



CITY OF PALO ALTO CITY COUNCIL MINUTES

Special Meeting
December 2, 2013

The City Council of the City of Palo Alto met on this date in the Council Conference Room at 6:05 P.M.

Present: Berman, Burt, Holman, Klein, Kniss, Price, Scharff, Schmid, Shepherd

Absent: None

Parks and Recreation Commission Members:

Present: Ashlund, Crommie, Hetterly, Lauing, Markevitch, Reckdahl

Absent: Knopper

AGENDA CHANGES, ADDITIONS, AND DELETIONS

None

CLOSED SESSION

1. Conference with Legal Counsel - Government Code Section 54956.9(b), (c)
Potential Litigation: Construction of the Mitchell Park Library and Community Center

The Council returned from the Closed Session at 6:50 P.M., and Mayor Scharff advised no reportable action.

MINUTES

STUDY SESSION

2. Joint Meeting with Parks and Recreation Commission.

Ed Lauing, Parks and Recreation Commission Chair, reported the packet provided to the Council contained the Parks and Recreation Commission's (PARC) purpose, a sampling of issues the PARC worked on, and three attachments regarding high impact issues. The high impact issues were the new Field Use Policy, Cubberley Community Center, and the PARC's recommendation for the Golf Course reconfiguration. A fourth topic could have been the PARC's recommendation for the El Camino Park design. The PARC would comment on the Long Range Parks and Recreation Master Plan (Master Plan), use of the 10 1/2 acres at the Baylands, dog parks, and improvements at the Golf Course.

Deirdre Crommie, Parks and Recreation Commissioner, stated the City's Comprehensive Plan provided for parks, recreation, and the preservation of nature. The Master Plan would be a blueprint for greater effectiveness. Work on the Master Plan would begin in early 2014. The PARC and ad hoc committees would work closely with the consultant to design surveys, conduct outreach meetings, and interpret feedback. Deliverables were inventory and assessment of park resources and recreational services; community preferences and project future needs; and a plan for needed capital development including costs and funding sources.

Mr. Lauing noted that the Council referenced the Land Bank as the Baylands athletic fields. The PARC encouraged the Council to review multiple needs and multiple uses for that space. Short-term needs for field usage were covered as a result of new and better fields and the Field Use Policy. Through the Field Use Policy, practice slots were precisely defined by time and age group to create more field space and to increase usage of fields. A cancellation policy was implemented to create a financial incentive for teams to release fields. The Master Plan study would allow the PARC to study long-term field needs and consider alternative recreational opportunities at the Baylands.

Jennifer Hetterly, Parks and Recreation Commissioner, reported the City had an unmet demand for dog exercise areas. In 2010, the PARC attempted to address those needs by adopting a policy that directed Staff to consider dog park opportunities when parks were renovated or improved. That attempt was not successful. The PARC wanted to target efforts and investments on identifying and accommodating the best suited neighborhood park arrangement for dog parks. The Master Plan and focused outreach would prioritize efforts. Another option was shared-use with athletic fields during

MINUTES

morning hours. Menlo Park had a successful shared-use partnership at Nealon Park. The key to success of shared-use dog areas was partnership with a dog owners' group. Outreach and negotiation would be needed to make a shared-use program successful.

Keith Reckdahl, Parks and Recreation Commissioner, remarked that the new Golf Course would be a destination location; however, it would be a bit tarnished by the aging facilities. Golf Course revenues would not be maximized with the current facilities. Staff proposed a 2015 Capital Improvement Program (CIP) to renovate the parking lot. Staff was reviewing methods to improve the plaza, entrance, and restrooms. There were no plans to renovate the clubhouse; although, it would be logical to renovate the clubhouse concurrently with the Golf Course. A timetable for making improvements was a concern.

Vice Mayor Shepherd wanted to support the PARC's efforts regarding dog parks, because they were a community need. She was unsure whether the Council clarified use of the Land Bank. Locating athletic fields at the Baylands could lead to tournament play. She wanted the PARC to vet all possibilities for athletic fields. She understood and shared concerns about the Golf Course clubhouse and pro shop. She suggested the PARC review Audubon certification for the Golf Course.

Council Member Schmid was impressed by the PARC's careful, detailed discussions based on good data. With respect to the Master Plan, he suggested the PARC consider whether a 7 1/2-acre site on the Los Trancos Valley should be a part of Foothill Park.

