



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

**TUESDAY, March 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 Keller:** I call the Citizens Advisory Committee meeting of the Comprehensive Plan  
3 updates to order on Tuesday, March 21<sup>st</sup>, 2017 and the time is 5:30. Will the secretary place call  
4 roll?

5 Present: Filppu, Glanckopf, Hetterly, Hitchings, Keller, Kleinhaus, Levy, McDougall,  
6 McNair, Moran, Packer, Peschcke-Koedt, Summa, Sung, Titus, Uang, Uhrbrock,  
7 van Riesen

8  
9 Absent: Garber, McNair

10 **Oral Communication:**

11 **Co-Chair Keller:** Our first agenda item is oral communications. Are there any speakers from the  
12 public who wish to speak today? Seeing and hearing none. We close oral communication.

13 **Staff Comments:**

14 **1. March 20<sup>th</sup> City Council Hearing**

15 **Co-Chair Keller:** Next, we have Staff comments on last night's meeting. I'd like to acknowledge  
16 that some people were there and I'd like to hear – if you were, you heard an interesting  
17 meeting and let's hear what Staff has to say about it.

18 **Hillary Gitelman:** Thank you, Arthur. Good evening everybody and thanks to those who were  
19 there or who were listening in last night. If you were there or were listening in, you know that  
20 the Council conducted a public hearing on the supplement to the draft EIR. There was a lot of  
21 conversation about the EIR but they started with this issue that we spent our last CAC meeting  
22 talking about, which is the placement of programs in the Comp. Plan. We reproduced for you  
23 today the two motions that were adopted last night. The first one, motion number one, address  
24 this program issue. To cut to the punch line, the Council basically reconsidered and retracted  
25 their prior direction to put the programs in the back of the book. Their direction last night was  
26 to proceed as originally intended where the programs are both in the Implementation Plan in  
27 the back and in the elements. They also asked the Staff to continue to work on consolidating redundant  
28 programs, eliminating any that are infeasible and incorporate suggestions from you all and the public  
29 about the relative priority and timeline for the programs and the estimated level of effort. I am hoping



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

1 that your work today is going to inform that work product. Then ultimately, the Council indicated that  
2 they'll be the final arbiter of this prioritization and the suit of programs that we bring forward. I thought  
3 it was a nice to have the Council really listen to what the CAC and others in the community had been  
4 saying to them in the last month or so. It was nice that they started out the meeting with that and then  
5 they heard testimony on the – or they offered comments and questions on the EIR. Then they grappled  
6 with this question of what should be described as the preferred scenario in the final EIR and that's what  
7 the second motion on this page references. Again, it was very – Len and I were talking about it that they  
8 were sort of statesmen like last night and they sort of swung to the middle and ended up with a set of  
9 recommendations or a set of direction to us that kind of reflects the middle of the range of planning  
10 scenarios that have been included in the EIR process. Good news on both fronts I think and we have a  
11 direction to move forward. The next time we go back to Council will be on May 1<sup>st</sup>, for them to look  
12 again at the revised Land Use and Transportation Elements. I'm looking forward to that and I hope that  
13 some or all of you will be able to either be there or listen in because of it – we're real to the point where  
14 the fruits of your labor are starting to show in these elements. I think they are pretty good and the  
15 Council is going to feel like we're making great headway when they see them on the 1<sup>st</sup>. That's our wrap-  
16 up.

17 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. The next meeting will be on April 18<sup>th</sup> that we know about and there will  
18 also be one in May. Also, I understand that it was in the Council's packet, something about  
19 acknowledging us so you might want to tell us when that is so all of us can show up.

20 **Hillary Gitelman:** In the Staff report last night, we put a little section on next steps and we laid out the  
21 next few Council meetings to talk about Comp. Plan items. May 1<sup>st</sup>. I have already mentioned but there's  
22 a date in the middle of June; I think it was June 5<sup>th</sup>, that we set aside for adoption of a resolution  
23 thanking the CAC for their efforts. I hope you'll plan to be in attendance and I'll let you know if that date  
24 changes but at this point, we feel like you guys will have wrapped up your work by then and it would be  
25 nice for the Council to acknowledge all of your efforts so June 5<sup>th</sup>.

26 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Don, you wanted to say something?

27 **Don McDougall:** I think I understood that you're saying that people who were there last night could  
28 comment in addition to Hillary's comments, is that true or you don't want to do that? That's fine.

29 **Co-Chair Keller:** If you want to do that very briefly, we have a lot of things to talk about.

30 **Don McDougall:** I do want to just briefly say two things. I have to say that I was impressed that Corey  
31 Wolbach did lead the listening to people I would say and I think he should be recognized for that.  
32 Whatever we think of whatever politics he might have, I think that he did listen to people and he did  
33 respond and individually, he fell on his sword for the collective Council I would say. The second thing  
34 that I would like to say is that I'm continued to be disturbed as Hillary reported, with the insistence that  
35 we reduce the number of programs. I've said before and I'll say again, the notes that I sent didn't get  
36 included in the package tonight so I'm sorry for that. I think the number of programs is informative. I  
37 think it's informative that there are more programs in the Community Services Element. It says that  
38 we're a much more compassionate community than we use to be. I think it's informative that there are



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

1 more in transportation because we're concerned about the same thing the Council is concerned about. I  
2 think it's informative that there are more things in the Natural Element because in fact, there – we  
3 understand more and I believe that we are more responsive to the natural environment than we were in  
4 1998. I think this desperate desire to reduce the number of programs will mislead the future. I think that  
5 leaving the programs there – I agree with what Hillary said about consolidating where there are  
6 duplicates. Let's do that and let's do that aggressively but other than that, I think the programs should  
7 be left there. They are informative, it understands – it allows people in the future to understand what  
8 we in 2017 were interested in and just simply getting rid of them in order have 160 programs instead of  
9 300 programs or 370 programs doesn't make sense. I think the other thing in there is looking at the  
10 Safety Element, there wasn't a Safety Element before. There is one now and I think the programs there  
11 are important. As will be pointed out those are ones that have been added by the professionals. I think  
12 they are programs that we don't want to have eliminated. Should we have a Fire Department, yes, we  
13 should. Do we want to eliminate that program so that somebody in the future can say gee, the plan  
14 doesn't say you have to have a Fire Department? I think the other thing to remember is that Council  
15 keeps telling us that they get to decide on this stuff. This is a guideline, it's not rules so why not put in  
16 the guild lines that we believe are the guidelines. Thank you for your forbearance.

17 **Co-Chair Keller:** Sure. Anybody else who wishes to speak briefly? Stephen.

18 **Stephen Levy:** You can check Hillary but in my conversations, there's an element in the first motion that  
19 I think was intended to be there but somehow didn't and you can check. I think the intent was that the  
20 programs be put back in under the policies and I thought it was there and when I read this, it didn't have  
21 that statement but I think that was the intent.

22 **Co-Chair Keller:** That's what motion number 1A was. Option 4B was to put the programs in the – also in  
23 the main body of the Comprehensive Plan.

24 **Stephen Levy:** Right but I'm saying put them – organize them under the policies.

25 **Co-Chair Keller:** Yes, that was the intent.

26 **Stephen Levy:** Yeah, ok. The second point is that I have a different take than Don. I listened to the  
27 whole meeting and read this, there was no intent or request to willy-nilly reduce programs. The  
28 language here is pretty clear that it's to consolidate redundant programs and eliminate infeasible  
29 programs. I don't have a particular definition for redundant or infeasible but the Council didn't say just  
30 throw out programs to reduce the number. For example, there are a whole bunch of programs in the  
31 Natural Environment Element that all say that we should conserve energy and they're all probably in the  
32 SCAP.

33 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Any other quick – Hi, Doria.



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

1 **Doria Summa:** Sorry and I'll be quick. I wanted to thank the Council who isn't here, for reconsidering the  
2 prior actions and I also want to thank Don. I really appreciate the analysis that he did of the programs  
3 and kind of counting them differently and thinking about them differently. I have to say, his work and  
4 also other members of this body who spoke last night have really convinced me that we shouldn't be –  
5 that prioritizing programs isn't really the right thing to do. They should all be left in because they all are  
6 an expression of somebody's heartfelt concern and desire. Redundancy is different or things that are  
7 complete, I agree that those should be taken out. I don't remember if Shani said this or I had a dream  
8 last night but she may have said – it's something like Sofie's choices, which do you pick to throw out.  
9 Then the other thing that struck me last night is that there were many, many letters At Places from the  
10 public and I just want to touch very briefly on three letters. One was from Super Intendant of schools  
11 McGee, Todd Collins, who is a Board Member and actually [Penny Elsons], who is a very well-respected  
12 civically engaged member of the public who I guess you would say. They're really strong concerns that  
13 the EIR was not a contemplating in any realistic way the impacts of Stanford's growth on the school  
14 system. I really worry that that's been under – I know it's not – it hasn't been the focus of what we've  
15 been doing but I really am very concerned that that has been grossly underestimated in the whole  
16 process here. I mean, the Super Intendent of Schools and a Board Member and then Penny, who has  
17 been working on school issues for many, many years. I just wanted to opine that I think it's very  
18 important that – then analysis of how Stanford's expansion is going to affect the school system be  
19 beefed up and done more accurately and completely. Thanks.

20 **Co-Chair Keller:** Hillary, will speak to that.

21 **Hillary Gitelman:** If I can just chime in on that issue. I appreciate the comment and we did get comments  
22 like that last night and we'll be addressing that in the final EIR as we move forward. I also wanted to say  
23 – I probably should have said this earlier that those of you who are interested in commenting on the EIR,  
24 the supplement to the draft EIR and draft EIR, the comment period goes through the end of the month  
25 and there's going to be another public hearing at the Planning Commission next Wednesday evening.  
26 You have another chance to do it orally or you can send us notes in writing and any subsistent  
27 comments we receive will be responded to in the final EIR. Feel free to submit comments like Doria's or  
28 on another subject; we're happy to get them.

29 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Shani.

30 **Shani Kleinhaus:** Thank you. I spoke last night about the prioritization. I've had – I did use Sophie's  
31 choice because I don't see how we're going to prioritize youth over elderly over people with  
32 developmental disabilities and all that stuff. I just don't – even if we don't take the – any of the  
33 programs out, I think the people who came to speak here over the time that we've been doing this are  
34 really the people who did not feel that there was somebody here representing them. So, none of us are  
35 probably going to be especially interested in their issues; whatever those issues where. I think that the  
36 result of a prioritization program here will essentially be setting side a lot of the comments that we got



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

1 from a lot of the people who came to speak from the public. One other thing that I have a problem with  
2 prioritization is – well, I kind of – I would like to get back to that because I’m not sure exactly but I do  
3 think that we will be leaving out groups that we shouldn’t and I don’t like this type of exercise. We’ve  
4 tried it and everyone – a lot of the people who participated in the exercise of the Implementation  
5 Committee did not like that exercise and we said ok, we’ll try it and see how it works. Maybe for Staff  
6 that works but for me, it didn’t. I don’t know what betters – a better way there is to do things but I think  
7 the best thing – we wasted a month and a half because of not knowing what’s going to happen with all  
8 these programs and how they’re going to be so maybe we need to have a little more time. What we  
9 might want to do is first look at consolidation and consistency and see if we have all of that. Only then,  
10 come back and see which programs – if we want to do that. One other thing is that a lot of new  
11 programs...

12 **Co-Chair Keller:** I just want to say is that right now we are talking about the comments on last night’s  
13 Council meeting. If we are going to get to DOT exercise, that will be next on the agenda. If you have any  
14 more comments on last night...

15 **Shani Kleinhaus:** I spoke about that last night so I was repeating that. I will – but that’s ok. We can talk  
16 about the other things later.

17 **Co-Chair Keller:** Ok. I want to trim this a little bit but Annette?

18 **Annette Glanckopf:** I didn’t go but I did watch every golden word and I don’t think we have really  
19 emphasized enough that we have really worked on the redundancy or the conflict between programs.  
20 The two things that I didn’t hear last night where that and the thing that Don brought up, which really  
21 have been something that I really resonate with is that the numbers that were presented for completed.  
22 I mean, that’s great that we completed something Palo Alto in 10-years. I was looking at this fairly  
23 carefully and I think we should have some different designation for the ongoing programs. That should  
24 defiantly be called out even though you guys put enormous work into this matrix of all these categories.  
25 I’ll come back later when we start talking about how we do this but I ...

26 **Co-Chair Keller:** We’ll deal with the (inaudible) next so if you can deal with last night’s meeting.

27 **Annette Glanckopf:** Again, I just think that our major effort should be to combine things and make a big  
28 point that things are not redundant and that we’ve really – the last Comp. Plan accomplished a lot more  
29 than the Council seems to think it did. That was my...

