



# City of Palo Alto

## City Council Staff Report

(ID # 6800)

---

**Report Type: Action Items**

**Meeting Date: 5/16/2016**

**Summary Title: Comp Plan 5th Scenario for EIR**

**Title: Direction on the Fifth Scenario Proposed for Analysis in the Comprehensive Plan Update Environmental Impact Report (EIR), Approval of Amendment Number 5 to Placeworks Contract Number C08125506 for the Analysis, and Approval of a related Budget Appropriation**

**From: City Manager**

**Lead Department: Planning and Community Environment**

### **Recommendation**

Staff recommends that the City Council:

- a. Discuss the fifth scenario requested for analysis in the Comprehensive Plan Update Environmental Impact Report (EIR), and provide direction to staff on the specific parameters for evaluation as part of the scenario; and,
- b. Approve Amendment Number 5 to Contract C08125506 with Placeworks to add \$423,814 for a total not to exceed \$2,801,157 for completion of the Comprehensive Plan Update and associated EIR; and,
- c. Amend the Fiscal Year 2016 Budget Appropriation Ordinance for the General Fund by
  - a. Increasing the Planning and Community Environment Department appropriation by \$356,140; and,
  - b. Decreasing the Budget Stabilization Reserve by \$423,814

### **Executive Summary**

The City of Palo Alto has been working on an update to its Comprehensive Plan since 2008 and published a Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) in February 2016 assessing four “scenarios” or alternatives at an equal level of detail, hoping to inform policy direction regarding the location and amount of growth desired by 2030, as well as policies and programs needed to mitigate the impacts of that growth.

On February 22, 2016, the City Council indicated their desire to analyze a fifth scenario in a supplement to the Draft EIR and this evening’s discussion is intended to ensure that parameters of the scenario meet the Council’s expectations. Parameters of the original four scenarios are summarized in Table 1 and some options/alternatives for analysis as part of scenario five are

included in Table 2.

**Table 1. Summary of EIR Scenarios: Population & Employment Parameters (1)**

	Net Change 2015-2030			Resulting Jobs/Housing Balance in 2030 <sup>4</sup>
	Population/Housing	Non-Res Sq. Ft. <sup>2</sup>	Jobs	
<b>1. Business as Usual</b>	6,600/2,720	3.3M	15,480	Jobs/Employed Residents Ratio of 3.20
<b>2. Slowing Growth</b>	6,600/2,720	3M	9,850	Jobs/Employed Residents Ratio of 3.04
<b>3. Housing Tested</b>	8,435/3,545	3.5M	12,755	Jobs/Employed Residents Ratio of 3.03
<b>4. Sustainability Tested</b>	10,455/4,420	4.M	15,480	Jobs/Employed Residents Ratio of 3.04
<b>5. Quality of Life<sup>3</sup></b>	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD

(1) The scenarios also include different ideas for zoning/implementation actions, transportation investments, and sustainability measures as discussed further in the Discussion section below.

(2) This number includes 1.3M sq. ft. that has already been approved at the Stanford Medical Center. The balance of the new nonresidential square footage would be located in areas both inside and outside of the “monitored areas” referenced in Policy L-8 and Map L-6 in the Comp Plan and in areas both inside and outside of the area subject to the interim annual limit of 50,000 square feet new office/R&D space.

(3) Per Council direction on February 22, 2016, this new scenario will have somewhat lower job growth and square footage than scenario 2, will incorporate sustainability policies from scenario 4, and will incorporate an adaptive or performance-based set of mitigation strategies aimed at improving the quality of life in Palo Alto.

(4) The number of employed residents in 2030 is estimated at approximately 48% of total population based on ABAG *Projections 2013*. The ratio of jobs to employed residents in this column assumes a 2014 base of 65,685 people and 95,460 jobs.

Source: Palo Alto Department of Planning & Community Environment, April 2016

To achieve the desired result, which is an improved quality of life for Palo Altans, Scenario 5 would include policies and mitigation strategies to address the impacts of growth (e.g. new traffic that might be generated) and to address quality of life concerns (e.g. traffic calming on neighborhood streets). A performance-based approach would be adopted, with policies and performance standards related to traffic and other quality of life issues.

**Table 2. Some Options for Scenario 5: Population & Employment**

Options <sup>1</sup>	Net Change 2015-2030			Resulting Jobs/Housing Balance in 2030 <sup>5</sup>
	Population/	Non-Res	Jobs <sup>4</sup>	

	Housing <sup>2</sup>	Sq. Ft. <sup>3</sup>		
<b>A. 10% fewer jobs than Scenario 2 &amp; housing equivalent to Scenario 3</b>	8,435/3,546	2.7M	8,868	Jobs/Employed Residents Ratio of 2.93
<b>B. 10% fewer jobs than Scenario 2 &amp; housing equivalent to Scenario 4</b>	10,455/4,418	2.7M	8,868	Jobs/Employed Residents Ratio of 2.85
<b>C. 10% fewer jobs than Scenario 2 &amp; 20% more housing than Scenario 4</b>	12,508/5,301	2.7M	8,868	Jobs/Employed Residents Ratio of 2.78

- (1) Other options can also be considered provided there is a reasonable argument that policies and programs in the Comp Plan Update can result in the desired population and employment numbers.
- (2) On March 21, 2016, a majority of the City Council expressed their desire to pursue removal of housing sites along San Antonio Road and South El Camino Real, and replace those with higher residential densities on sites in Downtown and the California Avenue area. This would result in housing and population projections similar to Scenario 3, as shown in Option A. The Council did not weigh-in on whether they would be interested in exploring higher residential densities and new housing sites in “pedestrian nodes” along the El Camino Real corridor. This is an idea advanced in Scenario 4 and reflected to varying degrees in Option B and C.
- (3) This number includes 1.3M sq. ft. that had already been approved at the Stanford Medical Center. The balance of the new nonresidential square footage would be located in areas both inside and outside of the “monitored areas” referenced in Policy L-8 and Map L-6 in the Comp Plan and in areas both inside and outside of the area subject to the interim annual limit of 50,000 square feet new office/R&D space.
- (4) Per Council direction, the new Scenario 5 should have somewhat lower job growth than Scenario 2, which is already quite low for a 15-year period given the amount of land zoned for non-residential uses and given that SUMC alone is estimated to generate 2,400 jobs. See the Discussion section below for more information.
- (5) The number of employed residents in 2030 is estimated at approximately 48% of total population based on ABAG *Projections 2013*. The ratio of jobs to employed residents in this column assumes a 2014 base of 65,685 people and 95,460 jobs.

Source: Palo Alto Department of Planning & Community Environment, April 2016

Any new housing sites (assumed to achieve the housing numbers in Options B and C above) would be intended to provide a mix of housing for Palo Alto residents, including affordable housing, senior housing, housing for special needs populations, micro units, housing with

preferences for members of the local workforce, and housing with reduced parking, reduced traffic impacts, reduced air emissions, and reduced energy and water use when compared with conventional units. See the Discussion section below for more about the potential policy parameters of Scenario 5.

Analysis of a fifth scenario will require additional consultant support and both a contract amendment and budget adjustment are also requested as part of tonight's agenda item. Importantly, analysis of a fifth scenario will inform later decision making regarding the Comprehensive Plan Update and the Council's direction does not represent a commitment to adopt the fifth scenario once the analysis is complete. The Council will have the opportunity to consider recommendations of the Planning and Transportation Commission (PTC) and the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) prior to making a final decision to adopt the Comprehensive Plan and may select any alternative or scenario that is adequately described and analyzed in the Final EIR.

### **Background:**

The 1998-2010 Palo Alto Comprehensive Plan (Comp Plan) contains the City's official policies on land use and community design, transportation, housing, the natural environment, business and economics, community services, and governance. Its policies apply to both public and private properties. Its focus is on the physical form of the City. The Plan is used by the City Council and PTC to evaluate land use changes and to inform funding and budget decisions. It is used by City Staff to regulate building and development and to make recommendations on projects. It is used by citizens and neighborhood groups to understand the City's long-range plans and proposals for different geographic areas. The Plan provides the basis for the City's development regulations and the foundation for its capital improvement program.

A Comprehensive Plan update was initiated by the City Council in 2006 to focus on preservation of commercial land uses, preservation of retail and community services to support new residential growth, incorporate sustainability concepts, update the housing element and prepare concept area plans for East Meadow Circle and California Avenue/Fry's areas. The planning work began in 2008 when the consulting firm (now called Placeworks) was engaged to assist, and continued at the Planning and Transportation Commission level until the commission submitted their recommendations in April 2014. At that time, the Council endorsed a new framework for the planning process to include broad community engagement, discussion and analysis of alternative futures, cumulative impacts, and mitigation strategies. A community "summit" was held in mid-2015, and a Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) was formed to make recommendations to the City Council on policies and programs for inclusion in the update.

### The EIR Process

Concurrent with ongoing policy deliberations by the CAC and the City Council, the City initiated an environmental review process in conformance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). CEQA is a state law that requires California agencies to identify the significant environmental impacts of their actions and describe feasible measures that can be taken to

avoid or mitigate those impacts. An Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is required by CEQA when an agency determines that a project may have a significant effect on the environment. An EIR evaluates a proposed project's potential impacts on the environment, and recommends mitigation measures or alternatives to reduce or eliminate those impacts. Decision-makers use information in an EIR to help determine whether or not to approve a project. The most common type of EIR assesses potential impacts associated with a specific development project.

The Comprehensive Plan Update is not a specific development project, and instead constitutes an effort by the City of Palo Alto to determine comprehensive land uses, policies, and programs that will guide public and private decision making regarding land use and development issues over the next 15 years. As a result, the City is preparing what is referred to as a program-level EIR, which assesses the potential cumulative impacts of development that may occur during the life of the plan, considers potential alternatives, and identifies mitigation measures that should be adopted to reduce or avoid significant impacts. This is the same level of environmental analysis that was prepared for the exiting Palo Alto 1998-2010 Comprehensive Plan and allows the City to better identify –and mitigate—cumulative impacts of overall growth that may otherwise be missed in a more focused project-specific environmental analysis.

CEQA specifically requires that a program EIR be prepared for plans that govern a continuing program. Although the legally required contents of a program EIR are the same as project specific EIR, a program EIR is more conceptual, with a more general discussion of impacts, alternatives and mitigations. CEQA clearance for subsequent projects can provide more specifics by “tiering” off the program EIR. Depending on the complexity of the project, such CEQA clearances can include Negative Declarations and Supplement EIRs.

An EIR describes the objectives for a proposed project, the location of the project and actions proposed. It evaluates how the existing environment would be changed if the project was approved and provides feasible mitigation measures or alternatives to avoid or reduce significant adverse changes to existing conditions.

A Draft EIR has been prepared for the Comprehensive Plan Update and was circulated for public and agency comments beginning on February 5, 2016 (the comment period is now scheduled to end on June 8, 2016). The Draft EIR describes the ongoing Comp Plan Update and examines four alternatives or “scenarios” at an equal level of detail. By doing so, the EIR was intended to inform decision-making and not to prescribe a specific outcome. On February 21, 2016, the City Council requested that a fifth alternative or “scenario” be defined, analyzed, and circulated for public review prior to preparation and certification of a Final EIR. See below for more information on the four scenarios in the Draft EIR and the Council's request for a fifth scenario.

### The CAC Process

The Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) is meeting monthly to craft their recommendations for policies and programs for each element of the Comprehensive Plan. Subcommittees of the full CAC meet between the full committee meetings, and have proved instrumental in reaching

consensus where feasible, and in articulating differences of opinion where these need to be elevated to the full committee or the City Council.

Members of the CAC are making use of recommendations forwarded by the Planning and Transportation Commission (PTC) in 2014, and more recent public input submitted via the “digital commenter” tool on the City’s website. The Sustainability Subcommittee is also using the draft Sustainability/Climate Action Plan (SCAP) as a source document to recommend complimentary policies and programs for inclusion in the Comp Plan (which is expected to incorporate the S/CAP by reference).

The Committee’s work on the Community Services & Facilities Element was reviewed by the City Council this spring, and their work on the Transportation Element will be reviewed by the City Council shortly. The CAC’s work on the Land Use and Community Design Element is taking more time than originally anticipated and may be affected by the Council’s deliberations on Scenario 5. An updated schedule of the CAC process, including associated meetings of the City Council and other boards/commissions is included as Attachment C.

#### The SCAP Process & Coordination with the Comp Plan Update

On April 18, 2016 the City Council considered the draft Sustainability and Climate Action Plan (S/CAP) and endorsed its goal of reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions to 80% below 1990 levels by 2030, which is well ahead of the State’s goal of 80% reductions by 2050. The Council also indicated their support for the guiding principles of the S/CAP and their desire for better coordination between the SCAP and the Comp Plan Update.

The Comp Plan Draft EIR includes adoption of the S/CAP as a mitigation strategy, and the Comp Plan CAC is working through a Sustainability Subcommittee to ensure that principles of sustainability are incorporated throughout the relevant elements of the Comp Plan. More detail on this effort and its outcomes will be shared with the City Council at a later date.

