Presentations for the
August 10, 2020
City Council Meeting
Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) Process & Plan Bay Area 2050
Objectives for Tonight

Staff Presentation Overview
• Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA)

Action & Discussion
• Questions & Answers
• Direction to Staff on RHNA and Plan Bay Area 2050
• Motions on Draft Letter:
  • RHNA Methodology Options (Attachment A)

Note that the Plan Bay Area 2050 Draft Blueprint City comment letter was issued on August 6, 2020 following Council action on August 3, 2020.
What is the Regional Housing Needs Allocation?

- Process by which the State allocates housing unit production across the state, region by region
- Focuses on total housing production by region, as well as housing offered at a variety of income affordability levels
- Uses a methodology created by regional representatives
Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND):
- HCD RHND of 441,176 new housing units on June 9, 2020
- The ABAG Exec. Board declined to appeal the determination; appeal deadline 7/10/20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Category</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Housing Unit Need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very-Low*</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>114,442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>65,892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>72,712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above-Moderate</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>188,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>441,176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Extremely-Low</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>Included in Very-Low Category</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Palo Alto’s Progress Toward 5th Cycle RHNA (2015-2023)

- City received 1,988 housing units
- City planned for 2,187 units in current Housing Element
- City issued 554 building permits for housing units by end of 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cycle</th>
<th>Total Need</th>
<th>Permits Issued</th>
<th>Permits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999-2006</td>
<td>230,743</td>
<td>213,024</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2014</td>
<td>214,500</td>
<td>123,098</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-2023*</td>
<td>187,994</td>
<td>121,973</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023-2031**</td>
<td>441,176</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Only includes building permits issued in 2015-2018 **Recently issued by HCD
## Palo Alto’s Progress Toward 5th Cycle RHNA (2015-2023)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deed Restricted</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Deed Restricted</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deed Restricted</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Deed Restricted</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deed Restricted</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Deed Restricted</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Moderate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deed Restricted</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Deed Restricted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>554</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RHNA Methodology

• Method by which ABAG will distribute the 441,176 new housing units amongst 101 Bay Area jurisdictions
• Provides the total number of units, as well as affordability levels
• Housing Elements must show compliance and demonstrate the means by which to provide the units
Housing Methodology Committee (HMC)

- Convened October 2019
- Members are elected officials, staff from cities, and stakeholder groups
- Not likely to use previous RHNA methodologies for the upcoming RHNA cycle
- No decisions on the RHNA methodology to use to date
- Draft methodology likely to be released in Fall 2020
1. **Factor Based Total Allocation and Income Shift**
   - *Total units* are allocated to a jurisdiction
   - *Income shift* used to distribute that allocation among 4 income categories

2. **Bottom-Up**
   - Factors and weights determine the number of units distributed to each income category
   - The sum of units in each income category equals a jurisdiction’s total allocation

3. **Incorporation of Plan Bay Area 2050**
   - To be further discussed August 13, 2020
Ten Exploratory Factors

1. High Opportunity Areas
2. Divergence Index
3. Job Proximity – Auto
4. Job Proximity – Transit
5. Vehicle Miles Travelled
6. Jobs-Housing Balance
7. Jobs-Housing Fit
8. Future Jobs
9. Transit Connectivity
10. Natural Hazards
### Factor Based Total Allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Palo Alto Hypothetical Baseline Allocation</th>
<th>Hypothetical Growth Rate (% Increase over Housing Units in 2019)</th>
<th>Hypothetical Housing Units</th>
<th>Difference from Hypothetical Baseline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>4,475</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Top Three RHNA Methodology Options (Using HMC Identified Factors & Weights):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methodology Options</th>
<th>Hypothetical Growth Rate (% Increase over Housing Units in 2019)</th>
<th>Hypothetical Housing Units</th>
<th>Difference from Hypothetical Baseline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing/Jobs Crescent</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>5,819</td>
<td>+1,344 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code Red to Address Housing Need</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>6,087</td>
<td>+1,612 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balanced Equity-Jobs-Transportation</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>6,532</td>
<td>+2,057 units</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Income Shift Example
3-Factor Bottom Up Example

