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Recommendation
Staff recommends that Council discuss the 2019 priorities, review the progress made on achieving them, and select priorities for 2020.

Discussion
On December 10, 2019, City staff presented a staff report to Policy & Services Committee to discuss and consider making recommendations to the City Council regarding 2020 priorities setting. Policy & Services Committee recommended “the Council use the 2019 City Council Priority Setting for the 2020 City Council Priority Setting Process, have the priorities be focused in such a way that items can be accomplished and, have the format and facilitation be determined by the new administration” (Minutes).

In October 2012, Council approved Priority Setting Guidelines (CMR: 3156) and outlined the role for the Policy & Services Committee in this activity. Per the Guidelines, a priority is defined as a topic that will receive particular, unusual and significant attention during the year. Additionally, there is a goal of no more than three priorities per year, generally with a three-year time limit.

A list of past Council priorities by year for the last five years includes:

2019
- Climate Change
- Grade Separation (choose preferred alternative by end of the year)
- Traffic and Transportation
- Fiscal Sustainability
2018
- Transportation
- Housing
- Budget and Finance (create an infrastructure funding plan)
- Grade Separation (choose preferred alternative by end of year)

2017
- Transportation
- Housing
- Infrastructure
- Healthy City, Healthy Community
- Budget and Finance

2016
- The Built Environment: Housing, Parking, Livability, and Mobility
- Infrastructure
- Healthy City, Healthy Community
- Completion of the Comprehensive Plan 2015-2030 Update

2015
- The Built Environment: Multi-modal transportation, parking and livability
- Infrastructure Strategy and Implementation
- Healthy City, Healthy Community
- Completion of the Comprehensive Plan update with increased focus from Council

2014
- Comprehensive planning and action on land use and transportation: The Built Environment, Transportation, Mobility, Parking and Livability
- Infrastructure Strategy and Funding
- Technology and the Connected City

The four 2019 Council priorities were chosen from a list of eleven submitted by Council members and discussed at their annual retreat on February 2, 2019. Other topics included pursuing a business tax and reconstructing Cubberley Community Center. Grade separation and transportation are both carry-overs from the 2018 Council Priorities, while climate change and fiscal sustainability are new priorities in 2019. Among the Council ideas proposed to address transportation and traffic issues were expanding the City’s shuttle program and promoting alternatives to solo driving.

Past annual citizen surveys have also allowed for an open-ended response on topics of interest or concern. The Executive Summary of the 2018 National Citizen Survey discusses the data from 2018, 2017 and 2014. In addition, staff e-mailed Council members requesting their suggestions
for priority topics to be included as part of the December 2019 Policy & Services Committee discussion on priorities. Priorities received from the Council Members to help inform the retreat discussion include:

- In addition to the four priorities from this year (2019), add “rebuild Cubberley Community Center”
- With respect to climate change, more specificity, particularly around sea level rise adaptations
- I would vote for roughly the same as we have this year (2019)
  - Grade Separations
  - Economic Diversity (not just fiscal)
  - Transportation and Mobility (not traffic)
  - Climate change (maybe)
- Housing
- “Make Palo Alto Fun Again”
- Traffic Congestion Relief
- Affordable Housing and Homeless
- Grade Separations
- Transportation: traffic relief/circulation and flow, mobility, parking, emergency response
- Subsidized deed restricted below market housing
- Retail revitalization

Accomplishments Addressing Council Priorities and Continuing Multi-Year Efforts
At the City Council retreat, the City Manager will review several accomplishments in addressing the City Council Priorities and continuing multi-year efforts. Below is a high-level list of some key accomplishments achieved in 2019 by City Council priority. As many of the City’s major accomplishments connected to addressing Council priorities are multi-year in nature, staff included some achievements that continue into the coming year.

Climate Change
- Implemented the most aggressive plastics ban in the nation
- Approved Reach Code requirements to support all-electric with new construction
- Decommissioned the Incinerator
- Celebrated the Re-Opening of the Reuse Zone
- Expanded Palo Alto participation in the Cool Block Initiative
- Biggest ever Bike Palo Alto Day
- Highest per capita EV sales in the nation
- Adopted a water reuse agreement Between Valley Water, Cities of Palo Alto and Mountain View

Transportation and Traffic
- Established the new Office of Transportation
- Extended the Bike share pilot program
• Expanded the City’s shuttle program
• Began Ross Road Interim Modifications

Grade Separation
• Continuing progress towards a decision on designing the City’s rail corridor for the future and a decision this spring

Fiscal Sustainability
• Adopted a balanced fiscal year operating and capital budget, including setting aside $4 million to the City’s Pension Trust
• Began developing a Pension Policy
• Released a new services guide to inform the public about City Services
• Adopted a workplan for a potential revenue ballot measure

Continued Other Multi-Year Efforts

Public Safety and Health
• Celebrated new Healthy Cities Rankings
• Launched the mobile emergency operations center
• Furthered construction of Fire Station 3
• Approved the Pets in Need contract to support the animal shelter and animal control services
• Celebrated the launch of several arts exhibits like Blue Trees, Catch Me if You Can

Investing in the City’s Future Capital Needs
• Approved construction of Highway 101 Bike Bridge
• Released the Cubberley Vision
• Began construction of the Cal Avenue parking garage
• Completion of Charleston and Arastradero
• Completion of University Avenue water and gas infrastructure upgrade for the next 100 years
• Ranked best rated streets in the county - 85 PCI score for streets
• Celebrated Baylands Boardwalk Opening
• Completed Running track repaving at Cubberley
• Expanded pickleball courts
• Continued construction of the new Junior Museum and Zoo

Recently Released City Services Guide Background and Overview
As part of the Fiscal Year 2018-2019 Budget, the City Council directed staff to develop two workplans to identify immediate changes to the budget and other strategic action. The City Council in December of 2018 approved budget adjustments contributing $4 million from the General Fund to the City’s IRS section 115 irrevocable pension trust fund (Pension Trust). The second workplan for strategic action was included in the 2019 fiscal sustainability workplan that
was adopted by the Council. In November 2018, staff embarked on the strategic action work plan. This work plan, using the FY 2020 Adopted Budget, identified over 120 programs across the City, allocating over 1,000 full time positions and nearly 1,150 total positions when including part-time staffing.

Throughout the city, departments have engaged in documenting a guide to City services and programs, using a common set of terms to describe the wide range of services and programs currently provided by the City. This is formally being called the “City Services Guide.” In December 2019, the City Services Guide and the City Services Guide Appendix was released, approved by the Finance Committee and shared as an informational item for the City Council. This document seeks to articulate not only the financial accounting of services but the work the City performs and provides on a daily basis and the outcomes delivered.

The City Services Guide is intended to be used as a tool to begin outreach and education on both the resources and the costs of business that support the delivery of services to the community, each a critical component of the City’s financial sustainability ecosystem. Staff expects to continue to build on this and begin to further tie in performance metrics to assist in a more robust measuring of the services that are provided.

The City Services Guide complements the City of Palo Alto’s budget, highlighting the work that our staff do every day to support all Palo Alto residents. From our Fire Department to our Information Technology Department, we work together to deliver cost-effective services in a personal, responsive and innovative way. The Fiscal Year 2019-2020 budget at a glance document was released earlier this month and can be found here.
In December 2019, City staff released an online survey to engage the community and gain input for the City Council as they discuss and set priorities for 2020. Attachment A provides a comprehensive report of all comments received through the online survey that was launched on December 10, 2019 and closed on Friday, January 24, 2020. The attachment also includes email correspondence received from the community on this topic.

High level survey results include:

- 504 people visited the online survey form
• 347 priority responses were provided
• 17.2 hours of public engagement

The comments received through the online survey range in focus and topics, however, several general themes emerged: (not in priority order)

• Create more housing overall and support housing for all income levels
• Reduce traffic, make streets safer, synchronize traffic light timing
• Make biking easier and safer
• Address rail grade separation/train crossings
• Support climate change, sustainability and resiliency
• Focus on fiscal sustainability
• Implement a plan for Cubberley
• Reduce airplane noise
• Move forward with undergrounding of utilities

Timeline, Resource Impact, Policy Implications (If Applicable)
The Council Priorities, set annually, guide workplans and direction for City activities in departments and in determining City-wide policies.

Stakeholder Engagement
Policy and Services Committee discussed possible 2020 priorities at their December 10, 2019 meeting. Action minutes are found here. The full Council was solicited for their recommended priorities for consideration at that meeting. The community was engaged to provide their thoughts on priorities via the City’s online survey tool at Open City Hall, December 10, 2019 – January 24, 2020. At the retreat itself community members are encouraged to attend and express their views in person.

Environmental Review
This is not considered a project that would be subject to environmental review.

Attachments:
• ATTACHMENT A- Community Input on City Council Priorities 2020
ATTACHMENT A

The following attachment relates to the City Council’s discussion on priorities and includes two sections. The first section includes input gained from the City’s online survey through Open Town Hall, the City’s community engagement tool, provided by OpenGov. The second section includes all emailed correspondence from the community providing feedback to the City Council.

Section 1: Compiled comments received through the online survey launched on December 10, 2019 and closed on Friday, January 24, 2020. High level survey results include:

- 504 people visited the online survey form
- 347 priority responses were provided
- 17.2 hours of public engagement

Section 2: This section includes all community correspondence received via email providing feedback on priorities for the City Council to consider. The email messages received are from December 2019 through Monday, January 27, 2020. Overall, nine emails were received from community members and ranged in topics.
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What are the priorities you would like to see the City Council adopt for 2020?

Summary Of Priorities

As of January 27, 2020, 11:13 AM, this forum had:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendees:</th>
<th>504</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Priorities:</td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours of Public Comment:</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Topic Start
December 10, 2019, 6:28 PM
**Individual Priorities**

**Name not available**
December 11, 2019, 11:28 AM

Please address the speed limit on stretch of Middlefield Road, specifically between Loma Verde and East Meadow. This stretch has speed limit of 25 MPH which is never enforced (I haven’t seen it enforced in the 20+ years I have been living on the street). The stretch is relatively long and doesn’t have any lights to regulate the traffic. Since the traffic moves at a high speed, the commuters (especially elderly) who get off the VTA bus have to be extra careful -- I have seen them almost getting hit, or worse getting yelled and honked at. It is not an option for them to go to either Loma Verde or East Meadow to cross the street. PLEASE address this ASAP -- it is a matter of time until someone gets seriously hurt.

---

**Peter Coughlan**
in Southgate
December 11, 2019, 5:53 PM

Climate change — specifically, ways that PALO Alto can sequester more CO2 than it produces

---

**Name not available**
December 11, 2019, 6:18 PM

We must do whatever we need to in order to fulfill our 80% reduction of GHGs by 2030. There is no time to waste and to be timid in our approach.

---

**Matthew Lennig**
in Community Center
December 11, 2019, 7:29 PM

(1) Replace existing 1950s-style bicycle racks at Rinconada Pool with inverted-U bike racks.

(2) Finish the project started years ago to bury electric power lines underground throughout Palo Alto. The project was halted after certain neighborhoods had their power distribution moved to underground cables. Many neighborhoods still have power poles with power lines up in the air. These aerial power lines should be buried underground.

---

**Name not shown**
in Charleston Terrace
December 11, 2019, 7:44 PM

I have lived in my Palo Alto home on E. Charleston Road for 17 years. I have watched the street go from 4 lanes to two lanes. I watched the Ross Road project go into effect and take a wide boulevard down to a narrow obstacle course that makes it harder to avoid cyclists, now I have only recently realized that the concrete obstacle course laid down on E. Charleston Road will be extended in front of my property. I am so not a fan of those awful median strips. If you wanted to accomplish having less traffic on that thoroughway you’ve already lost me because I actively avoid it. Now, with the expansion planned for next spring for the rest of the road I am really upset. Those median strips are too large. Often they aren’t kept up and they become eyesores (just look at the one near Louis Road). They block traffic flow in the case of a needed emergency egress and they make it more difficult to avoid cyclists by pushing cars further toward the edge of the road. I hear that these modifications have been planned for many years. Unfortunately, due to my work as a busy professional and a single parent I missed the opportunity to provide input earlier. If there is any chance to block the further implementation of this plan I would like to add my voice now.

Addendum: I see that many people want us all to "bike to work". Not all of us can bike, or even want to bike. Often biking puts you at risk of inevitably being hit by cars despite the city’s efforts to make the city bike friendly. Not everyone has or wants to spend an extra 2 hours on a bike getting too and from work. Often it is dark in the mornings or it is cold and/or rainy. The same goes for the ride home which isn’t particularly safe for Women. Not everyone has time to change clothing and shower once they get to work. Needless to say I will never be biking to work. I do envy those who find it pleasurable to do so.
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Improve free shuttle system for students

Amie Ashton
in Downtown North
December 12, 2019, 7:59 AM

Safe, protected bike routes! Now that Ross Road is done, my husband and I RIDE to the YMCA daily. That is four trips reduced (two each way) in the City, and I am not the only one. The use of bikes on the street, to area schools, and the YMCA has greatly increased. They Y has about 25 bike racks for 50+ bikes and some days they are ALL FULL and it is a beautiful revelation. This is cars off the road, cleaner air, less nose, fewer GHGs, and more COMMUNITY spirit! Please prioritize more bike routes to get folks out of cars and out with their neighbors. It is for health and the environment. Fewer cars is a win for bikes and drivers (because they have to deal with less traffic).

Also housing!!!!! High density, and lots of it along Caltrain, at Cal Ave, and along University. You want thriving urban commercial centers that are resilient in the face of online shopping, build housing.

Neilson Buchanan
in Downtown North
December 12, 2019, 10:45 AM

City planning is clearly a political process with many voices from many sides.
1. This "open mike" approach via web questionnaire is legit way to hear from citizens. It is not clear to me how input from Palo Altans vs others is managed.
2. Priorities are solicited annually via the Annual Citizens Survey which captures a reasonable sample of Palo Alto citizens' opinions. This linear multi-year survey is very appropriate for any city government because most workable solutions are long-term requiring alignment of staff and financial resources.
3. The annual statement of mayor's priorities is important too.

However, too much flux in priorities without steady-state financial and human resources is recipe for mediocrity undeserving of Palo Alto's claim for excellence.

Bottom line: How will Council use objective and subjective data to align 2020 priorities, budget and staffing?

Name not available
December 12, 2019, 11:01 AM

Sustainability, grade separation, and transportation continue to be hot-button issues. I would love to see a focus on sustainable transportation - like focusing on regulating parking to reduce single-occupancy vehicles, transit-friendly policies, and bike and pedestrian facilities and emphasis. We have 11 years to change our ways before climate change is irreversibly damaging. We need to act now as fast as possible and get clear council leadership that no one is exempt from this.

Annette Isaacson
in Midtown/ Midtown West
December 12, 2019, 11:40 AM

Climate change and affordable housing. Allow duplexes and quadplexes in areas currently zoned for R-1

Name not shown
December 12, 2019, 10:27 PM

community safety shall be our city's priority.

Kenneth Horowitz
in University Park
December 13, 2019, 12:52 PM

Cubberley site.
Do not renew the lease with PAUSD. The City Council has given the School District over $200M since 1990 with no improvements made with the facilities. The priorities of the City and PAUSD are different and it is time for the Council to move forward. Allow the school district do what it really wants (future school land), and let them lease deteriorating and unacceptable facilities at their own risk. Now the Council should prioritize the 8 acres that the City owns. Seek a bond in 2020 so that the nonprofits have safe and modern facilities at Cubberley. Don't waste time
collaborating with PAUSD. Time is now to make Cubberley your #1 priority. It is truly a local issue and manageable!

Elizabeth Beheler
in Charleston Meadows
December 14, 2019, 10:17 AM

Make progress on the Cubberley development. I was excited to see that there were plans for big improvements but I was disappointed to learn they were just ideas and that there isn’t a real timeline for bringing it into reality. It’s quite run down right now but there’s a lot of space that could potentially benefit so many of us. Would love to see that move along.

Name not available
December 14, 2019, 1:29 PM

Airplane Noise!!!!!

Andy Robin
in Community Center
December 14, 2019, 1:38 PM

Please protect our sleep by fighting to stop concentrated, low-flying flights over Palo Alto.
Please protect our health by fighting to reduce concentration of flights over Palo Alto at all hours. Concentrated jet exhaust particulates are scientifically known to be bad for health.
Thank you.

Name not shown
in Greenmeadow
December 14, 2019, 3:50 PM

1. Fiscal sustainability
2. Climate change (esp transportation: safer biking, more useful transit)
3. Grade separation (design and funding)
4. Better balance of office space and affordable housing (less office space, more affordable housing)
5. Less noise (esp aircraft)

Jennifer Landesmann
in Crescent Park
December 15, 2019, 4:46 PM

#1 PACC and City staff transparency and communication - using new methods, data and media to track progress/advocacy on issues that involve regional, state, and federal actions. Best to communicate regularly and consistently. For example about airplane noise. Ask community for ideas about what that could look like. Or even old methods would be nice like live Town Halls on specific topics.

#2 HEALTH

#3 Clean air - City needs to advocate for higher altitudes for air traffic.

#4 airplane noise, airplane noise, airplane noise

Name not available
December 19, 2019, 2:31 PM

Housing
What else?
Please continue to prioritize climate. As part of that, we need to reconsider our approaches to transportation and individual cars. I would love to see better bike lanes, especially going east/west and prioritize beyond rides to schools - such as to shopping districts. And better public transportation. The Palo Alto shuttle is fabulous, but not frequent enough nor reliable enough timing-wise to use it to catch a train. Thank you

Bob Moss
in Barron Park
December 19, 2019, 2:59 PM

Priorities: Climate change
Grade Separations
Traffic & transportation
Housing

Name not available
December 19, 2019, 4:06 PM

Affordable housing, road repairs (especially on El Camino Real)

Name not available
December 19, 2019, 3:29 PM

Testing

Mark Meyers
in Charleston Terrace
December 19, 2019, 3:49 PM

Important priorities for the City of Palo Alto would be affordable housing and traffic controls.

Bill Fitch
in Evergreen Park
December 19, 2019, 3:55 PM

I want more housing but I know city council can’t get reelected if they support it. So I hope SB50 passes. Nothing is near as important as housing our workers near their jobs.

Name not available
December 19, 2019, 4:06 PM

What is happening on the roads in S. Palo Alto is awful. There is traffic where none existed before the ‘improvements’, more road hazards from same. A big mess.

Please add more "Keep Clear" markings around driveways coming and going from Charleston Shopping Center and the back entrance to Cubberly to help reduce accidents and increase traffic flow.

The light turning left onto Middlefield Northbound from Charleston Eastbound has a problem. If the first car stops abruptly, realizing they aren’t going to make that cycle, the light isn’t triggered and drivers in the turn lane don’t get a light for several sequences until the front car moves out of the lane and goes straight.

Traffic backs up, frustration grows, people make unsafe moves. Please fix the turn light.

Also, several years ago when they redid the traffic lines at Middlefield and Loma Verde, they didn’t align them correctly and people have to swerve to stay in their lane. If the turning person is in the intersection and doesn’t go, it creates a hazard for those folks going straight.

Name not shown
in University Park
December 19, 2019, 4:07 PM

1) Cubberley redevelopment
2) Housing
3) Grade separation
4) Transit / shuttles / parking rationalization

Jolinda Decad
in Midtown/ Midtown West
December 19, 2019, 4:07 PM
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Stronger incentives to go green
Increased security measures to keep us safe and catch criminals - such as cameras in public garages (police department wants it but city has not implemented for supposed "privacy concerns.")
Building codes that make it harder to ruin neighborhoods - look at my cul-de-sac on Webster Street (south of Oregon Expressway, off of Middlefield) to see what the city allows without neighbor review.

Name not available
December 19, 2019,  4:30 PM
Grade separation, fiscal responsibility, and traffic. Please don't spend any time or my money doing the state and federal government's job with respect to climate.

Jonathan Lewis
in Midtown/ Midtown West
December 19, 2019,  5:29 PM
Safer streets for cyclists and pedestrians, more traffic calming, more infrastructure that encourages multi-modal transit and discourages car use. This has implications for climate, public health, and the character of our neighborhoods. Consider taking one block of downtown Palo Alto and permanently closing it to vehicular traffic - Ramona between University and Hamilton would be a great candidate if it wasn't for the garage access issue.