### **Discussion**

As noted above, public agencies are required by CEQA to conduct environmental review to identify significant environmental impacts and adopt feasible mitigation prior to making a final decision on a proposed project. This law ensures that decision-makers and the public understand the implications of agency decisions in advance and consider alternatives that would reduce or eliminate significant environmental impacts. The current CEQA process is being used to help advance the Comprehensive Plan Update by assessing high-level planning scenarios that illustrate or test various possible policy decisions and the Draft EIR is unusual in that it evaluates the alternatives at an equal level of detail. The four scenarios included in the Draft EIR were developed based on public workshops in the summer of 2014 and are described briefly below.

#### The Four Scenarios in the Draft EIR

At the core of the Draft EIR's analysis are four high level planning scenarios that were designed to test a range of possible land-use, transportation, jobs and housing choices that must be made before the Comprehensive Plan Update is completed, and to show what the impacts of those possible choices would be.

The four scenarios are:

1. "Business As Usual" – the "business as usual" scenario shows the results if the City continued to operate under the existing Comprehensive Plan with no changes to goals, policies and programs. Any new housing built would be constructed under existing zoning and no innovations in housing or new approaches to address the high cost of housing would be explored. No new growth management measures are anticipated, and any transit or traffic improvements would come from the existing infrastructure plan for the City. This scenario uses a local forecast of housing growth based on the City's past performance (a long term average of about 150 new dwelling units per year), and ABAG's 2013 projection of job growth.
2. Scenario Two, or the "Growth Slowed" Scenario, would slow the pace of job growth when compared with Scenario One by moderating the pace of office/R&D development throughout the city. Scenario Two would also ensure that the modest amount of housing growth expected under Scenario One would be built-out as small units and other housing types appropriate for seniors and the Palo Alto workforce. Transportation investments in this scenario would include implementation of the County's expressway plan.
3. Scenario Three, or the "Housing Reconsidered" Scenario, would implement a growth management regime similar to the interim annual limit on office/R&D adopted by the City Council in 2015 for the fastest changing areas of the City and would eliminate housing sites along San Antonio and South El Camino. In place of these housing sites, Scenario 3 would increase housing densities on sites Downtown, near California Avenue, and in other locations in the City close to transit and services. Policies, regulations, and incentives would be designed to ensure smaller units for the working professional and senior populations of the City. Transportation investments would include grade separating the Caltrain crossings at Meadow and Charleston by placing the railroad tracks in a trench.
4. Scenario Four, or the "Sustainability Tested" Scenario, assumes the most growth in housing and employment, consistent with ABAG projections. Rather than moderating the pace of development, this scenario would seek to limit the impacts of development. Potential policies and regulations would be enacted to advance sustainability objectives, including free transit passes for residents in transit-served areas, achieving LEED platinum certification for new development, maximizing local solar energy production, foregoing new natural gas hookups, and utilizing drought-tolerant landscaping.

Transportation investments would include grade separating the Caltrain crossings at Meadow and Charleston by placing the railroad tracks in a trench, and incorporating mix flow bus rapid transit on El Camino Real (with curbside stations and queue jumping for transit vehicles).

### The Fifth Scenario

The Draft EIR anticipated that the City Council might ultimately want to mix and match components of the four scenarios, or pursue a hybrid of two or more. On February 22, 2016, the City Council indicated their desire to craft a fifth scenario for analysis and public review prior to proceeding to a Final EIR.

The Council's motion on February 22, 2016 is excerpted below, and made it clear that the Council would like to define a "quality of life" scenario that has less job growth and less non-residential square footage than Scenario 2, that incorporates sustainability measures from Scenario 4 in alignment with the S/CAP, and that uses an adaptive or performance-based approach to ensure that impacts of growth are avoided to the extent feasible. The Council also requested consideration of ways to possibly regulate employment densities (i.e. the number of workers per sq. foot).

### **Figure 3. February 22, 2016 City Council Motion Restated**

*Direct Staff to develop a "fifth scenario" for analysis in a supplement to the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) that:*

- A. Adds the sustainability options from the current scenarios, which reduce impacts, including traffic, greenhouse gas impacts, noise, etc.; and*
- B. Includes further mitigations along with prospective mitigation enforcement measures for a scenario that improves the quality of life in Palo Alto by mitigating the impacts of future growth and development; and*
- C. Wherever possible, the scenario will use Palo Alto specific data; and*
- D. Where possible to integrate the Sustainability Climate Action Plan (S/CAP) in the fifth scenario; and*
- E. Evaluate mechanisms for regulating employment densities in existing buildings; and*
- F. Evaluate lower General Office and R/D development than Scenario 2; and*
- G. Evaluate transportation and parking regulation triggers if mitigation measures are failing or exceeding expectations.*

The following discussion addresses five characteristics of the Fifth Scenario consistent with this motion: (1) Net change in employment & non-residential development 2015-2030; (2) Net change in population and housing 2015-2030; (3) Potential zoning changes to accomplish these levels of development; (4) Infrastructure investments; (5) Potential sustainability measures to reduce impacts; and (6) Other potential performance or mitigation measures to address the impacts of development.

The EIR will assess the impacts of the scenario, including the level of growth assumed as well as

the principal investments and policy parameters that are articulated as part of the scenario. The proposed contract amendment in Attachment A provides for an analysis of the scenario with and without mitigation measures and other performance measures or strategies to reduce or eliminate physical impacts and preserve or improve quality of life.

### **1. Jobs & Sq. Ft.**

The City Council has articulated their desire for lower office/R&D development and employment than assumed in Scenario 2 and the options presented in Table 2, above, suggest or 10% fewer jobs and square footage than in Scenario 2 (i.e. a total of 8,868 new jobs and 2.8M new sq. ft.).

With this projection of future job growth, Palo Alto would see the 2,400 jobs anticipated as part of the SUMC as well as an average of 431 jobs per year over the 15 year life of the Comp Plan. This seems low given the amount of land zoned for non-residential uses and existing building space in use for employment-generating uses in the City.

With the projected increase in new square footage, Palo Alto would see completion of the 1.3M sq. ft. approved as part of the SUMC project, plus an average of 93,000 sq. ft. in additional non-residential square footage per year. New non-residential square footage in areas shown on Comp Plan Map L-6 are subject to the square footage cap in Comp Plan Policy L-8, and new office/R&D square footage would be limited to 50,000 square feet in areas subject to the City's interim annual limit on Office/R&D uses if this program were continued after the two-year trial.

[Note that new jobs and new non-residential square footage are not proportionally related because new jobs can be added in existing as well as new building space. Generally, the rate of job growth and employment densities change cyclically, with more jobs and higher densities in good economic times, and fewer jobs in economic downturns. See the Zoning section below for a discussion of regulating employment densities.]

### **2. Population & Housing**

A majority of the City Council expressed their desire to pursue removal of housing sites along San Antonio Road and South El Camino Real, and replace those with higher residential densities on sites in Downtown and the California Avenue area. This would result in housing and population projections consistent with Scenario 3, which is consistent with Option A in Table 2, above.

The Council did not weigh-in on whether they would be interested in exploring higher residential densities and new housing sites in "pedestrian nodes" along the El Camino Real corridor. This is an idea advanced in Scenario 4 and reflected to varying degrees in Option B and C above, which also assume rezoning to convert non-residential density (floor area ratio or FAR) to residential density in some areas of the City. (See below for more on potential zoning changes for evaluation as part of Scenario 5.)

At the Council’s discussions about Scenario 5 (February 22) and housing policies generally (March 21), the City Council expressed its interest in stimulating workforce housing (i.e. housing for teachers, fire fighters, and others who work in Palo Alto) and testing the idea of micro-units with reduced parking and other sustainability measures (bike share/car share, net zero energy, all electric buildings, etc.). These and other housing types (accessory dwelling units, multifamily affordable units, cohousing, etc.) can be facilitated via changes to the City’s zoning regulations and/or use of the City’s Below Market Rate (BMR) housing program and Council has requested that staff consider actions that might be taken before the Comprehensive Plan Update.

### 3. Zoning Changes

Goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan Update will be implemented through programs, some of which will support specific changes in the City’s zoning ordinance. The four EIR scenarios recognize this fact by suggesting and evaluating zoning code amendments that could accompany the Comp Plan Update. These suggested amendments are not meant to be prescriptive, but generally outline actions that could be taken to implement the policy parameters of each scenario.

Similarly, the evaluation of Scenario 5 can test a variety of zoning amendments to achieve the population/housing and employment/square footage numbers discussed above. Suggestions are included in Table 4, below. City Council input on potential additions and subtractions for Scenario 5 would be helpful.

**Table 4. Possible Zoning Code Amendments for Scenarios 5**

Proposed Zoning Code Amendments <sup>a</sup>	Scenarios				
	1	2	3	4	5 <sup>a</sup>
Planned Community (PC) zoning district provisions would be reformed.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Strategies to preserve retail would be enhanced for the city’s neighborhoods.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Incentives would be considered for small lot consolidation along El Camino Real.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
A Conditional Use Permit (CUP) would be required for new office and R&D uses in order to regulate employment densities.		✓	✓	✓	
An alternate mechanism would be explored for moderating employment densities, either through regulation or revenue collection (See Discussion below.)					✓
Allowable commercial densities in the Downtown (CD zoning District) would be reduced and replaced with residential densities.		✓	✓	✓	✓
In the Neighborhood Commercial (CN) and Service Commercial (CS) districts, non-retail portions of allowable commercial floor area ratios (FARs) would be reduced and replaced with residential use.		✓	✓		✓
In the Community Commercial 2 (CC-2) district, the allowable 2.0 FAR would be reduced to an FAR of 1.5 near California Avenue.		✓	✓		

Proposed Zoning Code Amendments <sup>a</sup>	Scenarios				
	1	2	3	4	5 <sup>a</sup>
In the Community Commercial 2 (CC-2) district, commercial FAR would be somewhat reduced and replaced with residential FAR.					✓
Modest exceptions to the City's 50-foot height limit would be permitted for residential uses only (including projects with ground floor retail and residences above).			✓	✓	✓
Allowable residential densities would be increased downtown, possibly by adding the PTOD <sup>b</sup> zoning designation to downtown and streamlining the permitting process to allow for residential development in the PTOD zone by right.			✓	✓	✓
Allowable residential densities would be increased on the El Camino Corridor, possibly by adding the PTOD <sup>b</sup> zoning designation to pedestrian "nodes" along the corridor with modified regulations to encourage use of the designation.				✓	✓
Performance-based zoning strategies would be adopted to minimize impacts of new market rate housing and new non-residential development by requiring mitigation, monitoring, and enforcement. Code changes could also address housing types and preferences.					✓
(a)The suggested zoning changes listed here do not include all of the sustainability measures or mitigation measures which are listed separately below. (b) The Pedestrian and Transit-Oriented Development (PTOD) combining zoning district is intended to allow higher density residential dwellings on commercial, industrial, and multi-family parcels within a walkable distance of Caltrain stations, while protecting low density residential parcels and parcels with historical resources.					

Source: Comp Plan Update Draft EIR, February 2016 and Palo Alto Department of Planning & Community Environment, April 2016

The City Council requested staff evaluate mechanisms for regulating employment densities and this concept was originally evaluated as part of EIR scenarios 2-4 by assuming a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) would be required for new office/R&D development, allowing the City to impose a condition to impose a limit of 250 sq. ft. per worker or something similar.

This approach would address the issue prospectively (i.e. on a going forward basis as new uses are approved), and would not address some Councilmembers' interests in regulating employment densities in existing uses. It would also create enforcement challenges for this City, likely necessitating additional enforcement staff as the number of new uses subject to employment density conditions increases over time.

To regulate employment densities in existing uses would be more difficult. In general, there are a range of possible methods to regulate employment density<sup>1</sup>, including:

<sup>1</sup> Establishing occupancy limits for housing units, restricting housing based on school impacts, and limiting development of housing units in general is legally challenging. The State Housing and Community Development Department (HCD), the Building Industry Association (BIA) and affordable housing advocates aggressively monitor such restrictions, and litigation would be very likely in the current housing environment.