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

31 **Don McDougall:** Yes, thanks. I just wanted to commend the Council for their actions last night. They  
32 began to act like representative leaders rather than giddy winners. It was a pleasure to see and a very  
33 good step forward for this community. Thank you.



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

1 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Amy.

2 **Amy Sung:** Actually, I have just some small question. Yesterday, I thought that it was so good to see so  
3 many members of the CAC that went to the Council meeting; that was tremendous I think. That shows  
4 that we really care about what we produce and appreciated that Council was taking the time to address  
5 it. My question was that I see that the two Co-Chairs submitted a letter to the Council. Was that on  
6 behalf of our CAC? I wasn't so sure of that. The other one that I heard repeatedly was the comments  
7 about had we know this is what Council wanted then we would have done it differently. I think that is  
8 very interesting and I just wanted to just bring up what I thought about that comment. In our real world,  
9 we produce something and then it was – whatever stage it is, we found that there are improvements to  
10 be made. I think it is a better when it's still in the planning and the paper stage that we make  
11 improvements and I really, really appreciated the opportunity for the Staff to put in such tremendous  
12 efforts to put all the programs in one place. That's the one thing that I think we are not afraid to do and  
13 that is that to make the final product the way that it is the best that it can be and not just say well, this is  
14 what it was given to us and we are just going to do what we were told from the beginning. That's my  
15 comment, thank you.

16 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. A little clarification, the first that was in the current Comp. Plan, the '98 to  
17 2010 Comp. Plan, the programs are in the Implementation Plan. They've always been there and so the  
18 only question is whether they were going to be in the elements under the programs – under the policies  
19 or not. That's what the Council decided to last night was to put them under the programs where – that's  
20 what motion 2A is. The second is that the letter from the Co-Chairs represents our understanding of  
21 where we saw the consensus of the meeting for people who were at the meeting. We also represented  
22 some of the comments from – that – where people were actually in favor of the Council's comments at  
23 the meeting – at the people who were at the meeting, some of them expressed interest in having the  
24 programs not be part of the elements and we mentioned that as well. That's our interpretation of what  
25 happened at the meeting so we put that together. A couple of things about this that I just want to add.  
26 One is that – I think that – I agree with Len that it was more of a collegial process and I think that that's  
27 important. The second thing is I wonder what eliminating infeasible policies and programs are? The  
28 reason I have concerns about that is because – for example, some people feel that undergrounding  
29 Caltrain is infeasible or even grade separation is infeasible. Yet, that's the consensus and actually, the  
30 position of the City. I'm not sure what the threshold is for something being infeasible. What the  
31 judgment is on that and so I had a question of that. I'm not sure if Staff wants to address that at some  
32 point but maybe we should – do you want to address that? Thank you.

33 **Hillary Gitelman:** Well, thanks for the opening. Just to reiterate, we as Staff, of course, are interested in  
34 following the Council's direction and the Council directed us to incorporate suggestions from this body  
35 on prioritization and a timeline. I hope that you will offer some comments on that tonight and of course,  
36 we're also will welcome any comments that you have on consolidating redundant programs. The Council



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

1 did have some pause about this phrase, eliminating infeasible policies and programs, because there was  
2 an acknowledgment that there wouldn't be a lot of programs in there that are infeasible but there are  
3 this issues that we have so many programs in there and they won't all be able to be completed. That's  
4 why prioritization is important so we're not going to get hung up on the infeasibility clause. I think we're  
5 going to focus on a consolidation of programs where that's appropriate and we would welcome your  
6 input this evening and we've been charged with prioritization. If you want to offer prioritization  
7 suggestions tonight, we would welcome those and reflect your input in our recommendation back to  
8 Council.

9 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. I guess infeasibility comes from a – there was actually a State legislature  
10 some number of years ago, that decided that Pie should not be 3.14 blah blah blah blah. That is should  
11 be 3 and State law actually defined it as such.

12

13 **Agenda Items:**

14 **1. Consent: Revised Business and Economics Element**

15 **Co-Chair Keller:** I guess out next agenda item – if we are closed on this, is the revised Business and  
16 Economics Element. Does Staff want to say anything about that first?

17 **Hillary Gitelman:** We put this back on consent at the Committee's direction. I think our thought was that  
18 it had benefited a lot from the last round of comments. If you all have additional comments that you'd  
19 like to submit. We're hoping tonight you'll forward it to the Council and then have a – in the next week if  
20 you have any additional (Crosstalk)...

21 **Elena Lee:** Yes, if you have additional comments, please send them to us by the 31<sup>st</sup> and we incorporate  
22 that into the packet that goes to Council for their review.

23 **Hillary Gitelman:** We're looking for a motion from the group this evening on this element.

24 **Co-Chair Keller:** Are there any very quick comments that people have? I guess – Hamilton, yes?

25 **Hamilton Hitchings:** I think Staff did a great of incorporating our feedback. They made some changes  
26 which were sort of made general to appeal to the group so I'm very supportive of that but I want on the  
27 record that there's a policy now that talks about sustainability. The way I had originally proposed it was  
28 to focus on innovative companies in mobility, which is self-driving cars and transportation like Tesla and  
29 Ford and the Stanford Research Center on that and greenhouse gas reduction. That will be lost when  
30 people look at sustainability but we have an opportunity to attract those kinds of companies to Palo Alto  
31 and so I just wanted it for the record that that's specifically was what I was talking about.

32 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Don.



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

1 **Don McDougall:** (Inaudible) I support what Hamilton just said. I think Staff did a really nice job and I  
2 agree that Hamilton's sustainability initiative was not – cannot be encompassed in one word. I am still a  
3 little concerned through the element that retail versus commercial business is not sufficiently separated  
4 in some places. We're just talking about business in general and it's not clear what it is we're trying to  
5 protect. I think one more pass through trying to make it clear whether we're looking after retail or we're  
6 looking after the business community because they are really different approaches.

7 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. I'd like to acknowledge that Council Member Lydia Kou is here and also, next  
8 is Bonnie Packer.

9 **Bonnie Packer:** Also, I think the Business Element is great. There was – I just remembered last time  
10 there was a discussion about whether or not there was really an Office of Economic Development in the  
11 City and then I saw it mentioned towards the end. I can't find it now so if it exists fine but if it doesn't  
12 exist, there was one of these programs or policies that mentioned it. That's just a little detail and  
13 another thought though about this particular element, I found that there were very few programs.  
14 There are a lot of policies and it made me think about the other elements and how some policies could  
15 be programs and programs could be policies. I just don't – this one seemed – this element may be  
16 because so much of the issues are covered in land use and transportation so it's a smaller element. It  
17 seemed to flow better but it also pointed out that when I went to do the DOT priority exercise and I  
18 looked at the programs, I didn't have the policies in front of me to remember what the programs – what  
19 policies was supposed to implement. It was very hard to prioritize without seeing the policies written in  
20 front of me in that chart. I am going to bring that up again when we talk about the process, later on,  
21 tonight. Thank you.

22 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Annette.

23 **Annette Glanckopf:** I think element really looks pretty good. I just had some small – two or three little  
24 small things and one is that I agree with Bonnie. I've been really hot on this Office of Economic  
25 Development. I have my own little vision of what it should be but I'm not really sure that the Council – I  
26 think we really need to have some sort of policy decision if there is an office, about what exactly the  
27 Council wants this office to do because I think it's going to imply Staffing if we do it the way the Business  
28 Element requires. I'm fine with that but to me, it's right now a little bit fluffy. I just echo what Bonnie  
29 said. The other things have to do with really retail, which I sort of put in my note. There was a section  
30 that was eliminated because it was supposed to be redundant but it's in the retail centers and it talks  
31 about maintaining distinct neighborhood shopping centers, which really there are only three that are  
32 attractive, accessible and covenant etc. etc. Since we call out all the other big areas, I would just like to  
33 see that one left in. We call that Cal. Ave, University, south of Forest etc. It wouldn't take very much just  
34 to leave it in. Finally, somewhere in Program B-4.3 – 4.6.3, they talk about studying retail and to me,  
35 really what we should be studying is what does make ground floor retail viable rather than just sort of  
36 numbers and concepts and looking at online shopping. What type of businesses fits in what area? Would



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

1 you put a high-end clothing store in a neighborhood center for example or what types of businesses? I  
2 think that could actually be a lot better and I would actually ask you to add that to the policy, which I  
3 think will fluff up the local retail. I really do agree with Don, it is really high level and it doesn't really talk  
4 in this section about local serving small business – local serving retail.

5 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you, Annette. I'll just add that that also is interesting in terms what makes a retail  
6 center and what's appropriate in a mix of a retail center? For example, a mix of shops with an anchor  
7 store like a grocery store, sufficient parking and what was interesting going back to a dead horse of the  
8 Alma Plaza, none of the proposals for that everywhere for a viable shopping center that had a sufficient  
9 number of other shops. Stephen.

10 **Stephen Levy:** Two quick comments and a question. I echo Don and Hamilton in thanking the Staff. My  
11 memory is that Hamilton meant what he said he meant so I hope that that can be clarified either from  
12 the notes or whatever. My question is Elena, if I heard right, we will pass the Business Element on  
13 consent in the existing element plus all of the comments that are made tonight, will be forwarded to the  
14 Council. That there will not be a revision per say but the comments will be additive and in a separate  
15 joint document.

16 **Hillary Gitelman:** That was out intention based on the input we received from this group last month.

17 **Co-Chair Keller:** Also, the comments people make between now and the 31<sup>st</sup> so people can still – CAC  
18 Members can still submit comments through the 31<sup>st</sup>. They will be attached to it but not revisions, yes.  
19 Don.

20 **MOTION**

21 **Don McDougall:** I was going to make a motion to the opposite. First of all, I agree with your comment  
22 about the defining a center and defining retail as being viable but I would be remised by not saying a  
23 sustainable; I think that's key. I would make a motion that we accept the current revision of the Business  
24 Element and that we allow Staff to moderately modify and I trust Staff to decide what is moderately  
25 modify it. If the statements and comments are outrageous then leave them out. If they just simply  
26 improve the element per say, then include them so that we avoid a round of discussion about all of the  
27 extra statements. My motion would be to allow the Staff to modify and then subsequently submit the  
28 Business Element.

29 **Co-Chair Keller:** I think the job of the (inaudible) restate the motion and so – or at least to – what I  
30 understand is that you are basically giving Staff the discretion to take into count our comments and  
31 make minor changes in the spirit of what we have and correction based on the feedback that Staff gets  
32 from the CAC Member. Does that (inaudible)

33 **Don McDougall:** Yes, thank you for the very clear restatement of my motion.



# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE *DRAFT MINUTES*

1 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you.

2 **Annette Glanckopf:** Arthur, I'll second it with my two amendments.

3 **Co-Chair Keller:** Great. (Crosstalk) First, before we do this, I think Shani had a comment that she didn't  
4 get to say and then we'll go into the motion. Yes?

5 **Shani Kleinhaus:** I'm sorry I had to miss the discussion last time but when I look at it, one thing that is  
6 really missing for me is profession services. It's not the same as small business necessarily and I don't  
7 see enough for doctors, psychiatrists, dentists – all this – not just health but other types of professional  
8 services. Small HR firms, lawyer firms, all those things. There's stuff about – I just don't see that called  
9 here and I think it's needed. B-1.4 could be consolidated into B-1.6. Those two are very similar. I'm not  
10 sure that they initially were like that but now they are. There is a – Policy B-3.3 is a program and not a  
11 policy so that's something that could be easily changed I suppose. I'm not sure whether Policy B-4.1,  
12 supporting the established technology sector means that the City needs to support Palantir. I think  
13 we've had a lot of discussions why that would not be a good idea but that's what it reads like to me. I  
14 think that Program B-5.1.4, revised zoning to – revitalize aging retail and allow space to accommodate  
15 small independent retail businesses. Often those things are opposite. If you renovate, then it's not  
16 affordable so I'm not – things tend to become bigger and different. I think there's an internal  
17 contradiction in this program. I think creating certainty, which is a goal, is something that we cannot  
18 commit too. That's wrong because usually when you streamline things, the way to do it is by cutting out  
19 the public input. By making sure you have regulation instead of conversation and I am not sure we really  
20 want to do that. I'm sorry I wasn't here before and the comments I just made, some of them maybe  
21 easy to fix and other may not. I would not vote to accept it yet. We're not ready.

