this was going to go out in the report to the subcommittee later this week but
36 we looked at all the programs from the last Comp. Plan, there were 266 or something like that, and I say
37 that we can say definitively that we have accomplished about 15% of them. In the Comp. Plan update
38 that we've been working on. There are slightly more than 400 that we've proposed and I think it's



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE *DRAFT MINUTES*

1 unrealistic to think that we're going to do more than 15% of those so we're going to ask the
2 subcommittee and ultimately this group to help us develop a prioritize recommendation for the Council.
3 Then they can take our recommendation or not but we will at least discharge our responsibility, I think,
4 in suggesting to them what we think the relative priority of these things are and then to the extent that
5 all of you can help us also get rid of the redundancies, that would be great. I think it would be an easier
6 sell to the Council if we didn't have 400+ of these programs; If we could get it down in number a little
7 bit. That's a little bit about what I think we're going to be doing with the subcommittee of the CAC and
8 where I hope we're going to end up with this process. I think our goal as Staff and I think the Mayor
9 articulated this in the State of the City Address is to end up at the end of the day with a Comp. Plan that
10 very much perpetuates the values in the existing Comp. Plan and that is completely compliant with State
11 Law and with our historic practice. The programs have a role in that and I think – I hope the Staff
12 recommendation as we develop it will help achieve that and that the Council will accept our
13 recommendation. Always with some changes but in the majority, I hope they will accept it. I'd be happy
14 to answer questions. I know this group has been longing for an opportunity to discuss this issue and
15 potentially whether you want to take a position or just continue to come to the Council meetings to
16 offer your individual support or opposing.

17 **Co-Chair Garber:** Let's entertain just clarify questions here because we'll get an opportunity to all
18 express ourselves. Stephen and then Bonnie.

19 **Stephen Levy:** First of all –ok. One, will Staff be able to give the subcommittee and then the Council and
20 the Committee's some idea of the relative workload involved in these items? I mean, priorities are
21 what's important to the community but if we pick four items at that each takes you a year?

22 **Hillary Gitelman:** Very good question. What we're shooting towards is a matrix or list of all the
23 programs with relative priority and relative level of effort.

24 **Stephen Levy:** Good.

25 **Hillary Gitelman:** We're not going to get into detail but we're going to say, one dollar sign, two-dollar
26 sign or three dollar signs. Just to try and at least, get out there what we think the relative level of effort
27 is.

28 **Stephen Levy:** The second question is will City Council weigh in on this question, I don't know much
29 about, is what is required by law? I heard that raised. I don't quite know what that means.

30 **Hillary Gitelman:** I think as Staff, we feel like that's one of the pieces of information we'll be providing
31 to the Council when we make a recommendation.

32 **Stephen Levy:** Not the subcommittee necessarily? Not enough time.



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE *DRAFT MINUTES*

1 **Hillary Gitelman:** We can talk about that in the subcommittee as well. Happy to do that. I would just
2 say, several – the government code requires implementation measures, terminology is important, in a
3 couple of the elements and certain things. One of the speakers referred to land use densities and
4 intensities so there are certain requirements in the government code but the government code also says
5 you can organize your General Plan any way you want to so you can put it into different chapters.

6 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Bonnie and then Arthur and then Annette. Lisa, you also had a question?

7 **Bonnie Packer:** I watched the video that you gave us. The link to that portion of the City Council meeting
8 and at the end, the City Manager said something about how in essences, this is an interactive, ongoing
9 process. This is not a done deal. They were just looking at a draft and the whole Comprehensive Plan will
10 come back to City Council. How are we taking that information into context? My second question is do
11 you – does anybody have any feeling whether this would apply to the other element, the Community
12 Services Element?

13 **Hillary Gitelman:** Thank you. I mean, I think these are – the last question about whether this applies to
14 all the elements is something we'll get clarification on, on the 20th. Hopefully, as I say, we'll be able to
15 steer towards a middle path and whatever we decide will be for all the elements. We won't treat one
16 different than the others. We'll see. In terms of the City Council, they're going to have additional
17 opportunities to weigh on this stuff and I thought the comment by the City Manager was right on. At this
18 point, what we're trying to do is give the Council the first look at all of your work products so the CAC
19 had worked hard on these things. We want the Council to take the first look. Prepare some revision
20 before it gets transmitted to the PTC for their work and their recommendation. Then what the PTC does,
21 goes back to the Council and it's not until that point that they finally have to adopt the actual final
22 language. There's still a long way to go.

23 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Just before we go on, I will acknowledge, Judy [Klineburge] having joined
24 us; the previous Mayor. Annette and then Lisa and then Jen.

25 **Annette Glanckopf:** Maybe you just clarified it but I understand what you've said about this concept of
26 meeting them halfway and putting together an appendix with programs, priorities and relative effort but
27 I'm still very concerned about how the programs actually get implemented because specifically, and I
28 also transcribed the entire Section H, when – you just repeated almost exactly what Mayor Scharff said.
29 He asked for that but he said – so I'm concerned about how stuff moves forward just because it's an
30 Implementation Plan and we have all the stuff listed because there's still not linking back. He said, the
31 way I understand this would work is that there would be an implementation section where all the
32 programs would be but they wouldn't actually mean that we would do them. Staff would have to come
33 forward and say, now we're going to implement programs such and such or we should implement a
34 program such and such or Council Members could write a colleague's memo or whatever, at which point
35 there would be the implementation of that that would move forward. Staff wouldn't have to spend the



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE *DRAFT MINUTES*

1 time on it and move forward on if there was no push from either a Council Member or from Council or
2 Staff driven. There would be no move to forward that. Again, I'm really concerned. We can do all this
3 work, we can prioritize if it were – the programs were in place, that would be part of the vision that we
4 could all refer to. Now, they're just going to be stuck away and even though there'll be a list of priorities
5 etc. I still am very unclear – to me, this is really the nut, besides the process, on actually how things will
6 be brought forward. Is it going to be cherry picking where some Council Members says gee, I really like
7 these three priorities or it is going to be Staff that has to take the time and effort to say these are our
8 top priorities? Maybe you could clarify that?

9 **Hillary Gitelman:** Yeah, really good question. First, let me clarify, I think that we're developing a
10 recommendation in which the programs would not be in an appendix. I think that is a word that is kind
11 of loaded and diminishes the importance of the programs that you've been working on. I think our
12 recommendation is going to try and find a way to perpetuate the Implementation Plan that's in the
13 current Comp. Plan. I mean that's what it is called. It's called the Implementation Plan and it's a list of
14 programs -- and our thought is that the introductory text of which the subcommittee and then this
15 CAC and then the Council will get to weigh in on will explain how the programs will be implemented. I
16 think it is sobering that only 15% of the programs in the last Comp. Plan were actually implemented
17 and so I think we have an opportunity to frame the table and the list of programs with the introductory
18 text to the Implementation Plan that makes it clear. Some of these programs are on-going and some of
19 these programs are already resourced. Some of these programs are not resourced but they're not costly
20 and don't require a lot of work. Some of these programs are costly and will require a lot of work and will
21 have to be budgeted in an annual budget cycle etc. We're all going to work on this explanation together
22 and I hope at the end of the day, it will be clear to folks that we've developed a suite of programs, we've
23 tried to prioritize them as best we can, we've acknowledged that priorities change over time but we've
24 given the community and the Council a clear view of how we think this Comp. Plan and its policies and
25 goals should be implemented over the life of the plan. Hope that made it a little clearer.

26 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Lisa and then Jen.

27 **Lisa Peschcke-Koedt:** Actually, two questions, just clarifying stuff. The Implementation Plan, I've
28 forgotten, it is an official required part of a Comp. Plan or it's discretionary whether it's there or not?
29 That's question one, sorry. The law doesn't call out the need for an Implementation Plan but it does
30 require implementation measures in some of the elements and this how we've chosen to implement
31 that locally.

32 **Lisa Peschcke-Koedt:** Ok. This is more – not to get into the debate of it but more – is there – did Council
33 specifically say or was there some downside to having said the top priority programs in the official
34 element and in the Implementation Plan? I think what you're saying is based on what Council is saying
35 that it would only be in the Implementation Plan?



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE *DRAFT MINUTES*

1 **Hillary Gitelman:** That could be something that they discuss on the 20th. I don't know where the
2 majority will be on the 20th. I think it could either way.

3 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Jen and then Arthur and that's the last – oh, I've got Alex, Shani, and
4 Hamilton.

5 **Jennifer Hetterly:** I just have a couple questions. First is that we have several programs that are EIR
6 mitigation measures and I wonder if those are ultimately, considered requirements – State requirement
7 even though – obviously the EIR has not yet been adopted?

8 **Hillary Gitelman:** Our position would be yes. The Council asked us to maintain existing legal
9 requirements and it we've identified something as a mitigation measure, it would fall into that category.

10 **Jennifer Hetterly:** The next question is as far as putting them all into an implementation chapter, how is
11 that any different from what the existing Comp. Plan does because the current implementation chapter
12 does attempt to prioritize among the programs. It's – what it sounds like to me is by removing them
13 from the elements, putting them into an Implementation Plan, which is not an adopted plan element.
14 That the only – we're not doing anything but removing the programs and adding a ramble saying we
15 really hope you're going to look harder at these than you might have.

16 **Hillary Gitelman:** I guess what I'm suggesting that the Implementation Plan would be part of the
17 adopted Comprehensive Plan. It would be part in parcel of the plan like it is today. I don't think anyone
18 would look at the Comp. Plan today and say oh, there's that implementation chapter in the back of the
19 book; it doesn't count. I think we consider that part of the Comprehensive Plan.

20 **Jennifer Hetterly:** Just to may clarify then because I want to make sure I understand what the situation
21 is. In the current plan, the programs exist within the adopted plan elements; they are enumerated there.
22 They also exist in the implementation chapter which describes how those programs will be implemented
23 over time. It seems to me if they are removed from the adopted plan elements, that the Implementation
24 Plan then no longer – then the Comp. Plan no longer provides authorization for Staff to pursue those
25 programs without further Council action. Despite the existence of an Implementation Plan that says if
26 you want to do this, these are what we think might be more important than others.

27 **Hillary Gitelman:** I guess I'm suggesting that there's another way to do that. That if you have an
28 Implementation Plan where all of the programs are located with the numeric attributes that related
29 them to the policies. All you've done is reorganized the document but you still have an Implementation
30 Plan that's part of the Comprehensive Plan like it is today.

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

32 **Alex Van Riesen:** (Inaudible) till I read this so I'm – this is all pretty new. I just want to see if I get this and
33 what I'm ultimately – maybe you can't say this – what drove the decision to do it this way? Was is surely



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE *DRAFT MINUTES*

1 the amount of programs that were suggested? Was it – I guess I’m wondering why instead of a
2 comment to the CAC to go back and say why don’t you prioritize the programs? Why this way of voting
3 on the City Council and really -- even giving the effect and obvious response of the city, why not just give
4 it back to us and say do this verses have a vote which elicits this sense of corruption in the government
5 about not – about violating the public process. Do you know why it went down this way?

6 **Hillary Gitelman:** I really can’t speak to the conduct of the meeting or – it was a noticed discussion of
7 the Land Use and Transportation Elements and the votes that happened where in that context. I also
8 can’t predict what’s going to happen on March 20th but I do know that we’re going to agendize another
9 discussion of this issue, which is garnered a lot of intense and emotional input...

10 **Alex Van Riesen:** Yeah.

11 **Hillary Gitelman:** ...and I hope at that time we’ll get clarity and my prediction or my hope is that we’ll
12 end up in the middle somewhere. In a place where people hate what they did on the 30th and people
13 who love what they did on the 30th can realize hey, there’s some common ground here and there’s a
14 way to get to the finish line with a plan that respects the current plans value and structure.

15 **Co-Chair Garber:** Shani and Hamilton. Arthur.

16 **Shani Kleinhaus:** I do not think we need the middle ground. I think there’s nothing that enforces or that
17 the City has to implement every one of the programs. It’s their choice which ones they want to
18 implement and they can always prioritize. The flexibility that they get by us not prioritizing things is a lot
19 wider than if we did. If we now go and prioritize programs and in 3-years there’s the (inaudible) and a lot
20 of vacancies and no problems to find housing, everything changes. We should not put priority in a
21 General Plan. We should be providing a big palette of programs the City can then prioritize when the
22 time comes as needed. If you look at what other Cities do for prioritization. The City of San Jose, their
23 prioritization is on the 28th. Other Cities have had it recently. They have different ways to do it. In San
24 Jose, the City Council and Staff can come up with memos. These are things that are important to us...

25 **Co-Chair Garber:** Shani?

26 **Shani Kleinhaus:** ...and that’s how they should do it.

27 **Co-Chair Garber:** Forgive me. You’re making comments which you are welcome to do in a moment but
28 it you have a clarifying question?

29 **Shani Kleinhaus:** I guess my question is why and I don’t have an answer to that and I want to – again,
30 like the letter we sent, register that this is a wrong way to do it. I wrote so many people to come here
31 and speak whether it’s the disabled community, the people who spoke for trees, all sorts of things. This
32 is just not right.



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Hamilton and then Arthur and Annette also wanted a -- one more.

2 **Hamilton Hitchings:** I have clarifying a question. You may have essentially, in assertion, that being in the
3 Implementation Plan was equivalent legally to being in the Land Use or Transportation Element but my
4 understanding and I'm not an expert, is that it is not the same legally. That if it's in the plan then
5 ordinances and zoning and other things the City does has to be consistent with it but if it's in the
6 Implementation Plan, it does not have to be. Could you speak a little bit about the subtle differences
7 between being in the elements versus being in an Implementation Plan? Thank you.