- Building Code regulations. The Building Code contains maximum occupancy densities. These densities are based primarily on ensuring safe egress in case of fire or other disaster. Occupancy densities vary by use and the occupancy density for business and industrial uses are 100 gross square feet per occupant. The Building Code contains uniform standards and to alter these standards the City must make local “climactic, geographical or topographical” findings. Palo Alto has an existing permitting scheme called “use and occupancy which could provide a practical enforcement mechanism for either building permit occupancy limits or related regulatory “use” requirements discussed below.
- Zoning – permitted uses. Like most cities Palo Alto’s zoning categories currently do not contain occupancy limits. While posing some practical enforcement challenges, it is legally possible to incorporate occupancy limits into either permitted or conditionally permitted use classifications (see below).
- Zoning – conditional use permits. It is possible to allow a base level of zoning density as a matter of right and require some form of discretionary permits (such as a conditional use permit) for increased density.
- Zoning – performance based zoning. This is a relatively new concept which specifies the goals (i.e. number of jobs, houses, car trips, etc.) and allows the applicant to propose a qualifying building. See <http://www.citylab.com/housing/2014/08/braving-the-new-world-of-performance-based-zoning/375926/>.
- Zoning – transportation demand management strategies. Since concerns about employee density is generally tied to traffic impacts, many cities attempt to regulate the direct traffic impacts. Transportation demand management (TDM) programs can be structured in a variety of ways, including payment of impact fees (supported by a nexus study linking high employment densities to traffic impacts) and mandatory participation in the newly established TMA. While the primary focus of TDM strategies is to reduce Single Occupancy Vehicle (SOV) trips of new development, many programs also have some incidental benefit of reducing SOV trips of existing development (i.e. establishment of shuttles that can be used by other neighboring businesses).
- Development Agreements. These allow more customized parcel specific regulations.
- Head count tax/Impact Fee. Most of the zoning methods regulate new development. It is more difficult to regulate existing businesses. One way to regulate existing businesses is to set a head count tax at a level designed to disincentive density.

#### **4. Infrastructure Investments**

The Comprehensive Plan Update will identify infrastructure investments expected to occur over the next 15 years to the extent feasible and will rely on the City’s adopted infrastructure plan as a base document. The planning scenarios evaluated in the program-level EIR provide an opportunity to evaluate other potential transportation infrastructure projects, and these are included in Table 5, below. City Council input on potential additions and subtractions for Scenario 5 would be appreciated.

**Table 5. Possible Infrastructure Investments for Scenario 5**

Summary of Infrastructure Investments <sup>a</sup>	Scenarios				
	1	2	3	4	5 <sup>a</sup>
New Public Safety Building	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Bicycle Bridge over US 101	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Bicycle/Pedestrian Plan Implementation Projects	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Byxbee Park	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
California Avenue Parking Garage	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Downtown Parking Garage	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Fire Stations	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
County Expressway Plan Implementation		✓			
Grade separation of Caltrain in a trench below Charleston and Meadow; other improvements along the corridor.			✓	✓	✓
Bus Rapid Transit on El Camino Real in mixed-flow lanes with the addition of queue jumping and curbside stations.				✓	✓
(a) This list is not a complete listing of the City's infrastructure plan, but includes those investments highlighted in Draft EIR Scenarios 1-4 as well as others that may be appropriate for highlighting in Scenario 5. There may be some overlap between the suggested investments listed here and the sustainability measures and performance/mitigation measures referenced later.					

Source: Comp Plan Update Draft EIR, February 2016 and Palo Alto Department of Planning & Community Environment, April 2016

## 5. Sustainability Measures

On April 18, 2016, the City Council indicated their support for the draft SCAP goal of reducing GHG Emissions 80% below 1990 levels by 2030 (twenty years ahead of the State's goal) and requested clarity on how the Comp Plan Update and the SCAP will be integrated. As noted earlier, a Sustainability subcommittee of the Comp Plan CAC is assisting with this effort to ensure that each element of the Comp Plan Update includes policies and programs that are supportive of the SCAP goal and consistent with its principles and strategies. At the end of the day, the two plans are intended to be coordinated and complimentary. Also, by incorporating the SCAP by reference, the Comp Plan will indicate the City's commitment to the plan, yet still allow it to be updated as needed over time without the need for a Comprehensive Plan amendment.

While SCAP principles and strategies have not been fully defined as of yet, Table 6 acknowledges the relationship between the two plans.

**Table 6. Possible Sustainability Measures for Scenarios 5**

Summary of Sustainability Measures <sup>a</sup>	Scenarios				
	1	2	3	4	5 <sup>a</sup>
<b>Mobility</b>					
Paid transit passes for employees in workplaces with over 50 employees (portion of SCAP Strategy F-INC-1)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Employer incentives for carpooling and bicycling (SCAP Strategy F-FAC-3.4)		✓	✓	✓	✓
Unbundled parking costs for multi-family units (portion of SCAP Strategy T-INC-2)			✓	✓	✓

Summary of Sustainability Measures <sup>a</sup>	Scenarios				
	1	2	3	4	5 <sup>a</sup>
Parking charge program for existing workplaces with over 50 employees (portion of SCAP Strategy T-INC-2)				✓	✓
Paid parking in Downtown and California Avenue areas (portion of SCAP Strategy T-INC-2)				✓	✓
Free transit passes for all Palo Alto residents in transit-accessible areas (portion of SCAP Strategy F-INC-1)				✓	✓
Adoption of the SCAP goal of a 80% reduction in GHG emissions by 2030 and alignment of the Comprehensive Plan Update with SCAP principles. Inclusion of Comprehensive Plan policies and programs that are supportive of the refinement and furtherance of SCAP strategies.					✓
(a)The suggested sustainability measures listed here do not include every strategy from the draft SCAP, which is still a work in progress. This list also does not include mitigation measures which are listed separately below, even though many address topics related to sustainability (for example, transportation mitigation to limit and off-set new trips).					

Source: Comp Plan Update Draft EIR, February 2016; Draft SCAP, April 2016, and Palo Alto Department of Planning & Community Environment, April 2016

## 6. Performance/Mitigation Measures

All of the EIR scenarios will require mitigation measures to address significant environmental impacts and these can be the source of performance measures analyzed as part of Scenario 5. For example, Mitigation Measure TRANS1a, establishes a framework for imposing a “no net new trips” requirement on market rate housing, office/R&D development, and other uses. The measure reads:

**TRANS-1a:** Adopt a programmatic approach to reducing traffic with the goal of achieving no net increase in peak period motor vehicle trips from new development, with an exception for uses that directly contribute to the neighborhood character and diversity of Palo Alto (such as ground floor retail and below market rate housing). The program should, at a minimum:

- Require new development projects to prepare and implement a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Plan to achieve the following reduction in peak period motor vehicle trips from the rates included in the Institute of Transportation Engineers’ *Trip Generation Manual* for the appropriate land use category. These reductions are deemed aggressive, yet feasible, for the districts indicated.
  - 45 percent reduction in the Downtown district
  - 35 percent reduction in the California Avenue area
  - 30 percent reduction in the Stanford Research Park
  - 30 percent reduction in the El Camino Real Corridor
  - 20 percent reduction in other areas of the city

TDM Plans must be approved by the City and monitored by the property owner on an annual basis. The Plans must contain enforcement mechanisms or penalties that accrue if targets are not met.

- Require new development projects to offset remaining peak period motor vehicle trips through one of the following methods:
  - By directly contracting with another property owner or organization to reduce trips generated from another site; or
  - By paying an annual fee to the City for use in reducing motor vehicle trips to the extent feasible through the provision of transit services, carpool/rideshare incentives, bicycle lanes, and other similar programs and improvements.

A full list of EIR mitigation measures needed for Scenarios 2-4 is included in Attachment B. The analysis of Scenario 5 will determine whether these or other measures are *required* for Scenario 5, however the City Council's initial input on potential additions and subtractions for inclusion as part of Scenario 5 would be appreciated.

### **Timeline/Next Steps**

The City Council will hold a public hearing on the Draft EIR on June 6, 2016 and the public comment period on the Draft EIR will close on June 8, 2016. At that time, all of the public comments received will be posted on the City's website and be provided to the City Council and the City's consultant will begin an analysis of the Fifth Scenario, as defined based on the Council's direction this evening.

Analysis of the 5<sup>th</sup> scenario is expected to be completed later this year, after which time the analysis will be circulated for public review and comment as a supplement to the Draft EIR. The City will prepare formal written responses to all substantive comments received on the Draft EIR and on the analysis of the 5<sup>th</sup> scenario in the form of a Final EIR. The City Council is required to review and certify the FEIR prior to taking action on the Comprehensive Plan Update.

A current schedule for the Comp Plan Update, including meetings of the CAC and the City Council, is provided as Attachment C. As noted earlier, this schedule reflects the CAC's need for additional time to finalize drafts of the Transportation and Land Use/Community Design elements for City Council review.

### **Resource Impacts**

The Fiscal Year 2016 Adopted Operating Budget did not anticipate a 5<sup>th</sup> scenario. Staff requests approval of a contract amendment and a budget appropriation of \$423,814 to provide the necessary funds to cover the costs of this additional work. Additional detail is provided in Table 7, below.

### **Table 7. Summary of Comp Plan Consultant Costs, Including the Requested Contract Amendment**

<b>Summary Breakdown</b>	<b>Cost</b>
Original Contract total w/Contingency (June 1, 2008)	\$849,981
Amendment #1 w/Contingency which included additional work (June 28, 2013): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Completion of the Cal Ave Concept Area Plan</li> <li>• Preparation of the Citywide Travel Demand Forecasting Model</li> <li>• Creation of the Comp Plan Amendment Implementation Matrix</li> <li>• Additional website administration</li> </ul>	\$290,019
Amendment #2 (March 3, 2014) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Preparation of “Our Plan so Far” and “Notice of Preparation”</li> <li>• Scoping and Alternatives Development</li> </ul>	\$597,206
Amendment #3 (March 2, 2015) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fiscal Analysis study</li> </ul>	\$157,525
Amendment #4 (September 15, 2015) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Citizen Advisory Committee support</li> <li>• Comp Plan Preparation and Adoption</li> <li>• Open Sourcing the Comp Plan</li> <li>• Earth Day Report Consultation</li> <li>• Council meeting support</li> <li>• Contract management support, labor and reimbursable expenses</li> </ul>	\$482,612
Amendment #5 w/contingency <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Creation and Analysis of the Fifth Scenario</li> <li>• Quality of Life/Fully Mitigated Fifth Scenario</li> <li>• Modeling of No-Growth Scenario</li> <li>• Additional Fiscal Analysis</li> <li>• Increased Staff Support</li> </ul>	\$394,350
Amendment #5 with Optional Task <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Optional Task (Infrastructure Financing Expenses)</li> </ul>	\$423,814
Revised Contract Grand Total	\$2,771,693
Revised Contract Grand Total with Optional Task	\$2,801,157

Source: Planning & Community Environment, April 2016

Costs associated with maintaining the Comp Plan are partially off-set via a surcharge on permits and planning entitlements issued in Palo Alto. In FY15, these revenues totaled \$256,690.

### **Environmental Review**

This evening's requested actions involve direction to staff and contract/budget decisions necessary to complete the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) on the Comp Plan Update. A Final EIR must be prepared and certified before adoption of the final Comp Plan Update.

#### **Attachments:**

- Attachment A: PlaceWorks, Inc. Contract #C08125506 Amendment 5 (PDF)
- Attachment B: Mitigation Measures (DOCX)
- Attachment C: Comp. Plan Update Revised Schedule (DOCX)



**AMENDMENT NO. 5 TO CONTRACT NO. C08125506  
BETWEEN THE CITY OF PALO ALTO AND PLACEWORKS, INC.,**

This Amendment No. 5 (“Fifth Amendment”) to Contract No. C08125506 (“Contract”) is entered into May 16, 2015 (“Amendment Effective Date”), by and between the CITY OF PALO ALTO, a California chartered municipal corporation (“CITY”), and PLACEWORKS, INC., located at 3 MacArthur Place, Suite 1100, Santa Ana, California, 92707 (“CONSULTANT”)

**RECITALS:**

A. The Contract dated effective June 1, 2008 was entered into between the Parties for Consultant to provide planning services for the development of a work plan to amend the existing comprehensive plan to a planning horizon no later than year 2020.

B. On September 15, 2015 the parties entered into Amendment No. 4 to increase the compensation by \$482,612.00 from \$1,894,731.00 to 2,377,343.00 for additional services as specified in Exhibit “A4” Additional Scope of Services.

C. On March 2, 2015 the parties entered into Amendment No. 3 to change the CONSULTANT’s name from DESIGN COMMUNITY & ENVIRONMENT, INC., a California corporation, located 1625 Shattuck Avenue. Suite 300, Berkeley, CA. 94709 to PLACEWORKS, INC., a California corporation, located at 3 MacArthur Place, Suite 1100, Santa Ana, California, 92707. Amendment No. 3 also increased the “Not to Exceed Compensation” by \$157,525.00 from \$1,737,206.00 to \$1,894,731.00, for additional services as specified in Exhibit “A3” Additional Scope of Services.

D. On March 3, 2014 the parties entered into Amendment No. 2 to extend the term to June 30, 2016 and increase the compensation to \$1,737,206.00 for additional services as specified in Exhibit “A1”.

E. On June 28, 2013 the parties entered into Amendment No. 1 to extend the term to June 30, 2014 and increase the compensation to \$1,124,073.00 for additional services as specified in Exhibit “A1”.

F. CITY intends to extend the term and increase the compensation by \$423,814.00 from \$2,377,343.00 to \$2,801,157.00 for additional services as specified in Exhibit “A5” Additional Scope of Services.

G. To accomplish this purpose, the Parties wish to amend the Contract.

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the covenants, terms, conditions, and provisions of this Fourth Amendment, the Parties agree:

SECTION 1. Section 2. TERM is hereby amended to read as follows:

**“SECTION 2. TERM.**

The term of this Agreement shall be from the date of its full execution through June 30, 2017 unless terminated earlier pursuant to Section 19 of this Agreement.”