22 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you, Shani. I also support the idea of supporting local serving businesses that are  
23 not necessarily retail. We see – for example, the outcry for 550 Hamilton and the – causing people to  
24 have to leave the thriving building with Bank of American in it on El Camino, which is supposedly being  
25 replaced by a – for what I consider, not illegal (inaudible) to zoning, commercial building that would  
26 have a large RND tenant in there. I think that we need to be careful about the encroachment of those  
27 RND-type services in – where they replace local serving, non-retail business. Hamilton?

28 **Hamilton Hitchings:** That change could be accomplished by adding three words to the end of Policy 4-6.  
29 Encourage the policy – it reads, encourages and support small independent retail businesses and other  
30 services. By other services, we also meant professional services but Shani didn't read it that way so we  
31 could add other services including professional services. That would be a three-word addition. I don't  
32 know if this group feels comfortable adding that too – as an amendment but if there is consensus on  
33 that, we could do that. I really don't want this to go back to the subcommittee so I'd rather we resolve it  
34 now.

35 **Co-Chair Keller:** I think Joanna has a comment.



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

1 **Joanna Jansen:** Yeah, we did hear this comment before about the need for professional services so the  
2 attempt to address that is in Policy B-4.2, which says encourage the retention of small businesses, non-  
3 profit organizations, and professional services, which are vital to a diverse and innovative economy.

4 **Co-Chair Keller:** Could you be on a microphone?

5 **Shani Kleinhaus:** That's about retention, that's not about bringing more. I think we need more than just  
6 to retain.

7 **Joanna Jansen:** I guess I was just making the point that professional services and this kind of service  
8 specifically is in Policy B-4.2 rather than adding to B-4.6 if that's acceptable?

9 **Co-Chair Keller:** I think this is – I think this fits in with the category of giving Staff the discretion to figure  
10 out how best to deal with this. Is there anybody who doesn't think we should encourage retention of  
11 our or growth of professional services? I don't see anybody who is opposed to that so there seems to be  
12 consensus on giving staff discretion on figuring out to do that. Ok, there was a – Jen, I think you wanted  
13 to go next and then I think Annette has some amendments.

14 **Jennifer Hetterly:** I just wanted to make one comment that doesn't have any policy implications but  
15 from a usability perspective for people reading the Comp. Plan. I think the narrative – the figure on page  
16 B-2 and I mention this last time, that it tracks the sales and used tax revenue by geographical area. That  
17 reflects the total revenue and I think that there's not a strong understanding that what Palo Alto gets  
18 out of the total is really just a small portion; some 10%-11%. I would love to see some – a sentence or  
19 some language in the narrative that just makes that clear to the reading that we're not getting \$22  
20 million dollars in sales tax revenue going into the City's coffers as a result to if we're getting some  
21 portion of that or maybe I missed the understanding it. If so, if you could clarify the language so that I  
22 would understand it and others would too. I think that would be helpful.

23 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. If want to say something, put up your tag but I think Annette is next.

24 **Annette Glanckopf:** You also need to change the word December on that chart. It's not spelled  
25 correctly.

26 **Co-Chair Keller:** Annette, you said you had several amendments.

### 27 **MOTION AMENDMENTS**

28 **Annette Glanckopf:** Right, I was going to second Don's motion with now three amendments. I would like  
29 to see that a paragraph is put back in, it's very short. To keep distinct neighborhood shopping etc., which  
30 you think is redundant but I think if really fits in with all the other different section. The other one is that  
31 I would like to add to the point of B-4.6.3 about the study that we're going to look at for retail – ground  
32 floor retail and talk about what makes ground floor retail viable and what businesses fit it. Then the



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

1 third motion would be that I don't think it's too terribly repetitive to add those three words that  
2 Hamilton came up with in one of the programs.

3 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. I think it was one of the policies, right Hamilton?

4 **Annette Glanckopf:** It was a program I think. Wasn't it?

5 **Hamilton Hitchings:** It was policy B-4.6.

6 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Don, do you accept those amendments?

7 **Don McDougall:** I would prefer that the amendment is with careful consideration of those three things  
8 as opposed to them being specifically called out because several people have made comments that  
9 we're not putting in the motion. I – you're making specific recommendations, right? I'm saying that I  
10 don't want that...

11 **Annette Glanckopf:** No, I'm just adding – One I just said was leave something in and then the other one  
12 was just add some wording.

13 **Don McDougall:** Right but then should we, in the motion, include Shani's comments and Hamilton's  
14 comments and (inaudible)(crosstalk)

15 **Annette Glanckopf:** I did include both of those.

16 **Don McDougall:** Are those the – if those are the only comments then I would have no objection but I  
17 would just say that with special consideration to as opposed to those being specific. I'm afraid  
18 something is being left out, as opposed to...

19 **Co-Chair Keller:** I think that was perhaps direction to include, it that's ok.

20 **Don McDougall:** Yeah, I'll accept that.

21 **Co-Chair Keller:** OK, great. Who – I think that Stephen had a comment and then I'd like to sort of trunk  
22 it. Not go too far on this so let's go.

23 **Stephen Levy:** Sure. Is Staff can clarify, my understanding is if figure B-2 and B-3 represent the total sale  
24 tax in the tax revenue and the distribution, not a – that they are the total.

25 **Hillary Gitelman:** That's correct.

26 **Co-Chair Keller:** I think that Jen's comment is that that's only a portion of the total revenue and that it  
27 should be indicated sale tax as a percentage of the overall revenue – whatever percentage it is  
28 (inaudible) revenue. Is that right, Jen?



# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE *DRAFT MINUTES*

1 **Jennifer Hetterly:** Maybe. I think maybe I should just talk to Staff after the meeting and clarify my  
2 (inaudible)(crosstalk)

3 **Co-Chair Keller:** Jen can talk to Staff afterward, great. Thank you. Are there any other comments before  
4 we call the question? Ok, great. I'm not going to restate the motion as amended. I think Staff has it. All  
5 those in favor of the motion – you had a comment, Amy?

6 **Amy Sung:** Excuse me, can you just repeat what is the motion that we are going to vote on?

7 **Co-Chair Keller:** We are voting on a motion to have the – to submit this element, the revised Business  
8 and Economics Element to Council. Giving Staff the discretion to incorporate the comments that have  
9 been made that are consistent with the – that are compatible with the comments that have been made  
10 and making minor additions or changes. Also, directions to include the three points that Annette had  
11 made, which were accumulating comments that were made by several people here.

12 **Hilary Gitelman:** Also, directing us to forward any written comments we receive by the end of next  
13 week.

14 **Co-Chair Keller:** Also, today's – those written comments by the 31<sup>st</sup> of March. As well as the notes of  
15 today's meeting. That being done, any – all in favor of the motion. Any opposed? Any abstentions? The  
16 motions carry with one abstention. Shani Kleinhaus abstains.

## 17 **MOTION PASSES WITH ON ABSTENTION**

18 **Co-Chair Keller:** If you have any further comments, please submit them by the 31<sup>st</sup>.

- 19 **2. Action: Draft Implementation Plan Chapter**  
20 **a. Introduction of Implementation Plan Chapter**  
21 **b. Report from Implementation Subcommittee**  
22 **c. Discussion of Draft Chapter**

23 **Co-Chair Keller:** Now we go onto the draft implementation chapter. This is not an element, it's  
24 a chapter so it has slightly different statuses. Perhaps we should go with Staff giving an  
25 introduction.

26 **Joanna Jansen:** Thank you, Arthur. I just wanted to take a minute to go over both the  
27 Implementation Plan itself and also, go ahead and talk a little bit about the DOT exercise. I'm  
28 going to be talking about both of those things. As Arthur said and as we explained in the Staff  
29 report, the Implementation Plan is a chapter of the Comp. Plan. It's in your existing Comp. Plan  
30 too. It gathers all of the programs from all of the elements into one table to track their  
31 implementation over time. It – you have that table and that was the bulk of your packet for this  
32 week. It was the 78-page table that gathers all of the programs from the elements as they have



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

1 been drafted by the CAC and those of them that have been – has specific direction given by the  
2 Council, we attempted to capture and reflect that direction from the Council in the plan as well.  
3 The table itself in your packet has a column showing the lead department or agency that would  
4 be responsible for the program. A relative priority column and that has five different priorities  
5 based on the feedback that we heard at the subcommittee. That includes what we are currently  
6 calling routine programs, meaning that things that Staff are going to do on a regular basis as  
7 part of the normal course of doing business. In progress or IP programs, those are things that  
8 are specific to elements such as – there’s one that I am looking at here that says, optimize  
9 traffic signal timing. That’s something that’s already in progress but it’s a (inaudible) that will be  
10 completed and checked off a list someday. Then there’s short, medium and long term and so in  
11 general, we are thinking that short means that we’ll do this within the first 5-years after  
12 adoption, medium is 5-10-years and long term is 10-years or more out most likely. We don’t  
13 have a lot of long terms but that’s what those prioritizes mean. Another column that we added  
14 to your plan here for you packet is that whether or not it’s a new or existing program. That was  
15 something that the subcommittee really expressed a strong interest in being able to see so  
16 we’ve added that information to this table. We found out that there are about; I think 110  
17 existing programs that are being carried forward and about 258 new programs that are being  
18 added based on bringing this up to date with the concern of today. Then finally, we have  
19 anticipated level of effort. Just trying to give at least some order of magnitude sense of whether  
20 a program is going to be less expensive or more expensive using a number of dollar signs to  
21 indicate that. We have not assigned any specific dollar values to any of these programs yet but  
22 we wanted you to have some kind of sense of scale. Certainly, your comments on those are  
23 welcome too if you have thoughts on how those columns are completed. Then for your packet,  
24 we just have a note column here to make sure that some of the changes that we made over  
25 time are reflected or so that you can see how these programs connect to things like the EIR  
26 mitigation measure for example. This table was really created for your packet. This is probably  
27 not the form that the implementation chapter is going to take in the Comp. Plan itself. We’re  
28 just trying to provide you with the most useful and distinct information to work through as a  
29 CAC. The existing Comp. Plan has a slightly different set of columns and certainly, we can  
30 explore the utility of those columns once the programs themselves get a little bit more refined.  
31 We’re pulling this all together into an adopted Comp. Plan. That is – that’s the implementation  
32 table itself and just to back up a second, the overall goal here is to provide a tool for the  
33 community, the decision makers and Staff to figure out how are we going to implement the  
34 Comp. Plan. How we are going to achieve the goals that are articulated in the Comp. Plan and  
35 also to help set prioritizes and make decisions on a year to year basis or as budgeting cycles  
36 move forward, about how to allocate resources and what new programs to undertake and what  
37 ongoing programs to continue. I think we heard some very insightful comments at the  
38 subcommittee about – just acknowledging the fact that prioritizes in this piece of the Comp.  
39 Plan – on of the reason why it’s a chapter and not an element is because I think we see this  
40 really as a very living piece of the Comp. Plan. Something that’s going to need to change on a



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

1 pretty regular basis and respond to changing conditions in the external world. We can and do  
2 want to set some priorities or get a sense at least, of prioritizes as of today, 2017, but it's  
3 probably not going to be exactly the same priorities that would be held 5-years from now or 8-  
4 years from now. A lot of things will change and those priorities are going to need to change in  
5 response. This is a more fluid piece of the Comp. Plan rather than the policies, which we're  
6 hoping are going to provide long standing regulatory guidance for all of the City activities. With  
7 that said about the Implementation Plan and what this is itself, then I want to go on and just  
8 explain a little bit about the DOT exercise that we're going to do tonight and then I'm sure you  
9 guys will have questions and thoughts on the DOT exercise. We definitely have time on the  
10 agenda to talk about that. You'll see these posters around the room and these are the same  
11 version of the rows of the programs that you have in your packet. To the extent that you did  
12 your homework and used your packet either electronically or hardcopy, to identify prioritizes or  
13 opportunities for consolidation or any other comments on the programs. You should be able to  
14 find that correspondence pretty easily and they're in the order on the wall that they are in your  
15 packet. If you start here with community services, transportation, land use and natural  
16 environment are on the wall in this room and right out there in the little area just outside the  
17 door, we have safety on the opposite side of the windows that are facing me and then business  
18 and economics on that wall next to the lady's room. That's the order that you can find in your  
19 packet. For the elements that have a larger number of programs, we have 10 dots each and  
20 they are color coded. You can see the poster – there's a poster on each one of the walls and  
21 next to where the posters are its reminding you of what color to use. It's just so you can keep  
22 track so you don't have to count each one of these so you have a set of colors to use for each  
23 element so for example, land use is blue. For the two elements with the least number of  
24 programs, we have a lower number of dots so for community services and for business and  
25 economics, we have four dots since those have considerably fewer programs than the others. I  
26 acknowledge that ten is more or less an arbitrary number. It seemed like a nice round number  
27 that folks can kind of wrap their mind around. It doesn't necessarily represent exactly the same  
28 proportion of programs in each element because there are different numbers but we thought  
29 we'd make it not to terribly complicated and just let you go with 10; see what you think how  
30 that works. We're going to ask you to put those on representing your highest priorities for the  
31 programs in that element. Each dot represents a priority for you. In the subcommittee, the  
32 questions came up of whether or not folks can put more than one dot on a program if they  
33 think that's really exceptionally high priority for them and we heard arguments on both sides of  
34 that point. We decided that for this round, you can put more than one on but just be aware  
35 that that does – it's going to affect the total so probably best to try to keep that a moderate  
36 number if you can, rather than putting all ten of your dots on one program. We didn't have that  
37 happen during the subcommittee so I don't think it's going to happen here but that's something  
38 to keep in mind. What we want to do it try to divided you up into (crosstalk) – Oh, thank you.  
39 Great input. One more point to make is when you are thinking about your priorities and again,  
40 you think about these however you want and you're going to have your dots to use how you



