**TABLE 4.1 WORK PROGRAM SUMMARY**

**Task A: Project Initiation**
1. Kick-off Meeting and City Tour
2. Refine Public Outreach Program
3. Review Background Information
4. Base Map Preparation
5. Project Website
6. Planning and Transportation Commission Meetings (Ongoing)

**Task B: Existing Conditions**
1. Transportation White Paper
2. Economic and Fiscal White Paper
3. Housing and Employment White Paper
4. Sustainability White Paper
5. Community Services White Paper

**Task C: Concept Plans**
1. Area Tour
2. Stakeholder Meetings/Outreach
3. Neighborhood Workshop #1: Issues Identification
4. CommunityViz Model Preparation
5. Neighborhood Workshop #2: Develop Alternatives
6. Develop Alternatives
7. Alternatives Workbooks
8. Neighborhood Workshop #3: Select Preferred Alternative

**Task D: Community Workshops**
1. Community Workshop #1: Open House: Background and Issue Identification
2. Youth Workshop
3. Community Workshop #2: Sustainability in the Comprehensive Plan
4. Community Workshop #3: Economic Development
5. Community Workshop #4: Land Use

**Task E: Draft Comprehensive Plan Amendment**
1. Background Information Update in Existing Elements
2. Goals and Policies Update in Existing Elements
3. Addition of Sustainability-Related Goals and Policies Throughout the Plan
4. Administrative Draft Comprehensive Plan Amendment
5. Public Review Draft Amendment
CITY OF PALO ALTO COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

**Project Tasks**

A. Project Initiation
B. Existing Conditions
C. Concept Plans
D. Community Outreach
E. Draft Comprehensive Plan Amendment
F. Draft EIR
G. Final Comprehensive Plan Amendment & EIR Revision and Adoption

**Project Meetings**

Internal Meetings
Transportation & Planning Commission Meeting
Community/Neighborhood Workshop
City Council Hearing

**Figure 4-1**

- Work Period
- Draft Product
- Final Product
Scope of Work for Comprehensive Plan Amendment

Introduction:
The City of Palo Alto’s Planning and Community Environment Department is soliciting proposals from qualified consultants or consulting teams with expertise in updating General Plans to prepare an amendment to the City’s Comprehensive Plan. The focus of the amendment is to extend the current Comprehensive Plan’s horizon year, update the land use map, modify and add text focusing on policies and programs relevant to issues of existing Council concern, revise the Housing Element and prepare the environmental analysis.

In addition to having knowledge and experience in revising Comprehensive Plan elements, the consultant or consultant team shall also have experience in preparing area studies and Environmental Impact Reports (EIRs). The City is seeking a multi-disciplinary project team of qualified firms and individuals and anticipates that the consultant team will be composed of a prime consultant and appropriate subconsultants. The City will accept a proposal as responsive if it covers only a portion of the Scope of Work and any proposer should be aware that the City may decide to request changes to the composition of the consultant team based on the evaluation of all proposals.

About Palo Alto:
Palo Alto is a community of approximately 62,500 residents located 35 miles south of San Francisco and 14 miles north of San Jose. The City of Palo Alto was founded more than 100 years ago and is name after a majestic coastal redwood tree located along San Francisquito Creek. A charming blend of old and new, Palo Alto’s tree-lined streets and historic buildings reflect a California heritage. A mix of business and residential areas anchored by a vibrant downtown defines Palo Alto’s unique character. At the same time, Palo Alto is home to Stanford Research Park, recognized worldwide as a leader in cutting-edge technological development. Palo Alto’s proximity to Stanford University adds cultural and educational opportunities for area residents. Characteristic of Palo Alto is the attention paid to open space and parkland provision and protection. Palo Alto has over 35 City-owned parks and nearly one-third of its 26 square miles is open space.

Palo Alto is strategically located and easily accessible to major transportation routes and facilities, including Interstate 280, Highway 101, and the Dumbarton and Hayward-San Mateo Bridges. Alternative transportation options are provided and encouraged in the City. Commuter rail transportation is conveniently located and the Palo Alto University Avenue stop is one of the most used in the CalTrain system. Numerous bike paths are located throughout the City and the City provides shuttle service.

Reason for Amendment:
In early 2006 the City Council was concerned that with four years still remaining before the 2010 horizon of the Comprehensive Plan was reached, the City had already exceeded the City’s 2010 housing development projections. The Council was concerned that the Comprehensive Plan did not envision the loss of sites providing critical revenue-generating retail services to convert to
housing leading to a possible imbalance of housing and retail necessary to serve residents’ daily needs, nor did the Comprehensive Plan envision the growing imbalance between housing and the provision of public services integral to housing, such as parks, libraries and schools. As a result, the Council directed staff to work with the Planning and Transportation Commission (PTC) to develop a work plan to amend the existing Comprehensive Plan to no later than 2020. A major focus of the amendment would be to ensure the provision of sufficient public services to serve new housing development and the preservation of sufficient land for neighborhood-serving retail uses.

The Council direction for the work plan included the following elements:
- Revise base conditions and update growth projections
- Update the land use map and land use designations
- Review appropriate Comprehensive Plan policies and programs
- Update the environmental analysis

Staff developed a work plan consistent with Council direction and structured the work program to use the PTC meetings as the venue for public participation and input in the amendment process with quarterly progress reports submitted to the City Council through the duration of the Comprehensive Plan amendment process. The work program was approved by the City Council on June 6, 2006; however, the budget for the work was not approved until June 2007.

**Background Information:**
The existing Comp Plan was prepared during late 1990s, adopted in 1998 with a horizon of 2010 and identifies the physical form of the City through 2010. The current Comprehensive Plan was the product of an over five-year effort that involved hundreds of Palo Alto residents and other interested parties. The document was written by synthesizing extensive public input, ranging from broad visions for the City’s future to detailed programs for specific sites supplemented with maps, text and graphics to create a plan that articulates the City’s aspirations and expectations for the future.

Since 1998 development has occurred throughout the City particularly housing development not anticipated in the plan. The continued growth experienced throughout the City raises potential conflicts with some of the policies of the existing Comp Plan. The City Council determined that updating the plan is needed now to ensure that Palo Alto’s quality of life continues to be protected as the City grows, emphasizing neighborhood preservation, a strong economy, ample parks and recreation, improved mobility for all modes of transportation, and the protection of the City and region’s natural resources and environmental quality. The Council direction is to ensure that Comp Plan continues to serve as the policy framework for a wide range of decisions concerning land use, development, design, and public investment priorities.

**Scope of Work:**
The amendment should allow the Comprehensive Plan adopted in 1998 to continue to serve as an important long-term roadmap for community growth and act as a day-to-day decision-making tool affecting the welfare of current and future residents for the next 5-10 years. The focus of the amendment would be to ensure the sufficient public services
are available to serve new housing development and that sufficient land for neighborhood-serving retail uses is preserved. The Council direction for development of the work plan included the following elements:

- Revise base conditions and update growth projections:
  - Incorporate recent trends in planning /new data into base conditions and identify a realistic growth rate for development through 2020.

- Update the land use map and land use designations:
  - Prepare land use evaluation for East Meadow Circle/Fabian Way/ West Bayshore area, existing Fry’s Electronics site and adjacent properties. The focus of the potential land use changes will be in these two specific areas; however, an overall evaluation of land use patterns within an area generally bounded by Highway 101, El Camino Real Embarcadero Road and San Antonio Road will be required.
  - Evaluate existing land use definitions and determine appropriate uses.

- Review appropriate Comprehensive Plan text:
  - Re-evaluate vision statement to determine its current relevance; vision statement should serve as the framework for the amendment to the Comprehensive Plan.
  - Focus on policies that allow conversion of non-residential land to residential uses
  - Add or strengthen policies and programs that limit the loss of retail serving uses
  - Revise existing Housing Element to update Housing Inventory and modify policies and programs where appropriate
  - Add a new Sustainability Chapter
  - Identify general areas for new parks and community facilities
  - Enhance and integrate a pattern of walkable neighborhoods

- Update the environmental analysis

  - Prepare Environmental Impact Report for amendment
  - Provide thorough analysis of service needs to schools, parks and libraries resulting from project growth through 2020
  - Integrate CEQA significance thresholds used in EIR in appendix to Comprehensive Plan amendment.

The goal of this amendment is to provide a revised Comprehensive Plan that:

- Addresses the key issues facing the city today
- Is supported by current, accurate, and comprehensive data
- Provides a framework for shaping and managing the City’s future growth
- Maintains a focus on the physical and economic aspects of the City
- Incorporates best practices with regards to urban design, transportation, environmental stewardship and sustainability
- Addresses sustainability
- Provides a framework for future development within two areas in the City
- Is clearly organized and easy to read and
- Is graphically attractive, highly visual, and easy to use.