SECTION 2. Section 4. COMPENSATION is hereby amended to read as follows:

**“SECTION 4. NOT TO EXCEED COMPENSATION.** The compensation to be paid to CONSULTANT for performance of the Services described in Exhibits “A”, “A1”, “A2”, “A3”, “A4” & “A5”, including both payment for professional services and reimbursable expenses, shall not exceed Two Million Eight Hundred One Thousand One Hundred Fifty Seven Dollars (\$2,801,157.00) The applicable rates and schedule of payment are set out in Exhibit “C5”, entitled “RATE SCHEDULE,” which is attached to and made a part of this Agreement.

Additional Services, if any, shall be authorized in accordance with and subject to the provisions of Exhibit “C”. CONSULTANT shall not receive any compensation for Additional Services performed without the prior written authorization of CITY. Additional Services shall mean any work that is determined by CITY to be necessary for the proper completion of the Project, but which is not included within the Scope of Services described in Exhibits “A”, “A1”, “A2”, “A3”, “A4” & “A5”

SECTION 3. The following exhibits to the Contract are hereby amended to read as set forth in the attachment(s) to this Third Amendment, which are incorporated in full by this reference:

- a. Exhibit “A5” entitled “SCOPE OF SERVICES”
- b. Exhibit “C” entitled “COMPENSATION”
- c. Exhibit “C6” entitled “RATE SCHEDULE FOR AMENDMENT NO. 5”

SECTION 4. Except as herein modified, all other provisions of the Contract, including any exhibits and subsequent amendments thereto, shall remain in full force and effect.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Parties have by their duly authorized representatives executed this First Amendment on the Amendment Effective Date.

**CITY OF PALO ALTO**

**PLACEWORKS, INC**

DocuSigned by:  
*David Early*  
45D4F370141B4B8...

David Early

**APPROVED AS TO FORM:**

**ATTACHMENTS:**

Exhibit "A5" "SCOPE OF SERVICES"

Exhibit "C" "COMPENSATION"

Exhibit "C6" "RATE SCHEDULE"

**EXHIBIT A5  
ADDITIONAL SCOPE OF WORK**

CONSULTANT shall prepare an environmental analysis of a fifth planning scenario for the Comprehensive Plan Update. The analysis will supplement the Comprehensive Plan Update Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) published on February 5, 2015. Specifically, CONSULTANT shall:

**I. Creation and Analysis of the Fifth Scenario**

CONSULTANT shall work with CITY staff to define the fifth scenario. This work will include:

**a. Definition of the Fifth Scenario**

CONSULTANT shall work with CITY staff to development 2030 population, housing, and employment projections. This scope of work includes eight (8) hours for buildout projections. CONSULTANT shall prepare a project description of the fifth scenario for inclusion in the new environmental analysis document, reflecting input from the City Council received at Council meetings in January through the date of this contract amendment, including a decrease in jobs below Scenario 2. This scope of work includes two rounds of revision to incorporate comments from CITY staff. During each round of review on the project description, CITY staff shall provide one consolidated set of internally-reconciled. In addition to the overall numbers, CONSULTANT staff will work closely with CITY staff to allocate development projections to traffic analysis zones within the Sphere of Influence (SOI). This step will also account for development projections in the SOI, outside the City limits, based on potential future projects that were not known prior to issuance of the NOP for the Comprehensive Plan Draft EIR. CONSULTANT will hold up to four (4) conference calls with CITY staff while conducting the tasks described above.

**b. Incorporation of the Sustainability/Climate Action Plan**

CONSULTANT will also incorporate the Sustainability/Climate Action Plan (S/CAP) into the project description.

**c. Environmental Setting**

This scope of work assumes that the environmental setting (existing conditions and regulatory framework) information from the Draft EIR will be incorporated by reference in the new analysis document. CONSULTANT will review the Draft EIR to ensure that the environmental setting is sufficient to prepare the analysis of the new analysis. This scope of work assumes that the environmental setting of the Draft EIR is sufficient and CONSULTANT will not conduct new existing conditions or regulatory framework research.

**d. Impact Analyses**

The new analysis document shall cover the same thresholds of significance used in the Draft EIR. CONSULTANT shall conduct the following tasks for the impact analysis

of the fifth scenario and S/CAP in the new analysis document:

i. **Traffic and Transportation.**

i. **Modeling.** Using the Palo Alto 2030 travel demand forecasting model, CONSULTANT will develop traffic projections for the year 2030 under the fifth scenario using the same methodology that was used for the four scenarios already included in the Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA). The following parameters will be projected for the new scenario:

- a. Mode Share. Trips to be made by Drive Alone, Shared Ride, Transit, Bicycle, and Walking will be projected. Transit Boardings and Transit Trips.
- b. Average Daily Traffic (ADT). CONSULTANT will provide ADT for the same 13 roadway segments that were included in the previous draft of the TIA.
- c. Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) by Directional Orientation. This information will be provided for both Palo Alto only and for Palo Alto and its Sphere of Influence.
- d. Vehicle Miles Traveled Per Capita. This information will be provided for both Palo Alto only and for Palo Alto and its Sphere of Influence.
- e. Turning Movement Counts for each of the Study Intersections. This data will serve as input to the motor vehicle level of service analysis to be conducted for the same 14 study intersections that were analyzed in the previous draft of the TIA.
- f. Additional Trips on the Study Freeway Segments and Ramps. The additional trips generated by the new scenario on the same freeway segments and interchange ramps that were included in the previous draft of the TIA will be projected.

ii. **Transportation Impact Analysis.** The fifth scenario will be presented in comparison to existing conditions and to the other four scenarios on all tables and in the discussion of each potential impact. Discussion of mitigation measures proposed for significant impacts will also be revised to incorporate the fifth scenario. The fifth scenario will be evaluated against the same thresholds of significance used in the Draft EIR TIA.

ii. **Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions.** CONSULTANT will use the traffic modeling and buildout projections for the fifth scenario to conduct an additional model run to assess air quality and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions.

iii. **Noise.** CONSULTANT will use the traffic modeling and buildout projections for the fifth scenario to model traffic noise impacts. CONSULTANT will update contour mapping in GIS as needed to reflect the fifth scenario.

iv. **Other CEQA Topics.** The new analysis document will also cover the following environmental topics:

- i. Aesthetics
- ii. Biological Resources
- iii. Cultural Resources
- iv. Geology, Soils, and Seismicity
- v. Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- vi. Land Use and Planning
- vii. Population and Housing
- viii. Public Services
- ix. Utilities and Service Systems

e. **Administrative Draft Analysis Document**

CONSULTANT shall submit an Administrative Draft document for CITY staff review and comment. The Administrative Draft document will be submitted electronically. CITY staff shall provide one consolidated set of internally-reconciled comments on the Administrative Draft.

f. **Screencheck Draft Analysis Document**

CONSULTANT shall incorporate comments from CITY staff to prepare a Screencheck Draft document for CITY staff review and comment. The Screencheck Draft document will be submitted electronically. CITY staff shall provide one consolidated set of internally-reconciled comments on the Screencheck Draft. CITY staff comments on the Screencheck Draft shall be limited to minor edits, and shall not affect the conclusions of the analysis.

g. **Public Review Draft Analysis Document**

CONSULTANT shall incorporate comments from CITY staff to prepare a Public Review document for publication. CONSULTANT shall produce and ship the Notice of Completion, 15 copies of the report summaries, and 15 CDs containing the entire document to the State Clearinghouse. CONSULTANT shall also produce up to 60 hard copies for CITY. This scope of work includes an expense allowance for these copies. If the actual cost of production costs more than this allowance, the cost of production will be billed at actual expense.

h. **Public Comment Period**

CONSULTANT shall attend two hearings to hear public comments on the new analysis document.

i. **Response to Comments and Final EIR**

CONSULTANT will respond to comments received on the new analysis document as well as on the Comprehensive Plan Draft EIR in a single combined Final EIR document. CONSULTANT will also prepare a Mitigation Monitoring Reporting Program (MMRP) for CITY review. For both the Final EIR and the MMRP, CONSULTANT will prepare one administrative draft, one screencheck draft, and one public review draft. This scope of work includes up to 120 hours to respond to comments. If substantial additional time is needed because of an unforeseen volume or complexity of comments, a contract amendment could be necessary.

j. **Final Hearings**

The Consultant shall attend two hearings on the analysis document and combined Final EIR.

II. **Creation and Analysis of Quality of Life/Fully Mitigated Fifth Scenario**

The CONSULTANT team will conduct an analysis of the fifth scenario using the same jobs and housing numbers and locations as described above, but adding relevant mitigation measures from the Comprehensive Plan Draft EIR, as well as any other measures to reduce or eliminate physical impacts and preserve or improve quality of life.

III. **Transportation and Greenhouse Gas Modeling of No-Growth Scenario**

The CONSULTANT team will model a regional scenario, using consistent methodology and assumptions as used in the Comprehensive Plan Draft EIR and analysis of the fifth scenario, that includes zero job and housing growth within the Palo Alto City limits. This no-growth scenario will be prepared as an informational item to illustrate the degree to which growth in Palo Alto, as opposed to growth elsewhere in the region, contributes identified potential impacts. The results of the modeling will be presented in a stand-alone memorandum or staff report; this will not be part of a CEQA document and no mitigation measures will be prepared.

IV. **Additional Fiscal Analysis**

a. **Updates to the Comprehensive Plan Fiscal Study**

On January 15, 2016, EPS published the Draft Fiscal Analysis of the City of Palo Alto 2030 Comprehensive Plan. On March 15, 2016, EPS presented the analysis, participated in discussion, and took comments concerning the analysis from the CITY's Finance Committee. Based on

comments received on the draft analysis, as well as in response to an evolving Comprehensive Plan, EPS proposes a number of steps to revise and augment the fiscal analysis.

i. **Additional Research Concerning Worker Spending**

EPS proposes to conduct up to three interviews with local business entities to better characterize local worker spending in the community. Potential

interviewees include Palo Alto Downtown (business and professional association), Stanford Business Park, and the Chamber of Commerce. EPS will coordinate with CITY staff to select interviewees. Findings from the interview process will be used to refine fiscal impact analysis assumptions and/or inform sensitivity analysis related to worker spending patterns, as appropriate.

ii. Additional Research Concerning Fire Department Service Burden

EPS proposes to re-engage with the CITY's Fire Department to review service burden data previously provided. It may be that additional analysis conducted by the department over the past six months (related to contract negotiations with Stanford University) could be used to better inform Comprehensive Plan analyses. EPS will conduct a follow-up interview with Fire Department staff, solicit a data update if warranted, and revise the fiscal impact analysis with new data inputs, as appropriate.

iii. Sensitivity Analysis

EPS proposes to evaluate the sensitivity of estimated fiscal impacts to potential variation in specific model assumptions. For example, EPS will test and report the fiscal impacts accruing to the General Fund in the event that real estate property turnover is higher or lower than assumed in the current analysis. EPS will perform sensitivity analysis and report results for testing of up to three key model variables, which will be identified and agreed upon with CITY staff in advance.

iv. Fiscal Analysis of Fifth Scenario

On January 18, 2015, the CITY Council and the Citizens Advisory Committee held a joint meeting to review the upcoming release of the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Comprehensive Plan Update. At the conclusion of this meeting, the Council adopted a motion requesting a fifth scenario aimed at improving the CITY's ratio of jobs to housing. EPS proposes to analyze the fiscal impacts of this additional Comprehensive Plan Scenario and document findings in the Fiscal Analysis Report.

**b. Community Infrastructure Funding Analysis [OPTIONAL]**

Planning for sustainable communities requires careful consideration of potential funding sources and financing strategies to pay for community facilities and infrastructure that improve quality of life and accommodate growth. As an optional task, EPS would review the proposed capital investments envisioned by the Comprehensive Plan Amendment Scenario Alternatives and assess funding options, including the CITY's existing financial resources, other potential sources of funds, and financing mechanisms that may cover all or a portion of the proposed community improvements and infrastructure (including growth mitigation projects). It is anticipated that this analysis would focus on the provision of major transportation

infrastructure, likely including parking facilities, expressway upgrades, CalTrain modernization, bus-rapid transit, and roadway/streetscape improvements.

EPS would coordinate with CONSULTANT and CITY staff to review and clarify the list of capital investments and improvements generated by the Comprehensive Plan Amendment process. EPS then would identify existing funding (e.g., impact fee programs) and other potential future funding sources. The analysis would evaluate the potential use of these sources of funds to achieve Comprehensive Plan infrastructure goals. The objective of the funding analysis would be to compare improvement cost estimates with funding sources and mechanisms to quantify at a high level the potential CITY revenue contributions (or shortfalls). As part of the consideration of potential new sources of funds, EPS would evaluate the feasibility of implementing these sources. The analysis would endeavor to realistically assess the potential for and magnitude of funding options, but would not constitute a financing strategy or plan of finance for Comprehensive Plan infrastructure.