8 **Hillary Gitelman:** Well, this is one of the issues that I think we are going to have to carefully investigate
9 and present to the Council on the 20th. First of all, I should say that we've talked -- we've to look at what
10 the other jurisdictions do and many other jurisdictions put the implementation measures in another
11 chapter at the end of the book in a separate plan. It's been our practice here in Palo Alto to include
12 those in -- under the policies that they are intended to implement and I think that's a perfectly fine
13 approach. My personal feeling is that it's -- when we evaluate programs for consistency with the plan,
14 we're really looking at the goals and policies of the plan and whether an implementation action like a
15 new development proposal or a new ordinance would further the goals and policies of the
16 Comprehensive Plan or whether they conflict with the goals and policies of the plan. The
17 implementation measures are another way to implement the goals and policies of the plan. Normally we
18 implement the Comprehensive plan through our day to day decision making on ordinances, on capital
19 improvements, on development projects and we also implement the Comprehensive Plan through the
20 specific measures that are identified in the plan, which again, call for ordinances and actions on the part
21 of the City. That's kind of a convoluted answer but I hope I got to your questions.

22 **Co-Chair Garber:** Yeah, we'll do Arthur first and then we'll go around. Can we pick up your question as
23 part of the surround?

24 **Annette Glanckopf:** (Inaudible)

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

26 **Bonnie Packer:** (Inaudible)

27 **Co-Chair Keller:** I think that it would be good too -- we've had a lot...(crosstalk)

28 **Co-Chair Garber:** Let's -- yeah.

29 **Co-Chair Keller:** ... of questions. Why don't we do that when we go around the room. You can ask
30 questions while going around the room too. I think that we've just -- this is getting a little bit out of hand
31 with lots of questions. We expected a few of them, not half the room making comments -- questions and
32 some comments. Let me follow-up on Hamilton's question. I had a chat with Mayor Scharff, who agreed
33 that having the programs not be in the elements but have them be in the Implementation Plan did not



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE *DRAFT MINUTES*

1 have the same legal weight as having them in the element. Having them in an Implementation Plan has
2 less legal weight than having them in the elements. In particular, the fact that the EIR requires them to
3 be in the elements indicated that there is a distinction. The second thing is that when I was on the
4 Planning and Transportation Commission, I saw development proposals that said that policies – goals,
5 policies and programs were in support of those development proposals. I am wondering whether if the
6 programs are not in the element but instead in the Implementation Plan, will developers who say that –
7 not say that these Comp. Plan things are in favor of the development? Will they no longer list programs
8 and now only list policies – goals and policies and those handful of programs that are retained for legal
9 reasons – I think that that’s a useful distinction that I think would help people.

10 **Hilary Gitelman:** Thank you for that question again, Arthur. I think I’m saying to Hamilton and I’ll say to
11 you, you have my commitment as Staff, we’re going to delve into this issue and provide from our legal
12 team and from our professional planning perspective an answer to that very question and when we go
13 back to Council on the 20th.

14 **Co-Chair Garber:** Ok. Let’s move on. A couple of things before we go around the table. I had sent out an
15 email from Arthur and myself on the appointments to the implementation subcommittee. Let me just
16 read them off here. Alex, Annette, Bonnie, Don, Elaine, Hamilton, Shani and Stephen. The ex officio
17 appointments are Doria and Whitney. Actually, Hillary, could I have you very briefly describe the rules
18 and responsibilities of the mission of that subcommittee for the benefit of some who have asked?

19 **Hilary Gitelman:** Sure. Again, we’re hoping to get a Staff report out to the Committee – the
20 subcommittee this week that includes a listing of all of the programs that the CAC has recommended in
21 each of the elements you’ve looked at so far. There are 400+ ...

22 **Male:** Oh, my gosh.

23 **Hilary Gitelman:** ...of these. We will include in them our first take – very preliminary take on relative
24 priority and relative level of effort. We’re hoping that the subcommittee will review this list with us.
25 Look for redundancies and help us scale down the list to the extent that’s feasible and help us with the
26 priorities. I’m confident that the initial take we have on it will change some and think the Committee is
27 going to be very useful in helping us do that. I hope you – those of you who are on the subcommittee
28 will either bring with you or have access to one of the later versions of the elements that we looked at
29 because we’re using the same number system. We relating the programs on the list back to the policies
30 that wherein the elements. We’ll send you copies or links?

31 **Elena Lee:** We’ll provide links to the most recent elements and we’ll also have hard copies of that – one
32 hard copy of each element at the meeting.



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE *DRAFT MINUTES*

1 **Hillary Gitelman:** Just to refresh what we want this subcommittee to help with – just as we did in prior
2 elements is to develop a set of recommendations, changes, that we would then bring to this full group
3 for discussion at your next monthly meeting.

4 **Co-Chair Garber:** We'll go around the table. Alex, just to give you a head up. I'm going to go first and
5 then you're next.

6 **Alex Van Riesen:** Awesome.

7 **Co-Chair Garber:** At the Council's meeting three Monday's ago, I share the Council person Phil initial
8 reaction to Wolbach's motion to remove the programs of the Land Use Element from the Comp. Plan.
9 While he shared the spirit of Wolbach's motion to make the Comp. Plan more clear and concise. He felt
10 that it was "a massive change to make without a lot more discussion." To be more direct, I wasn't
11 happy. I felt that the Council's action threatened to under mind the hard work that we've done here at
12 the CAC. I think that all of us to a greater or lesser extent believe that the Comp. Plan can stand to be
13 condensed, redundancies removed, made easier to read and speak with more clear and concise voice. I
14 recognize that the CAC is advisory. The Council can take or leave our work as they wish but Arthur and I
15 have worked our butts off to get the CAC to work together towards a consensus where we can and
16 provide clear alternatives where we cannot. In fact, everyone here has done that. It has been hard,
17 difficult work that at times has been very trying. Who here hasn't had their sense decorum challenged?
18 Who hasn't wanted to leave the Committee? Who has wished that they didn't have to deal with
19 someone else's differing view? Who amongst us hasn't complained that the CAC simple doesn't work or
20 that it can't work? We've managed to move through most of these feelings to a greater degree that I
21 think many of us have expected. We have been successful moving the Committee's work forward. I was
22 pissed that the Council was ignoring our real accomplishment. That we were finding a way to get
23 something done together as a community. I will not support an action to (inaudible) the Council for their
24 action. We rightfully need to air our thoughts and criticisms so that they are captured in the verbatim
25 minutes for the Council and the public to read. Then, assuming that the underlining issue that the
26 Council's attempting to grabble with 3-weeks ago, was how to make the Comp. Plan more clear and
27 concise. We need to focus productively on the ideas that the CAC can recommend that Council can take
28 to accomplish this. In addition to our own comments, Arthur will share some thoughts that he and I have
29 discussed along these lines. If we need to, we will present the Council alternatives for them to consider.
30 You'll note that I have handed out at your places 5 question that may help us structure our conversation
31 this evening. The questions are regarding programs location, the CAC's involvement, the continuity with
32 other elements, prioritizing programs in the work plan and the CAC's commitment to it. It's now 6:20.
33 I'm going to try and focus on seeing if we can get through this by 7:30 but let me ask a question of
34 everyone. Are there large issues that anyone wants to bring up relative to the Business Element? I'm
35 hearing that there is a lot of support for it and most people seem to be on the same page so I don't think
36 we have a long discussion there. If we need some more time, I will take some out – sometimes out of



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 that. Otherwise, we'll try and end by 7:30 or shortly thereafter on this item. Alright. Let's move forward.
2 Alex.

3 **Alex Van Riesen:** First, can I get a copy of those 5 questions? I don't – I did not get one of those. Thank
4 you. As I stated earlier, this was relatively new information to me. I will leave it with, I think Dan, what
5 you read was well said and captured how I feel. I think I would also, had it not been inappropriate,
6 would have added my name to the letter that went to the Council. I guess I would just summarize but –
7 that at the best it seems like this was an unwise move. At worst, it seems somewhat questionable in
8 terms of motives and intentions but I don't know enough and I'd like to hear more. I'm disappointed in
9 their decision.

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

11 **Don McDougall:** You can say anything you like...

12 **Whitney McNair:** Sorry, I was a little confused.

13 **Don McDougall:** ...you don't have to answer Dan's damn questions.

14 **Whitney McNair:** We're just commenting about that piece of...

15 **Co-Chair Garber:** Yeah, if you have comments regarding the Council's action on the 30th. If you have
16 none, you can pass.

17 **Whitney McNair:** No, I don't have any comments.

18 **Co-Chair Garber:** Don.

19 **Don McDougall:** First off I want to say, these are incredibly, interesting and insightful questions. Thanks,
20 Dan. I want to thank Hillary for her introduction and perseverance in answering all of the questions. I do
21 want to say, Hillary, I disagree with the concept that we need to get a half way -- in between
22 compromise. I, like Dan, believe that it – working hard to come up with something that is better than
23 what we have or good or perfect or whatever, that's ok with me. Working to improve it is ok with me
24 but compromising half way in between, I hope we don't start with that. Second thing I want to say is
25 that I'm really proud to be asked by Jennifer to co-author this At Place document you have. I think it was
26 a good spirit that we did this together. The third thing I want to do is echo what Dan said. I am very
27 proud – more proud than co-authoring with Jennifer. I am more proud that as part of this Committee, I
28 think we have encouraged and listened to input from the community, both through people coming and
29 participating here and through online. I think we've done a good job of listening to Staff and their
30 Council. I think we've done a particularly good job of listening to one another and I think now, we do
31 have something that is a balance. It's not determined to go one way or the other; whatever issue it is.
32 I'm proud of that conclusion but I would say that the process – I'm concerned that the process we used



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE *DRAFT MINUTES*

1 was to look at each element, to work with what Council gave us at the vision for that element and what
2 Council gave us as a first draft, I would say, of the goals throughout that element. Then we were
3 challenged to having those goals to come up with the policies and programs that fall into that space. We
4 could have approached this totally different and I suspect that as we compare our results to other
5 communities, that might be part of the difference that people come up with. Let's agree on what all of
6 the elements are and then let's agree with the vision for all those elements. Then let's agree with all of
7 the goals through every element. Then let's come up with all of the policies and then go back and come
8 up with all of the programs. If you were doing a Business Plan in a startup or whatever, that's probably
9 how you would do it. You would put up policies on the wall. You'd get all them right and then you would
10 figure out, what programs do I need to do to implement that? We didn't do it that way. I suspect that if
11 we did it that way, we would come up with a very, very different output and that's one of the reasons
12 I'm reluctant to just simply say, let's take the programs out and put them else ware because I really
13 believe that we created those programs in the context of the plan we were given. The fourth or the fifth
14 thing however – whatever – however we're counting is I'm really concerned that any of the CAC work is
15 considered transparently and separating the policies out does not constitute transparency or separating
16 the programs out from the policies does not constitute transparency. I would like to finish a couple more
17 points. One is that has been viewed as a small minority of the Council or whatever and like Dan, I'm not
18 particularly interested in admonishing particular members of the Council or whatever. I do remember –
19 you probably remember me coming back to this body a year ago, saying, we just went to Council. I sat
20 on the – I sat up there with Staff and had Council Members say, you need to create a document that is
21 wishy-washy so that we have more flexibility. That was not one of the current majority. The purpose of
22 what they did last – on the 30th or 31st was again, to give them more flexibility. My biggest concern, both
23 last year and this year is that flexibility is another word for ignore and that's why I am reluctant to
24 encourage that they get separated out.

25 **Co-Chair Garber:** Don?

26 **Don McDougall:** I don't see it as partisan, I see it as a dangerous way to set up the Comp. Plan for not
27 just last year's Council or this year's Council but 5-years and 10-years from now where everything gets
28 separated and you give them, even more, flexibility.

29 **Co-Chair Garber:** Don? Don? Forgive me.

30 **Don McDougall:** I'll stop.

31 **Co-Chair Garber:** Ok. Thank you. Whitney, you had a brief comment?

32 **Whitney McNair:** I do, I'm sorry. Thank you for indulging me. I did get a chance to look at the questions
33 for the CAC to consider and I do support the things that Dan, you said. I don't feel comfortable sending a
34 letter admonishing the Council. It was maybe something that was done. It wasn't very eloquent or – the
35 way it was done but I don't know if I believe by stripping out the implementation measures and – or the



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE *DRAFT MINUTES*

1 programs and making an Implementation Plan that diminishes them in some way. It's like an EIR. You
2 guys have seen those, EIRs? At the end of an EIR, you have a mitigation monitoring and reporting
3 program. You have a collection of all of the programs and all the requirements. It says when you're
4 going to get them done, who's responsible for them and it gives you an easy checklist that you carry
5 with you. That you follow all of those things to make sure that they're implemented. It's easier to
6 prioritize them. It's easier to see them all in one place. You can – if you look at some different Cities,
7 they prioritize them over a time period or by funding mechanisms but there's a way that you can kind of
8 sort them and see them together versus just within a document. I'm not sure I would actually ask that
9 you have the City Attorney review to see the way that it's done. I don't know if I support or agree with
10 the comment that by having it in an Implementation Plan, it doesn't carry the same legal weight. It's still
11 is adopted by ordinance or by resolution so I think you could make sure that implementation of it does
12 carry the same weight as the Comp. Plan. I do think we should continue as a CAC. It's been challenging
13 at times but the group has worked well together. I think the subcommittees have been very effective at
14 really diving into an issue. We should continue to look at those programs and develop them as we see fit
15 through the document and still carry those forwards in whatever it is the CAC takes forward to Council.

16 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. I want to make clear that my comments were no way criticizing the letters
17 that have been written or the letters to the editor or anything of that sort. All I was talking about was
18 this body formally taking a position of admonishing the Council. Julia.

