



Planning & Transportation Commission

Draft Minutes: December 9, 2020

Virtual Meeting
6:00 PM

7 **Call to Order / Roll Call**

8 Approximately 6:05 pm

9 Mr. Vinh Nguyen, Admin Associate III: Ok, I'll begin the roll call. Commissioner Alcheck?

10
11 Commissioner Alcheck: Present.

12
13 Mr. Nguyen: Commissioner Hechtman?

14
15 Commissioner Hechtman: Present.

16
17 Mr. Nguyen: Commissioner Lauing?

18
19 Commissioner Lauing: Present.

20
21 Mr. Nguyen: Commissioner Riggs?

22
23 Commissioner Riggs: Present.

24
25 Mr. Nguyen: Commissioner Roohparvar?

26
27 Vice-Chair Roohparvar: Present.

28
29 Mr. Nguyen: I mean Vice-Chair Roohparvar.

30
31 Vice-Chair Roohparvar: Present.

32
33 Mr. Nguyen: Commissioner Summa?

34
35 Commissioner Summa: Present.

36
37 Mr. Nguyen: Chair Templeton?

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 Chair Templeton: Present.

2

3 Mr. Nguyen: Ok, we have a quorum. Thank you.

4

5 Chair Templeton: Great, thank you very much. I see some hands raised and the first thing we're
6 going to take raised hands for is items not on the agenda. So, if you wish to speak to the item
7 that is on the agenda, you may want to lower your hand until after that item.

8 **Oral Communications**

9 The public may speak to any item not on the agenda. Three (3) minutes per speaker.^{1,2}

10 Chair Templeton: So, first thing we'll do is Oral Communications and this is for members of the
11 public who wish to speak on items, not on the agenda. Please raise your hands now. Mr.
12 Nguyen?

13

14 Mr. Vinh Nguyen, Admin Associate III: Ok, it looks like we have just one raised hand from
15 Rebecca so our first speaker will be Rebecca.

16

17 Ms. Rebecca Eisenberg: Hi, thank you so much. This is Rebecca Eisenberg. I appreciate you
18 allowing me to speak and as always, I'm grateful for your hard work on behalf of the City.

19

20 I'm speaking still about Castilleja, which is not on the agenda, which remains a problematic
21 issue. First of all, I had sent an email that I didn't receive a response regarding potential
22 conflicts of interest by Commissioner Alcheck. In that letter... well, among the fact that I listed
23 many, many statutory issues and failures to enforce on behalf of the City, including the Planning
24 Commission. I also noted that there is evidence out there that is pretty strong that Mr.
25 Alcheck's sister attended Castilleja. That his sister and his parents are significant donors to
26 Castilleja. That his nieces or niece attend Castilleja and that he is intending to, if possible given
27 the very, very competitive admissions rate, he hopes to send his own daughters to Castilleja.
28 When I sent that there is no response. It couldn't have been that because you don't value me as
29 a community member and it couldn't have been that you didn't read it. So, was it because
30 these are true? I just know what I heard and what I saw on the internet. If that's the case. I
31 think that those types of relationships with Castilleja are at least require disclosure on behalf of
32 Mr. Alcheck. Whether or not he should recuse himself is of course dependent on what conflicts
33 there are, but it's strange. If it's... if these relationships don't pose a conflict that requires
34 recusal, why not just let the world know, and that way you can create the appearance of
35 integrity that we're all hoping that... on behalf of the appointed and elected leaders like you all.

36

37 Second, I just want to clarify that I think Castilleja is a great school, but there are fundamental
38 reasons why we need to enforce our laws here. And the laws make it very clear that we can't...
39 the City cannot grant a Conditional Use Permit if there's not a public benefit. Not a benefit to
40 Castilleja or its family base or leaders which who are undoubtedly great people, but a benefit to

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 the City of Palo Alto. And none have even been proposed and because when we give Castilleja
2 all these benefits, we actually divert money from our public-school students. I detailed those in
3 my letters. I'm out of time so I urge you to read them. Thank you.

4
5 Mr. Nguyen: Thank you for joining us tonight and Chair Templeton, that concludes Oral
6 Communications.

7
8 Chair Templeton: Thank you very much.

