

**SUMMARY OF COMMENTS FROM 9/24/12 COUNCIL MEETING –
ARTS AND ENTERTAINMENT DISTRICT**

	Comment	Response
1.	The process lacks transparency and needs review by city commissions and boards (Planning and Transportation Commission, Parks and Recreation Commission, ARB, etc.) to inform Council decision-making. Explain the process.	<i>Pages 4-9 of the City Manager Report (CMR) describes the review by the city commissions and boards to date, and the additional review that is anticipated.</i>
2.	Need neighborhood/community outreach plan and input on intermodal terminal and master plan	<i>Members of the community are encouraged to attend commission and board meetings where the master plan is being reviewed. In addition, a community workshop is envisioned in January. The “Open Town Hall” feature on the City’s website could provide an additional forum for community input.</i>
3.	Need to address building heights – try taking top floor office that is smaller in area off, reduce floor-to-floor heights, increase building mass 10-20% to reduce number of floors. Describe building footprint v. building height.	<i>The massing and building heights in the master plan continues to evolve in response to community input. Pages 10-12 of the CMR describes the most recent revisions to the master plan concept including massing and building heights.</i>
4.	Need to affirm council commitment to 50-foot height limit citywide (and address downtown application issues for minor adjustments to 50 foot limit), and have this before council before revisiting the project	<i>This issue of the 50-foot citywide building height is related to the Arts & Innovation District Master Plan concept, but it is also a larger community issue that extends beyond the master plan. Discussion of the citywide building heights is ongoing as part of the Comprehensive Plan Update. Recent board and commission meetings that have discussed the issue are summarized on pages 8-9 of the CMR.</i>
5.	Park swap need discussion, doesn’t seem equal if trading park land for streets, plaza not same as park	<i>The parkland swap is discussed on pages 13 and 18 of the CMR.</i>
6.	Relocate Julia Morgan in El Camino Park (if teen center, not isolated, public comment -- special needs pediatric care center?)	<i>The potential relocation of the Julia Morgan building is discussed on page 12 of the CMR.</i>
7.	Present project for what it is, it is not in scale/compatible with downtown	<i>The first step to determining what type of development is appropriate for any location is referring to Comprehensive Plan policies. There are a number of applicable policies, however several policies have particular relevance and are listed in Attachment K: Commissioner Questions and Staff Responses 10 24 12. In addition, this site has a history of master planning that goes back decades. Any proposed development for the site needs to be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and the spirit of the master planning efforts.</i>
8.	Public needs more information to weigh concrete benefits and impacts	<i>The City has prepared Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) that outlines key aspects of the proposed master plan concept.</i>
9.	What are city resource impacts, revenue impacts?	<i>Page 20 of the CMR provide an overview of potential city resource impacts and revenue impacts.</i>
10.	What are the direct/indirect economic development benefits?	<i>The FAQ provides a discussion of potential direct and indirect economic development benefits of the proposed master plan.</i>
11.	What are the timeline and costs and cost allocations?	<i>The FAQ, as well as page 10 of the CMR, provide discussions of the timeline for the master plan.</i>