As with other tasks, EPS would conduct the funding analysis in close cooperation with CITY staff and the consulting team. It is expected that the CITY or their consultants would be primarily responsible for identifying the desired capital improvements and estimating improvement costs. Note that this task may require involvement from specialized professional advisors, (e.g., transportation or civil engineer consultants currently working with the CITY) to provide reliable infrastructure cost estimates, which is not included in the EPS budget.

#### **c. Fiscal Analysis Deliverables**

Consistent with the Draft Fiscal Analysis, EPS will continue to document data, methods, and findings from the fiscal and funding analysis in a clear, well-written report. As part of this scope of work, EPS will prepare a Second Draft of the Fiscal Analysis Report, which includes the Comprehensive Plan Fiscal Study updates as well as a new chapter on Community Infrastructure Funding if the optional task is selected. EPS will provide CONSULTANT with a Preliminary Second Draft for review. After receiving and incorporating any comments from CONSULTANT, EPS will deliver to the CITY the Second Draft Report. Finalization of this Report will include one-round of consolidated comments from CITY staff, EPS revisions as needed and appropriate, and EPS production of a final document.

#### **d. Meetings and Presentations**

This scope of work includes three in-person meetings in Palo Alto:

- i. A Comprehensive Plan hearing in which EPS responds to question concerning the Draft Fiscal Analysis;
- ii. A meeting with CITY staff to receive comments on the Second Draft Report; and
- iii. A presentation to Council or the Finance Committee on the Report.

Additional meetings may be held as needed by telephone or in person. Supplementary in-person meetings are not included in the fixed-fee budget proposal but may be authorized on a time-and-materials cost basis with prior approval by the Client.

V. **Increased Staff Support**

CONSULTANT will increase the level of support to CITY staff in preparing for, facilitating, and summarizing Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) meetings, CAC subcommittee meetings (assuming up to four separate subcommittees), and CITY Council meetings. This will include research and writing of staff reports; preparation of and revisions to policies, programs, and narratives in response to CAC and subcommittee comments; conference calls weekly or more often, if needed; and assistance with preparation of agendas, meeting notes and CAC comment matrices, among other tasks as needed.

**EXHIBIT “C”  
COMPENSATION**

The CITY agrees to compensate the CONSULTANT for professional services performed in accordance with the terms and conditions of this Agreement based on the hourly rate schedule attached as Exhibit “C5”.

The compensation to be paid to CONSULTANT under this Agreement for all services described in Exhibits “A”, “A1”, “A2”, “A3” “A4” & “A5” (“Services”) and reimbursable expenses shall not exceed \$2,801,157.00. CONSULTANT agrees to complete all Services, including reimbursable expenses, within this amount. Any work performed or expenses incurred for which payment would result in a total exceeding the maximum amount of compensation set forth herein shall be at no cost to the CITY.

**REIMBURSABLE EXPENSES**

The administrative, overhead, secretarial time or secretarial overtime, word processing, photocopying, in-house printing, insurance and other ordinary business expenses are included within the scope of payment for services and are not reimbursable expenses. CITY shall reimburse CONSULTANT for the following reimbursable expenses at cost. Expenses for which CONSULTANT shall be reimbursed are:

- A. Travel (including within the San Francisco Bay Area – at actual cost
- B. Report printing and reproduction – at actual cost
- C. Deliveries – at actual cost
- D. Data purchase – at actual cost

All requests for payment of expenses shall be accompanied by appropriate backup information. Any expense anticipated to be more than \$500.00 shall be approved in advance by the CITY’s project manager.

**ADDITIONAL SERVICES**

The CONSULTANT shall provide additional services only by advanced, written authorization from the CITY. The CONSULTANT, at the CITY’s project manager’s request, shall submit a detailed written proposal including a description of the scope of services, schedule, level of effort, and CONSULTANT’s proposed maximum compensation, including reimbursable expenses, for such services based on the rates set forth in Exhibit C-1. The additional services scope, schedule and maximum compensation shall be negotiated and agreed to in writing by the CITY’s Project Manager and CONSULTANT prior to commencement of the services. Payment for additional services is subject to all requirements and restrictions in this Agreement.

**EXHIBIT C6**  
**RATE SCHEDULE FOR AMENDMENT NO. 5**

<b>STAFF LEVEL</b>	<b>HOURLY BILL RATE</b>
Principal	\$190–\$250
Associate Principal	\$175–\$200
Senior Associate/Senior Scientist	\$145–\$180
Associate/Scientist	\$110–\$150
Project Planner/Project Scientist	\$90–\$115
Planner/Assistant Scientist	\$75–\$95
Graphics Specialist	\$60–\$100
Clerical/Word Processing	\$40–\$110
Intern	\$50–\$70
Subconsultants are billed at cost plus 10%. Mileage reimbursement rate is the standard IRS-approved rate.	

**EXHIBIT "C6"  
RATE SCHEDULE AMENDMENT NO. 5**

	PLACEWORKS													SUBCONSULTANTS		Subconsultant Labor Total	Total Task Budget		
	Jansen	Hill	Mena	Vermilion	Fitzgerald/Mantey	Rodenbaugh	Hass	Michener/Mazur	Sotelo	Garcia	Foley	GRAPHICS	WP/CLERICAL	HEXAGON	EPS				
	Principal-in-Charge \$175	Senior Associate \$160	Associate \$150	Assoc. Principal (AQ/GHG) \$195	Noise Engineer/Manager \$180	Senior Scientist \$165	Principal (Hazards) \$190	Senior Geologist/GIS \$160	Senior Planner \$145	Project Planner \$105	Noise \$85	\$80	\$100	Transportation & Traffic	Fiscal				
<b>Hourly Rate:</b>														PlaceWorks Hours	PlaceWorks Labor Total				
<b>TASK I. Creation and Analysis of the Fifth Scenario</b>																			
a. Definition of the Fifth Scenario	16	6	32								8			62	\$9,400	0		\$0	\$9,400
b. Incorporate S/CAP	12		20	16							24			72	\$10,740	0		\$0	\$10,740
c. Environmental Setting	10	2	22								4			38	\$5,790	0		\$0	\$5,790
d. Impact Analysis	46	0	70	14	30	10	8	24	4	94	10	0	0	310	\$44,990	25,260		\$25,260	\$70,250
e. Administrative Draft Analysis Document	36	0	64	4	2	2	2	2	2	40	2	4	4	164	\$23,450	0		\$0	\$23,450
f. Screencheck Draft Analysis Document	16		24	4	2	1	1	1	2	24	2	2	4	83	\$11,595	0		\$0	\$11,595
g. Public Review Draft Analysis Document	6		16	2	2	1	1	1	2	12		4	4	51	\$6,985	0		\$0	\$6,985
h. Public Comment Period	16		4											20	\$3,400	0		\$0	\$3,400
i. Response to Comments and Final EIR	40	8	96	4	2	6	2	2	0	40			4	204	\$30,110	0		\$0	\$30,110
j. Final Hearings	16		4											20	\$3,400	0		\$0	\$3,400
<b>Task I. Subtotal</b>	<b>198</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>348</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>246</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>1024</b>	<b>\$149,860</b>	<b>\$25,260</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$25,260</b>	<b>\$175,120</b>
<b>TASK II. Quality of Life/Fully Mitigated Fifth Scenario</b>																			
Quality of Life/Fully Mitigated Fifth Scenario	26	0	30	14	18	10	8	12	4	44	10	4	4	184	\$26,880	\$23,120		\$23,120	\$50,000
<b>Task II. Subtotal</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>184</b>	<b>\$26,880</b>	<b>\$23,120</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$23,120</b>	<b>\$50,000</b>
<b>TASK III. Modeling of No-Growth Scenario</b>																			
Modeling of No-Growth Scenario	10		12	14					4	12			4	56	\$8,520	20,540		\$20,540	\$29,060
<b>Task III. Subtotal</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>\$8,520</b>	<b>\$20,540</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$20,540</b>	<b>\$29,060</b>
<b>TASK IV. Additional Fiscal Analysis</b>																			
Updates to Fiscal Analysis	10	3	5											18	\$2,980	0	33,130	\$33,130	\$36,110
<b>Task IV. Subtotal</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>\$2,980</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$33,130</b>	<b>\$33,130</b>	<b>\$36,110</b>
<b>TASK V. Increased Staff Support</b>																			
Increased Staff Support	60	120	24							112				316	\$45,060	0		\$0	\$45,060
<b>Task V. Subtotal</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>316</b>	<b>\$45,060</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$45,060</b>
<b>Labor Hours Total</b>	<b>304</b>	<b>139</b>	<b>419</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>414</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>1,598</b>					
<b>Labor Dollars Total</b>	<b>\$53,200</b>	<b>\$22,240</b>	<b>\$62,850</b>	<b>\$14,040</b>	<b>\$10,080</b>	<b>\$4,950</b>	<b>\$4,180</b>	<b>\$6,720</b>	<b>\$2,610</b>	<b>\$43,470</b>	<b>\$2,040</b>	<b>\$1,120</b>	<b>\$2,400</b>		<b>\$233,300</b>	<b>\$68,920</b>	<b>\$33,130</b>	<b>\$102,050</b>	<b>\$335,350</b>
<b>EXPENSES</b>																			
PlaceWorks Reimbursable Expenses																			\$10,967
Subconsultants' Reimbursable Expenses																			\$721
2% of Labor for Office Expenses (Copies, Faxes, Phone, Misc. Printing)																			\$4,666
10% Subconsultant Markup																			\$10,277.10
<b>EXPENSES TOTAL</b>																			<b>\$26,631</b>
Recommended 10% Contingency																			\$32,376
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>																			
OPTIONAL TASK																			
Infrastructure Financing Expenses	6	1	3											10	\$1,660	0	25,240	\$25,240	\$26,900
<b>OPTIONAL TASK TOTAL</b>																			<b>\$2,557</b>
<b>Grand Total with Optional Task</b>																			<b>\$29,457</b>
Subconsultants Cost are billed at cost plus 10%																			
Reimbursable expense are billed at CONSULTANT'S current rates plus 2% of CONSULTANTS labor																			
																			\$423,814



---

**Aesthetics and Visual Resources**

---

AES-1: The following policies and programs, or equally effective language, shall be included in the proposed Plan to ensure that future development under Scenarios 3 and 4 would not degrade the visual character or quality of the area:

- Policy: Promote high quality, creative design, and site planning that is compatible with surrounding development and public spaces.
- Policy: Preserve the character of residential neighborhoods by encouraging new or remodeled structures to be compatible with the neighborhood and adjacent structures.
- Policy: Maintain and enhance the University/Downtown area as the central business district of the City, with a mix of commercial, civic, cultural, recreational, and residential uses. Promote quality design that recognizes the regional and historic importance of the area and reinforces its pedestrian character.
- Program: Review and revise as needed the Downtown, El Camino Real, and South of El Camino Real Design Guidelines to support and enhance the existing visual character of these neighborhoods with building forms and massing that relate to the street and the pedestrian, whether through traditional architectural forms or innovative new designs.
- Program: In areas of the City having a historic or consistent design character, design new development to maintain and support the existing character.

AES-4: The City shall develop an ordinance that will require development projects of a certain size or location to prepare an analysis of potential shade/shadow impacts. The ordinance shall focus on potential impacts to public open spaces (other than public streets and adjacent sidewalks) between 9:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m. from September 21 to March 21. Projects that are shown to shadow open spaces during these times shall mitigate these impacts through building and site design features.

---

**Air Quality**

---

AIR-1: The policies and programs, or equally effective language, shall be included in the proposed Plan to ensure that it is consistent with the *2010 Bay Area Clean Air Plan*:

- Policy: Make land use decisions that encourage walking, bicycling, and public transit use.
- Policy: Reduce emission of particulates from wood burning stoves, construction activity, automobiles, and other sources.
- Program: Locate higher density development near transit corridors and near multimodal transit stations. Support regional, State, and federal programs that improve air quality in the Bay Area.
- Program: Encourage infill, redevelopment, and re-use of vacant or underutilized parcels employing minimum density requirements that are appropriate to support transit, bicycling, and walking.
- Program: Promote mixed-use development to provide housing and commercial services near employment centers, thereby reducing the necessity of driving.

AIR-2a: As part of the City's development approval process, the City shall require applicants for future development projects to comply with the current BAAQMD basic control measures for reducing construction emissions of PM<sub>10</sub> (Table 8-1, Basic Construction Mitigation Measures Recommended for All Proposed Projects, of the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines).

AIR-2b: Prior to issuance of construction permits, development project applicants that are subject to CEQA and have the potential to exceed the BAAQMD screening-criteria listed in the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines shall prepare and submit to the City of Palo Alto a technical assessment evaluating potential project construction-related air quality impacts. The evaluation shall be prepared in conformance with BAAQMD methodology in assessing air quality impacts. If construction-related criteria air pollutants are determined to have the potential to exceed the BAAQMD thresholds of significance, as identified in the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, the City of Palo Alto shall require that applicants for new development projects incorporate mitigation measures (Table 8-

---

2, Additional Construction Mitigation Measures Recommended for Projects with Construction Emissions Above the Threshold, of the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines or applicable construction mitigation measures subsequently approved by BAAQMD) to reduce air pollutant emissions during construction activities to below these thresholds. These identified measures shall be incorporated into all appropriate construction documents (e.g., construction management plans) submitted to the City and shall be verified by the City's Planning and Community Environment Department.