10 **Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions**

11 The Chair or Commission majority may modify the agenda order to improve meeting management.

12 Chair Templeton: Alright, any Agenda Changes, Additions, or Deletions?

13
14 Ms. Rachael Tanner, Assistant Director: I do not have any requests for changes or deletions.

15 **City Official Reports**

16 1. Directors Report, Meeting Schedule and Assignments

17 Chair Templeton: How about we move onto City Official Reports?

18
19 Ms. Rachael Tanner, Assistant Director: Thank you, Chair Templeton, Vice-Chair Roohparvar,
20 and Members of the Planning Commission. It's good to be with you this evening. This is our last
21 meeting for 2020 if you can believe it. So, I think we are all very hopeful about the news that
22 the vaccine is coming and looking forward to 2021. My public service announcement and I'm
23 sure all of you have read and members of the public that even with the onset and coming of the
24 vaccine. It will be some time before that is distributed significantly and so we're still right now
25 in a Shelter in Place mode. Really pretty much back to where we were in March of this year
26 unfortunately with some exceptions. Of course, essential services are continuing, construction
27 activities are continuing, retail is available in addition to essential retail at grocery stores and
28 pharmacies and things like that, and some outdoor activities are encouraged or are able to
29 continue.

30
31 You may have noticed that sadly we had to discontinue outdoor dining as well and so the Uplift
32 Local Streets of University Avenue and California Avenue have been opened again to vehicle
33 traffic. We are watching closely, always, what the Public Health Officials say and when they will
34 lift those restrictions. We're hopeful that it will be soon, but realistically we're in this for I
35 believe at least 3-weeks or at least through January 4th. There's a Shelter in Place Order right
36 now and we'll look to see if our capacity at our ICU beds in our hospitals is able to become
37 greater so that those could be lifted. So, that's at least one indicator and as many know the
38 indicator that precipitated this most recent Shelter in Place. So, I just encourage everyone to be
39 safe during the holidays and if to the degree that you're able to shop locally at local small

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 businesses that again, are still open at I believe 25 percent capacity. So, you'll have to wait in
2 line a little bit to get inside. Many of our retailers are offering online options or you may choose
3 to give a gift card to a local restaurant. Those are some great ways that you can support a local
4 retailer and give a gift to those who you are planning to give gifts to this year. If that's what is
5 part of your tradition so, I just want to encourage folks to think about that.

6
7 One of my jobs and roles with the City has been to be part of the group that is looking to think
8 about our retailers and how do we recover from the pandemic and the stories that we hare are
9 just really, really hard to hear. They're very real in terms of the dire straights that not only the
10 owners of the businesses are but they are always very first and for most to talk about their
11 employees and the folks who work there who are really impacted by not having a paycheck, not
12 having hours to work. So, we're definitely thinking about all of them this time of year. So, that's
13 my little announcement regarding that.

14
15 On some positive news for the department, we continue to make headway in terms of filling
16 some of our vacancies. So, we hope that in January we'll have a new Principle Planner on board
17 so know on wood we are able to hire that person and move forward. And we continue to
18 monitor construction and development activity. Overall, we're still down this year from last
19 year's development activity in terms of the number of planning applications and building
20 permit applications that we're receiving. It's not too far off month over month when you look.
21 It's like maybe 20 or 30 permits less per month but really, we never really made up for that big
22 downturn we had for the first few months of the Shelter in Place where things ground to a halt.
23 And certainly, I think we see that people change their plans, put plans on hold that they may
24 have had to do development or construction work and so we are watching that closely.

25
26 And then this last Monday and the Monday prior, City Council did have two discussions about
27 the Economic Recovery. Last weeks was a great panel discussion about the Economic Recovery
28 and I think worthwhile to even watch the opening study session where three experts talked
29 about different aspects of the recovery. And that is some topic we hope to bring to the PTC
30 early next year as well in terms of particularly what the remote work scenario might look like,
31 where will people be traveling, how will they be getting to work, how many people will be
32 coming to work? So, something that we're monitoring closely and some of the conversations
33 we've had just in the course of business with developers. We always ask hey, what does your
34 crystal ball show? What are your tenants saying? What do you see on the horizon and all
35 indications so far that folks are interested in coming back physically to work? Especially
36 companies that require collaboration, that need meeting space for group gatherings for
37 discussions, and so though there may be some type of hybrid in terms of employees working
38 from home and working in the office. It certainly is not indicated that we'll see most people
39 working from home 100 percent of the time. So, I think that's good news for our City and good

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 news I think for a lot of us who want to get back to the office and working together with our
2 colleagues in person.