Name not shown
in Palo Verde
December 19, 2019,  5:34 PM
Housing housing and more housing for low and moderate income individuals and families near transit and services.

Name not available
December 19, 2019,  6:01 PM
Get rid of the traffic calming bollards, bulbouts, Botts dots roundabouts and other COSTLY and DANGEROUS nonsense that's impeding through traffic, especially since it doesn't look like the pro-growth majority's going to do anything to reduce under-parked huge office complexes and hotels.

Name not available
December 19, 2019,  7:58 PM
Climate change
Keep Foothills Park closed to non-Palo Alto residents
Deal with traffic

Name not available
December 19, 2019,  9:25 PM
1). Make it easier to optimize use of Caltrain. More frequent service to SF. We need more bike shares. Put them by the station. Make it safer to park personal bikes by the station. Add More shuttles to downtown station. We Need one along university ave! Sam trans 280 281 take way too long to get to the train.
2). Create a pedestrian zone downtown. Downtown Palo Alto is boring. The plaza at university and Emerson feels like to center so why are arts/music /events at the civic center ???? These aren’t a draw. We need to make downtown Palo Alto a dynamic destination like Redwood City.
3). Make it easier to be greener. Make solar and compost way easier.

Name not available
December 20, 2019,  8:05 AM
- climate change, which includes prioritizing other modes of transportation over those modes that use internal combustion engines.
- transportation: Do not make parking and increasing traffic flow priorities over walking, cycling, shuttles. (folded into climate change)
- affordable housing
- affordable housing
- affordable housing ...

Name not available
December 20, 2019,  8:18 AM
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1) Fix the streets in Palo Alto - need repaving
2) Traffic light timing - respond to traffic that exists at that time of day or week
3) 1998 Flood - 20 years have gone by and there are 5 districts to coordinate - install improvements!!

Name not shown
in Duveneck/ St Francis
December 20, 2019, 9:13 AM

Housing. This city is a country club.

Nathan Szajnberg
in Greenmeadow
December 20, 2019, 9:27 AM

Lower real estate taxes

Name not available
December 20, 2019, 9:35 AM

Affordable housing

Dan Bloomberg
in Barron Park
December 20, 2019, 9:36 AM

Top priority: get control of runaway pension liabilities and get rid of the huge debt we've foolishly amassed.
(1) Renegotiate contracts with SEIU to remove unfunded defined-benefit pensions, and use 401K matching instead.
(2) Negotiate with CalPERS to retire pension liabilities in less than 20 years.

Name not available
December 20, 2019, 9:51 AM

Airplane noise

Malcolm Slaney
in College Terrace

December 20, 2019, 10:05 AM

The most important thing our community can do is get the trains and cars out of the same intersections. This is a really rich town. There is no reason to still have kids and cars getting hit by trains.

I'm happy to pay for undergrounding the crossing. Please do something soon.

Helen Young
in Palo Verde
December 20, 2019, 10:14 AM

My top priority is to see that the City Council ensures that Palo Alto becomes a CEDAW (UN Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women) City and passes the ordinance that has been in process since 2017 which would ensure gender equity in our city.

Judith Wasserman
in Leland Manor/ Garland
December 20, 2019, 10:20 AM

Climate change
Grade separation
Affordable (really - not just according to statistics) housing

matthieu Bonnard
in Old Palo Alto
December 20, 2019, 10:23 AM

1. Find innovative ways of to discourage use of cars (even EVs) and promote public transportation or simply walking.
Too many PA residents get in their cars to grab coffee, go to the mall, etc because the city of Palo Alto offers very few alternatives:

- What about testing scooter or bike sharing programs?
- What about buses routes that would go through neighborhoods instead of just high traffic roads. Buses could be small hybrid vehicles with capacity of 10/20 people (my hometown called Sceaux in France uses that. They are super popular because they are very accessible
and frequent) what about make at least part of University street pedestrian only?

2. Affordable housing
Being the 3rd richest zip code in the country comes with duties

3. Get the Caltrain tracks under or above grounds because
   a) humans, including kids, die every year because of antiquated railroads crossings, that might be acceptable in a desert, not in a densely populated area
   b) Palo Alto is rich and disruptive
   c) Palo Alto is the heart of the world-famous Sillicon Valley,
   d) this is the 21st century

Name not available
December 20, 2019, 10:32 AM

* Fiscal responsibility.
* Lower real estate taxes.
* Less traffic congestion by reducing housing.
* Less money spent on "traffic flow" projects that only reroute traffic.
* Lower utility bills.
* Continued use of curbside recycling.
* No interest in programs or legislation that deter local business.
* No interest in climate change, other than reduced litter and pollution.

Name not available
December 20, 2019, 10:36 AM

I would like to see our city declare a climate emergency, and enact policies that reduce waste and consumption of fossil fuels, including plastic usage. The cities timelines are far too slow in addressing the need for businesses to change wasteful practices, especially when alternatives are readily available.

Name not available
December 20, 2019, 10:38 AM

I am most concerned about the disruption of the environment due to jet noise overhead. Not only has it increased the stress level and ability for residents to get a good night’s sleep, it is a health hazard due to the constant rain of fuel pollutants from the skies above us, especially for our children. Please make this a priority in 2020. Thank you.

John Koval
in Old Palo Alto
December 20, 2019, 11:09 AM

More affordable housing; more protection for renters. People with the means to own one or more houses in Palo Alto continually cite traffic as such a problem, but the reason we have so many commuters is in large part because people can’t afford to live near where they work. If you can live near where you work, you’re more likely to opt for climate-friendly commutes (like biking) that take cars off the road. It’s frustrating that the City Council keeps taking up traffic as a core issue, but not the underlying problem -- it speaks to who they’re really looking out for.

Name not shown
in University South
December 20, 2019, 10:34 AM

1. Traffic - Improve Arterial Flow to reduce commute through neighborhoods
2. Airplane Noise - Hold the FAA responsible for dumping all of the new traffic to SFO over PA, particularly the overnight flights that interrupt our sleep and quality of life!
3. Caltrain - Do not cut off vehicle access to Paly & Stanford by closing Churchill, this will make Embarcadero impassable!! And finish up grade separations.
4. City Vibrancy - Zone first floor of Cal Ave and Downtown for retail only. The downtown is especially suffering from the lack of a welcoming and vibrant environment (see Redwood City, San Mateo, Santana Row, and many other cities that have surpassed PA).
5. Housing - Build additional housing adjacent to Caltrain Stations, not out in neighborhoods. Allow higher structures within walking reach of stations. Zone new development to be at least one new housing unit per job. Don’t leave out parking as our transit plan is not adequate.

6. City Character - Move the Motorhomes from neighborhoods and El Camino to open areas near the city yard and end of San Antonio Road.


The city should seriously consider building a student overpass on Embarcadero to the Town and Country mall. The traffic problems there are serious. Sometimes a line of cars extends almost to Bryant everyday because of the light permitting Palo Alto High School students to cross the street to Town and Country. The Town and Country automobile exist at that same crossing complicates the problem. Automobiles existing have to merge into an already crowded lane on Embarcardero. An overpass would considerably relieve the problems.

david schrom
in Evergreen Park
December 20, 2019, 11:41 AM

Plan towards a steady-state city with stable population stable amounts of building, pavement, and other infrastructure, and stable amounts of material (e.g., water) and energy (e.g., electricity) throughput. Pick a size to which each of these will be limited.

Grade separation is the most important thing you can actually do to improve the traffic congestion, cohesiveness and safety of our town. That said, HOUSING within reach at least for our teachers and firefighters should be a priority. And BTW, climate change cannot be a LOCAL priority; it must be national or at least statewide. Your recent rule banning gas is silly and misguided (see Nancy Green’s Opinion letter to the Dec 20 Daily Post “Natural gas ban.”

Michael Fischer
in Charleston Terrace
December 20, 2019, 11:53 AM

1. Grade Separation -- Get it done!
2. Street Maintenance -- Why so poor?
3. Fiscal Sustainability -- Long range planning
4. Climate Change -- Keep up the efforts

1. Climate Change
2. Airplane Noise. Hold the FAA accountable. Stop the low flying overnight flights. Our time in our garden and yard has been ruined by the steady and constant flights. Our neighborhood has become an airplane superhighway. The FAA destroyed our quality of home-life, we are begging the city to help us get it back- please act.
3. Affordable Housing
4. Fix the traffic light timing at Embarcadero/ECR/Paly/T&C. How many years does it take to fix this? Keep our thoroughfares as thoroughfares, so our neighborhoods don’t become permanent alternate routes.

Climate change
Transportation - shift away from SOV
Housing

Grade separation is the most important thing you can
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December 20, 2019, 12:46 PM

Affordable Housing
A Better Stanford - Palo Alto Relationship
Fred Krefetz
in Downtown North
December 20, 2019, 12:47 PM

Engage legal action against the FAA to stop jet traffic noise due to Nexgen implementation which concentrates SFO flight paths over Palo Alto!!! This has been going on since 2014 and has seriously degraded the quality of life and health in our city. Other communities in the country have taken more aggressive action than Palo Alto and some have gotten results. Not dealing with this aggressively is shirking your governing responsibility.

Doron Keller
in Midtown/Midtown West
December 20, 2019, 1:10 PM

Remove car dwellers from our neighborhoods. Find a humane solution that is not in residential areas.

Markus Fromherz
in Barron Park
December 20, 2019, 1:19 PM

2020 priorities should be the same, with climate change action at the top, and I would add housing as another priority, perhaps right after climate change.

Name not available
in Greenmeadow
December 20, 2019, 1:44 PM

I commute from Hayward to Palo Alto M-F for work. I would like it to be easier to get in and out of town during commute hours.

December 20, 2019, 2:05 PM

Fiscal Responsibility is a necessary commitment for the stated priorities of Climate Change, Grade separation and Traffic and Transport.
Your continuing efforts to decrease airplane noise is a valuable and specific Climate Change endeavor.

Jamie Beckett
in Evergreen Park
December 20, 2019, 4:07 PM

1/Halt office construction
2/Address problems of traffic, parking and crowding caused by continued office construction in Palo Alto
3/Retain retail and restrict gyms on commercial streets
Despite a shortage of housing and worsening problems with traffic, parking and crowding, Palo Alto continues to allow new office construction. I live in a mixed-used area that once felt like home. Now it feels like living in an office park. I realize that mixed-used means just that, but where is the housing and retail? Instead, the city has allowed tens of thousands of feet of new office space without taking any action to address traffic on Page Mill Road/Oregon Expressway and other major arteries.
Meanwhile, one retailer after another has been forced out by high rents and replaced with a gym or other fitness facility. California Avenue, once home to two bookstores, an art-supplies store and other retail, now has at least a half-dozen gyms. This reduces the street life and foot traffic and makes it harder for retailers. How do Mountain View, Menlo Park, San Carlos and other Peninsula cities manage to retain retail? Can't we learn from them?

Name not shown
in Greenmeadow
December 20, 2019, 6:55 PM

AIRPLANE NOISE

Barbara Bowden
in University South
December 20, 2019, 8:26 PM

Low and moderate cost housing - no new office space until
we can house city workers and teachers; stop letting developers buy their way out of providing low-income units in new developments. The $ never yields indentifiable housing benefits.

Restore bus service throughout the city - stop sending money to VTA until they provide us service commensurate with our financial contribution to their funding.

Reduce pension liability and negotiate to stop defined benefit plan for new employees, start new employees with 401k’s & employer matching % to ee contribution. 

Begin accumulating funds to deal with grade crossings, consider selling naming rights for them.

Continue work to stop the relentless noise from overhead jets. The noise is miserable and unhealthy. Some quiet at night would be particularly welcome. It’s so bad, my grandchildren can not have sleepovers.

My top priorities include constantly increasing traffic, climate change, constantly growing office populations leading to more traffic and fewer parking places, anemic public transportation, grade crossing, particularly not closing Churchill

1) Since 2014, each day over 300 jet aircraft fly low and loud (many as low as 1800 ft) directly over Palo Alto. When the FAA transitioned to NextGen in 2014, they never measured (or planned to measure) the impact of chronic jet noise and exhaust exposure on humans. There is ample peer-reviewed scientific literature supporting negative health effects of chronic jet noise and exhaust exposure including impaired learning in children and cardiovascular toxicity in adults.

Make housing a priority. In 2019 council said let’s wait and see how the housing support policies we just adopted have worked.

But in 2019 despite council’s efforts, very little new housing was build or proposed, far, far below our goal of 300 added units per year.

And in 2019 we postponed the second part of council’s adopted housing work plan -- to look at gentle density in RI neighborhoods-- duplexes and the like.

Please adopt the following housing goals as a minimum:

--complete the housing work plan
--propose a bond for low income housing
--support the regional housing agency funding plan for low income housing
--learn why so little housing is being proposed and adopt additional incentives
--support state legislation to backfill housing fees so communities get the money but it is not added to the cost of housing

El Camino Real in Palo Alto is a car wrecker. I know that the road belongs to the County of Santa Clara. The City must have some influence with the Board of Supervisors to get El Camino Real paved. The construction trucks working at Stanford have eaten the road down to its first paving it seems. Tax payers should not have to have their cars repaired more often because of Stanfords growth.
A less car-dependent Palo Alto will have a smaller impact on climate change as single passenger automobiles produce the most carbon dioxide pollution per mile of any transportation option. A less car-dependent Palo Alto won’t need to waste billions of dollars on grade separation, and without grade separation as the city has defined it, will guarantee fiscal stability. Finally, a less car-dependent Palo Alto will relieve traffic by including more housing close to transit and pedestrian areas and more opportunities for bicycling.

Peggy Prendergast
outside Palo Alto
December 23, 2019, 2:58 PM

Hello, I would love to see the Palo Alto City Council approve more housing units. It has been increasingly frustrating for neighborhood cities who are building more than 10,000 housing units. Palo Alto does not come close to building new homes. What can be done about this? Is it fair to expect Menlo Park, Mountain View, Sunnyvale and Redwood City to do all the building? Meanwhile home prices in PA go even higher because the inventory is so low? In 2020, I sincerely hope the leaders of PA make a true, honest and sincere commitment to building more homes and go beyond the affordable housing requirements.

My #1 priority and it should be Palo Alto’s as well-housing for the homeless. Rv parks for people living on the street. Instead of continuing to “talk about” action is needed and NOW.

Fix Ross Road. Return it to the way it used to be. It’s a current danger to both cars and bikes. Start with the ridiculously large traffic circle at East Meadow and Ross.

I would like the city to be more aggressive in trying to decrease the number and timing of jet airplane overflights.
Ozzie Fallick
in Evergreen Park
December 25, 2019, 8:17 PM

Build as much dense housing near transit as possible. We have plenty of office space already and nowhere near enough housing. Where are the workers supposed to live?

I don’t know that the PA Council has much influence over this, but our electricity generation mix is about to get a lot dirtier with the premature closure of the Diablo Canyon nuclear plant. Any pressure the Council can exert to keep the plant open would be helpful.

Hamilton Hitchings
in Duveneck/ St Francis
December 26, 2019, 4:23 PM

Fiscal Sustainability - continue to move towards addressing over $700 million unfunded pension obligation
Traffic and Transportation - improve people circulation (cars, bikes, walking) including by more aggressively limiting office space expansion
Grade Separation - figure out a less expensive & less disruptive plan and work on business tax that earmarks where funds go so funds not diverted
Climate Change - we need to be a leader in the USA so we can show other cities what’s possible

Jim Fox
in Fairmeadow
December 31, 2019, 10:30 AM

Housing, and housing, and housing are important issues - including providing (restoring) single-room occupancy as well as affordable rental and owner-occupied housing.

and the train - we need to find solutions that don’t stop traffic crossing Alma everywhere.
Jim Fox

Name not available
December 31, 2019, 10:32 AM

Infill housing with subsidized housing in larger amounts
Plans for rail crossing - tunnel or elevated

Name not shown
in Crescent Park
December 31, 2019, 11:02 AM

I believe housing must be a priority for Palo Alto. All around us cities are building many large multi-unit dwellings, facing the reality that the lack of housing means both homelessness and ever-increasing rents and house prices, while Palo Alto manages to authorize fewer than 100 new multi-family units and a scattering of ADUs. We cannot keep increasing the number of people working in Palo Alto and not provide for housing. We must also honestly address parking. If we don’t want homeless people on our streets or RVs parked along El Camino and elsewhere (really, a rather creative solution to homelessness when you think about it), then there must be more housing overall. Clearly defining zones for multi-family and requiring employers to contribute to housing funds are possible means to foster increased housing.

David Coale
in Barron Park
December 29, 2019, 6:05 PM

Address parking in "non-commute" neighborhoods, those too far from either downtown, train, or Stanford. It is bad here as well. Too many commercial vehicles parked all the time, not just during work hours. This includes the oversized vehicles that people are living in. We need to be compassionate to these people, but also to those of us who do have homes here in Palo Alto. Not pleasant to find human waste on the sidewalks.
2020 City Council Priorities
What are the priorities you would like to see the City Council adopt for 2020?

December 31, 2019, 5:11 PM

Housing, Housing, Housing: for middle and low income workers. SUPPORT SB50. Apply affordable housing overlay around the city. Create a lot of housing for teachers at Cubberley: instead of gyms. Add a school to support housing in Charleston area.

Diane Rolfe
in Old Palo Alto
December 31, 2019, 10:41 PM

Please add Housing as a top priority for the City of Palo Alto in 2020.
Thank you.
Diane Rolfe, 1360 Emerson Street, Palo Alto

Name not shown
in Palo Verde
January 2, 2020, 1:44 PM

I would like to see Palo Alto become more business friendly. We chase businesses away to Mountain View and other surrounding cities, losing revenue that has to be made up with higher taxes.

ron hall
in Community Center
January 2, 2020, 2:39 PM

More affordable housing. Eliminate the ground floor retail requirement and reduce parking requirements for projects with 25% affordable component.
R Hall Channing Ave.

Steve Raney
in Crescent Park
January 3, 2020, 12:17 PM

These priorities are my personal opinion only. These priorities do not represent the views of PATMA.

1. 1.5C climate change leadership. The IPCC’s October 2018 Special Report on Global Warming of 1.5C recommended halving GHG emissions by 2030 to avoid disastrous impacts. No U.S. state or region has adopted the 2030 halving goal, nor has developed a plan to achieve that goal.

1A. Adopt a city policy to halve GHG emissions by 2030. The policy should acknowledge that while incremental measures are virtuous, non-incremental measures (10% or greater reductions) will be required.

1B. Dedicate staff and budget for leadership among nearby cities, the county, and the region to advocate for the halving policy.

2. Enact a regionally-scalable traffic reduction policy

2A. Adopt a city policy of 19% per capita transport GHG reduction by 2030 in support of the state’s allocation to the region to reduce regionally-controlled transport GHG by 19% per capita. (See MTC’s Plan Bay Area 2050.)

2B. Dedicate staff and budget for collaboration among nearby cities, the county, and the region to analyze traffic reduction policies.


2D. Enact a high-impact traffic reduction policy. One example policy is: Cap SOV Commuting at 50% SOV. At no cost to employers, SOV commuting can be capped at 50% SOV (a reduction from the current 75%). This applies to both current and future buildings. A simple majority state bill has progressed through State Legislative Counsel (attorneys who create bill language). The policy is in the regional Transportation Improvement Program (#SCL170003). The law enables local supermajority votes for ordinances to cap in-commuting to cities at 50% SOV. The concept builds on Stanford’s commute program. Two-page policy brief: http://bit.ly/50pcntSOVcap

3. Pilot a regionally-scalable housing technique that can produce 30,000 or more housing units per year.

3A. One example technique: unsubsidized affordable zero-car TOD microunits with local union labor. The private sector can finance, build, and market 8’ x 20’ micro-studios renting for $1,300/month, without taxpayer subsidy. Such housing works best in transit-oriented areas where a downtown streetscape helps provide an extended living room. Such housing meets the definition of moderate-income (80% to 120% of area median income).
affordable housing. Multiples of 8’ x 20’ can also be built, such as a 640 square foot four-bedroom apartment, providing housing for larger families. Modular steel housing units are stackable so that a structure can arise from nothing to complete building envelope in one week, with finish work such as plumbing hookups taking additional time. Details: http://bit.ly/micro-apt.