---

AIR-2c: Prior to issuance of construction permits, development project applicants that are subject to CEQA and have the potential to exceed the BAAQMD screening-criteria listed in the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines shall prepare and submit to the City of Palo Alto a technical assessment evaluating potential project operation phase-related air quality impacts. The evaluation shall be prepared in conformance with BAAQMD methodology in assessing air quality impacts. If operational-related criteria air pollutants are determined to have the potential to exceed the BAAQMD thresholds of significance, as identified in BAAQMD's CEQA Guidelines, the City of Palo Alto Planning and Community Environment Department shall require that applicants for new development projects incorporate mitigation measures to reduce air pollutant emissions during operational activities.

---

AIR-2d: Implement Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a. In addition, the following policy and program, or equally effective language, shall be included in the proposed Plan to reduce long-term air quality impacts by emphasizing walkable neighborhoods and supporting alternative modes of transportation.

- Policy: Encourage new residential, commercial and mixed-use development around transit stations, locations with bicycle and pedestrian connectivity, neighborhood-serving retail, and city services to allow residents and employees to meet daily needs without the use of the private automobile.
  - Program: Promote mixed-use development to provide housing and commercial services near employment centers, thereby reducing the necessity of driving.
- 

AIR-3a: Applicants for future non-residential land uses within the city that: 1) have the potential to generate 100 or more diesel truck trips per day or have 40 or more trucks with operating diesel-powered TRUs, and 2) are within 1,000 feet of a sensitive land use (e.g., residential, schools, hospitals, nursing homes), as measured from the property line of a proposed project to the property line of the nearest sensitive use, shall submit a health risk assessment (HRA) to the City of Palo Alto prior to future discretionary Project approval or shall comply with best practices recommended for implementation by the BAAQMD.

The HRA shall be prepared in accordance with policies and procedures of the State Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment and the Bay Area Air Quality Management District. If the HRA shows that the incremental cancer risk exceeds 10 in one million (10E-06), PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentrations exceed 0.3 µg/m<sup>3</sup>, or the appropriate noncancer hazard index exceeds 1.0, the applicant will be required to identify and demonstrate that mitigation measures are capable of reducing potential cancer and noncancer risks to an acceptable level, including appropriate enforcement mechanisms.

Mitigation measures and best practices may include but are not limited to:

- Restricting idling on-site beyond Air Toxic Control Measures idling restrictions, as feasible.
- Electrifying warehousing docks.
- Requiring use of newer equipment and/or vehicles.
- Restricting off-site truck travel through the creation of truck routes.

Mitigation measures identified in the project-specific HRA shall be identified as mitigation measures in the environmental document and/or incorporated into the site development plan as a component of a proposed project.

---

AIR-3b: Applicants for residential and other sensitive land use projects (e.g., hospitals, nursing homes, and day care centers) that are subject to CEQA within 1,000 feet of a major sources of TACs (e.g., warehouses, industrial areas, freeways, and roadways with traffic volumes over 10,000 vehicle per day), as measured from the property line of the project to the property line of the source/edge of the nearest travel lane, shall submit a health risk assessment (HRA) to the City of Palo Alto prior to future discretionary Project approval or shall comply with best practices recommended by the BAAQMD.

---

The HRA shall be prepared in accordance with policies and procedures of the State Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) and the Bay Area Air Quality Management District. The latest OEHHA guidelines shall be used for the analysis, including age sensitivity factors, breathing rates, and body weights appropriate for children age zero to 16 years. If the HRA shows that the incremental cancer risk exceeds 10 in one million (10E-06), PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentrations exceed 0.3 µg/m<sup>3</sup>, or the appropriate noncancer hazard index exceeds 1.0, the applicant will be required to identify and demonstrate that mitigation measures are capable of reducing potential cancer and non-cancer risks to an acceptable level (i.e., below 10 in one million or a hazard index of 1.0), including appropriate enforcement mechanisms.

Measures and/or best practices to reduce risk may include but are not limited to:

- Air intakes located away from high volume roadways and/or truck loading zones.
- Heating, ventilation, and air conditioning systems of the buildings provided with appropriately sized Maximum Efficiency Rating Value (MERV) filters.

Mitigation measures identified in the HRA and best practices shall be incorporated into the site development plan as a condition of approval. The air intake design and MERV filter requirements shall be noted and/or reflected on all building plans submitted to the City and shall be verified by the City’s Planning and Community Environment Department.

AIR-4: The following policy, or equally effective language, shall be included in the proposed Plan to reduce odor impacts:

- Policy: All potential sources of odor and/or toxic air contaminants should be adequately buffered, mechanically or otherwise mitigated, to avoid odor and toxic impacts that violate human health standards.

---

**Biological Resources**

None

---

**Cultural Resources**

CULT-1a: The City shall prepare and adopt an ordinance that would regulate the demolition or alteration of a historic resource listed on the National and/or California Register, or listed on the City’s Historic Inventory, if alterations would significantly alter the historic value and/or character defining features of the historic resource.

CULT-1b: Include a program in the Comprehensive Plan Update requiring the City to update and maintain the City’s Historic Resource Inventory to determine all historic resources that are eligible for the California Register as well as important examples of California history or prehistory. Historic resources may consist of a single building or structure or a district.

Include a policy in the Comprehensive Plan requiring an evaluation prior to the issuance of a demolition or alterations permit, where proposed development would affect a potential historic resource that has not been evaluated for inclusion into the City’s Historic Resources Inventory.

CULT-1c: The following policy and program, or equally effective language, shall be included in the proposed Plan to ensure that future development under all four scenarios would not adversely affect a historic resource listed or eligible for listing on the National and/or California Register, or listed on the City’s Historic Inventory:

- Policy: Protect Palo Alto’s archaeological resources, including natural land formations, sacred sites, the historical landscape, historic habitats, and remains of settlements here before the founding of Palo Alto in the nineteenth century.
- Program: Require that a records search of the California Historical Resources Information System be conducted and reviewed by a cultural resources professional for proposed new development to determine whether the site contains known prehistoric or historic cultural resources and the potential for as-yet-undiscovered cultural resources.

---

CULT-2: Implement Mitigation Measures CULT-1a, CULT-1b, and CULT-1c.

---

CULT-3: The following policies, or equally effective language, shall be included in the proposed Plan to ensure that future development under all four scenarios would not damage archaeological resources:

- Policy: Protect Palo Alto’s archaeological resources, including natural land formations, sacred sites, the historical landscape, historic habitats, and remains of settlements here before the founding of Palo Alto in the nineteenth century.
  - Policy: Require that a records search of the California Historical Resources Information System be conducted and reviewed by a cultural resources professional for proposed new development to determine whether the site contains known prehistoric or historic cultural resources and to determine the potential presence of as-yet-undiscovered cultural resources.
  - Policy: Require that areas found to contain significant prehistoric artifacts be examined by a qualified consulting archaeologist for appropriate protection and preservation.
  - Policy: Require that if cultural resources, including archaeological or paleontological resources, are uncovered during grading or other on-site excavation activities, construction shall stop until appropriate mitigation is determined and implemented.
  - Policy: Require that any archaeological or paleontological resources on a development project site, as a condition of project approval, be either preserved at their location or adequately documented as a condition of removal. When a development project has sufficient flexibility, avoidance and preservation of the resource shall be the primary mitigation measure, unless the City identifies a superior mitigation. If resources are documented, their preservation should be coordinated with descendants and/or stakeholder groups, as warranted.
  - Policy: Continue to consult with tribes as required by California Government Code Section 65352.3. In doing so, use appropriate procedures to accommodate tribal concerns when a tribe has a religious prohibition against revealing precise information about the location or previous practice at a particular sacred site.
- 

No mitigation necessary.

---

CULT-5: The following policies, or equally effective language, shall be included in the proposed Plan to ensure that future development under all four scenarios would not damage paleontological resources:

- Policy: Require that areas found to contain significant prehistoric artifacts be examined by a qualified consulting archaeologist for appropriate protection and preservation.
  - Policy: Require that if cultural resources, including archaeological or paleontological resources and unique geologic features, are uncovered during grading or other on-site excavation activities, construction shall stop until appropriate mitigation is determined and implemented.
  - Policy: Require that any archaeological or paleontological resources on a development project site, as a condition of project approval, be either preserved at their location or adequately documented as a condition of removal. When a development project has sufficient flexibility, avoidance and preservation of the resource shall be the primary mitigation measure, unless the City identifies a superior mitigation. If resources are documented, their preservation should be coordinated with descendants and/or stakeholder groups, as warranted.
- 

CULT-6: Implement Mitigation Measures CULT-1a, CULT-1b, and CULT-1c.

---

CULT-7: Implement Mitigation Measures CULT-1a, CULT-1b, CULT-1c, CULT-3, and CULT-5.

---

**Geology, Soils, and Seismicity**

---

None

---

---

### Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change

GHG-2: To ensure that Palo Alto's GHG emissions are reduced consistent with the State's long-term goals, the proposed Plan should contain the following policy and program, or equally effective language, articulating these goals and ensuring steady progress towards their achievement:

- Policy: Strive to achieve and exceed target reductions in greenhouse gas emission levels set forth by Executive Order S-03-05.
- Program: Adopt an updated GHG emission reduction plan as part of the S/CAP aimed at achieving or exceeding the State's goals, and monitor the City's progress on an annual basis.

GHG reduction policies included in the S/CAP, which is being prepared in conjunction with proposed Plan, would ensure substantial progress toward the long-term GHG reduction goals of Executive Order S-03-05. However, at this time, additional State and federal actions, as well as advances in technology, are necessary to achieve the deep cuts required to meet the 2050 emissions target. These actions are beyond the jurisdiction of the City of Palo Alto and therefore it is unclear whether the City alone can mitigate this impact to a less-than-significant level.

GHG-3: To address the potential impacts associated with exposing additional people to the effects of climate change, the proposed Plan should include the following policies and programs, or equally effective language, to ensure that future development would address potential risks and that the City would work with other agencies to coordinate strategies for minimizing risk, ensuring appropriate response/recovery, and planning for resiliency:

- Policy: Monitor and respond to the risk of flooding caused by climate change that may result in changes to precipitation patterns, sea level rise, and storm surges.
- Policy: Promote and participate in cooperative planning with other public agencies and regional and adjacent jurisdictions, especially regarding issues related to climate change, such as water supply, sea level rise, fire protection services, emergency medical services, and emergency response planning.
- Program: Develop and implement "green infrastructure" practices to mitigate flooding through improved permeability or paved areas, and storm water capture and storage.
- Program: Regularly coordinate with regional, State, and federal agencies on rising sea levels in the San Francisco Bay and major tributaries to determine if additional adaptation strategies should be adopted to address flooding hazards from increased sea levels for existing or new development and infrastructure. This includes monitoring Federal Emergency Management Agency flood map updates to identify areas in the city susceptible to sea level rise, addressing changes to State and regional sea and bay level rise estimates, and coordinating with adjacent municipalities on flood control improvements as appropriate.
- Program: Prepare response strategies that address sea level rise and increased flooding, and other events related to climate change, such as increased flooding, landslides, soil erosion, wildfires, and storm events. Include response strategies to address sea level rise on Palo Alto's levee system.
- Program: Develop new development requirements for shoreline development to ensure that new development is designed and located to provide protection from potential impacts of flooding resulting from sea level rise and significant flood events. Requirements may include: new setbacks to ensure structures are set back far enough inland that they will not be endangered by erosion; limits on subdivisions and lot line adjustments in areas vulnerable to sea level rise to avoid the creation of new shoreline lots; incentive or transfer of development rights (TDR) programs to relocate existing development away from high risk areas; and/or triggers for relocation or removal of existing structures based on changing site conditions and other factors.

---

### Hazards and Hazardous Materials

None

---

### Hydrology and Water Quality

---

HYD-2: The City shall continue to investigate the potential impacts of basement construction dewatering and update standard conditions of approval to contain the following or equally effective measures:

- Prohibit dewatering during the rainy season.
- Encouraging greater fill station use by distributing more door-hangers and enlisting other public outreach regarding dewatering, fill stations, and trees.
- Strengthening outreach on the water cycle and value of fresh water flows to storm drains, creeks, and the Bay.
- Refining requirements for contractor Use Plans, including maximizing on-site water use, one day/week water truck hauling service for neighbors, and City landscaping and piping to nearby parks or major users where feasible.
- Expanding fill station specifications to address water pressure issues resulting from multiple concurrent users, including separate pumps for neighbors where needed and sidewalk bridges for hoses to prevent tripping hazards.
- Broadening the City's Basement Pumping Guidelines to require a determination of the impacts of groundwater pumping on adjacent buildings, infrastructure, and trees or landscaping. Applicants would determine the size of the temporary cone of depression caused by pumping and avoidance measures would be required if impacts are anticipated. The Urban Forestry staff may develop guidelines for soil enhancement and supplemental watering (by project applicant) for neighboring landscaping. Additional measures could include adjusting the location, depth, or duration of pumping or altering construction methods.