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

1 see fit. When we talked about this at the subcommittee, some folks thought well, if a program  
2 is already in process or it's a routine program, maybe that means that I don't need to put dots  
3 on it or shouldn't waste my dots on that because it's already happening. Instead, I want to use  
4 my dots to express what I think on something that is not happening already that should  
5 happen. That's one way of thinking about it but I would also suggest that those ongoing  
6 programs and even the routine programs are drawing from the same pool of money and Staff  
7 time as are new programs. We have at the City a finite set of resources and part of the  
8 challenge here – it is a really difficult choice to figure out how to use those finite resources or  
9 how to prioritize them in a given year based on what's happening in Palo Alto and what we're  
10 hearing the community and a lot of other conditions that we have to take into account. It can  
11 happen in a City that a City looks at what it can do with the finite set of resources and decides  
12 to discontinue a program that's currently happening in order to fund a new effort or a new  
13 project. If you do think that there's something that's in progress already that's important to  
14 continue, consider putting a dot on that because it is – the fact that it's in progress already,  
15 doesn't necessarily guarantee that it will continue forever. Just logistically, given the space that  
16 we have available, what we thought might work best is to divide you up into three groups and  
17 have each group focus on a set of two elements at a time and then we'll rotate. We'll do 15  
18 minutes for those two elements and then you'll rotate to the next set of two elements. That  
19 way everybody gets a shot and you have about 15 minutes per set of two and we're not having  
20 all 21 people try to put dots on one poster at a time. Yes?

21 **Hamilton Hitchings:** If you're going to do that, can you please make sure that we're on the ones that we  
22 were on in the subcommittee for as our first one?

23 **Co-Chair Keller:** Actually, what we're going to do is do it based on where you're sitting and just go  
24 around and do it that way because it's easier to divide up. Otherwise, people have been in different  
25 subcommittees and they've been overlapping so that's not necessarily going to work. The way – what  
26 I'm going to suggest is that if you're sitting on this side of the room, you do the –these are the dots. The  
27 dots are in here. The dots are in your envelope. What we are going to do is that the people who are  
28 sitting on this wall are going to do the wall behind them first. The people who are sitting on that wall are  
29 going to do the ones in the corridor first and the people who are sitting on this wall are going to do the  
30 ones over here and behind me first. That's the simplest way and then we'll rotate around in a clockwise  
31 fashion. It's as arbitrary as any other one but at least it – you were self-selected without realizing it. I  
32 have one preliminary comment and that is that I think the term 'relative priority' for short term,  
33 medium, and long term are routine and in progress. The word priority is probably inappropriate. I would  
34 say relative timing might make more sense because we're going through a prioritization exercise so that  
35 would – because short, medium, long-term, that's a time element and not a priority element. What  
36 we're going to do first is those people who are – we're going to give people – we're going to go around  
37 once. The people who are on the implementation subcommittee will go first, people who are not on the  
38 implementation subcommittee will go second in terms of a discussion on the next thing. If you were on



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

1 the implementation subcommittee, please put your tags up. If you were not on the implementation  
2 subcommittee, put your tags down and we'll go around. Then we'll take everybody else in the second go  
3 around. We'll give everybody two minutes to go around this and make any comments you have before  
4 the dot exercise and then we'll come back after the dot exercise and have another round until the end.

5 **Joanna Jansen:** Can I make just one more logistical comment...

6 **Co-Chair Keller:** Sure.

7 **Joanna Jansen:** ...in case it comes up. Some of these that are all of a solid color, it's a little bit hard to see  
8 the dots or where the edges of the dots are but this is a dot. It might look solid to you. If you need any  
9 help getting the dots off or reaching the row that you are trying to reach or anything else, please let us  
10 know. There will be Staff around near the posters and we are happy to help you with those mechanical  
11 pieces.

12 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Do the Staff have any more comments? Great, so let's kick it off with Elaine.

13 **Elaine Uang:** I'm glad to see that we are going through this prioritization effort and I'll just keep this  
14 really brief. I'm actually very glad that the dot exercise is staying in the way that we – that you had  
15 envisioned it. I thought it was actually very useful during the implementation subcommittee to see in  
16 totality what everybody else was thinking. I think the danger with – it's a useful tool to have a  
17 spreadsheet and have each of us internally prioritize but the danger of doing that is that we can't all see  
18 everyone's possibilities. As an elementary school teacher, will tell you, the act of actually getting up and  
19 physically moving around and using movement to view so much information – a large quantity of  
20 information in totality is actually very useful. Not only does this give you the ability to see all the  
21 programs in three very concentrated posters. It allows you to make connections between different  
22 programs and allows you to see redundancies a little bit better as opposed to just these little 8 ½ by 11  
23 sheets. I actually found the implementation subcommittee exercise to be quite useful and I'm glad to  
24 just see that where perpetuating this so thanks.

25 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. By the way, there are two purposes of the name tags. One is to show me  
26 you want to speak and the other is to remind me of your name because even though I remember  
27 everybody, I am really bad at names and I forget them all the time. Don.

28 **Don McDougall:** I have to say that I am not longer enthusiastic about the dot exercise. The first thing I  
29 would say is that Arthur is absolutely right. The short, medium and long are totally different than in  
30 progress or routine. One is measuring time and time (inaudible) and ones measuring the status. A  
31 second comment would be that I think it's interesting that through here you've got the 1, 2, 3 dollar  
32 signs. Anything that is measured or evaluate has 2 or 3 dollar signs. I don't think that's necessary and I  
33 think that's pejorative relative to anything that we want to measure. I think that everybody continues to  
34 repeat two things. One is that things will change in the future and I think the real issue here is which are



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

1 the things that Council, Staff or whatever, are going to review every year or every 5-years or every 15-  
2 years? They need to be put in those buckets, not buckets of a higher priority. The Council will change,  
3 the Staff will change. Everything will continue to change; circumstances will change and knowing how  
4 frequently we're going to look at these things is more important than in 2017, we thought this was a  
5 high priority but by 2018, it's not and it becomes useful information. The other thing that I would ask is  
6 that I don't understand what the result of this is going to be. As Elaine said, it was really usually to sit in  
7 a room with the subcommittee and do this exercise and look at it and say wow, look at all the dots.  
8 There all there and they're not there or whatever. What we haven't heard here is when we're done,  
9 does Staff go away and take all of the programs that don't have any dots and delete them or what  
10 happens? We don't understand – we got an explanation about how we do the exercise but we have not  
11 an explanation of what happens with the dots. I mean, does Council get given seven dots for this one,  
12 three dots for that one, no dots for this one. I don't understand and I am not in favor of this exercise in  
13 this format.

14 **Hillary Gitelman:** I'd like to respond to that if I could? For those of you who weren't at the  
15 subcommittee meeting, we had a similar round and kind of talking about do we like the dot exercise, do  
16 we not and I think we went around and everybody was like no, we don't want to do the dot exercise.  
17 Then we did the dot exercise and we went around and said hey, that was kind of interesting. We learned  
18 something out of that. I'm hoping we will go through that same process this evening. I'm going back to  
19 the City Council motion last night, they directed Staff to encourage – to incorporate suggestions from  
20 the CAC and use their own judgment to identify relative priorities of the implementation programs. We  
21 have an obligation to give the Council our recommendations regarding priorities and this evening we are  
22 looking for your input on that. That's the purpose of the dot exercise.

23 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you.

24 **Don McDougall:** I don't think that answers my question about what are you going to do? Tell them high,  
25 medium or low or delete the ones that you didn't like? That doesn't answer my question, I'm sorry.

26 **Elaine Costello:** Excuse me, let me try and – one thing that we were talking to the Co-Chairs earlier  
27 today. One thing is that we are not entirely sure – we do know that we have an obligation to get back to  
28 the Council on priorities and we do look forward to your input. We – what we will do, is we will take –  
29 we'll add a column or I'm just going to say add a column and we'll show how many dots there were from  
30 this dot exercise. Our thinking this afternoon when we met with the Co-Chairs, was we would then send  
31 that back out to you and before we forwarded anything to the Council – once we get the results from  
32 tonight's dot exercise, we'll take a look at it – it is not – we're not really high on – we're not high on  
33 anything but we're not excited about deleting programs. That's just not – I can't think of one program  
34 that we deleted. We are – have been charged with trying to consolidate them but we are very, very  
35 interested in what your thoughts are about what's the most important things to do? Our thought was  
36 that we would put this together as a piece of information for you. We would give it some thought and



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

1 we would send it back out to you and then you could back at the next meeting. There are a number of  
2 possibilities that we thought of what we would do next. We would ask for your comments on it. We may  
3 ask you to refine a few things. We haven't really settled on that part yet but we do know that our plan is  
4 to put this on a spreadsheet. We have figured out with Place Works how we can send it back out to you  
5 as a spreadsheet that you could fill in again and comment on. This is the first iteration toward getting a  
6 sense of priorities. That's where are thinking is right now.

7 **Co-Chair Keller:** After we do the dot exercise, we'll have an opportunity – if we get to it soon enough, to  
8 comment afterward and figure out where we go next. Ok? Who's next? Shani?

9 **Shani Kleinhaus:** I still don't feel comfortable with this. I would rather we did something like three colors  
10 for each one of those next 5-years, next 10-years, next 15-years so look at more scheduling rather than  
11 comparing them to each other. I think that would be more helpful in terms of prioritization because it  
12 says what you do sooner rather than a competing – I have ten dots for every environmental program on  
13 earth, whether it's noise or air pollution or nature or all these other things; it just can't be done. I just  
14 don't understand this. I don't think it will reflect the things that are really important. There's a lot of  
15 things in progress. One of the questions I had is you say it has 258 programs but a lot of them seem to  
16 be in progress already, even if they are new. How many new programs that are not yet being  
17 implemented are there by Staff? I don't have an answer to that. I don't know if Don it in his table but I  
18 really think it's very, very important to know how many truly new programs there are and if so, they  
19 should be highlighted because what the City is already doing, they prioritize this to continue or not but  
20 most likely they will continue. I'd like an answer to that if possible. How many new programs that are  
21 not yet being implemented, are there?

22 **Elaine Costello:** There are 258 new programs...

23 **Shani Kleinhaus:** Yes.

24 **Elaine Costello:** ... and some of them – we don't – I haven't really broken it out into what is being  
25 implemented but since they are new...

26 **Shani Kleinhaus:** There are a lot of programs here that when I looked at it, there seemed to be more  
27 programs that are new and next to them had in progress. The new with nothing.

28 **Elaine Costello:** We don't have the number for whatever (crosstalk) (inaudible)

29 **Shani Kleinhaus:** I think that's really important to know how many new programs that are not in  
30 progress there are because what happens over time is the Council directs new programs all the time,  
31 whether they are in the plan or not. Now we captured some of those that are already in progress and  
32 we put them into this document so what happens next to the ones that came from the public that can  
33 to speak to us and asked for the news ones that are not already in progress. That's something that I



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

1 don't see here and I think it will be lost. I would really like to know that number of how many are there  
2 that are not already in progress and are new or somehow already being executed as a matter of  
3 routine?

4 **Co-Chair Keller:** I'm not sure Staff can give you that number today but when we have out spreadsheet,  
5 (Inaudible)

6 **Shani Kleinhaus:** Any news ones that are routine but were just captured here or in progress and is  
7 captured here, should be taken out of the new programs. They are just captured, they are not new.

8 **Co-Chair Keller:** Hamilton.