Affordable units

- Access to High Opportunity Areas: 40%
- Jobs-Housing Fit: 40%
- Job Proximity - Transit: 20%

Market-rate units

- Job Proximity - Auto: 50%
- Job Proximity - Transit: 30%
- Jobs-Housing Balance: 20%
Hypothetical Housing Unit Allocations

Palo Alto (2019 HHS: 27,629)  
(Santa Clara County)

- Alloc. Per 2019 Household Share: 4480
- Crescent (2019 HH Baseline): 5790
- Bottom-Up 3 Factors (2019 HH Baseline): 5620
- Blueprint Allocation (Scaled to RHND): 11130
- Crescent (Blueprint Baseline): 15040
- Bottom-Up 3 Factors (2019 Blueprint Baseline): 14390

City of Palo Alto
RHNA Next Steps

• Continue Housing Methodology Committee Discussions
• Fall 2020 - HMC/ABAG Proposed RHNA Methodology to HCD
• Spring 2021 – Release of Draft RHNA to local jurisdictions
• Summer 2021 – Appeals of Draft RHNA numbers
• Winter 2021 – Final RHNA numbers
• January 2023 - Palo Alto develops Housing Element Update based on final RHNA; certified by HCD
Recommendations in Draft Letter

• Support 2019 existing households as baseline methodology
• Support income shift up to 150%
• Long-range regional plan for the 9 County Bay Area
• **State law requires (a)** Regional Transportation Plan and the (b) Sustainable Communities Strategy
• MTC and ABAG are required to periodically to update the plan
• Focus on four key issues: (a) economy, (b) environment, (c) housing (d) transportation
• Identifies policies, strategies, and investments for the region
• Does not change local land use authority
• **Vision:** To ensure a more affordable, connected, diverse, healthy, and vibrant Bay Area for all
## Plan Bay Area 2050 & RHNA and Key Milestones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ABAG 2023 RHNA and Plan Bay Area 2050 Key Milestones</th>
<th>Proposed Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing Methodology Committee Kick-Off</td>
<td>October 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan Bay Area 2050 Regional Growth Forecast</td>
<td>April 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCD Regional Housing Need Determination</td>
<td>June 9, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan Bay Area 2050 Draft Blueprint</td>
<td>July 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABAG &amp; Housing Methodology Committee Proposed RHNA Methodology</td>
<td>Fall 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan Bay Area 2050 Final Blueprint</td>
<td>December 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Subregion Shares</td>
<td>December 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft RHNA Methodology to HCD for Review</td>
<td>Winter 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final RHNA Methodology, Draft Allocation</td>
<td>Spring 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHNA Appeals</td>
<td>Summer 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Plan Bay Area 2050</td>
<td>September 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final RHNA Allocation</td>
<td>Winter 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Element Due Date</td>
<td>January 2023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dates are tentative and subject to change
Staff Recommendation

1. Discuss and provide direction to staff as appropriate on two regional planning efforts, which are Plan Bay Area 2050 and the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) process.

2. Direct staff to submit a comment letter to ABAG/MTC’s Housing Methodology Committee reflecting City Council initial comments regarding the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) methodology options that are under consideration.
Rachael Tanner
Assistant Director
Rachael.Tanner@CityofPaloAlto.org
(650) 329-2761

Rebecca Atkinson
Planner
Rebecca.Atkinson@CityofPaloAlto.org
650-329-2596
POCKET SLIDES

To be presented as needed during discussion
Plan Bay Area 2050 & RHNA Weblinks:

Plan Bay Area 2050:
• Draft Blueprint:
Growth Geographies:
https://mtc.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=9cf8663fabf4478788312de1bcc2977c
• Public Outreach Opportunities:

RHNA:
• Housing Methodology Committee:
  https://abag.ca.gov/our-work/housing/rhna-regional-housing-needs-allocation/housing-methodology-committee
• HMC Visualization Tool:
  https://rhna-factors.mtcanalytics.org/
### Exploratory Factor Influence:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Hypothetical Growth Rate (% Increase over Housing Units in 2019)</th>
<th>Hypothetical Housing Units</th>
<th>+/- Housing Units from Hypothetical Baseline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Palo Alto Hypothetical Baseline Allocation</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>4,475</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RHNA Methodology Factors:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Hypothetical Growth Rate (% Increase over Housing Units in 2019)</th>
<th>Hypothetical Housing Units</th>
<th>+/- Housing Units from Hypothetical Baseline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to High Opportunity Areas</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>7,226</td>
<td>+2,751 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs-Housing Balance</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>6,678</td>
<td>+2,203 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Proximity - Auto</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>6,482</td>
<td>+2,007 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Miles Travelled</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>5,119</td>
<td>+644 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs-Housing Fit</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>5,118</td>
<td>+643 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Hazards</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>4,161</td>
<td>-314 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divergence Index</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>4,064</td>
<td>-411 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Jobs</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>3,691</td>
<td>-784 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Proximity - Transit</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>3,459</td>
<td>-1,016 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Connectivity</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3,113</td>
<td>-1,362 units</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA)

Palo Alto Hypothetical Baseline Allocation:

- Total Allocation: 4,475
- % Growth in Housing Units: 16%
- Very Low: 18%
- Low: 10%
- Moderate: 8%
- Above Moderate: 65%
Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA)

Comparison of Shares of Very-Low Income Units for Income Allocation Options:
Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA)

HMC Initial Consensus Items:

• More housing should go to jurisdictions with more jobs than housing & to communities exhibiting racial and economic exclusion

• The RHNA methodology should focus on:
  • Equity, as represented by High Opportunity Areas
  • Relationship between housing and jobs

• Equity factors need to be part of the total allocation, not just the income allocation part of the RHNA methodology

• Do not limit 6th Cycle RHNA allocations based upon the past RHNA allocations

• Housing in high natural hazard areas is a concern, but RHNA may not be the best tool to address this
# Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA)

## Pros/cons of income allocation approaches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Income Shift</strong></th>
<th><strong>Bottom-Up</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROS</strong></td>
<td>• Allows greater control over total unit allocations</td>
<td>• Allows more fine-grained control for income allocation: allocations for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Directly addresses statutory objective to balance disproportionate concentrations in each income category</td>
<td>affordable units and market-rate units can be set independently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONS</strong></td>
<td>• Increasing the share of affordable units in higher-income jurisdictions means more market-rate units must be directed to other jurisdictions</td>
<td>• Less predictability for the total unit allocations to jurisdictions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No ability to finetune income allocations using factors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Plan Bay Area 2050: Process and Deliverables

**2019**
- **Perspective Papers**
- **Futures Final Report**
- **Project Performance**

**2020**
- **Draft Blueprint**
- **Final Blueprint**

**2021**
- **Implementation Plan**
- **Draft Plan Document**
- **Final Plan Document**

- **Draft EIR**
- **Final EIR**

**PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT**
- **Policy & Advocacy**
- **Scenario Planning**
- **Technical Analyses**

**JULY 2020**

* = Major Policy Board Decisions
Plan Bay Area 2050: Growth Geographies

Priority Development Areas – Red
• Areas within ½ mile of high-quality transit planned for housing and/or job growth

Transit Rich Areas – Dark Green
• Areas within ½ mile of transit with peak headways of 15 minutes or less

High Resource Areas – Purple
• State identified high opportunity areas within 16-30 minute bus headways
Plan Bay Area 2050: Draft Blueprint: Household Growth Pattern

Plan Bay Area 2040: 2010 to 2040
+0.8 million new households

MAP LEGEND
X% County’s share of regional growth, sized based upon total number of new households

KEY GROWTH STATISTICS
46% in Big 3 Cities
33% in Bayside Cities
21% in Inland/Coastal/Delta
77% in Priority Development Areas
61% in Transit-Rich Areas
22% in High-Resource Areas