**Project Approach:**
The selected consultant/consulting team will work in partnership with the Department of Planning and Community Environment staff. The consultant will also work closely with the PTC, community groups, and citizens of Palo Alto. It is anticipated that the City staff will take the lead with regard to public notification and outreach with consultant advice and support; will prepare the Housing Element and will oversee review of existing policies and programs; but the consultant team will be responsible for overseeing preparation of the document, developing the data analysis and the area plans and preparing the environmental analysis. The City of Palo Alto will also take the lead in initial data collection and ongoing availability of data and GIS resources. The consultant shall prepare land use forecasts for both housing and employment through the planning horizon based on economic studies and realistic growth projections. The consultant team will be responsible for the quality and comprehensiveness of their written and graphic materials; however, the City will be responsible for the final editing and formatting of the document.

The consultant work will include the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report to support the goals, policies and objectives of the amended Plan. It is desired that the EIR would be prepared in concert with the amendment as the process progresses rather than at the end of the document completion in order to promote cost efficiencies and to expedite the overall process.

As part of the amendment process, the City is interested in either creating a new Sustainability Element or incorporating sustainability policies into existing elements particularly as they relate to sustainable development practices, including solar and green building design and strategies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions based on direction from the City’s recently adopted Climate Protection Plan. Policies and implementing strategies for economic development and retention shall be incorporated into existing elements, particularly as they support the City’s Economic Development Strategy with a focus on neighborhood serving uses and tax generating uses and redevelopment/reuse of infill properties including identification of incentives to encourage redevelopment.

The planning process will be managed by the City’s Chief Planning and Transportation Official. The planning process will be overseen by an internal core working group that will meet on a regular basis. The City Council will receive quarterly status reports throughout the amendment process. The PTC’s role will include ongoing review and comment on the General Plan amendment but will not be directing the consultant’s work.
The following documents will be required at the culmination of the work:

- Amended Comprehensive Plan
- Environmental Impact Report and all documents necessary for EIR certification
- Two area studies

**Public Awareness/Community Participation Process**
The City is seeking an innovative and expeditious community participation process. Given Palo Alto’s strong commitment to public outreach, the consultant team should have extensive knowledge and experience with organizing meetings, workshops and round table discussions for public participation. The amendment process must include significant public participation, including consensus building and possible conflict resolution around key issues. Most likely to be concerns for the community are the growth capacity for future development, particularly housing development, and locations for housing intensification.

The proposal should describe, at a minimum, the consultant’s experience in each of the following areas and a facilitation process for thorough and extensive community involvement:

- Working with planning commissions, councils and the public.
- Utilizing techniques such as 1) study sessions 2) workshops and 3) presenting information through a variety of media including web-based technologies.
- Using on-site sketch designs and chart strategies to depict future scenarios with realistic simulations.

The City encourages the consultant to provide suggestions in the proposal for additional outreach strategies and opportunities. City staff will be responsible for meeting coordination, set-up and noticing; the consultant team will be responsible for meeting facilitation and presentations. The urban design consultants are expected to work closely with residents/businesses/neighborhood associations within each study area in preparation of the area plans, and neighborhood meetings will be held regularly in the two study areas to engage the community and ensure adequate neighborhood participation as each area plan is developed. PTC meetings will provide the forum for discussion/input regarding the overall changes to the Comprehensive Plan specifically related to all other revisions.

**Submission Requirements:**
Proposals must include a cover letter, a description of the consulting firm’s capabilities and services, a discussion of the firm’s expertise relative to the background and experience requirements contained herein, and resumes of qualified professionals who will be responsible for completing assigned tasks.

**Consultant Selection Process**
The tentative process for selection of the consultant is:
(1) Technical review of proposals and selection of finalists;
(2) Interview of finalists;
(3) Final Consultant selection by the City.

The consultant will be required to complete the tasks to update the Comprehensive Plan within a budget of $800,000. The update process is projected to be accomplished within a three year period.

Selection Criteria

1. Understanding the City’s needs and issues to be addressed
2. Qualifications and experience of consultant team members
3. Availability of consultant team members
4. Experience with public participation

To complete the work items identified, consulting teams should include expertise in the following disciplines:

- Land Use Planning
- Urban Design
- Public Participation/Facilitation
- EIR preparation
- Economic Development

Important Dates:
- RFP available—December 2007
- Deadline for Proposals—January 31, 2008
- Consultant interviews—February 2008
- Recommendation to City Council—March 2008

The amendment process will begin in the first half of 2008 with the selection of the consultant team; a public review draft of the amendment should be ready by late 2009, followed by public hearings and adoption in mid 2010.
Planning and Transportation Commission
February 27, 2008
Verbatim Minutes

EXEMPLARY

3. **Comprehensive Plan Work Program:** Update on status of Comprehensive Plan Work Program and consultant selection process.

Ms. Julie Caporgno, Chief Planning and Transportation Official: Thank you Chair Holman. First of all I want to explain why you have received a revised Staff Report. Yesterday at our pre-Commission meeting Vice-Chair Garber asked where the four bold items were and the last I saw this Staff Report it had bold items but somehow in reformatting it lost them. So what we have done is put them back in so you know where the bold items are. None of the other language has changed in the document.

I just wanted to go over the background a little bit. If you remember at your Retreat in December when we were talking about where the Comprehensive Plan process several Commissioners request that we review the adopted work plan with you prior to its going to Council when it goes as part of a consultant contract selection process. I think Chair Holman had mentioned something about new Commissioners and I realized afterwards that there are three of you who have never seen the work program and for the other four of you this is a refresher for you. So I believe that Commissioners Tuma, Keller, and obviously Commissioner Fineberg this is new to you.

This was last seen by the Commission in May of 2006 and at that time the Commission had suggested two additions to the work program that you saw and those were incorporated. One of them is to rezone accordingly under the update of the land use map and land use designations. If we change any land use designations the Commission requested that we rezone at the same time any properties. Then the second thing that you requested was that you implement and expand Program H-29 of the Comprehensive Plan which was to discourage any reduction of existing housing units through loss of rental units. That was incorporated as part of the work program but it has since been deleted because the Attorney’s Office determined that Program H-29 is not legal. So we have eliminated that as part of the work program because we can’t pursue it. When we amend the Comprehensive Plan that will come out.

The work program that is before you was approved by Council in June 2006 however, nothing has happened with it because the budget for the amendment was not approved until June of last year. Subsequent to that time we have developed the RFP. We send out the RFP for consultant selection. We received six proposals and we have scheduled interviews for next week and the following week of the consultant teams. The consultant selection is slated to go to Council on April 7 and as you probably know the consultant selection contract review is not part of your purview and it is the responsibility of the City Administration.
So I just wanted to go over briefly the work program. First of all, the Council’s focus was to ensure that sufficient public services are available to serve new housing development and that sufficient land for neighborhood serving retail uses is preserved. This is kind of an outgrowth of all the housing development that occurred in the early 2000’s, probably 2002 through 2005. The existing Comprehensive Plan had assumed about 2,400 units would be developed by 2010 and at that time we were exceeding that number as far as development applications and approvals. So that was the reason for moving forward on the Comprehensive Plan at that time.

I had Roland check today to find out where we are with that number. We obviously approved quite a bit of development but actually what has either been developed or is under construction is just about 2,400 units. Some of those units that went through the approval process, because of the housing market right now they have not acted on those development approvals.

The other thing that the Council had expressed concern about in relationship to the increased housing was what the impacts of that would be on public services such as parks, libraries, and schools. So the main elements of the adopted work program were to revise the base conditions and update the growth projections. Again, this gets back to that issue of the 2,400 anticipated units that were to be developed by 2010 and to look at what do you want to do between now and 2015 or 2020? The Council kind of left it open to us, which would be the horizon year. We are aiming for 2020 but depending on what our consultant team recommends it may be less than that. If we go to 2020 it doesn’t mean that you can’t revise the Comprehensive Plan before that it is just the same thing may happen if the anticipated development starts to change. It may necessitate changes to the Comprehensive Plan earlier.

The next thing that we are going to do is update the land use map and land use designation and rezone accordingly. The focus of land use designation changes would be in the East Meadow Circle/Fabian Way/West Bayshore area and the Fry’s Electronics area with adjacent properties. The Commission probably remembers that recently we applied for and were granted a priority development area status under ABAG for the Fry’s area, which means that they are recognizing that because of its location near transit we can focus jobs and housing in that area. We probably after the Comprehensive Plan process and we have better knowledge of what the land uses would be we are going to pursue more detailed analysis and maybe get some funding from ABAG and MTC to do a much more detailed plan for that area.

The other thing that we will be doing is evaluating existing land use definitions and determining appropriate uses. One of the areas we will probably focus on is should we change the Zoning Comp Plan like the Ordinance to limit housing in certain areas? Right now the Comprehensive Plan allows housing in most areas and we might want to be pretty definitive, maybe even more definitive about what some of these land use designations allow and don’t allow. So that is what we were thinking of when we included that.
Then the second major component is to review and modify the Comprehensive Plan text. We will look at all the vision statements to determine their applicability and appropriateness now. Right now I have Staff who are looking at scanning the programs for relevance and clarity, and kind of updating that. That will be coming back to the Planning Commission hopefully in June or July and then it will go to Council. What we are hoping to do is we will have certain aspects of the Comprehensive Plan that we have said are still relevant and we don’t need to do anything or we have updated them. Then the areas we need to focus on will be left for the process.