Council Member Holman concurred with Council Member Schmid's comment regarding the 7 1/2-acre site. She questioned whether the PARC considered the Stanford-Mayfield playing fields within the Master Plan. Sterling Canal had potential for community gardens, dog parks, and trail connectivity. She inquired about the status of the parks and trails application.

Ms. Hetterly indicated a redesign of the website was in process. A parks and trails application was beyond the PARC's scope of work. An application could be considered in the future.

Council Member Holman presumed the PARC was reviewing the Lucy Evans Interpretive Center for updating. She wanted the PARC's input regarding the urban look of parking lots located in natural areas.

Council Member Burt felt renovating the Golf Course parking lot provided an opportunity to make it compatible with the Baylands area. If the projections

MINUTES

for Golf Course revenue were achieved, then revenue in future years could be invested in Golf Course facilities. Currently, there was no funding available for improvement of facilities. He recalled that the Council specifically supported locating playing fields on the 10 1/2-acre Land Bank. He requested Staff clarify the Council's direction for use of that area when it approved the Golf Course redesign.

Rob De Geus, Assistant Director of Community Services, recalled that the Council directed Staff and the architect to design the Golf Course to make room for possible future playing fields.

Council Member Burt requested Staff review the record. He understood the Council's intention was to construct playing fields. If good arguments for changing that intention existed, then the Council could revisit its decision. The Lucy Evans Interpretive Center was a valued community resource, and its importance had been diminished. He would like it to be a thriving place again. Perhaps the City could collaborate with the Palo Alto Unified School District (PAUSD). He asked why the dog park at Pardee Park was not constructed.

Pat Markevitch, Parks and Recreation Commissioner, reported neighbors expressed an interest in not having a dog park or restroom facilities at that site.

Council Member Burt could not think of any neighborhood park that had immediate neighbors who would support a dog park. He suggested Staff and the PARC create a process to allow Council input with respect to improvements at parks.

Council Member Berman noted residents were initially concerned regarding a Field Use Policy. He asked if residents remained concerned since the Field Use Policy was implemented.

Mr. Lauing stated the Field Use Policy was implemented and used without problems.

Council Member Berman felt the City benefited from improved use of existing assets.

Mr. Lauing indicated drafting the Field Use Policy was incredibly complicated.

Council Member Berman asked if the dog park at Nealon Park was located on a grass or turf field.

MINUTES

Ms. Hetterly reported it was located on a grassy baseball field.

Council Member Berman inquired whether clean-up after the dogs had been an issue.

Ms. Hetterly remarked that there had been no incidents.

Council Member Klein expressed concern about dog parks. The City needed dog parks. His recollection regarding the Land Bank was the same as Council Member Burt's. The area was not the perfect place for playing fields; however, there were no other good options. He expected the Council to proceed with playing fields at the Baylands. Tournament play at those fields would be a positive experience.

Vice Mayor Shepherd did not ask the PARC to change direction from what the Council wanted. The Council did discuss the Land Bank as playing fields, but not what type of playing fields. There was a possibility to configure the fields for tournament play. If the fields were used for tournament play, then the Council needed to vet it seriously.

Council Member Kniss presumed the need for fields was not necessarily satisfied; however, existing fields were being used without problems.

Mr. Lauing reported short-term needs for fields were met. Long-term needs had to be investigated.

Council Member Kniss was aware of the need for dog parks. Currently, one field was being used as a dog park; however, she did not know how the area was policed. She noticed in many parts of Palo Alto dogs ran freely at parks. The thought of a world class Golf Course was tempting, but not necessarily realistic.

Mayor Scharff was impressed with the Field Use Policy. He understood the City had a shortage of playing fields, but the new Field Use Policy opened up a great deal of field time.

Mr. Lauing concurred. In addition three new fields with lights made a difference.

Mayor Scharff asked if lights would be added to fields at El Camino Park.

Mr. Lauing did not believe lights were part of a current CIP.

MINUTES

Mr. De Geus reported the infrastructure of the park would allow lights to be added later. Additional outreach was needed, because some residents lived fairly close to the field.

Mayor Scharff inquired about the cost of installing lights.

Mr. De Geus indicated approximately \$100,000.

Mayor Scharff felt the issue was not funding, but outreach to neighbors.