Draft Blueprint: 2015 to 2050
+1.3 million new households

MAP LEGEND
X% County’s share of regional growth, sized based upon total number of new households

KEY GROWTH STATISTICS
41% in Big 3 Cities
37% in Bayside Cities
22% in Inland/Coastal/Delta
70% in Priority Development Areas
70% in Transit-Rich Areas
29% in High-Resource Areas
Plan Bay Area 2050: Draft Blueprint: Job Growth Pattern

**Plan Bay Area 2040: 2010 to 2040**
+1.3 million new jobs

- **MAP LEGEND**
  - X%: County’s share of regional growth, sized based upon total number of new jobs

- **KEY GROWTH STATISTICS**
  - 44% in Big 3 Cities
  - 40% in Bayside Cities
  - 17% in Inland/Coastal/Delta
  - 55% in Priority Development Areas
  - 59% in Transit-Rich Areas
  - 25% in High-Resource Areas

**Draft Blueprint: 2015 to 2050**
+1.4 million new jobs

- **MAP LEGEND**
  - X%: County’s share of regional growth, sized based upon total number of new jobs

- **KEY GROWTH STATISTICS**
  - 49% in Big 3 Cities
  - 35% in Bayside Cities
  - 16% in Inland/Coastal/Delta
  - 42% in Priority Development Areas
  - 50% in Transit-Rich Areas
  - 19% in High-Resource Areas
Plan Bay Area 2050 Next Steps

- **July - August 10, 2020** – Public feedback on Draft Blueprint
- **Summer 2020** – Strategy refinement; analysis of the Final Blueprint
- **Fall 2020** - MTC Commission and ABAG Executive Board adoption of Final Blueprint
- **Spring 2021** – Release of Draft Environmental Impact Report, Draft Plan Bay Area 2050, and Draft Implementation Plan
- **Fall 2021** – Adoption of a Final Environmental Impact Report, Final Plan Bay Area 2050, and Final Implementation Plan
Recommendations in Council Comment Letter

- Time extension
- Integrate COVID-19 into the long-range model
- Update telecommuting projections
- Revise and ensure accuracy of growth geographies
- Model Palo Alto’s Office Development Cap
- Greater public transparency about methodologies
- Request for specific data about job growth projections
- Clarification of if SB 35 and other policies were incorporated
- Support for some of the draft strategies
Plan Bay Area 2050: Growth Geographies
## 5 Key Challenges for Final Blueprint - Seeking Solutions!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How do we further increase production of homes affordable to lower-income residents, especially in High-Resource Areas?</th>
<th>A larger regional measure for affordable housing?</th>
<th>More strategic investment in High-Resource Areas?</th>
<th>Expanded affordability requirements in new TODs?</th>
<th>Support for modular housing and lower-cost techniques?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How can new or expanded strategies better address traffic congestion and transit overcrowding?</td>
<td>New strategies related to regional rail &amp; express bus?</td>
<td>More funding for bike &amp; pedestrian infrastructure?</td>
<td>Redesign transit system with key timed transfers?</td>
<td>More corridors with means-based all-lane tolling?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How can we reduce risk of displacement so more residents can remain in place?</td>
<td>Supportive services in Communities of Concern?</td>
<td>More affordable housing in Transit-Rich Areas?</td>
<td>Workforce training programs?</td>
<td>Pilot universal basic income?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do we close the greenhouse gas emissions gap in a sustainable and equitable manner?</td>
<td>50% telecommute mandate for big employers?</td>
<td>Exponentially grow regional subsidies for EVs?</td>
<td>Require GHG offsets for all highway projects?</td>
<td>Reform on- and off-street parking policies?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How could more ambitious strategies be employed to shift jobs closer to the region’s workforce?</td>
<td>Expand jobs-housing impact fees?</td>
<td>Office development caps in West &amp;</td>
<td>Tax subsidies to woo major employers?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
City and Staff Actions To Date and Ongoing