We will also be revising the Housing Element. When we came to the Planning Commission originally this wasn’t on our work schedule because we didn’t know the timeline for requirements for new Housing Elements. It was shortly after we went to Council that we found out and then we took the work program back to Council at one point and included this item.

The other three items that Council added to the work program were to identify general areas for new parks and community facilities, and enhance and integrate a pattern of walkable neighborhoods, kind of a connectivity component. Then they also had wanted us to incorporate a goal addressing the City’s commitment to reducing global warming. We have since changed that to add a sustainability chapter since in the ensuing year and a half sustainability has become such a major issue for this community. When we go to Council that will be identified for them and it still addresses the issue but it just addresses it much more substantially than what they had originally envisioned.

The final major component is to update the environmental analysis that was done and we will prepare an EIR. We are going to provide analysis of service needs to schools, parks, and libraries from project growth through 2020 or 2015 depending upon the horizon year. That is not necessarily a requirement or the detail that we hope to go into for EIRs. Then we are going to take the CEQA significance thresholds that we use in the EIR and include them in the Comprehensive Plan as an appendix. This will document the thresholds that we currently use to ensure consistent application and transparency.

So that is the overview of what we are going to be studying. The public outreach that we had identified, the Council had recommended that the Planning Commission act as the major forum for public input particularly on the plan overall. Obviously we will be going to the two neighborhood areas for those two neighborhood studies. What we are suggesting that you do tonight, obviously if you have any comments on the work program we would appreciate those and we can include those in the Staff Report to Council. However, we won’t be making any recommendations to change the work program because this is the work program they adopted. This is the work program that we are basing the consultant contract on. So if they elect to make any changes they can do that but at this point we won’t be recommending any.

We are hoping that maybe you would start the initial discussions about the public outreach because once we get the consultant onboard we will be coming back to you with
them and trying to figure out exactly what we need to do to make it effective for the public and efficient for everyone. We also will be coming back with a detailed timeline at that time. Right now we don’t know all of it there is some question about when we are going to be doing stuff. So until we get the consultants onboard we won’t have that timeline. So we are hoping that maybe we will be coming back to you in May or June. It will be dependent upon the contract execution. So with that I open it up to any of your questions or comments.

**Chair Holman:** Commissioner Sandas.

**Commissioner Sandas:** Actually, Julie, I was thinking it would be a really good idea tonight to talk about the public outreach element. The way the Comprehensive Plan was originated and put together required so much public input and it required a big committee of people who worked over a long period of time that I think it might be a little unnerving in some ways to the community to think that for amending and revising and updating, etc. they wouldn’t be as involved. So one of the things that I find really difficult is reading the City ads, the public notices in the newspaper. Unless you know to look for them, unless you know specifically what you are looking for you can’t see it. So I am just wondering if in that $200,000 a year that we are allotted that we are allotted extra money for advertising either online or in display type advertising to peak people’s curiosity and interest. I don’t even know if we are allowed to do that.

**Ms. Caporgno:** I don’t think the online advertising will actually cost us particularly on the City’s website. We are also hoping to work closely with PAN, Palo Alto Neighborhoods, to make sure that all the neighborhood groups are aware of any sort of meetings and actually get feedback from them as to what would be most efficient and helpful. So any suggestions that you have.

I forgot to mention two things. I think this was distributed to you. There has been some question about the amount of detail and the kinds of planning that will go into these two areas. Right now this is the detail that we are anticipating. This is a plan that is in the Comprehensive Plan currently and it really is a land use circulation map. Then when that is developed the Comprehensive Plan could include a program that would recommend a more specific area plan such as SOFA to be developed for a particular area. So at this point that is what we envision. There is no way that we would be able to do much more than this level of detail given the amount of work that we are anticipating and the budget that we have and the timeframe. The timeframe will probably not cause quite as much concern it is just a matter of the budget and the consultant contract itself.

The other thing that I forgot to mention is that Commissioner Fineberg sent us some questions this afternoon. I didn’t have a chance to get back to you so if you want to just go through them ask the ones that you think you still want to get answers to or if you want me to go through them I can, whatever would work for you best I will be glad to do.

**Commissioner Sandas:** I still have the floor and I have another question. The other thing that I wanted to mention that I, as a Planning Commissioner, have great difficulty with
are the questions that the public at large have about zoning and the distinctions between different type of zones like CS, CN, R-1. There are very few people that I have come into contact with who know anything about those things. I really think that as a part of our public outreach when we are showing maps and we are showing area plans and so forth that we are really clear as to what the different zoning areas are and why. Initially in the Comprehensive Plan there were reasons why different areas were zoned different ways. I think that we need to create some context for people in terms of the public outreach.

**Ms. Caporgno:** I just want to add that in either March or April we are having a consultant come down to discuss new urbanism with the Council. The Commission obviously will be invited to kind of give some context to the background and foundation of our Comprehensive Plan both generally and specifically as it applies to Palo Alto. Some of what you are talking about too, just kind of the land use issues and how they relate to each other will be discussed at that time to provide particularly the new Council Members with some background. Obviously the public and anyone else, new Commissioners, will be invited as I said.

**Chair Holman:** Commissioner Tuma.

**Commissioner Tuma:** Two things. One is a couple of follow up comment on the issue of public outreach. Because we are going to be using PTC and study sessions as the vehicle for outreach we should think about if there are ways that we could relax our usual rules for study sessions or somehow make it a little bit more interactive like you would typically do in outreach. In this setting in a study session it doesn’t really lend itself to the kind of dynamic that we would want to create. It also goes to as the notice goes out. There is one thing about the regular Planning Commission meeting information but a whole separate thing is really going on while we are doing this. One thought I had in terms of outreach is maybe some outreach to the press to have them write about it to bring it to people’s attention that this fairly significant process is about to get kicked off, as maybe free advertising if you will.

On a separate issue having to do with the Housing Element can you give us some idea, let’s say we were not doing the Comprehensive Plan Update, we would still have to do a Housing Element to comply with ABAG, right?

**Ms. Caporgno:** Yes.

**Commissioner Tuma:** Okay. How much else are going to be able to get done for these dollars during the time we are looking at Housing Element? Does this really take up all of the air in the room during that phase or is there really anything else going on?

**Ms. Caporgno:** The way the scope of work that we included in our RFP that we sent out was that Staff is going to be primarily responsible for the Housing Element since we know locations of sites. Obviously they feed into each other and the consultant team is going to have to be working on that. I think that the consultant team will be looking at
these two areas, urban design components and kind of the land use issues for the two areas of some general urban design issues that might relate to each of these areas, but the land uses and the Housing Element would mainly done by Staff. There is one component of the Housing Element that takes a lot of time that probably the Commission isn’t that interested in but it is the tech document that has all sorts of data about what we accomplished in the past and a variety of affordable housing programs that we have and any sort of impediments to housing that are currently in our processes. So that type of information the City is much more familiar with than the consultant team would be.

**Commissioner Tuma:** Just to go one step further on this issue, the $200,000 a year does that include not only consultant time but Staff time?

**Ms. Caporgno:** I am sorry I didn’t hear the question.

**Commissioner Tuma:** The budget for this process is $200,000 a year for four years, right?

**Ms. Caporgno:** Correct.

**Commissioner Tuma:** Okay, does that $200,000 include Staff time as well as consultant time?

**Ms. Caporgno:** No, it is just consultant.

**Commissioner Tuma:** Just consultant, okay.

**Ms. Caporgno:** And, probably the most expensive aspect of the consultant contract is going to be the EIR because usually they are about $400,000 to $500,000. So that is going to eat up a lot of the contract funds.

**Chair Holman:** Commissioner Keller to be followed by Commissioners Lippert and Fineberg.

**Commissioner Keller:** First could you tell me the timeline of the Housing Element?

**Ms. Caporgno:** The Housing Element is supposed to be completed by July of 2009. We will be receiving our final Regional Housing Needs Allocation in June of 2008. So they give you a year to complete it. Obviously the way our timeline works when the Council increased the timing for this they don’t jive because we will be completing the Comprehensive Plan a year and a half to two years after the Housing Element is due. So we included in the scope of work for the consultants that we need some feedback as to how to make this work. If we are a little bit late with the Housing Element, I think last time we were about a year late. So it is a possibility that we can extend beyond the July 2009 deadline but there still is going to be some additional time given the schedule that the Council directed us to adhere to with the $200,000 per year it would extend beyond even that. So we need to talk to the consultant team and this is going to be a discussion
item with the Council I am sure. Two of the proposals that we have received actually recommend accelerating the schedule. I am assuming that the consultants would like to be in and out regardless of the Housing Element issue. They don’t want to drag this on for an extended period of time if it can be done in a shorter period of time.

Commissioner Keller: What is the time range over which the Housing Element applies? In other words, what is the period?


Commissioner Keller: Okay so it goes from 2007 to 2014 and the Housing Element won’t be approved by the City until basically two years or so into the period.

The EIR is tied to the Comprehensive Plan and not the Housing Element, is that correct?

Ms. Caporgno: That is the critical part why we can’t get the Housing Element done any sooner than the Comprehensive Plan. The EIR is going to cover both the Comprehensive Plan and chapter four of the Comprehensive Plan, which is the Housing Element.

