



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE  
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
AT PLACES MEMO  
Tuesday, April 18, 2017**

The following documents are attached for your review and information:

1. CAC member Don McDougall's comments
2. CAC member Bonnie Packer's comments
3. CAC member Annette Glanckopf's comments

**CAC Member Don McDougall's Notes on Implementation of the LIVING  
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN  
April 18, 2017**

I agree with the sentiment captured here that the Comprehensive Plan is a **Living Document**. This is an important concept in its development, adoption and future use.

In order to facilitate and ensure its future **Life**, I suggest the Review and Update definition should be more robust and complete.

**Observations:**

- Frequently CAC have been told that very few (15% or 5% or 20%) of the previous plan Programs were completed.
- Any previous annual report by the PRC does not seem or have received much publicity if even visibility or transparency.
- Frequently CAC have been told there were too many Programs to review.

**Questions or Issues:**

- The section (copied below) does not indicate or suggest at what level PRC should review and report or if the report should be qualitative or quantitative.
- The section does not suggest what kind of updates are encouraged or allowed – priorities changes, deletions, additions, editing of Policies or Programs? It simple says priorities will evolve.
- The section does not say who (Council) approves updates.

**Suggestions:**

- The PTC should provide an Annual Qualitative report of the progress towards all of the Goals defined in the Plan. I believe this would meet State Law or Municipal Code or would like to hear otherwise.
- The PTC should provide suggestions to Council for changes in Policies.
- The PTC should not have to report on Programs that were defined as Regular or Ongoing.
- The PTC should review all other (non-regular) Programs at a frequency determined by Priority. High priority Programs should be reviewed Annually, medium biannually and low on a 5 year basis.
- The PTC should provide a Quantitate report on the Programs reviewed (what % have been complete, or in regular status or not doing well). It should not be a surprise.

I'm sure there are other details to such an approach but if we want this to be a truly **LIVING COMPREHENSIVE PLAN** with confidence that it will be vigorously followed and its progress transparent to the Palo Alto citizens some version of these Suggestions must be adopted!

**REVIEW AND UPDATE**

The Comprehensive Plan is a living document. Palo Alto's priorities will evolve through the life of this Plan, and therefore changes will need to be made to the Implementation Plan. Annually, as required by State Law and the Municipal Code, the Planning and Transportation Commission will submit a report to the City Council on the status of the Comprehensive Plan and its implementation. This review can be combined with the Commission's review of the City's Capital Improvement Program (CIP), which also occurs on an annual basis.

## Bonnie Packer's Comments on the Draft Introduction and Governance Element April 18

In the 1990's the comp plan focused on neighborhood associations and volunteerism, which is very, very good. However, in the current era, we have become more aware of the need to create more effective avenues for civic engagement of residents eager to do so.

Shift the references from neighborhood associations to non-profit or private civic, environmental, cultural, neighborhood and social services organizations throughout this element.

**Introduction** under Major Themes: add before "small businesses" " private, non-profit civic, environmental, cultural and social services organizations "

**Governance:** In the narrative, greatly expand the language about Civic and Service Organizations – do not limit the discussion to neighborhood organizations. There are dozens of these organizations providing services in child care, youth and senior activities, volunteerism, environment, civic engagement: e.g., Avenidas, PACCC, YMCA, YCS, ACS, Kiwanis, Rotary, Canopy, Acterra, Red Cross, PTAs, Neighbors Abroad, youth sports organizations, Woman's Club, League of Women Voters, Palo Alto Forward, Palo Alto Community Foundation, Friends of the Palo Alto Library, PA Chamber of Commerce, Environmental Volunteers – to name just a few. These organizations are a natural way for the City to connect with its residents and encourage a more active civic life.

Make the following changes – underlined.

Change the title: ~~CIVIC AND NEIGHBORHOOD ORGANIZATIONS~~ to CIVIC, ENVIRONMENTAL, CULTURAL, NEIGHBORHOOD AND SOCIAL SERVICES ORGANIZATIONS

GOAL G-2 Informed and involved civic, environmental, cultural, neighborhood and social services organizations and residents.

**Policy G-2.1** Continue to provide information on the City's website about non-profit or private civic, environmental, cultural, neighborhood and social services organizations addressing subjects like planning and environmental issues, earthquake preparedness, neighborhood beautification, event planning, how to communicate with City Hall, and guidelines for establishing and managing non-profit or private civic, environmental, cultural, neighborhood and social services organizations .[Previous Program G-7]

**Policy G-2.2** Establish and enhance two-way communication between City staff and non-profit or private civic, environmental, cultural, neighborhood and social services organizations . [Previous Policy G-5]

**Delete Program G2.2.1.** It doesn't belong in this Element. Where feasible, assist residents

**Bonnie Packer's Comments on the Draft Implementation Plan  
April 18**

Please include the links to each Element in the Implementation Plan Table – clean copy. These links are in the Implementation Table with CAC Priority – provided as link only, but not in the Table you are asking us to send to CC.

The ranking of programs in the staff report based on our very unscientific dot exercise is inappropriate. While some noted that we learned something from the dot exercise, this should not be the prime driver of how the programs are ranked.

To be able to determine the status of the implementation of the programs, please consider adding a procedure to the Implementation Plan where one can track whether these programs are included in the work plan of the various departments. Perhaps you could include links to the department's annual work plans so one (i.e., the Planning & Transportation Commission) can ascertain whether these items are actually being considered.

Note: the City Council is expected to review the Shuttle Vision Plan on April 17. This Plan should be explicitly referred to in the Transportation Element and in the top priority item T1.14.1

Where did the following four priorities come from? They did not come from the CAC. Are these the City Council's current priorities?

