



REGIONAL HOUSING MANDATE COMMITTEE WORKING MINUTES

Regular Meeting
December 12, 2013

The Regional Housing Mandate Committee met on this date in the Council Conference Room at 4:05 P.M., 250 Hamilton Avenue, Palo Alto, California.

Present: Berman, (Chair) Holman, Scharff, Schmid

PAUSD School Board Member: Mitchell, Batten-Caswell

Planning & Transportation Commissioner: Michael

Absent:

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

None

ACTION ITEMS

1. Work Plan for 2015-2022 Housing Element for the 2014-2022 Regional Housing Needs Allocation Cycle.

Tim Wong, Senior Planner, reported January 31, 2015, was the deadline for the City to have its Housing Element certified by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD). Some of the negative impacts of not having a certified Housing Element were: preparation of a Housing Element update every four years as opposed to every eight years; lawsuits; and loss of grant funding. The current Housing Element was certified relatively late in the previous cycle; therefore, many programs and units could rollover to the new Housing Element update. One of the major challenges would be identifying a sufficient number of sites for the 2014-2022 Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) cycle. Staff assumed approximately 1,500 units would rollover to meet the assigned RHNA requirement of 1,988 units. Staff needed to identify 488 units to reach the requirement. Because the City identified smaller sites, HCD would most likely require a surplus of units. Staff assumed HCD would require a surplus of approximately 200 units. Overall Staff would need to identify parcels to accommodate approximately 700 units. Under RHNA requirements, up to 25 percent of the total requirement could be filled by existing units; therefore Staff would review existing units that were non-deed restricted. The requirement also stated that the jurisdiction must have committed

WORKING MINUTES

assistance within the first two years of the Housing Element period. Committed assistance was defined as a legally enforceable agreement which obligated funds to provide for affordable housing. Approximately 200 units could likely be identified through zones that already allowed residential uses, specifically the Fry's site along San Antonio Avenue. Staff would have to identify the remaining 500 units. Some parcels would need to be rezoned to increase the density or to allow residential uses. For the upcoming cycle, HCD provided a streamlined update process in which it would review a Housing Element update in 60 days. Previously, HCD reviewed updates over a period of months. In order to be eligible for a streamlined review, the City must complete a few items such as rezoning for adequate sites to meet the current RHNA; rezoning a district to permit emergency shelters by right; rezoning to permit transitional and supportive housing as a multi-family use; adopting a reasonable accommodation policy; and adopting a Density Bonus Ordinance. At the Planning and Transportation Commission (PTC) meeting the prior day, the PTC recommended approval of rezoning Neighborhood Commercial (CN) sites to increase the zoning to meet RHNA requirements; a zoning amendment for the Research, Office and Limited Manufacturing (ROLM-E) Zone District to allow emergency shelters by right; amended definitions of the Zoning Code to allow for transitional and supportive housing as a multi-family use; and a Citywide reasonable accommodation policy. The Regional Housing Mandate Committee (Committee) reviewed a draft Density Bonus Ordinance. All the zoning amendments and the Density Bonus Ordinance were scheduled for presentation to the Council on January 13, 2014. With the streamlined process, the City was only required to update certain sections.

Mayor Scharff inquired whether the actions recommended by the PTC applied to the existing Housing Element.

Mr. Wong responded yes, the 2007-2014 Housing Element.

Hillary Gitelman, Planning and Community Environment Director, clarified that those items were only a portion of items the City committed to implementing in the existing Housing Element.

Melissa Baten-Caswell, Palo Alto Unified School District School Board Member, asked if the assumptions were utilized in the last Housing Element.

Mr. Wong replied yes. The assumptions were contained in the 2007-2014 Housing Element. The last page of the Staff Report provided a timeline for preparing the 2015 Housing Element for certification. The timeline included tasks that needed to be completed for the current Housing Element and for the adoption of the 2015-2023 Housing Element.

WORKING MINUTES

Chair Holman requested clarification regarding committed funding for conversion of existing units. She asked if committing housing impact fees to the purchase of existing units was sufficient to meet the requirement.

Mr. Wong did not believe committing funds to a project would be sufficient, because a commitment of funds was not legally enforceable. Staff would attend an HCD workshop on the Housing Element on January 15, 2014, in Sunnyvale. Staff could follow up with an HCD representative regarding detailed questions.

Chair Holman inquired whether the public could attend the workshop.

Mr. Wong believed the public could attend but would confirm that information.