Commissioner Keller: It looks like from your Staff Report that you originally asked for $300,000 more than the City Council actually approved. If the same $800,000 were doled out in a compressed timeline rather than over four years would that allow more work to be done by consultants in the same amount of time being that the temporal overhead would be reduced?

Ms. Caporgno: Yes, I believe so. Right now I think we could probably get it done in three years because it is four fiscal years and right now we have six months of this fiscal year, two full fiscal years, and then six months of the fourth fiscal year. So it really would be three years but if we could accelerate it more that would meet the Housing Element requirements much better. I think from what we have heard from people generally the sooner the better.

Commissioner Keller: The Housing Element is going to expire as you said in 2014?

Ms. Caporgno: That is correct.

Commissioner Keller: How does the timing of the Housing Element ending and presumably there would be a new Housing Element from 2014 to 2022 or something like that. How does that affect when the Comprehensive Plan is reasonable to end whether it should be through 2015 or 2020?

Ms. Caporgno: I guess you could do it either way. It would seem to me that given the fact that we won’t have done a complete overview or update of the Comprehensive Plan through this process, this is more of an amendment just looking at the existing Comprehensive Plan and extending, that probably the 2015 date is maybe more viable. We were trying to get as much longevity out of the Comprehensive Plan when the
Council said up to 2020. If we developed this Comprehensive Plan Amendment through 2020 and in 2014 when we do the next Housing Element it was decided that it is not going to work for too much longer and we should do a complete update there wouldn’t be anything that would prevent you from doing that, but you would have the ability to extend beyond that. However, if we start going with 2015 then it is a given that in 2015 we are going to need to update the Comprehensive Plan.

Commissioner Keller: Thank you.

Chair Holman: Commissioner Lippert.

Commissioner Lippert: First of all I would like to echo my fellow Commissioner’s question or comment regarding public outreach. I think before Commissioner Keller, Tuma and Fineberg had joined us on the Commission we had talked about having some public outreach sessions. In fact, doing the majority of them maybe on Saturdays as half-day sessions and to try a little more informal setting where it might be done as a roundtable or actually breaking us up into a Commissioner per group in a workshop type format. So I just want to make sure that that doesn’t get lost.

Going back to your list here on I guess the adding of the sustainability chapter addressing the City’s commitment to global warming. This is going beyond the City’s new sustainability ordinance in terms of the LEED checklist and then finally having LEED requirements, is that correct?

Ms. Caporgno: This is more of a policy statement. So we would probably be using a variety of documents that have been prepared by the City. This is still to be determined but maybe have a separate chapter that deals with sustainability or within each chapter have some component that deals with sustainability. I think the consultants that we have discussed this with and just generally planners in different cities that have been doing this too it has been done either way and we have to determine, and we will probably be getting your advice, on what would be the more effective way of doing it.

Commissioner Lippert: Well, there are two components to this. One is I guess the City has begun to make a commitment towards reducing the carbon footprint of development. We do have our own City utility. Is it appropriate to think about perhaps engaging the Utility Advisory Commission as part of this component? There is a saying a kilowatt saved is a kilowatt not having to be produced. So the idea here is that I think by engaging that group in this chapter or this section it might be helpful

The second part of it is that the state now has state law that is beginning to require cities to reduce their carbon footprint. How does that new legislation work into that? You don’t have to answer me that is a question that I am having.

The last comment I wanted to make is it says here add a new sustainability chapter addressing the City’s commitment to global warming. Because City’s is capitalized what you are really talking about and I think it might be the other way around. It is city with a
small ‘c’ meaning the residents of Palo Alto as a community our commitment to reducing global warming.

Chair Holman: Commissioner Fineberg.

Commissioner Fineberg: Julie, thank you. Some of my questions have been answered but let me go ahead and ask a couple of the higher priority questions. In my question number one you have already given us some information about the Comprehensive Plan element, timing, and the scope of the work, the Housing Element Update, and ABAG goals. What is the timing of the Stanford Development Agreement with the other three pieces?

Ms. Caporgno: Curtis you might want to jump in here but I believe that the Development Agreement is anticipated to be completed at the end of this year. What land use changes, general policies that come out of that Development Agreement would be included in the Comprehensive Plan Amendment but they are separate. There can be amendments to the Comprehensive Plan that are made while we are in the process of reviewing it. It is not that it is static until this process is completed. So ideally you look at everything comprehensively at one time but in this particular case the medical facility and shopping center will be going forward. The Development Agreement is more – there are some changes that will be made to the Comprehensive Plan as a result of the Council approving this but a lot of this has to deal with a more detail than would go into the Comprehensive Plan anyway.

Commissioner Fineberg: Are there pieces, information or goals, that in order to effectively negotiate the Development Agreement we need to know, either this body or Council, would need to know what does the future Comprehensive Plan look like or what are the future Housing Element goals? I am wondering if they are happening in the most optimal sequence.

Ms. Caporgno: I don’t know. As I said maybe ideally you would do all of this at one time but I think in this particular case they have applied for this Development Agreement and these changes we are expediting it in conjunction with state requirements.

Commissioner Fineberg: Thank you. Would there be any advantage then to the City to expedite, as Commissioner Keller had mentioned, if the funding were to come forward in a more expeditious manner would there be advantages to all parties for having the work plan sped up rather than what I am characterizing as the slow track?

Ms. Caporgno: I think so particularly because of the Housing Element. For no other reason but for that alone that would be advantageous. When the Council made the determination to delay it and it was really a budgetary issue and there wasn’t really a discussion about what the downside would be as far as planning issues.

Commissioner Fineberg: Okay. Two more quick questions. Can you characterize a little bit about what the differences would be between overall land use patterns and either
specific area plans or the coordinated area plans, and why are either being selected for the two areas you have identified, and then whether or not anything happens at Cal-Ventura?

**Ms. Caporgno:** I gave you Cal-Ventura just as an example just to show that this is the kind of detail that we envision coming out of both of the area plans for both East Meadow Circle extended area as well as the Fry’s site. It is kind of more of a vision of what the land uses would be for each of those areas, and kind of general circulation patterns, will the land uses work, and pedestrian connectivity issues. Then if in fact the Council elects when they approve the Comprehensive Plan Update, and we may as a program include recommendation that a specific area plan also be prepared like SOFA for one or both of these areas. Then the Council if they approve that part of the Comprehensive Plan then they would also at some point have to budget for preparation of the area plan or plans. As with Cal-Ventura we have never received funding so that is why nothing has been done other than what you see before you. There hasn’t been any funding allocated by Council to do anything more definitively than this.

**Commissioner Fineberg:** So what would trigger Council to then say let’s fund Program L-30 or let’s do two specific area plans? Is that something Staff would bring to Council or would this Commission recommend it?

**Ms. Caporgno:** It could be recommended when the Comprehensive Plan Amendment goes to Council. Then it really comes back to each year’s budget. The reason I assume this Cal-Ventura hasn’t been funded, there may be a variety of reasons but there are other items that they feel are more important to be funded. So it comes back to the General Fund and what are the priorities each year.

**Commissioner Fineberg:** Okay, my last question. The work program you presented to us was approved by Council over two years ago. Do you have a sense or what can you say about whether it still remains a timely and effective work program or has the baseline changed at all? Does Council need to review the work program again or if you hear nothing it is good?

**Ms. Caporgno:** Well, I don’t know really. I can just tell you that we haven’t heard anything to indicate that there is a change but there are four new Council Members. Now one of the Council Members was part of the Planning Commission that approved the work program. I know that there have been various questions since the budget was approved in June. Our Director has indicated that there has been some desire expressed on the part of different Council Members that we begin to move forward with this and they are anticipating the consultant contract coming before them. Now when they are refreshed with the work program whether or not they will decide they want to make any changes I don’t know. I haven’t heard anything and I think the impetus to provide retail is still a desire to make sure that there are sufficient City services for existing residential development and is still very foremost in their work items and of importance for the city. Curtis, you might want to weigh in on that too.
Mr. Williams: That is correct. There are somewhat different circumstances now than two years ago particularly from the standpoint of the housing market and the residential market being a very different picture than we were seeing at that point and that is what I think the work program reacted strongly to, some of those projects and the accelerated rate of project we were seeing at that time. So even though that has slowed I think those issues are still pretty paramount for the City to address now and hopefully get things in place so that if things pick up again we have something to work from at that point. The same thing with the retail end of it and even more so maybe than two years ago we have the need to protect and enhance a retail environment and potential sales tax revenues.

Ms. Caporgno: I was just going to add one other thing. We haven't actually talked to them about the Comprehensive Plan Update but in discussing the ABAG numbers with Council it doesn't sound like they have decided that they want to embrace a lot of housing and that they feel the preservation of neighborhoods and schools and services are extremely important. In the interim period of time from the time they adopted the work program to now we did implement some rezoning to ensure that some properties that were used for commercial purposes but were on sites that were designated and planned for residential development were changed to ensure that that commercial development was retained.

Chair Holman: Commissioner Keller, do you still have questions?