**SUMMARY OF COMMENTS FROM 9/24/12 COUNCIL MEETING –
ARTS AND ENTERTAINMENT DISTRICT**

12.	Need traffic analysis before the advisory measure.	<i>The FAQ, as well as pages 15-16 of the CMR describes the preliminary traffic assessment for the master plan has been prepared. A Complete Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) would be prepared as part of an Environmental Impact Review (EIR) process.</i>
13.	Need parking study – sufficient parking, if use Caltrain parking will Caltrain demand spill over into downtown, avoid neighborhood impacts	<i>Parking is discussed in the FAQ. The master plan concept includes three levels of underground parking accommodate between 850 to 900 automobiles. The master plan concept anticipates sharing parking between compatible uses where peak parking demands are at different times. Parking would be evaluated as part of the EIR process.</i>
14.	TheatreWorks LOI need to revisit language in more general way re: have availability for public use without impacting performance	<i>The TheatreWorks Letter of Intent (LOI) continues to be refined along with the master plan concept. A Draft LOI is included with the CMR as Attachment T.</i>
15.	Downtown development cap – what is impact on cap, how to reconcile the scale of this project?	<i>This site falls outside the official Downtown Commercial Study Area, and therefore does not “count against” the Downtown development cap as described in the Municipal Code. However, the downtown development cap study, which will begin in early 2013, will take this project into consideration of parking and traffic impacts in the area. Any environmental document associated with this development will take existing and proposed downtown development into consideration, too. Finally, this project must be factored into the Citywide development cap as established in the City’s Comprehensive Plan.</i>
16.	Need define type of retail tenants in master plan, how it will be managed/designed? Need to think of it like shopping center to support placemaking	<i>Study of the retail component is ongoing. Staff recently met with three different retail development experts to discuss the potential for the ground floor uses at the site. The findings are described in the FAQ.</i>
17.	Redesign pedestrian/bike Lytton tunnel to be like Homer tunnel	<i>Pedestrian and bicycle paths are discussed on pages 12-13 of the CMR, as well as the FAQ.</i>
18.	Close gap in bike routes through transit center	<i>The master plan concept has been revised to provide a continuous bike route through the transit center. It is discussed on pages 12-13 of the CMR, as well as the FAQ.</i>
19.	Revisit surface parking impacts at El Camino Park	<i>The El Camino Park plan would be revised in coordination with the Arts and Innovation District Master Plan. The current concept for El Camino Park including its surface parking is discussed on pages 12 and 18 of the CMR, as well as the FAQ.</i>
20.	Revisit design for walking connection from downtown to project	<i>Pedestrian and bicycle paths are discussed on pages 12-13 of the CMR, as well as the FAQ.</i>
21.	Include TDM in project mitigations	<i>The master plan includes expanded Transportation Demand Management (TDM) elements to promote the use of alternative transportation modes, such as transit and bicycling. TDM is discussed in the FAQ.</i>
22.	Consider amenities attractive to 20-30 year old techies, such as roof top terraces	<i>The current master plan uses and amenities are described on pages 11-15 of the CMR. The master plan is evolving, and amenities would continue to evolve if a development project is submitted under the master plan.</i>
23.	Improve existing Caltrain ramps and tunnels, existing is so undesirable	<i>Pedestrian and bicycle paths are discussed on pages 12-13 of the CMR, as well as the FAQ.</i>