Chair Holman requested Staff provide notification.

Council Member Berman asked if one of the impacts of not having a certified Housing Element was restrictions being placed on a municipality's ability to issue building permits.

Mr. Wong understood that outside groups could sue a city on the basis of not having a certified Housing Element. The inability to issue building permits could be one of the legal consequences.

Council Member Berman indicated the public could better understand the need for a certified Housing Element if they were aware of that consequence. The inability to obtain a building permit could affect anyone who wanted to change his home.

Ms. Gitelman added that the significant cost of litigation was another factor.

Council Member Berman felt residents and affordable housing nonprofit agencies closely observed City actions. He inquired about the deadline for accomplishing elements to obtain a streamlined review.

Mr. Wong believed the deadline was prior to submission of a draft Housing Element. HCD staff would review the draft Housing Element to determine if the City was eligible for streamlined review.

Council Member Berman asked if submission would occur in the latter half of 2014.

Mr. Wong replied yes.

WORKING MINUTES

Council Member Berman suggested Staff keep in mind the Council's Break with respect to the timeline.

Council Member Schmid requested clarification of the note that the homeless shelter site had been identified east of Embarcadero.

Mr. Wong noted Staff had not identified sites. The zoning amendment made emergency shelter a permitted use in the ROLM-E Zone District. If a developer or group applied for an emergency shelter on a parcel in the ROLM-E District and met the emergency shelter standards and guidelines, an emergency shelter would be a ministerial obligation or by right.

Council Member Schmid asked where the district was located.

Mr. Wong reported east of Highway 101 along Embarcadero Road.

Council Member Schmid asked if it was located on either side.

Mr. Wong responded just east of Highway 101.

Council Member Berman asked if it was located on either side of Embarcadero Road.

Mr. Wong answered yes, on either side of Embarcadero Road.

Council Member Schmid inquired whether community playing fields were eligible.

Mr. Wong did not believe community playing fields were eligible since they were zoned PF.

Council Member Schmid noted the Staff Report mentioned the movement toward higher density, from 15 to 20 units per acre. Staff provided the example of Fry's, where it would be great to get 50-60 more housing units. Higher density created parking and traffic issues. He understood that currently the applications in process were utilizing the parking and traffic densities appropriate for that district. He asked if the Housing Element would be excluded from operating in that area.

Mr. Wong responded no. The Fry's site was currently zoned RM-30. Staff would perform an environmental review for the Housing Element update, which would consider some of the build out. If individual projects came in, there would be additional California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review.

WORKING MINUTES

Council Member Schmid recalled a project that indicated two of the intersections were close to F. He inquired whether traffic capacity would be available for development of the Fry's site.

Ms. Gitelman would have to analyze traffic capacity if the Council chose that strategy to add units. Unfortunately the State did not recognize traffic constraints or water constraints as a valid reason for not meeting RHNA requirements. If the Fry's site was not appropriate, then Staff would search for alternatives.

Council Member Schmid was very surprised to learn of the regional distribution of units contained in the current Housing Element. The goal of the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) project was to obtain housing units in transit oriented, densely built areas. In the Housing Element, Downtown contained only 9 percent of the housing units and California Avenue had only 19 percent. He asked why Staff did not identify more housing units in the Downtown or California Avenue Pedestrian and Transit Oriented Development (PTOD) area.

Ms. Gitelman could review that in the next Housing Element cycle. Staff would have to consider many factors in the next cycle to add sites for approximately 700 units. There would be an opportunity to reconsider sites included in the current Housing Element.

Council Member Schmid felt the first step should be to identify the geographical sites that would attain the overall goals of the program.

Ms. Gitelman agreed. Staff's suggested first step was public outreach and demographic analysis. That would occur in March 2014.

Council Member Schmid referenced Staff's suggestion of implementation of a small residential unit overlay district in the PTOD. He requested a definition of a small unit overlay.

Mayor Scharff asked if it was micro housing.

Mr. Wong reported a small unit overlay was an emphasis towards construction of smaller units, maybe not micro units. Smaller units, less than 900 square feet, could be appropriate to use in a PTOD area which would add the walkability factor.

Council Member Schmid felt those issues were important elements of the updated Comprehensive Plan. He noted the Committee was mentioned only twice in the timeline and asked if Staff would not engage the Committee regarding the next Housing Element.

WORKING MINUTES

Ms. Gitelman assumed Staff would keep the Committee apprised as work proceeded.