Commissioner Keller: Yes I do. You mentioned earlier that there were a lot of Housing Elements that were in some sense approved but for which construction has not yet commenced. You said that of the construction that commenced there were somewhat, not much, but in excess of the 2,400 housing units that were in the Comprehensive Plan. When do development approvals expire if the construction is not commenced? Do we have a reason to believe that this housing will not be built?

Mr. Williams: Most of our approvals have one-year timeframes with one-year extensions. So two years on the outside before it would expire.

Commissioner Keller: So do we have reason to believe that these approved housing developments will actually not be built?

Ms. Caporgno: I guess it is hard to tell. Some of that like the TK/CJL component hasn't gone forward yet. They have not broken ground on that. So some of it may be the phasing of it and that they are slowing down on some of it. I don't Roland if you want to go through it.

Mr. Williams: The 195 Page Mill is one that at this point looks like it is not going anywhere. It may be a new owner and we will if they come back with a similar project or not.
Ms. Caporgno: Also the Essex project was adjacent that we had assumed would go forward and the police building was approved for that site. Roland if you want to just go through it.

Mr. Roland Rivera, Senior Planner: We did anticipate 525 San Antonio. It was a lot subdivision that was approved about six years ago that has not moved forward and a couple of small ones. I think what Julie was mentioning was some of these entitlements for example the 345 Alma Plaza has entitlement but has no at this point gone for a building permit.

Commissioner Keller: I think as far as the TK/CJL I drive by there pretty often and it looks like there is a lot under construction there although I am not sure if BRIDGE Housing has started construction.

Ms. Caporgno: They have received the funding so I think they broke ground or are about ready to.

Mr. Williams: The private side, the BUILD part of it, is under construction. The affordable BRIDGE component is not under construction yet but that is where Schwarzenegger came out and announced that Prop 1C funds were being made available to support that project in addition to a number of others throughout the state. So we do expect that will be moving forward. A lot of the CJL site is under construction. I think the podium is under construction and then on top of the podium is where the housing would be going. So don’t know that the housing units themselves are under construction.

Commissioner Keller: Well the whole project is under construction. So based on the approvals that have happened do you have an idea how many housing units you expect to be built in the 1998 to 2010 timeframe?

Ms. Caporgno: There are 71 that are entitled but no building permits have been issued. What we were talking about as far as the ones that are either under construction or have been built from 1997 through 2008, which is the timeframe of the Comprehensive Plan that is 2,458. I think at one point we were talking about 2,700 or 2,800. I think people have not moved forward because the phasing of these projects has slowed down. My understanding of the Vantage Echelon project that is slow a little bit as far as the selling of them. That is what I heard but I am not certain of that.

Chair Holman: I think Roland had something to add.

Mr. Rivera: Also in relation to your question about what is project from present to 2010 when the current Comprehensive Plan ends we were originally anticipating about 250 to 300 housing units. At this point we are looking at about 138 that are currently in the entitlement process that we are anticipating to be approved by 2010.
Commissioner Keller: It looks like during this Comprehensive Plan period we did somewhat go over the amount in the EIR. What would you suggest we do next time if that were to take place?

Chair Holman: Can I just add on to that by saying it shouldn’t happen? So maybe if the question were phrased rather than what would you suggest or recommend if we surpass it next time maybe how would you address being able not to surpass what has been evaluated for the EIR because that actually is I believe illegal.

Commissioner Keller: Well, I am happy with it either way. Perhaps the best way is how do we make sure that the amount of housing units that are built is covered by the EIR and that we don’t go beyond it. Let me put it that way.

Ms. Caporgno: I think if we were to establish some sort of monitoring or annual reporting. I know that we were tracking it but there wasn’t anything that said you have gone to a certain point and the Council needs to initiate this process. Maybe as part of this update we develop some sort of process for tracking that we would do each year and it would go to Council.

Commissioner Keller: Would a concept like rationing market rate housing units based on the pro rata annual allotment of market rate housing units from the Housing Element, would something like that make sense?

Chair Holman: Commissioner Keller, I think we are getting into a fine grain area that really is beyond the scope of this item. So I have been generous in letting you go but it is beyond the scope of this item. Commissioner Fineberg, you had a question?

Commissioner Fineberg: On the issue of housing count I would like to see, maybe not tonight but in the future, discussion on what will go into the housing count. There have been a number of contentious issues on what does get counted and what doesn’t get counted, what happens to single family homes built on bare lots, what happens to the houses that were in the Comprehensive Plan’s EIR that were built on Stanford land, and different people have Staff versus residents all expressing I would say a great deal of common sense and passion and have different ideas about what should be counted. I would love to see some coming together and definition of what we count and what we don’t count.

Chair Holman: I have just a couple of questions. One is a part of the housing update, H-29. I have been told that the City Attorney’s Office has said that there is case law that says that that isn’t legal. I have no idea why it isn’t legal. If we could just get some kind of information about that that would be great. I presume that is okay.

As a part of this Comprehensive Plan Update and establishing where we are would that include potentially looking at baseline traffic counts? We are looking at areas that are potentially going to have a lot of activity going on and there has been discussion in the past about what Palo Alto uses as baseline counts versus what different people interpret
to be what CEQA says you are supposed to do and what other cities use as base count. So would that be a part of what might be looked at here?

**Ms. Caporgno:** I think that as far as the criteria for what we consider to be significant, is that what you are asking about or just the evaluation of the amount of traffic generated by different types of development?

**Chair Holman:** What would be used as the baseline? Would that be part of what would be looked at as a part of the Comprehensive Plan Update for the areas that we will be studying? In other words, some places use existing conditions, some places use if a property has been vacant for awhile, some cities use what the potential was or what the previous condition was when the site was occupied. So the question is would that consideration be open to discussion as a part of this Comprehensive Plan Update?

**Ms. Caporgno:** That is why I was talking about the significance criteria because that is really what you are looking at when we evaluate traffic for individual projects. What we are going to be doing here for this analysis is looking at it from a model perspective because obviously it is not a near term analysis it is a long-range analysis. So we have to decide on what model we are going to use and we may be using the VTA model. This concept of how we do traffic is probably not something that will come out of the Comprehensive Plan but we will be looking at including in the Comprehensive Plan, as I mentioned before, currently what are criterion are for level of service and that sort of thing will be inserted in the Comprehensive Plan and maybe subsequent to that we will have some evaluation as to any sort of modifications to that. At this point that is not part of the program.

**Chair Holman:** Okay. Then akin to a question that Commissioner Fineberg had asked and one that I had raised with Staff previously is this was pushed out to a four-year program because of budgetary reasons. Staff has indicated that there could be some efficiencies and some rationale for shortening that timeframe. I know you said that you aren’t going to change you recommendation to the Council did I understand that correctly?

**Ms. Caporgno:** What I had indicated is we weren’t recommending any changes to the work program. As far as the timing, in fact I had indicated we are going back and forth internally about should it be 2015 or 2020. They didn’t really adopt anything as far as a specific ending date. The Council just said up to 2020. So it was kind of left to Staff and the consultant team as to what would be the most prudent timeline. I am sorry you are talking about how quickly we are doing it. When they changed it to the four years we probably aren’t going to go back and recommend anything. We can put in our Staff report what you’re recommending but we I don’t think are planning on recommending a tighter timeframe for completion.

**Chair Holman:** However, if we make comments recommending your comments or make suggestions or recommendations based on your comments that would be agreeable it sounds like.
Then lastly as far as questions are concerned it is again akin to Commissioner Fineberg's seventh question and one that I had raised previously as well. It has to do with the timeline. Does Staff have an idea about if we actually can afford to wait four years to do this given that we have had changed conditions out there that the price of land keeps going up? So if we new parklands, if we need new neighborhood centers can we really afford to wait four years especially considering we are already two years behind when we were supposed to start anyway? The financial impact of compressing this schedule and the financial impact of waiting, can we really afford to do that?

Ms. Caporgno: I think that if there was an opportunity for us to acquire parkland or a site for a community center obviously we could still do that there is nothing that precludes us from doing that. The advantage of the Comprehensive Plan is to look at the city as whole and decide what are the more appropriate locations for parks and community centers. Now we can't specifically identify centers and parks unless we are able to purchase them and I think this is what we were envisioning doing, that in this general area it is park deficient so it would be good to have a park but we can't say it is on this property unless we have the ability to acquire the site, the same thing with a community center. It is just more of a comprehensive look at it but there is nothing that would prevent us if an opportunity arose for us to acquire something. So I don't think that we will be missing anything that significantly.

Chair Holman: Except that as you say we would be advantage by having done the Comprehensive Plan so we would be able to better evaluate what would be a prudent purchase or not from a planning standpoint. Curtis.

Mr. Williams: Just a couple of things sort of on the flip side. One is I think the Council is probably going to have to ask the question if they think about expediting things of whether we can afford to expedite things because we are in a tough budget situation as it is. I don't begin to know where additional money would come from to move it faster.

The second thing is that I think frankly a lot of the timeline is driven by public participation and it is hard to envision the kinds of things we are trying to do getting done much faster than that and still keeping the level of public participation that I think the community is interested in doing. So what we have talked about before is maybe we say it is going to be faster and then maybe it actually does happen in the three years that we are looking at it happening. So maybe if that is the strategy that is fine but I just don't want to mislead anyone into thinking that we can move faster than will allow for adequate public input to a couple of significant area studies as well as some really key community issues with community services and retail and revenue and such.