3
4 We do... are very, very fortunate that we have Sylvia Star-Lack from our Office of
5 Transportation here with us as well and Sylvia, I just want to make space if there's anything
6 you'd like to update from the Office of Transportation for the Planning Commissioners to
7 know? Ok, it's a slow time of year for everyone I think a little bit right now, but we do have I
8 believe a study session item coming from Office of Transportation early next year in January to
9 us so we look forward to that. Thank you for being here Sylvia, appreciate it. So (interrupted)

10
11 Chair Templeton: Very much, thank you both.

12
13 Ms. Tanner: That's my report and I'm happy to answer any questions if there are any.

14
15 Chair Templeton: Great. It looks like Commissioner Riggs has his hand up.

16
17 Commissioner Riggs: Yeah, I do, sorry. So, two questions Rachael, first is there... on the
18 economic development front, is there any... are there any Staff related efforts to propose to
19 Council small business relief grants or permit waivers for TIs? Particularly TIs that deal... that
20 have dealt with COVID? It seems like that's becoming a trend for a lot of California... particularly
21 California Cities that are our size and particularly for downtown oriented businesses. So, that's
22 question one, and then question two was is kind of a... it could be a Sylvia question as well. I
23 wanted to see if there's any dialog about Council's decision on the 788 San Antonio project and
24 where that... where and when that corridor study might happen?

25
26 Ms. Tanner: Great questions Commissioner Riggs. Regarding relief efforts, there is... there has
27 been and continues to be a small business grant program. There was a first-round earlier this
28 year, there's a second round of \$5,000 grants that are being... I think that have been in terms of
29 solicited folks who want to get the grant and they're being distributed. It's obviously a pretty
30 small amount of money and a small number unfortunately of businesses that are able to be
31 serviced. There's potential for that to continue again next year and as far as other relief effort.
32 Council... we did take to Council some ideas for ideas such as some zoning base reliefs. Could
33 we look at our zoning in terms of making it easier for new businesses to open? There has been
34 a fee waiver for example for outdoor dining. The fees were waived for those reviews and so it's
35 conceivable that Council could consider those types of waivers more on the larger fee waiver.
36 That's something certainly Staff can propose.

37
38 We will be coming back to the PTC with some ideas of other ways through at least the Zoning
39 Code, which obviously is again more focused on folks wanting to open a business or reopen or

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 modify than it is on our existing businesses, unfortunately; but that's one tool that we have and
2 we'll be bringing that to PTC for consideration some potential changes that we could make.

3
4 And Sylvia, did you want to address the other question? For San Antonio overall the Council did
5 approve the project and I think with good discussion regarding the need for more planning. And
6 I know Sylvia, I believe you have had or are having some bike and pedestrian planning in that
7 area as well. Is that correct on the San Antonio, or you have had it in the past, or it's part of the
8 coming bike plan? I know I'm forgetting what planning efforts are underway.

9
10 Ms. Sylvia Star-Lack: For sure we will talk about that as part of the upcoming Bike Plan. We are
11 still talking internally with planning. We need to coordinate on what the parameters are going
12 to be of that San Antonio corridor and so those... that coordination needs to happen before it
13 can come back to Council with the broad outlines of what that plan will look like.

14
15 Chair Templeton: Alright, thank you. Thank you all. I had a quick question. What is happening to
16 the parklets now that the streets are back open? Do they have to be removed or can they stay
17 put?