3B. Dedicate staff and budget for analyzing scalable techniques, modular housing construction techniques, required zoning/parking changes, market demand, etc. Collaborate with nearby cities, the county, and the region.

3C. Acquire control over an appropriate parcel. Then get the pilot project built and occupied.

Name not available
January 4, 2020, 11:09 AM

1. Unquestioned sustainable financial strength
2. Dramatic decarbonization of life in Palo Alto
3. Caltrain grade separation

Name not shown
in Palo Verde
January 4, 2020, 11:39 PM

Climate change, including sea level rise and green house gas emissions
Affordable housing
Traffic and transportation
Fiscal sustainability

Name not shown
in Midtown/ Midtown West
January 5, 2020, 9:56 AM

climate change - moving quickly to zero waste, pollution control, energy resilience, sea level rise, and others transportation - moving to better/more extensive public transit, car-free roads, more electric fast charging stations
housing - reduced/low income affordable housing for all

Peter Cross
in Barron Park

January 5, 2020, 12:44 PM

Building electrification
Affordable housing
Grade separations
Public transportation

Name not available
January 5, 2020, 2:23 PM

City council should continue with the 4 priorities from 2019. The climate crisis should be #1 followed by Caltrain&grade separation.

Stephen Rosenblum
in Old Palo Alto
January 5, 2020, 7:06 PM

Palo Alto needs to commit to being carbon free by 2030

Name not available
January 6, 2020, 2:25 PM

I would like to see Palo Alto partner with neighboring communities to establish a biodiversity conservation plan for the San Francisquito Creek watershed. See San Francisco’s Biodiversity Program at https://sfenvironment.org/article/the-biodiversity-program/biodiversity-program-summary

Name not available
January 6, 2020, 3:56 PM

Our City must address the barriers to high density housing. We need to raise height limits and we need to stop tip toeing around these problems.

Glenn Fisher
in Charleston Terrace
January 6, 2020, 8:42 PM

1) Building permit/architecture review process. Housing
takes way too long and is too expensive; to get more housing built we have to be clear we want it, what the guidelines are, and make it fast and easy to get approval.

2) Traffic. We need better public transit alternatives (empty busses? single-person cars?)

3) Grade separation. It’s time to cut to the chase, pick an alternative and get started.

4) Fiscal responsibility. If we don’t have money, we can’t do anything. A clear, transparent budget process and reporting, and a way for citizens to participate in budget choices, as well as making sure we’ve covered pension obligations and they won’t swamp us.

Name not available
January 7, 2020, 5:15 PM

1) Traffic and transportation, particularly on Embarcadero in the area near Town and Country and Paly. Also work on influencing traffic improvements on 101 through Palo Alto, where it is worsening. Castilleja -- Reign them in and make them abide by existing enrollment agreements. Kill this ridiculous talk of expansion.

2) Grade separation. Let’s get it done.

Name not available
January 8, 2020, 9:13 AM

Please adopt San Jose’s ADU amnestie acceptions

Name not available
January 8, 2020, 9:00 PM

Housing, housing, housing!

Name not shown
in Midtown/ Midtown West
January 9, 2020, 12:07 AM

My priorities for the city of Palo Alto are the following: climate change, homelessness, need to stop approving new office space and replace it with affordable housing options.

Name not available
January 9, 2020, 1:14 PM

Housing should be the council’s number one priority in 2020.

Traffic and parking are no longer an issue due to ride share and the efficacy of TDM programs.

It’s embarrassing to live in a City that creates no housing at all given the current dire need for that.

Please fulfill your mandate to make this happen.

Name not available
January 9, 2020, 1:16 PM

More housing
Rationalize parking and shuttles to reduce traffic and increase transit

Name not available
January 9, 2020, 1:27 PM

More housing and density. The suburban nature of Palo Alto
Alto is not sustainable, just as the agrarian nature of Palo Alto in a previous lifetime was not sustainable.

Name not shown
outside Palo Alto
January 9, 2020, 1:30 PM

I think housing and supports for the greatest diversity of people possible should be a top priority for the City of Palo Alto. There are many residents and families of residents that are being displaced by the extreme cost and elite focus of this town. Let’s create and retain a population that lives and works in this city, starting with families that have lived here for generations. We have room, creative capability, resources, and financial support to be an inclusive community to seniors and disabled people aging in place, students, veterans returning home, etc., all of whom add to the richness and depth of our locale. Thank you for taking this opinion into consideration as you make plans and resolutions for 2020 and moving forward!

Name not available
January 9, 2020, 1:34 PM

For the League of Conservation Voters of Santa Clara County, our highest priority inside cities is transit oriented development, emphasizing housing. Commute trip lengths on the Peninsula are embarrassingly high.

Name not available
January 9, 2020, 1:52 PM

The top two priorities for Palo Alto in 2020 are 1) increasing the supply of all kinds of housing and 2) increasing the frequency and accessibility of public transportation.

Peter Rice
in College Terrace
January 9, 2020, 1:52 PM

Housing
Housing
Housing

Evan Goldin
in Crescent Park
January 9, 2020, 2:00 PM

Council's top priorities should be making progress on housing and transportation, through a lens of our climate change crisis. My younger generation of Paly grads is quickly getting priced out of the area, and we're seeing workers commuting from as far away as Stockton and Madera to work here. We need vastly more housing, vastly better non-auto transportation and we needed it three decades ago.

Council should: 1) Convert parking minimums to parking maximums 2) Upzone near transit (you've claimed you don't need SB50. PROVE IT!) 3) Reduce barriers to home construction so people can live locally, such as allowing 2-3 units on every piece of land city wide. 4) Invest in better transportation, not in parking garages. Nothing will move the needle more on climate change than these things.

Chris Colohan
in Community Center
January 9, 2020, 2:02 PM

Housing to jobs ratio. Since decreasing jobs is not practical, must increase housing.

chao Lam
in Downtown North
January 9, 2020, 2:04 PM

Housing please

Name not available
January 9, 2020, 2:11 PM

Would like to see Council insure Fiscal Responsibility and sustainability be a focus this year followed by completing a plan for grade separation.
I don't see how we can achieve our climate goals and reduce traffic without building more housing in Palo Alto. We are also seeing retail businesses in Palo Alto struggle to get workers, the PAPD struggle to hire police officers, and my veterinary hospital struggle to hire enough vet technicians due to the housing shortage. So we have to make building more middle housing and affordable housing a priority if we are to retain our quality of life in Palo Alto and meet our 4 City Council priorities.

My priorities are building more homes and increasing access to transit. These are the most important things that Palo Alto can do to fight inequality and climate change.

Approve 2,000 new affordable housing units of any size by April 2023.

Please focus on these policy areas in 2020 to further climate and equity goals:
Housing: form-based zoning citywide, financially feasible transit-oriented near rail stations and ECR, designate public-owned parcels for affordable housing
Transportation and Mobility: grade separation, active transportation promotion (bike share, protected bike lane network), parking pricing and management

We need to increase the amount of housing build in Palo Alto significantly. We have become a mockery worldwide for blocking any new housing.

We need more workforce housing. Start with housing for municipal employees and nonprofit staff.
--Carol Steinfeld, board member, Stevenson House

Water - from scarcity to flooding. It seems as if one of the consequences of climate change is that we are going to see more extremes, more frequently. We can't be complacent just because it rained today.

Safety. More regulations on the rental property, such as the accessibility to the house owner information.

Build and allow more housing so that people can live near where they work and the young and old can afford to live in our town. Reduce urban sprawl and waste by creating high
density housing near transit.

**Name not available**  
January 9, 2020, 9:08 PM

HOUSING!! I am a highly educated millenial working in the legal industry in Palo Alto. But I do not see a long term future here because of the housing prices.

**Name not available**  
January 9, 2020, 9:34 PM

I would like to see compensation and benefits for City Staff improved to be better aligned with the quality work that they do and to ensure that the City can attract and retain the best and brightest workers. As things currently stand there are many other cities in the Bay Area that pay the same or more than Palo Alto with lower cost of living and shorter commutes. Also the City should try to be more like the private sector with flexible work schedules, work from home options, depending on job classification (where appropriate). Why force Staff to sit in horrible traffic 2-3 hours round trip just to sit in front of a computer in a City paid office space when they could do the exact same work from home or a coffee shop down the street from their house a day or two a week? Please get with the times!

**Name not available**  
January 9, 2020, 9:47 PM

I would like to get all the RVs off our streets.

**Name not shown**  
in University South  
January 9, 2020, 10:07 PM

More housing for local workers will reduce traffic and provide greater justice.

**Name not available**  
January 10, 2020, 8:58 AM

The most important change to the 2019 priorities is to add housing as a 1st priority. Housing supply is a Palo Alto’s biggest problem and one that won’t get solved unless the Council commits to policies to make it possible and not chicken out of tough decisions.

**Name not available**  
January 10, 2020, 10:03 AM

Expand affordable workforce housing

**Ted Wang**  
in Community Center  
January 10, 2020, 10:36 AM

Housing

**Name not available**  
January 10, 2020, 1:11 PM

HOUSING! Period. I want to make sure we remain the vibrant, diverse city - we love. We will not be able to do that without a Council that understands that housing for everyone, including low-income and affordable - is the key.

**Name not available**  
January 10, 2020, 1:13 PM

Housing and Cubberley

**Gabriel Manjarrez**  
in Midtown/ Midtown West  
January 10, 2020, 1:18 PM

HOUSING

**Name not shown**  
in Midtown/ Midtown West  
January 10, 2020, 1:27 PM

Housing
Name not shown
in Midtown/ Midtown West
January 10, 2020, 1:39 PM

More housing, homes, apartments, skyscrapers if needed. I understand the people that already have their property and want things to be the same as they were 30 years ago but that is not reality. The world has change as has the local population. Let people who own homes build second stories as well if needed. This close minded mentality of having to keep the Eichler look is ridiculous.

Jeff Hoel
in Midtown/ Midtown West
January 10, 2020, 2:12 PM

In 2020, Council should make citywide municipal fiber to the premises (FTTP) a priority.

According to MuniNetworks, as of January 2019, https://muninetworks.org/communitymap 305 communities are being served by some kind of municipal FTTP network. (Of these, 109 are being served by citywide municipal FTTP.)

In 2019, when Council did not make citywide municipal FTTP a priority, staff proposed (06-24-19) a third revision of its "fiber to the node" ("FTTN") idea -- and, I regret to say, Council approved staff's issuing an RFP for this idea -- but staff has not returned to Council since then. That's not much progress for a year. Anyhow, FTTN is not FTTP.

Don't let staff bamboozle you into thinking that 5G wireless (or any kind of wireless) is good enough to be an alternative to FTTP. https://www.eff.org/wp/case-fiber-home-today-why-fiber-superior-medium-21st-century-broadband

Name not shown
in Barron Park
January 10, 2020, 5:50 PM

(1) Move forward with fiber-to-the-premises for Internet access. Despite AT&T’s promise to deliver FTTP in the SF Bay Area and some progress in Palo Alto, lots of Palo Alto neighborhoods can't get gigabit Internet access. Municipal fiber services have been successfully deployed in many communities, and should be a priority for Palo Alto.

(2) Improve the reliability of the electric utility. The reliability of the power in Palo Alto has been deteriorating over the years that I have lived here. We seem to have an outage every month or two now. This is unacceptable, and the City Council should be directing the Utilities to do the necessary maintenance to prevent this.

(3) Fix the roads. The potholes are bad on many Palo Alto streets, and the PCI reports don’t seem to capture the problems.

(4) Fix the traffic signals. Apparently we have smart traffic lights (at least at some locations). You wouldn’t know it from the way the traffic flows. I suspect that the systems are either not correctly programmed or components have failed.

Name not shown
in Ventura
January 10, 2020, 6:54 PM

City Council should make housing a top priority for 2020, for creating affordable ones for future residents and well as tenant protections for our current neighbors. As all in the Bay Area know, there’s a major housing crisis: every week there are stories of displacement, evictions, homelessness, and traffic problems, all of which are due to there are little housing near our workplaces and little housing except for the wealthy. We shouldn’t pay lip
service to incidents like the President Hotel, then completely ignore it, especially in a city nearly half-tenant. A change is going to come; the question whether this council is going to progress or react.

Utility reliability should also be a priority. Palo Alto has seen its share of power outages and internet outages, the former of which can occur just by a single bird at a single power line. The power grid needs to be robust, and information about outages should known more widely than just tweet. And as PG&E will continue power shutdowns, we will need assistance for those living west of 280 and the rest of us, if need be.

---

**Name not available**
January 10, 2020, 7:04 PM

MY PRIORITIES ARE:
Climate/environment
Affordable housing

---

**Name not available**
January 10, 2020, 8:52 PM

Robbery prevention
Youth mental health

---

**Name not shown**
in Duveneck/ St Francis
January 10, 2020, 9:06 PM

Housing - denser housing near transit
Transportation - continue building out safe bike routes and install safer bike parking (bike theft is a deterrent to biking downtown), enhance shuttle routes, work with other cities to get VTA routes that our students need
Grade separation - this is a safety issue as well as a traffic circulation issue

---

**Name not available**
January 10, 2020, 9:29 PM

Afford/Senior Housing

---

**Name not available**
January 11, 2020, 9:06 AM

Housing

---

**Name not shown**
in Midtown/ Midtown West
January 11, 2020, 9:31 AM

Housing and Homelessness

---

**Name not available**
January 11, 2020, 10:12 AM

Quality of life issues. Too much traffic, too crowded, nowhere to park. Not everyone can ride bikes. Sorry, I wish I could. Preserve open space.

---

**Name not available**
January 11, 2020, 10:51 AM

I am a low-income senior living in Midtown. I've been here 20 years.
My Landlord keeps raising my rent. I now pay 60% of my income on rent.
I am very afraid of being forced out of my apartment and my town.
Please prioritize rent control.

---

**Sheryl Klein**
in Crescent Park
January 11, 2020, 1:43 PM

I would like to see housing especially affordable housing be a priority for 2020. Creating additional housing will help ensure the our community remain economically diverse, reduce traffic and commutes.

---

**Name not available**
January 11, 2020, 1:59 PM

Housing, especially affordable housing.
Palo Alto has lagged behind adjoining cities in providing this basic necessity.

We need to work on getting more housing built to do our part alleviate the bay area's housing crisis, and build a more affordable and sustainable bay area, where people do not have highly polluting commutes from the central valley in afford to live in our area.

Palo Alto is awesome - we have access to nature, 2 train stations, 3 great places to shops/eat etc., great schools, bikeways, trees. It's a beautiful place with super smart people. Let’s figure out a way to generate more housing at all income levels but especially more housing that is affordable to the people that work here. This means affords for childcare providers, nurses, nonprofit professionals, teachers, wait staff, etc. etc. etc. If people work here and live here we can mitigate traffic and create a more diverse, equitable, inclusive community.

The city council’s stance towards making Palo Alto more affordable is the same as the Trump administration’s policy to migrants: “We’re full!” And we are not. We have plenty of room and wealth and can open our hearts to other human beings so they have less commute time, more opportunity and a better quality of life. More housing (and more affordable housing) might slightly affect current residents’ quality of life because of density, while making a huge impact on the quality of life of people who would be able to move closer to their jobs and schools. People who live in Palo Alto have been blessed with some combination of prosperity, brains, luck and talent, we should use our talents to find solutions to make Palo Alto affordable and welcoming.

In 2020, please prioritize:
* Increasing the production of market-rate and affordable housing. Let’s meet and exceed our goal of 300 new homes/year.
* Investing safety infrastructure for alternatives to driving (walking, biking, bike/scooter share, buses, Caltrain, etc).
* Addressing climate change, which can be done in part by addressing the above two priorities.
downtown. A must. No flow, no grow. THEN consider how to add more housing. Execute FTTTP plan to prepare for this century. Then, greatly increase use of internet for virtual meetings, virtual companies. Redefine headquarters, offices. Increase the efficiency of locating in downtown. Make Palo Alto a shining example.

Name not available
January 13, 2020, 9:13 AM

Moving forward with the proposed Foothills Park pilot program to welcome a small number of neighbors is a priority for my family. We think it’s important to project a welcoming attitude and implement a better, data-based study of this issue.

Name not shown
in Downtown North
January 13, 2020, 7:02 PM

-- Install fiber optic technology.
-- Traffic lights should be responsive to immediate traffic conditions.
-- Create quiet zones on Caltrain/motor vehicle crossings. It has not been shown that blaring train horns are any more successful at preventing accidents and suicides than just bell ringing when gates are lowered.

Name not shown
in Fairmeadow
January 13, 2020, 9:47 PM

Housing, particularly for young people\people working in service jobs, rather than tech, (such as teachers, etc.) who cannot afford housing at all here.

Name not available
January 14, 2020, 10:41 AM

Housing
Traffic Congestion

Lynnie Melena
in Barron Park
January 14, 2020, 11:41 AM

Top priorities are: Addressing climate change Increasing the supply of housing (including new local sources of funding for affordable housing, making progress on the North Ventura Coordinated Area Plan) And expanding alternatives to the auto Mitigating climate change depends strongly on addressing housing and transportation

Name not available
January 14, 2020, 11:51 AM

I’ll stick with simple requests this year since the city can’t even seem to accomplish these simple things from its rules and regulations book.

Fix the traffic light timing and sensors at just about every signal in the city. Enforce leaf blower ban. Enforce red curb ‘no parking anytime’ at Edgewood Shopping Center St. Francis Drive.

Jeffrey Hook
in Evergreen Park
January 14, 2020, 11:51 AM

1. Complete blower ban for all properties (residential, multifamily, commercial). Currently there is a ban on gas-powered blowers for single family residential only. Passed in 2005, it is widely ignored and seems to not be enforced at all. Blower noise is extremely annoying, and blower activity, whether from gas or electric, puts polluted dust into the air. This pollution, which may contain rodent feces, automobile brake pad dust, and bacterial or fungal allergens, drifts onto neighbors' properties. It is straightforward to see that the property owners who allow blowers are exacting a heavy cost on their neighbors which is completely uncompensated, and were it to be fairly priced, would cause the cost to rise above that of using brooms and rakes. Better still, is to develop a city program very similar and compatible with the utility water conservation program that offers rebates to homeowners who convert to low water-use landscaping. It is very
possible to design landscapes that do not require power tools for weekly maintenance. Such gardens are much more likely to be friendly to birds and pollinators. They will also help reduce the city's carbon footprint. Blowers were not invented until 1970, and landscapes were maintained just fine prior to their invention. A "Blower-free Garden" sign similar to the "Palo Alto Green" sign can be made and proudly displayed in conforming gardens to encourage others to join in. A modest rebate from the city will certainly help. Announcement can be made in the utility bill.

2. Transportation. What about supporting a statewide bill to require that all companies with more than X employees offer their employees the option of working from home 3 days per week, if the job is classified as office work (workers' comp classification can be used as verification). Allowing workers to work from home will result in a huge drop in traffic. Traffic is a cost imposed on the environment and on local residents that is, like blowers, not compensated. The costs are road degradation, congestion, mental stress, increase of response time for emergency vehicles, air and ground pollution, climate change, noise pollution and lost worker productivity. It is time to move beyond words like "encourage" which have no teeth and have been ineffective for decades. It is time to require employers to offer work-from-home options.

3. Business tax. It makes no sense that Palo Alto has no business tax. Start with e.g. $.10/ft2/year (this is half of what just went into effect in East Palo Alto) and increase over time to be in line with other Bay Area cities, or higher if deemed reasonable. The marginal cost to most businesses will be quite low, and the money raised could be as much as $30-40M per year, which can go a long way to addressing transportation and affordable housing issues.

4. Adopt a "Think globally, act locally" policy that begins by acknowledging the "global hectares" (gha) analysis done by www.footprintnetwork.org. This analysis shows that Earth’s human population is in overshoot. We now require 1.7 earths biocapacity to sustain our consumption. Biocapacity is broken down by country. For the U.S., our biocapacity is a little over 3 gha per person but our consumption is over 8 gha per person. The dataset includes a column for the population level in each country that brings consumption and biocapacity into balance. For the U.S. it is 145 million, the population at the end of WW II. We need to reduce population and consumption per person in some combination to achieve balance, ideally to reduce consumption below the balance level to allow our environment to recover. The City should commission a local gha study and recommend limits to city population and a road map to dramatically reduce consumption. With a population limit data point, we can then address affordable housing. Without it, there is no limit to population and no sound scientific basis for making policy.