19 **Julia Moran:** I agree that 400+ programs are too many but like Dan, I think that there are ways that we
20 can trim it down and make it more concise and make it more usable and this was disappointing. I also, I
21 mean Dan touched upon, I think we are a huge Committees that probably too big to be as functional as
22 it could be but we also represent such a huge breath of the community and I think that the work that
23 we've done here -- there are times that we've been incredible divisive but we've also come together a
24 lot and really compromised and worked, especially, on those subcommittees. I think that's valuable and
25 it's created a document that's not perfect to any of us but really has a place in the City.

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

27 **Shani Kleinhaus:** I want to the City of San Jose to ask for a certain project to move forward. It wasn't
28 high priority for them, it was for me. Their City manager brought out their Comprehensive Plan or
29 General Plan and said this is a book of conflicts. That's what I have to deal with. Everything is in there
30 and I have to pick and choose and your project is not something I feel is a high priority. We went to City
31 Council and I'm not going to go through that but there is a different process. The Comprehensive Plan is
32 not a Comprehensive Plan outline. It is a Comprehensive Plan, everything is in there. The City's priorities
33 are given to City Council. How do other Cities do this? Some of them have a priority session where
34 different City Council Members, as well as Staff, come up with – these are our priorities for the next 6-
35 months or year and then they vote and then they choose the ones they want to move forward with.
36 Other Cities do – Sunnyvale, they've had a study issue system, where anyone can propose a study issue.



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 It can be somebody from the public or somebody on City Council or Staff and then they go through
2 these in a certain manner and they have to get at least 3 votes or 2 votes to get through this first step
3 and then they go on. Just to take all those programs out, to me, is quite offensive; I'm offended. I
4 reached out to communities – the people who came from the disabled community are people who I
5 notified and I told them, this is another opportunity. You might want to come again and speak to us. A
6 lot of what they spoke about when into – a lot of the programs are not going to be a high priority for
7 Staff. They probably are a high priority for the community but they are not really big things that take a
8 huge amount of work and a lot of resources; they are really important to keep there. I don't know that
9 we can't have in the implementation chapter that something puts all these programs together but I'm
10 really opposed to removing them from where they are. At least those that had consensus and did not
11 have a huge opposition here. The ones that are controversial, those really should be prioritized
12 potentially, City Council should pay attention. All of the rest of them really should stay where they are.

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

14 **Doria Summa:** I want to start out by thanking everyone who's already spoken about this very elegantly
15 and eloquently. I have to say, I was there that night as where some of my colleagues. Co-Chair Dan and I
16 were there till the end and it was shocking to me. I've been to a lot of City Council meetings and I've
17 never quite seen anything happen that way. I realize that we're a recommending body and the Council
18 can do whatever they want with us but I frankly, was a little bit ashamed that they would so cavalierly
19 through away the work of so many people including Staff, the Co-Chairs and this body with no
20 discussion; no warning. I surely would – if I had known anything like that was going to happen, I surely
21 would have taken an opportunity to speak, whereas I didn't think I had to speak that evening because I
22 thought it was time for other people in the community who have not been able to have as much
23 influence over the process as I did, to speak and there were already many speakers. I would also like to
24 say that I was not able – I did not think since I'm back here as the representative from PTC, I did not
25 think it would be appropriate for me to sign onto the letter that 6-people sent in but I was very proud of
26 them. I'm proud to know people like that, that aren't afraid to speak up and write so plainly and well
27 about things. I really appreciate Alex's simple question. Why did the Council do this? Sure, maybe it was
28 for flexibility but I don't think flexibility should be built into the Comp. Plan. I think the Comp. Plan
29 should serve Council's that have majorities or minorities that have different priorities. The Comp. Plan
30 should serve those of us in the community that is more pro-growth, faster growth, and those of us who
31 believe in slower growth. I don't see how tearing the programs out of the Land Use Element makes for
32 an elegant document across the board unless we take the programs out from all the elements and I
33 don't think anyone's suggesting that. I also believe that the process of us developing this would have
34 been totally different if we had taken the programs out. I think it would have been a tighter and cleaner
35 process. I think we would have written policies that had – that were more precise, relevant and well
36 written and I think it's a very disappointing turn of events. I don't know what to do to remedy it except



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE *DRAFT MINUTES*

1 to ask the larger community, all of Palo Alto, to share in thanking the Staff and the Co-Chairs and my
2 colleagues for the work we did and to ask the Council to better respect us and the process. Thank you.

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

4 **Len Filppu:** Yes Hillary, I have a question and was told that we could – it's ok. I was patient. Is the
5 compromise idea that you're talking about, has that been floated by the Council at all? Is that...

6 **Hillary Gitelman:** You know, I just – I didn't want to suggest that something is fully baked. What I
7 wanted to impart to this group is our thought process as we're trying to put together a report – a Staff
8 report to the Council for March 20th. We are investigating how other jurisdictions do it. Putting some
9 thought into what's happened in this community in the past. In other words, the structure of the current
10 Comp. Plan and how that's worked and what some various approaches might be. I think there are a
11 number of ways that this could have finally be resolved and ultimately, it's going to be up to the Council.
12 What we have so far is this slim majority telling us they want us to put the programs in a separate
13 chapter. I'm trying to suggest, I guess, that there's a way to do that and not lose the value of the work
14 that's happened so far. I don't know whether the Council will reconsider their position. I think some of
15 the comments that you all are making are not just passionate but insightful. We probably would have
16 approached this task a little differently if we'd know that the structure was going to be different. We'll
17 see on March 20th what the Council says and what the Staff comes up with in terms of a final
18 recommendation, whether it's this kind of compromise or one extreme or the other, will be available to
19 everyone 11 days before the meeting.

20 **Len Filppu:** Thank you for that and thank you also for making this item number 1 on the agenda; for
21 changing that, I greatly appreciate that. It's the elephant in the room that we're very glad to be able to
22 talk about. I think the Council, you know, they're a political body and I think they made a political
23 decision. A slim sliver of a majority voted to remove the programs and this is after years of work by
24 other Councils, citizens, CAC members, Staff and as others have mentioned, input from citizens, input
25 from the community of Palo Alto. Often when I was speaking for programs and – that helped to define
26 the meaning and the intent of the policies, that was based on input from the soccer mom or the --
27 whomever, out in the community who doesn't have time to watch all this but does wish to have a voice.
28 I would urge the CAC, all of us here, to push back on Council. I don't – I think they threw the baby out
29 with the bathwater. I don't believe that they expected the kind of impact and result and reaction that
30 their getting. Not just from some of us in the CAC but also from the community and the speakers who
31 were here tonight. I believe that as a political body they will pay attention and I'd rather have them pay
32 attention to the importance of the entire community participating in input on this plan and have them
33 reconsider their position. I would urge us to – as they've thrown the baby out with the bathwater, I think
34 we should try to save the baby. Thanks.

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



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE *DRAFT MINUTES*

1 **Jennifer Hetterly:** I don't support a middle ground approach. I think -- I don't have confidence that this
2 new Implementation Plan would carry the same weight as what we currently have in the existing Comp.
3 Plan in terms of the direction the programs offer to Staff and to the community. I think the context of
4 putting the programs and the policies together – if you take them apart, you lose the context and that
5 makes it more difficult not only for Staff and for Council to figure out what's implementing what -- what
6 measure is related to what policy? It makes it impossible for the community to get a holistic view of
7 what exactly the City is trying to do. I also think that the policies without the program, like others, have
8 said before, was – we built those together as representatives of a balance and I think separating them
9 without going back through and reconsidering every single set of policies and programs, it—there's just
10 – it doesn't represent the consensus. I think it's a false representation of what the CAC has put forth. I
11 don't think that we need to admonish Council though I would love to personally, but that doesn't mean
12 that we can't ask them to reconsider what was an imprudent move. I think that – I think and hope that
13 the CAC would have a unified voice in requesting that, rather than supporting some middle ground that
14 doesn't meet our needs.

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

16 **Annette Glanckopf:** Thanks. I – my comments are going to echo a lot of what everyone had said. I really
17 think its 100% acceptable for us to go back and say, you know, this whole thing only took ten minutes of
18 your time, it came in the middle of the night, there was no one there, it wasn't noticed. I think you need
19 to reconsider after some thought and here is our number of letters etc. that really flush out the
20 situation. I actually, also think that we all need to call our Council Members and tell them what we think
21 so we need to be proactive. They still haven't said anything about the programs in the other elements so
22 now it's both transportation and land use. This really talks about transparency in government, which
23 really is a concern. This major decision happening in ten minutes. There were a lot of questions. People
24 said – even Council Member Phil says that gosh, I've got a couple minutes to think about it? I'm very
25 concerned that even though this might be the perfect solution, how the whole public, and I think other
26 people talked about this, are going to reflect on it. Reflect on our time and reflect on the work that
27 we've done. In the process, I think people have mentioned this but again, this should have been done –
28 if we were going to do it this way and I understand that other Cities have done it this way, we should
29 have been given this direction on day one because if you look at the policies, they're – we really have –
30 we would have flushed them out like what was described earlier but the way we've got it now is some of
31 the policies are really programs, some of the programs are really policies and they are all sort of
32 intertwined. I think it would have been dramatically different, as pointed out if we had been given a
33 different direction initially. The other problem with putting it into an appendix, which we're going to do
34 anyway, which I don't support. I mean, I support the appendix the way Hillary described it but I think
35 you need to have the programs under the policies. Even Council Member Phil says that I would like to
36 see the programs under the policies. How am I going to compare this program by this aspect of the
37 policies? The policies are really the meat, they are the specifics that talk about how it – the programs are



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 the specifics that talk about how the policy is going to be implanted. A Julia Child cookbook doesn't
2 work here so the question that I was going to ask is how are you going to relate all this if you don't have
3 it right there and that doesn't make any sense. I'm also against this idea that oh, let's do it – that came
4 out -- oh, it was done at the CCAP, let's do it here. I don't think there was any comparison between the
5 CCAP and the Comp. Plan. This is our document – legal document. This is our vision of the future and
6 again, the programs do flush out our vision. Even Council Member Holman said when someone comes –
7 Hillary, you talked about this early. When someone comes to the Planning Commission or Council, they
8 refer to this program and this policy. I think it's just totally diluted if you hide the programs off
9 somewhere which – and you don't tie them all together, which is what I'm thinking. Again, I'm running
10 out of time. I'm not so concerned about doing every single program. That's ok but again, there is vision
11 so you can have a vision but you don't have to fulfill it. I end up with the recommendation that we
12 respectfully ask them because there wasn't enough public input because it wasn't noticed etc., for them
13 to rethink this and have a more robust discussion on where we should go from here.

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

15 **Ellen Uhrbrock:** I'm really in favor of splitting out the programs into a separate list and having them very
16 well cross referenced to the policies because they support them and they give each other meaning.
17 Actually, I think this is a move which gives the Staff considerable power because what you do is move
18 the programs off into a separate treasure chest, which they can go back to and look and see what fits
19 and what we do next. I think it could be advantageous for the Staff. I think that it will, in fact, make it
20 easier to read the plan for the citizens -- for us because you read back and forth. What I do each time is I
21 first study the vision and then I study the goals and I look at the programs, in order to see how they
22 support the goals. I think that's not a usual way to examine a business problem, which this is. We don't
23 want to throw out the baby with the bath water. We want to save the baby no matter how informed it
24 may be. It's taken a lot of thought and time and you treasure this and you have it in your supply kit that
25 you can then go ahead and give good direction and good plans for the Council. I think that – I've spent
26 most of my time on this Committee, even before it was a Committee, working hard in order to get the
27 voice of the seniors heard by the City Council and to also help them know how you can share your
28 opinions and be heard so they're writing letters and all the things – maybe they can't come here for one
29 reason or the other. I think that the improvement of the – I will look back as my greatest
30 accomplishment and contribution to this group. I am in favor. I can see why this happened and at the
31 end of the meeting, the agenda didn't allow enough time in order to really discuss the programs at all
32 and actually, they moved right along. I was listening to it late at night and it was a way of moving
33 forward. No, you don't reprimand them for it. You say gosh, you know, it's true. You couldn't really think
34 about that. Let's do it and let's see what's best. My own recommendation split them off as an
35 organization problem and see how it will work – an operation problem.

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



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 **Bonnie Packer:** This is a difficult issue. If what the City Council did was actually throw away the
2 programs as some here have said, then I would be vehemently opposed. They didn't throw the
3 programs away so I think that's a miss characterization and its one to get – one could easily be
4 emotional about. What they did do is recommend a separation and it's a separation that most of us are
5 concerned with and what that separation of the programs from the policies means. I agree with what
6 others have said that if we had known this from the get-go, everything would have been written very
7 differently. The policies might have reflected – would have said, this should be our policy to be – for
8 example, this and then had the programs under, we would have written it differently. When you
9 separate the programs out from the policies, you lose a lot and I see that's a problem. We also don't
10 know, until we get a legal opinion about this, what weight the programs have if they are located
11 someplace else. I don't think they would lose weight but in the way, people respond to documents if
12 could happen. I think – when I – I was about to agree with whatever – either thing in the letter but then I
13 went and listened again – well, it was really the first time I had listened to the YouTube transcript and I
14 don't think that the City Council meant to throw away our work. They said that several times. They
15 actually used the word – somebody used the words, this is not a slap in the face of the CAC. I don't think
16 that was their intent but I also think that they did not understand the consequences or the unintended
17 consequences of the separation and that's what I think needs to be reconsidered. Some policies have
18 certain kinds of programs that you could take away and it wouldn't hurt and other policies have
19 programs that – it's very complicated and so do you separate, what you don't, could create so much
20 work for the Implementation Committee that it could slow down the whole Comp. Plan process; that is
21 may not be worth it. I would agree that we respectfully ask them to reconsider and that we should also
22 recognize, I think, that they really didn't mean to throw it away. I think they respect our work and I think
23 we should acknowledge that and feel grateful – I don't know if grateful is the right word. Just except
24 that they liked us. That's -- what I'd like to know is what the impact – I mean, they have to understand
25 the impact of the location of the programs. Oh, did the – my time is up? My time is up?