Council Member Kniss asked if neighbors complained about the lighted fields at Palo Alto High School and Gunn High School.

Ms. Hetterly stated the PARC did not receive complaints.

Vice Mayor Shepherd understood PAUSD received complaints.

Mayor Scharff was sympathetic to improving the Golf Course parking lot, pro shop, and clubhouse. He suggested the PARC provide advice to the Council regarding Golf Course facilities. He preferred improvements be made sooner rather than later. With City revenues improving, some projects might be funded. He recalled that the Council planned for athletic fields at the Baylands. The PARC should provide the Council with reasons for not constructing athletic fields at that site. There would be few opportunities to create athletic fields in the future. He was intrigued with the concept of a dog park similar to the one in Menlo Park. He inquired whether the PARC had determined a location.

Ms. Hetterly reported the PARC had not vetted a location. There was a variety of locations for consideration. Possible locations were Greer Park, Baylands Athletic Center, and Sterling Park.

Mayor Scharff asked if a dog park was most useful in local parks or one large area.

Ms. Hetterly indicated the demand was for both local parks and a large area.

Mayor Scharff noted the Council recently became aware of the 7 1/2 acres next to Foothill Park. That would be an interesting area for the PARC to consider.

Council Member Holman recalled that the Golf Course architect presented information to the PARC regarding the original designs for buildings at the Golf Course.

MINUTES

Mayor Scharff asked if those original designs were constructed.

Council Member Holman reported some of the buildings were constructed.

SPECIAL ORDERS OF THE DAY

3. Selection of Candidates to be Interviewed for the Storm Drain Oversight Committee for Three Terms Ending on October 31, 2018.

MOTION: Mayor Scharff moved, seconded by Vice Mayor Shepherd to interview all the applicants for the Storm Drain Oversight Committee.

MOTION PASSED: 8-0 Kniss absent

AGENDA CHANGES, ADDITIONS, AND DELETIONS

None

CITY MANAGER COMMENTS

James Keene, City Manager, announced the Utilities Department was offering an exchange of up to two incandescent holiday light strings for highly efficient LED holiday lights. The final phase of the University Avenue tree maintenance was scheduled to begin December 4, 2013. Between December 4-14, 2013 and December 17-21, 2013, Caltrain was expected to work within its right-of-way.

Vice Mayor Shepherd inquired whether the Downtown parking limit would be extended from two hours to three hours during the holidays.

Mr. Keene understood there were reasons not to change the seasonal parking limit. He would provide clarification at a later time.

COUNCIL MEMBER QUESTIONS, COMMENTS, AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mayor Scharff noted the holiday tree lighting ceremony was well attended. The City won the Mayor's Cup from Mountain View at the Turkey Trot. More than 25,000 people attended the Turkey Trot.

Vice Mayor Shepherd attended the ceremony to open the anaerobic digester in San Jose. Council Members Berman and Kniss also attended.

MINUTES

Council Member Klein reported the court in Sacramento issued decisions against High Speed Rail. Palo Alto deserved praise for helping stop High Speed Rail.

Council Member Burt reported the Policymaker Working Group discussed significant increases in Caltrain ridership. Cities in the Peninsula were building transit oriented development in anticipation of more riders using Caltrain. The demand for Caltrain ridership would also increase when electrification occurred. If funding for High Speed Rail was delayed and electrification funding occurred, then Caltrain was liberated to utilize track capacity as much as possible. The Palo Alto Rail Committee recommended Caltrain evaluate the potential of increasing capacity by lengthening the platforms of high demand stations.

Council Member Kniss was troubled by the lack of funding for Caltrain. Extending platforms was a problem for Caltrain, because of real estate issues.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

Cybele Lo Vuolo-Bhushan felt the Vehicle Habitation Ordinance was not well written. She hoped the Council would revise the Ordinance to prevent lawsuits.

Wayne Douglass reported a neighbor lost his residence; however, other neighbors took him in and found him a home in Barstow.

Shani Kleinhaus announced a burrowing owl was sited at Byxbee Park. The Audubon certification for golf courses provided best practices, but was not an enhancement for a golf course.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION: Council Member Price moved, seconded by Vice Mayor Shepherd to approve the minutes of October 21 and 28, 2013.