Name not shown
in Duveneck/ St Francis
January 14, 2020, 11:51 AM

Housing: Building more housing near public transportation, building more housing in general

Name not available
January 14, 2020, 11:56 AM

Please prioritize lowering barriers to building both market rate and affordable housing

Name not shown
in Greenmeadow
January 14, 2020, 1:25 PM

More housing, more housing, more housing -- and better public transit so we don't choke in traffic once we get more people here.

Name not available
January 14, 2020, 2:04 PM

Flood control for San Francisquito Creek
Airplane noise

Name not available
January 14, 2020, 2:42 PM

I'll stick with simple requests this year since the city can't even seem to accomplish these simple things from its rules and regulations book.

Fix the traffic light timing and sensors at just about every signal in the city.
Enforce leaf blower ban.
Enforce red curb ‘no parking anytime’ at Edgewood Shopping Center St. Francis Drive.

**Perry Randall**
in Evergreen Park
January 14, 2020, 3:48 PM

Housing - the lack of even close to moderately affordable housing in such a population center is responsible for many downstream effects, exacerbates transportation issue because everyone in the area is forced to drive here. Stanford is also exacerbating this by not contributing to housing and making housing only available to its own. Where are regular working people supposed to live?

Transportation - living a reasonable life in Palo Alto and many other surrounding areas requires you to drive, this again makes transportation a huge issue and pollutes our streets and creates noise. Caltrain schedules are inadequate, there is no BART, because everyone is driving it also makes traffic terrible so even when you’re forced to drive, driving is also difficult!

Noise - I live near california avenue and the noise from cars, yard equipment, and commercial traffic, street cleaning is at times unbearable. This is a big drop in quality of life for people who expect to be living in the suburbs free of this commotion.

Car free spaces - downtown areas such as University avenue and California avenue should not allow cars on the main roads, instead we should focus on bringing transit to the periphery and making walkable spaces.

**Name not shown**
in Duveneck/ St Francis
January 14, 2020, 4:42 PM

As of now, Embarcadero Road largely submits to speeding out-of-town cut-through traffic. If we can implement bike improvements, we can show that we are serious about being a bicycle friendly city, both to our residents and to those that use the road. Embarcadero is the most common sense biking and walking connection to a large number of our city’s amenities, including Town and Country, Edgewood Plaza, Riconada Park/Museum, Riconada Library, Children’s Library, Gamble, Walter Hayes, Casti, PALY, Stanford... etc. It is utilized at all times of the day with people walking and biking. The incredibly dangerous driving on Embarcadero, including countless accidents at an intersection last year (I’m only aware of those at Greer/Embarcadero) with one resulting in a car launching over the sidewalk and hitting a resident’s fence, mean that pedestrians using this road are in danger. A bike lane from Edgewood Plaza to Stanford would help make drivers more cautious and drive slower, make it so that bikers and walkers do not have to navigate around each other on Embarcadero’s sidewalks, make it safer for bikers that are currently riding in the road with the traffic, and make it known that we are serious about being bicyclist friendly on this common sense bike route.

**Name not shown**
in Downtown North
January 14, 2020, 6:05 PM

Reduce traffic.
Continue to encourage bicycle usage.
Severely limit new office space and jobs.
Stop caving to real estate/developer interests over Palo Alto residents’ quality of life.
Oppose SB-50.

**Name not available**
January 15, 2020, 4:47 PM

I request that the City Council make passage of safe storage laws for firearm owners a priority. Many cities and counties in the Bay Area have already passed such laws. The Gifford Law Center is an excellent resource for studying how all these local and county laws resemble each other. The PA City Council can leverage these in coming up with a version best suited for Palo Alto. Research shows that safe storage of firearms makes a big impact on suicide prevention and other forms of violence.

**Name not shown**
in Evergreen Park
January 15, 2020, 5:52 PM

Climate change and local actions to fight it (see Carbon Free Palo Alto recommendations)
Traffic

Name not shown
in Leland Manor/ Garland
January 15, 2020,  6:08 PM

1. Crime. I’m reading about crime in Palo Alto on the news and in social media weekly, sometimes daily. Car break ins, assault, break ins, robbery etc. Whether Stanford Mall & parking lots, Midtown Safeway, Downtown Palo Alto, as well as residential crime. Do we need more security cameras in public places, more police on patrol, something else?? -- I don't know what will deter crime but something needs to be done. Otherwise what's the point of living in this city if the cost of living is already really high and now the crime rate is trending upwards too!?!?

2. Traffic. I’d recommend that the traffic lights be better synchronized as people suggest. Also, I’d recommend considering having all cross walks at a given intersection have a walk light synchronized to be at the same time including letting people walk diagonally across the streets. In cities I've seen this done, the traffic flow seems much better and pedestrians seem much less at risk for getting hit by impatient drivers. It doesn't work well to alternate walk signs with so many cars doing right hand turns.

Name not available
January 15, 2020,  6:41 PM

Grade separations: Please plan for the long term benefit of Palo Alto residents since what ever 'solutions' are chosen will outlive us, our kids, and their kids. I personally prefer the more costly out of sight out of mind options. In a few decades, the cost of this project will be a mostly forgotten foot note. The structures built will be daily reminders for perhaps a century of your decisions in the months to come. Please plan for the long term aesthetics and quality of life as best you can.

Housing, development, SB-50, traffic: please, no more development without adequate infrastructure included! Traffic is miserable, adding more housing and commercial development will do nothing but make it worse without significant and REAL modifications to roads and mass transit. SB-50 specifically has no plan to mitigate the new housing it mandates. It will likely be a huge win for developers and a big loss for residents. Consider getting/requiring big technology companies to contribute significantly to the problem they largely created. Resist 'input' from silicon valley leadership group with respect to this issue. Their purpose is make sure their tech clients contribute as little as possible, and that residents pay as much as possible for local mass transit improvements. Consider a proposal to dismantle all local mass transit agencies and create a regional mass transit agency where county boarders are no longer unnecessary barriers to mass transit.

Andy Poggio
in Midtown/ Midtown West
January 15, 2020,  8:15 PM

Internet access is more important than ever before. The incumbent ISPs in Palo Alto offer slow service, poor service, or both. And they are not making substantial investments to improve their infrastructure; they are simply milking their current infrastructure.

I would like to City Council to commit to a Fiber-to-the-Premises (FTTP) plan for 2020. Thank you.

Yifei Huang
in College Terrace
January 15, 2020,  9:57 PM

Thank you Palo Alto City Council for all your hard work towards an emission-free city, and I would like to see the issue of climate change continue to top the priority list this year. However, I'm worried that this will continue to be an issue unless other cities, states, and countries follow in our footsteps. I think we should encourage our sister cities to adopt similar changes, advocate for the aggressive measures we've implemented in neighboring cities and states, and decisively support national legislation that works towards a carbon-free economy.

Name not available
January 15, 2020, 10:08 PM

Electric and gas system reliability and resiliency are vital to our modern economy, and the health and safety of our citizens. The consequences of failure to invest in modernization and redundancy was vividly demonstrated...
by the Public Safety Power Shutoffs (PSPS) last fall. While Palo Alto was fortunate to avoid PSPS this year, and unlike most municipal utilities, including nearby City of Santa Clara, we have no indigenous generating capacity to be able to provide power in the event of PSPS, earthquake, sabotage, or other grid failure.

Moreover, Palo Alto has a single point of failure at the Colorado Avenue substation, whose aging equipment is adjacent to a creek and the Baylands that flood, and which is accessible and unprotected from nefarious malefactors. Replacing the Colorado Avenue substation could take many weeks or months in the worst case, and the loss of power for that duration would harm our citizens, damage our primacy in technology and innovation, and harm local, state, national and even global economies.

Given the accelerating risks due to climate change and other foreseeable hazards, it is prudent for the City to invest in electric power resiliency measures.

1. A second independent grid connection, geographical and electrically separated from Colorado Avenue is urgently required. A relatively short connection path could be made from Stanford along Sand Hill Road to a new substation near downtown north.

2. Distribution systems should be upgraded to permit sectionalizing so the grid can be fed from both the existing (Colorado Avenue) and new grid connections, to allow for maintenance as well as failures.

3. Indigenous generation should be acquired in at least enough capacity to support rolling blackouts around the city. This would require study as to the size of loads at the various distribution substations and the acceptable duration of time that customers would be with and without power, as well as which loads/customers would be curtailed. The utility’s baseload of about 80 MW could be readily served from a single, compact combustion turbine, and the entire load could be supplied from a small combined cycle occupying the Fry’s parking lot. High pressure gas and a substation are conveniently located nearby.

These measures would provide the resiliency appropriate for Palo Alto’s role in the world.

Name not available
January 15, 2020, 10:13 PM

Electric and gas system reliability and resiliency are vital to our modern economy, and the health and safety of our citizens. The consequences of failure to invest in modernization and redundancy was vividly demonstrated by the Public Safety Power Shutoffs (PSPS) last fall. While Palo Alto was fortunate to avoid PSPS this year, and unlike most municipal utilities, including nearby City of Santa Clara, we have no indigenous generating capacity to be able to provide power in the event of PSPS, earthquake, sabotage, or other grid failure.

Moreover, Palo Alto has a single point of failure at the Colorado Avenue substation, whose aging equipment is adjacent to a creek and the Baylands that flood, and which is accessible and unprotected from nefarious malefactors. Replacing the Colorado Avenue substation could take many weeks or months in the worst case, and the loss of power for that duration would harm our citizens, damage our primacy in technology and innovation, and harm local, state, national and even global economies.

Given the accelerating risks due to climate change and other foreseeable hazards, it is prudent for the City to invest in electric power resiliency measures.

1. A second independent grid connection, geographical and electrically separated from Colorado Avenue is urgently required. A relatively short connection path could be made from Stanford along Sand Hill Road to a new substation near downtown north.

2. Distribution systems should be upgraded to permit sectionalizing so the grid can be fed from both the existing (Colorado Avenue) and new grid connections, to allow for maintenance as well as failures.

3. Indigenous generation should be acquired in at least enough capacity to support rolling blackouts around the city. This would require study as to the size of loads at the various distribution substations and the acceptable duration of time that customers would be with and without power, as well as which loads/customers would be curtailed. The utility’s baseload of about 80 MW could be readily served from a single, compact combustion turbine, and the entire load could be supplied from a small combined cycle occupying the Fry’s parking lot. High pressure gas and a substation are conveniently located nearby.

These measures would provide the resiliency appropriate for Palo Alto’s role in the world.

William Conlon
in Old Palo Alto
Electric and gas system reliability and resiliency are vital to our modern economy, and the health and safety of our citizens. The consequences of failure to invest in modernization and redundancy was vividly demonstrated by the Public Safety Power Shutoffs (PSPS) last fall. While Palo Alto was fortunate to avoid PSPS this year, and unlike most municipal utilities, including nearby City of Santa Clara, we have no indigenous generating capacity to be able to provide power in the event of PSPS, earthquake, sabotage, or other grid failure.

Moreover, Palo Alto has a single point of failure at the Colorado Avenue substation, whose aging equipment is adjacent to a creek and the Baylands that flood, and which is accessible and unprotected from nefarious malefactors. Replacing the Colorado Avenue substation could take many weeks or months in the worst case, and the loss of power for that duration would harm our citizens, damage our primacy in technology and innovation, and harm local, state, national and even global economies.

Given the accelerating risks due to climate change and other foreseeable hazards, it is prudent for the City to invest in electric power resiliency measures. 1. A second independent grid connection, geographical and electrically separated from Colorado Avenue is urgently required. A relatively short connection path could be made from Stanford along Sand Hill Road to a new substation near downtown north. 2. Distribution systems should be upgraded to permit sectionalizing so the grid can be fed from both the existing (Colorado Avenue) and new grid connections, to allow for maintenance as well as failures. 3. Indigenous generation should be acquired in at least enough capacity to support rolling blackouts around the city. This would require study as to the size of loads at the various distribution substations and the acceptable duration of time that customers would be with and without power, as well as which loads/customers would be curtailed. The utility’s baseload of about 80 MW could be readily served from a single, compact combustion turbine, and the entire load could be supplied from a small combined cycle occupying the Fry’s parking lot. High pressure gas and a substation are conveniently located nearby.

These measures would provide the resiliency appropriate for Palo Alto’s role in the world.

Name not shown
in Downtown North
January 15, 2020, 11:01 PM

Keep the priorities the same. Work on keeping Palo Alto on track to help the environment. Work on keeping the city financially stable and have employees pay more for their pensions like other workers do. And work on the train track separation. That should keep you busy. Don’t get distracted with all this housing nonsense. You have done a good job limiting office growth, keep it up so you don’t add more jobs.

Name not available
January 16, 2020, 7:08 AM

Housing

Name not available
January 16, 2020, 9:09 AM

Addressing traffic. We cannot continue to increase density and development without a strategy to address increased traffic. Current thinking that people will just take public transportation is just a dereliction of duty in order to approve more development. Further thinking should also consider flow as well as traffic calming. Arastradero Road is a disaster due to the idea that traffic calming is successful when the road is jammed with no cars moving.

Name not shown
in Old Palo Alto
January 16, 2020, 9:29 AM

1) Restore trust in government:
- not removing Michael Alcheck from office makes city council complicit and sanctions his behavior.
- Commit to campaign finance reform to avoid quid pro quo. No one running for council should be taking money from developers or businesses. These are NOT your primary customers and make you conflicted. If the money flow cannot be stopped, then it should be PROMINENTLY displayed during campaigns so everyone knows whose bread you will be buttering.
2020 City Council Priorities
What are the priorities you would like to see the City Council adopt for 2020?

2) Ensure organizational and council alignment. Ex - Council should give PTC direction on what you want them to work on and what you don't want them to work on. They are off the rails (again, focused on satisfying their own personal interests, developers, etc)

3) Fiscal stewardship. Stop wasting taxpayer money on things like $2.1 million council chamber audio/visual upgrades, $4m house for city manager, tons of consultants, wasting money traveling to visit 9 sexy international destinations (sister cities) on a regular basis, stop with constant raises (base benchmarking on TOTAL compensation not base salary), pension reform (which includes not making it worse by raising salaries), ...

4) Stop taxing residents with ever increasing fees (raising utility rates, various fees). Start raising taxes big time on businesses who aren't doing their fair share to fix infrastructure issues they caused.

5) Stop cell tower installations in residential neighborhoods. Stand up to telecom like Los Altos is. Don't let the city attorney make all the decisions around this. Be bold and listen to residents.

Barry strauss
in Midtown/ Midtown West
January 16, 2020, 9:34 AM

If the grade around the Cal Ave train tracks will be an item, can the city also add a "bike" tunnel there? Currently, it's dangerous walking in the tunnel as bikes zoom/speed by from both directions - seems like a lawsuit waiting to happen. Rarely do riders walk their bikes in the tunnel. If bike riders had their own tunnel, there would be less danger to pedestrians, especially those hard of hearing (i.e., can't hear bikes coming from behind).

Name not available
January 16, 2020, 9:44 AM

Quit it with the utilities rate hikes.

Bob Hinden
in Palo Verde
January 16, 2020, 9:47 AM

I have a few things I would like to see the City Council adopt as priorities for 2020. These are:

Fiber-to-the-Premises (FTTP): We need a real plan for this in 2020, it would be good for everyone in the city, it's time. Internet access is more and more important to everyone in the city. The current commercial ISPs are not investing in Palo Alto, they are only raising their prices.

Reliable sustainable electricity: There have been number of major outages in 2019, it's time to make our local power grid more reliable. The current approach for green power doesn't work if our grid is not reliable. I think there should be more local solar and storage to make us more green and reduce our reliance on PG&E. It's not clear that our current approach to green power is really green. Too many losses in the power grid, it's probably on green on paper. Promote local solar and local storage.

Stop wasting our tax money: Stop the so called traffic calming projects like Ross Road, we don't need a boutique bridge over 101, a new public safety building, etc.

Precious Balin-Watkins
in Charleston Terrace
January 16, 2020, 9:56 AM

Improve separated bike lanes in Palo Alto. Build separated bike lanes on Meadow and Park. Keep our kids safe!

Name not shown
in Evergreen Park
January 16, 2020, 9:37 AM

Solve the camper van living on El Camino Real. Provide real alternative options and then enforce no camping/living on city streets

Nancy Krop
in Barron Park
January 16, 2020, 10:01 AM

Hi
I am very concerned about the proliferation of people having to live in RVs and out of their cars to work in our city. Please add "affordable housing" as one of your top priorities. We simply cannot add more jobs until we can house our current workforce. Thank you. Nancy Krop, Palo Alto resident

Name not available
January 16, 2020, 10:16 AM

My priority is to have the Council ignore (if not actively reject) the recommendation of the Parks and Recreation Commission to change the access requirements for Foothills Park. The so-called trial would be difficult to reverse. There has been no mention of the criteria to be used to judge whether the trial is successful or not. No mention of how much Palo Alto has spent over the years to maintain the park; no mention of the financial implications; no analysis of the effect on those who use Page Mill Road; no mention of any possible benefit to those who live in Palo Alto and are your true constituents.

Isaac Winer
in Leland Manor/ Garland
January 16, 2020, 10:18 AM

Improving the flow of traffic on Embarcadero Road near Town & Country. There is tremendous congestion on Embarcadero at the intersection with T&C and Paly high school. This creates unreasonable delays and risks for drivers trying to navigate the area. The pedestrian crossing between Paly and T&C contributes to these risks during school break hours (early morning, lunchtime and classes ending) and adds risk to the students crossing. Perhaps consider a bridge crossing over Embarcadero for students/pedestrians between Paly and T&C. Perhaps consider more sophisticated traffic light patterns and/or lanes in this area.

Name not shown
in Midtown/ Midtown West
January 16, 2020, 10:23 AM

I agree with continuing the 2019 priorities for 2020, with the inclusion of affordable housing.

Affordable Housing
Climate Change
Grade Separation
Traffic and Transportation

Irina Cross
in College Terrace
January 16, 2020, 10:25 AM

I am Irina Cross long time resident of Palo Alto

David Lieberman
in Professorville
January 16, 2020, 10:34 AM

The fact that housing does not show as a priority gives the game away. The city has spent the last several decades actively working to prevent more housing through a morass of bureaucratic barriers. More housing will REDUCE traffic, will REDUCE noise, will REDUCE carbon emissions. Please make building 20,000 new dwelling units number one priority.

Mora Oommen
outside Palo Alto
January 16, 2020, 10:37 AM

I would like to request that the city actively recruit for positions that were previously filled but have been vacant since the last person resigned-
Superintendent of Recreation Services
Economic Development Manager

Both of these roles play a critical roll in supporting the diversity and culture of our community.

Elliott Bloom
in Midtown/ Midtown West
January 16, 2020, 11:29 AM

I believe that the climate change policies of Palo Alto are elitist and very wasteful of public resources given the pressing problems that Palo Alto faces. My highest priorities are:
1. Infrastructure improvements, particularly Palo Alto's electric grid. Bringing utilities underground to help avoid blackouts is high on this list.
2. Get moving on connecting Palo Alto. This is a serious safety issue, as well as a future traffic nightmare as the train frequency increases.
3. Solve the homeless problem in Palo Alto. Worrying about plastic straws and utensils is immoral when people are sleeping in the streets in our town. Yes, let them eat cake!

Bret Andersen
in Palo Verde
January 16, 2020, 11:52 AM

Council Priorities 2020

Focus on meaningful, goal oriented, measurable systemic changes that are required to enable our community to address the profound challenges we face.