9 **Hamilton Hitchings:** I'm just going to flow from Shani's. It's not a false fact but it's a highly miss leading  
10 statement to say that there are 258 new programs. What the correct statement is that the  
11 Comprehensive Plan has added texted for 258 new programs within the thing but many of those are  
12 programs that are fully funded and ongoing. When you throw out a number like that, people are really  
13 latching on to like this 15%. 15% is another false fact because many of those are ongoing, many of them  
14 cannot be completed like the cap of 1.7 million-square-feet so people latch on to that and say see, we  
15 only did 17%. No, we didn't do over half or half of what's in the Comp. Plan. We just – a lot of those  
16 things are ongoing. We have to be really careful about completely misrepresenting what's going on  
17 through how we speak. I do want to thank the Staff for eliminating or I should say consolidating the  
18 number of programs and there's plenty more room to consolidate. Just an example, C-5.1.1 through C-  
19 5.4.1, those four programs to me look pretty identical and could certainly be consolidated. I don't know  
20 if you can get that down to two or one but that's an example. There's a lot more room so I want to  
21 support and highly encourage the Staff to continue that progress and I think they can reduce the  
22 number of other things. I think Arthur put it really well that this isn't so much about selecting things. It's  
23 about talking about which things we should do first. The priorities are essential – what we are doing  
24 with these dots is talking about what we think the highest priority of things that we should be working  
25 on in the next 5-years let's say. Then they'll go back and look at the next things and that's how we  
26 should view this, as a timing exercise rather than a priority. I feel this exercise – I know this isn't going to  
27 be popular, is a useful exercise. I did it at a small startup and that start-up kind of changed the world.  
28 You all are carrying smartphones around now so the – we did this and I – we do it all the time in the  
29 industry. It's like stop whining guys. Anyway, just had to throw that out there. This is part of getting shit  
30 done. I just want the Staff to confirm that they're not deleting programs that don't get votes. Thank you.

31 **Elaine Costello:** No, we're not going to delete programs just because they didn't get votes and if  
32 programs get consolidated, we'll merge the numbers – we're really not trying to play the game here.  
33 We're really trying to set what should be done first and respond to the Council's request for priorities.

34 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Doria.



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

1 **Doria Summa:** First of all, I approach this as a prioritization, not a timing because that's what it was  
2 called. That's a problem for me and I really would like to associate my concerns with Don and Shani and  
3 to a certain extent Hamilton's. I'm sure his startup succeeded for other reason than the dot exercise.  
4 That was probably a merit of the product. Regardless, I have a problem with prioritizing because I think  
5 it leaves things out and that's kind of Shani's ethical approach to this. I have a problem with what the  
6 work that Don showed me that he did last night, which Hamilton really referenced in that the numbers  
7 aren't really factual. I have a problem – I do not see how the dot exercise encourages any interactivity or  
8 discussion between this group. It's like 19 adults running around individually without participating with  
9 one another at all so I don't see how it advances the conversation. I'm concerned I guess, based on  
10 some of Don's question about how it's going to be used. If it's not really going to be used, what's the  
11 point of doing it? I'm also concerned that a more accurate way would be to do it the way that I  
12 recommended at the subcommittee level, which is having a workable electronic spreadsheet. Where  
13 everyone could – where priority designation for each item would have been decided whether it's 1  
14 through 3 or 1 through 5 and you could only vote once on everyone that you were interested in. I'm not  
15 concerned that Staff is going to throw away sad, little, unpopular programs. That's not really my  
16 concern. My concern is that it's not telling us anything and that with multiple dots being able to be used  
17 by one person and given the number of people here, that the percentage of interest could be miss  
18 represented. Other than that, that's about it.

19 **Co-Chair Keller:** Annette.

20 **Annette Glanckopf:** I pretty much think this is not – even though it's going to be a lot of fun to run  
21 around and put dots on things. I really don't think it's getting there and I agree with what Don said and  
22 Doria said. For me, I think our focus should be trying to figure out which new programs are the high  
23 priority programs and combine the ones that are redundant. I counted in my own estimation, at least 20  
24 programs that I would consolidate. It also concerns me that we go off in detail – we have all these  
25 Master Plans out there and then we go into detail and we cherry pick things from the Master Plan so I  
26 think that's something that we have to be cautious of. If I were looking at this as a Council Member, I  
27 would like to know what department is doing what priorities? If you look at this, community services  
28 and poor Hillary, have just about everything in the plan. Public Works has a little bit, the fire has a little  
29 bit, police has a little bit, so it's really misleading to sort of say that we're going to just put dots there. In  
30 the Business Element, there are only nine programs and so, that's not ten, even though you have  
31 reduced it. In the Safety Element, as Hamilton has pointed out a number of times, almost every program  
32 in there is a high priority program. In the future, what I would like to see is if I were allocating the  
33 money. I would like to see this by the department and by priority. I think you need to leave them in the  
34 Comp. Plan with the policies and programs but when you get to big Implementation Plan, to me it  
35 should be by the department. High priorities first and maybe sub-departments so transportation,  
36 planning, business development and then go from there. Then also, finally, I looked at this in detail and  
37 to me, I think – again, I think it is a work of art what you guys did but I don't totally agree with



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

1 everything as far as existing or new programs. I think there's a whole bunch of things that are ongoing,  
2 that are really not new and maybe have different lead departments. I'm willing to do the dot exercise  
3 and maybe that will pick out the high of the high but again, I don't think it's getting there, just the way  
4 Doria said. I don't think in the end game – we're going to all have a good time doing this but I don't think  
5 it really gets the end result we want.

6 **Co-Chair Keller:** Alex.

7 **Alex Van Riesen:** What I took from what Hillary said is that you were given a mandate by the City  
8 Council to prioritize these. I get the pragmatist in me says that you're going to prioritize this one way or  
9 another and the City Council wants that and the question is whether we'll have any input in that or not.  
10 It seems to me, this is our chance to speak up. I agree that you may not like it because it may artificially  
11 force the equation but it does seem to me that the ones that are gathering our greatest attention are  
12 the ones that need to be addressed the soonest. The things that are getting our greatest attention. I  
13 sympathize with those Sofie's choice issue and that there are lots of things but the reality is they – it's  
14 going to be difficult to accomplish all the things that are on the list, to begin with. I find that we need to  
15 be able to have some focal point to start with. Having said that, I'd like to see tonight that there's some  
16 resolution to this issues about how many programs are actually accomplished in the first 15-years. I  
17 know Don has put out some – I can't totally read Don's – I'm reading yours – I hear – I don't know if my  
18 concerns are the same as Shani but what percentage of the programs were actually accomplished? I  
19 hear some disagreement with the number 15% so I'd like a brief run through at some point on how did  
20 we come up with that number? Is that number accurate and how was it defined? Another one is that I  
21 guess I've been asking myself, are there any other options for creating a priority list and it sounds like – I  
22 don't know if anyone else has come up with any – that – I don't know if it's worth it to continue to give  
23 time to think about that but I do want to say that I like the idea of things to revisit in 5, 10 and 15-years.  
24 My idea – I don't – I wonder if we should consider including a policy and/or a program for the City  
25 Council to be mandated to have to review this document every year because what I have heard is that –  
26 from other people, is that no one ever looked at this in the first 15-years. Now, I kind of don't believe  
27 that's true but shouldn't it be mandated that the City Council has to come back and review this  
28 document publicly. Then that would be an opportunity for the community to speak into some of the  
29 elements or the priority of the programs that are not being addressed. Can I just mention one last thing?  
30 I just wanted to say that I think it's a mistake – the only thing that -- I would rather us not double up on  
31 the dots. I think for a more accurate read, I'd rather that everyone – well, I still think it communicates  
32 something.

33 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Bonnie.

34 **Bonnie Packer:** Hi, I am standing because I hurt my muscle. It hurts to sit. Ok, I agree with most -- what  
35 most people said who were concerned about this exercise. When we came to the implementation  
36 subcommittee I said, we don't have any criteria for creating priorities. I'm sure Hamilton when you did a



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

1 priority thing, you had criteria. Do we have the resources? Do we have the time? All these things you  
2 consider when you are doing a priority exercise. We don't have criteria to work with. Some people are  
3 saying time and some people say what's our most favorite thing that we like. For all of us, when we  
4 were working on these elements, all the programs are kind of important otherwise, we wouldn't have  
5 put them in. How do we choose? We go to Safety, am I going to weigh one against another and have  
6 somebody die because we didn't do the flood thing right. We didn't – you know. Those are – when I –  
7 when we got this a week early and I thought, that's nice. They are giving us lot of time but I felt that this  
8 is not a good use of my volunteer time. To really spend all this time thinking about each program and  
9 trying to prioritize and weigh it against the other programs. It's just too heavy, it's too much and it was  
10 just – without the policies in here – see a lot of the programs seem to be redundant and should be  
11 consolidated. That's because probably this program is trying to implement a certain policy and the other  
12 program that sounds like that program is implementing another policy. Without – I didn't want to take  
13 the time to go back to whatever draft I had of the particular element that these things were referring to.  
14 I couldn't really figure it out. Why aren't we prioritizing the policies? Why not do that and then within  
15 the policies prioritize the programs. It just seems like the Council wants us to do this but what are they  
16 going to learn from it if we're confused about what we're doing? I hope they read these minutes and  
17 they understand our frustration. When it comes to the – when push comes to shove, it's really going to  
18 be a matter of political will and City Resources and the particular Council what's really going to happen.  
19 Our input is probably not going to inform them that much in 2017 or in 2018. Thank you.

20 **Co-Chair Keller:** Stephen.

21 **Stephen Levy:** My understanding Hillary, is that Staff was asked to develop some priorities in that  
22 process and gather input from this Committee. Is that correct? I joined the Committee to serve in an  
23 advisory Committee to the Council. I'm happy to do that. I kind of feel that the experience when we did  
24 this at the subcommittee is that we talked about it for an hour and then finally somebody said let's do it  
25 and we all looked at it at the end and there were actually some pretty strong priorities that dropped out  
26 of it. I would rather just get it on and do it. My memory – Hamilton, and others of the subcommittee  
27 were that we all felt that there were some duplications. I looked at it and there were probably eleven  
28 policies that said it one way or another that we should be energy efficient in the City. There are probably  
29 eight policies that say that we really need to be careful about seismic events in the City. I end up with a  
30 question. Is that for Staff or are you asking our input on the consolidation or will that come from you  
31 looking at the priorities?

32 **Hillary Gitelman:** I think we'd welcome your input this evening about this consolidations task.

33 **Stephen Levy:** Fine. (Inaudible) since you now said that this would come back to the Committee, have  
34 we blown our schedule? We were tasked with doing the introduction governance thing in April and then  
35 being done in May. I would hate to blow the schedule. Can you comment on that?



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

1 **Hillary Gitelman:** I think your hope is that this would come back as an item early on the agenda at your  
2 next month meeting and we'd still have time to do the governance and other things that are scheduled  
3 for that day. We just want to show you as a result of this meeting and your input in the intervening  
4 month, how we've revised the table that you see.

5 **Stephen Levy:** You don't anticipate any more subcommittee meetings or duplicate meetings or anything  
6 like that?

7 **Hillary Gitelman:** That's correct.

8 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. If those of you who are on the subcommittee could please put your tags  
9 down and those of you who were not on the subcommittee, if you wish to speak put your tags up so  
10 that I can call on you. Amy, you were not on the subcommittee so you go first.

11 **Amy Sung:** I wanted to say that I am in favor of this dot exercise simple because (inaudible). This is the  
12 work of our labor and who else is more familiar with the product that has been produced and delivered  
13 – to be delivered. When you look at the context, I think a lot has to do with the intent of what the  
14 programs are intended to do. I think that gives a great inside to the Council who is going to make the  
15 decision. Why was it deemed more important and why it was given such a weight of priority? Not that  
16 that will be automatically be granted but I think it provides a great insight and guidance. At least what  
17 the Council can do it reach back to the Committee – I don't know. I'm sure that – but then we will be all  
18 gone and go our separate ways but I think that provides a great insight and intent. When there is a vast  
19 number of programs and if everyone is giving equal weight, how do you evaluate? I remember we were  
20 all so excited and I think it was even mentioned yesterday what – Did I remember correctly? That we  
21 were so congratulating that our Palo Alto schools were being ranked number one. My god, there are so  
22 many schools in the State and in the Country and we were so happy because there was some sort of a  
23 ranking system. I think that is what we are being told, that you categorize so that you put them in little  
24 boxes to see how they have been stuck up against each other. I do want to address the concerns that,  
25 what happen to those that are not being favored? You feel like you have so many kids and those that  
26 are not being loved and neglected -- I think we heard the reassurance that those that are not being  
27 loved will still be there. Just kind of showing that this is a product that's being delivered but carries  
28 different weight. Thanks.