---

### Land Use and Planning

LAND-1: Include policies and programs in the proposed Plan to ensure that the intensity of future development under Scenarios 3 and 4 would not adversely change the land use patterns or affect the quality of life in Palo Alto neighborhoods. This could be accomplished by maintaining existing Comp Plan policies related to compatibility and quality of life in the area:

- Policy: Maintain Palo Alto's varied residential neighborhoods while sustaining the vitality of its commercial areas and public facilities. Use the Zoning Ordinance as a tool to enhance Palo Alto's desirable qualities.
- Policy: Evaluate changes in land use in the context of regional needs, overall city welfare and objectives, and the desires of surrounding neighborhoods.
- Policy: Promote increased compatibility, interdependence, and support between commercial and mixed-use centers and the surrounding residential neighborhoods.
- Program: Encourage greater use of allowed density within zoning regulations through smaller housing units near multimodal transit stations to take advantage of transit availability.

---

LAND-2: The following policies and programs, or equally effective language, should be included in the proposed Plan to further reduce potential impacts to visual character and ensure compatibility with adjacent land uses:

- Policy: Where possible, avoid abrupt changes in scale and density between residential and non-residential areas and between residential areas of different densities. To promote compatibility and gradual transitions between land uses, place zoning district boundaries at mid-block locations rather than along streets wherever possible.
- Policy: Preserve the character of residential neighborhoods by encouraging new or remodeled structures to be compatible with the neighborhood and adjacent structures.
- Policy: Promote high quality, creative design and site planning that is compatible with surrounding development and public spaces.
- Program: Maintain and periodically review height and density limits to discourage single uses that are inappropriate in size and scale to the surrounding uses.

- Program: Review and change zoning regulations to promote gradual transitions in the scale of development where residential districts abut more intense uses.
- Program: Use the Zoning Ordinance, design review process, design guidelines, and Coordinated Area Plans to ensure high-quality residential and commercial design.

---

LAND-5: To avoid potential impacts from physically dividing an established community, the proposed Plan shall include the following policies, or equally effective policies:

- Policy: Design future transportation projects (including roadway, bicycle, pedestrian, and transit projects) to improve connections between and within neighborhoods, rather than divide neighborhoods.
- Policy: Pursue a below-grade alignment and not an elevated alignment for regional fixed rail in Palo Alto, including both high speed rail and Caltrain.
- Policy: Ensure that future grade separation projects include a community participation and review process, and undergo environmental review. Future grade separation improvement projects would have the potential to cause environmental impacts, such as impacts associated with construction-related emissions, noise, and traffic, and aesthetics and land use impacts. These impacts, and alternatives to these grade separation projects, would be evaluated in detail when the projects are more clearly defined.

---

## Noise

NOISE-1a: The following policies and programs, or equally effective language, shall be included in the proposed Plan to ensure that long-term operational noise under Scenarios 2, 3, and 4 would not result in significant increases in average 24-hour noise levels.

- Policy: Encourage the location of land uses in areas with compatible noise environments. Use the guidelines in the table “Land Use Compatibility for Community Noise Environment” to determine compatibility.
  - For exterior noise, the guideline for “normally acceptable” noise levels in residential areas is an  $L_{dn}$  of 60 dBA. This level is a guideline for the design and location of future development and a goal for the reduction of noise in existing development. However, 60 dBA  $L_{dn}$  is a guideline which cannot necessarily be reached in all residential areas within the constraints of economic or aesthetic feasibility. This guideline will be primarily applied where outdoor use is a major consideration (e.g., backyards in single-family housing developments and recreational areas in multiple-family housing projects). Where the City determines that providing an  $L_{dn}$  of 60 dBA or lower outdoors is not feasible, the noise level in outdoor areas intended for recreational use should be reduced to as close to the standard as feasible through project design.
  - For interior noise, the requirements of the State of California Building Standards Code (Title 24) and the Noise Insulation Standards (Title 25) are extended to all new dwelling units in Palo Alto. Specifically, interior levels for all habitable rooms must not exceed an  $L_{dn}$  of 45 dBA in all new dwelling units in Palo Alto.
  - Noise exposure(s) should be determined from a) more detailed noise exposure studies, or b) area-specific or project-specific noise measurements, as appropriate. Noise contour maps in this plan can be used as a preliminary screening tool in determining approximate noise exposure.
  - Prior to the initial development application for future developments near noise-sensitive land uses, the applicant shall submit an acoustical analysis by an acoustical engineer demonstrating projected compliance with the Comprehensive Plan, the Noise Ordinance, and the State building code. The analysis shall be based on acoustical readings, equipment specifications, architectural designs (even if preliminary), and any proposed sound reduction/insulation measures, such that the pertinent land use compatibility, interior environments, and project-related noise emissions can be demonstrated to comply with prescribed city, county, and state noise standards.
- Policy: The City may require proposals to reduce noise impacts of development on adjacent properties through appropriate means including, but not

---

limited to, the following:

- Construct noise walls when compatible with aesthetic concerns.
- Screen and control noise sources such as parking, outdoor activities, and mechanical equipment.
- Increase setbacks for noise sources from adjacent dwellings.
- Whenever possible, retain fences, walls, or landscaping that serve as noise buffers although design, safety, and other impacts must be addressed.
- Use soundproofing materials and double-glazed windows.
- Control hours of operation, including deliveries and trash pickup, to minimize noise impacts.

Program: Update the Noise Ordinance to provide for clear interpretation of the regulations, and to review the appropriateness of existing standards. Strictly enforce the Noise Ordinance.

---

NOISE-1b: The following policy, or equally effective language, shall be included in the proposed Plan to ensure that aircraft noise under all four scenarios would not result in significant increases in average 24-hour noise levels.

The following new policy shall be adopted as part of the proposed Plan. The wording of this policy may change as long as the revised policy is equally effective in mitigating potential aircraft noise impacts:

- Policy: Ensure compliance with the airport related land use compatibility standards for community noise environments by prohibiting incompatible land use development within the 60 dBA CNEL noise contours of the Palo Alto airport.
- 

NOISE-1c: The following policies, or equally effective language, shall be included in the proposed Plan to ensure that railway noise under all four scenarios would not result in significant increases in average 24-hour noise levels.

- Policy: Minimize noise spillover from rail related activities into adjacent residential or noise-sensitive areas.
  - Policy: Reduce impacts from noise and ground borne vibrations associated with rail operations by requiring that future development of habitable buildings address the following:
    - Be sited at least 100 feet from the centerline of the tracks whenever feasible.
    - Interior noise level of up to 45 dBA Ldn, with windows closed must be ensured through structural design. For habitable buildings located within 100 feet from the centerline of railroad tracks, developments shall provide a detailed noise impact analysis, prepared by a qualified acoustical consultant technician, demonstrating that noise and ground borne vibration issues associated with rail operations have been adequately addressed (i.e., by building siting or construction techniques). This study must demonstrate that an interior noise level of 45 dBA Ldn will not be exceeded with windows closed.
    - Provide a detailed vibration impact analysis, prepared by a qualified acoustical consultant, demonstrating that ground-borne vibration levels will not exceed 72 VdB (relative to one microinch/sec) at residential buildings or 65 VdB at buildings with vibration-sensitive uses.
- 

NOISE-2: Implement Mitigation Measures NOISE-1a, NOISE-1b, and NOISE-1c.

---

NOISE-3: Implement Mitigation Measures NOISE-1a, NOISE-1b, and NOISE-1c.

---

NOISE-4a: The following policies and programs, or equally effective language, shall be included in the proposed Plan to ensure that future development under all four scenarios would not result in indoor noise levels that exceed acceptable levels in residential development.

- Policy: Encourage the location of land uses in areas with compatible noise environments. Use the guidelines in the table “Land Use Compatibility for Community Noise Environment” to determine compatibility.
-

- For exterior noise, the guideline for “normally acceptable” noise levels in residential areas is an  $L_{dn}$  of 60 dBA. This level is a guideline for the design and location of future development and a goal for the reduction of noise in existing development. However, 60 dBA  $L_{dn}$  is a guideline which cannot necessarily be reached in all residential areas within the constraints of economic or aesthetic feasibility. This guideline will be primarily applied where outdoor use is a major consideration (e.g., backyards in single family housing developments and recreational areas in multiple family housing projects). Where the City determines that providing an  $L_{dn}$  of 60 dBA or lower outdoors is not feasible, the noise level in outdoor areas intended for recreational use should be reduced to as close to the standard as feasible through project design.
- For interior noise, the requirements of the State of California Building Standards Code (Title 24) and the Noise Insulation Standards (Title 25) are extended to all new dwelling units in Palo Alto. Specifically, interior levels for all habitable rooms must not exceed an  $L_{dn}$  of 45 dBA in all new dwelling units in Palo Alto.
- Noise exposure(s) should be determined from (a) more detailed noise exposure studies, or (b) on area-specific or project-specific noise measurements, as appropriate. Noise contour maps in this plan can be used as a preliminary screening tool in determining approximate noise exposure.
- Prior to the initial development application for future developments near noise-sensitive land uses, the applicant shall submit an acoustical analysis by an acoustical engineer demonstrating projected compliance with the Comprehensive Plan, the Noise Ordinance, and the State building code. The analysis shall be based on acoustical readings, equipment specifications, architectural designs (even if preliminary), and any proposed sound reduction/insulation measures, such that the pertinent land use compatibility, interior environments, and project-related noise emissions can be demonstrated to comply with prescribed city, county, and state noise standards.
- Policy: For all future residential projects greater than four dwelling units that are proposed to be within the 65 dBA  $L_{dn}$  noise contours, as depicted on current Comprehensive Plan mapping, an acoustical analysis prepared by a qualified acoustical consultant shall be submitted to the City as part of the entitlement review application. As part of the above acoustical analysis, require that projects include appropriate layout, structural, and/or architectural design features to ensure meeting the interior noise standards of the City and State codes.

---

NOISE-4b: The Land Use Noise Compatibility Guidelines established in the current Comprehensive Plan shall be maintained under all four scenarios.

---

NOISE-5a: The following policies, or equally effective language, shall be included in the proposed Plan to ensure that future development under all four scenarios would not result in significant construction-related vibration impacts.

- Policy: Require a detailed construction noise impact analysis, prepared by a qualified acoustical consultant, for all projects that require discretionary approval and that are located within 100 feet of any noise sensitive land uses. If impacts are identified, require a noise monitoring plan to be prepared and submitted prior to the issuance of construction permits. This plan shall identify the monitoring locations, durations and regularity, the instrumentation to be used, and the appropriate noise control measures that will be incorporated to ensure compliance with the noise ordinance.
- Policy: Continue to prioritize construction noise limits around sensitive receptors.

---

NOISE-5b: Implement Mitigation Measure NOISE-1c.

---

NOISE-6: Implement Mitigation Measures NOISE-4a and NOISE-4b.

---

NOISE-7: Implement Mitigation Measures NOISE-1a, NOISE-1b, NOISE-1c, NOISE-4a, and NOISE-4b.

---

NOISE-8: The following policies, or equally effective language, shall be included in the proposed Plan to ensure that future development under all four scenarios would not result in significant impacts to sensitive receptors from construction noise and vibration.

- Policy: Require a detailed construction noise and vibration impact analysis, prepared by a qualified acoustical consultant, for all projects that require discretionary approval and that are located within 100 feet of any noise- and/or vibration-sensitive land uses.

- If noise impacts are identified, require a noise monitoring plan to be prepared and submitted prior to the issuance of construction permits. This plan shall identify the noise monitoring locations, durations and regularity, the instrumentation to be used, and the appropriate noise control/mitigation measures that will be incorporated to ensure compliance with the noise ordinance.
- If projected daytime vibration levels exceed 90 VdB (relative to one microinch/sec) at workshop uses, 84 VdB at offices uses, 78 VdB at residential uses, or the limits for VC-A through VC-E uses shown in the FTA manual, a vibration mitigation plan is to be prepared and submitted prior to the issuance of construction permits.
- Policy: Continue to prioritize construction noise and vibration limits around sensitive receptors.

NOISE-11a: Implement Mitigation Measure NOISE-1c.

NOISE-11b: The following programs, or equally effective language, shall be included in the proposed Plan to preclude overall community noise impacts that are in excess of established State and/or City standards.

- Program: Encourage the Joint Powers Board to pursue technologies to reduce train whistle noise in communities served by Caltrain.
- Program: Evaluate changing at-grade rail crossings so that they qualify as Quiet Zones based on Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) rules and guidelines in order to mitigate the effects of train horn noise without adversely affecting safety at railroad crossings.

NOISE-11c: City of Palo Alto staff and officials shall participate in and contribute to the environmental impact assessment of future Caltrain and HSR development programs for railway operations within the city’s SOI.