- Council Adoption of PDAs & PCAs 1/13/20
- Council Meeting Tonight
- Council Informational Report 6/22/20
- Meetings with MTC/ABAG Staff
- Ongoing RHNA HMC Meeting Attendance
- Consultation with HCD Staff
- PTC Study Session 7/08/20
- Ongoing Plan Bay Area 2050 Meeting Attendance
- Ongoing Working Meetings with SCCAPo & Santa Clara County Jurisdictions
SUMMER STREETS UPDATE & RESOLUTION

City Council – Item 6
BACKGROUND – COUNCIL ACTION ON JUNE 23, 2020

1) City Council passed a resolution authorizing:
   1) Temporary street closures
   2) Temporary pilot parklet program

2) Passed an interim urgency ordinance temporarily allowing:
   1) Expansion of outdoor dining and retail on both public and private property,
   2) Waived permit fees and design review
   3) Allowing on-sale consumption of alcohol in outdoor dining areas, Lytton & Cogswell Plazas

3) Asked staff to look at lower-cost parklet options.
   The ordinance and resolution passed unanimously.
STAFF RECOMMENDATION


2) **Adopt a Resolution Amending Resolution No. 9909** to:
   1) Extend the Temporary Street Closures of California Avenue, University Avenue and Other Downtown Blocks to December 31, 2020
   2) Extend the Temporary Street Closure of University Avenue to Include the Block Between Emerson Street and High Street
   3) Extend the Expiration Date of Resolution No. 9909, Including the Duration of the Temporary Parklet Program, to September 7, 2021
   4) Allow Activities in Addition to Outdoor Dining and Retail to Occur on Temporarily Closed Streets

3) **Provide Comment and Further Direction** on the Program.
PROGRESS & ACTIVITIES

- Weekly Zoom meetings (1) Cal Ave merchants (2) Downtown merchants
- Bi-weekly Zoom meetings w/community
- Daily staff contacts w/stakeholders; phone, email, and socially distanced visits
- Review and issue permits
- Inspect construction of parklets
- Close streets to traffic and update traffic plans
- Online surveys for patrons and businesses
- Develop & issue guidelines as new uses re-open
- Ongoing communications, signage & advertising
- Weekly pedestrian, cyclists, diner counts
- Weekly parking impact counts
- 1-week traffic counts in downtown
203 Survey Responses*

- **Local** - 92% of respondents live in Palo Alto
- **Dining & Strolling** - 70% dined outdoors, 30% had not
- **Popular Locations** - 40% dined at Cal Ave, 20% at University, 40% at both
- **Weekends and Evening Popular** - Friday and Saturday and in the evening

- **Active Transportation Common** - 36% walked & 15% biked to Summer Streets
- **Great Parking Experience** – 95% of drivers had great parking; 5% fair
- **Feels Safe** – 95% said they felt safe
- **Will Return!** – 95% said they would continue to patronize

* as of July 23, 2020
PATRON FEEDBACK

• Positive responses, “Love it”, “Great idea!”, “Feels like Europe.”
• Requests to make this permanent or an annual (summer) activity.
• Some concerns over distancing, mask wearing, and general wisdom of dining outdoors during the pandemic.
• Even those not dining enjoyed visiting and people-watching.
CALIFORNIA AVENUE
Key Takeaways

• Street closed from El Camino Real to Birch.
• Birch to Park closed briefly, but re-opened.
• 11 restaurants permitted for outdoor dining.
• Evening is busier than lunch.
• Weekends are the busiest.
• Responding businesses estimate 25-60% of pre-pandemic revenue; average is 32%.
• Neighboring street parking not impacted.
UNIVERSITY AVENUE
Key Takeaways

• University Avenue closed from High St. to Cowper.
  • Adjusted on 8-7-20 to open High St and close a portion of Ramona
• 15 restaurants permitted for outdoor dining.
• Evening is busier than lunch.
• Weekends are the busiest.
• Responding businesses estimate -16-80% of pre-pandemic revenue; average is 35%.
• Cross/side street businesses report 22-60% of pre-pandemic revenue; average is 22%.
• Neighboring street parking mostly unimpacted, except one section of Webster.
PARKLETS

• Overall successful program.
• 22 parklet applications received.
• 6 parklets in use.
• City hired architect created standard plans.
• Director of Public Works updated Standards to allow for at-grade parklets.
• Parklets often accommodate less seating than indoors and less than a closed street.
• **Private parking lots**
  • 2 applications for use of private lots for dining/retail.