MOTION PASSED: 9-0

CONSENT CALENDAR

Robert Moss spoke to Agenda Item no. 5 and was happy to see the Council reviewing Planned Community (PC) Zoning. Residents indicated they were upset with the PC process and the type of developments constructed. The

MINUTES

Maybell Avenue Project did not follow City Policy to protect single-family and low density areas.

MOTION: Vice Mayor Shepherd moved, seconded by Council Member Kniss to approve Agenda Item Numbers 4-9.

4. Approval of Amendment Number 1 to Contract No. C13148737 with Advanced Design Consultants, Inc. in the Amount of \$85,886 for a Total Not-to-Exceed Amount of \$320,755 for Design of Fire/Life Safety and Sprinklers for the Lucie Stern Community Theatre and Community Center as Part of the Lucie Stern Buildings Mechanical / Electrical Upgrades Project PE-14015.
5. Approval of Continuation of Council Consideration of an Appeal of the Director of Planning and Community Environment's Architectural Review Approval of a New Mixed-use Development at 636 Waverley Street, a Parcel in the CD-C(P) Zone. The Proposed Four-Story 10,278 Sq. Ft. Building Includes 4,800 Sq. Ft. Of Commercial Uses On The First And Second Floors And Two Residential Units On The Third And Fourth Floors. The Project Provides 20 Parking Spaces In A Below Grade Garage. Environmental Assessment: Exempt From The Provisions Of The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Per Section 15303 For 636 Waverley Street (STAFF REQUESTS THIS ITEM BE CONTINUED TO DECEMBER 16, 2013).
6. Approval of Amendment Number 2 to the Agreement with Waste Management of California, Inc. That Will Reduce the City's Annual "Put or Pay" Tonnage Commitments Through 2021 and Modify Other Terms and Conditions of the Disposal Agreement.
7. Ordinance 5226 entitled "Ordinance of the Council of the City of Palo Alto to Add Chapter 16.61 to the Municipal Code to Establish a Public Art Program for Private Development" (First Reading, November 12, 2013 PASSED: 8-0 Burt absent).
8. Endorsement of the City's Participation in the Georgetown University Energy Prize Competition and Submittal of the City's Letter of Intent to Compete.
9. Resolution 9384 entitled "Resolution of the Council of the City of Palo Alto Declaring Results of the Consolidated Special Municipal Election Held on November 5, 2013."

MOTION PASSED: 9-0

MINUTES

STUDY SESSION

10. Initiating a Community Conversation on the Future of the City, Including the Comprehensive Plan, Planned Community Zoning, Parking and Traffic Strategies, and Related Matters.

James Keene, City Manager, acknowledged that residents were fortunate to live in the center of one of the world's premier areas. Increasingly, every existing industry felt compelled to connect to Silicon Valley, and Palo Alto was the heart of Silicon Valley. The impacts of renewed demand for Silicon Valley generated significant contemporary challenges and concerns in the community. Because of concerns regarding planning for and managing of growth, the Council scheduled the Study Session. Staff was concerned about their ability to manage demands and workload. The Study Session was a positive opportunity to clarify a collective vision expressed through a renewed Comprehensive Plan and through citizen participation to inform the Council's decisions. Staff solicited initial comments and questions from the Council to shape the Staff Report.

Hillary Gitelman, Director of Planning and Community Environment, reiterated that the Comprehensive Plan was the City's guiding document for land use and development decisions. Other policies were intended to be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. The Comprehensive Plan was adopted in 1998 and remained valid. The Comprehensive Plan articulated limits for Citywide development and Downtown development, both of which the City had not reached. The Staff Report attempted to articulate changes in Palo Alto and concerns that occurred because of changes. The City had an opportunity to combine planning efforts into the Comprehensive Plan update and to subject it to community engagement and environmental review. Another opportunity was to continue short-term problem solving related to traffic and parking. A third opportunity was to continue processing projects consistent with current zoning while holding them to a high standard. Staff provided six broad questions to capture individual comments and suggestions from Council Members. In discussing the questions, Staff hoped to focus on a process and return with information at the time of the Retreat.

Mr. Keene felt the Council needed time to hear from the public and to discuss broader strategies. Staff provided initial thoughts for discussion and could summarize the Council's comments at the end of the discussion.

Harvey Miller indicated a discussion of the future of the City should be placed in the context of the future of the nation. The issue was the demographic shift. He provided copies of an *Atlantic Monthly* article regarding housing.