Council Member Schmid inquired whether the timeline was a listing of the future schedule for the Committee.

Mr. Wong suggested it was a guideline for engagement of the Committee.

Mayor Scharff stated Council Member Schmid's points about up-zoning the California Avenue and Downtown areas to provide more housing in transit areas were interesting and worth discussion. The Committee needed to include the community in such a way that people debated and discussed the different issues. Micro units were an interesting concept. More interesting was the concept of mass, size, and density which allowed the same building with smaller units. Smaller units may provide fewer people and less impact on schools, but they also provided units to meet RHNA numbers. The Committee needed to discuss zoning to have the least impact on the community, traffic, schools, and parking while meeting the RHNA numbers. An overlay district could provide small units; however, they would need to be parked. He was concerned that the Council would not have sufficient time to discuss and revise a draft Housing Element before the submission deadline. Staff should return to the Committee prior to performing public outreach to discuss and frame issues. The Committee should discuss Staff's work monthly and have check-ins with the Council. The Committee should review a draft Housing Element first, then the PTC, and finally the Council. Given the short timeframe, the timeline should be specific and detailed. He understood HCD allowed Palo Alto's small zoning sites because they were actually developed. He questioned the number of small zoning sites contained in the Housing Element that would cause HCD to require a surplus of 200 units. Perhaps the City should utilize State Legislators to push back on the surplus, as the number seemed arbitrary and capricious. That was the type of question he wanted the Committee to discuss in early January 2014.

Ms. Gitelman was attempting to advise the Committee of what Staff thought HCD would require. HCD always extracted a surplus over the RHNA number.

Chair Holman suggested Staff consider maximum unit size as opposed to an overlay.

Ms. Baten-Caswell suggested zoning for granny units would provide a good number of units.

Mayor Scharff recalled that other cities utilized granny units to meet RHNA requirements. The Committee should discuss all options.

WORKING MINUTES

Ms. Baten-Caswell recommended Staff review the traffic impact of granny units. They might not create as much traffic as individual apartments.

Ms. Gitelman reported HCD sometimes required a survey of second units to determine the income level served by second units. HCD would allow a city to count second units at that income level. It was difficult to use second units to meet the low-income and very-low-income requirements.

Ms. Baten-Caswell inquired whether an emergency shelter was the same as transitional and supportive housing.

Mr. Wong answered no. Those were different uses. Emergency shelter was overnight shelter for the homeless. Transitional shelter provided housing for a maximum of six months to occupants not ready to move into permanent housing.

Ms. Baten-Caswell indicated the likelihood of Palo Alto Unified School District (PAUSD) serving children from an emergency shelter was fairly low.

Mr. Wong agreed as the maximum residency period was a few days.

Barb Mitchell, Palo Alto Unified School District Board Member, asked if the City was in the third or fourth cycle of ABAG Housing Elements.

Mr. Wong stated 2014-2022 was the fifth cycle.

Ms. Mitchell noted the current Housing Element pointed to a statistic of 8.5 percent of land use in Palo Alto was for public facilities. She wondered if that percentage was typical amongst ABAG communities. That could be part of a future discussion. The Committee was not allowed to consider school impacts.

Mayor Scharff clarified that the Committee was allowed to discuss and consider school impacts in the aggregate. The Committee was not allowed to consider them with respect to a specific project.

Ms. Mitchell referenced the statement that the Committee was not allowed to consider school impacts in addressing the regional housing obligations.

Mayor Scharff reported the Committee also was not allowed to consider sewer and traffic impacts in terms of refusing to meet the required number of units.

Ms. Mitchell asked if the purpose for including PAUSD Board Members was to discuss school impacts.

WORKING MINUTES

Mayor Scharff replied yes.

Ms. Mitchell inquired if the time was appropriate for a discussion of school impacts resulting from additional housing on San Antonio Avenue and at the Fry's location.

Chair Holman stated it would be a good time to provide input to Staff.

Ms. Mitchell indicated the Fry's site was projected to yield enough students for an elementary school. An elementary school was not located within the Ventura Corridor. PAUSD would want to be involved in discussions concerning development that would be family friendly and walkable and that would not produce additional traffic.

Ms. Baten-Caswell asked which schools students in the Ventura Corridor attended.

Ms. Mitchell reported currently most students in the Ventura Corridor crossed El Camino Real to attend Juana Briones and Barron Park Elementary Schools.