Housing / Climate / Livability:
- Meaningfully expand the market for low cost house building by rezoning/permitting high density, especially small/tiny unit, home building consistent with the fair and practical SB 50 proposal. Set annual targets for such housing.
- Favor dense, walkable, pedestrian only retail/housing zones
- Stop/reverse(via disincentives/fees) large office development to reduce our current outlandish income/jobs/housing imbalance

Transportation / Climate / Livability
- Follow through on bike / pedestrian plans that are long overdue
- Charge a fair cost for parking and congestion where needed to reduce demand and fund SOV reduction efforts
- Expand the Transportation Management Association program (or emulate it) as it is a local, proven, measurable, successful SOV trip reduction approach
- Set measurable annual goals to reduce the number of Single Occupancy Vehicle (SOV) trips in order to reach our 80/30 GHG and congestion reduction goals

Energy / Climate / Livability:
- Expand mandatory electric building codes to existing buildings where it is cost effective upfront to switch from gas to electric
- Provide a proactive program to help residents and businesses switch to electric systems with easy permitting, direct installation services and financing to cover the upfront cost for electric upgrades on the utility bill. Start with measures that are cost effective today and expand as costs decline to cover all measures and buildings.
- Set measurable annual goals starting in 2020 to for the number of gas powered buildings and appliances to be switched to electric in order to meet 80/30 climate objective
- Redirect funding, 2020 and on, for gas network improvement or expansion to the electrification / gas decommissioning effort. Limit spending on gas infrastructure to short term maintenance and safety measures only.

Finally, focus on public engagement and trust: Include the public in developing and implementing the above solutions. The actions above complement and reinforce each other but only if the city, businesses and residents all agree to make large investments and lifestyle changes cooperatively over the next 10 years to create a better built environment and support a thriving community.

Patrick Butler
in University Park
January 16, 2020, 11:57 AM

Severely restrict new office space. Require more environmental impact studies for these projects as they all impact our quality of life.
Do not install so-called "smart" electric meters on all Palo Alto homes, as you are planning, with little publicity, to do. Such meters tier rates by the time of day and drastically increase our electric bills as they attempt to push our usage of AC/ heating/ laundry into the late evening. The cost of installation will be in the millions. If you want to cut back on usage, why do the largest commercial consumers of electricity pay less per KWH than residential users? Also, you should look at the use of electricity by the City of Palo Alto. Place meters on City offices and take the usage out of their budgets. That might also be a good place to start using your tiered meters if city employees think it is such a great idea.
I would like Palo Alto to review the Palo Alto groundwater situation and consider if it is really wise to allow new homes to have basements where millions of gallons of groundwater are sent to the Bay.

Celia Boyle
in Barron Park
January 16, 2020, 12:12 PM

Climate change - increase opportunities for education. Zero waste. How do we get reduce the enormous amount of plastic used in every aspect of our lives. And just where is all our recycled materials in the blue bins going now that China is rejecting it. Please increase awareness. I love the compost bins - perhaps encourage people more to place their food scraps in the bin by education/outreach.

Financial oversight: More transparency on how much money is lost on errors made by city government-ie the penalty for not having a grocery store in the JF location. I read that the city missed collecting a substantial penalty, the error in negotiations by the school administration...etc. We are paying enormous property taxes and it is painful to see revenue forgone. I’d rather see my taxes going for excellent programs such as tuition for special education, etc. than for being lost due to administrative errors.

John Guislin
in Downtown North
January 16, 2020, 12:23 PM

I want to see more than just another list of 3 or 4 priorities. I want a list of priorities that also includes goals and deliverables so residents can hold officials accountable. So, if transportation is a priority, goals/deliverables might include:
- ensure increased funding for the TMA, minimum 50% to be provided by local businesses
- design a shuttle system that will unblock the roads near our Downtown and California commercial cores with a pilot running by end of year.
- establish a Residents Advisory Group to prioritize all of our concerns relating to transportation and traffic

Without goals and deliverables, the annual priorities are just feel-good placebos and do not improve our quality of life or address critical challenges.

CPA’s four big priorities are certainly good and important ones. I would add, at a perhaps slightly lower priority level, the undergrounding of our communications and electrical distribution wires. In many parts of the world this is already standard practice, and I’ve had more than one visiting friend from Europe comment to me about how horrendous our mess of wires is to see. Besides the beautification of the city, it would trade a one-time expense against the ongoing cost of utility tree pruning. The tree pruning is an endless cost, thus at some point in the future the savings will have paid for the undergrounding. And we would not experience some of the electrical outages we periodically have when a tree falls against a wire, or a mylar balloon causes a short.

CPA’s four big priorities are certainly good and important ones. I would add, at a perhaps slightly lower priority level, the undergrounding of our communications and electrical distribution wires. In many parts of the world this is already standard practice, and I’ve had more than one visiting friend from Europe comment to me about how horrendous our mess of wires is to see. Besides the beautification of the city, it would trade a one-time expense against the ongoing cost of utility tree pruning. The tree pruning is an endless cost, thus at some point in the future the savings will have paid for the undergrounding. And we would not experience some of the electrical outages we periodically have when a tree falls against a wire, or a mylar balloon causes a short.
distribution wires. In many parts of the world this is already standard practice, and I’ve had more than one visiting friend from Europe comment to me about how horrendous our mess of wires is to see. Besides the beautification of the city, it would trade a one-time expense against the ongoing cost of utility tree pruning. The tree pruning is an endless cost, thus at some point in the future the savings will have paid for the undergrounding. And we would not experience some of the electrical outages we periodically have when a tree falls against a wire, or a mylar balloon causes a short.

Name not shown
in Crescent Park
January 16, 2020, 1:35 PM

How to defeat SB 50.

Thomas Wasow
in Barron Park
January 16, 2020, 1:44 PM

Affordable housing is the issue that dominates all others. Increasing the overall supply of housing is part of the solution, but the emphasis must be on housing that people of modest means can afford. Given the high cost of land here, that is only possible if Palo Alto stops resisting increased housing density. We have to rethink height limitations and other restrictions designed to limit density of housing. To keep increased density from resulting in gridlock on our streets, we need more and better mass transit options, so this has to be a second priority. Making the city more bike friendly could also help. But it all comes back to housing, housing, housing. Palo Alto’s record of repeatedly failing to meet its housing goals is shameful; we can do better. The North Ventura neighborhood provides the best opportunity in decades to make a meaningful increase in the city’s stock of affordable housing. The city council needs to be bold in its vision for that area, maximizing the amount of affordable housing created while attending to the transportation needs of the people who will live in that housing.

Climate change, especially infill/higher-density housing and better non-car transportation options
Grade separation

Scott O Neil
in Charleston Terrace
January 16, 2020, 2:04 PM

The only priority that matters right now is getting more housing built. The city has three jobs for every two residents, and residential population probably exceeds what the city is built for. The council should be trying to reverse that 30,000 housing unit deficit.

The housing crisis is the most important local issue because it’s forcing families and social groups apart. As young adults start their lives they are forced to live in financially desperate conditions or leave. Most leave. I grew up in the bay area and very few of my non-tech friends still live nearby. It’s increasingly difficult for local businesses and the city to recruit and retain employees in positions that do not command high salaries but are nevertheless critical to a thriving community.

The housing crisis is the most important thing the council can tackle to address climate change, our most pressing global issue. Housing close to jobs means lower transit trips distances, and easier use of low-carbon transit options. Higher densities expose heating and cooling efficiencies. Poor land use is driving excessive energy consumption, and the council has the power to reduce this.

Bay Area leaders are morally accountable for the extensive social, economic, and environmental damage the housing deficit is causing. They are in a desperately deep hole. It is not enough to just stop digging. The problem must be addressed.

Reid Kleckner
in Midtown/ Midtown West
January 16, 2020, 5:35 PM

The City of Palo Alto needs to prioritize the creation of new housing. While the city is not itself a developer, the city can relax zoning requirements near transit to create the conditions necessary for more housing to be built. The
council should also look at parking requirements and relax them near transit. It’s time to get creative and think about how we can bring new young families into our community.

Name not shown
in Greenmeadow
January 16, 2020, 6:42 PM

Lower real estate taxes.
Yikun Wu

Name not shown
in Midtown/ Midtown West
January 16, 2020, 8:40 PM

We need to solve the problem of people having to live in their cars. Perhaps an affordable housing option for a certain length of time for people who need to get back on their feet would solve this problem, or perhaps social programs. I am sure each vehicle dwellers story as to how they got to this situation may be different, and there may not be one size fits all solution. But City Council needs to address the fact that having so many vehicle dwellers in PA is a huge problem.

I’m extremely uncomfortable with all of the vehicle dwellers at the end of our street. There are at least 10-15 vehicles with people living in them at any time at the end of Colorado Ave. That area is completely crowded with motor homes and other cars people are living in. The City Council just passed new legislation so that they can live on church lots. We have a church across the street from our home - so now vehicle dwellers will be living in the church lot across the street (which is not nearly large enough for all of the cars parked on Colorado) AND at the end of our street. I’m not sure what City Council thinks it solved by passing this new legislation - I believe it is just encouraging the problem and it will grow more and get even more out of hand. Let’s face it, a neighborhood should be made up of homes. If people need to live in RVs or cars, there should be an RV park for them to do so or something of that nature. If it is affordable housing that would solve this problem, then City Council should find a way to make that happen. But just allowing this to go on and on and encouraging it is not the solution.

Alice Smith
in University South
January 16, 2020, 9:09 PM

Grade-crossinga at Churchill, Alma (Palo Alto Ave), East Meadow and West Charleston solved because traffic planning demands this solution now.

Name not available
January 16, 2020, 9:12 PM

Build more housing. Any housing. All housing. Just build more of it.

Kevin Kiningham
in Charleston Meadows
January 16, 2020, 9:17 PM

1) Significantly higher density near transportation 2) Increasing the overall supply of housing.

Name not available
January 16, 2020, 9:25 PM

Affordable housing is a priority for me. I want teachers, nurses, construction workers and first responders to feel a part of this community.

Let’s start to build taller buildings and denser row housing!

L. David Baron
in University Park
January 16, 2020, 9:50 PM

I’d like to see the council focus on making changes to zoning code that would allow the development of denser infill housing, particularly around Downtown (where I live) and California Avenue, and perhaps also along El Camino and San Antonio. Allowing people to live in denser housing has major environmental benefits: to reducing human-caused global warming from transportation and climate control, and reducing local pollution from car transportation. This type of housing is clearly in high
**2020 City Council Priorities**

What are the priorities you would like to see the City Council adopt for 2020?

---

Demand (as we can all see from its price): lots of people would rather live in apartments in or near Palo Alto than face a 90-120 minute commute that they might otherwise need to find housing affordable to them. Addressing the housing crisis is also critical to having a fair economy in our region, rather than one that only works for people who bought their homes in the 1970s or are very rich. A functioning society depends on having a mix of people of different skills, some of whom earn different incomes. We should allow everybody who is part of our community to live in our community, and not force all but the richest to commute from long distances away.

California has a massive housing shortage. The state needs to allow the construction of 3.5 million new homes. Palo Alto’s fair share of that, given its location close to transportation and strong economic activity, is probably around 15,000-20,000 homes. Yes, that’s a large number. But if we want to have a path out of this housing crisis, we need to think seriously about how to accommodate that level of growth (the sort of growth that California had in the 1940s and 1950s, and about 50% more than the sort of growth California had in the 1960s and 1980s).

I think this means a number of things: (1) expanding the area around Downtown and California Avenue that is zoned for larger buildings, including both office and multifamily housing (2) increasing the number of homes that can be built in areas zoned for multifamily housing by substantially increasing FAR, height, and lot coverage limits, and increasing or entirely removing unit density limits (3) relaxing the parking requirements that massively increase the cost of building new housing (and use the money to subsidize car owners), and gradually move towards a model where people pay a market price for parking and (4) improving transit and improving infrastructure for walking and cycling so that more people feel they don’t need to own cars (5) allowing more office construction (with similar relaxation of building limits as for homes) in these central areas as well so that people living there are more likely to be able to walk or bike to work rather than having to drive to suburban office parks, since having jobs centralized is more important for a good transit system than having homes centralized.

Housing, including Affordable housing for middle income residents.

Transportation/transit - focus on this rather than parking garages. Include separate bike lanes, please. Let’s be leaders!

Climate resilience and carbon neutrality.

Airplane noise reduction.

Thank you.

---

**Barbara Kingsley**

in Greenmeadow

January 16, 2020, 9:58 PM

Housing. Especially below market rate. Given the high land prices, we need to address the R1 zoning restrictions to allow reasonable density. People are being unnecessarily spooked by the specter of 4 story apartment buildings sprouting up next door. But when I go out walking and see > 3k square feet houses being built, it disturbs me that no duplex—> triplex occupying the same amount of space, would be allowed on these lots. (My first Palo Alto house —50 years ago—was just under 1k square feet.) Increased density would also make better public transportation possible.

What about something like a R1.5 zoning of our current R1 neighborhoods, allowing up to 4 units, providing guidelines on footprint/height that would make these fit in better.

---

**Name not shown**

in University South

January 16, 2020, 10:11 PM

- Traffic and parking . . . especially in the neighborhoods adjacent to the downtown area
- Decisions on the Caltrain crossing issues

---

**Lisa Van Dusen**

in Community Center

January 16, 2020, 9:58 PM

To make Palo Alto a home town that works for all of the individuals that live here, and for those that might want to
live here. Our town is not affordable to anyone except a certain elite sector of the labor market. To reduce our carbon footprint as quickly as possible, which requires more low and middle income housing, as the one sector of our GHG emissions that is increasing is Palo Alto located employee commute emissions, as employees drive hours to get to work. EVERY town, and every economy, will be affected if we all don’t do our part to make this happen. No more planning for the current moment, more long term vision.

**David Gudeman**
in Charleston Meadows
January 16, 2020, 10:27 PM

Increasing density of housing through zoning reform.

**Mary Jane Marcus**
in College Terrace
January 16, 2020, 10:50 PM

My #1 care for Palo Alto is to focus on community well-being, including renters, youth, elders, all backgrounds and cultures, those from neighboring cities, those who have to commute long distances -- by supporting creative CIVIC spaces for community life and positive interactions with one another. Parks, schools, rental facilities aren’t enough.

#2: Challenge R-1 Zoning - allow for more small units on these lots to more readily meet human rights need for housing while keeping PA character.

#3: Hire a new Sustainability Coordinator to lead the boldest climate plan (including consumption goals, not just production) in the country.

**Name not shown**
in Duveneck/ St Francis
January 17, 2020, 8:15 AM

Incentives to get us out of our cars are most important: better bikeways, better free shuttle service with better-than half-hour schedules, walkways separated from car traffic where feasible.

City vehicles should be HV, PHEV or EV

Find funding for good Caltrain grade separations.

**Name not available**
January 17, 2020, 8:50 AM

1) No empty residences: Require living spaces have a minimum occupancy rather than sit empty as investments or vacation homes.

2) Require large (and mid-sized?) businesses locating in Palo Alto to add as much to the housing stock as required by their employees; incentivize on site dormitories and other amenities for efficient, commute-free, employee living.

3) Incorporate a reasonable search engine on the City of PA website; currently I do Startpage.com searches and follow their links into the city’s website.

**Name not available**
January 17, 2020, 9:38 AM

More housing near jobs and transit. 8 story apartment buildings.

**John Kunz**
in Leland Manor/ Garland
January 17, 2020, 10:38 AM

High Speed Rail. Options include:

1) lots of high speed traffic at grade, which is a major safety and pedestrian/car movement problem

2) Raise tracks 15 feet in air on an elevated railway, which blocks east-west views of the city

3) Underground rail, pay for undergrounding with air rights, build tall buildings along the El Camino corridor, and put parks and soccer fields on what is now train right of way.

Some Stanford students built 3D models in the computer of these options, showed dozens of patrons at a coffee shop the options and asked viewers what they liked best. Strong preference was for #3. Survey not statistically valid in any way, and study now a number of years old, but city could readily redo the process today. Point: visualization much better than simple descriptive words. Council process needs better discussion than simple words from passionate advocates.
2020 City Council Priorities
What are the priorities you would like to see the City Council adopt for 2020?

Name not shown
in Charleston Terrace
January 17, 2020, 11:38 AM

Make more affordable housing for low income, instead of commercial building.

Jake Millan
in Downtown North
January 17, 2020, 11:53 AM

In addition to the housing crisis in Palo Alto, I would like to see a concerted effort by the City of Palo Alto to enforce existing air quality laws that have already been passed—some over a decade ago. Specifically, the gasoline leaf blower and vehicle idling laws—those are very easy to enforce and greatly improve the immediate air quality in the City of Palo Alto and beyond.

Additionally, during City sponsored events like the Children’s Fire and Police Demonstation outside City Hall—can we not have the diesel engines idling the entire time? The Fire Engine was the only vehicle not turned on and spewing emissions directly into the kids’ faces.

Thank you,
Jake

Name not shown
in Charleston Terrace
January 17, 2020, 2:29 PM

You need to figure out how to stem the bleeding of money to the pension system. Ideally all city (and state and school) employees would be in the same boat as the rest of us and get a 401K and Medicare at 65. As my company and most of the rest of the private sector have dumped pensions, so should governments transition away from them. Too much money is being diverted to the too generous promises made in the past that other priorities that would otherwise be on the radar are being squeezed out by these growing expenses. Most people do not understand the amount of money being diverted to the pension system and endless medical benefits and away from other projects and needs. Oh, and grade separation needs to be done somehow. I wish it could be underground but putting it up in the air is better than not doing it. And when this is done, get two lanes on Alma both directions over Embarcadero, please. And do not close Churchill off.......

Name not available
January 18, 2020, 4:02 AM

My main priorities are climate change, transportation (including grade separation), housing the homeless and low income workers, and fiscal sustainability.

Name not shown
in Downtown North
January 18, 2020, 12:12 PM

I’d like to see the city council evaluate adopting Ranked Choice voting for city elections.

Tim Flagg
in Crescent Park
January 18, 2020, 1:21 PM

Airplane noise and pollution from low flying airplanes.

Name not shown
in Old Palo Alto
January 18, 2020, 4:57 PM

Creating affordable housing.

Bruce Hodge
in Palo Verde
January 18, 2020, 6:02 PM

Climate Mitigation
- Focus on implementing programs that put the City on track to meeting its 80/30 Climate goals.
- All programs should have key performance indicators and regular public reporting of progress or lack thereof
- Staff should provide more transparency with respect to their work in this area
- Adequate staffing levels to address these issues
## 2020 City Council Priorities

What are the priorities you would like to see the City Council adopt for 2020?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affordable Housing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- For both low &amp; middle income residents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transportation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Increased funding for the TMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Implement paid parking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Susan Stansbury

in Barron Park  
January 18, 2020, 6:30 PM

I would like to see climate change and fiscal responsibility remain priorities. Additionally, on a related matter, I would like to see the city divest from fossil fuels from their portfolio and invest in clean energy. Here is a link to a toolkit for cities from leaders around the world:  
https://c40.my.salesforce.com/sfc/p/#36000001Enzh/a/1Q0000000MmBe/0sK2VDoRdYwGyPuXNGTakGB47EnJKXFUE5qWgpJEawg  
To help with this process, public banks are now legal in California. I would like the city to explore forming a public bank with other local municipalities as a means to take our money out of Wall Street and invest it locally. San Francisco is already taking steps to do this. See  

### Mark Grossman

in Old Palo Alto  
January 19, 2020, 9:42 AM

Climate change is the #1 issue facing the world, and every possible action, both local and global, must be taken in the next 1-10 years to address it. The city must phase out its fossil fueled vehicle fleet, assist residents with phasing out their gas appliances, and divest from bonds and banks financing the fossil fuel infrastructure. Palo Alto should also measure, report, and mitigate the carbon intensity of all future legislative measures.

### Name not shown

outside Palo Alto  
January 19, 2020, 11:22 AM

Priorities must be on housing, and housing affordability. Palo Alto has become a gated community, out of reach for people with regular jobs including teachers, plumbers, staff (e.g. at Stanford). This trend must be reversed by allowing more building, especially near transit centers but in general as well. It's simple supply and demand, and housing subsidies are not the answer, building more units is.

### Kyrie Robinson

in Palo Verde  
January 18, 2020, 7:39 PM

Climate, climate, climate.  
Train track grade separation.  
Plan for Fry's / Ventura that includes housing, retail, walkable neighborhood amenities. Get the owner to move on SOMETHING.

### Name not available

January 18, 2020, 7:17 PM

Housing, including mixed use options that promote housing.

### Name not available

January 20, 2020, 9:28 AM

Climate Change.
Climate change and environmental pollution need to be priorities to protect the health and well being of our community and beyond. What more can Palo Alto do to cut emissions? Think creatively and aggressively! What if downtown and Cal. Ave. were a pedestrian zone? (it would be amazing!) What if there were free bikes or scooters, or e-bike check-out credits? What if there are more incentives or challenges so people don't drive to work? What if parking charges went up by a factor of 10? What if all home remodels and new office construction went all electric w/ solar etc. now? What if the Palo Alto Shuttle had more routes? What if Palo Alto residents got free bus passes on transit, and a Caltrain allowance? What if all companies had to set up electric commuter buses for their employees? What if all delivery vehicles had to be electric, or using e-bikes with carts? What if ...