MINUTES

Low density usage caused traffic and increased land prices. More multi-family housing was needed as the population aged.

Eric Filseth felt there were two conflicting visions for Palo Alto. Vision A was a medium-density, family town. Vision B was a financial and professional hub. Vision B came with unsolvable traffic, parking, pollution, and over-stretched City infrastructure and schools. Staff and the Council attempted to implement Vision B within a framework of laws supporting Vision A. A clear majority of residents were not willing to accept the costs of Vision B.

Robert Lancefield urged the Council to take a long view when considering the small changes that led to large changes.

Martin Bernstein stated a Planned Community (PC) was a tool for City evolution. A balance between developers and residents was key to a successful PC process. The public could support a PC if it felt it received a fair outcome.

Robert Moss suggested the Council consider the interaction of planned projects with existing projects; transparency; comparison of proposed projects with the Comprehensive Plan; and careful revision of the PC process.

Ruth Luoy related problems with traffic lights and lack of turn lanes on El Camino Real.

Dick Rosenbaum indicated the Council was ignoring the Stanford-Arrillaga and Jay Paul Projects. The Council should direct Staff to notify both applicants that their projects were no longer likely to be approved.

Neilson Buchanan recommended the Council initiate an effort with Staff and neighborhoods to understand development rights related to parking assessment districts. Staff continued to approve projects with no negative impact.

Richard Brand indicated the parking problem in Professorville was worse than in areas south of Oregon Expressway. The Comprehensive Plan stated development should meet commercial needs but not at the expense of residential quality of life. People moved to Palo Alto for the quality of life it provided.

David Kleiman encouraged responsible development. Projects should be parked. The Council should provide developers with transparency and consistency.

MINUTES

Ken Hayes stated PC Zoning allowed other opportunities not necessarily envisioned by the creators of the Zoning Ordinance. A PC Zone provided flexibility; however, that flexibility should be in accord with the objectives and spirit of the Comprehensive Plan. The PC process should engage the community. The Council should consider different PC Zone categories.

Randy Popp felt existing guidelines and regulations were thoughtful and forward-thinking, imperfect but well drafted. Halting projects in midstream created an environment and an expectation of unmanageable risk. Growth of the City needed to occur in a fair and predictable manner within the established framework.

Michael Alcheck remarked that a diversity of opinion was crucial to the discussion. He supported sustainable communities with smart growth and density done well.

Susan Fineberg believed the Council and Staff did not listen to residents. The Council structured a planning process with predetermined outcomes that found no significant impacts. She requested the Council implement a series of reforms beginning with a moratorium on all major projects in all zoning designations; allow public participation in updating the Comprehensive Plan; revise the project review and approval process; restructure PC Zoning regulations with an emphasis on public benefit; and restore consistency and predictability for development applications that conformed with current zoning.

Chris Donlay suggested the process was not broken but only running amok. The many planning hearings should allow disclosure of pertinent information. The review bodies did not apply critical thinking to individual projects.

Paul Machado did not understand why the City had a Comprehensive Plan when many exceptions were granted.

Herb Borock reported the 1989 Land Use and Transportation Study provided total development potential for nine areas of the City. The Council should direct Staff to provide development totals for the City and for each of the nine areas. PC Zoning was not needed to protect 100 percent affordable housing projects, because the State Housing Density Bonus Law provided protections. It was inappropriate for the Council to consider the Arrillaga and Jay Paul Projects at the current time.

MINUTES

Fred Balin remarked that individual projects recast the Comprehensive Plan. The current Comprehensive Plan was a good document and the result of wide community engagement; however, it was not respected.

Shani Kleinhaus noted all cities in Silicon Valley struggled with traffic and parking problems. The City was slowly chipping away the open space, which was a vital treasure.

Greg Goodwin related his experience with traffic and parking in San Francisco. Rapacious decisions could destroy the quality of the City.

Adina Levin, Friends of Caltrain, noted the use of electronic media in other cities to include a wider population in community discussions. In coming transportation discussions, the Council should consider initiatives comprehensively and iteratively.

Daniel Garber indicated the City should find ways to take advantage of growth to move forward the City's interests. Each project in the pipeline was an opportunity to work with applicants to move the City closer to its own goals. Involving the City earlier in the applicant's design process would be more effective than enacting legislation. Creating incentives to meet current parking demand was potentially a far more effective method to manage a project's size and impacts.