Ms. Caporgno: Can I just add one thing? When we came to the Commission previously and discussed this the Commissioners that were here at the time thought we were really ambitious and probably would never achieve a two-year timeframe. So I think if we can do it within three years for Palo Alto that would be quite a success. Given the fact of the
public participation that is going to be needed for this and trying to find a way of doing that very expeditiously but enabling as much participation as possible.

Chair Holman: Commissioner Tuma to be followed by Vice-Chair Garber. Comments I presume at this point.

Commissioner Tuma: No, they both just answered the exact question I was going to ask, why not?

Chair Holman: Vice-Chair Garber, comments.

Vice-Chair Garber: Yes, if I may. I find my comments divide themselves into a couple of different categories.

Chair Holman: I apologize. I am going to interrupt Vice-Chair Garber. You are looking for comments or a motion on this item?

Ms. Caporgno: We were not looking for a motion because you wanted to see it again and you wanted to discuss it. So what I plan on doing is summarizing your comments and including them in the Staff Report or CMR that goes to the Council.

Chair Holman: Good enough, thank you. So sorry Vice-Chair Garber.

Vice-Chair Garber: No worries. First of all comments regarding the work plan and the bullet points in the work plan. They divide themselves into sort of two categories in my mind. First of all our recommendations to Staff about how to think about those and the second of which are really addressed to the City Council for inclusion or exclusion of those bullet points. Then there is another piece, which has to do with process. So to that end let me work backwards.

I would agree with the comments that have been made regarding the process that the outreach to the public be as inclusive as possible and include groups both neighborhoods as well as potential stakeholders, and potentially and ideally including the schools to be made a part of that process.

I think there is also in the same sort of general process comments the general suggestion I think I am hearing here is that if the environment has changed from two years ago when these priorities were first created that causes them to be reshuffled I think that should be within the Staff’s purview to make those readjustments. I think in particular here housing is raising its flag. In particular it may cause how cash is allocated over this period of time to be managed slightly differently in order to address some of those issues. I will leave it to Staff to figure out the best way to make use of the City’s resources there.

The other comments related to the work plan relative to recommendations to Staff on how to organize them, in particular under filled-in bullet number three which starts, Review and modify appropriate Comprehensive Plan text. It would seem to me that as
part of the conversation there, enhance and integrate a pattern of walkable neighborhoods, that may be the appropriate place to have the discussion regarding a neighborhood center in College Terrace. I don’t know if that can be made part of that or if that fits there but that is one suggestion.

Relative to comments more directed towards City Council in terms of things that are in addition to the work plan that is here and it would be under the second bullet point which is, Update land use map and land use designations and rezone accordingly, I would like to suggest that the Council consider including in this although it may be larger than the small pot that we already have here an evaluation of Policy L-2 which is the connection that the City has with Santa Clara and Stanford as well as Program L-27 which is the importantly the link between the University Avenue and the Stanford Mall. That area of town represents some potential high impact positive impacts economically to the City that could benefit from taking a look at how those spaces are used and what those linkages can be especially as we are in the middle of the conversation with Stanford about their other developments. I think there is a synergy there that can be taken advantage of in particular there is the opportunity to look again at the study that was done between the City and Stanford for creating an entertainment district at the end of University to operate as that link.

I will leave that for the moment and come back if necessary. Thank you.

Chair Holman: Commissioner Lippert.

Commissioner Lippert: I am pretty much in agreement with what my colleagues have said and I would like to add just a couple of other things. We don’t really have any input in the consultant selection process but in the selection process itself some of the things that we have raised in here I think might be worth pursuing in the interview process and asking the consultants how they might deal with some of those things. So that you begin to understand that they would be able to meet our needs. What I am specifically looking at here in terms of the public outreach process, finding out how they have gone about doing those, and successes that they have had in the public outreach process.

Also there is the new chapter on sustainability and most of these consultants I am sure have had experience with Housing Elements and walkable communities and transportation, etc., etc. Sustainability is really relatively new and again I would sort of flush that out with them and find out what their thoughts are with regard to that and see if there is some compatibility there.

Chair Holman: Commissioner Tuma.

Commissioner Tuma: I would align myself with the comments of the previous two Commissioners adding a couple of things and emphasizing one in particular. The one that I want to emphasize is the comment that Commissioner Garber made with respect to making sure that the outreach includes the schools community. I think keeping in mind the way that I think of that is not just the school district itself but the active parent
community within the schools community. We don’t see the same folks here that we see over at the meetings at 25 Churchill. So thinking of ways to reach out to that community and get them involved in the Comprehensive Plan not just the district officials but the parent community there as well would be good.

I would like to see some sort of a cap or a ration or some sort of number that we cannot exceed in terms of the number of building permits granted that matches up with the total EIR numbers that are evaluated for purposes of the next go around. I don’t know within legal confines how we can do this. I think that is a worthwhile endeavor. That is it for now.

Chair Holman: Other Commissioners, comments? Commissioner Keller.

Commissioner Keller: First I would like to also agree with the comments of the three Commissioners that preceded me. Also with respect to schools I think there should be a discussion with the Palo Alto Unified School District whether district growth might indicate that additional land is needed for schools and whether there is any desire on their part to acquire a school site such as in the East Meadow Circle area. That might be an opportunity for a school site, I don’t know.

Also, to the extent that we can take into account school impacts I would like to understand that better with respect to the Housing Element. I think that is perhaps the single biggest impact of the housing that we build and the nature of the housing we build. I would like to understand a little bit more differentially what kind of housing causes what kind of impacts:

Based on the comments about the Housing Element I would encourage an end date of the Comprehensive Plan revision of 2015 rather than 2020 precisely because we are in a whole other Housing Element at that point. I think that that becomes more problematic.

With respect to outreach I think that it will be good for the Planning Division to have interest lists that people can subscribe to for various topics. Just an email list that people can subscribe to like Frank’s Weekly Memo or whatever. That we come up with a dozen or half a dozen or some number of general lists and when something comes along on that list we notify of when such a meeting is taking place. I think that would do a lot towards helping deal with outreach in general so people would be aware.

With respect to traffic counts I would actually be interested in the baseline traffic counts be based on actual counts that were made no more than five years prior to the application.

With respect to the second bullet of the border of San Antonio Road I suggest that that border be extended to the city boundary when the city boundary extends beyond San Antonio Road. I think pretty much all along from 101 to Alma Street the city border does extend beyond San Antonio Road. I don’t understand why that little strip of land isn’t included.
My final comment for now, I will make some more later if I have the opportunity, is I would like to express a concern about the process being occurred for Cubberly. The reason I am expressing a concern about that is because the City Council is taking discussions about having the City Council's eight or so acres being used for Foothill College with the presumption that the remaining space will be usable for City purposes by lease. I would not be surprised with the amount of housing that is being built and the fact that the school district's expansions of Gunn and Paly are based on the mid level projections of what housing is expected to be, based on housing, and that the housing being built in South Palo Alto is likely to exceed that considering that there are more family oriented than the housing that was previously built around the SOFA area. That during the reasonable life of the Foothill College project will be turned back into some sort of school. So I think that a more comprehensive look at that and I am not sure exactly which body should do that but I think that we are entering into this in a way that may not be as far sighted as is appropriate.

Chair Holman: Commissioner Lippert.

Commissioner Lippert: In reviewing Commission and Board and Council agendas I believe there is a City School Liaison Committee meeting coming up. I was just wondering if it would be possible to somehow bring up the whole timeline and the portions that we were talking about previously with regard to getting school input and trying to do it at that meeting, make it visible at that point. Maybe ask how we might engage the school district at that point because they only have those liaison meetings twice a year.

Mr. Williams: No, they have them monthly I think and they had one this morning I think.

Commissioner Lippert: Maybe that was the one that I just saw.

Mr. Williams: What we will do is I will talk to Steve, he goes to all of those pretty much, and talk to him about scheduling something or someway to convey communicating to them this timeline and if they want to put it on their agenda to talk about it that would be fine, and what the best ways they think to get input from the school district are.

Commissioner Lippert: That would be great.

Chair Holman: Commissioner Fineberg.

Commissioner Fineberg: I think it is wonderful and a delight that I can say that I agree with all the comments of all the Commissioners that have spoken so far tonight. I think that is quite wonderful.

I agree that public input is vital. I think that we also may want to consider a way to get input from the public about how we can best reach them. It is very telling when I look in the room tonight that here we are talking about how to engage the public and we have two members of the public here. So I think we really need to look and Samir mentioned
going out through the schools. That is something that I think we haven’t done traditionally. Maybe going out through other affinity groups, different nonprofit volunteer groups, or other places where people congregate especially where the Comprehensive Plan will touch them or the amendment and the updates to the Comprehensive Plan will touch them.