26 **Co-Chair Garber:** Please, complete your thought.

27 **Bonnie Packer:** I was just going to say, when I was on the Planning Commission, I remember that there's
28 an exercise that we have to go through to see whether the Comp. Plan – the implementation process is
29 going. We do that annually; do you still do that on the Planning Commission? Do an analysis and the
30 15% of the program from the existing Comp. Plan is kind of – turns you into a cynic. Maybe the result of
31 all this discussion is that we urge and keep on urging the City Council Members to direct Staff to give
32 them tools so that these things can be implemented. Look at all the programs that say, change the
33 zoning code to do X, Y and Z. Go and do that. That doesn't cost anything. It's just a few more hearings
34 and you have a zoning code change, I mean, you don't have to build anything. Why can't we do those
35 things? Remember when we did minimum densities in the House Element? That's been sitting there for
36 3-years, nobody has done anything, right? To change the zoning code. That's where – that's it.



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE *DRAFT MINUTES*

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

2 **Hamilton Hitchings:** What this Committee has accomplished is truly impressive. We've managed to
3 come to a consensus on all the policies and programs in every element except the land use. Even in the
4 Land Use Element, we worked together to queue up options for the City Council to vote on. This
5 remarkable achievement meant that we had crafted a Comprehensive Plan that truly represented our
6 City and community. Many of these programs took significant discussion to thoughtfully craft. When I
7 look at the work of the Transportation Element, Environmental, Community Services and Public Safety, I
8 see a brighter future because of the programs in those elements. By removing the programs from the
9 Comprehensive Plan, the City Council has discarded much of the community consensus. Community
10 consensus is important. Not including the programs in the Land Use and Transportation Element,
11 weakens their weight and loses context. One of the biggest concerns I had with that City Council
12 meeting on 1/30 is that removing all the programs was not publicly noticed and that was a dramatic
13 change. As a fundamental shortcoming in transparency and open government. It's one thing to publicly
14 notice it and then remove it, it's another not too. Some of the justifications that were given where that
15 the old Comprehensive Plan had conflicting programs yet not a single conflicting program was cited in
16 the current one and of course if they had, we would have eagerly worked to remedy that as Staff has
17 been very diligent with this plan. The second was flexibility but I believe this makes the program less
18 nimble. I know a lot about management. The biggest problem with micromanagement is the lack of
19 bandwidth resulting in items not getting done and when they do, not being properly thought out at the
20 level they deserve. The City Council should be working at a higher level on the big issues like moving the
21 ball on transportation and housing, not on these individual programs. City Council's come and go. Do we
22 want to divide, hostile town for the next 15-years or do we want to – or do folks have the foresight to
23 pursue community consensus based approach that will form a much stronger, longer lasting and a more
24 effective foundation for the City. When I think about the programs in our Comprehensive Plan, I think
25 about things like the Fry's Coordinated Area Plan, which is a program. The – reducing and measuring
26 single occupancy vehicles – let me just give you an example of a specific program. Private – Walk and
27 Roll have been tremendously successful and there is a program in there to do it for private schools. That
28 will never see the light of day and get time on the City Council agenda but it's a great program that City
29 Staff can easily implement if it was in the Comp. Plan. There are numerous programs concerning public
30 safety, environment, community services and specifically to help the child, elderly and the disabled, that
31 will be lost as a result of this. This is not about admonishing the City Council. It's about adopting
32 community consensus for the future of this City. Thank you.

33 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thanks, Hamilton. Stephen.

34 **Stephen Levy:** Thanks, Ellen, for your work for seniors. What I hear is a lot of distressed of an
35 ambiguous Council statement that I happen to, with Bonnie, trust that they meant what they said that
36 the programs were not discarded. I think that lack of trust is not helpful to a civil discussion going ahead.



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 I think that what Hillary proposed is my version of what reconsideration means. Reconsideration doesn't
2 mean putting all 400 programs back in the Comp. Plan, Land Use Element willy-nilly. Reconsideration
3 means -- I think, what the Council meant, was time for the community to come in and give feedback on
4 the priority question here. For Staff to give feedback on implementation; time of Staff. I am struck that
5 only 15% of the program were ever implemented. That suggests to me that our subcommittee and our
6 Committee and the Council work with Staff to give Council on recommendations on what priorities are,
7 what timeframe is reasonable for people to work on. I think we are doing with the implementation
8 subcommittee exactly what reconsideration means. We'll give them either a set of consensus
9 recommendations or a set of options like we did with the policies and life will go forward. I don't think
10 admonishing anybody -- I don't think this sense of outrage which was never there when the last Council
11 passed vote after vote that was 5-4, when the last Council routinely dismissed the recommendations of
12 the Planning and Transportation Commission and admonished them. I think we can cool that all down.
13 Council's come and go. The Council that gave us direction was unseated in a sense. If the new Council
14 wanted to give us direction when we wanted to work for another year, that would be this sitting
15 Council's direction, not the last Council's direction. I think we have to muddle through and try and get
16 through this with some civility as best I can. I hope the Implementation Committee finds a middle
17 ground because we are a divided group. We are a divided community if we're not going to continue to
18 have 5-4 and letters of people being appalled. We need to find some middle ground to identify the
19 programs that are a priority. Get Staff and Council working on them. I don't whether they're in the
20 element or in an Implementation Plan. I'm not a lawyer but I'd like the implementation subcommittee to
21 have the scope to weigh in on these issues.

22 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you, Stephen and Lisa, just before you go and if I can ask Hillary to help me out
23 here. Unfortunately, I'm going to need that light. There we go, thank you. I was just checking back on
24 the draft action minutes just so that we're not going around and around on this topic. I believe that the
25 last action that the Council did and I'm going to read it here from the motion on this top is Council
26 Member Wolbach moved, seconded by Council Member Fine to direct Staff to remove from the final
27 draft of the Comprehensive Plan update all programs in the Land Use Element not required by State law.
28 To be taken up at future dates a policy discussion and use the implementation section of the plan to
29 indicate the relative cost and priority of each program. Am I understanding that they were taking it out
30 of the element and then putting it into the -- they were not -- ultimately, they didn't take it out of the
31 Comp. Plan but they putting them just in the Implementation Plan?

32 **Hillary Gitelman:** I think that's one reading of it and I think on March 20th we'll confirm whether that is
33 the will of the majority of the Council.

34 **Co-Chair Garber:** Ok. Lisa, thank you.

35 **Lisa Peschcke-Koedt:** I have very much similar views I think to what has been shared, a couple of
36 differences but I want to share my views and then a recommendation also of what we would do going



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE *DRAFT MINUTES*

1 back to Council to see if we agree on it. I don't think it would necessarily be unanimous but maybe close
2 and apologize in advance, I might just go slightly over but I'll try not to. First of all, kind of like Don was
3 saying, I've also been an exc. In tech. companies for decades now and we always do what we call VSEM,
4 which is vision, strategy, execution and metrics. You set your long-term visions and your goal is kind of
5 the big picture that should last a long time. Strategy is usually a more mid-term, it could be 5 or 10-years
6 whatever but that kind of goes I think to the goals and to some extent our priorities and then the
7 execution isn't just what you're going to do today and in the next year. It really is the big buckets of stuff
8 we're going to go which I've always thought as what we were doing in the programs and they care out
9 that vision and strategy. Then when you've got that, you also need your metrics to see if you're on track
10 and what matters and what you're going to measure but you normal then, also have your 1-2-year
11 priority list. The stuff you're going to do first. Most critical including with resources and such. You can't
12 do everything at once, what are we going to do there? I've always thought the Comp. Plan was
13 something very similar to that and it worries me a lot if we take the programs, which I think are kind of
14 our execution and even a little bit of our strategy, out of the element. Legally or not, I have my own
15 opinion but I think it doesn't have the same weight to only be in the Implementation Plan. My personal
16 view is I think we should have the most important, maybe more long range programs in the element,
17 including the land use -- any element but including the land use and then the stuff that we think is most
18 important to do first would be in the Implementation Plan and clearly there would be duplicates. The
19 Implementation Plan, what are you going to do now kind of thing? I think taking them out and I
20 apologize but I don't think that middle ground of only being in the implementation -- again, if where my
21 discussion, I don't think it carries the same weight and there where various comments about it gets it
22 more -- it's not a comprehensive and I also don't think it's coordinated very well that way. That's my
23 personal view. As far as the Council and I -- it's hard because I didn't go that meeting and I've certainly
24 been at meetings where it's late at night and someone give you a mountain of work to do and you just
25 kind of go, I can't deal with it.

26 [Video skipped a section of Lisa's speech]

27 **Lisa Peschcke-Koedt:** [Video started back up mid-sentence] ... policies and leave a lone the visions and
28 goals. That was our original charter. We questioned it and they said no, that's what we want to do. If
29 now the Council -- if they are truly saying and we're now going to take those programs out and not give
30 them the right weight, I do think that's disrespectful. I'm not saying they intended it to be because I
31 have no -- I'm guess that everyone was just tired, right? I have certainly had nights like that. I don't mean
32 it in that sense and it's not personal but I would think that if we could ask the Council to clarify and if
33 we're understanding correctly, the majority interpretation here, then to reconsider and come back and
34 tell us. It is a new Council. If they don't want us involved, they can tell us that. If they do want us
35 involved, what can we do to help? I would ask them to reconsider -- sorry, if it's not just a clarification
36 like yeah, Lisa, we actually agree with everything you just said, this is just a clarification. Assuming it's
37 not then they have to reconsider is that the Council could ask us -- number 1 was really think through



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE *DRAFT MINUTES*

1 that shouldn't at least the key programs be part of the elements and a prioritized sub-set of those – and
2 it may be that they aren't 400 by the time we've done that but whatever the smaller number are also in
3 the Implementation Plan so that we can give it back to the Council and say this is what we, the
4 community input to us and the CAC as a whole, this is what we think is most important. Here Council,
5 this is really it and you shouldn't leave them out of the elements. The other thing I think around the
6 prioritization is that was something we all talked about when we first forming is that there is so many
7 things to do here. Shouldn't we have a, across the whole plan, a prioritize list? I think that's a valuable
8 thing if the Council wants it from. The last is again, not deeming bad intent or assuming it, is I think if the
9 Council comes back and says no, we don't need to clarify. You guys understood us and no we're not
10 going to reconsider, I would formally propose that we disband. I think that we have no role to play then.

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

12 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. First thing is I'm going to make a couple comments but before that, I'm
13 going to make a question of Hillary and the question is in the current Comp. Plan that was done is 1998,
14 what's in the Implementation Plan? My understanding is that it has all the programs and some sort of
15 prioritization or ranking or something in there already. Is that what's in there? Am I correct about that?

16 **Hillary Gitelman:** Yeah. It also identifies who would be responsible for the programs and there are
17 another number of columns but essentially, that's it.

18 **Co-Chair Keller:** If I understand the recommendation of the motion by the Council majority, it is
19 retaining that Implementation Plan as it is, without change and to remove the programs from the Comp.
20 Plan. Am I understanding that correctly?

21 **Hillary Gitelman:** Again, you heard the transcript that Dan read from. We're all trying to parse and then
22 understand exactly what the Council's directions was. I think that is certainly one reading of it and we
23 will get further clarification on the 20th.

24 **Co-Chair Keller:** Great, thank you. As I mentioned, I had some conversations – it was actually at the
25 Chinese New Year Celebration at Mitchell Park Community Center and Mayor Scharff, who is a real
26 estate attorney, said that not having the programs be in the Land Use Element means that they have
27 less legal weight. He did make a clear statement to that affect to me. In addition, Council Member
28 Wolbach said that their decision was not final. That the – he wanted feedback from the CAC. That's what
29 the CAC is for is to give feedback to the Council and give advice to the Council. He wanted our advice as
30 to what to do and he said that the idea of removing the programs from the Comprehensive Plan was a
31 new idea. Its hadn't occurred to him in previous times that the – this had gone before the Council, for
32 example, last year and that's why he hadn't brought it up. It was a new idea that he had. The item does
33 come back to Council on both land use and transportation as Hillary mentioned on March 20th. I'm not
34 sure what the compromise is. A compromise sounds to me like Solman splitting the baby, using a
35 metaphor that other people had talked about but in fact, I don't see a compromise. Either the programs



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 are in the elements – and housing element – I’m sorry in the Land Use Element or they’re not in the
2 Land Use Element. They can’t be half in except for maybe the ones required by the EIR are in and the
3 ones not required by the EIR are out. That’s – either there in or out. You can’t be half pregnant. Either
4 there in or out. That’s pretty clear to me. I, like Bonnie, participated in the PTC when we did the zoning
5 ordinance update and that was not cost free. It took a lot of Staff time and some consultant time. It also
6 took up PTC time that we could have done on other things. It was a multi-year process. We did that.
7 Also, as we mentioned by quite a number of people, the program – if we had the opportunity to
8 understand that we were no going to have the programs as part of the Comp. Plan, that only policies
9 would be part of the Comp. Plan. We would have written the programs differently and the policies
10 differently, we would have done that. In particular, one of the things mentioned at the Council meeting
11 was the idea that Council Members where to have the opportunity to select programs that they wanted
12 to reinstate as policies. I think that as they are now, programs are – there wasn’t a motion but it was in a
13 narrative. If you actually listen to the video, there was a comment about that. That people can – Council
14 Members can bring that back when the item comes back to them on March 20th. It seems to me a
15 couple of things. First of all, programs explain policies where they appear. We’ve written them that way.
16 We’ve written the programs – we haven’t – we made the policies and programs redundant. We’ve made
17 it so that the programs elucidate the policies that they appear under. I think that’s the way we wrote
18 them. If we knew the programs where going to be differently – where located somewhere else and not
19 in the body of the element, we would have written the policy to be self-contained and not rely on their
20 interpretation for the programs. It seems to me that there are two options. The options are either put
21 the programs back, which by my count there are 14 voting members of the CAC present today and 11 of
22 those people said that they wanted the programs put back into the Comp. Plan. I counted only 3 people
23 who said otherwise. Secondly, the other option is that if the Council persists in the notion of having the
24 programs be in – not in the Comp. Plan and only in the Implementation Plan, which they have long been
25 in the current 1998 Comp. Plan. Then the CAC, as a recommending body and as the citizens – and as the
26 embodiment of the citizen’s inputs into the Council for the Comp. Plan should have to opportunity to
27 change programs into policies and reword policies to make them clearer where they are not clear as
28 being separated from the programs. I think we should have the same opportunity to do that as it’s being
29 given to Council. If that means that we have to stretch things out, I hope that those of you on the
30 Implementation Plan – a subcommittee will be participating in that because I think it’s important work
31 but in a fact, it furthers our work in an important way. I think that’s – when you change things around
32 it’s not cost free. For us, the cost is that we have to spend more time on the Implementation Plan than
33 we otherwise might and I’ve been thinking about this for some time that the Implementation Plan,
34 having one meeting about it wasn’t sufficient in the first place. Now that the Implementation Plan might
35 have a whole bunch more weight than when otherwise and then the implementation subcommittee
36 actually should decide if the programs are removed from the Comp. Plan Element and only in the
37 Implementation Plan that decision as to realigning some programs as policies should be recommended



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE *DRAFT MINUTES*

1 by the Implementation Plan and this – to the CAC as a whole and then more forward from that. I think
2 that’s the alternative solution we should consider. Do you want to weigh in Hillary before?