Ms. Baten-Caswell added Escondido Elementary School.

Ms. Mitchell indicated children in the northern section currently crossed Alma Street to attend Walter Hays Elementary School.

Mayor Scharff asked which neighborhood comprised the northern section.

Ms. Mitchell stated Southgate.

Mayor Scharff recalled that the Southgate neighborhood was built out; therefore, children came from Ventura and south of California Avenue.

Ms. Baten-Caswell remarked that those were today's boundaries.

Mayor Scharff inquired whether the boundaries might change.

Ms. Mitchell reiterated the importance of PAUSD-City communications with respect to alternatives that would benefit future families. Most elementary schools were located on 5 acres. She inquired whether development along the San Antonio Corridor would occur on the southern side of San Antonio Avenue.

Mr. Wong answered yes.

Ms. Mitchell noted children from the southern side flowed to Fairmeadow Elementary School.

WORKING MINUTES

Ms. Baten-Caswell remarked that the City boundary on the south side of San Antonio Avenue crossed in and out of PAUSD's boundary.

Ms. Mitchell reported students located within Palo Alto limits on the south side of San Antonio Avenue would have to cross San Antonio Avenue. She inquired whether development of sites identified for the Housing Element would result in 700 units or more.

Chair Holman reported traditionally sites produced fewer units than zoning allowed.

Ms. Mitchell asked if the lower number resulted from fewer homes being built or from partial development.

Chair Holman explained that historically developers built fewer homes because residents wanted larger units.

Mr. Wong indicated Staff did not utilize maximum density in calculating housing inventory sites. Staff used a realistic capacity of 20 units per acre.

Ms. Gitelman added that HCD provided default densities for use in calculations.

Ms. Mitchell inquired whether that was a change in methodology.

Ms. Gitelman stated it was a change for the cycle just completed.

Ms. Baten-Caswell reported that PAUSD predicted middle schools would be full within three years. Projections predicted middle school enrollment would then decrease and then be full again. PAUSD was searching for solutions. The City's potential rezoning of areas would factor into PAUSD discussions.

Ms. Mitchell referenced the loss of approximately \$4 million in transportation grants if the City opted out of ABAG. The estimated cost of building an elementary school was \$30 million and \$50 million for a middle school. It made sense to consider a broader view of tradeoffs. PAUSD could not count on State funding to build schools.

Ms. Gitelman explained that opting out of ABAG would not eliminate RHNA requirements. The City would still have to comply with the State housing statutes. The choice was not between impacts and grants.

Ms. Mitchell was not proposing the City opt out of ABAG. Sharing communications would allow PAUSD and the City to understand the impacts on both agencies.

WORKING MINUTES

Shirley Nathan could not believe ABAG could dictate housing numbers and impose strict penalties for noncompliance. She appreciated the Council's attempts to fight ABAG; however, the Council needed to take a stronger stand against ABAG. The City did not need the grants so badly that it would allow the City to be transformed because of housing numbers.

Mark Michael, Planning and Transportation Commission, reported the PTC recommended the Council adopt the first set of Ordinances to conform to the 2007-2014 Housing Element. The PTC also had a lively discussion about the California Avenue Area Concept Plan. Simultaneously the PTC was working with advance planning on a review of the draft land-use element. Both of those related to the overall effort by the Council and the community to complete the amendment of the Comprehensive Plan. The PTC discussed gathering comments and feedback for Staff regarding the California Avenue Area Concept Plan, including the potential for housing in the transit oriented district. The PTC hoped the Housing Element update could address the increasing percentage of the senior population, the jobs-housing imbalance, and the large number of people who were entering the workforce and who did not have children. The PTC was mindful of the schedule for work on the Housing Element and would probably constitute a subcommittee to work with Staff.

Chair Holman suggested the PTC be mindful of transparency and community involvement with respect to subcommittee work. The Comprehensive Plan and California Avenue Area Concept Plan would play into the Housing Element.

Ms. Gitelman indicated Staff would solicit Committee suggestions regarding public outreach and begin discussing identification of sites at the next meeting.

Mayor Scharff believed the purpose of having PAUSD Board Members participate on the Committee was to provide feedback. The City needed to know if PAUSD would open a school in Ventura in order to discuss land use.

Ms. Baten-Caswell remarked that PAUSD removed the Fry's site from the planning calendar, because it was not under active discussion.

Mayor Scharff stated it was under active discussion

Ms. Baten-Caswell felt Staff from the City and PAUSD should talk. Ann Dunkin was responsible for PAUSD projections.