**SUMMARY OF COMMENTS FROM 9/24/12 COUNCIL MEETING –
ARTS AND ENTERTAINMENT DISTRICT**

24.	Resolve transit operations and capacity with agencies and Stanford	<i>Transit operations are discussed in the FAQ. The current master plan concept expands existing capacity from 21 bus stops and layovers to 32 stops and layovers. This provides 12 for Marguerite shuttles and 20 for the transit agencies, per Stanford, VTA and Samtrans request for near-term capacity.</i>
25.	Address loss of significant trees	<i>The CMR discusses landscape concepts on pages 14-15. The master plan will include a landscape plan, which would address existing trees on the site as well as new trees and landscaping. Any project submitted under the master plan would also be required to have a landscape plan.</i>
26.	Consider how to create broader Arts District that links to Stanford's facilities, such as the Bing Center	<i>Path and roadway connections to Stanford are discussed on pages 12-13 of the CMR.</i>
27.	Explore how to leverage dollars to create connections across the tracks	<i>The FAQ includes discussion of funding sources and strategies for transportation site improvements.</i>
28.	Want fly over animation like Stanford Medical Center	<i>The Stanford Medical Center proposal was a project submittal, whereas the Arts and Innovation Master Plan is a planning effort and is more conceptual. The master plan puts less emphasis on the specific building architecture than would be found with a project submittal. However, a project subsequently submitted under the master plan would be expected to utilize a range of visual tools as it undergoes design review, possibly including fly-over animation.</i>
29.	Clarify no indirect ABAG impact by project that will increase housing allocation	<i>The FAQ discusses the ABAG mandates. ABAG's housing and employment projections are based on regional and sub-regional estimates, and already assume substantial employment growth in the City through 2040, sufficient to accommodate what is proposed on this and other sites. It is unlikely that ABAG's projected housing needs would change based on office growth in Palo Alto.</i>
30.	How will theater lease work with Stanford so no concern of losing lease	<i>Stanford and TheatreWorks will be responsible for an agreement for the theater lease. TheatreWorks has indicated it would need to have an agreement in place to secure funding for its capital campaign.</i>
31.	Expect to see revisions to master plan with input from boards and commissions at next council session on this topic	<i>The master plan concept has been revised to reflect input from the Council, boards, commissions, and community member correspondence. The revisions are described on pages 10-15 of the CMR.</i>
32.	Focus on "Hostess House" and include it in the Master Plan	<i>Siting of the Julia Morgan Hostess House is ongoing, with coordination between the master plan and the El Camino Real Park planning. A concept to relocate the building to El Camino Park is described in page 12 of the CMR, and will be further considered by the Historic Resources Board at its December 5th meeting.</i>
33.	What have we done to ensure that the retail will be utilized and full of activity?	<i>Staff recently met with three different retail development experts to discuss the potential for the ground floor uses at the site. The findings are described on page 13 of the CMR.</i>

**SUMMARY OF COMMENTS FROM 9/24/12 COUNCIL MEETING –
ARTS AND ENTERTAINMENT DISTRICT**

34.	This is a great opportunity to create something of historic proportions	<i>The master plan process is intended to recognize the importance of the site and opportunities.</i>
35.	Concern of conflicts of interest	<i>Conflict of interest protocols apply to the master plan, as it would any other project submittal or planning process.</i>
36.	Why weren't the neighborhoods involved in meetings?	<i>Council, commission, and board meetings have been the primary engagement venues for the planning process to date. A community workshop is envisioned for January.</i>
37.	Please think bigger -- a bond issue to match Mr. Arrillaga's contribution to underground the tracks.	<i>The master plan encompasses the Stanford lands, El Camino Park, and the transit center. Undergrounding the rail tracks would be part of an overall rail corridor strategy that would extend beyond the master plan boundaries. The Council and community could consider a bond issue for rail corridor improvements independently, but the master plan is not contingent upon rail corridor improvements.</i>
38.	Why is there no housing in the Master Plan?	<i>Office and Residential uses both benefit from proximity to transit, though studies show that office users are more likely to use transit when nearby than residents. Office use is being proposed in the Arts and Innovation District in order to accommodate demand in Palo Alto for state-of-the-art office space.</i>
39.	What is the process between now and the election?	<i>The FAQ, as well as page 10 of the CMR, provide discussions of the timeline for the Advisory Measure.</i>
40.	When is the citywide height limit going to be discussed with Council?	<i>There have been two study sessions since September 24, 2012 Council meeting regarding the City's height limit. There is interest in exploring where additional height might be acceptable, given existing context and planning documents for housing growth. Additional public outreach is envisioned. The process to change the text in the Comprehensive Plan regarding height, and the height limit in any particular zone district, would involve reviews and actions by the ARB, PTC and Council.</i>
41.	Who is paying for the different parts of this project?	<i>The master plan is being funded through the use of Intermodal Transit Funds set aside in the Stanford University Medical Center Development Agreement. The processing of any project application submitted under the master plan would be funded by application fees.</i>
42.	Describe the parking. Will it be available to the public?	<i>The FAQ discusses parking for the master plan.</i>
43.	Better describe the parkland swap. Include the map. Be clear about the uses on the parkland and the plaza.	<i>Diagrams of the parkland swap are included in Attachments A and B. Proposed uses of the parkland and plazas are described on pages 14-15 of the CMR, and in the FAQ.</i>