18
19 Ms. Tanner: So, the parklets that are taking up a parking space, so not... we had where of
20 course where folks were able to dine in the roadway, kind of in the center of the street, and
21 streets were closed. But the parklets that are in parking spaces are going to be remaining.
22 Council did authorize those to remain through September of next year through Labor Day.
23 Again, thinking that hopefully, we'll be out of the pandemic by then but also wanting to
24 encourage folks to make the investment to construct a more attractive and certainly accessible
25 parklet. And so that happened and those are in place until next September. We do need to
26 work on as Staff on a transition plan and bring to Council and also to PTC for consideration what
27 a permanent parklet program might look like. And then hopefully we can do that so those
28 parklets could transition for those who want to, to a permanent program if that's what Council
29 approves.

30
31 Chair Templeton: Cool, thank you for the update. Alright, so any other Commissioners have
32 questions before we move on to our agenda item? Alright, also members of the public if you do
33 raise your hand, we'll be creating a stack of... an order of comments so you're welcome to raise
34 your hands if you want to speak on the agenda item.

35
36 **Action Items**

37 Public Comment is Permitted. Applicants/Appellant Teams: Fifteen (15) minutes, plus three (3) minutes rebuttal.
38 All others: Five (5) minutes per speaker.^{1,3}

39
40 2. PUBLIC HEARING: Recommendation on the Preferred Plan Alternative for the North
41 Ventura Coordinated Area Plan

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1
2 Chair Templeton: We're moving to the public hearing on the Preferred Plan Alternative
3 recommendation for the North Ventura Coordinated Area Plan. So, over to you, Staff.

4
5 Ms. Rachael Tanner, Assistant Director: Thank you and Commissioners, I will be sharing my
6 screen and why did it go... is that showing the first slide? North Ventura Coordinated Area Plan
7 to everyone? Excellent.

8
9 Good evening, I have the pleasure of presenting the North Ventura Coordinated Area Plan, the
10 draft alternatives to the Planning and Transportation Commission this evening. I'm joined by
11 Jean Eisberg. She is the owner and operator of Lexington Planning. She's a consultant that we
12 have fortunately due to a vacancy been able to use her services on this project and she has
13 been working on other projects. She was before us earlier this year with the objective standards
14 work and so you'll recognize her from that. We also have Chitra Moitra with us. Unfortunately,
15 Claire Campbell, our Manager of Long-Range Planning, has had a family emergency and she is
16 not able to join us this evening, but she has worked very diligently on this project and so we will
17 certainly be missing her this evening.

18
19 So, the purpose of this meeting is to present and review the three draft alternatives that have
20 been prepared for the North Ventura Coordinated Area Plan, to take public comment, to have
21 PTC ask questions, to have a discussion amongst the members, and we request that the hearing
22 be continued to January 13th, 2021. This is both to give time for more discussion, more thought
23 for PTC Members, and additionally, we had planned to adjourn earlier because of the City
24 Council doing interviews with PTC Members. Even though that is no longer happening, we did
25 notice the public in the agenda and in the Staff report that we would be continuing and we
26 would request that the PTC follow that stated and published order. So, that members of the
27 public who were relying on that can participate today and tune in in January. We do hope that
28 when we come back in January at our first meeting the PTC will recommend a preferred
29 alternative for City Council consideration. Our presentation this evening will go we'll have an
30 overview of the NVCAP, our process, we'll preview the alternatives, also the Matadero Creek
31 improvements and talk about next steps.

32
33 So, some of the context overall for this project that has changed I would say in some ways
34 significantly since the project was first conceived and the grant was applied for in 2017 are the
35 COVID-19 Pandemic and the resulting remote work, the Housing Element and RHNA that is
36 coming in the six cycle and proposed projects in the Plan Area. So, no one could have foreseen
37 in 2017 that we would have a pandemic that would lead to many, many workers in Palo Alto no
38 longer coming here daily to students at Stanford not coming on campus. And so, while this has
39 certainly put a halt for many projects and plans and led many to question will we have office...
40 need of office spaces? What will housing look like? What kind of housing will folks want? We do

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 believe that in the long run that the Silicon Valley, Palo Alto, the Bay Area will become... will
2 continue to be a job center and will continue to be a place that people want to live and make
3 their homes in. And so, this is a long-range plan that will certainly last beyond the pandemic
4 and the pandemic will certainly color the early years of this plan's life. We do think it is
5 worthwhile to continue pursuing this planning effort.