Patrick Ye
in College Terrace
January 20, 2020, 10:11 AM

I would like the council to consider ways to intelligently increase housing density that relieves high rents, minimizes total traffic on Palo Alto streets, and reduces per capita carbon footprint. As a young professional, I feel like I represent a segment of the Palo Alto citizenry that would benefit from increased housing supply and use low carbon methods for their shorter commutes.

Name not shown
in Duveneck/ St Francis
January 20, 2020, 5:37 PM

More affordable housing for low income residents. Allow for more diversity of class in Palo Alto so that minimum wage folks can live where they work. More housing!

Name not available
January 20, 2020, 10:25 PM

Train Transportation

Palo Alto should be a leader in building reliable regional transportation. Unlike some NIMBY neighboring cities, we should support the completion of a BART circuit, accelerate the EPA - Fremont connector, finish grade separation and improve frequency on Caltrain, push Caltrans to add train lines on 101 and 280 that connect with the segments on 85/87 down south and lead the El Camino Real development corridor in including a VTA line all along El Camino. Buses just give public transit a bad name because without special rights of way, they are slow, unreliable and a burden on small city streets. Go all in on trains.
I think we especially need progress on housing and sustainability. We need to add substantial numbers of homes, before we add any more jobs. (Same for our neighboring cities.) Few current residents of Palo Alto could afford to move in at today’s prices! For sustainability, I would focus on moving us away from single occupancy automobiles. Moving 3000 pounds of automobile on every trip is not sustainable, even if electric. If we are to keep travelling by jet airplane, we will have to abandon inefficiency and carbon for the rest of our trips.

We need to make progress on housing, with higher density, with BMR and lower options. This should be in locations that can be served by transit or personal transportation (walking, biking, scooters). We need to consider connection of jobs to transit systems, too. Can offices be convenient to the nearest bus stop, instead of across an acre of parking?

We need to lobby VTA to put a 522 Rapid bus stop at Barron Ave, to serve the dense Ventura neighborhood, new housing developments on that part of El Camino, and Barron Park.

Prioritize transportation improvements include several long-time efforts in our current bike/ped plan. Build the new bike bridge over 101 quickly. Connect the bike lanes on Charleston/Arastradero by funding and building phase 3. Provide sufficient bike parking at all libraries, improve California Ave, including a solution for the Farmers’ Market, and promote bike parking at the private shopping centers. Then fund the next revision of the bike/ped plan - We can learn how to build cost-effective improvements to improve bike connectivity for all users.

This year CalTrans should finish six new signalized pedestrian crossings on El Camino. (They really should have last year!). These safety improvements include locations with recent fatalities. There are other heavily used, unprotected crossings in Palo Alto that should be evaluated for similar treatments (Middlefield/Sutter and Churchill/Castilleja, to name two.)

We should charge for parking, and then everyone will be able to find a place.
2020 City Council Priorities
What are the priorities you would like to see the City Council adopt for 2020?

Name not shown
in Evergreen Park
January 21, 2020, 5:56 AM

First priority for Palo Alto should be transportation improvements and traffic mitigation. This is key to addressing many other pressing problems, including truly affordable housing (beyond "below market") to motivate economic diversity in our community and the badly needed infrastructure and public service investments that will be need to support that housing and those who will live in it. Doing so also means sharing necessary costs equitably - not just putting them on the back of those who live or will here - meaning businesses whose employees commute to work in Palo Alto must contribute in a significant way.

susan chamberlain
in Downtown North
January 21, 2020, 7:39 AM

1. Sustainability
2. Housing
3. Transportation

Name not available
in Downtown North
January 21, 2020, 8:38 AM

Climate Change is the most important

Name not shown
in Evergreen Park
January 21, 2020, 10:44 AM

We need to decrease our carbon emissions asap and as much as possible. Let’s support electric cars and solar power from homes so citizens can plug in their cars to their homes.

Jan Holliday
in Crescent Park
January 21, 2020, 10:46 AM

My top priority is the unhoused population not only in Palo Alto but what has become a national crisis. I believe we need to be creative in dealing with traffic in our neighborhoods.

Name not shown
in Duveneck/ St Francis
January 21, 2020, 12:09 PM

1. climate change - 2. housing. 3. transportation
4.inequality

Susan Voll
in Barron Park
January 21, 2020, 12:51 PM

I am very concerned about the continued growth Palo Alto is experiencing. Can we please stop adding office space to this little city?! Every time a new office is added we offset our working/living ratio more, bring in more traffic, and put more stress on city services. Every time we add more housing we bring more traffic into the city, add to bulging attendance in the schools and again put stress on city services. Property values go up and long time residents and treasured businesses are lost. Not everyone can live in Palo Alto, not everyone needs to live in Palo Alto or work here. Geographically we are a small city, let’s not add more and more houses and businesses than we can harmoniously sustain.

Name not available
in Old Palo Alto
January 21, 2020, 8:54 AM

We need to decrease our carbon emissions asap and as
After 5 years the City needs to finally address, in a meaningful way, the jet traffic that has been shifted and concentrated over the residents of Palo Alto. The City has done nothing effective to this point.

Cherrill Spencer
in Barron Park
January 22, 2020, 12:10 AM

In October 2018 the Palo Alto City Council directed staff to study and return to the Policy and Services Committee with options for a City Ordinance endorsing the United Nations’ Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW). The Policy and Services Committee has yet to direct staff to start this study and so we remain ignorant of the extent to which women and girls who live and work in Palo Alto suffer discrimination and how the City could amend its policies to counter this discrimination. I request that the Policy and Services Committee, chaired in 2020 by Councillor Alison Cormack, make it their top priority to direct city staff to start work on an ordinance based on the principals of the United Nations’ CEDAW. See the pertinent resolution of the Palo Alto City Council here: https://www.cityofpaloalto.org/civicax/filebank/documents/67315

Name not shown
in Palo Verde
January 22, 2020, 8:53 AM

1. Our water. Is our water really safe? EWG believes there are issues. Why are water quality issues so hidden?
2. Our electric grid—are we ready for electric cars? Almost every house on my street has at least 1 electric car and some families have 2. Are we keeping lines clear of trees and other hazards? We had a 3.5 hr power outage in our neighborhood in December due to a tree hitting the lines.
3. Taking care of community plantings and trees. On the bicycle boulevards and public library and community center, who is responsible for taking care of the plantings? Plantings require weeding, pruning and upkeep (replacing dead plants etc). They are not getting it—not on Ross Road, not at Mitchell Park Library/Community Center.
4. Hidden costs of going green. For example, building permits costs for electric car chargers, gray water etc. We need to create incentives for people to go green.

5. Communication. I had to specifically search for this survey. Most people don’t have the time and really have lost that sense of civic responsibility. I get emails from all kinds of organizations every day. Where is Palo Alto in this? Our social media, out-reach e-mail marketing and website are far behind in functionality and reach.
6. Where is our high speed rail? Let’s bite the bullet and get our baby bullet train. We say we want to change. We say we want to really do something to stop climate change. I just don’t see it happening. All talk and no action. Yes, it is hard and we must do it. Real, concrete projects, not just waving hands.
Thank you so much for this opportunity to share.

Stephen Rock
in Charleston Terrace
January 22, 2020, 10:51 AM

1) Better Transportation
 a) grade separation of RR
 b) Improve Public Transportation system with more buses.
 c) Smart and maintained signal lights coordinated over many blocks
 d) Safer and more bike routes.

2) Cost effective reduction of CO2 output by reducing waste
 a) No outdoor heating
 b) Outdoor lighting off during day
 c) Store doors closed when heating/air conditioning on
 d) Solar and Wind from least expensive sources (probably not rooftop)
 e) Prioritize parking for small cars (fuel efficient).
 f) Parking fees for cars to encourage bike and bus

3) Enforcement of Traffic laws

4) Encouragement of the arts by subsidizing theater, music, etc.

League of Women Voters of Palo Alto Statement on City Council Priorities 2020

Name not shown
outside Palo Alto
January 22, 2020, 2:47 PM

1. Our water. Is our water really safe? EWG believes there are issues. Why are water quality issues so hidden?
2. Our electric grid—are we ready for electric cars? Almost every house on my street has at least 1 electric car and some families have 2. Are we keeping lines clear of trees and other hazards? We had a 3.5 hr power outage in our neighborhood in December due to a tree hitting the lines.
3. Taking care of community plantings and trees. On the bicycle boulevards and public library and community center, who is responsible for taking care of the plantings? Plantings require weeding, pruning and upkeep (replacing dead plants etc). They are not getting it—not on Ross Road, not at Mitchell Park Library/Community Center.
4. Hidden costs of going green. For example, building permits costs for electric car chargers, gray water etc. We need to create incentives for people to go green.

5. Communication. I had to specifically search for this survey. Most people don’t have the time and really have lost that sense of civic responsibility. I get emails from all kinds of organizations every day. Where is Palo Alto in this? Our social media, out-reach e-mail marketing and website are far behind in functionality and reach.
6. Where is our high speed rail? Let’s bite the bullet and get our baby bullet train. We say we want to change. We say we want to really do something to stop climate change. I just don’t see it happening. All talk and no action. Yes, it is hard and we must do it. Real, concrete projects, not just waving hands.
Thank you so much for this opportunity to share.
The city should make production, not merely encouragement, of low and moderate income housing (including for the missing middle) a high priority and adopt dramatically different measures than it has adopted to date. Impact fees have been depleted, highlighting the need to find new sources of financing. Some ideas include bond measures, headcount or other taxes on large employers, using public land for housing (e.g. Cubberley), adopting a “no-net loss of housing” ordinance, use of eminent domain, transfer of surplus lands to affordable housing organizations, mixed-use developments, partnering with nonprofit developers, community land trusts or shared equity housing cooperatives, and investigating new sources of financing by partnering with social equity funds, pension funds, or banks with a commitment to housing people currently unserved by market rate developers.

The severe lack of housing affordable to low and moderate income households has created a social and environmental crisis, threatening our community’s character and diversity, and making it impossible for essential workers to live here.

The League of Women Voters position is that decent housing, affordable to people of all income levels, is a basic right and that public policies should promote this outcome. Homelessness, the lack of affordable housing and climate change are League legislative priorities. These two topics are closely related: a 2017 Terner Center UC Berkeley study found that creating infill housing would be the one policy which would have the greatest downward effect on greenhouse gas emissions for Palo Alto.

The shortage of housing for working people has caused people to live in their vehicles or on the street; schools, public institutions, health care industries, the nonprofit sector, and retail businesses are unable to hire or retain employees; long commutes generate significant greenhouse gas emissions, contributing to global warming. Those able to find housing here often spend up to 50% of their income on shelter, leaving them on an economic tightrope. These conditions are unacceptable.

Council recognized housing as a priority in 2018. Its Housing Workplan required the city to adopt policies which would encourage housing for all income levels, including the middle class, as required by state law. The city has not finished that part of the Workplan which addresses new policies for housing for the missing middle, ironically because of the short staffing in the planning department created by the housing shortage. We urge the city to focus on implementing policies relating to missing middle housing.

Terry Godfrey
President, LWV Palo Alto

A "climate protection-related public relations" educational campaign to "create a sense of moral imperative" as recommended by the 2007 Palo Alto Green Ribbon Task Force. This should help explain the broad rationale for anti-pollution efforts, i.e., 80 x 30, which is to mitigate the over-heating of our global climate. As well as the big, and foreboding, picture, such a campaign could also include education about local housing and transit efforts, along with household carbon footprint plans.

For more information, please see https://coolcalifornia.arb.ca.gov/household

Ken Joye
in Ventura
January 22, 2020, 4:06 PM

In the fall, I picked up a volume at a local bookstore entitled "No One Is Too Small To Make A Difference", which is a set of speeches made by Greta Thunberg (if you have not read it, I will loan you my copy). As she forcefully states, addressing climate change must be a priority for us all. I urge you to consider all issues before you throw this filter; you can take steps which will make a difference. I won’t presume to suggest which steps are most important: changing the economics around housing construction? compelling fewer single-occupancy vehicle trips? addressing *both* sides of the jobs: housing ratio? Thank you for your service!

Becky Sanders
in Ventura
January 22, 2020, 5:58 PM

1. I would like us to get real about the fact that no for profit
developer is going to build the housing we need without exacting concessions from the city, such as allowing more office development so they can get maximize the return on investment. More offices will exacerbate our already grotesque jobs/housing imbalance. We need a way, way, way out of the box, non-profit solution. As a city, we need to get into the business of buying property and converting it to affordable and BMR housing. That is the housing that we need. We are meeting our goals for market and luxury housing. Let’s put a cap on those! And let’s find those expert non-profits that know how to build this kind of housing. What financial products can be structured. Can we apply for grants? There must be a way to raise some capital for such a worthy endeavor. No new office space, period. Not until we are at 1-1 ratio workers/housing units.

2. I would like to see civility at the dais be a priority at all levels of government - starting with the council, and going right down to the commissions, boards and committees. I urge the meeting chairs to give equal time to all voices and to have zero tolerance for any funny business up on the dais, whether it’s talking abusively to another body member or calling out someone in the audience. Let’s embrace civic engagement and have productive meetings with a specified goal of reaching consensus.

3. I would like to see some progress meeting the needs of our vehicle dwellers. Allowing faith communities to provide safe places to park is a good start. The housing crisis which I alluded to above has forced even tech and construction workers as well as the working poor into their cars and mobile homes. It’s a public health crisis as well as a humanitarian crisis, particularly when children are living with such instability, and when the streets and parks serve as their waste management solution. Let’s find a way to get folks off the streets and into more stable, if temporary housing solutions, while we sort out how we are going to pay for the housing that we need.

Thank you.

Christopher Dembia
in Evergreen Park
January 23, 2020, 10:03 AM

Affordable housing and climate change. More opportunities for communal/cooperative living.

Name not available
January 23, 2020, 10:04 AM

Save money by cleaning the streets less. Allow residents to make the turns that are restricted morning and night in North PA. Build higher for more density. Container homes. Allow empty commercial buildings to change over to or allow for part of it to become residential. Make NIMBYs realize that the more multi-family that is built, makes their single family homes go up in value!

Elliot Margolies
in Barron Park
January 23, 2020, 10:27 AM

#1 Affordable and Attainable Housing
#2 Re-balancing Jobs/Housing
#3 Immigrant Rights / Protection of Undocumented Families
#4 Places for RV Overnight Parking
#5 Climate Change measures including renewable energies, water-recycling, plastics recycling that is converted to products in US

Name not available
January 23, 2020, 10:34 AM

I think denser housing should be the cities top priority. We need housing for middle and lower income families in our city.

Walter Bliss
in University Park
January 23, 2020, 10:40 AM

It is time for the PA Council to provide incentives to BUILD LOW-INCOME HOUSING for our city workers, service sector workers, low-income people who contribute much to the welfare of this city. Cities around us have done their fair share. We also need shelters for the homeless.
2020 City Council Priorities
What are the priorities you would like to see the City Council adopt for 2020?

Anne Gregory
in Midtown/ Midtown West
January 23, 2020, 11:20 AM

No on 50, it does nothing for affordable housing

Aram James
in Duveneck/ St Francis
January 23, 2020, 11:49 AM

# 1. Priority for 2020 — release the investigation re Palo Alto Police Captain Zack Perron. The alleged vile and racist conduct by Perron is being covered up by the city of Palo Alto. The alleged racist incident occurred on Jan 28, 2014 — nearly 6 years ago. Having a high ranking officer under a cloud of racist and outrageous conduct is unacceptable. If the allegations are true the message being sent to the other members of the PAPD and to our community members ... is that our city council, city manager, city attorney and police chief are willing to accept and promote a culture of racism in our police department - with no mechanism in place to expose and hold accountable racist members of the PAPD. We must not allow such a culture to fester in our city.

# 2. I have filed an extensive CPRA request ( at the city council meeting on Tuesday January 21, 2020) re important data re the use of Tasers, expense of Tasers and other relevant data points. I expect full transparency in the release of these records in a timely fashion ... and full compliance with the CPRA by the city. Once I have all necessary data — I will present the information to the community and the city council. I will then call for the city council and HRC to re-examine whether Tasers are still necessary in Palo Alto. Should we ban Tasers in Palo Alto given the growing evidence that Tasers are much more dangerous then originally thought?

# 3 priority for 2020. A robust discussion re the critical need for a bathroom at Bol Park. A bathroom designed to complement the extraordinary natural setting.

Sincerely,

Aram James
415-370-5056

P.S. any guideline for civility (code for self-censorship) must not be used to chill speakers full right to exercise their first amendment rights.

Leora Tanjuatco Ross
in Palo Verde
January 23, 2020, 12:00 PM

Palo Alto needs to prioritize building more multifamily homes, at all levels of affordability.

Name not available
January 23, 2020, 3:09 PM

Providing affordable housing.

Name not shown
in University South
January 23, 2020, 3:37 PM

1) Palo Alto needs to secure a site and open a large year-round shelter, including secure tiny houses, for those without homes because not enough affordable homes have been offered for too long. The Opportunity Center provides services, but not shelter, so people still need somewhere secure to go at night that is nearby.

2) Palo Alto needs to provide land, either public or purchased private sites, and grant funds needed for the development of 500 hundred new units of affordable homes for those with extremely low and very-low incomes who are most in need of housing.

3) Palo Alto needs to stop allowing the development and expansion of buildings that will bring more jobs until there is a meaningful jobs-housing balance in this city.

Name not available
January 23, 2020, 3:43 PM

Dear Members of the City of Palo Alto Staff,
Please make affordable, diversified housing the #1 priority for the City of Palo Alto in 2020. Without a sustainable community with an adequate housing stock, Palo Alto will
loose its economic and social vitality. The middle class and the young adults will move away in desperation. Many thanks.
Diane Rolfe 1360 Emerson Street, Palo Alto, CA

Name not shown in Research Park
January 23, 2020, 3:43 PM

If Palo Alto is serious about wanting builders to bring more housing projects to Palo Alto, the current height limits need to be updated to reflect today’s economic realities. At four stories, almost no multifamily housing project with structured parking (underground or with a concrete parking garage capable of parking the number of cars needed to meet city code and appease existing neighborhoods) will meet the necessary financial threshold. As a result, housing is not getting built in Palo Alto when it’s getting built in neighboring cities such as Mountain View, Sunnyvale, Redwood City, etc. In areas such as El Camino Real and in other select locations, height limits should be raised to 5-7 stories. Other cities are able to manage these types of heights by requiring sensitive transitions in height between El Camino and lower density residential neighborhoods that are adjacent to El Camino parcels. In other words, building heights can be stepped down to meet the existing neighborhood +1 story. So, a 7 story building might transition down to 2 or 3 stories adjacent to older single family neighborhoods so that existing residents’ views/privacy are not unduly impacted.

Justine Burt in Crescent Park
January 23, 2020, 8:38 PM

Please alter zoning and streamline permitting to allow an increase of housing supply within one mile of the three train stations and along El Camino Real.

marty klein in Palo Verde
January 23, 2020, 11:34 PM

STOP NARROWING OUR STREETS. Everyone agrees traffic keeps getting worse—so why narrow streets from four lanes to two lanes, slowing everything down more? Why hobble more streets by making cars share a lane with bikes?

More people are living in Palo Alto, so you’ve cut down the capacity of Arastradero, Ross, Middlefield, and other streets. This is like inviting people to a dinner party and throwing away half your chairs.

I drive on the WRONG SIDE of the street whenever there’s a bicycle on Ross Road, the latest “traffic calming” disaster. Do you really expect cars to go at the speed of bikes for 3 or 4 blocks? Bikes used to do fine on Ross (where there are NO SCHOOLS). Then you added concrete bulbs that cut down the lane for bikes, shoving them into the road in front of cars.

You owe residents DATA—give us numbers showing how “dangerous” our streets were before you cut them down, and then give us numbers showing how much “safer” our streets are after you cut them down. Show us how all these “bike boulevards” are leading to huge increases in bike riding, decreasing car trips.