Arthur Keller suggested the Council think proactively and consider changing past policies to reflect current needs. In addition, the Council should consider new and creative solutions.

Davina Brown stated commercial development increased parking, traffic, and pollution problems while providing few benefits. She requested the Council stop granting exceptions to the Comprehensive Plan.

Norman Beamer reported the City did not need more office space. The Council should halt efforts to build more office space in Palo Alto.

Joe Hirsch believed residents did not like project approvals granted by the Council and its bodies. He requested a moratorium on all new higher-density developments until a Land Use and Transportation Study was completed. He requested the Council revise the Density Bonus Ordinance to grant the City more control and hold a true, two-way dialog with residents.

David Jeong participated in two prior revisions of the Comprehensive Plan. The Council ignored the Comprehensive Plan and citizens' wishes.

MINUTES

David Adams suggested the Council eliminate the PC process and direct Staff to be transparent and impartial.

Eric Rosenblum agreed that housing in Palo Alto was not affordable. Younger adults wanted a walkable community and higher density housing. Palo Alto did not need more offices. The Council had to work on the fundamental demand for transportation to alleviate the growing parking problem.

Jennifer Landesmann felt out-of-scale development marred the quality of life in Palo Alto. The building height limit was important to maintain quality of life.

Council Member Kniss requested Staff define Planned Community as it currently existed. Some valuable community projects would not exist without PC Zoning, such as the Opportunity Center and Tree House Apartments. In five years, the number of jobs in Palo Alto increased from 70,000 to 90,000, which caused a great deal of the parking problems. She requested Staff comment on traffic data provided in the Staff Report.

Ms. Gitelman noted two data sets were included in the Staff Report. One was average daily traffic volumes for a number of locations in Palo Alto, comparing 1999 volumes with 2013 volumes. In many locations, daily traffic volumes were not equal to those in 1999; although, some areas were approaching 1999 volumes. The second data set compared average daily traffic volumes along El Camino Real from 2002 through 2012. That data demonstrated that traffic was essentially stable. Traffic data did not show significant traffic degradation. Traffic volumes followed economic cycles.

Council Member Kniss was surprised by the data. The community had grown and changed since the 1980s. The Council did listen to public comments. Palo Alto was a vibrant and exciting community to live in.

Council Member Schmid felt the dialog with respect to the Comprehensive Plan should express the vision for Palo Alto. The starting point for public dialog was the identification of data. While Staff's data indicated traffic was declining, travel time seemed to increase. He utilized data from the Current Comprehensive Plan and the recent Stanford project to determine that traffic delay at 12 intersections increased from 35 to 55 percent at each intersection between 1996 and 2009. Traffic studies provided by development projects indicated the number of cars at specific intersections increased 20 percent. Traffic was increasing dramatically, on the average of 3-5 percent per year. He requested Staff comment on the conflicting information provided through these studies.

MINUTES

Ms. Gitelman wished to clarify that traffic volumes were not the sole determinant of congestion. Peaking characteristics would differentiate daily traffic volumes from peak hour traffic volumes. Other factors were conflicting movements and signal operation. Staff needed to communicate a great deal of data as part of a comprehensive evaluation of traffic and parking impacts. Perhaps that data could be communicated in the context of the Comprehensive Plan.

Council Member Schmid suggested the Council open a dialog with the community beginning with the basic issues of traffic and parking. The Palo Alto traffic model consistently indicated no significant impact to traffic. Staff could help the community engage in issues by providing data that everyone could work with.

Council Member Klein believed a Special Meeting would be needed to develop a dialog. The debate of growth in Palo Alto extended to the 1890s. Palo Alto was a vibrant community. Moratoriums had many types of unintended consequences, usually negatives ones. He wanted to continue consideration of the Jay Paul Company Project. The Council needed to be creative in its outreach to all residents.

Council Member Berman wanted to see smart, strategic, limited growth in Palo Alto. He expressed concern about the inability of his generation to afford housing in Palo Alto. Parking was clearly a problem for the City. The Council needed to create a comprehensive vision for the Downtown, California Avenue areas and the City as a whole. The Council and Staff would have to be creative in crafting a City dialog to create opportunities for residents to engage.