6
7 The Housing Element and RHNA, while we knew in 2017 we would need to do a Housing
8 Element in the six cycle around this time. We did not foresee that our RHNA Allocation would
9 be nearly 10,000-housing units. If that allocation stands at about that number, or even a few
10 thousand less. It is orders of magnitude greater than the 19... 1,988-units that we had assigned
11 as our fifth cycle RHNA. And so how that affects the project is that we will be coming to PTC,
12 work with then the community in the next 18-months to develop our new Housing Element
13 update. And in that Housing Element, we will need to identify opportunity sites that could
14 accommodate these 10,000-units. Presently, there are a number of housing opportunity sites
15 within the NVCAP and so depending on how the rezoning happens as part of the NVCAP. Those
16 sites could continue to be Housing Element sites if they are upzoned significantly in accordance
17 with state laws, or they may cease to be housing opportunity sites which means we have to find
18 those sites else were in the City. This is certainly not to indicate that the NVCAP should take on
19 all of or even a significant portion of that 10,000 housing units, but it is to keep in mind that
20 what is changed here through zoning and through the plan will have an impact on our Housing
21 Element and on our ability to identify those housing opportunity sites.

22
23 And lastly and perhaps most recently, we have received several project proposals within the
24 NVCAP area. There currently is no moratorium on development in the area and under state law,
25 we cannot have a moratorium that ceases housing development. The City could enact a
26 moratorium on commercial development, but housing applications would still need to be
27 received. The City has prescreened a Planned Home Zone on Olive and Pepper Avenue facing El
28 Camino Real which was a few... maybe a few weeks ago at City Council and then we also have
29 received an SB330 application for a project whose address is 200 Portage. That is a portion of
30 what is colloquially known as the Fry's site which is 340 Portage which is proposed to have 85
31 townhomes. And for some, this project and proposal can seem to throw a wrench in the plans
32 in that it is a housing proposal for one of the larger opportunity sites within in the NVCAP area.
33 It does provide housing. It does provide and take some of the ques from the plan so far in terms
34 of the mobility and the circulation pattern. It is not as much housing as some of the alternatives
35 envision for this site. It is not as much open space as some of the alternatives envision for the
36 site but the City will be processing that application and again, it could go forward and certainly
37 change some of the calculations if it comes to fruition on what can happen now on the Fry's
38 site. But all of that withstanding, certainly, we're riding the waves of change and we are kind of
39 forge ahead with our planning, but I think these are important factors for the PTC certainly to
40 consider as you're evaluating what you feel is the best and preferred alternative.

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1
2 So, a project overview, this is the site. This is Coordinated Area Plan Area is founded roughly
3 by Page Mill and El Camino Real with the Caltrain tracks and then Lambert Avenue. So, on the
4 other side of the plan area is Boulware Park and including the newly expanded portion so you
5 won't see that park pictured in the Plan Area but it is immediately adjacent there. It's close to
6 the Cal Ave Business District, it's also very close to the Cal Ave Train Station which is a great
7 asset. This project was granted funded by a grant from Caltrans and the City Council adopted
8 goals, the City Council adopted objectives for this plan, and then appointed a 14 member
9 Working Group with folks from a variety of roles who are serving as really our brain trust to try
10 to come up with what is best for this Plan Area.

11
12 This is a snapshot of kind of the most recent parts of the plan. So, what we've been doing this
13 year in 2020, we've had a workshop earlier this year, we had a community survey that was
14 online for folks who couldn't attend the workshop, we had a PTC study session in April to orient
15 the PTC Members so hopefully, you remember some of that. That can aid you today in
16 evaluating these alternatives and we had a number of Working Group meetings over the spring
17 and summer and fall really to work to understand other points of consensus that the Working
18 Group members have that they'd like to see reflected in the alternatives. So, we've developed
19 with that in mind the prefer... the draft alternative before you. We're looking for a PTC
20 recommendation and again hoping that comes in earlier 2021. We would then present that to
21 the City Council we're hopping around March of 2021 and based on what the City Council
22 chooses as the preferred alternative and gives Staff direction. We would then pursue technical
23 studies such as traffic studies, further economic feasibility studies, to really understand that
24 alternative and provide suggestions for how it might be refined. We'd then bring that forward
25 to the City Council for consideration and their final blessing before we go off and really draft
26 the plan, do the environmental study, and then have Council to adopt the plan. So, that's kind
27 of where we are, where we've been, where we are today, and looking ahead.

