



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
AT PLACES MEMO
Tuesday, May 16, 2017**

The following documents are attached for your review and information:

1. CAC member Annette Glanckopf's comments
2. CAC member comments Don McDougall's comments
3. CAC Co-Chair Arthur Keller's comments
4. CAC member Hamilton Hitching's comments
5. CAC member Ellen Uhrbrock's comments

Public Comments

1. Nielson Buchanan's comments
2. Richard Brand's comments

CAC Comments on Intro and Governance

May 16, 2107

Annette Glanckopf

Almost done!

Green Boxes: Color looks very nice, but can the font be bigger. I find it very hard to read with the green background.

INTRODUCTION

Protecting & Sustaining the Natural Environment:

I do not know where it fits..we talk about the urban forest, but it would be great to add something that talks about the impact of overbuilding and losing permability ...maybe if this protecting the urban forest is a vision, we should also talk about concept of maintaining lot coverage and a healthy area for water to seep into the soil...esp in R1 neighborhoods

Meeting Residential & Commercial Needs

The city should be committed to attracting and preserving locally owned neighborhood serving businesses

Eliminate the phrase in the first paragraph :especially in areas of mobility & greenhouse reduction". Even though this is an admirable goals, I do not think mention of specific types of businesses belong here.

Providing Responsive Governance & Regional Leadership

Add highlighted wording

It encourages collaboration among citizens, businesses, **neighborhood associations** and local officials.

Uses and Organization of Plan

Remove wording

"Hope you will find it useful, easy-to-read document. " much too fluffy and not needed, not too many people will sit down and read the Comprehensive plan cover-to-cover.

In paragraph that starts State Law, remove word "above" that follows Table 1 – unless it really is right above the text.

In definition of Policy. Why remove the wording "but it is not mandatory". I suggest leaving it in. As staff has presented previously, the city has not always taken action on all policies in comp plan.

Implementing the Plan

Question: I thought that prioritization was not going to be done in the comp plan? If this is correct, then do we need the statement " Additionally the city council may change the prioritization of programs through the regular 5 year review cycle of the implementation plan." The council always has this prerogative.

GOVERNANCE

Goal G1: Program G1.1.1 and the wording "neighborhood associations" to read "Enhance 2-way dialog communication between residents, **neighborhood associations**, other organizations, and the city council..."

Goal G2: Policy G2.3 Program G2.3.1

Add Coordinate with neighborhood association. Suggested rewording

“Collaborate with neighborhood associations to continue town hall meetings.....”

Goal 2: Policy G2.4 Program G2.4.1 Add complimentary or no-charge

Offer the use of city facilities to civic, environment, cultural, **neighborhood associations** and social service organizations for meetings & events at **complimentary or** discounted rates.

Note: Over the last 2 years, staff, council and PAN have spent considerable time in discussing the role of neighborhoods and the no-charge use of city owned facilities.

Goal G4: Program G4.1.4 reword **appreciation package to welcome** package.

Annette’s comments on Future Comp Plan 5/16/17

Pros

- Lots of good experienced people spent long hours working on this
- good to have co-chairs
- good to have subcommittees
- city staff responsiveness
- public speakers and letters with content
- group listening to recommendations of subject matter experts
- taking majority/minority opinion forward
- reducing redundancies and repetitions between elements
- public outcry against council actions removing programs
- agendaizing elements for council as only action item

Cons

- elimination of programs from comp plan by council
- composition & selection of members
- group way too large. keep to 11-15 members
- negative attitude by some CA members when positions mentioned they did not support
- consultants lacked Palo Alto view
- too much paper
- too long a process
- city soliciting comments via open city hall
- not involving chamber earlier
- not sufficient group discussion when a new idea is brought up
 - we didn't catch on till later, how to champion or disagree
 - People not listening and thus bringing up same idea after it had been mentioned

CAC Comments on Governance and Glossary
May 12, 2017
Don McDougall

A few comments:

Introduction

Major Themes, - Protecting and Sustaining the Natural Environment

Second sentence “connected network of connected open spaces, parks, and green spaces” does not capture the idea and policies of the Element that the “connections” are important in their own right. Maybe “ **network of open spaces, parks, green spaces and their connections**”?

Governance

Goal G-4, Policy G-4.1

Maybe “encourage volunteers **from** youth to seniors”. “Including” implies that they need special encouragement where as youth and seniors do most of the volunteering today. It’s really a continuum of age groups volunteering that we need to encourage?

Goal G-4, Policy G-4.1 Program G4.1.1

Maybe this could be more than one program or made clearer. “expand opportunities for volunteer assistance” – assistance to or by volunteers? Awareness of organizations seems like a good program by itself – and important. And recognition may or may not be part of the awareness.

Goal G-4, Policy G-4.1 Program G4.1.4

If we’re going to reach out to the real estate community to develop a package (which would seem to be in their self interest, shouldn’t the program encourage their participation in helping as well?

Glossary

Should include “Preserves” since both the Baylands and Foothills are defined as “Preserves”, with the implication at least and the fact that they have different origins, purposes, protections and rules of use than “Parks”?

CAC Comments on Glossary
May 16, 2107
Co-Chair Arthur Keller

Jobs/Housing Balance: remove this definition. It is incorrect and redundant with Jobs/Employed Residents Ratio.

Moderate Income: reference area as Santa Clara County, as was done for Low Income

Peak Hour: should reference morning or evening commutes, not daily. That is, there is a morning peak hour and an evening peak hour, not just a daily peak hour.