3 **Hillary Gitelman:** (Inaudible)

4 **Co-Chair Keller:** In terms of this, I think that makes sense. I also raise the question in (inaudible) number
5 3 – question number 3, continuity with the other elements. If all programs are removed from the Land
6 Use Element and also, there was a motion to remove them from the Transportation Element in reaction.
7 Does it make sense to have them with the housing natural environment, safety, community services and
8 business and economics because there’s some inconsistency there. Well, there’s a little kind of glitch
9 that happens with that. If the decision is made to remove them from everywhere, they can’t legally be
10 removed from the housing element because that’s an approved housing element by the housing – HCD
11 (Housing and Community Development) department of the State of California. Therefore, that can’t
12 even be touched so that’s one element that has all of its programs and then the other elements don’t
13 have any programs? Somehow there’s some weirdness going on there that is -- I think we have to
14 understand that better. That may make us go back and want to revisit all the elements in terms of these
15 programs and put the policies back – put programs back as policies, that’s going to be a lot more work. I
16 think that – to me those – the recommendations that I’d like to see and may I make a motion to that
17 effect?

18 **Co-Chair Garber:** Why don’t you hold it until after Hillary has a chance.

19 **Co-Chair Keller:** Ok, I’ll let Hillary give her comments and then if I may make a motion to that effect I
20 will.

21 **Hillary Gitelman:** Just because I such a stickler about the Brown Act earlier, we noticed this for
22 discussion rather than action but I think – let me see if I can try and ...

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

24 **Hillary Gitelman:** I think you all have made incredibly insightful and important comments. I recognize
25 the passion with which some of them were delivered and I think your suggestions and your Council are
26 much appreciated. I would love to transmit the full transcript of this to the Council with a summary that
27 says a majority of those present requested that the Council reconsider – clarify and reconsider their
28 direction. I think it’s clear that a majority of you feel like the programs – you would have done this
29 differently if the programs were going to be separated and that the programs you crafted had some
30 purpose in being just opposed with the policies they were implementing. I would hope that you would
31 trust the Staff to characterize your input in that way and we’ll also transmit the full transcript because I
32 know there some folks who didn’t agree with everything I just said and I don’t want to diminish those
33 comments. I think you have our commitment, as Staff. We’ll transmit your comments, characterize them
34 carefully. We will provide the Council with answers to some of the questions we weren’t quite able to



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE *DRAFT MINUTES*

1 handle this evening and we are fully committed to working with the subcommittee on implementation
2 to review the Implementation Plan and bring it back to this group for further discussion. Just looking
3 ahead, your next meeting is March 21st, I believe, which is the night after the Council meeting so we will
4 have an opportunity to understand and react if the Council does or doesn't reconsider their action based
5 on your request.

6 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Let's take a couple of questions if people have and then maybe, rather
7 than creating a motion because you're right, it wasn't noticed. Maybe we find it appropriate to take a
8 straw poll if that's appropriate or if that's a desired thing. I've got Stephen, then Lisa, then Hamilton, and
9 the we had Bonnie, Len. Anyone else? Alright. Stephen, go ahead.

10 **Stephen Levy:** If I remember the roll call, there are 14 present of what 21 or 22 members?

11 **Co-Chair Garber:** Actually, because of the [phonetics][netristion], we're at 17 so there are 3 members
12 that are not here.

13 **Stephen Levy:** Right, but

14 **Co-Chair Garber:** 2. 3, yeah.

15 **Stephen Levy:** When the element that we're talking about was considered, there are a number of
16 members who weighed in on that element who are not present and their voices should be represented.
17 They worked as hard as anyone else on that element so it's not really 14 out of 17 who worked on the
18 element. Isn't that correct?

19 **Co-Chair Garber:** That is correct.

20 **Stephen Levy:** Secondly, I thought we had a long discussion several meetings ago about taking votes and
21 the sense of the room was not to take votes. If we start taking votes, I have a whole lot of votes that I'd
22 like to go back and have taken. I think that's a path that's probably not prudent. Isn't that correct that
23 we decided as a body to give options and not take votes?

24 **Hillary Gitelman:** If I can...

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

26 **Hillary Gitelman:** I don't want to speak for the Co-Chair but I think what Dan is suggesting that we
27 simply take everyone temperature and make sure that my characterization of the majorities views is
28 accurate.

29 **Stephen Levy:** I support what Dan said, that's why I raised the point about the people who are not here.
30 Amy is not here, Elaine is not here. I've talked to both of them. Adrian is not here. Lots of people who
31 worked on the element are not here.



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 **Hillary Gitelman:** Am I right Dan? You just – we’re going to take a straw poll to make sure that I had
2 appropriately characterized the views of those present.

3 **Co-Chair Garber:** That is correct. We can – we don’t even have to raise our hands but I think it is
4 appropriate for us to find out who feels what about what topic. I don’t think that is creating a motion or
5 formalizing, which is what we had avoid doing previously. For instance, when we had submitted –
6 correct me if I am wrong Hillary. When we had submitted the Land Use Element, we did have some
7 notices to how many people spoke for which of the alternatives where supported. Right? There...

8 **Stephen Levy:** We did when there where options. We absolutely did when there are options.

9 **Co-Chair Garber:** I think the idea here – Shani?

10 **Shani Kleinhaus:** (Inaudible)

11 **Co-Chair Garber:** Don, I was hoping to get back to you because I cut you off but...

12 **Don McDougall:** (Inaudible)

13 **Co-Chair Garber:** Right.

14 **Don McDougall:** (Inaudible)

15 **Co-Chair Garber:** Mic.

16 **Don McDougall:** I am a perfectly willing to support an effort to improve this. As I – I want to repeat, I
17 don’t like the idea of let’s compromise as oppose to find a way to make it better, if we all agree. In any
18 priority activity, I think you have to except that – except for the issue of the housing – all programs come
19 out and I don’t think that as much as I’m on that Committee, I don’t think the implementation
20 Committee should decide priorities. The whole CAC should and there should be some way of polling or
21 whatever that you do that you need to come up with.

22 **Hilary Gitelman:** Again, we’re going to transmit the full transcript so everyone’s input will be presented
23 to the Council.

24 **Co-Chair Garber:** Yeah, it’s looking like our straw poll is quickly being blown by the wind here. Thank
25 you, Stephen. Lisa, you had some comments as well? No. Hamilton? Then Bonnie and then Len.

26 **Hamilton Hitchings:** Sure. I think it’s not fair to characterize this as an issue about trust because I spend
27 over an hour, very carefully transcribing word by word what Greg Scharff and Cory and other folks said
28 at the Council meeting to try and understand and accurately interpret what they were saying. I think I
29 got a pretty clear idea afterwards which was that the intention was to remove the programs from the
30 plan and not only would they be removed, there would be a significant barrier to get them implemented



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE *DRAFT MINUTES*

1 because you'd have to come back in front of the Council and get the Council's approval. It's – I'm literally
2 just reacting to what Greg and Cory said. The thing to keep in mind here, these were not the
3 controversial programs. We cued up the controversial programs for votes because that's the idea. There
4 the City Council, they get to decide on – this was the stuff that we agreed on. Maybe not everything is
5 100% but that's part of what being – coming to consensus was on it. I think that's pretty powerful that
6 we had a consensus on that. The – I think that there – we're talking about whether we trim them down
7 and prioritize them. I think it's a really big effort to go through it and cut, let's say, the programs in half. I
8 mean I basically think that's biting off more than we can chew but I do think it's the purview of the
9 Council and the Staff to pick the programs that they believe are important and prioritize those but I
10 don't think it's appropriate to do it for the next 15-years. Does anyone in this room honestly think things
11 aren't going to change dramatically in the next 2-3 years in ways that we might not even be able to
12 imagine? We have major changes going on at the federal level just for starters. Certainly, changes we
13 couldn't anticipate a year ago, I don't think prioritization is the right tool here. I think the right tool is to
14 recognize that the programs will be prioritized based on the current Council and Staff, based on the
15 conditions that are local at that time. We should put them back in but maybe even acknowledge
16 formally within the plan something to that effect. Those are my comments.

17 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you. Bonnie and then Len.

18 **Bonnie Packer:** One thing I think would inform our discussion and maybe also the Council's discussion
19 when they do reconsider is a full understanding of the role of the Comprehensive Plan. People here –
20 some people said that the authority of the Comp. Plan and I don't know that the Comp. Plan has
21 authority in the same way the ordinances do so I think we need to understand that the relationship
22 between the Comp. Plan and how the Council makes decisions. I always understood that the Comp. Plan
23 is something that they can measure their decisions against as opposed to the plan that dictates what the
24 decisions are. Maybe it goes back and forth but I think we need a little clarification and maybe the City
25 Council needs clarification on that. I don't know. The other thing about all the different people touching
26 the different parts of the elephant and I think the elephant was a discussion that the City Council had
27 about this issues and each of us had read it somewhat differently, which just shows how in artful they
28 were in – I think the motion was poorly drafted and their discussion on it was poorly drafted so none of
29 us really knows what they intended for anyone to do. That's a concern and I hope that would be
30 reflected in the transcript that they read when you send it to them. In terms of your summary, Hillary, of
31 what we are talking about. I think the issue is programs in or programs out? It's not so much you
32 reconsider. I think the sense of many people here is that when we did this work, we understood that the
33 programs were going to be with the policies and that's what the whole thing was based on. Had we
34 known it differently – and they even said that in their discussion; well, we had told them this a year ago,
35 we should have done that but they didn't so now they have kind of created a mess and it's going to
36 delay – their goal – one of their priorities is to finish the Comp. Plan and they've kind of just thrown in a
37 monkey wrench because it's going to take a too long to unravel what it is they did, which they may have



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 thought was going to be streaming but looks like maybe not. I just hope that that goes into your
2 transcript.

3 **Co-Chair Garber:** Ok, so clearly, we're not going to be taking a poll or anything of that sort, however,
4 let's make sure that anybody else that would like to speak to this – and I've got Len and Annette. It's
5 already 7:30. We'll go perhaps another 10-minutes or so unless somebody else needs to speak. Len, go
6 ahead.

7 **Len Filppu:** My comment or question was going to be how would you characterize the term majority
8 thinking on this issue tonight when you talk to City Council? That's been talked about and – but I think
9 that it is important for, at least for me, to say that I believe that we should push back and keep the
10 programs in the Comprehensive Plan. To fully reflect the input of years of work, not just from Staff and
11 Council and the CAC but citizens, residents, the community of Palo Alto, many of whom were here today
12 to speak on this issue. Probably more speakers than we've ever had and all of whom were sad to learn
13 about the Council actions. Thanks.

14 **Co-Chair Garber:** Just before I go to Annette, let me just ask in general, I think there's – most of us here
15 are – our first recommendation is to keep the programs where they are and keep the plan in place as
16 we've had it so that we don't have to revisit the damn thing. If the Council comes back and says no. Do
17 we want to consider additional recommendations about how we would deal with that now or is that
18 something we would deal with in a – as part to the Implementation Committee or what? Later.

19 **Len Filppu:** Later. Just to continue on my time, I would say later. I think that you put the ball in their
20 court.

21 **Co-Chair Garber:** Ok. Thanks. Annette. I'm hearing that later from several voices in the room here.