I say the data don’t support your ridiculous changes, which are making things worse. Dare you prove me wrong?

Name not available
January 24, 2020, 6:54 AM

More affordable housing availability and options...

Name not shown in Southgate
January 24, 2020, 8:24 AM

I’m a resident and homeowner in the city of Palo Alto. I drive around and see fancy, sprawling office parks but I also see RVs and converted school buses housing our poorer community members. I’m tired of the wealth disparity, and the inequality and the lack of dignity for gardeners, construction workers, teachers and nurses. I would like to see the city council prioritize building housing, REAL housing, that’s accessible for everyone. Allowing in-law units is like sticking your finger in a damn that’s about to burst. Change the rules to allow taller residential buildings along El Camino and Alma and
mandate affordable units. I see Redwood City and Mountain View adopting these changes and I'd like to see my town do it as well. We need to stop thinking of Palo Alto as a sleepy suburb and start transitioning to a more healthy, vibrant city that is welcoming to all.

Jeralyn Moran
in Barron Park
January 24, 2020, 8:36 AM

Mitigation of Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions from our City must be a top priority for the City Council in 2020. This includes (but is not limited to) ramping up the public transportation infrastructure, clearing the way for dense housing construction near transit, promoting Electric Vehicle adoption (with robust plans for a comprehensive charging station network) and incentivizing the move toward a plant-based diet.

Holly Pearson
outside Palo Alto
January 24, 2020, 9:38 AM

Climate change should remain one of Palo Alto’s highest priorities, and a major part of the city’s strategy should involve trees. Large trees should be protected for the carbon they sequester as well as their other environmental and public health benefits. Additional trees should be planted, not as an after-thought to development but as an integral part of the design.

Darlene Yaplee
in University South
January 24, 2020, 9:30 AM

Palo Alto should continue to address climate change as a top priority, which will mean addressing both transportation and development. Trees play a key role in addressing climate change, by sequestering carbon, combating the urban heat island effect, and as part of a complete streets strategy that will encourage people to make more trips without cars. As such, it’s critical that trees are protected in the development process.

Name not available
January 24, 2020, 10:16 AM

Ban Leaf Blowers
More low income housing
Shelter for the homeless
Airplane noise.

**Name not available**  
outside Palo Alto  
January 24, 2020, 12:55 PM

1. Reduce airplane noise, especially between 10:00pm and 8:00am.
2. Figure out a way to not close Churchill Street to car traffic. In my opinion, Embarcadero Road and El Camino Real is the worst intersection in Palo Alto and it will only get worse if Churchill is closed to car traffic.

**Izabel Grey**  
outside Palo Alto  
January 24, 2020, 1:05 PM

I’m about to be a first time mom, so buying a home and putting down roots in a place for our new family is top of mind. We were renting on Emerson st but found a better rental 1mi away in Menlo Park, but we plan to buy in PA. I honestly don’t understand the housing crisis situation well enough, despite trying to research it and it’s hard for me to know which bills would be best for my family and PA over time. I don’t feel like I’m seeing useful discourse in the city council to help educate me and others on this topic. It’s complicated and I can totally see logic in all sides of the argument. If I spend every penny of savings both my husband and I have earned for the duration of our careers on a house in PA, which is the reality in order to get a 3 or 4 bedroom house that isn’t completely falling apart. If we do this and then housing prices fall a lot, it would be hard to ever recover from this financially. So I can kinda see the NIMBY point of view, while simultaneously being really frustrated by it. However, PA can’t just become a place for a small group of ultra rich people to live in, that never changes. I’m not sure what the best path forward is or what my options are, and I feel many people are misinformed or under informed on this. Please help us think through this and see all sides of the situation, and don’t just argue about policy details most people don’t understand and don’t have background on. I don’t think we are actually all on different sides. This could take the from of having open forums with experts, and doing q & a sessions about specific top concerns of residents, but these can’t turn into political bickering and positioning. This turns people off, keeps people misinformed, and hurts everyone in the end. These are my honest feelings and concerns, and I hope this was helpful.

**Name not shown**  
outside Palo Alto  
January 24, 2020, 1:08 PM

I’d like the Council to do whatever it can to reduce the noise from jets on landing approach to SFO. (Prop planes from our local airport do not bother me - they are infrequent and a different pitch)

**Name not shown**  
in College Terrace  
January 24, 2020, 1:08 PM

Airplane noise reduction, rat removal, city employee pension reform

**Name not available**  
outside Palo Alto  
January 24, 2020, 1:08 PM

The ongoing aggravation of airplane noise into SFO is a significant issue for me, and I would hope the city gives a high priority to addressing it. It affects the quality of life here. I don’t think FAA will respond to city complaints. I think the city should bring action directly against the airline companies that are impacting us by flying over our city for the benefit of their customers and their own profit. The FAA doesn’t require the airline companies to fly noisy Airbus jets over our city, or to fly over the city at midnight — that is the airline company’s decision, made for its own convenience and profit. If the airline companies can be made to feel the heat, they will complain to FAA, and then we will see some action. I urge the city to make this a high priority, and to do it by commencing a civil action against the offending airline companies.

**Jenny Wan-Mernyk**  
in Crescent Park  
January 24, 2020, 1:09 PM

Work with FAA to assess alternative waypoints to reduce disproportionate amounts of low altitude air traffic over
Palo Alto and neighboring cities, as well as eliminating night jet noise with quiet approaches over the bay.

**sallie whaley**  
in Crescent Park  
January 24, 2020, 1:11 PM

Airplane noise is my top priority. Second, is zoning. Single family zoning is crucial!!!

**Name not available**  
January 24, 2020, 1:15 PM

Two top priorities for our family are:  
1) air traffic noise over Palo Alto homes  
2) Palo Alto traffic congestion

**Name not available**  
January 24, 2020, 1:15 PM

Priorities:  
(1) Improve bike routes. More with better isolation from automobile traffic. (For example, close automobile ingress-egress at Bryant-and-Embarcadero (“north” side not Castilleja side). Drivers are using the reduced stop-sign bike route as a way to get to downtown from Embarcadero. They endanger bicyclists on this “Bicycle Boulevard”.)

(2) Lobby for reductions in jet airplane over-flights to reduce noise over Palo Alto.

(3) Control/reduce non-housing development in downtown and Cal Ave areas; require adequate parking accompany housing development.

**Name not shown**  
in Old Palo Alto  
January 24, 2020, 1:26 PM

Quiet location with clean air to breathe.

**Name not shown**  
in Green Acres  
January 24, 2020, 1:33 PM

Please make airplane noise a City priority. We are suffering every day and night from the frequent onslaught of low flying aircraft.

**Name not shown**  
in Leland Manor/ Garland  
January 24, 2020, 1:41 PM

Please address the ever increasing noise from airplanes.

**Name not available**  
January 24, 2020, 1:51 PM

Reduce airplane noise!!

**Name not available**  
January 24, 2020, 1:52 PM

You have to address the airplane noise. It is terrible.

**Name not shown**  
in Downtown North  
January 24, 2020, 1:58 PM

Airplane noise and pollution should be the First Priority for the City Council of Palo Alto. For more than three years now, our community has been unfairly exposed to constant Low and Loud aircraft noise and pollution 24/7, adversely affecting the health and well being of our community. City Council has not done enough to represent Palo Alto in this arena. The time is now.

**Mark Shull**  
in Old Palo Alto  
January 24, 2020, 2:08 PM

The issue of the growing concentration of airplane arrivals over Palo Alto needs to be made a priority. The city’s
past strategy of hoping for improvements has resulted in a major increase in concentration due to the Select Committee’s recommendation to redesign SFO’s class B airspace, which resulted in the creation and positioning of SFO’s main arrival waypoint in the very middle of Palo Alto. This in turn resulted in all three arrival streams now merging over Palo Alto, rather than be relatively distributed as in the past. In addition, Palo Alto passively allowed the SFO Roundtable to move Pacific Arrivals from over Atherton and Menlo Park to a path that also crosses the middle of Palo Alto, adding significant night-time, heavy international aircraft and Oakland cargo traffic to our already crowded skies.

All of these have happened because Palo Alto refuses to take this issue seriously, and passes it off as something that will somehow improve if we cooperate with the ongoing changes or that cannot be helped. These changes are not being driven by the FAA, but rather by regional bodies and Congressional efforts that Palo Alto refuses to challenge or counter in any meaningful way.

This must change. It not just the noise, but major studies, including those sponsored by the FAA, are showing that concentrating jet traffic created highly toxic plumes of ultrafine exhaust particles that do not dissipate quickly as the FAA assumed in creating its new arrival concentration models. These ultrafines are much smaller than diesel particulates, and produced almost exclusively by jet exhausts when engines are at low power. They are invisible, but according to the National Institutes of Health, they have a much higher toxicity that larger particles like diesel because they cannot be expelled from the lungs.

University studies in Seattle, Boston, LA and Amsterdam have have show concentrations of ultrafines under arrival paths, and these arrival paths are a fraction as intensive than those over Palo Alto. (It is unclear why ultrafines do not dissipate quickly, but one hypothesis is that unlike diesel they are too small to attach to dust in the air.) Our health, particularly those most affected by ultrafines (the elderly, children and those with respiratory problems), and Palo Alto needs to move aggressively move to undo the air traffic concentration that it has allowed regional roundtables and SFO to centralize over us during the past 4 years.

The air traffic situation needs to be a priority. At a minimum, Palo Alto needs to conduct measurements of the ultrafines we are ingesting. And, it should not be buried under a general environmental category or continue to be a reporting and no action task for city staff.

---

**Name not available**  
January 24, 2020, 2:12 PM

Traffic abatement  
Airline traffic noise.

**Name not shown**  
in Midtown/ Midtown West  
January 24, 2020, 2:20 PM

Repair streets and pavement throughout the city where construction and telephony crews have excavated and then failed to patch the road surface evenly or left steel plates in place.

Convince the FAA to reconfigure the SFO approach route with (1) higher altitude (2) lower power (3) more evenly distributed traffic (4) approaches over the Bay when this can be done without risk.

**Name not shown**  
in University South  
January 24, 2020, 2:43 PM

Airplane noise and routes

**Name not shown**  
in Palo Verde  
January 24, 2020, 3:04 PM

Top priority should be the RELENTLESS airplane noise caused by the extreme amount of planes flying over Palo Alto. It is affecting our quality of life, our health and our sleep. There is so much data out there to prove how bad it is and it’s only going to get worse! Palo Alto needs to do something or else we will lose one of the best communities to live in. Ours!

**Name not available**  
January 24, 2020, 3:15 PM
1. Why HAVE YOU FAILED TO PROVIDE INCENTIVES TO BUILD LOW, LOW-INCOME HOUSING FOR OUR WORKERS? WHAT YOU CAN DO IS: Halt all office, condo development until we get low, low-income housing --Seek out proposals, with incentives for developers. We desperately need to house the workers, the poor, those who struggle to survive in Palo Alto.

2. Support CEDAW: Time to sign on for Palo Alto-- we need to affirm diversity, protect the rights of all, end discrimination against women. We have been working for four years to get the PA Council to ACT on this important UN policy. NOW IS THE TIME TO ACT.

3. Ban Tasers-- They are dangerous, overkill, not needed in this town, and are too expensive. Train the police to be humane agents for the law, not destructive, and potential killers.

Sincerely,
Dr. Roberta Ahlquist

Name not shown
in Crescent Park
January 24, 2020, 3:23 PM

We need a City Council that will serve the citizens of PA and not the non-citizen developers who are getting rich as the expense of the rest of us. We need a council that has the guts to tell downtown offices that they have to decrease the number of jobs within a defined time frame, that will reject all expansion of office space in Palo Alto, and to tell Stanford that within a defined time frame cross town traffic will be limited to less than what we have now. Then maybe we won't need to deal with rail crossings. Then maybe we'd have a basis for an exemption to SB50.

Tell all the people who want to come here to go somewhere else - there's no law that says we have to destroy our community in order to accommodate others who want to profit from our values. Come spend 15 minutes at the intersection of Seneca and Boyce, and tell me that the airplane noise is something we have to live with - drag the FAA bureaucrats to that location and have them listen.

Considering my suggestions above, if the reaction is "we can't do that", then perhaps we should look a the way government in Palo Alto works, possibly admit that it doesn't work now, and change to a structure that will work.

Elaine Uang
in Downtown North
January 24, 2020, 4:09 PM

As both a Housing Element CAC and Comp Plan CAC member, I'm appalled at how badly Palo Alto has performed on housing. It is City Council's duty to work toward Housing Element goals and implement Comp Plan programs. Council needs to re-prioritize housing production ASAP. Here are three housing priorities (plus one transportation priority):

1) Go Back to the Future, take inspiration from the 1920 when Palo Alto's three 7+-story downtown buildings were constructed - Hotel President, Staller Court, Casa Real. Let's abolish the 50' height limit downtown (increase the FAR and reduce parking requirements) and let 20 more of these housing projects to be built in the 2020s.

2) Make co-housing & multi-generational living legal again. Evergreen Park, College Terrace, Downtown North & South are full of these housing types - why can't ALL neighborhoods have them? Why can't Palo Altans have more affordable housing and stronger social bonds? Please let 2, 3, or 4 families or generations legally coexist on a single parcel.

3) Allow more small apartments along Middlefield and Alma. Existing one-two story small apartments structures along Middlefield and Alma are not in great shape, and these corridors could support much more housing 3-5 stories, especially around train stations. But what about traffic? Read on...

4) Start some Shuttles! The Manager’s Mobility Partnership coordinated a Peninsula Bikeway from RWC to MV, why not start up Peninsula shuttles along Middlefield and Alma to support more housing capacity (and existing businesses!) These corridors could use very frequent (every 10 min) express and infill semi-express shuttle services across county lines between from Redwood City to Sunnyvale. We don’t need transit stopping at our border (San Francisquito Creek)

Please make re-prioritize housing so we can work toward meeting our 2023 Housing Element goals and implement our 2030 Comp Plan goals and programs.

Name not shown
in Duveneck/ St Francis
January 24, 2020, 4:09 PM
The issues to which I would give priority are:
Maintaining the independence of the City Auditor’s Office.
Hiring truly qualified city management.
Ticketing red-light scofflaws.
Ensuring pedestrian and bicyclist safety.
Addressing traffic congestion.
Effectively lessening air traffic noise - SFO, PAO, and SJC (when weather causes low rerouted landing approaches over Palo Alto).
Improving city infrastructure repair and maintenance.

Name not available
January 24, 2020, 4:12 PM

Airplane noise. We have a "sacrificial highway" going over Palo Alto that interferes with sleep as well as normal daily enjoyment of our homes. If your house is not under this highway you probably don't care. But you are our representatives. Please help to mitigate this problem which appeared without any notice and has gotten worse not better over the years. It seemed as though the council was willing to take this up in the past but backed down at the last minute. This issue is not over. Please do not forget about it.

Name not shown
in Downtown North
January 24, 2020, 4:20 PM

I have written to you many times about the intolerable airplane noise over our Midtown house. I again urge you to put Airplane Noise and Pollution as your #1 priority for 2020. This is the most serious threat to our quality of life in Palo Alto that we have ever had and it comes from outside our community.

The current FAA routes over Palo Alto impact not only the quality of life but the health and well-being of its citizens. The constant drone reduces productivity and increases stress levels. It affects sleeping, concentration, enjoying the outdoors and just plain living. It brings additional pollution with the increased flights and lower altitudes. And it is unfairly affects Palo Alto compared to other communities in the Bay Area.

Please set Airplane Noise and Pollution as your #1 priority for 2020.

Name not available
January 24, 2020, 4:26 PM

I would like to see the city council commit to alleviating airplane noise which has plagued our neighborhoods since the FAA adopted a policy of funneling approaching SFO inbound flights at lower altitudes over our homes and schools. The growth of SJC has further burdened Palo Alto with many days of exceedingly loud, and very low flying planes. Past reluctance by the city council to take any substantial action to address this serious problem is a source of great disappointment.

Ken Bencala
in Barron Park
January 24, 2020, 4:26 PM

Climate change is the highest priority. A focus on the urban canopy is a mechanism for the city to have a positive impact. Trees need to be protected for the carbon they sequester along with combating the urban heat island effect. Additional trees need to be planted as an integral part of every development design. Open spaces need to be required in every development project and single-family housing project. Strong preference should be given to tree species that are adaptable to climate change threats, can foster resilience, build biological diversity, support native wildlife, and are resistant to insect and disease damage.

Name not shown
in Greenmeadow
January 24, 2020, 4:33 PM

Please consider prioritizing projects that reduce our contributions to climate change and help to mitigate its impacts, as envisioned in the Comprehensive Plan. Toward this end, I think it would be most effective to focus on these three areas, considering priorities in each category within a sustainability context:
1. Transportation (the largest contributor to GHF emissions)
2. Housing and Land Use
3. Budget/Finance

Financial and staff resources are limited, so let’s prioritize...
projects and programs that move us toward a sustainable future environment—a legacy our children and grandchildren will remember with gratitude. Let’s be worthy of their trust in us to protect their future. Here is what this might look like:

Transportation

Comp Plan Goal T-1 “Create a sustainable transportation system, complemented by a mix of land uses, that emphasizes walking, bicycling, use of public transportation and other methods to reduce GHG emissions and the use of single-occupancy motor vehicles.”

Finish what we started. Complete construction of the Charleston/Arastradero Plan, Adobe/101 Pedestrian Bicycle Bridge, and bicycle boulevards. These projects have languished for nearly two decades while the Cal Ave parking garage is being constructed at lightning speed and magnificent cost. Going forward, let’s evaluate major transportation expenditures based on how well they serve Goal T-1.

Implement paid auto parking in high demand areas on the public streets and in existing public parking garages. Let’s not use public funds for public auto parking going forward. If businesses and developers want to subsidize driving, that is their prerogative. It should not be the responsibility of taxpayers. Auto parking garages encourage more people to drive, exacerbating congestion, creating safety and GHG impacts, and undermining progress toward Goal T-1.

Complete plans for grade separation and Shuttle expansion plans and create a funding plan for improving transit. Fill in gaps created by VTA cuts. Consider asking the VTA Grand Jury to propose specific mitigations for VTA failures to provide equitable levels of service in Palo Alto—perhaps providing CoPA with funding for Shuttle expansion.

We need more bike parking at many city facilities, most city events, and many commercial and retail locations citywide. Safe Routes to School has demonstrated that inadequate bike parking is a real deterrent to biking. It also has shown that placing new bike parking in visible, convenient locations that connect well to on-street bike facilities and desirable destinations draws new riders. It reminds people who often drive that they could try something different. Identify areas where bike parking gaps exist and address the problem using grants—as we did with PAUSD. This will be far less expensive than building auto parking.

Start work on the next Bicycle-Pedestrian Transportation Plan—but please do not postpone current projects in order to accomplish this task.

Housing & Land Use

Make better use of land where we can. Consider Goal T-1 in land use planning. More units of higher density at locations that are well-supported by public transit. Slow down office/jobs growth. Addressing the jobs:housing imbalance requires us to work on both sides of the balance. As we grow housing (especially higher density housing) we must preserve public land to increase services (school and community spaces) that new residents living in much smaller spaces will badly need in order to preserve quality of life and minimize car trips to these services.

Budget

Nothing gets done without money. Invest in infrastructure that aligns with the vision for sustainability outlined in our Comprehensive Plan. Conserve money to fund more affordable housing, transit and public facilities we will need to support denser housing…and to mitigate the inevitable impacts of climate change that already are underway.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Richard Gerould
in Crescent Park
January 24, 2020, 4:34 PM

Commercial Aircraft Noise—the noise created by commercial aircraft approaching SFO is a significant quality of life issue for many of us in Palo Alto. I live in Crescent Park and the overflying approaching aircraft number over 100 each day. Most of them approach at an altitude of 4,000 feet or lower, which for international flights in particular can occur at any hour of the night. Typically they fly over Palo Alto toward the MENLO waypoint, which is roughly at the intersection of Willow Road and 101 (I happen to be a private pilot so I have some familiarity with the waypoints).