I think that it is imperative that we pause just long enough with the work plan to make sure it is what we need and the right thing to do in today’s conditions. That may be something that Council simply looks at and says yes this is good, or maybe there needs to be a bit more discussion about what to tweak and that may indeed bring in other bigger issues of things that need to be added, changed, reprioritized. In that view of possibly there might be changes I would like to see some priority given to revisiting the guidelines and the rezoning along El Camino. Our baseline has changed. There have been a number of issues with walkability, setbacks, sidewalks, height, everyone knows what those are and is the work plan update an appropriate time to revisit that. I would like to see some consideration before the work begins about whether the two areas that will be undergoing a great amount of change should be left as land use evaluations or specific areas. I am not sure leaving that decision for later makes sense because if you do a land use evaluation you have done your work I am not sure I understand why later you would then implement a specific area plan.

I would like to also echo Commissioner Keller’s comments about reviewing the methodology for traffic counts. I think that count is a bit problematic especially the public perception of it. It may just be that there needs to be some lay language put in our public outreach about how it is done. I am not sure that the way we are doing it yields us the results we want and need going forward. So that’s it thank you.

Chair Holman: I am reminded that we have no cards from the public here so I will open and close the public hearing. I, like Commissioner Fineberg, haven’t heard anything that I disagree with. I guess I would emphasize that I would hope that we would target a two and a half year timeframe. I know Staff says that three years is probably about the fastest they could do it given input but I am concerned that if we target three years we will be five years. We were going to be done in four years and now we are two years later and haven’t started. So I am going to suggest that we target a two and a half year timeline.

The same comment about I would have thought there would be several members of the public here because there are several issues with Tentative Maps that people in the public have commented about yet there is no one here to speak to that. So I don’t know what the best way is but I would suggest that Staff put some questions out about what better descriptions. It may well be the descriptions that we are putting in the notices. While they are legally satisfying they not be descriptive enough to get people informed about what we are really discussing. So when something like the Comprehensive Plan Update, Tentative Maps, those kinds of things I think the language may be the holdup on getting participation. I think some questions to PAN, Chamber of Commerce, whatever.
One question that I have that I didn’t ask earlier is this is the identified area for the Comprehensive Plan Update that was identified. Is there any anticipated development in some other part of town that is not covered by what this work plan is aside from we know that Stanford has its proposals out there, but are there any others anticipated? Commissioner Keller mentioned the issue of south of San Antonio. That whole Charleston area has for some time been discussed and I haven’t heard anything really recent given how the market has changed. Is there anything else that Staff has gotten an inkling of about large change or development?

Mr. Williams: I wouldn’t say so. I think when you talk about basically South El Camino, East Meadow, East Bayshore, it seemed like a couple of years ago there was some discussion about Embarcadero east to the Baylands and that but it doesn’t seem like much at all has been brought up going out there at this point. That area down near Charleston, the industrial sort of area, is pretty quiet as far as we haven’t seen parcels getting merged together or drastically different developments or anything like that or heard about them. So there are probably things and I think we are going to cover it relative to maybe some of these land use issues particularly relative to retail and protecting retail that cover more than just a specific area. It covers kind of all of our retail corridors to try to develop more strategies to do that but not really in response to any specific potential development proposal.

Chair Holman: Thank you for that update. I would still suggest that we include that area south of San Antonio because markets can change quickly and cities cannot respond fast enough. So I would suggest that it still be included.

As far as neighborhood centers, which have been a topic of conversation lately and one of my passions, Vice-Chair Garber mentioned College Terrace. I would say anywhere up or down El Camino would be ripe and potentially some place on San Antonio but less likely but certainly South El Camino.

I think I will add one thing that has to do with the process again. I think we could be better informed. While I agree with you Julie that having a slower process wouldn’t preclude us from purchasing some land or working with a developer to do something but having this plan done sooner does better enable us to make a more comprehensive and a better thought out approach to development and what the city should be as we change and evolve. I will stop there.

I think Commissioner Keller had a light on and then Commissioner Lippert does as well.

Commissioner Keller: I agree with the comments regarding El Camino and particularly with respect to the Grand Boulevard. I believe there have been some materials on that and I saw a presentation of that at the Joint Venture Silicon Valley. So making that available would be worthwhile.
With respect to the East Meadow Circle and its wings if you will towards Fabian and towards West Bayshore I would underscore the interest in including San Antonio Road towards Middlefield because that is a zone that could potentially be redeveloped.

Considering that one of the principles of retail is putting it at your border so that your neighbors can come visit you Mountain View has done an excellent job of doing that over by Costco and the new Charleston Center or whatever it is called. I would see a wonderful opportunity to encourage the triangle between San Antonio and 101 and Charleston turning into a retail center to work in concert with the adjacent retail on the Mountain View side.

That gets to a related issue which is that I think the Commission should pay attention to what is going on at the 101/San Antonio/Charleston interchanges in particular the plan as I understand it and as there is money for it about realigning the 101/San Antonio interchange so that rather than entering that 101 from Charleston with that crazy interchange that is the same as the exit ramp onto Rengstorff, instead going onto San Antonio Road. I think that requires particular attention and I think that being that we are the Planning and Transportation Commission we should do that. That also involves taking another look at the intersection of San Antonio and Charleston.

Continuing with the transportation theme high-speed rail may or may not happen. Caltrain electrification is more likely to happen even if Caltrans high-speed rail does not happen. That means over some period of time there will be more and more trains going on there according to the Caltrain 2025 plan. Therefore I think we need to start thinking about how we handle that, whether it is in terms of grade crossing and how we might accommodate them, whether it is taking Caltrain and high speed rail and putting it underground under Alma, or whether it is moving it to El Camino and making it along there. I think those are the kinds of things we should start exploring. I am not sure that that should be done as part of the Comprehensive Plan revision but that is certainly something that I think we should be consideration. At the appropriate time I think we should also consider the Palo Alto Multi-Modal Station as some have mentioned particular in the case that high speed rail is approved. That will require significant attention because I am hoping that we will lobby for high speed rail having a stop at Palo Alto and making that a multi-modal station being a high speed rail stop and the implications for that.

My next to last comment is that with respect to the Cal-Ventura stuff and the priority development area and all that consideration not only should we talk to the appropriate residents but we should particularly make outreach to CAADA, the California Area Development Association. I think that is critically important for the local businesses to be involved.

I will finally end on the note of civic engagement. This is a priority for the Council and therefore I think it should be underscored as a priority for us to figure out how we can better engage the public to provide input to the Planning Commission. I am one who believes that if we can engage public better in issues when they come to the Planning
Commission then they will be able to be addressed better in our deliberative process than when it gets to the Council where the Council has limited time and limited energy and limited attention to put to the matters that we have already considered in detail.

**Chair Holman:** I see no other lights. Commissioner Lippert.

**Commissioner Lippert:** I just wanted to add one other thought and this is just building on Commissioner Garber’s thought with regard to centers of community and Chair Holman’s comment with regard to San Antonio. Cubberly has been recently looked at as being redeveloped. Even though that probably has legs of its own I think it is worth looking at in terms of the Comprehensive Plan and policy.

**Chair Holman:** Okay, if I haven’t overlooked anybody else? Okay. Does Staff have something to add? Julie.

**Ms. Caporgno:** I know this issue about San Antonio and the line where we are or aren’t going to include any of that area that is still up to be determined yet. So there was nothing that was really definitive which is generally that area. So definitely south of San Antonio Road can be included. It was just kind of more generally this is the area we are looking at but it wasn’t that there was an actual line and we include anything other than that.

**Chair Holman:** We might differ in what it should be but we should at least look at it. Commissioner Keller

**Commissioner Keller:** I don’t want to harp on this too much but I want to identify that in the paragraph in the second bullet, which is the bullet on the top of page two, it refers to the East Meadow/Fabian/West Bayshore area and then it refers to an overall evaluation of land use patterns. So what is going on is that there is the specific area of focus and then a more generic issue of land use patterns. I am suggesting that the consideration of land use patterns of course go to the city border but I am also suggesting just to be painfully clear that the land use evaluations for the East Meadow Circle/Fabian/West Bayshore that also include San Antonio Road. It is in the first as well as the second not merely in the second.

**Chair Holman:** Okay. Commissioner Fineberg.

**Commissioner Fineberg:** I am not sure if one more quick question is out order but just for clarification, my memory, which can be faulty, was that the work plan over the next year was going to also include Staff updating the status of programs and policies. Maybe I am missing it but is that in this document and what is the difference?

**Ms. Caporgno:** You mean as far as the work program? It is in here under the Review and modify appropriate Comprehensive Plan text, scan all programs for relevance and clarity. We will be bringing back to you the programs and policies and talking to the various departments that are responsible for them and trying to update where we are with
all of them. We will bring that back to the Commission. That is what I had said earlier and maybe May or June that will be coming back to you.

**Commissioner Fineberg:** Would it help if that said something like update on status so that that extra component of knowing whether it is to be scheduled or to be delayed or has been done, is in there?

**Chair Holman:** Commissioner Keller is going to get the last comment or question.

**Commissioner Keller:** Just for the record, of the two people in the public one is right now leaving and the other is a member of the press.