22 **Annette Glanckopf:** I really want to be clear about this and I'm definitely an advocate of leaving the
23 programs in. I think we've made – people have been very eloquent tonight. I think a lot of us have been
24 trying to second guess what Council is intending and I don't want to have any false facts. Hamilton said
25 this but I think it's really important to restate it. They were in credible clear on what they meant and
26 Hillary, you asked Mayor Scharff, 'can I clarify the motion? Is it to illuminate the programs' and Greg
27 Scharff said, '(inaudible) in the implementation section', so he did talk about relative cost and priority
28 which is great, 'and see the way I understand this would work is that it would be an implementation and
29 that's where all the programs would be but they wouldn't actually mean that we would do them.' That's
30 very clear to me. 'Staff would come forward and say, now we're going to implement program such and
31 such or we should implement program such and such or Council Members could write a colleague's
32 memo or whatever at the point there would be implementation of that, would move forward.' Now that
33 to me, is very, very clear so we shouldn't have any false facts. This was their intention as far as I'm
34 concerned, that they really wanted to be able to be the people that selected what gets moved forward. I
35 want to see the programs still in the Comp. Plan and I think the implementation section should be as – I



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 think one of use described it, to start off with – in each element some sort of 2-year plan, 3-year plan
2 and have the high priority items of the element. To me, it's incredibly clear what the Council intentions
3 where. Scharff goes on to say, 'There are a bunch of programs that a lot of people put time and work
4 into and thought we should do but none of these have been vetted by Council.' They want to dump
5 them out. 'Frankly, by Council and a careful and thoughtful discussion of each one of them and if Staff
6 wants to move them forward or a Council Member thinks we should move them forward, then we'll
7 move them forward.' To me, I think we should – that was very clear to me what he actually – what his
8 intent was. I don't think we should be false and try to second guess it. You can't be clearer than that.

9 **Co-Chair Garber:** ok, thank you. Alex. Stephen, you want to speak again but Alex.

10 **Alex Van Riesen:** I just wanted to say, as one of the folks who initially did call in to question, I think the –
11 whatever the Council's motivations where. I want to say I agree. I want – I can back pedal from that. I
12 don't know what those where. I think it still would be interesting to hear them reflect on that but even if
13 you take that out of the equation. I guess what I want to say that it seems clear to me tonight, if we
14 remove all intention and motive out of it. What's been uniformly said is that the way this was done and
15 even that it has been done is highly suspect by the vast majority of this group. Even if you through in
16 some of the people who are no longer here or not here tonight. Even if the comments could speak for
17 themselves, it would be pretty obvious that it's at least twice the number of people. That it's a pretty
18 strong feeling on this team. I feel like I just wanted to make that clear.

19 **Co-Chair Garber:** OK. Stephen.

20 **Stephen Levy:** How does Staff decide what programs to move forward in? I'm wondering where they are
21 talking about a serious issue of contention here or whether in reality Staff takes direction from Council
22 on what programs to pursue and in what order. I really don't know the answer.

23 **Hillary Gitelman:** At present, we'll be working with the Implementation subcommittee and this CAC on
24 the programs that you have identified and put in the plan.

25 **Stephen Levy:** I meant in general.

26 **Hillary Gitelman:** Ultimately, in the future...

27 **Stephen Levy:** No, in the past. Just in general. Do you do programs on your own without Council asking?

28 **Hillary Gitelman:** I think when the Committee looks at the programs next month, you'll see some of
29 these things are ongoing already so they've already been budgeted and they're in play. Some of them
30 have not been budgeted and will take very little effort and some of them have not been budgeted and
31 will take a lot of effort.

32 **Stephen Levy:** I was asking a different question. Let's take the ones that are in play. Did..



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE *DRAFT MINUTES*

1 [Greg ??:] (Inaudible)

2 **Stephen Levy:** Do you do programs when Council doesn't ask for one? Do you do them when – in the
3 order that Council asks for them? How are – how is your work on programs developed?

4 **Hillary Gitelman:** We have an annual budget and an annual capital improvement plan that's adopted by
5 the Council (inaudible)(crosstalk)

6 **Stephen Levy:** Right so it's Council, right? Programs – right, so this whole idea that somehow you do
7 programs that Council doesn't want, that just sticks me as strange so wherever they are – it sounds to
8 me like the programs you work on are ones that are in the Capital Plan or the annual budget or the
9 annual thing that you take direction from Council on the programs. This is a mountain in a molehill it
10 seems to me. Anyhow.

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

12 **Co-Chair Keller:** Firstly, I don't think that on the adopted budget it says you're going to implement X, Y,
13 and Z programs and budget for them. I understand it gives budgets to the various Staff departments and
14 as Staff departments will then figure out in terms of the programs they do based on those budgets and
15 there's – but I've never seen in the budget saying we're going to do program number L -3.1.4, for
16 example. I've never seen such a thing and I don't think it occurs. In terms of – there was a mention that
17 was made of the authority of the Comp. Plan. Well, I have seen things where it says this is consistent
18 with the Comp. Plan or this is not consistent with the Comp. Plan. If the program is part of an element is
19 it considered whether it's consistent with the Comp. Plan. The program is not part of an element and
20 somewhere else like the Implementation Plan, then it is not considered whether it is consistent with the
21 Comp. Plan. That's my understanding of when Mayor Scharff said it is not have the same value so that's
22 my understanding. I think that that's a question that Hillary should ask of the City Attorney when Hillary
23 gives the information to the Council. I think that's a question that she should raise. We have not, in our
24 City, encountered the environment in which we have no programs in the Land Use Element so there will
25 only be speculation other than Mayor Scharff saying, it doesn't have the same legal value. I think in
26 terms of Alex's comment that says that it's hard for us to understand what the Council says. Actually,
27 Dan and I had invited several Council Member. We had invited originally the Mayor and the Mayor
28 couldn't make it and then Council Member Wolbach he could make it but he said it depends on whether
29 Staff says its ok. Also, Council Member Holman was invited and they both did a contingent on whether
30 Staff said it was ok. Staff said it was inappropriate to have Council Members give us information of only
31 two of them considering that it's a 9-member Council so that was not done but that's, in some sense,
32 why we are in continuing to speculate. I see it as the sense and an overwhelming consensus of this body
33 that it is our considered recommendation to put the programs back into the Comp. Plan. I think some of
34 us and I've mentioned this as a fall back and I think others of us do not want to have a fall back measure
35 but as a fall back measure, if they choose not to do that. I think it makes sense to give the CAC the



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 opportunity to change programs into policies just as was given to Council Members at that meeting to
2 come back on March 20th. I think that means that essentially, the schedule will have to be stretched out
3 to give us an opportunity to do that and we'll have to take that – to do that because we're the ones who
4 are closest to those programs. They're supposed to be high level. We – our job was to tee up questions
5 for the Council to decide a high level and in particular its inconsistency's. For example, there where
6 motions made by the Council to include programs. There was a motion made by the Council to include a
7 program to consider increasing FAR for hotels from either 3.0 or 2.5, where ever it is. Does that program
8 now go into the Implementation Plan after they made a motion to include it? This – clearly, they were
9 not even self-consistent in that meeting. I'm confused as to what they are doing but I think there's
10 clarity in this Committee and I think that that's pretty clear, the sense of what we should put forward to
11 the Council Thank you.

12 **Co-Chair Garber:** Bonnie, I am going to take your comments and then I want, to sum up and move on
13 here. Go ahead.

14 **Bonnie Packer:** I don't disagree with the last part of what you said but I think Arthur, you were
15 misleading us by saying – by implying the Implementation Plan was not part of the Comprehensive Plan.
16 The Implementation Plan is very much a part of the Comprehensive Plan. This is why the Council
17 Member's keep on saying, it was a formatting issue. They were just moving the programs into the
18 Implementation Plan. Now, I think a lot of us think that the programs belong with the policies for a lot of
19 other reasons because of the way they work together. The way the inform each other but the
20 implementation – I just had – the Implementation Plan is also the Comprehensive Plan and I don't think
21 we want to say – I think it would be wrong...

22 **Hamilton Hitchings:** (Inaudible)

23 **Bonnie Packer:** Well, he may not have been correct but I mean, when he said it that way but the Comp.
24 Plan has an Implementation Plan as part of the Comp. Plan, I mean that's what it is.

25 **Co-Chair Garber:** Bonnie, may I interrupt? Hillary, could you offer some clarification but I want to move
26 past this.

27 **Hillary Gitelman:** I think that the Implementation Plan can be adopted by the resolution that adopts the
28 Comprehensive Plan and can be part of the Comprehensive Plan as Bonnie says. I did not go back and
29 check out how the resolution reads. In the current Comprehensive Plan, it's a little bit moot because the
30 programs, as people have pointed out, are sprinkled throughout so it's a little bit different but the
31 question is, if the implementation program were separated out into an Implementation Plan they could
32 be adopted as part of the Comp. Plan.

33 **Co-Chair Garber:** Let's a – we need to – we're going to move on here because we've got something else
34 that we have to discuss but let me make this one suggestion and that is Staff has gotten a very good idea



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 of where the CAC is on this topic. I would also like to suggest that with the establishment or the
2 Implementation plan if there are the further direction that the Council does make that that be
3 considered in the implementation subcommittee and their recommendations brought to the larger CAC
4 for direction/action and/or other thoughts. With that, we're going to move on. Someone in this room
5 would like to take a 3-minute break. We will be back here in 3 minutes.

- 6 **2. Action: Business and Economics Element**
- 7 **a. Introduction of revised Business and Economics Element**
- 8 **b. Report from Business and Economics Element Subcommittee**
- 9 **c. Discussion of Draft Element**

10 **Co-Chair Garber:** Alright, we are at item #2. Although I – we do still have one member of the public here.
11 If anyone would like to speak on this topic, please give me a card but I'm not seeing any. Staff will
12 introduce this so Elena?

13 **Elena Lee:** Thank you. Following the January CAC and February business and economics subcommittee
14 meeting, the element was revised with narrative goals, policies, and programs. The vision statement was
15 revised to provide a more balanced tone between businesses and neighborhoods. The 6 existing goals
16 were retained although the position for the first and second goals were changed and one new goal was
17 added on fiscal responsibility and that is now Goal B-2. Other changes include seeking to clarify that
18 start-ups and entrepreneur are highly valued. Redundant policies and programs were removed as they
19 are already discussed in Land Use and Safety Elements and that was specifically identified in the report.
20 The word character was replaced with neighborhoods. Other changes included languages added to
21 recognize the value of local serving retail. Language about livability was replaced with specific
22 neighborhood concerns such as traffic and parking. The natural environment was also specifically
23 identified as a significant asset for the local economy. In Goal B-6 it now includes the word retail so it's
24 clear is about retail centers and not just centers. Those represent some of the changes that were made
25 reflected in the revised element. Staff now requests that the CAC forward this revised element to
26 Council. Thank you.

27 **Co-Chair Garber:** Ok. I think we can start by going around the table.

28 **Co-Chair Keller:** (Inaudible)

29 **Co-Chair Garber:** Ok. Lisa, can we start with you?

30 **Lisa Peschcke-Koedt:** Overall, I like it. I think it's a – the subcommittee did a great job and it's more
31 balanced to me, given our comments last time so overall, positive. Just reviewing the comments – the
32 other comments that came in, most of mine agreed with, I think, Bonnie's specific changes and such so
33 just for the record. I had a couple of important comments and a couple that is more just questions or
34 typos but I'm just going to go through it and do it all at once. Is that ok?



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

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

2 **Lisa Peschcke-Koedt:** In the vision, second to last line, it uses the word employment areas and I didn't
3 know, is that its own term or should be districts? Just a – don't have an opinion. Just a question. In the –
4 page 2 – sorry, I'm using the redlined Attachment B as my version. In the second big paragraph where it
5 says the City is recognized as a hub. It lists out the different things. I think we should add the word
6 technology because otherwise, we don't cover HP and some other companies in the area. It's
7 substantive, it's not fall on your sword but it is substantive. Minor typos. A couple of the places where
8 the section heading where at the end of the paragraph before. It just needs to get moved down. Then I
9 had questions. I think this was in Bonnie's as well but the – on page B-9, policy B-1.1, where it talks, or
10 service requirements. I wasn't really sure what that was but I had suggested that that's the broader City
11 Goals -- I mean the Goals of the Comp. Plan and our broader goals are what I would mean by that but I
12 didn't know. Then Policy B-1.3 where it says engage with all stakeholders in the business community. I
13 might delete business because I think it's in the community. Especially since we are talking about
14 including the public. Then Policy B-1.4, I don't disagree with the focus on mobility and sustainability. It's
15 more is that all we wanted to make a priority? There are others in there. Is that a broader one? I don't
16 disagree with those two I just think it may be too few. Then I like the changes for the fiscal
17 responsibility. I think I'm near the end. Then on page B-17, Policy B-6.4, more talk about discouraging
18 development that would turn the district into a regional shopping center. I was just curious more about
19 the thinking of it. I'm not sure I have a strong opinion either way but I wanted to hear...

20 **Stephen Levy:** (Inaudible)

21 **Lisa Peschcke-Koedt:** ...what the subcommittee – I'm done. Thank you, Stephen.

22 **Co-Chair Garber:** That's fine. We will be liberal so long as you guys are willing to stick (inaudible)

23 **Stephen Levy:** Maybe if there's another round, I want to thank Hamilton especially, Don and Amy who
24 are not here and Whitney and Alex. It was a great subcommittee. I'm pleased with the draft. I'm pleased
25 with the collegiality. I'll wait to see what other comments are. Obviously, we wrote the draft so I don't
26 have any particular objections to the draft that we wrote.

27 **Co-Chair Garber:** Ok, thanks. Hamilton.

