

May 9, 2017

TO: CAC Members

From: Co-Chairs Daniel Garber and Arthur Keller

RE: May 15, 2017, Final CAC Meeting, "Continual Learning" Discussion Item

The Co-Chairs sincerely hope that you will join us for the last CAC meeting. As part of our final meeting we are organizing our discussion of the Continual Learning agenda item into the following parts:

- 1) Your thoughts on completing the Committee's work on the Comprehensive Plan and how it should be formatted and presented.
- 2) Goals. What were the goals the committee was to attain when it started? The co-chairs will share their understanding of these goals with the group and then ask for other committee members for their understanding of what these goals were. The co-chairs will then lead a brief discussion to learn how well these goals were met – or not.
- 3) Pluses; things we did well. The co-chairs will ask the committee members to share what we think the CAC collectively did well.
- 4) Deltas; things that should be changed next time around / things we could have done better. The co-chairs will ask the committee members to share what we think the CAC could have improved on; what advise we might give the next group that does this.

The co-chairs will capture these comments on flip charts that Staff will provide.

As we end our assignment that we were each appointed to, it is important for us to have a collective understanding of the value of the work we have done. Please give some thought to the goals, pluses and deltas of our committee's combined efforts and bring them to our May 15<sup>th</sup> meeting.

## **CAC Comments**

### **From: Arthur Keller and Dan Garber**

On May 1st the City Council reviewed and amended the Land Use and Transportation elements of the Comprehensive Plan that the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) of the Comprehensive Plan Update had recommended. The Council made changes to the language of several policy and programs from CAC recommendations. We ask the Council reconsider several of these changes and return to CAC's recommended language. These Policies and Programs include the following:

#### **Policy T-5.1**

As written by the CAC Policy T-5.1 reads; "All new development projects should *meet* parking demand generated by the project, without the use of on-street parking, consistent with the established parking regulations. As demonstrated parking demand decreases over time, parking requirements for new construction should decrease."

Council changed the word "meet" to "manage."

Some on the CAC did not want development projects to provide unnecessary parking, while others felt that projects should satisfy the need for parking they generate, as had been recommended by the Planning and Transportation Commission draft. The CAC agreed on the wording as compromise language to express the idea that projects should satisfy the parking demand they generate when they are built, but the parking requirements for new projects will go down as parking demand is demonstrated to decrease. Our understanding is that the word "manage" instead of "meet" means that new projects may not have to supply the parking demand they generate and that projects can have others supply the needed parking generated by the project. We request that the Council restore the hand fought compromise language by the CAC.

#### **Program T1.24.1**

As written by the CAC, Program T1.24.1 reads; "As part of the effort to reduce traffic congestion, regularly evaluate the City's current Transportation Impact Fee and modify as needed to implement transportation projects, and consider new fees that new development projects must pay to the City for use in reducing roadway congestion impacts to the extent feasible through the provision of transit services, shuttles, carpool/rideshare incentives, bicycle lanes, and similar programs and capital improvements."

Council removed the language "that new development projects must pay to the City."

In discussing this, the CAC concluded that the project's applicant should pay for mitigations that reduce roadway congestion to the extent feasible. It appears that the Council's supports this intent but it is not clear to us how the Council intends to pay for these project impacts. If not the applicant, then who would pay for these impacts generated by projects?

### **Program T2.3.1**

As written by the CAC, Program T2.3.1 reads; “When adopting new CEQA significance thresholds for compliance with SB 743 (2013), also *adopt* desired standards for multi-modal levels of service (MMLOS), which includes motor vehicle LOS, at signalized intersections for use in evaluating the consistency of a proposed project with the Comprehensive Plan.”

Council changed the word “adopt” to “explore.”

There are three main types of traffic impact measures. Level of Service (LOS) is a measure of intersection congestion, something we experience driving in Palo Alto. This program will expand LOS to include bicycles and pedestrians (hence the term multi-modal). California has adopted Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) as a traffic impact measure. Developments can improve VMT while worsening LOS. Previously the Council decided Palo Alto will use both measures. There is a third measure, Traffic Impact on Residential Environments (TIRE), that considers traffic intrusion into residential neighborhoods, and it is the focus of Policy T-4.5.

In discussing this, the CAC considered that there are not now multi-modal levels of service (which include bicycle and pedestrian levels of service) but the City has motor vehicle level of service. The CAC language indicates that multi-modal levels of service will be adopted, while the Council language indicates only consideration of levels of service for bicycles and pedestrians.

### **Conclusion**

The CAC-recommended language for the first two items indicates the intent that new developments cover the cost of their impacts. Council’s changes make this principle less clear. Council’s change to the third item reduces support for bicycles and pedestrians and undercuts the Council decision to go with both LOS and VMT transportation impact measures. We recommend restoration of the CAC-recommended language.