Council Member Burt felt people lived in Palo Alto because they valued the quality of life in Palo Alto. The community had always been willing to accept a moderate rate of change under certain conditions. First, development projects should be high quality. Second, indirect impacts of development projects should not significantly degrade the broader quality of life. Third, residents wanted early and meaningful participation in the process for issues that affected them. The City could not accommodate every person who wanted to live or work in Palo Alto. The harm that resulted from misinformation was difficult to repair and undermined the Council's and Staff's credibility. Only 2 of the 21 projects in the pipeline were PC Zones. PC Zoning was not the primary culprit of too much development occurring too rapidly. The Council should ensure that PC projects were not abused. Zoning standards needed to be adjusted to allow public space and appropriately scaled buildings and parking. A 20 percent increase in jobs, an

MINUTES

8 percent increase in population, a 30-50 percent increase in intersection congestion, and a 20 percent decline in traffic was not possible. The number of PC projects had not increased over the prior 15 years. Many PC projects were now valued community assets. Community dialog was needed. He was frustrated by the lack of emphasis placed on project compliance with the Comprehensive Plan. Staff Reports should present all significant elements of the Comprehensive Plan that a project impacted. He was interested in the possibility of new projects being fully parked and perhaps even over parked. The Council needed data regarding the number of employees for each employer in the City. He favored implementation of a business registry to obtain accurate data. The review process should be altered to ensure the quality and compatibility of projects was better for the community.

Council Member Holman inquired about further discussion of the topic and the possibility of Staff summarizing Council comments.

Mayor Scharff indicated a Special Meeting would be held to continue the discussion.

Council Member Holman requested clarity regarding next steps for Staff follow up.

Council Member Klein called Point of Order. There should be an understanding regarding the length of Council Member comments.

Mayor Scharff believed each Council Member should be allowed to speak at least once.

Council Member Klein suggested Council Members be notified when their comments reached 15 minutes in length.

Council Member Holman agreed with a number of Council Member Burt's comments. The Council recently discussed Core Values, and the Council should adopt public trust as a Core Value. The Council should require transparent, objective, and balanced Staff Reports. Data regarding traffic impacts was not plausible, and the Staff Report should contain other factors. The Staff Report mentioned support of innovation and entrepreneurship; however, it did not mention support of community character. The City should have a moratorium on PC projects, including projects in the pipeline. In a number of instances, public benefits were not delivered, were not consistent, were not clearly identified, or were not enduring. The Council, Boards, and Commissions needed specific training on compatibility. Development standards should be reviewed. Her previous question to Staff

MINUTES

regarding employee density in commercial space as it affected traffic analysis, parking demand, and traffic demand management programs should be addressed coherently. She also favored implementation of a business registry as a means to track traffic and parking implications. She questioned whether data contained in the Longitudinal Employee Household Dynamics Program was applicable to Palo Alto.

Ms. Gitelman reported the data was specific to Palo Alto. Staff was engaged in collecting data regarding employee density as a part of the Downtown CAP Study.

Council Member Holman believed California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) training was necessary for the Council, Boards, and Commissions. The 27 University Avenue Project received public scrutiny with little of it being positive. Any project at that site should be significantly different and presented in a transparent manner.

Vice Mayor Shepherd stated the sense of community in Palo Alto was vibrant. The Council's most impactful decision was dedicating 700 acres for development of Stanford Research Park. The Council could review processes to ensure transparency. She was unsure how to initiate a discussion regarding the future of the City. An update of the Comprehensive Plan had been delayed for various reasons; however, it should be presented without further delay. The City's website could contain a timeline regarding the Comprehensive Plan. Efforts to keep the community informed regarding development decisions were important.

Council Member Price indicated the Council had a responsibility to define the terms of engagement. Her responsibilities as a Council Member were to represent both the current and future community. Decisions were needed regarding housing, density, and urban design. The residential population and the employment population would continue to grow. The questions were the pace of growth and how to anticipate growth. She opposed a moratorium for PC Zoning. Greater education regarding development standards, base zoning, and PC development was needed. She inquired whether the next discussion would include the integration of other plans and programs with an intensified community engagement program.

Mr. Keene reported Staff would need to compile a map of the connections of all topics. Staff hoped to return to the Council in the first part of February 2014 with detailed recommendations. Time and intensive Staff work was needed to organize information coherently.