Mayor Scharff asked if she should attend Committee meetings.

WORKING MINUTES

Ms. Baten-Caswell suggested Ms. Dunkin's meeting with City Staff would be more beneficial. PAUSD's need for a school in Ventura would depend on development in the area.

Mayor Scharff estimated 1,000 units would be built in the next seven years.

Ms. Gitelman noted about 100-110 units were constructed per year.

Mayor Scharff suggested communication between the City and PAUSD would provide PAUSD with information regarding development of the Fry's site. He had heard that Ventura was not appropriate for a school site. The City would benefit from having that type of information from PAUSD.

Ms. Baten-Caswell could not state that PAUSD performed a study on that site to determine if it would fit PAUSD needs. PAUSD was unsure what its needs would be.

Mayor Scharff stated having PAUSD Board Members as part of the Committee allowed them to learn about and plan for development.

Ms. Mitchell reported PAUSD would build classrooms based on where students lived and when the number of students increased. Information from the City would allow PAUSD to make decisions that would ensure walkable routes to classrooms. She did not believe PAUSD would relinquish its right to repurchase the Ventura property given the character of the Ventura Corridor, unless a more mutually beneficial solution could be found.

Ms. Baten-Caswell agreed real property for school use was the main issue. PAUSD was fortunate to acquire 525 San Antonio Avenue.

Ms. Mitchell indicated the Ventura site was small, 2 1/2-3 acres.

Ms. Baten-Caswell clarified that it contained 4.6 acres.

Ms. Mitchell felt dislocating and disrupting community services was not in the best interest of PAUSD. A lot of return could be had from having common discussions early. Hopefully PAUSD demographic projections would look similar to the City's projections.

Chair Holman hoped to compile information to work with the League of Cities and other communities to push back against ABAG. If the purpose of the Housing Element was to reduce greenhouse gases, then the lack of walkable routes to school defeated the purpose.

Mayor Scharff wanted to be clear in terminology. There was no value in pushing back against ABAG. The value was in pushing back against HCD.

WORKING MINUTES

Pushing back against HCD without receiving negative consequences was a political issue. He requested PAUSD demographers make a presentation to the Committee.

Ms. Baten-Caswell shared a demographic report at the City-School Liaison Committee meeting. She expressed concern that the report was not shared with everyone.

Chair Holman felt the Committee should receive information first hand, because it was considering a specific issue.

Mayor Scharff wished to have as much PAUSD information and input as possible.

Ms. Baten-Caswell reported that PAUSD projections were not based purely on the demographer report. The City would benefit from Ms. Duncan meeting with City Staff prior to making a presentation to the Committee.

Ms. Mitchell noted demographer projections had a shelf life of five years. Overemphasizing the demographer's report could lead to comfort levels and bad decisions, because projections tended to show the line going down when no data was available. The biggest factor in enrollment growth was population growth. She would be cautious about spending a great deal of time on PAUSD demographic reports for City decisions.

Ms. Bate-Caswell understood the City needed to know where PAUSD would open schools; however, PAUSD did not know where to open schools until it knew where housing would be located. If the City invested in transportation corridors, then students would be located there.

Ms. Mitchell indicated the demographer methodology extrapolated past data to the future. When there was a large development, the demographer assumed it will occur again in the future. Ironically the forecast projected major growth in the south cluster despite the City's policy shift to transit-oriented development. City policies were shifting in ways that made the rearview model not only confusing but most likely misleading.

Ms. Baten-Caswell believed rezoning the San Antonio Avenue area would affect the south cluster.

Chair Holman felt the number of houses built per year was not important. The amount of land zoned for housing would be built at some point in time.

Council Member Schmid recalled that the 2007-2014 Housing Element identified 43 percent of units in the south El Camino Real Corridor. That was essentially a projection that two-thirds of new housing units would be

WORKING MINUTES

located in that part of town. There was no elementary school in the Ventura neighborhood. The Council pledged to review traffic on Maybell because of the school commute. Those were signals of the City concerns.

Ms. Mitchell noted a great deal of activity in the west cluster.

Council Member Schmid asked if that began at El Camino Real or Alma Street.

Ms. Baten-Caswell answered El Camino Real.

Ms. Mitchell clarified El Camino Real in the south.

Council Member Schmid indicated a large migration of children occurred every morning during rush hour in that corridor. That was an area of interest for the City.