29 **Co-Chair Keller:** Len. Ellen, did you want to speak?

30 **Ellen Uhrbrock:** I'd like to say that from the very, very beginning working with this group, I have always  
31 been more interested in what the programs are and what you're going to plan to do over the next 20-  
32 years. Really, I am more interested in the programs and how you are going to do it than I am in the  
33 policies. The policies seem to be rather – I shouldn't say this but rather easy to write. They are very  
34 grand but then, how are you going to do it.? I like seeing all the different programs and then I like seeing  
35 how they fit together and build something that is coherent and progress. To me, it's been rather an



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

1 interesting assignment. Then I look at these programs and I think, ok now, if that was my job, how would  
2 I organize it and how would I do it? Some of them I don't understand at all and can't figure out how I can  
3 do it at all; that's not surprising. It's a game and I think that we might as well play this game and see  
4 what we are able to do and do it good or bad. Actually, what we are doing is helping to advise the Staff  
5 what they – what their jobs are going to be and you're advising the new City Planner on how he has to  
6 be the CEO and worth the big bucks in running Palo Alto. That puts me in a rather low level of working  
7 with the Committee but it's been very interesting, very fun and this is big business. Whatever I  
8 contributed would be a little bit and thank you for putting up with me.

9 **Co-Chair Keller:** Len.

10 **Len Filppu:** Thank you. I think that there – here's what I am thinking about this issue. There is confusion I  
11 believe, in what the City Council intends to do – there go the lights.

12 **Co-Chair Keller:** It's 7 – there's the 7<sup>th</sup> inning stretch, we have the 7 o'clock dark.

13 **Len Filppu:** Yes, and I am trading and selling stickers too if anyone is interested. There's this sense that  
14 there's this number shock about the programs. That people are freaked out at the number of programs.  
15 When this group was chartered with creating – coming up with – thinking out of the box, asking the  
16 neighbors, finding input from the community and writing down a smorgasbord of a variety of  
17 interesting, relevant programs. What I am worried about and maybe it's just my years in Washington  
18 have made me jaded. I'm worried that in an environment where the City Council first voted to relegate  
19 programs to an appendix to move on with whatever agenda and then, the next step is ok, they are back  
20 but let's prioritize with just ten dots. There are an enormous amount of programs within elements, that  
21 once you put a numerical value – once you quantify these programs, it's much easier for not Staff, not  
22 the process going on here but the next set of eyes reviewing this to say well, these didn't make the cut  
23 so let's just get rid of these. That's what I am worried about and that's my message to City Council is  
24 please understand that these have been squabbled over, fought over, thought out of the box over, input  
25 from neighbors and residents and they're presented to you in good faith for your due consideration.  
26 Thank you.

27 **Co-Chair Keller:** Jen.

28 **Jennifer Hetterly:** I'm also a little concern about the dot project. I think it vastly oversimplifies a complex  
29 challenge of prioritizing programs but I also – and I also don't think that it represents suggestions from  
30 the CAC. I think if you go forward to Council saying, based on this dot exercise, these are the CAC's  
31 recommendations. I don't think that gives them a full picture and it wouldn't seem to me, to represent  
32 all the issues that people are concerned about today. Early on, in this process and really throughout the  
33 process, we've talked about the implementation stage as when we were really going to come back  
34 together and look at the whole picture and pull it all together and see how everything fits. Where we  
35 had extra, where we had not enough and fill in the gaps; whatever. This doesn't accomplish that in my



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

1 view. I think it doesn't – the dots don't allow us to say ok, now that we look at the whole thing – oh, let  
2 me back up. Not having the policies together with the programs; I think is doing exactly what we just  
3 told Council not to do. We can't then have a holistic view of what's going on and how they relate and I  
4 think that's part of some of the discomfort that we're seeing at the table today. We couldn't go back  
5 and look up every single policy that went with every single program in order to make those connections.  
6 I think we're starting out the gates at a deficit because we didn't have that big picture. I think there are  
7 several areas where we have lots of policies that say support this and a program that says, collaborate  
8 with so and so to support that. Where the program doesn't really go much further than the policy, those  
9 would be easy redundancies perhaps to eliminate. There are also plenty of places where we could  
10 integrate the program into the policy and have sufficient comfort on this panel to say that's ok, we can  
11 give up that program as long as the policy has this little extra. There may well be places – oh, for the  
12 downtown cap there were some programs that were eliminated as a result of Council's choice not to  
13 have the downtown cap but it doesn't seem like they are naturally connected. One was evaluated and  
14 adjust the zoning definition for office uses allowed in downtown and consider ways to prioritize for  
15 small business and startups. That doesn't have anything to do with whether or not we have a downtown  
16 cap or not. I think we're missing – there's a lot of stuff that's falling through the cracks that we're not  
17 pulling together by relying on this very simplistic program. Last, of all, I am concerned about the dot  
18 distribution. I think the total number of programs in an element is no reflection on the importance of  
19 the individual programs within that element. It may well be that the Business Element has some – two  
20 programs that are hugely important but since it's the shortest one, it gets one sticker. Where  
21 transportation maybe has 30 programs that are hugely important out of the 77. It's not a numbers  
22 game. It's a qualitative game and I think that we missed that in doling out the numbers. I think if you are  
23 going to dole out the numbers in that arbitrary way, that you should do it equability in that arbitrary  
24 way. If you are going to say 10% for each element, then you ought to be 10% for each element. Not 10%  
25 for two of them and 8% for some of them and 6% for some of them. It ought to be uniform.

26 **Co-Chair Keller:** Julia.

27 **Julia Moran:** I'm fine doing the dot program. I share some of the concerns that other people have but  
28 hopefully, it'll flush out as we go forward. I just hope that once we do it, that we both look at what –  
29 maybe this will be obvious once it's all on the wall but both look at the results to see our priorities but  
30 also were within an area where we have a lot of similar programs and which ones stand out within that.  
31 I – when I went through it -- for example, early childhood. There were two programs involving early  
32 childhood and I – my priority was having something involving early childhood not one over the other  
33 and so I'm not sure the best way that that will be shown so I'm hoping that will be the case. As well as  
34 perhaps – like Stephen said, there are sections where there are 10+ programs involving – I think I  
35 counted 15 programs about taking care of our trees. Perhaps – I hope that we can use this in the  
36 subcommittee or the Staff to help with figuring out which of those tree programs are important and as  
37 they go forward and consolidate.



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

1 **Co-Chair Keller:** Lisa.

2 **Lisa Peschcke-Koedt:** A few thought. A little bit different – the first is I agree. I think we should do the  
3 dot exercise and the way I am taking it – I think there’s been a little bit of discussion about this. I’m  
4 taking this as our first chance to show what we think are most important, potentially to do first. Nothing  
5 is being taken out of the plans so everything is there. This is at least our chance to give some priority in  
6 the context of what should we do first. Second – sorry about that. The second is I did – I think you  
7 mentioned and you mentioned it Arthur, the way this was laid to priority – to me, prioritization means  
8 what’s most important, not what costs the most money or is the fastest to do or the slowest to do or  
9 whatever. It’s really what moves the needle? If this is our goal, this is our vision. What gets us the  
10 furthest there and that’s my number on priority. It doesn’t matter if it’s going to take 5-years or 5-  
11 minutes, that’s still my number one priority. The way I’m doing – at least the dots, I’m not sure if we are  
12 all doing it the same way is what’s most important. What’s going to get us closest, fastest or furthest –  
13 not fastest, furthest on our journey of where we are today to where we want to be through all these  
14 different programs that we’re eventually going to hopefully do. Priority would be what’s most  
15 important, not what’s fastest or cheapest or whatever so that’s on the dot exercise. I’m all for doing it. I  
16 think we’ll actually learn something from doing it and then we can always step back and say – as I think  
17 you mentioned and someone else mentioned too is how to we help pull it all together and see how  
18 things mesh. I would still love to do that and this won’t get us there but it at least gets us a start on what  
19 might be most important. A subsistent question on the Land Use Element. The two programs that we  
20 have put in relating to height had come out but it didn’t have a comment saying that Council had said to  
21 take them out. I am actually – assuming that we still have the discretion to do something, I was going to  
22 propose we – because we had talked so much about that here. I’m not into the exact wording but add  
23 back something where we came back over and over to the idea of allowing more dense housing and  
24 potentially some height flexibility if it was near transit and it was part of some – I’m not talking Master  
25 Plan in a technical sense but part of plan to go toward (inaudible). I don’t see it in here anywhere and so,  
26 it just – unless Council has directed us to take it out, I was going to ask if we could put that –however we  
27 want to word it, something back in that kind of captures because we spent a lot of time on that both in  
28 transportation and in land use. Those are my comments.

29 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. The first is in terms of height flexibility, there actually is something in the  
30 Housing Element already there in terms of height flexibility near transit and with respect – (inaudible)  
31 respect to low – to – with respect to low-income housing. It’s not here because we’re not prioritizing the  
32 Housing Element. That’s done and it’s already been sent to the State. We don’t have the Housing  
33 Element here. It’s already in the Housing Element. We don’t have the Housing Element here. I’m not  
34 sure whether the Housing Element should be in the Implementation Plan as well and just incorporated  
35 and that’s an open question. Consolidations interfere with the dot exercise because if you do the dot  
36 exercise before consolidation, then if people have put two dots on something to consolidate, if you sum  
37 them, you get two dots together. If you – things may fall out because they weren’t a sufficient priority



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

1 individually but become a higher priority when they are consolidated. There's some interaction there  
2 that I have discovered when I have done this exercise on prior work. That you always do consolidation  
3 work first and then you do the dot exercise but we're not doing that in that order. There's also this  
4 distinguishing between the urgent and the important and we are confusing the two in terms of dot  
5 exercise. Secondly, there's the notion of dot currency. The dots are currency and there are no relations  
6 to the cost. Should you use three dots in order to count for one dot on a 3-dollar sign item and one dot  
7 for a current – for a single dollar sign item, as an example. I can put three dots on 3-dollar sign item and  
8 somehow that has the same weight as putting three dots on one dollar sign item. Even though it's hard  
9 to do all three of the 3-dollar sign items because they are costly. Maybe we should make a distinction  
10 between things – between programs and policies that are newly codified versus ones that are newly  
11 instituted. Right now, if they are newly in the Comp. Plan, we're not making the distinction if whether  
12 they are things that are already ongoing for which they are newly codified in the Comp. Plan, as opposed  
13 to simply something that we are proposing to start; that's a new program – a true new program. We  
14 should make a distinction between true new programs and newly codified programs that are already  
15 ongoing and I think that will clarify the count of what we're really adding. I would like to see the policies  
16 put back into the spreadsheets so when we get this back, we can see it in context. I hope the  
17 consolidation is an opportunity to clarify wording because I think that when you are going through this  
18 process and consolidating, clarifying and trying to eliminate conflicts is a useful thing. In terms of Alex,  
19 maybe we should have a quiz for – on the Comp. Plan for Board, Commissioners, and new Council  
20 Members. Also, a program that is not loved does not necessarily mean that it is killed but maybe it  
21 starved and doesn't get attention. Maybe that's the (inaudible) prioritizing – prioritization. Maybe  
22 ongoing programs shouldn't be programs. Maybe they should be policies and maybe we should take an  
23 opportunity to revisit that. Just as Annette talked about – I think you talked about the Safety Element, I  
24 think you mentioned that there were a lot of policies without programs? Maybe that's what this should  
25 be. Ongoing things should be policies and not programs. I just want to make a reference that there is an  
26 old song for those us who are old enough. Remember a song about eleven spoons full and said – the line  
27 is, you know you have to finally decide, say yes and leave the other behind. That's a good Segway into  
28 doing the dot exercise. I'm hoping that we can do the dot exercise 10-minutes per wall because  
29 otherwise, we will have no time to discuss. If you can try to do 10-minutes per wall and then move on  
30 from there and Staff will basically try to shuffle us on to the next group when we can. Please, let's go  
31 with the dot exercise. The group on here – on the wall by the windows will do community service and  
32 transportation. The group over here by the wall – this wall with the clock will do land use and  
33 community design and natural environment and the group over by the corridor or the entrance will to  
34 the two outside. Thank you. We are talking about next steps and one of the things that I'd like to just  
35 mention is that since Staff is talking about sending us a spreadsheet along for our review, we can briefly  
36 talk about – there are two purposes of the spreadsheet. One is to provide our input but the spreadsheet  
37 can also be done – can also be useful as a way of getting data. For example, if the spreadsheet included,  
38 just of discussion sake, the lead department of agency. You could take that spreadsheet and sort it as



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

1 you wished to be able to do analytics based on that. For those of us who are computer savvy with our  
2 Microsoft Excel, you could have fun and analysis the data you got from the spreadsheet. I basically filled  
3 time with that information till people sat down. Maybe Staff can give us a comment on how we should  
4 lead with the process and then we'll go around the room.