I grew up in the Bay Area and have lived at our present address since 1997. When we moved here, all commercial aircraft approaching SFO flew over the San Francisco Bay, descending from over 10,000 feet over Milpitas. There was (and is) very little noise over any Peninsula communities when the Bay approach is used. Somewhere about 5-8 years ago, flights started being redirected from the Bay approach to over Palo Alto and the MENLO waypoint (probably as part of the FAA Next Generation Air Transportation System (NextGen)) . This change in approach pattern did not receive any local review and the FAA has consistently resisted efforts to address it. I am sure the history is well known to the City Council.
It would be one thing if current residents knowingly had moved into the vicinity of SFO or in the flight path of approaching commercial traffic. However, what happened is that the FAA simply decided to reroute traffic over Palo Alto and other Bay Area communities without any environmental review.

I understand that the City Council has declined in the past to join legal efforts to compel the FAA to address the commercial aircraft noise issues. I believe that this issue is at least as important as the other priorities listed by the City Council and should be added as a priority.

Thank you for your consideration.

Name not available  
January 24, 2020, 4:38 PM

Control noise, from airplane but train and car...

marie-jo fremont  
in Leland Manor/ Garland  
January 24, 2020, 4:50 PM

* Airplane noise. Airplane noise. Airplane noise. Continue to fight the disproportional concentration of aircraft over Palo Alto on an almost 24-hour basis.  
* Climate change. Make drastic changes to curb carbon emissions.  
* Fiscal responsibility. Be frugal.

Name not shown  
in Duveneck/ St Francis  
January 24, 2020, 4:56 PM

priorities: less airplane noise, improve traffic on Embarcadero, better oversight of the city manager, auditor to report to city council not the city manager, stop red light runners, resist pressure to develop more housing and offices just because we are supposed to

Name not shown  
in College Terrace
1. End the jet noise plaguing our lives, do whatever it takes.
I can no longer get a full night of sleep and it has become impossible to sit outside in my yard at all. I moved here for the peace and quiet, and we no longer have that. We have loud, low planes at least as early as 5:30am and as late as 2:30am. During the day we have planes flying over as low as 1500 feet every 60-90 seconds. The air quality in Palo Alto has to have been affected. If one of those planes loses altitude and crashes, a huge swath of Palo Alto and Menlo Park can be wiped out. There apparently was no Environmental Impact Study done by the FAA before they trashed the quality of life of Palo Alto and surrounding towns. If this isn't our City Council's highest priority, you are NOT doing your jobs. Forget global warming which most of us won't live long enough to see, it's long past time to make this the top priority and get it fixed so we can enjoy our homes and gardens again.

2. Put an end to senseless growth that may enrich some developers and give the council more tax dollars to play with, but overtaxes the city’s infrastructure and makes life stressful for those who actually live here. I would point to the planned development of East Meadow Circle by Google. That area has no direct exits to any major road, so we will have hundreds more car and bus trips a day going through residential streets including onto the new Ross Road bike boulevard. How is that going to improve life for kids riding their bikes to/from school not to mention the rest of us who thought we lived in a residential neighborhood, not in a high traffic, overly dense commercial development?

3. Stop wasting our tax dollars on poorly thought out and worse executed projects like the Ross Road bike boulevard which pushes bikes into the same space as cars, puts bulbouts and other hard to see impediments in the path of drivers, and slows emergency vehicles that can’t readily transit the badly designed roundabouts. How did this project go through with so little input from residents and no adjustments when its many failings became obvious?

4. The real priority I’d like to see is a City Council that actively seeks out input from residents all the time, not just once a year for a retreat, and listens to that input to make constructive change in our city. You should be on top of all the issues I’ve outlined above, but you haven’t been. You need to restructure your approach so you really represent and serve the voters in this city.

Osborne Hardison
in Greenmeadow
January 24, 2020, 6:34 PM

1. Reduce jet noise day and night.
2. Fix the dangerous interchange from the San Antonio service road into San Antonio going east toward 101 near Middlefield.
3. Did I mention jet noise?

Melanie Liu
in Duveneck/ St Francis
January 24, 2020, 6:39 PM

1. divestment from fossil fuels
2. investment in low and extremely low income housing
3. investment in citywide EV shuttles that are fast, free and frequent

Name not shown
in Crescent Park
January 24, 2020, 6:41 PM

#1 - Stop the flight paths being straight over us with jets low and noisy literally every 2-6 minutes presently(!) [Cresent Park etc.]

#2 - Remove local retail and business KILLING ridiculous rules of zoning changes by business and building owners desiring to rezone to alternate forms of retail (Ex. gym to food sales) telling owners what they can or cannot do building and stop this 100% business-murdering parking space fantasy slaughtering all retail outside of 1 block from University to having an impossible amount of parking losing downtown immunity.
Palo Alto had a very special history of supporting its local business, and due to these corporate interests (office buildings and ignoring all small retailers' desires and protections required for little guys) taking full control our local downtown has completely lost its soul and is not AT ALL supportive of small business and long term inviting behaviors for local business to thrive and draw even more culture and promise (as the soul is NOT the big retailers).

#3 - Actually enact long term 'smartest shining city on the hill' intelligence beyond unreasonable bickering and enormous and utterly ridiculous fantasmical budgets
(Churchill and the 50yrs too late kids crossing trains . . etc-etc.) in removing the obvious elephant of ‘TRAFFIC’ in the room by truly looking at: University from 101, Embaradaro, Oregon Expressway, Page Mill, Sand Hill, and Arastadaro MAIN thoroughfares they TRULY ARE and as an air traffic controller does, and with a sound and wise 20-year lens and really looking into alternate methods already utilized by other cities for solutions such as:

a) intelligent traffic lights (not these dumb antiques from the 1950-60’s)
b) timed efficiency (Ex: certain times of day restricts or enables flow and is broadcast to all entering and leaving)
c) improvements and ADVANCED design flow using some of our Valley genius employed into algorithmic intelligence finally!

Sally O’Neil
in Barron Park
January 24, 2020, 8:36 PM

Climate change is a gigantic problem that already does and will increasingly affect all of us. One way to do our part is to focus on Palo Alto’s trees, which provide many benefits to us, including but not limited to: moderating climate warming, helping to clean our air, sequestering carbon and simply making our children and adults happier and more relaxed. Tree canopy in schoolyards has been shown to influence students’ mental health and comfort. Our city council can make a difference right now at a relatively low cost that does not threaten the sustainability of the city budget by devoting resources to caring for our existing trees and fostering the planting of and caring for the right kinds of trees. Trees are not a luxury, nor are they peripheral to our daily experience. They are a crucial element of our local environment and our lives and health. This is now recognized worldwide. Let us here do our part -- we all benefit from an environment with healthy trees.

Name not shown
in Midtown/ Midtown West
January 24, 2020, 9:37 PM

Airplane noise is a major quality of life and health issue, one of the biggest if not the biggest in Palo Alto. All airplane traffic is badly impacting us, this particularly includes all SFO bound traffic, and San Jose bound traffic when it is shifted to a “South Flow”, which impacts Midtown Palo Alto very badly. The airplanes are particularly harmful at night. They wake us up and keep us from sleeping. Airplane noise needs to be lessened. Airplane traffic needs to be reorganized so that Palo Alto does not bear the brunt of it on the peninsula any longer as we do now.

Karen P
in Duveneck/ St Francis
January 24, 2020, 10:03 PM

The steady rise in air traffic since the FAA decided to re-route and concentrate SFO and SJC flights over Palo Alto has seriously increased noise and air pollution, threatening the health and wellbeing of everyone in the City (as well as our neighbors). Numerous residents have spoken at council meetings about the disruption to their lives. Teachers have said how overflights require them to interrupt class lessons. It is well past time for the City to specify the reduction of jet noise and emissions as a key priority. Given the City’s past failure to timely recognize and challenge the FAA’s implementation of NextGen, there is an added responsibility to finally give this issue appropriate attention.

Name not shown
in Palo Verde
January 24, 2020, 10:15 PM

We need less dense housing, limits on street parking, limits on jet noise from low-flying planes.

Name not shown
in Old Palo Alto
January 24, 2020, 10:20 PM

Please advocate for our city and the city’s clean air and clean noise requirements, that we have planes diverted from overhead to over the Bay.
Honorable City Council Members,

Please consider prioritizing projects that reduce our contributions to climate change and help to mitigate its impacts, as envisioned in the Comprehensive Plan. Toward this end, I think it would be most effective to focus on these three areas, considering priorities in each category within a sustainability context:

1. Transportation (the largest contributor to GHF emissions)
2. Housing and Land Use
3. Budget/Finance

Financial and staff resources are limited, so let’s prioritize projects and programs that move us toward a sustainable future environment—a legacy our children and grandchildren will remember with gratitude. Let’s be worthy of their trust in us to protect their future. Here is what this might look like:

**Transportation**

*Comp Plan Goal T-1 “Create a sustainable transportation system, complemented by a mix of land uses, that emphasizes walking, bicycling, use of public transportation and other methods to reduce GHG emissions and the use of single-occupancy motor vehicles.”*

Finish what we started. Complete construction of the Charleston/Arastradero Plan, Adobe/101 Pedestrian Bicycle Bridge, and bicycle boulevards. These projects have languished for nearly two decades while the Cal Ave parking garage is being constructed at lightning speed and magnificent cost. Going forward, let’s evaluate major transportation expenditures based on how well they serve Goal T-1.

Implement paid auto parking in high demand areas on the public streets and in existing public parking garages. Let’s not use public funds for public auto parking going forward. If businesses and developers want to subsidize driving, that is their prerogative. It should not be the responsibility of taxpayers. Auto parking garages encourage more people to drive, exacerbating congestion, creating safety and GHG impacts, and undermining progress toward Goal T-1.

Complete plans for grade separation and Shuttle expansion plans and create a funding plan for improving transit. Fill in gaps created by VTA cuts. Consider asking the VTA Grand Jury to propose specific mitigations for VTA failures to provide equitable levels of service in Palo Alto —perhaps providing CoPA with funding for Shuttle expansion.

We need more bike parking at many city facilities, most city events, and many commercial and retail locations citywide. Safe Routes to School has demonstrated that inadequate bike parking is a real deterrent to biking. It also has shown that placing new bike parking in visible, convenient locations that connect well to on-street bike facilities and desirable destinations draws new riders. It reminds people who often drive that they could try something different. Identify areas where bike parking gaps exist and address the problem using grants—as we did with PAUSD. This will be far less expensive than building auto parking.

Start work on the next Bicycle-Pedestrian Transportation Plan—but please do not postpone current projects in order to accomplish this task.

**Housing & Land Use**

Make better use of land where we can. Consider Goal T-1 in land use planning. More units of higher density at locations that are well-supported by public transit. Slow down office/jobs growth. Addressing the jobs:housing imbalance requires us to work on both sides of the balance. As we grow housing (especially higher density housing) we must preserve public land to increase services
(school and community spaces) that new residents living in much smaller spaces will badly need in order to preserve quality of life and minimize car trips to these services.

**Budget**

Nothing gets done without money. Invest in infrastructure that aligns with the vision for sustainability outlined in our Comprehensive Plan. Conserve money to fund more affordable housing, transit and public facilities we will need to support denser housing...and to mitigate the inevitable impacts of climate change that already are underway.

Minimizing contributions to climate change should be guiding priorities in each of these critical areas.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Penny Ellson

P.S. My PC warns me that the city site for submission for these comments uses cookie tracking. Please ask staff to fix this. I have opted to use email for this reason. I ask staff to include my comments with others they have collected on their tracked web site.
December 21, 2019

To the Council (to add as a 2020 priority)

Senate Bill 35 (SB35): Each City then updates the Housing Element of its Comprehensive Plan to show sites where the new housing units can be built and the policies and strategies to meet the housing needs.

The PF zones, the many city parking lots surrounding the two downtowns, University and California Avenues, are the best potential locations for Palo Alto’s response to the State’s housing initiative. There are several very significant reasons why this is an appropriate idea:

The first and most important fact is the city’s ownership of the land. The most significant cost to a developer is the first one – the purchase of the land. If this cost is minimized, or if the city leases the land to the developer for some significant period these savings could be leveraged to reduce the rents to an affordable level to satisfy the state’s program requirements. In a mixed income development, this initial cost savings could be used to skew the rentals to allow a significantly larger percentage of affordable units.

A second benefit would be the retention of the parking under this new housing. The Senate Bill (SB50) proposes a significant reduction in the parking requirement for such transportation rich areas, so the parking can remain as a public amenity to reinforce the viability of the retail commercial uses.

The state has insisted on an abbreviated local review process. So a third benefit of city ownership is the opportunity to study the potential of these sites now, by exploring various planning and architectural options such as massing and density modeling; contextual issues; site development schemes including how to incorporate the parking; whether to provide ground floor retail uses; how to improve the quality and minimize the negative impact of the service areas at the rear of the
retail; and how to landscape the residual spaces either at the ground level or on decks or rooftops, etc. While these would be early schematic exercises, they would establish a format for further development and prioritize the sites with the most obvious potentials.

A fourth benefit would be that these sites would not displace any existing residential use.

And a fifth benefit would be aesthetic. The least attractive areas around these two downtowns, especially at California Street, are these endless parking lots.

This forward thinking initiative would give Palo Alto a leg up on the state’s mandate and allow a reasonable timeframe for the necessary input and coordination with the Council, City Planning, the review Boards and the City’s technical agencies.

The task of organizing this effort is quite significant: it really requires a leader, someone to establish the milestones and deliverables who can properly analyze economic feasibility; who can determine if additional funding such as tax incentives or the use of the impact fees or other forms of subsidies are needed; and who can present these findings along with physical models to the Palo Alto community.

This decision will likely require much discussion, which means it will not be coordinated with the Objective Standards Project as scheduled by City Planning to be completed by August 2020. While this is unfortunate, perhaps it will be an incentive for the Council to act expeditiously.

I hope you will consider this.

David Hirsch
CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

Dear City Council,

Please approve the $10.5 million loan to PAH so that the 100% affordable housing Wilton Court project can be built.

You know how important this project is for Palo Alto. By approving this loan, you ensure that it happens.

And please make housing, particularly affordable housing in transit-rich areas, a City Council priority this year.

Thank you for your consideration.

Bonnie Packer
768 Stone Ln
Palo Alto
I propose placing "TASERS TO BE BANNED", as a priority issue, on Palo Alto City Council's agenda for 2020.

During the past two decades, PAPD cost our city hundreds-of-thousands of dollars for breaking civil rights and unprovoked violence against law-abiding Palo Alto residents. In 2007, Council allowed taser use by a slim 5-4 vote. In 2008, long-time resident Anthony Ciampi was injured as a result of being tasered, filed an $11-million-dollar lawsuit, and settled victorious. Mr. Ciampi was NEVER suspected of a crime.

Taser voltage is unreliable, and can be lethal. According to WASHINGTON (Reuters), in the U.S., there has been more than 1,000 deaths after being tasered by police officers.

I've lived my life in Palo Alto, and I don't know of one resident that supports the use of tasers in our community. In 2018, East Palo Alto City Council members voted unanimously to nix the use of tasers by their police officers.

Tasers are uncivilized instruments of torture.

Danielle Martell
Palo Alto City Council Candidate 2016 & 2005
CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

1. Halt all office, condo development until we get low, low-income housing --Seek out proposals, with incentives for developers. We desperately need to house the workers, the poor, those who struggle to survive in Palo Alto.

2. Support CEDAW: Time to sign on for Palo Alto-- we need to affirm diversity, protect the rights of all, end discrimination against women

3. Ban Tasers--

Sincerely,

Roberta Ahlquist
Dear Mayor Fine and council members,

Please expand the programs in the housing work plan and provide funding for staff support on the many items not yet started. And then reinstate housing as a priority at the Retreat.

As the staff memo notes, despite positive council action with regard to ADUs and incentives adopted last year, these measures alone will not come close to meeting the housing targets in the adopted Comp Plan and will leave the city unprepared for the higher RHNA targets we will receive as HCD has added substantial targets to relieve overcrowding and cost burdens for existing residents.

Staff has provided a long list of potential additional policies.

Those that come to the top of my list include:

--planning for low rise 204 unit complexes and row houses in neighborhoods--originally scheduled as part of the 2019 housing work plan

--additional height limits when paired with commitments for more subsidized units

--lowering or eliminating retail requirements in new housing developments

--exploring coops and community land trusts

--working with Stanford for housing on their city properties

--developing additional funding sources for projects like Wilton that are 100% BMR--like a bond or parcel tax and including a substantial commitment of business tax revenues

--further streamlining the approval process.

In addition I would ask the state legislature to develop legislation to backfill some or all of the impact fees so the city can retain the funds but the cost of projects can come down.

Finally I would have council remind the NVCAP committee of the importance of substantial new housing in that area for the reasons outlined in the staff report as to the importance of North Ventura if we are to meet our goals and simultaneously avoid being sued by the state for violating our Housing Element.

Stephen Levy

365 Forest Avenue (a wonderful home for 17 families in downtown that would be illegal to construct today

Palo Alto
Hi Council member Greg Tanaka,

I hope you and your family are doing well. I previously lived in Palo Alto for most of my life, but moved to Redwood City for the last 5-6 years. I’m now living in Palo Alto again.

1. At some point I would like the opportunity to meet with you to discuss my experience with issues surrounding safe parking programs.

   **My personal # 1 priority for the city council for 2020**

   2. I would also like to discuss, with you, the issues surrounding PAPD Captain Zack Perron—and the failure of the city and or the police department —and the part played by the Palo Alto Independence Police auditor—in failing to release the IPA report re allegations that Captain Perron acted in a racist and bigoted manner towards a now former member of the PAPD—during an incident dating back to Jan 28, 2014...nearly six years ago now.

   In fact I know that soon the city of Palo Alto will be having Its annual meeting re setting priorities for 2020. My request is that this critical issue be prioritized as the # 1 issue before the city council for 2020. I realize this is a long shot—but I feel compelled to make my best effort to see that this issue is not ignored.

   I will copy this e-mail to the entire city council and any staff members you suggest .... so that at least my input is considered prior to the annual retreat—for priority setting.

   In a separate e-mail I will send a copy of a short letter to editor of the Daily Post....that I wrote back on December 16, 2019 titled: *City foot dragging*.

   3. **Second requested priority for our city council for 2020. Ban Tasers**
In the 2007 I was very active in Palo Alto in opposing the introduction of Tasers into the city of Palo Alto. I believe it is time to permanently ban Tasers in Palo Alto....it is not a weapon that is needed by our police department. The weapon is extremely expense to maintain and are very unsafe ....and are rarely used by the PAPD.

In a separate email I will send you two articles I co-authored with attorney Richard Konda ....a few years back... when we opposed the purchase and use of Tasers by the Santa Clara County Sheriff’s Department.

Although the issue of the use of Tasers in our jails is different than the use of Tasers by our police in the streets ....many of the key issues are the same. I will also send you-if still available-the video of my presentation to the Palo Alto Taser Task Force back in 2007. Ultimately in May of 2007 our City Council in a 5-4 vote...voted to allow the PAPD to purchase Tasers. Guess who provided the 5th and deciding vote!!!!!

**3rd priority for the City Council to consider in 2020 is a bathroom At Bol Park.**

4. I will discuss this issue in detail with you.... council member Tanaka...when we meet and do my best to prepare a memo of reasons for this request to be provided to staff members who are preparing issues for the upcoming retreat.

Sincerely,

Aram James  
415-370-5056  
abjpd1@gmail.com

Sent from my iPhone
Dear Council members,

A severe shortage of housing for working households in our community has caused people to sleep in their vehicles at night in unsafe conditions. I support the trial safe parking program which would let up to 4 vehicles stay overnight in parking lots of religious institutions and through connections to social service agencies, help vehicle dwellers find permanent housing. I live in south Palo Alto, in a neighborhood which has religious institutions which may apply for a permit under this program.

I urge the council to quickly work on the tier 2 and tier 3 safe parking proposals which would include large private lot owners and city-owned land.

The safe parking program is a temporary fix for a larger problem. The city needs to adopt policies which will produce permanently affordable housing for working people—including the middle class (teachers, first responders, nurses, etc.). Other communities have used community land trusts and co-ops to provide permanently affordable housing for the working population not served by market rate developers. The number of homes produced by our inclusionary ordinance is so small as to barely address the problem.

Please make production of housing for working people in our community a priority this year.

Thank you.

Lisa Ratner
Dear City Council Members,

Please prioritize addressing the Climate Crisis, especially manifested as increasing density of housing near jobs and/or transit.

Thank you.

Best regards,

Nancy Neff