Pocket Park: should indicate public dining. Private dining facilities are not pocket parks. Or maybe remove dining altogether as an explicit item.

Ridge Trail: Can we get an updated figure, rather than using one from 1997?

Santa Clara Valley Water District (SCVWD): Should reference that Palo Alto gets its water from the San Francisco Water Department. Should also define San Francisco Water Department, which gets its water primarily from the Hetch Hetchy Reservoir.

Transit-oriented Development: Should reference Pedestrian and Transit-oriented Development (PTOD), which is a Palo Alto-invented reference and refers to the California Avenue area as an optional overlay.

Trip Reduction: minimize the necessity of driving alone or at all.

Very Low-Income: reference area as Santa Clara County, as was done for Low Income.

Please add this definition:

Electric Vehicle Supply Equipment (EVSE): a device that supplies electrical energy for recharging an electric vehicle. Level 1 EVSEs use 110V AC power. Level 2 EVSEs use 240V or 208V AC power. Level 3 EVSEs provide even faster charging.

**CAC Comments
May 16, 2107
Hamilton Hitchings**

Here is my in-place comments. Sorry its a little late. If you do not have time to print it, let me know and I can print it and distribute it.

Citizen Advisory Committee Post-mortem Feedback by Hamilton Hitchings

- The entire committee came to consensus on all the elements and was able to agree broadly on many topics including:
 - The need for affordable housing
 - The need to prevent the growth of single occupancy vehicle trips and improve alternatives
 - The need to reduce GHG
 - The importance of public safety and community services
- For the few controversial land use issues the committee could not agree on we did a good job of laying out choices that represented the different points of view for the city council to vote on
- The subcommittees were a big success and are a must have for next time
- Staff should attend the subcommittee meetings along with the consultants
- Out of the loop consultants not familiar with Palo Alto caused some problems initially
- The committee was made up of a cross section of Palo Altans and there was a good effort to select sufficient representation from South Palo Alto

- Despite having a 3 to 1 application to acceptance ratio, some committee members who were accepted eventually dropped out and a few others attended barely over 50% of the meetings
- Better screening is needed and should include:
 - A higher level of up-front commitment from participants
 - PTC should have a voting seat
 - Stanford should have a voting seat
 - The Chamber of commerce should have a voting seat but it must be someone who represents the small businesses and not just the big and medium sized ones
 - More renters
 - More working parents with students in the Palo Alto public schools who are not from the developer community
 - Continue to ensure South Palo Alto is sufficiently represented next time
 - A concerted effort should be made to select members who accurately reflect the concerns of the community
 - Subject matter expertise should be one of the considerations (like Shani had on the environment, Arthur on transportation, Annette on emergency services, Elaine on transportation) which is very helpful for crafting programs and policies at the subcommittee level
 - Committee size should be reduce to 15 (22 was too many)
 - It's a good opportunity for folks who are considering running for city council because they will learn so much about how the city works
- There was not a good job of incorporating the PTC and the original draft. In the case of the transportation element, the PTC had significantly improved it.
- Having City Council define the Goals was good but it would have been helpful if they provided more upfront guidance in-terms of their desired output and about specific policies they wanted to see or remove. Problem is it felt like 9 different opinions rather than one unified voice of the council
- The coordination with city council was poor
- City council's proposal to remove all programs was disastrous
- However, there should be a better mechanism to substantively incorporate city council feedback such as reducing the number of programs
- More time should be spent up front solidifying the role of what the committee will produce and getting strong buy in
- Have the City Council more closely follow the Comp Plan
- More thorough review of citizen input and keep the public more informed about the status such as posting revisions to the elements online and allow citizen comments

CAC Comments
May 16, 2107
Ellen Uhrbrock

To: Co Chairs Arthur Keller and Dan Garber CAC Comprehensive Plan 2030

Re: Who is Interested in your Opinions? Who do you call in City Hall?

The job of recommending action on programs in the Comp Plan has been given to the Planning and Transportation Commission.

Please encourage members of the CAC and public to attend meetings and share their comments with the PTC. Encourage members of the CAC and public to follow Palo Alto affairs on the city web site: Channel 26; You Tube; Daily Post and Weekly.

I will encourage senior citizens to communicate with the city – and the PTC in person and on-line. CAC members can do this through local neighborhood Town Halls.

The Comprehensive Plan 2030 can do this by including the names and contacts of staff responsible for each program included in the Comp Plan. Please keep the contact list current and up to date.

The Council wants, needs and depends on public input. The public wants and needs to know –

WHO TO CALL IN CITY HALL

Thank you –
Ellen Uhrbrock

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Neilson Buchanan's Comment for May 16th 2017 CAC Meeting

May 11, 2017

I will be out of town on May 16.

I strongly urge everyone to take to heart and mind a key value statement in the current comp plan.

To paraphrase... currently there is a prominent statementthat city strives to promote commerce but not at the expense of residential neighborhoods.

In the quest of modernizing the comp plan I hope leaders and Council will note and amplify this statement. This statement should be positioned in the introduction to the Comp Plan.

Neilson Buchanan
155 Bryant Street
Palo Alto, CA 94301

650 329-0484
650 537-9611 cell
cnsbuchanan@yahoo.com

Richard Brand's Comment for May 16th 2017 CAC Meeting

May 12, 2017

I too strongly urge that this key value statement remain intact in the new Plan and not be watered down for secondary reasons such as jobs etc.

Richard Brand
281 Addison