28
29 We've had a significant amount of public engagement for this program and this slide just shows
30 a number of the activities that we've undertaken from Working Group meetings, community
31 meetings, meeting with decision-makers, we have a stellar project website that is updated with
32 all of our meeting information and all of the attachments and documents that have been
33 provided. We had stakeholder interviews, community surveys and we're meeting also right now
34 with property owners who own large or significant number of parcels in the area to understand
35 what their thoughts are on the NVCAP. Two property owners are members of the Working
36 Group but some are not and we want to make sure they're all connected to and understand the
37 latest proposals. So, we hope to conclude those hopefully this year. This year is getting short.
38 We have a number scheduled and that can be information that we can provide in January when
39 we return to the PTC.
40

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 For the alternative's development process, we really took into consideration a lot of different
2 data points. Existing conditions analyses, Council adopted goals, the Working Group, financial
3 analyses, architectural, qualitative and quantitative data and that helped to prepare the first
4 alternatives that were released earlier this year in January that were developed by our
5 consultant team. Again, this summer City and Staff have worked with the Working Group and
6 gathered community input to refine those alternatives and then, of course, coming with those
7 preferred alternatives or draft to Working Group, to the PTC, and City Council.

8
9 So, we want to talk a little bit about some of the constants that are across all the alternatives.
10 You'll see that the heights and densities of the taller buildings on El Camino Real. That there is
11 transitions zones of heights and densities from higher density areas of existing single-family
12 homes. That's there's affordable housing envisioned being provided through a bonus program
13 on El Camino Real and Page Mill sites that would allow a 20-story or 20-story? 20-foot bonus for
14 sites that 100 percent workforce or 100 percent affordable housing. So, we're hopeful that
15 some of those developers will get in the game and be able to acquire some of those sites and
16 build that housing. You'll also see that we have transportation improvements that are pretty
17 consistent across the alternatives. Really what would amplify is that if there are an alternative
18 with a greater number of people projected, that some of those transportation improvements
19 might be calibrated to accommodate the greater number of people that would be expected,
20 and the greater number of trips that might be associated with that.

21
22 I'm going to turn it over now to Jean Eisberg and she's going to take these next few slides so
23 Jean?

24
25 Ms. Jean Eisberg, Consultant: Ok, thank you. So, as Rachael mentioned the transportation
26 improvements at this point are pretty consistent across the three alternatives. So, we do
27 anticipate that the alternatives that do have more development associated with them would
28 get more improvements. Just as projects are paying into Impact Fees or doing improvements
29 based on off-site improvements required as part of a project. Just to orient you to the map
30 we've got some of these solid orange lines showing where ped and bike improvements are
31 focused. And sometimes that means widened bike lanes like on Park Boulevard or potentially
32 more of a [unintelligible] shared street design. Reducing the number of curb cuts to ensure
33 safety for pedestrians and bicycles and reducing those conflicts with vehicles. The red circles
34 are showing places where there would be potential intersection improvements both for
35 vehicles and for other modes. And then the red hash lines on interior streets are identifying
36 places for potential traffic calming measures. Additionally, we've got some orange hatching on
37 some of these large block sites for that 395 Page Mill and that 340 Portage and those are trying
38 to extend the street grid, break up those large expanses so that particularly pedestrians and
39 bicycles would have more mobility throughout the site. So, again this would be continued to be

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 refined as we move through the process and once that preferred alternative is identified and
2 the traffic analysis is conducted on that scenario.