5 **Hilary Gitelman:** Elaine and Joanna are looking at me worriedly. What is she going to say about that dot  
6 exercise? Thank you all for getting up, moving around and giving us your thoughts. What we did at the  
7 subcommittee was to just go around with one round of comments of observation. What did we learn  
8 from this exercise and in tonight, I think we'd also be interested in your thoughts on next steps, just so  
9 we're all on the same page of what we were thinking would happen next. As Arthur said, we would send  
10 out a spreadsheet that shows you the results from tonight's exercise and provides an opportunity for  
11 you to present – provide us with some additional input. I am most interested in getting your input on  
12 consolidation suggestions. We're going to still talk about how we send this out and what we ask from  
13 you and when but I think many of you have observed that the consolidation question is probably the  
14 most useful – use of our time. We'll try and put that front and center with the request we send out to  
15 you. God, there was one more thing I wanted to say.

16 **Co-Chair Keller:** While you are thinking of the other thing, I am wondering if that's an opportunity to  
17 take things that are ongoing programs that really should be considered policies and recommend that  
18 that be done.

19 **Hilary Gitelman:** If you all have suggestions on that kind of thing, we'll take those as well because what  
20 we'd like to do is ultimately, provide the Council with our recommendation here and anything that we  
21 need to clean up along the way we will. I also wanted to acknowledge the request we had for some  
22 additional numbers – number of new programs, the number of completed programs. We will get back to  
23 you all with that. Oh, I remember what the other things were. There was a request to provide the  
24 policies in the document. That is going to be problematic for us because if you think about it, the goals,  
25 plus the policies, plus the programs are the whole plan. We would go from having a spreadsheet that's –  
26 how many pages is this? 70 something pages to quite a voluminous document. Also, a lot of the policy  
27 language is still very much in flux because the Council hasn't completed their review. I apologize, I would  
28 love to do that for you but we're just not going to be able to – we're going to have to continue to ask  
29 you to compare the spreadsheet you get with the elements that have the programs. The last version of  
30 these things and if you can't do it, I totally understand. We're going to – there are going to be  
31 opportunities for the public to engage with this whole plan as it gets closer to the finish line and if there  
32 are any horrible disasters, we'll catch them along the way. We just can't at this point consolidate the  
33 whole things. It's just not feasible.

34 **Elena Lee:** I'm sorry, I'd like to also add that I think on the website, we have linked all the latest version  
35 of each element so there will be a central place where you can select and pick the latest so that should  
36 help a little. Yes, we can do that.



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

1 **Elaine Costello:** What I think we can do – one of the things that is happening is that – as Hillary said, we  
2 are responding to the Council and doing additional versions of things so there are sets of policies  
3 roaming around. We will make sure that the set that you should use in reference to this set of programs  
4 is identified at the top – we can probably put it on each page even, with a link so that you could at least  
5 see the one and if you say, wait, I saw another version. Yes, there are other versions. What the other  
6 versions are is that we are responding to changes that the Council asked for. For example, in land use at  
7 their meeting in; I think January. We're certain – you're going to see different things but we'll make sure  
8 that each page has a link to the version of the element that these programs relate to. Does that work for  
9 you?

10 **Hillary Gitelman:** We'll send out some instructions with the materials. I think it would be useful to do a  
11 round of comments and observations.

12 **Co-Chair Keller:** Are you talking about pages or tabs? Are each of these a page or just one long  
13 spreadsheet?

14 **Elaine Costello:** You are so far ahead of us Arthur. Those are excellent questions.

15 **Co-Chair Keller:** Ok great. Thank you. Also, you might also simply put the links to all of the element – all  
16 the latest versions of the elements in the email cover note to which you would attach the spreadsheet.  
17 That might be easier than putting them in the header of a spreadsheet. Whatever is easiest for the Staff.  
18 Why don't we do around the room and I think last time we started with Elaine. This time, we'll start with  
19 Lisa and you'll have two minutes and we'll just go around the room. If you're quick, we will be able to  
20 popcorn afterward.

21 **Lisa Peschcke-Koedt:** I'll actually be very quick. I thought this was a really good exercise and it's  
22 wonderful to see how much common thought we have I think around a lot of them. There are quite a  
23 few orphan ones that will hopefully still get moved forward but it's nice to see that. I don't have any  
24 questions or anything else to add.

25 **Co-Chair Keller:** Stephen.

26 **Stephen Levy:** I think we replicated what happened when the subcommittee did it, which was we had  
27 an hour discussion then we went around and did the dots and there was a whole bunch of agreement.  
28 In response to consolidation, I just looked at one element. We have a ton of programs that say we want  
29 to be energy efficient and we also have an SCAP. We have a ton of programs that say we want clean  
30 water and water quality. With all difference to Shani – I'd worked with Shani, we have over 20 programs  
31 that say we really, really, really value the trees. Those are all important topics but whether trees, water  
32 quality, and energy efficiency are worth 55 programs, that's one area I'd look at to consolidate. I'm sure  
33 there are others that – perhaps you could take a topic or heading of cost effective – I looked down there



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

1 and there are five things that are cost effective and they could be dot items under one and that would  
2 be a way to preserve the content but make it a program about having cost-effective energy

3 **Co-Chair Keller:** Bonnie.

4 **Bonnie Packer:** I'm looking forward to the new version with the links because that will really help with  
5 being able to consolidate – I mean offering suggestions about consolidation because it was really hard to  
6 do that. I know some people wrote on the pages and I did that in the subcommittee but it's really hard.  
7 It's – I'm looking forward to that and I'm wondering when we get this, will we be – could we – will we  
8 have an opportunity to – in our response to sort of do the dot exercise again without the actual dots?  
9 You know what I mean?

10 **Hillary Gitelman:** I think we're still giving some thought to how this will work exactly. I hope you can be  
11 patience and we will try and get this out in a reasonable time frame.

12 **Bonnie Packer:** Thank you.

13 **Co-Chair Keller:** Julia.

14 **Julia Moran:** I was glad we did the exercise. I'd agree with Stephen that I think the topics that he named  
15 and I am sure there are others, where there's a ton of – pretty much saying the same thing within a  
16 program but it's relating to different policies. If there's a way that we can cross over and not have that  
17 many programs repeated would be great.

18 **Co-Chair Keller:** Jason.

19 **Jason Titus:** Same, I thought it was actually a useful exercise. I did think that it sorts of culls out the  
20 things that people are at least – where there are commonality and interest. Then, also I think the energy  
21 efficiency was one area where I think it's really important -- we did have a large number of things that  
22 could probably be organized together.

23 **Co-Chair Keller:** Alex.

24 **Alex Van Riesen:** Same. I thought it was a helpful exercise and I agree with Stephen. I thought it went  
25 similar to how it went in the subcommittee.

26 **Co-Chair Keller:** Annette.

27 **Annette Glanckopf:** Well, I still felt like a 4<sup>th</sup> grader but – and didn't have enough time. I did find it really  
28 difficult because some of the elements I had like 20 high priorities and it was very difficult to make those  
29 decisions. It is interesting to see the commonality.

30 **Co-Chair Keller:** Jennifer.



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

1 **Jennifer Hetterly:** I have two things to say. First, in the preamble for the implementation chapter, on  
2 page 2 there's a section called priorities. It says that in adopting this plan, the CAC says the following  
3 three broad priorities – I'm wondering where those came from? Did these come from Council because  
4 we haven't framed the entire Comp? Plan in the context of those three priorities as far as I know.

5 **Hillary Gitelman:** I think this was our reading of the work that the CAC has done so we'd love your  
6 comments or thoughts on that if you think that should be revised.

7 **Jennifer Hetterly:** Off the top of my head I would say that I would love to see it be revised to be the --  
8 first one to be, increase the proportion of affordable housing in the community. I'd love to see an added  
9 item to maintain the balance of public service and facilities as the population grows. I think ought to  
10 broaden it beyond just those three. My next comment is, however –whatever you all decide to do with  
11 this dot program, I would like to know what are Staff's expectations in terms of whatever form it takes,  
12 your representation of what the CAC suggestions are about prioritization. I'm wondering if the CAC is  
13 going to have an opportunity to act on – to confirm or endorse whatever that representation is or are  
14 you all just going to represent how you think best and send it forward?

15 **Hillary Gitelman:** Ideally, we will have another version at the next meeting that the Committee can bless  
16 if you feel so inclined.

17 **Jennifer Hetterly:** I personally think that it is important for the Committee to bless whatever's put forth  
18 as the representation of our suggestions. If we're not going to have the opportunity to do that, then that  
19 will certainly affect the nature of my participation in the process.

20 **Co-Chair Keller:** Is this an opportunity for Staff requesting that in this go around with – along with the  
21 spreadsheets, we solicit people to suggest what the priorities are and that we filter them at the next  
22 meeting?

23 **Hillary Gitelman:** I think we would like any comments you have on the introductory section. Not just  
24 that but there are two or three pages of text here. If you have any suggestions of how that should be  
25 edited, we would be happy to accept them.

26 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you.

27 **Doria Summa:** I guess – I don't find this very useful. I don't know how you can look at it at this point and  
28 seeing all these dots and frankly, connect them. It doesn't mean anything to me yet. Maybe when we  
29 have time to study the results it will mean something. I share Jen's concern about those priorities. I  
30 think boiling down to three is too narrow. That's about it. I don't think there's any way to discuss the  
31 content of anything. We can't even see from where we are sitting and stuff.

32 **Co-Chair Keller:** Len.



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

1 **Len Filppu:** I'm just curious, does this exercise – will this exercise have any bearing on where in the  
2 element these policies and programs might appear? In other words, if there's one program that just is  
3 wildly dotted out more than others, does that move it up in the Comp. Plan at all?

4 **Hillary Gitelman:** No. At this point, we are continuing to believe that the programs will be under the  
5 policies that they are intended to implement in the elements and then they'll appear by a goal in this  
6 Implementation Plan.

7 **Len Filppu:** So, there is not change to the goals or the policies?

8 **Hillary Gitelman:** That's right.

9 **Len Filppu:** The tail is not wagging the dog.

10 **Hillary Gitelman:** The tail is not wagging the dog.

11 **Len Filppu:** Ok, thank you.

12 **Co-Chair Keller:** Hamilton.

13 **Hamilton Hitchings:** If you look at – we had a lot of discussion in this Committee about land use and  
14 transportation and when I look over at the land use and when I look at the transportation, we actually  
15 tend to agree in many cases on what some of the most important programs are. I think that's a very  
16 reassuring for me and actually, shows that there is a lot of consensuses. I mean land use was fairly  
17 contentious but if you look at these programs, there's a lot of support. I hear that there is a lot of  
18 concern that this prioritization will be miss used and I have a couple of comments about that. First, I  
19 think we are overweighting how much importance the Council is going to put on this. They have asked  
20 for out input and I think – when I look at this, there's a bunch of columns and I see – the way I  
21 envisioned this is that there's going to be an additional column. Maybe it's like how many votes each  
22 one of these got. When – if I was a Council Member and I was scanning down, I would be like oh, this  
23 one got 12. I won't – I'm going to stop and pay extra attention to that. I'm going to read it a second  
24 time. If I have a fundamental philosophical – it may not change it and ultimately, the Council and Staff  
25 are going to do this anyway. They are going to do it in a different context, they'll do it around budgets,  
26 the overall. They are not going to go well; public safety only got 10 dots so we're going to cut the Fire  
27 Department. I mean, they are going to have to do it and this just provides another column of input. I  
28 don't really – I would like us to share this information as just part of the Implementation Element. Just  
29 another column in here besides relative priority, new and existing, and anticipated. I'd also like for the  
30 things that got a lot of dots, Staff to go back and consider revising the priorities. If something got 10  
31 dots, it really should be priority low. User discretion but in general, do that. I'd also like to see maybe a  
32 list of the top 10 or 20 – maybe top 20 programs that this Council did. Just put in a list so that it's  
33 something that the existing Council can quickly skim and go oh, these are things that they thought were



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

1 really important. Just because I know everybody has their (inaudible) things and a lot of us have the  
2 same things. It just gives it a little bit more attention and it's more likely that it will make it onto their to-  
3 do list. I guess I am done. There is one last thing, sorry. The priorities, we did discuss the priorities but if I  
4 was going to come up with three priorities, I would give the Staff an A for picking three. However, I do  
5 agree with Jen. We do need to add the word percentage of affordable housing and not – the other one  
6 that I would like to add -- maybe it doesn't make it on there – is increase public safety. We actually have  
7 a ton of stuff in the Infrastructure Plan that's in the cue for public safety like a new Police Department,  
8 improvements to the fire stations etc. My special interest would be for that but I think if there's only  
9 three, they have picked at least three good ones.