**Population and Housing**

POP-4a: Conduct a nexus study and update the City’s affordable housing linkage fee for commercial development to ensure that new job-generating development adequately mitigates the costs of its impacts on housing affordability in Palo Alto.

POP-4b: Continue to increase the supply of housing in the city through implementation of the adopted Housing Element policies and programs, and/or slow the rate of job growth in the city. Possible zoning adjustments to accomplish more housing and/or fewer jobs could include changes to allow more residential density by right in areas that are well-served by services and transit, somewhat reducing commercial FAR and replacing it with residential FAR, and/or implementing an annual limit on new office and R&D development.

**Public Services and Recreation**

PS-7: To address the potential impacts of necessary property acquisition and park construction/improvement, the Comprehensive Plan Update and/or the Parks, Trails, Natural Open Space and Recreation Master Plan shall incorporate policies and programs addressing funding, community input, and environmental review, as follows:

- Continue to collect park impact and park dedication (in lieu) fees from new development to ensure there is funding to add and improve parklands during the life of the Comprehensive Plan. Reevaluate the fees on a regular basis.
- Consider integrating new pocket parks within existing neighborhoods where this is possible by acquiring small parcels or conditioning new development.
- Where there is publicly owned land that could be improved for public use, consider designating this land as parkland when improvements occur.
- Pursue reliable and sustainable mechanisms to address a growing gap in maintenance funding as park and community services facilities uses increase.
- Monitor the health of the parks and the effectiveness of recreation facilities in the face of growing demand and use; evaluate services to respond to growing and changing demographic patterns.
- Monitor impacts on habitat and ecosystems and develop conservation plans to preserve and protect them.

- Ensure that new parks and park improvements are developed with ample community input and assessed to ensure that significant environmental impacts are avoided or mitigated to be less than significant.
- Consider utilizing park impact and park dedication (in lieu) fees to rehabilitate, expand, or otherwise increase utilization of existing parks and recreation facilities.

In addition to these measures, the City would require permitting and review of new parks in accordance with CEQA, which would ensure that any environmental impacts are disclosed and mitigated to the extent possible. This EIR is a programmatic document and does not evaluate the environmental impacts of any project-specific development. With mitigation, the impact is less than significant.

PS-8: Implement Mitigation Measure PS-7, above.

### Transportation and Traffic

TRANS-1a: Adopt a programmatic approach to reducing traffic with the goal of achieving no net increase in peak period motor vehicle trips from new development, with an exception for uses that directly contribute to the neighborhood character and diversity of Palo Alto (such as ground floor retail and below market rate housing). The program should, at a minimum:

- Require new development projects to prepare and implement a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Plan to achieve the following reduction in peak period motor vehicle trips from the rates included in the Institute of Transportation Engineers' *Trip Generation Manual* for the appropriate land use category. These reductions are deemed aggressive, yet feasible, for the districts indicated.
  - 45 percent reduction in the Downtown district
  - 35 percent reduction in the California Avenue area
  - 30 percent reduction in the Stanford Research Park
  - 30 percent reduction in the El Camino Real Corridor
  - 20 percent reduction in other areas of the city

TDM Plans must be approved by the City and monitored by the property owner on an annual basis. The Plans must contain enforcement mechanisms or penalties that accrue if targets are not met.

- Require new development projects to offset remaining peak period motor vehicle trips through one of the following methods:
  - By directly contracting with another property owner or organization to reduce trips generated from another site; or
  - By paying an annual fee to the City for use in reducing motor vehicle trips to the extent feasible through the provision of transit services, carpool/rideshare incentives, bicycle lanes, and other similar programs and improvements.

TRANS-1b: Establish and implement a policy that eliminates (“unbundles”) free or subsidized parking in new commercial and residential development (i.e. requiring employees and residents to pay separately for parking).

TRANS-1c: Work to advance plans for grade separation at intersections along the Caltrain tracks to reduce traffic congestion/delay and improve safety; seek funding for design and implementation from local, regional, State, and federal sources. Ensure that future grade separation projects include a community participation and review process, and undergo environmental review. Future grade separation improvement projects would have the potential to cause environmental impacts, such as impacts associated with construction-related emissions, noise, and traffic, and aesthetics and land use impacts. These impacts, and alternatives to these grade separation projects, would be evaluated in detail when the projects are more clearly defined.

TRANS-1d: Take a leadership role in regional transportation planning and advocating for specific transit improvements and investments, such as Caltrain service enhancements, Dumbarton Express service, enhanced bus service on El Camino Real with queue jumping and curbside platforms, and additional

---

VTA bus service.

---

TRANS-1e: Work with the PAUSD to ensure that decisions regarding school assignments are analyzed to reduce peak period motor vehicle trips to and from school sites.

---

TRANS-3a: The City shall require new development projects to prepare and implement TDM programs, as described in TRANS-1a. TDM programs for worksites may include measures such as private bus services and free shuttle services to transit stations geared towards commuters.

---

TRANS-3b: Take a leadership role in regional transportation planning and advocating for specific multi-modal freeway improvements, such as dynamic pricing, express bus service, transit and HOV priority, and other enhanced mobility options.

---

TRANS-6: Provide traffic signal prioritization for buses at Palo Alto intersections, focusing first on regional transit routes. Also, provide queue jump lanes and curbside platforms for buses on El Camino Real.

In concert with Mitigation Measure TRANS-6, Mitigation Measures TRANS-1a, TRANS-1b, and TRANS-3 would eliminate the impact on transit at the following intersections, which are projected to operate at a substandard level of service and are used by at least one bus route:

- Middlefield Road and East Charleston Road (#2) under Scenarios 1 and 4
- El Camino Real (SR 82) and San Antonio Road (#8) under Scenarios 1, 2, 3, and 4
- Foothill Expressway and Page Mill Road (#9) under Scenarios 1, 3, and 4
- Foothill Expressway and Arastradero Road (#10) under Scenarios 1, 3, and 4
- Alma Street and East/West Charleston Road (#4) under Scenarios 1 and 2

VTA Route 88 runs on East/West Charleston Road and crosses the Caltrain tracks and Alma Street. The intersection of Alma Street and East/West Charleston Road (#4), is one of the impacted intersections under Scenarios 1 and 2, but signal *pre-emption* for VTA's bus service would not be possible at this location, due to the railroad crossing and the need for Caltrain to have signal pre-emption capabilities. However, signal *priority* for VTA buses should be possible at this intersection, and would provide sufficient mitigation to eliminate the impact on transit at this intersection. However, impacts on transit at all intersections and segments where buses operate would not be eliminated.

No further feasible mitigation measures have been identified. Thus, all four scenarios would have a significant impact on transit operations by increasing congestion. These impacts are considered *significant and unavoidable*.

---

TRANS-8: Develop a proactive neighborhood traffic calming program with a tool box of specific improvements that can be used to discourage non-local drivers from using local, neighborhood streets to bypass traffic congestion on arterials.

---

TRANS-9: Implement Mitigation Measure TRANS-8.

---

### Utilities and Service Systems

---

---

UTIL-15: The following policies and programs, or equally effective language, shall be included in the proposed Plan to ensure that future development under Scenarios 2, 3, and 4 would comply with applicable solid waste regulations:

- Policy: Reduce the amount of solid waste disposed in the City’s landfill by reducing the amount of waste generated and promoting the cost-effective reuse of materials that would otherwise be placed in a landfill.
- Policy: Reduce solid waste generation through salvage and reuse of building materials, including architecturally and historically significant materials.
- Policy: Encourage the use of reusable, returnable, recyclable, and repairable goods through incentives, educational displays and activities, and through City purchasing policies and practices.
- Policy: Increase program participation to maximize recycling and composting from all residents, businesses, and institutions, and consider ways to expand recycling and composting programs.

---

UTIL-17: The following policies and programs, or equally effective language, shall be included in the proposed Plan to ensure that future development under Scenarios 2, 3, and 4 maximize energy efficiency and conservation:

- Policy: Optimize energy conservation and efficiency in new and existing residences, businesses, and industries in Palo Alto.
  - Policy: Maintain Palo Alto’s long-term supply of electricity and natural gas while transitioning to renewable energy and energy conservation.
  - Program: Encourage establishment of public education programs addressing energy conservation and efficiency.
  - Program: Incorporate cost-effective energy conservation measures into construction, maintenance, and City operation and procurement practices.
  - Program: Incorporate State and federal energy efficiency and renewable energy standards and policies in relevant City codes, regulations, and procedures for both privately-owned and City-owned projects and properties.
  - Program: Evaluate the merits of electrification strategies and implement suitable programs to switch from gasoline/natural gas to electricity to achieve deep carbon emission reduction.
-



## Comprehensive Plan Update Revised Schedule – May 2, 2016 DRAFT\*

Date*	Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) Schedule of Meetings & Topics	Schedule of Other Events Related to the Comp Plan Update	City Council Schedule of Comp Plan Discussions
May 2		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CAC Land Use Subcommittee</li> </ul>	
May 4		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CAC Sustainability Subcommittee</li> </ul>	
May 10		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CAC Land Use Subcommittee</li> </ul>	
May 11		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PTC Draft EIR Hearing (Continued from April 13)</li> </ul>	
May 16			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• City Council Scenario 5 discussion &amp; direction to staff</li> <li>• Placeworks contract modification</li> </ul>
May 17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land Use &amp; Community Design Draft Element Review</li> <li>• Recommendation on the Draft Community Services Element Considered on Consent</li> </ul>		
May TBD		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CAC Land Use Subcommittee</li> </ul>	
June TBD		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CAC Transportation Subcommittee</li> </ul>	
June 6			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• City Council Public Hearing on the Draft EIR</li> </ul>
June 8		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DEIR comment period ends; transmit public comments to the PTC &amp; the City Council</li> </ul>	
June 21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recommendation on the Draft Transportation Element</li> <li>• Recommendation on the Draft Land Use Element</li> </ul>		
June TBD		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CAC Sustainability Subcommittee</li> </ul>	
July 19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Natural Environment Element Policies &amp; Programs (Discussion)</li> </ul>		
July TBD		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CAC Sustainability Subcommittee</li> </ul>	
July TBD		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CAC Natural Environment Subcommittee</li> </ul>	
Aug 15			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• City Council Review of CAC work on the Transportation Element</li> </ul>
Aug 16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Safety Element Policies &amp; Program Discussion</li> <li>• Natural Environment Draft Element Recommendations (if feasible)</li> </ul>		
Aug TBD		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CAC Safety Subcommittee</li> </ul>	
Aug TBD		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CAC Sustainability Subcommittee</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• City Council Review of CAC work on Land Use Element &amp; Direction regarding Policy L-8</li> </ul>
Sep 20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Business &amp; Economics Element Policies &amp; Programs (Discussion)</li> </ul>		

\* All dates and topics subject to change; additional meetings may be scheduled as needed.

**Comprehensive Plan Update Revised Schedule – May 2, 2016 DRAFT\***

Date*	Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) Schedule of Meetings & Topics	Schedule of Other Events Related to the Comp Plan Update	City Council Schedule of Comp Plan Discussions
Sep TBD		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CAC Sustainability Subcommittee</li> </ul>	
TBD			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>City Council Review of CAC work on Natural Environment &amp; Safety</li> </ul>
Oct TBD		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CAC Business &amp; Economics Subcommittee</li> </ul>	
Oct 18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Safety Draft Element Recommendations (if feasible)</li> </ul>		
Nov 1		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Publish 5<sup>th</sup> Scenario Results for 45-day public review period (supplement to the Draft EIR)</li> </ul>	
Nov 7			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>City Council Discussion &amp; Direction on Governance &amp; Implementation</li> </ul>
TBD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SPECIAL MEETING – Governance Element Policies and Programs (Discussion)</li> </ul>		
Nov TBD		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PTC Hearing on the Fifth Scenario</li> </ul>	
Nov TBD		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CAC Sustainability Subcommittee</li> </ul>	
TBD		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CAC Governance Subcommittee</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>City Council Hearing on 5<sup>th</sup> Scenario supplement to the Draft EIR</li> </ul>
Nov 15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Business &amp; Economics Element Recommendation (if feasible)</li> </ul>		
Dec 13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Governance Element &amp; Implementation Plan</li> <li>Putting it all together/Final Recommendations</li> </ul>		
Dec 31		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Revised Draft Comp Plan Update Disseminated for Public Review</li> </ul>	
Feb (2017)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PTC Review &amp; Recommendation to the City Council (Multiple meetings)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Final Review of Transportation Element</li> </ul>
March			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Final Review of Land Use Element</li> </ul>
March			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Final Review of Natural Environment and Safety Elements</li> </ul>
April			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Final Review of Business &amp; Economics, Community Services &amp; Facilities Elements</li> </ul>
April			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review of Implementation Plan</li> </ul>
May			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Final Review of City Council's Changes &amp; Errata</li> </ul>
May		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Publication of the Final EIR, Mitigation Monitoring Plan &amp; Draft CEQA Findings</li> </ul>	
May			<p>UPDATED COMP PLAN &amp; FINAL EIR ADOPTED</p>

\* All dates and topics subject to change; additional meetings may be scheduled as needed.