3
4 The next slide shows our methodology for evaluating potential development and so the tables
5 that we'll talk about in the next couple slides calculate build-out or potential development that
6 could be built as a result of each alternative. And so, what we did is we looked at what is the
7 viability of these sites as opportunity sites to actually develop in the next 20-years or so in the
8 planned horizon. So, one, has the owner expressed interest in redevelopment? Two, are parcels
9 greater than 10,000-square feet? This tends to be the threshold at which a project is really
10 viable. Sites smaller than that contend to be difficult to develop. Either they're too expensive,
11 hard to make the parking fit, etc. We took into account parcels with contiguous ownership.
12 There are many property owners that own multiple sites that could be consolidated to make a
13 site over 10,000-square feet and then we forwarded these into three tiers of potential. And so,
14 the Tier One sites have the most potential, the Tier Three sites have the lowest potential.
15 Maybe they're smaller or more difficult to develop. We excluded parcels that had approved
16 entitlements, parcels that are owner-occupied single-family homes or owner or excuse me,
17 condo... commercial condos. Excluded water district parcels at the creek and excluded parcels
18 that have recently redeveloped in the last 10-years and so the next slide shows a map of where
19 those sites are located. We've got the green circles showing those Tier One sites. Those are the
20 highest potential. The orange dots showing the moderate potential Tier Two sites and the Tier
21 Three sites shown in yellow. We also have these red asterisk showing sites with proposed
22 project applications on them.

23
24 You'll see on the next slide that these are applied in different ways within the different
25 alternatives and so for example, Alternative One there may be fewer incentives to
26 redevelopment and so we would anticipate that fewer sites would actually turn over. Where in
27 Alternative Three, which as Rachael is going to walk through in a minute, there's higher
28 incentives for redevelopment in terms of densities and heights that are allowed, and therefore
29 we can anticipate that more sites would turn over. And so, this is a snapshot of what we could
30 anticipate in terms of development and you'll see that we have a row that say realistic potential
31 in terms of new housing units and maximum potential. The maximum potential is if all of those
32 opportunity sites build-out. It's probably an unlikely scenario but just to give you that feeling of
33 what could be anticipated. The realistic potential is the turnover really of the Tier One sites and
34 in some cases Tier Two sites. And then as we get into Alternative Three where we have more
35 incentives for redevelopment, potential turnover of Tier Three sites. We've also shown here the
36 potential build-out for office uses and as Rachael explained more. We see more office
37 development in Alternative Three compared to Alternative one and Two. Retail development is
38 tracking with residential development so the economic consultant for the project has identified
39 what that metric is for how much retail can be supported by new population and so that retail
40 commercial space is tracking with the increase in households. We also have potential build-out

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 in terms of parks and open space. The scenario here is that the alternatives that allow for more
2 development would allow for potentially more Park Impact Fee and park dedication which
3 would increase the amount of park space.
4

5 And the next slide shows the metrics for what this development potential really means in terms
6 of people and jobs. And so just based on the City's Inclusionary Zoning Requirements or on-site
7 for-sale units and the assumptions about fees in-lieu for rental projects. You see the below-
8 market-rate housing units tracking with the increase in market-rate units. Likewise, the
9 residential population would obviously track with the number of units. Not too many jobs being
10 created compared to what's there right now in any of the scenarios, but you see that
11 graduating with the additional commercial space. And then we've also identified a potential
12 jobs/housing ratio, so that's the number of housing units that would be needed to support the
13 new jobs. Just making sure that we're both accommodating jobs that are new jobs that may be
14 created as well as potential jobs that are there now. And then lastly, is the parks and open
15 space ratios so the City's General Plan and the Parks Master Plan have metrics for goals and
16 targets, 4-acres per 1,000 new residents, and the General Plan has a 2-acre per 1,000 standard
17 based on neighbors' parks. The Parks Master Plan has a 4-acre per 1,000 standard so we're not
18 achieving that. Each alternative does a little better so that just demonstrates that the park
19 would either need to be identified in some other way; whether that's through City acquisition
20 or some other format.
21

22 I'm going to pass it back to Rachael for the next slides to walk through the actual alternatives.
23

24 Ms. Tanner: Excellent. Thank you, Jean. I do want to note, Jean will have to disappear. She's got
25 another Planning Commission, if you can believe that, with a different City. So, we thank her for
26 her expertise that she's able to offer tonight and she will (interrupted)
27

28 Commissioner Alcheck: Rachael... Assistant Director Tanner, can I ask a quick question before
29 she leaves? I just... like a point of clarification (interrupted)
30

31 Chair Templeton: At the [unintelligible] of the Chair I would say. Chair Templeton?
32

33 Chair Templeton: When is Jean leaving?
34

35 Ms. Eisberg: I'm leaving at 7:00.
36

37 Chair Templeton: Do you anticipate getting through this before then so we could do it with the
38 regular round of questions, or should we?
39

40 Ms. Tanner: If you want to have some questions with Ms. Eisberg we should do that now.

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

Chair Templeton: Alright, excellent. Thank you for bringing that up. Commissioner Alcheck followed by Vice-Chair Rookparvar.