• **Public parking lots**
  • Agreements w/the City and businesses for use of parking lot for dining/services (i.e., Rose and Crown).

• **Recreation, personal services, etc.**
  • Developing guidelines and rules that will be published.
  • Staff are working w/test cases.
RESOLUTION

Summer Streets
EXTEND STREET CLOSURES TO 12-31-2020

- Authorize extending the temporary street closures to December 31, 2020 by amending Resolution No. 9909.
- Give the City flexibility to work with stakeholders to modify the closures throughout that time.
- Modifications may include the time of day or days of the week.
- Further modifications if/when indoor dining is allowed, as the seasons change, and during the holiday shopping period.
- Staff intend to return to the City Council in early December.
ADD 1 BLOCK DOWNTOWN CLOSURE

• Staff recommend amending Resolution No. 9909 to add the block of University Avenue from High Street to Emerson Street to the allowable closure footprint.*
• This section of University hosts fewer diners and pedestrians than other sections and was opened to traffic on 8-7-2020.
• The flexibility to close this section enhances options for these restaurants and retailers in the future.

*Currently, this closure is effectuated under a separate temporary street closure permit the City has issued.
Staff recommend extending the expiration date of Resolution No. 9909 to allow the parklet program to run through Labor Day 2021.

- Director of Public Works to extend the duration of the permits for platform parklets through that date.

- The extension would create a longer time period over which restaurateurs could amortize the parklet investment.

- Staff recommend at-grade parklets expire 12-31-20.
ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES IN CLOSED STREETS

• Clarify that additional activities, such as recreation, are allowed to take place in closed streets.
• Such activities will require a permit to occur.
• Staff will work to minimize or eliminate conflicts between uses.
LOOKING AHEAD

Summer Streets
CONSIDERATIONS FOR FUTURE PROGRAMS

Items to Address Via Local Action, Planning, and Programming
- Winter weather
- Address additional topics from Business Roundtable
- Programming to aid additional industries/business types
- Sustainability of dedicated staff time and City resources

Macro-Factors Impacting Future of Local Programs
- Santa Clara County on State 3-Day Watch List
- Return to Workplaces or Extended Work From Home
- Overall contours of the pandemic
STAFF RECOMMENDATION


2) **Adopt a Resolution Amending Resolution No. 9909 to:**
   1) Extend the Temporary Street Closures of California Avenue, University Avenue and Other Downtown Blocks to December 31, 2020
   2) Extend the Temporary Street Closure of University Avenue to Include the Block Between Emerson Street and High Street
   3) Extend the Expiration Date of Resolution No. 9909, Including the Duration of the Temporary Parklet Program, to September 7, 2021
   4) Allow Activities in Addition to Outdoor Dining and Retail to Occur on Temporarily Closed Streets

3) **Provide Comment and Further Direction** on the Program.
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Zoning Amendment
Amending PAMC 18.52 & 18.54
for EVSE Installation, ADA Compliance, and Restriping

August 10, 2020
www.cityofpaloalto.org
Presentation Overview

- Review proposed code updates
- Timeline
- Summary of each of the seven code changes
- Recommendation
Code Update Items 1-3

1. Reduces standard vehicle parking stall dimensions to allow installation of Electric Vehicle Supply Equipment (EVSE)

2. Re-establishes and updates a prior code to allow extra bike parking to replace required vehicle parking spaces

3. Establishes language governing motorcycle parking
Code Update Items 4-7

4. Provides local standards for lot re-striping & maintenance

5. Brings local code language in compliance with State requirements and the Americans with Disability Act (ADA)

6. Enables parking lot retrofits for accessible parking and EVSE utility equipment

7. Adjusts codes associated with the proposed changes and to provide internal consistency and clarity
Timeline

Required Code Updates

- Compliance with State Law for Electric Vehicle Supply Equipment (EVSE)
- Compliance w/Americans with Disabilities Act