28 **Co-Chair Garber:** I really appreciated working with everybody. Stephen took a little bit of extra time to
29 work with me so I'm very grateful for that. I'm going to completely switch gears. Forgetting everything
30 that happened in the last hour and a half. Ok, here we go. Every day, it warms my heart to watch
31 parents walk their young children by my house to the local elementary school. Likewise, I take pride in
32 the fact that this City has incubated the most successful tech. companies in the world, such as Google
33 and Facebook and continues to do so with companies such as VMWare and Tesla. It is possible to have a
34 very livable neighborhood and a world class innovative technology companies in the same city as we do



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE *DRAFT MINUTES*

1 today. I feel this element has been improved in terms of the focus on being business friendly and does a
2 better job of emphasizing the City's fiscal health. It has definitely been watered down in terms of its
3 focus on neighborhood livability but given the productive discussion we had in the subcommittee, I
4 really only have one recommendation addition that I would like to see in this regard, which is to add
5 back in the strip policy – stripped down version of Policy B-1, from the original 2007 version of the
6 element which would not go under Goal 2 which would say, use a variety of planning and regulatory
7 tools to ensure the business change is compatible with Palo Alto neighborhoods. I have one other minor
8 point – well, actually two. Although my colleagues in the subcommittee were not enthusiastic about it,
9 I am still advocating for retaining a revised version of the policy on our City trees, which reads, Palo Alto
10 means tall tree and its flourishing tree system is part of our brand along with the other assets such as
11 great City services and its adjacency to Stanford University. Not exactly an earth shattering controversial
12 statement.

13 **Stephen Levy:** (Inaudible)

14 **Hamilton Hitchings:** Yeah, they didn't put it in so that's...

15 **Stephen Levy:** (Inaudible)

16 **Hamilton Hitchings:** ...See, so Stephen liked it too. A good reason for City Staff to put in that last thing I
17 just suggested about the trees. Lastly, I would say Palo Alto is positioned -- Lisa, this gets to the thinking
18 behind that program you commented on, sustainability and mobility. I would say that Palo Alto's
19 position to be a national leader on mobility companies. We already have Tesla, which is the leader in
20 electric vehicles and becoming a leader in autonomous driving. We have huge amounts – to be precise, I
21 think either half a billion or a billion, pouring into Stanford for autonomous driving and given our
22 particular issues around traffic, it makes a lot of sense for us to actively try to recruit pioneer companies
23 in this area. Likewise, global warming is the largest issue facing mankind's existence and Palo Alto
24 continues to be a leader – a City leader in this area and I think we should focus on attraction companies
25 that are innovative in this area. Thank you.

26 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thanks, Hamilton. Bonnie.

27 **Bonnie Packer:** Ok, thanks for the subcommittee and – oh, thanks for the subcommittee and Staff for a
28 good element. I have a – I submitted comments and I'll just focus on the substantive ones. The rest are
29 all just typos and stuff. I'd like to put in the narrative at the end of the employment section. The
30 importance of the other parts of the programs in the Land Use and Transportation Element that address
31 mobility and housing – transit and housing for the employees because this is what benefits the
32 employers and this is how we're helping keep business – economic vitality and so a reference – I had
33 some language in here. A reference in the narrative and perhaps also a policy somewhere in the plan. I
34 think under Goal B that addresses – that recognizes that we should continue the work and the programs
35 and the other elements that help employees, which then help employers. The other thing I suggested is



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE *DRAFT MINUTES*

1 there's a policy under Goal 5, it's 5.4, it says businesses of all kinds should be encouraged to advance
2 Palo Alto's commitment to both fiscal and environmental sustainability. That really belongs under Goal
3 B-1 so I suggest moving that policy under Goal B-1. The other substantive thing is I think you should add
4 Town and Country back in as a regional center. Just because it's described elsewhere in greater detail, all
5 you need is one sentence but to not have it there when you have all the other centers, which are also
6 addressed in the Land Use Element in different ways. Just to say, don't put it in there because we talk
7 about it elsewhere is -- doesn't make sense to me. All you have to say is recognize and preserve Town
8 and Country Villages that is an attractive retail center servicing Palo Alto and residents of the wider
9 region. That's the first sentence of the land use program or policy or whatever it is but that's all you
10 have to put in here. That's what I would recommend. My last point was adding a general policy that
11 refers to the Land Use and Transportation Element which support housing and transit opportunities to
12 support the employees and that benefits economic vitality. The rest are just some verb suggestions;
13 rewrites. Thank you

14 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you, Bonnie. Ellen.

15 **Ellen Uhrbrock:** All I have to say is this subcommittee for business and economics was the best
16 subcommittee and best Committee working I have ever seen in this group. I had wonderful Staff people
17 that also shared it and I'm sorry I missed the second round of when you did this but I have great
18 confidence that what you did was as good as could be done at this time so congratulations.

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

20 **Annette Glanckopf:** Well, I have a couple comments and I still think that this general introduction is to
21 flowery. I – unfortunately, I'm a crisp, technical writer and I think it sounds like a PR announcement from
22 the Chamber with all – apologizes to the Chamber. I don't ever remember specifically, discussing shuttle
23 serving retail centers although it's a good idea. Throughout this document there seems to be a lot of
24 emphasis on the office of economic development and up to this time, it's just really been a number of
25 bean counters and so there's a lot of implications about additional Staff like on page B-7, the office – the
26 OED plays a key role. Well, it hasn't ever so far in supporting business growth so that to me is very
27 concerned and 'the office can serve as a facilitator between residents and businesses.' I think that's
28 really a planning or building function. This is also reflected on page B-9 and go – Program B-1.1.1,
29 implement the office of economic development policy to guide business development. I would use the
30 word direct if you have to have that in there and Policy 1 – B-1.4, I think the City should attract
31 businesses and I agree, rather than OED and I think there needs to be much more areas other than
32 mobility and sustainability. There is a lot discussion about partnerships between public and private
33 space for community non- profits. I think that's a great goal but you know, as long as you're going to do
34 that, it might be good to put the concept of private sector providing meeting spaces or connecting –
35 reaching out to the community as well. There's lots of things they could do for transportation and
36 parking. I, again, saw that the tree system, because it was referenced in the Staff report, it -- I never did



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE *DRAFT MINUTES*

1 find it in the document and again, I support putting it back in. When I look at Goal B-2, which is sort of
2 out there -- and I am really concerned about Policy B-2.2, strong inter dependence between commercial
3 centers and surrounding neighborhoods. I'm not sure what that really means and who is going to do
4 this? To make any kind of this connection work, there really needs to be the right type of retail and a key
5 plan to have someone whether -- just to finish this point -- to reach out and work with the residents. I
6 think if we were going to focus on something, we should as a City, start trying to develop especially, in
7 the small neighborhood centers, to form a merchant's association and just -- since I am running out of
8 time. There is -- along in Goal-4, I think we really do need, Jennifer mentioned this, to really focus on
9 small independent locally serving businesses, especially in the neighborhood centers. We need to attract
10 the right business to the right location and assist in keeping them. That is very, very true but the real
11 problem these days is not -- that fact is that they're in the wrong place and we should -- and the problem
12 is the cost in rents as opposed to maybe the viability of the business or even being in the wrong place.

13 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thank you, Annette. Jennifer.

14 **Jennifer Hetterly:** I'd like to commend the subcommittee also. I think this is greatly improved from the
15 last go around. I don't think it's balanced but I think it is a vast improvement. I do think it's irresponsible
16 for us to promote a Comprehensive Plan that doesn't acknowledge -- even an interest in striving for
17 moderation in the pace of job growth and that has been eliminated from this first goal as well as Policy
18 B-2.3 I guess is the closest one in this latest draft. Seems like, with intense local and regional criticism of
19 our jobs and housing balance, it's undeniable impacts on the local and regional economy and quality of
20 life. I just don't see how we can put forward a Comp. Plan that doesn't say we're going to at least try to
21 pace job growth. That aside, I was thrilled to see the At Places comments today because I agree with all
22 three of you on virtually all of your comments so I was happy to see that consensus and I hope that Staff
23 and the subcommittee will incorporate those where there is agreement. I was sorry to see that there are
24 no policies or programs in the compatibility and interdependency section that address compatibility or
25 how the business environment will complement the residential neighborhoods so I would love to see
26 that fluffed up a little bit with something to acknowledge the compatibility piece of that heading. I also
27 noticed the street tree policy that was referenced in the Staff report is gone so I assume that's going
28 back in.

29 **Male:** (Inaudible)

30 **Jennifer Hetterly:** Ok, awesome. Great.

31 **Male:** That policy will go in there. I'm sorry.

32 **Jennifer Hetterly:** Then, under predictability and flexibility, Policy B-4.4, which was about large --
33 attracting and retaining large employers in the Stanford Research Par. I'd like to see that rewarded to
34 say concentrate large employers in the Stanford Research Park. It seems to me that it's Stanford role to
35 attract and retain leaseholders within the Research Park and it's the City's job to talk about where they



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 want what type size. Then again as Annette mentioned, small independent and community services
2 businesses are distinct from -- just any retail business is really valuable in Palo Alto and I would like to
3 see that highlighted more and just lastly, Policy B-5.3, about strengthening the office of economic
4 development. I think it absolutely needs to be strengthen but I would go beyond just communication
5 between residents and businesses and navigating procedures and have that office serve a role in
6 attracting and retaining local serving retail and services because that's -- clearly, we're saying all over the
7 place retail is suggesting here and that's what we need is somebody that can help them bridge -- make
8 that connection. Thank you.

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

10 **Len Filppu:** Yes, thanks. I too like this rev. a lot and I think we're definitely getting in there. On Goal B-1,
11 the policies that moderate the pace of job growth has been deleted. I'm wondering if an alternative
12 might be considered. Something along the lines of policies that support prudent growth. That's a
13 possibility and I offer it because in the meaning of prudent, showing thought and care for the future. On
14 Policy B-2.2, I agree with Annette's view. I offer -- support a strong interdependency. You could change
15 that to make it more proactive, support strong, synergistic programs between existing commercial
16 centers and surround neighborhoods. That gets us active to take advantage and leverage the
17 interdependence that exists. Not just acknowledge the interdependence. Policy B-2.3, at the end of the
18 sentence it says such as -- coordinate on shared concerns such as traffic, parking issues. I'd include
19 livability. Recognize that business and neighborhoods need to coordinate on a shared concern such as
20 traffic, parking, and livability issues. It isn't just traffic and parking, there's more involved. Then here's
21 the one that I'm wrapping up. These are the pink box comments. Some of these indicate that this
22 program has been put over to land use and if land use doesn't have any programs, then I would really
23 like to consider inserting these programs into this element. Especially, the comments that are identified
24 as JJ6, JJ8, and JJ10, all of which deal with the appearance of streets, enhancing sidewalks, preserving
25 adequate parking, widening sidewalks, narrowing travel lanes, that kind of thing so if we're going to lose
26 them in land use, let's put them in here. Thank you.

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

28 **Doria Summa:** Yes, great work by the subcommittee. Something that Jennifer had in her comments that
29 she didn't mention is Figure B-2 and B-3 are contradictory and that probably needs to be cleared up and
30 kind of hard to understand. In the discussion about business employment districts on page B-8, its noted
31 that 1/3 -- over 1/3 of the jobs in Palo Alto are located in the Stanford Research Park. It goes on to talk
32 about Stanford University medical center. I think it would be very helpful to know approximately how
33 many people work in the medical center also and to have those two figures in the same place. Policy B-
34 1.3, I agree with an early speaker that said just take business out, 'engage with all stake holders in the
35 community.' The tree thing is taken care of. Policy B-2.3, I agree with Len that livability should be added
36 back in and I thought B-2.1 was just written in kind of a confusing way so maybe take a look at that. B-



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE *DRAFT MINUTES*

1 4.4, retain and attract large employers in the Stanford Research Park. I think that the – I think there
2 should be a recognition that that's where – the Stanford Research Park is where a large employer are
3 appropriate as opposed to other business areas in the City. In B-4.7, encourage and support the retail –
4 operations small independent retail businesses and other services that service community. I think some
5 of those – small independent is taken out. I think it should be put back in. I'm not sure if this is the right
6 place to evaluate the effectiveness of ground floor retail requirements and preserving retail space. I
7 would recommend removing that. About Goal B-5 in B-1.2, improve design guild lines to reduce
8 ambiguity more clearly – articulate design principles. I think what we really want to talk about here are
9 the compatibility rules not design. Let's see, economic development – just some other things. Oh, I also
10 think the – B-7.3, invest – encourage investment in activity along El Camino and within the Stanford
11 Research Park that compliments the Research Park and enhances its physical appearance. It should
12 include that enhances adjacent neighborhoods to the Research Park not just the Research Park. Thank
13 you.

14 **Co-Chair Garber:** Thanks. Julia.

15 **Julia Moran:** Just a couple comments. Like Ellen said, I was only able to make the first subcommittee
16 meeting but we had a very productive meeting and I see a significant amount reflected in the revised
17 element. It's much, much better than it was before and much less combative between living in Palo Alto
18 and working Palo Alto. The – it still feels to me a little too focused on the current economic situation of
19 Palo Alto of strained retail and very strong office space economic environment, which is what's
20 happening today but it is not necessarily what will be happening in 10-years. I'd like to see something
21 that reflects what our policies are if there aren't jobs here or empty office spaces. Then second, I'd also
22 – I didn't see anything about our neighboring huge companies like Facebook, Google type companies
23 and the economic impact those have on our City and if one of those chooses to move, what that means
24 for us and just in general, what the impact of those – the significant amount of employees in those
25 companies to our downtown retail and health services and everything else. I know those are broad
26 comments but I'd like to see those reflected. Thanks.