10 **Co-Chair Keller:** Shani.

11 **Shani Kleinhaus:** I'd like to reiterate that it's really important to show what is completely new and not  
12 already being done and codified. You asked for redundancies so I marked a few of the one that I found. I  
13 think in the community and services and services and facilities, there is a lot of redundancy. C-1.19, one,  
14 two, three can probably be put together. Same with C-1.17.1 with potentially C-1.18.2. There are others  
15 and I would let you go through and see that there are a lot of things. I think it's evident because people  
16 kind of picked one of them but if you really look and put them together, then they got a lot more points  
17 and it looks like it. There is one that has an error I think. N-4.8.2, I think it says the opposite of what it  
18 wants to say. It says explore ways so that dewatering does not result in recharge into the aquifer. I think  
19 that is not what it should be so please take a look at that one. T-2.1.1 can be combined with T-2.1.2. T-  
20 6.6.4 has been done in many of the other ones so it kind of – you can break it into others relatively  
21 easily. I have a few more of those. There something – L-3.2.1 which just seems like there's some kind of  
22 leftover text here so we might want to look at that one, L-3.2.1. L-9.4.2 was moved but stills remain in  
23 the land use so it needs to be removed from there. I'm not sure about this one, looks like N-4.14.1 and  
24 4.14.2 can be combined. I think that's what I wrote down but there are probably a lot more of them.

25 **Co-Chair Keller:** Ellen.  
26

27 **Ellen Uhrbrock:** I think the Council at the start of each year or election year has a retreat where they set  
28 their own priorities, is that an annual event? Wouldn't that be a good time for them to review the  
29 priorities of the long-range plan and see where they are – measure on what had been done before and  
30 what is going to come up? I think it would be something they could really benefit from to know how  
31 we're doing or which way we are going and it fits in when they start a new Council meeting. My other  
32 comment is that somebody ought to reread a lot of these and see if our policies are actually policies and  
33 programs are actually programs. They seem to be able to morph from one to the other a lot and that it  
34 would be clearer overall if it was distinct that this is a policy and this is a program. The reading of it  
35 would be lots – more comprehensive to somebody who is wanting to see what's in this. That's all.



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

1 **Co-Chair Keller:** Don.

2 **Don McDougall:** There have been lots of comments that this was a useful process because now we  
3 know what important. I would argue that we also know now what's not important so relative to  
4 Hamilton's suggestion that we actually put a column in and tell them how many – the Council how many  
5 dots things go. I would argue that if this is a useful process, then we should look at land use – that one  
6 sheet over there and there are two of them that have a lot of dots. Those should be called out as being  
7 important. Everything else that's not in that category, should just simply be put in. If you start saying this  
8 is important, this is less important, this is less important, this is not important at all. Then it will never  
9 get any attention and if nobody voted for looking after disabled, does that mean that it gets ignored  
10 forever. I would never put in the number of dots. I would put in two or three out of each category that  
11 says what's important because implicitly, you're saying what's not important and everything else and I  
12 think that's wrong. I keep hearing consolidation. I object to consolidation. I think that we should be  
13 talking about removing duplication where they persist. The reason I object to consolidation is that I think  
14 that if you look at the table that I created, the number of programs associated with a particular item; I  
15 think is informative of what we thought was important. I think Council, Staff, the users of the document  
16 need to think about what goals did we say were important. What policies did we say were important as  
17 well as what programs? If you look at this, you can see under transportation, that sustainable, which is  
18 all about SOVs, parking and safety and transit dependent came out as either new or with lots of  
19 programs. Implicitly, that tells me that those things are important. If we start saying let's consolidate  
20 and take all those programs down to two programs. I no longer have that information about what's  
21 important so I think duplication makes sense. I think consolidation is a dangerous thing to do. As relative  
22 to the implementation and the implementation subcommittee, I think I will happily comment on your  
23 preamble because I think the thing that we want to make sure is that we've created some sort of user  
24 manual. How do we expect this to be used? Is it going to be put on the shelf for people to look at when  
25 they think they need information or is it something that's going to be proactively reviewed on an annual  
26 basis? That's why I insist that we need to say that we don't need to review all 250 programs every year  
27 but maybe we need to review 125 of them. Half of them need to be reviewed every year. Some of them  
28 every 5-years or whatever. We need a user manual so that we have some expectation about how this  
29 gets used in the future. Thank you.

30 **Co-Chair Keller:** Amy.

31 **Amy Sung:** I really enjoyed this process. I really think that it is kind of a validation to show that this is  
32 really an area that we gather a lot of agreements and attention so I really liked this exercise. In terms of  
33 consolidation, I remember in the beginning when we started out, there were some Stanford students or  
34 Professor or they volunteered work. They – I remember vaguely that their work had to do with the kind  
35 of deep (inaudible) and then they are going to see what (inaudible) did receive the most attention. I  
36 think we see a lot of those in social media and that you can see that instead of consolidating this –



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

1 affordable housing for instance. If you condense it into one word, it becomes one word but if you said  
2 that technology that Stanford (inaudible) is, then you will see that it pops up in ten places. I think that is  
3 one way to see – to gauge how often that has been mentioned and popped up. I think that might be  
4 something to remember. In term of implementation, I think that looking at it – the -- for example, the  
5 top three or top five, it really shows that there’s really an area that gathers attention and our energy so  
6 that it may warrant special attention. Like I said, not everything is created equal and of course, I am very  
7 concerned about those that have one dots or no dots so maybe that issue should be color coded as a  
8 first tier, a second tier and a third tier and that’s just that. Thank you.

9 **Co-Chair Keller:** Elaine.

10 **Elaine Uang:** Two points, I’ve seen a couple of programs where they might be the same general concept  
11 but applied to different parties. For example, on the Safety Element, we have emergency power backup  
12 for the City and then emergency power backup for the residence. I’m wondering if maybe there is some  
13 opportunity to – if they are just two separate parties, do they need to be two different programs and  
14 just something around that. Same with things like safe routes to school for PAUSD versus safe routes to  
15 school for private schools and daycare centers or something like that. If they are different parties but  
16 generally the same concept, maybe they actually could be the same programs. I just think it’s worth  
17 taking a look at. Then, in some ways, the way that we structured this by doing very hierarchical goals,  
18 policies and then programs supporting each policy, has sort of hamstrung us a little bit and that  
19 hierarchical approach might not be the right thing because it doesn’t leave us the opportunity to make  
20 connects and allow programs to actually support multiple policies or go support policies across  
21 elements. I took a look and I actually went to the OPR – the State OPR general plan guidelines, just kind  
22 of looking at what is their recommendation for the structure of general plans. They basically say goals  
23 and policies are key in the primary. I looked around at some of the neighboring – our neighboring Cities;  
24 Mountain View and San Jose just have goals and policies in their general plan. Redwood City has another  
25 interesting fact which I really thought – at first I scratched my head but now I actually see some value in  
26 it. They have goals and policies and then they have a separate implementation section under each  
27 element but it’s separate. It’s not connected – the programs aren’t directly connected to specific  
28 policies. They are just a set of programs and I think the way – the reason why that is, is that some of  
29 those programs might overlap between several policies. I mean, I get why we did it the way that we did  
30 it but now, kind of rolling back up and thinking about things. Maybe the structure has not allowed us to  
31 capitalize on places where there is overlap and really highlight what that overlap is. I don’t know that we  
32 can really go back based on council direction and change that but it had occurred to me that maybe  
33 there is a lot of languages to weigh through because we are structuring it in such a way that it’s  
34 preventing us to thinking about linkages. The linkages to me are really where you’re going to get the  
35 streamlined Comp. Plan. A streamline Comp. Plan is very important because the more concise – the  
36 more usable the document is and the more accessible it is to the general public and that’s where I’m  
37 really worried that while I’m not – I think it’s all very important stuff that we’ve talked about. It’s going



# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE *DRAFT MINUTES*

1 to be really hard for the average person to come along and really just want to go through this and say  
2 hey, yeah, I get it. Here's what my Cities vision is and here are all of the direction that they want to take  
3 to fulfill that. It's going to be basically – no one is going to look at it now because it's this massive brick  
4 and we put the programs in two places.

5 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. I appreciate the comments that people have. I have some concern about  
6 consolidating programs where – that might actually not be appropriate. Let me give – my favorite case  
7 and point and that are, there is a program in there to have a coordinated area plan for Fry's electronics  
8 site and California Avenue. Now, there's a difference between having one coordinating area plan for  
9 both sites, which something that will take (inaudible) years and won't be done by the time that the Fry's  
10 site lease is up in 2019. When we have an opportunity to design what we want for that site versus  
11 having two coordinating area plans, one of the Fry's sites, which is just on that side alone and figure out  
12 what you're going to do with that site as it turns over and you can do that quickly and get it done. Then  
13 the broader one, you can do over time, which is the California Avenue site and because those have been  
14 consolidated into one program, we have the mistake of hauling off the urgent from the important  
15 because Fry's site is urgent. The second thing is that we can talk about how we might have done it in  
16 terms of having programs be different but the history of our City is that programs went under policies  
17 went under goals. That's how we authored it and that's what we did. If we had a different way of doing  
18 it 2-years ago, or perhaps 8-years ago, when I first started working on the Comp. Plan on the Planning  
19 Commission. If we had a different direction, we'd have gone differently but this is where we are now.  
20 What we can do, however, is we can think about organization online and I would like to see us talk  
21 about this at the last meeting. Have a little bit of discussion and maybe somewhat of a brainstorming  
22 session on how this – there's two versions of this. There it is as a PDF document or a document on the  
23 shelf, which is the official version of – the legal version of the Comp. Plan as a document. Then there is  
24 more livable, usable version of that in which there are hyperlinks, in which programs can appear under  
25 multiple places. In which there are cross references. In which all of the sustainability stuff can be culled  
26 out so you can index them. Where there are hyperlinks from a reference to say the Tree Production  
27 Manual or the Urban Forest Master Plan. All of those are hyperlinked out so that you can get to them  
28 directly to where they exist. I think that would be a much more useful document and actually, would  
29 become a go-to document for a lot of stuff in the City because otherwise, you don't know where  
30 everything is. You know where to find the Bay Lands Master Plan. You know where to find the – what all  
31 these different plans are. If they are all referenced from the Comp. Plan, think about that as a great  
32 index to all the policies of the City in one place from one source. Finally, I think that the other thing we  
33 can do in the – I hope we can do at the last meeting, is thinking about what lessons we learned. We  
34 basically spent 2-years of this – hard fought 2-years and a lot of work that we did. Can we really get  
35 some lessons learned from this process and use that as an opportunity to capture that so when we go to  
36 the next round in this -- I hope it starts in 2025 or earlier because if we're going to have the next Comp.  
37 Plan actually go into effect in 2035, we have to start early. Then that means that we can sort of dig that  
38 out of the time capsule and give it to the next Comp. Plan Committee and say ok, this is what lessons we



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

1 thought you might have learned. Let's try to use that as the basis for the next one. Staff seems to have a  
2 comment and then we can answer – people can also talk again.

3 **Hillary Gitelman:** I was just going to try and wrap up because we're almost at that hour. I really – first I  
4 wanted to acknowledge all the input we got this evening. I know everyone wasn't thrilled about the  
5 exercise. It was difficult what we asked you to do, it was imperfect but I think we got a lot out of it and I  
6 hope at some level, all of you understand what we were trying to go for and know that we will use this  
7 information to generate another product that we will again, appreciate your input on. We're being a  
8 little vague about what we're spending out to you and what it will look like and exactly what we'll be  
9 asking but we'll try and firm that up in the next week or so, so we give you plenty of time before the  
10 next meeting. If you have questions in the (inaudible) or additional suggestions that didn't make it out in  
11 the air this evening. Please don't hesitate to email that to the Staff and we'll start assembling a package  
12 of information for the next meeting.

13 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Remember that your comments on the Business and Economics Element are  
14 due on March 31<sup>st</sup>. Also, due on March 31<sup>st</sup> are your comments on the supplemental draft  
15 Environmental Impact Report on the Comp. Plan. If anybody has any last-minute comments, we'll  
16 entertain them. Otherwise, this meeting is adjourned.

17 **Feedback for Continuous Improvement:**

18 **Future Meetings:**

19 Next meeting: April 18<sup>th</sup>, 2017 – Rinconada Library (Embarcadero Room)

20

21 **Adjournment: 8:30 PM**