MINUTES

Council Member Price asked if a discussion of PC reform would occur in the short term.

Mr. Keene would return to that issue in the summation.

Mayor Scharff felt the Council was concerned with quality of life. The Council made progress during the year regarding parking; however, progress was small when compared to the magnitude of the problem. He wanted the City to build a parking garage. He inquired about the amount of money contained in the Parking Fund.

Aaron Aknin, Assistant Director Planning and Community Environment, indicated the Parking Fund would contain \$4-\$4.5 million by the end of 2014.

Mayor Scharff believed a parking garage and a Residential Parking Permit (RPP) Program would provide relief to neighborhoods. Traffic was a continuing problem. The best way to solve both the traffic and parking problems was to reduce car trips through a Traffic Demand Management (TDM) Program. The Planning Department was overwhelmed with initiatives. Updating the Comprehensive Plan while engaging the community was important. He asked if an updated Comprehensive Plan could be presented to the Council in two years.

Mr. Keene responded yes.

Mayor Scharff requested the City Manager provide a plan to increase Staff in the Planning Department. Both the City Manager and Director of Planning should carefully review Staff Reports for logic and accuracy. Staff Reports should list advantages and disadvantages in order to provide information to the Council. The right way to engage the community was through the Comprehensive Plan. Staff should come back with a plan for doing that. The City should have a moratorium on processing PC applications until the community understood PCs and PC Zoning.

Mr. Keene clarified that the Jay Paul Project and the Arrillaga Outreach Project were removed from the December 2013 Agenda because of a community design process. The Agendas for meetings on December 9 and 16, 2013 were full. A discussion to frame the issues related to PC Zoning would inform next steps. Given the Council's comments, Staff would have to navigate between accuracy and completeness in its reports and recommendations. The Staff Report was careful not to draw conclusions with respect to the traffic data. Staff would begin a data and research initiative to support the Comprehensive Plan process. First Staff would need

MINUTES

to design a process for and have the capacity to support and implement topics suggested by the Council. Citizen participation and outreach alone would be a major undertaking. The Comprehensive Plan and Cumulative Impact initiative was the organizing focus around which other planning processes had to converge. The entire process would be a public collaboration that would be iterative and evolutionary. Staff could provide recommendations on the two PC projects for specific action prior to returning with components for the Comprehensive Plan discussion. He questioned whether the Council wished to target February 2, 2014 for Staff to return with the process design and resource plan.

Ms. Gitelman noted public and Council comments covered many aspects of planning. Staff could return with specific resource and scheduling items or continue the Study Session discussion.

Council Member Holman wanted to continue the discussion to either December 9 or 16, 2013 in order to provide clear direction to Staff regarding next steps.

Mr. Keene could not include the discussion on either December 9 or 16. Staff could return on one of those dates with the two PC projects.

Council Member Holman clarified that Staff would not need to return on December 9 or 16 with responses. She wanted the Council to complete the dialog in order to provide Staff with definitive direction.

Mayor Scharff agreed the December 9 and 16 Agendas were full. The Council could hold a Special Meeting in December 2013; however, he was unsure if a Special Meeting was necessary. He understood Staff recommended February 2014 as a possible date.

Mr. Keene reported Staff would return sooner than February 2014 if they could complete the work sooner. The main themes for discussion were clear. He wondered whether a Council discussion of next steps would be efficient.

Council Member Kniss did not believe a discussion of next steps was needed. Staff would have a difficult time summarizing the Council discussion.

Council Member Holman reiterated that she wished to hold a Council discussion to assist Staff with determining next steps.

Council Member Kniss expressed confidence in Staff's ability.

MINUTES

Council Member Schmid suggested a prioritization of questions related to the Comprehensive Plan, visioning, and engagement would be helpful. It might be helpful for the Council to engage in determining the first steps.

Mr. Keene indicated it was not realistic for Staff to prepare information in only eight days for the Council meeting on December 16, 2013. Staff needed time to organize and compile information. All the main pieces were there; Staff needed time to add details regarding the process.

Council Member Burt inquired whether a discussion in January 2014 was feasible.

Mr. Keene would begin working on information and provide a status update close to the New Year. Staff could present the two PC projects for a decision on January 13, 2014.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 12:05 A.M.