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

28 **Whitney McNair:** Great, thank you. It was a great discussion with the subcommittee. Let's see, I agree
29 with Julia's comments about the snap shot – the information on the pie charts; they're just one year.
30 They don't really show you any trends. I think it would be better to have a trend line. One of the
31 interesting trends is sales tax that – just for instance, the Research Park shows 3 million dollars in sale
32 tax revenue in 2015 but it was up to 10 million in 2013 and it's been 6 and 10 and 4.5 so what's the
33 trend in sales tax. You also have transfer tax, which makes that a more complete picture. The economy
34 may change. It's currently strong but some areas it might be diminishing so if you want to – if the City
35 wants to attract certain businesses, it has to be more than just saying, that's what I want to have come
36 here to Palo Alto. There needs to be – I like to think of it as an on switch. If you determine what kind of



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE *DRAFT MINUTES*

1 business you want to have, what levers can you turn on in order to encourage those types of companies
2 – that business sector to come to Palo Alto and there isn't anything in here really, that's giving you that,
3 that on switch. It still has a regulatory tone to it. To that degree, I agree with Annette's comments about
4 the office of economic development. I'm not even sure how fully Staffed it is at this point but there's a
5 lot of responsibility in the element played to OED. Just trying to consider how that would Staff its self-up
6 in order to reach out to companies, whether it's retail companies or small companies up to big
7 companies. What is it that the City can do in order to keep you here with in Palo Alto? Then a few little
8 things. Let's see, there was a program, B-5.1.4, and it says that it's revised the zoning and other
9 regulations to encourage revitalization of aging retail structures and then there was a new – just quickly.
10 There was new tag onto that, 'and encourage the preservation of Class B and C office spaces' and that
11 says it's an existing program in the Comp. Plan. I went back to the existing Comp. Plan and that last
12 piece of it is not in there at all. It was about encourage revitalization of ageing retail areas so I
13 understand there has been some discussion about trying to maintain some spaces for smaller
14 independent consultants – independent practitioners but to now, put in there something that's
15 preserving Class B and Class C office spaces. I think that goes against some of the sustainability practices
16 and some ideas about revitalizing some of these older businesses in buildings, especially like in the
17 Research Park. If you want to have smaller spaces for smaller firms then say that. I don't think that this
18 roundabout way of saying preserve Class C office buildings I the way to do it. Just be clear on what it is
19 that you want to get at. I think – oh, and I just had – just a fact on the – the business registry that the
20 City put out, indicates that the Research Park has 29,000 employees and so these pie charts are saying
21 there's 36% of the jobs are in the Research Park, which would be a lot high than that 29,000 so I just
22 don't know what that data source is. If you could just look to confirm that that percentage is actually
23 accurate.

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

25 **Alex Van Riesen:** I to enjoyed being on the Committee and I was unable to make the last meeting but
26 I've – the other comments that I've heard echo mine so I'll pass.

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

28 **Co-Chair Keller:** Firstly, I'm hearing that there are lots of tweaks. Not major changes but lots of tweaks
29 that people are asking to be made. I'm wondering – I'm going to first as Staff, does it make sense since I
30 don't think this is going to Council right way, to have the Committee do – meet one more time to reflect
31 these changes – subcommittee meet one more time to reflect these changes in the element and have it
32 come back to us on consent next time and hopeful people will just be able to review it. Then not actually
33 have us meet on it but it doesn't seem like it's 100% ready for prime time.

34 **Hillary Gitelman:** I guess let me ask a question of the group. In past elements, you were able to adopt
35 them subject to the changes that we could incorporate from the comments that were made that



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE *DRAFT MINUTES*

1 evening and those that we couldn't include, we were instructed to attach when we transmitted it to the
2 council. Do you not think that that would be appropriate? I'm just asking because we are chock-a-block
3 with things that we have to do like Staff reports for Council meetings and for the implementation
4 subcommittee and all the rest.

5 **Co-Chair Keller:** Well, in – ok, let me try a different thing. How about if we do not have the
6 subcommittee meet but instead Staff make the changes and bring it back to us so that we can actually
7 see them and bringing it back on consent, rather than having us not see what happens until months
8 later when it goes to Council.

9 **Co-Chair Garber:** Arthur, can I ask – Stephen, is one of the Committee Members and maybe some of the
10 other Committee Members might want to add on.

11 **Stephen Levy:** There have been two sets of what you call tweaks. One set dealing with the elements
12 that were redundant, dealing with the pattern of growth in the City, dealing with the word livability.
13 These were unanimously 6-0 approved by the subcommittee the way they are. There are other language
14 tweaks that the Staff may consider but this Committee, which everyone has praised, was very deliberate
15 and very much in unanimity on illuminating the redundant arguments. Not making this element a
16 debate about the growth of the city, which will come up in the scenarios and very consciously
17 illuminating the word livability.

18 **Co-Chair Garber:** Hamilton.

19 **Stephen Levy:** I think the comments today would go back on that.

20 **Hamilton Hitchings:** The only thing it say is – I agreed to the illumination of livability within the context
21 of adding that one policy I mentioned earlier and it didn't make it in so – and I know a number of other
22 Committee Members want to see, and I heard today, some language in there around protecting the
23 neighborhoods. It's not very controversial language. It's just saying you're going to take it into account.
24 To have – to say we're not going to put anything in there about businesses having to have any impacts, I
25 think, is a little bit much. I mean, I would like to see something added in there about that.

26 **Co-Chair Garber:** I don't want to open this up a great deal here but Hillary, do you have a suggestion
27 about how we can move through this?

28 **Hillary Gitelman:** I think there are two choices. If the Committee feels like this is close enough. That with
29 some of the changes that have been recommended you would feel comfortable recommending this to
30 the Council subject to those revisions and ask us to transmit any comments we can't include. For
31 example, comments that might conflict with the Committees discussion. That's choice number one.
32 Choice number two is Arthur's suggestion that this needs enough work that it should come back on
33 consent at your next meeting.



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

- 1 **Co-Chair Garber:** Could it be that Staff makes modifications, minor they may be, and they sent a draft to
2 the subcommittee for review. They don't have to meet but could then sent back comments and then it
3 could come back to the meeting here on consent.
- 4 **Hillary Gitelman:** What I'm really trying to do is have the Staff have – and consultants have to work on
5 multiple sets of revisions. I mean in past elements; this group has felt comfortable...
- 6 **Co-Chair Garber:** You're trying to avoid that.
- 7 **Hillary Gitelman:** Giving us enough direction that we just have to update the element once and transmit
8 it to Council. Obviously, if you not comfortable doing that here, we can make the changes and bring it
9 back to the CAC but what we'd like to do in that case is not get further revisions but just get comments
10 we would enclose with the element.
- 11 **Co-Chair Garber:** Subcommittee? We're not doing motions.
- 12 **Co-Chair Keller:** (Inaudible)
- 13 **Co-Chair Garber:** Oh, that's true. I suppose it is.
- 14 **Co-Chair Keller:** (Inaudible)
- 15 **Co-Chair Garber:** I have not forgotten that. Stephen.
- 16 **Stephen Levy:** Ironically, we had an almost 2-hour discussion about reading the mind of Council
17 Members with all sorts of words like appalling and disrespecting and throwing the baby out with the
18 bath water yet when you come back with the subcommittee nearly 6-0 on every item. To which Staff
19 can report to Council a sense of the subcommittee. That (inaudible) goes out the window, you know? I
20 don't know what our subcommittee worked on if (inaudible)(crosstalk)
- 21 **Co-Chair Garber:** I think there are...
- 22 **Stephen Levy:** Now wait a minute, wait a minute.
- 23 **Co-Chair Garber:** Yeah?
- 24 **Stephen Levy:** We had a long discussion about quality of life and livability, ok? And tried, with
25 Hamilton's help, to find some way that wasn't a code work in the 1950's, 60's, 70's, 80's and 90's and we
26 did. The idea that the neighborhoods and the businesses aren't connected and need to work together is
27 all through the element. If Hamilton has a word or two to make it better but I see no reason to go back
28 and go over with the subcommittee a discussion that we had in quite depth, in two meetings on some of
29 these. There are other issues that the Staff can look at. Some wording changes about whether Town and
30 Country is in or some other stuff and make a decision.



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 **Co-Chair Garber:** I was actually...

2 **Stephen Levy:** (Inaudible)

3 **Co-Chair Garber:** ...more focused on topics that were not having to do with livability because I think
4 there have been a number of conversations or a number of suggestions here that I think could make the
5 element better. Annette and then Hamilton.

6 **MOTION**

7 **Annette Glanckopf:** I'd just like to make a motion. I would like to make a motion that to save Staff work,
8 it comes back on consent. I think you can't think of everything in a Committee is – it's great the work
9 you've done. I heard a number of very compelling arguments that are not about livability and I think that
10 I'm very happy to see how Staff incorporates them. Bring them back on consent and ...

11 **Co-Chair Garber:** Move from there.

12 **Annette Glanckopf:** That's my motion. Bring is back on consent. Any comments would just be added to
13 the transmittal and so I hope I get a second.

14 **Co-Chair Keller:** I second.

15 **Co-Chair Garber:** Well, we have not finished out substantive comments from both Arthur or me yet. A
16 motion has been noted. It has been seconded by the Co-Chair. Let's get some discussion around this.
17 You've already spoken on your motion. Do you want to speak on it anymore, Annette?

18 **Annette Glanckopf:** No but it's 8:30 and so I don't think – this is very academic where we are going on
19 this. I think we need to cut to the chase so I'd like to call the discussion to an end.

20 **Co-Chair Garber:** The secondary to the motion.

21 **Co-Chair Keller:** I'm happy to have the vote on it. I think it will be clear but Dan and I have not made
22 substitutive comments on the substance of the element and so we should have the motion taken quickly
23 after we make our substantive comments. Firstly, with respect to University Avenue in down town and
24 California (inaudible), there's a mention (inaudible) of office in University Avenue. We really should be
25 talking about small office, profession office, not large RND. In particular, the mention that was made of
26 concentrating large businesses in the Stanford Research Park, I think that that's missing and needs to be
27 added. Julia mentioned the effect of large businesses like Google and Facebook on our retail. I also
28 wonder about the effect of Google and Facebook on our housing and their impact on Palo Alto housing
29 needs because they don't supply the housing on site. Also, with respect to not large RND within Stanford
30 – within California Avenue, Ventura, El Camino. Those are not places for RND. I think we should have
31 some policy in there about retaining local professional – serving professional services in small offices



COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
DRAFT MINUTES

1 and limit their displacement, especially by large RND. I think that's something that needs to happen. I
2 think we saw that at 550 Hamilton. We're seeing that happen in the former Bank of America building
3 where people are being displaced for a large RND building. I don't think it's appropriate. Those are my
4 substantive comments and I agree entirely with Annette's motion.

5 **Co-Chair Garber:** If I may, I will make a couple of comments and then we'll go to the vote. First of all, I
6 think I support almost all of the comments that have been said but let me just point out a couple of
7 them in particular. Hamilton, I think that your revision of the tall tree piece I think is good. I mean my
8 concern initially about that was not to redo what we did in the Natural Element but the fact that it is a
9 part of what the vision, what the environment is, the branding -- although I hate to use that word -- of
10 our town, I think it's appropriate. It's an appropriate thing to do there. I do have some quibbles with the
11 vision. The word duel suggests to me that the business world and the residential world exist together
12 but in parallel and it doesn't suggest that these two parts are in fact dependent and reliant on each
13 other to for the City that we know. For me, the test is sort of simple. Without our businesses, we'd be
14 something more like Atherton. Without our neighborhoods, we'd be come -- we could become all sorts
15 of different things. A biggest East Palo Alto, a mosaic of big box stores and office or office buildings. I
16 don't know -- Yeah, Emeryville -- fine. The second piece there and this is going to be kind of controversial
17 I suspect but I think some of you know that I have been writing a history of Oregon Expressway and I
18 lecture for PAST and at other places on the history of Palo Alto. Ignoring for the moment that we have
19 had no neighborhoods if Stanford hadn't created Palo Alto over 100 years ago. There's no mention of
20 Stanford's central role in driving the vitality in innovation of Palo Alto's business community. We simple
21 wouldn't be the Silicon Valley if Stanford were not here. What we would have become possibly, was
22 the town of Mayfield, which would have like been annexed either to Menlo Park or Mountain View a
23 couple of decades ago. I don't know if that deserves to go into the vision but I think there needs to be
24 some acknowledgement that the fact is that all of our business reputation stems from that and the
25 adjacency and closeness we have with that. To Whitney's point, I was going to make the exact same
26 comment. Jennifer, thank you for the catch on the -- those two pie charts not adding up. I do think that
27 seeing that as a trend is, for me, almost the heart of this element because it gets to the question of
28 where you can start to ask, what do I get? What do I get from all that money and what is it doing for me
29 in the community? I would also like, frankly, to see another graphic in there and that is because the
30 taxes and fees are generated from the use of our land is so central to how our community sees itself as
31 well as funding more than half the general fund. That includes our community services. I would have
32 liked to have seen a graphic that trended and shows that relationship in there as well. Finally, to
33 Annette's comment about the economic development office, spot on. We have an extraordinary weak
34 to non-existent development, economic, whatever you want to call it. I have worked in a variety of other
35 cities where that role is a key in dynamic and power role and that just simple doesn't exist. I think
36 importantly for a town like Palo Alto, if can help us tie the visions and the needs of the neighborhoods to
37 the mission of the business community and that would be something of great value. With that, all those
38 in favor of the motion as its stated say aye?



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

- 1 **Group:** Aye.
- 2 **Co-Chair Garber:** All those opposed? All those abstaining?
- 3 **Stephen Levy:** I don't even know what the motion is.
- 4 **Hamilton Hitchings:** (Inaudible)
- 5 **Co-Chair Keller:** The motion is to have the item to come back on consent at the next meeting – the
- 6 element.
- 7 **Stephen Levy:** (Inaudible)
- 8 **MOTION PASSED 13-0 WITH STEPHEN LEVY ABSTAINING.**
- 9 **Co-Chair Garber:** Folks, it is 8:35, thank you very much. 8:33 to the Co-Chairs watch. We are adjourned.
- 10 **Feedback for Continuous Improvement:**
- 11 **Future Meetings:**
- 12 Next meeting: March 21, 2017 – Rinconada Library (Embarcadero Room)
- 13
- 14 **Adjournment: 8:35 p.m.**