Chair Holman recalled that a previous update of the Zoning Ordinance allowed more granny units, and it was not well received by the public. She suggested Staff review the historical aspect of granny units.

2. Staff Response to Questions on Housing Methodology and ABAG.

Hillary Gitelman, Planning and Community Environment Director, reported the Regional Housing Mandate Committee (Committee) requested information regarding Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) methodology used for distributing the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) and the relationship between office development, job growth, and housing numbers. The background materials from the Housing Methodology Committee explained in detail how ABAG went through the allocation process. The methodology changed each housing cycle, because statutes provided for the agencies to develop a new methodology. The Committee requested a summary of consequences if the City removed itself from ABAG. Even if the City removed itself from ABAG, it would still have to fulfill RHNA requirements. In addition, the City would not be able to participate in the next discussion of methodology. The City would lose access to some grants from State and regional agencies.

Council Member Schmid referenced statements and a statute regarding methodologies for allocation. In the last cycle, ABAG requested, demanded, and overrode the State Demographer on the housing numbers. The key question was did ABAG do that legally. He questioned whether the Committee should be interested in the relationship between ABAG and the State Demographer.

WORKING MINUTES

Mayor Scharff did not believe that account was accurate. He recalled HCD pushing for a much larger number, and ABAG successfully negotiated to decrease that number. ABAG actually preferred a lower number, because politically it was easier to distribute.

Council Member Schmid stated ABAG appealed to change the methodology and determined a higher number. That was the shift share model the Committee discussed. HCD did not create the numbers; ABAG did. The statute stated the State Demographer must agree to the requested number from the regional body. There ultimately was a meeting of ABAG and the State Demographer. Whether the State Demographer was fully in agreement was a very important point.

Ms. Gitelman recalled from her participation in the Methodology Committee that ABAG staff led the Methodology Committee through development of the methodology, planning around a large number. At the end of the process the number was lower than originally anticipated.

Council Member Schmid agreed that ABAG lowered its number from the shift share model specifically. ABAG increased the State Demographer's number by 60 percent, and then decreased that number by 10 percent.

Ms. Gitelman believed one benefit of ABAG membership was the opportunity to participate in discussions of methodology development.

Chair Holman suggested the Committee could discuss that topic in January or February 2014.

Melissa Baten-Caswell, Palo Alto Unified School District Board Member, was surprised that ABAG tried to make the allocation for all cities equivalent with respect to income levels. That was a superficial method to even things out. Different communities were attractive to different levels of income for various reasons.

Ms. Gitelman believed ABAG was attempting to be fair. Communities with a high concentration of low-income people would not receive a high allocation of low-income housing. That calculation was included in the "fair share" portion of the methodology.

Mayor Scharff noted that in each allocation cycle the Methodology Committee had the right to recommend using or not using the fair share portion.

Ms. Baten-Caswell questioned whether fair share achieved its goal.

WORKING MINUTES

Mayor Scharff was not supporting the process, merely explaining it. Cities with a great deal of low-income housing and public housing advocates strongly supported fair share. It was difficult for small, wealthy cities to impact that process.

Ms. Mitchell inquired about the City's perspective for focusing on HCD rather than ABAG.

Mayor Scharff reported ABAG told the Methodology Committee that it was fighting to lower the allocation number. Many people believed rejecting Plan Bay Area would cause HCD to issue a higher number. HCD determined the allocation and approved Housing Elements. The City should focus on HCD. HCD did not really have accountability. There was a strong push to base the allocation on the Academic Performance Index (API) score. HCD wanted to place most of the housing in cities with good API scores. That was narrowly defeated.

COMMITTEE MEMBER QUESTIONS, COMMENTS, AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Melissa Baten-Caswell, Palo Alto Unified School District School Board Member, clarified that the west cluster began at Alma Street.

Barb Mitchell, Palo Alto Unified School District School Board Member, requested City Staff provide her materials electronically.

Chair Holman indicated Ms. Mitchell should receive an email with a link to all materials.

FUTURE MEETINGS AND AGENDAS

Hillary Gitelman, Planning and Community Environment Director, inquired about the date of the next meeting.

Chair Holman responded January 9, 2014.

Ms. Gitelman reported Staff planned to discuss community outreach and choices around sites; however, she may not be prepared by January 9.

Chair Holman suggested Staff poll for a later date if necessary.

ADJOURNMENT: This meeting was adjourned at 5:36 P.M.