At the adoption of this Plan in 2017, the City sees the following four broad priorities:

- Increase the Proportion of Affordable Housing
- Reduce Single-Occupant Vehicle Trips
- Protect and Sustain the Natural Environment
- Maintain a Safe Community

with neighborhood improvement, beautification, and planting projects. [Existing Program G-9]

**Policy G-2.3** Encourage civic participation by civic, environmental, cultural, neighborhood and social services organizations in the governing process by providing easy access to data media channels and other creative means. [Existing Policy G-6]

Add a program under this Policy: Facilitate the easy availability of City facilities to non-profit or private civic, environmental, cultural, neighborhood and social services organizations for their meetings and events for a greatly discounted fee.

Policy G3.2 add “civic organizations” after “residents”

In the Glossary: consider including definitions of neighborhood associations, social service organizations, civic organizations, arts and cultural organizations, clubs, etc.

## **Annette Glanckopf's Comments on the Implementation Section, Introduction and Governance Section**

**April 18**

### **IMPLEMENTATION SECTION**

I do not/did not support using the dot system as a priority setting tool. Not everyone was prepared, so in some cases dots were just applied to items that already had support...or people were lobbied in front of the charts to put a dot on their favorite program.

While some of the items rightly surfaced as high priority, I do not feel this method adequately addresses ongoing programs. **Each Element should stand on its own.**

The dot method is unbalanced, since the majority of the programs are for Community services and Planning & Transportation.

In the matrix on staff comments under lumping together Land Use, Transportation, Natural Environment and Safety. No Police, Fire, and OEs items were prioritized in the dot method.

I found it interesting in the full implementation matrix that

- Police had 8 programs.
- OES & Fire both had 14 programs.
- Utilities had 31
- Public works had 71

Moreover, why are Community Services and Businesses lumped together? I do not agree with the High Priority items: such as Shop Palo Alto (tried many times before and was a failure. This is tied to my comments on the "help" the city provides small businesses), impacts of online shopping (to me is a low priority with everything else going on). Also although not politically correct, I feel there are too many high priority items prioritized for children and not enough for seniors (Largest segment of population) and those with special needs.

### **INTRODUCTION – marked up version**

Meeting Housing Supply Challenges: **It is not clear to me that Palo Alto safeguards single family neighborhoods. I would remove that phrase**

Meeting Residential and Commercial needs: Under city is committed to retaining businesses **Although this sounds very nice, I have not seen any actions to support this lofty goal....especially since so many small businesses are leaving and it is so difficult for new businesses to get through the permitting process. Remove the wording "is committed to retaining businesses" or have council develop a concrete policy to help businesses esp small ones.**

Page I-5: **Remove sentence under use and organization of plan “ The hundreds of citizens & officials who have prepared.....” It is self-serving and not needed.**

### **GOVERNANCE SECTION:**

**Page G3: Include the Citizen Corps Council on the list of Boards and Commissions per the request of the Director of Emergency Services and the Chair of that Committee.**

*GOAL G-1 Effective opportunities for public participation in local government.*

***Program G1.2.1** Continue use of neighborhood organizations, City website, local media, online technologies and other communication platforms to keep residents informed of current issues and to encourage citizen engagement. [Previous Program G-4]*

**MY COMMENT: Continue use of neighborhood organizations” should be “Continue communication with neighborhood organizations”**

GOAL G-2 Informed and involved civic and neighborhood organizations and residents.

Policy G2.1 Continue to provide information on the City’s website about neighborhood and civic organizations addressing subjects like earthquake preparedness, neighborhood beautification, event planning, how to communicate with City Hall, and guidelines for establishing and managing neighborhood and civic organizations. [Previous Program G-7]

### **MY COMMENT:**

- **There is no place currently on the city website that refers to neighborhoods, although the website redesign committee asked the city to link to the PAN (Palo Alto Neighborhoods) site.**
- **The topics selected to highlight this point are very random....Where did neighborhood beautification come in – this has never been a priority, nor can I ever remember any action by the city in Midtown. Public Art, bathrooms, dog parks?**
- **Event Planning? The city is going to provide information on how to plan events? If the intent of this term was to schedule rooms, then use that terminology**
- **Omit the entire last part about guidelines for establishing & managing neighborhood organizations. There are no “city guidelines for establishing and managing neighborhood and civic organizations.” NOR SHOULD THERE BE,**
- **Nor do I know where to find out "how to communicate with City Hall" apart from the info on each commission/department's page.**

**ADD PROGRAM: Continue to hold regular town hall meeting with neighborhoods**

**ADD PROGRAM: Support neighborhood associations by allowing them period use of public meeting rooms.**

PolicyGg2 2 . Establish and enhance two-way communication between City staff and neighborhood groups . [Previous Policy G-5] Where feasible,

**What does this mean? It works quite nicely now as is.**

Program G2.2.1 assist residents with neighborhood improvement, beautification, and planting projects. [Existing Program G-9]3

**The only effort that I am aware of to assist neighborhoods is Canopy. Working with them is usually an individual project not a neighborhood one. I suggest removing this policy. What about public art, or dog parks, or noise, urban blight, leaf blowers or code enforcement?**

**DEFINITIONS:**

I understand that many terms have been removed, since they aren't mentioned in comp plan document. However, **I would lobby to retain the following ones.** The comp plan will be used for reference, and this is a great place for a dictionary. The ones I think should be retained are

- Bollard
- Building envelope
- Charette
- Inclusionary housing
- Land banking
- Mitigated negative declaration
- Negative declaration
- Non-conforming
- Regressive fee
- Transitional housing
- Uniform building code
- Vacancy rate
- Vertical integration