**Chair Holman:** With that we will close this item and move on then to approval of minutes for the meeting of January 30, 2008
ENVIRONMENTAL CRITERIA (SIGNIFICANCE THRESHOLDS) USED BY THE CITY OF PALO ALTO

Aesthetics (Visual Resources)
A visual impact is considered significant if the project will:
- Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings; or
- Significantly alter public view sheds or view corridors or scenic resources (such as trees, outcroppings or historic buildings along a scenic roadway); or
- Require substantial terrain modifications that degrade the visual character of the site; or
- Allow for new development that would violate existing Comprehensive Plan policies regarding visual resources; or
- Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area; or
- Substantially shadow public open space (other than public streets and adjacent sidewalks) between 9:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m. from September 21 to March 21

Air Quality
An air quality impact is considered significant if the project will:
- Violate an ambient air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation as indicated by the following:
  1. Direct and/or indirect operational emissions that exceed the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) criteria air pollutants of 80 pounds per day and/or 15 tons per year for nitrogen oxides (NOx), reactive organic gases (ROG), and fine particulate matter of less than 10 microns in diameter (PM10); or
  2. Carbon monoxide (CO) concentrations exceeding the State Ambient Air Quality Standard of nine parts per million (ppm) averaged over eight hours or 20 ppm for one hour (as demonstrated by CALINE4 modeling, which would be performed when a) project CO emissions exceed 550 pounds per day or 100 tons per year; or b) project traffic would impact intersections or roadway links operating at Level of Service (LOS) D, E or F or would cause LOS to decline to D, E or F; or c) project would increase traffic volumes on nearby roadways by 10% or more); or
- Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people; or
- Expose sensitive receptors or the general public to substantial levels of toxic air contaminants (TACs) where:
  1. Probability of contracting cancer for the Maximally Exposed Individual (MEI) exceeds 10 in one million; or
  2. Ground-level concentrations of non-carcinogenic TACs would result in a hazard index greater than one (1) for the MEI; or
• Does not implement all applicable construction emission control measures recommended in the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines (Table 2); or
• Conflict with or obstruct with implementation of the 2000 Clean Air Plan, the 2001 Ozone Attainment Plan, or the 2005 Bay Area Ozone Strategy.

Biological Resources
A biological resources impact is considered significant if the project will:
• Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations; or
• Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, including federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means; or
• Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites; or
• Result in a substantial adverse effect to any “protected tree” as defined by the City of Palo Alto’s Tree Preservation Ordinance (Municipal Code Section 8.10) or
• Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community plan.

Cultural Resources
A cultural resources impact is considered significant if the project will:
• Adversely affect a historic resource listed or eligible for listing on the National and/or California Register, or listed on the City’s Historic Inventory; or
• Eliminate important examples of major periods of California history or prehistory; or
• Cause damage to an important archaeological resource as defined in §15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines; or
• Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries; or
• Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature, or
• Directly or indirectly destroy a local cultural resource that is recognized by City Council resolution.

Energy
Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15126.4(a) and Appendix F (Energy Conservation), EIRs must include a discussion of the potential energy impacts of proposed projects with particular emphasis on avoiding or reducing inefficient, wasteful and unnecessary consumption of energy. Impacts are assessed based on an evaluation of consumption of
energy by the project. Development generally results in the consumption of energy in three forms: 1) the fuel energy consumed by construction vehicles; 2) bound energy in construction materials such as asphalt, steel, concrete, pipes, and manufactured or processed materials such as milled lumber and glass; and 3) operational use of energy by future businesses for transportation, equipment operation, and cooling of buildings. Construction materials and the operational use of energy should be addressed.

Geology, Soils and Seismicity
A geologic or seismic impact is considered significant if the project will:

- Expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects including the risk of loss, injury or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault, strong seismic ground shaking, seismic related ground failure (including liquefaction), landslides, or expansive soil; or
- Expose people or property to major geologic hazards that cannot be mitigated through the use of standard engineering design and seismic safety techniques; or
- Be located on a geologic units or on soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse; or
- Cause substantial erosion or siltation.

Hazardous Materials
Note: Some of the thresholds below can also be dealt with under a topic heading of Public Health and Safety if the primary issues are related to a subject other than hazardous material use.

A hazardous materials impact is considered significant if the project will:

- Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment as a result of the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials; or
- Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment; or
- Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school; or
- Construct a school on a property that is subject to hazards from hazardous materials contamination, emissions or accidental release; or
- Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment from existing hazardous materials contamination by exposing future occupants or users of the site to contamination either in excess of soil and ground water cleanup goals developed for the site or from location on listed hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5; or
- Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires; or
• Result in a safety hazard from a public airport for people residing or working within the project area; or
• Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan.

Hydrology
A drainage and water quality impact is considered significant if the project will:
• Substantially impede or redirect flood flows through placement of structures within the 100-year flood hazard area; or
• Substantially degrade or deplete ground water resources or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level; or
• Substantially increase the rate, volume, or flow duration of storm water runoff or alter the existing drainage pattern or the site or area, including altering the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site, including increased in-stream erosion;
• Significantly increase the rate, volume, or flow duration of storm water runoff in a manner which would result in new or increased flooding on-or off-site, or exceedance of the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems in local streams; or
• Provide substantial additional sources of pollutants associated with urban runoff or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality; or
• Expose people or structures to a significant risk or loss, injury or death involving flooding by placing housing or other development within a 100-year flood hazard area or a levee or dam failure inundation area; or
• Result in stream bank instability; or
• Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.

Land Use
A land use impact is considered significant if the project will:
• Adversely change the type or intensity of overall existing or planned land use patterns in the area; or
• Be incompatible with adjacent land uses or with the general character of the surrounding area, including density and building height; or
• Conflict with established residential, recreational, educational, religious, or scientific uses of an area; or
• Convert prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide importance (farmland) to non-agricultural use; or
• Conflict with any applicable City land use plan, policy or regulation (including, but not limited to the Comprehensive Plan, coordinated area plan, or the City’s Zoning Ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect; or
- Physically divide an established community.

**Noise**

A noise impact is considered significant if the project will:
- Cause the average 24 hour noise level (Ldn) to increase by 5.0 decibels (dB) or more in an existing residential area, even if the Ldn would remain below 60 dB; or
- Cause the Ldn to increase by 3.0 dB or more in an existing residential area, thereby causing the Ldn in the area to exceed 60 dB; or
- Cause an increase of 3.0 dB or more in an existing residential area where the Ldn currently exceeds 60 dB; or
- Result in indoor noise levels for residential development to exceed an Ldn of 45 dB; or
- Result in instantaneous noise levels of greater than 50 dB in bedrooms or 55 dB in other rooms in areas with an exterior Ldn of 60 dB or greater; or
- Expose persons to or generate excessive groundborne vibrations or groundborne noise levels; or
- Expose people to noise levels in excess of established state standards; or
- Generate construction noise exceeding the daytime background Leq at sensitive receptors by 10 dBA or more.

**Population and Housing**

Population and housing impacts are considered significant if the project will:
- Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure); or
- Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere; or
- Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere; or
- Create a substantial imbalance between employed residents and jobs; or
- Cumulatively exceed regional or local population projections.

**Public Service**

A public service impact is considered significant if the project will:
- Result in an adverse physical impact from the construction of additional fire, police, recreational or school facilities, such as stations, parks or schools in order to maintain acceptable performance standards.

**Transportation**

A traffic impact is considered significant if the project will:
- Cause a local (City of Palo Alto) intersection to deteriorate below Level of Service (LOS) D; or
• Cause a local intersection already operating at LOS E or F to deteriorate in the average control delay for the critical movements by four seconds or more, and the critical volume/capacity ratio (V/C) value to increase by 0.01 or more; or
• Cause a regional intersection to deteriorate from an LOS E or better to LOS F; or
• Cause a regional intersection already operating at LOS F to deteriorate in the average control delay for the critical movements to increase by four seconds or more, and the critical V/C value to increase by 0.01 or more; or
• Cause queuing impacts based on a comparative analysis between the design queue length and the available queue storage capacity. Queuing impacts include, but are not limited to, spillback queues at project access locations; queues at turn lanes at intersections that block through traffic; queues at lane drops; queues at one intersection that extend back to impact other intersections, and spillback queues on ramps; or
• Cause a freeway segment (for each direction of traffic) to operate at LOS F or contribute traffic in excess of 1% of segment capacity to a freeway segment already operating at LOS F; or
• Impede the development or function of planned pedestrian or bicycle facilities; or
• Impede the operation of a transit system as a result of congestion; or
• Create an operational safety hazard; or
• Cause any change in traffic that would increase the Traffic Infusion on Residential Environment (TIRE) index by 0.1 or more on a local or collector residential street; or
• Result in inadequate on-site parking capacity; or
• Result in inadequate emergency access.

Utilities and Service Systems
A utility impact is considered significant if the project will:
• Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board; or
• Require or result in the construction of new storm water or wastewater facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects; or
• Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that it has inadequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments; or
• Need new or expanded entitlements for water supplies; or
• Be served by a landfill with insufficient permitted capacity; or
• Result in adverse physical impacts from new or expanded utility facilities required to provide service as a result of the project; or
• Result in a substantial physical deterioration of a utility facility due to increased use as a result of the project.