March 2019

Problems Defined and Solutions Explored

January 2020

Consideration of Suggested Code Amendments and Feedback Provided by PTC

May 2020

Revised Proposed Code Changes to PTC Based on Feedback & Further Analysis

August 2020

PTC Recommendation on Draft Ordinance Forwarded to City Council
1. Reduction in Stall Size for EVSE

Retrofitting for EVSE
• New code section allows minor size reductions of required dimensions for parking stalls; encroachment into space
• Existing sites may have stall widths reduced up to 18” for EVSE installs
• Max 10% of the total required parking stalls or 2 stalls, whichever is greater
• EVSE utility equipment get reductions

Minimizes Process While Balancing Code Requirements
• Minor encroachments proposed minimally impact overall parking stall size
• Staffs suggestion is considerate of both small and large sites (parking lots)
2. Bike Parking Substitution for Car Space

Allows More Bicycle Parking
- New code section to allow for 8 short-term or 4 long-term bicycle parking to replace one car parking space
- Substitution would be for bike spaces above the required bike parking
- Maximum substitution is two parking spaces, or 10% of existing spaces

Minimizes Process While Balancing Code Requirements
- Minor substitution would allow for greater bicycle parking capacity
- Spaces must be near primary entries or meet best practices for bicycle parking
- New code involves less process for applicants seeking this substitution
3. Motorcycle Parking

**Allows Motorcycle Parking**
- New code section allows motorcycle parking and notes required stall size
- Motorcycle parking does not count towards the required vehicle parking

**New Parking Standard to Maximize Parking Lot Usage**
- Establishes code language for motorcycle parking can allow greater parking capacity
- Allows motorcycles to have a designated space and avoids use of standard parking spaces for automobiles
4. Parking Lot Re-striping & Maintenance

Allows Existing Facilities to Restripe for:

• Improvements to circulation
• Meet current parking design standards
• City Waste management objectives (refuse enclosures)
• City Stormwater policies
• Eliminating potential hazards

Existing Non-compliant Facilities Can Make Improvements

• Intended for existing development and existing parking lots
• Director’s Adjustment allows for a case-by-case analysis
• Minor parking stall loss would be allowed
5. State Law Compliance for Accessible Parking & EVSE

Updates for State Law Consistency

• AB 1100
• EVSE/ready parking counts as a standard parking space
• Accessible EVSE/Ready counts twice towards the parking requirements

Updates for Consistent Parking Stall Counting

• Makes standard accessible parking space count with EVSE/Ready count twice
• Accessible parking with accessible path & accessible van parking
6. Local Code Compliance with Accessible Requirements & Retrofitting EVSE

Required Accessible Parking Upgrades
• New code formalizes required accessible parking upgrades
• Minor parking spaces loss is allowed

EVSE Utilities Equipment
• Allows for minor parking stall loss for EVSE utilities equipment

Minimizes Process and Formalizes Current Practices
• Formalizes current staff practice for retro-fitting Accessibility upgrades
• Allows for additional flexibility for the associated EVSE utility equipment
7. Code Clean-Up

Minor Changes: Clarifications, Definitions, and Internal Consistency

• Provides associated language for the proposed code (e.g. new definitions)
• Updates existing language to allow for Downtown to take advantage of the proposed code changes
• Unifies PAMC 18.18 (Downtown Code) & 18.52 with one set of code regulations rather than two
• Ensures consistency between PAMC 18.52 & 18.54
• Updates existing language for ADA parking with current regulations
Recommendation

Staff and PTC recommend City Council take the following action:

Adopt the proposed ordinance (Attachment A) amending Title 18 (Zoning Code) Chapters 18.52 (Parking and Loading Requirements) and 18.54 (Parking Facility Design Standards) of the Palo Alto Municipal Code (PAMC)
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