Commissioner Alcheck: So, this is just specific to the... if you... we could go back a slide if you will? So, the... I guess you're calling it... the summary of the feasibility of residential development that you guys kicked off a minute ago suggests under each alternative a certain number of units. Was that specific to a parcel or is that total because the units here, when you talk about development potential, don't align precisely with the numbers that are used in the Feasibility Study? So, I'm just trying to understand if there's two different... is there... is one the entire area and one's a... the Feasibility Study, when it says for example total units under each prototype. That... I'm just trying to understand how did you arrive at net new housing units? Is it different than the criteria used for the Feasibility Study?

Ms. Eisberg: Sure, and when you're referring to the Feasibility Study, are you referring to Attachment D from Strategic Economics?

Commissioner Alcheck: Yeah, so they do each alternative in the units... the number of total units ranges from 18 to 192 in all these different sort of (interrupted)

Ms. Eisberg: Oh ok. So (interrupted)

Commissioner Alcheck: Like 192 being if we allowed 50 to 70-foot tall mixed-use residential buildings.

Ms. Eisberg: Right.

Commissioner Alcheck: So, when you have 142 there, how... what category (interrupted)

Ms. Eisberg: Sure, so if I'm looking at Packet Page 50, which is one of the pages of Strategic Economics' Feasibility Study. They actually are showing you the prototype. So, for example, in that left-hand row, townhomes. If you had 18 townhomes in that prototypical townhome and then in the far-right column 192-units in the prototypical mixed-use multi-family residential. And so, they're analyzing the feasibility of the product type as opposed... in addition to the feasibility of Alternative Three with its 1,500 potential units.

Commissioner Alcheck: So, if (interrupted)

Ms. Tanner: So, for example (interrupted)

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 Commissioner Alcheck: Just so I'm clear, so is there a connection between the 1,500-units let's
2 say that you've listed hereunder Alternative Three and the number of "product type" that
3 would be inserted into the NVCAP area? And for example, what would that number be? Would
4 there be 10, 50 to 70-foot tall buildings, or I guess in this case would it be eight to multiple by
5 192? I'm just trying to figure out sort of if I... how many of the sites would have to have which
6 product types. Is there any information regarding that?
7

8 Ms. Eisberg: So, in general, on the way we've developed this methodology and what you're
9 seeing on the screen right now. The densities and the... the densities that were used to
10 determine this development potential are based on the feasible product types that Strategic
11 Economics produced as part of their January report and what they're referring to here. So,
12 although I can't tell you how many sites are... we'll actually probably could back out how many
13 sites are townhome sites versus how many sites are 50 to 70-foot mid-rise sites. And when
14 Rachael goes through the alternatives, you'll be able to really see that on the map. It's just we
15 don't have... we can't report to you right now the specific link between the two but
16 (interrupted)
17

18 Commissioner Alcheck: Ok so let me ask you one more question, maybe this will help me. In the
19 Feasibility Study for Alternative One, for example, it looks like none of the product types would
20 be likely or realistically feasible. So, if the suggestion that you could achieve 500 and potentially
21 as many as 860-units simply using townhomes? Is that the conclusion that I'm supposed to
22 draw here that the (interrupted)
23

24 Chair Templeton: Just to interrupt just a second. Ms. Tanner, will that be... that kind of question
25 be answered when you go through the alternatives?
26

27 Ms. Tanner: I will be (interrupted)
28

29 Chair Templeton: Because I want to make sure (interrupted)
30

31 Ms. Tanner: It will be. I think the way to think about it is that first what was developed for
32 feasibility were the product types and so Strategic Economics... also can folks hear me? Am I
33 coming through?
34

35 Chair Templeton: Yeah but I think your video is frozen.
36

37 Ms. Tanner: Yes, your images are frozen for me too so I don't know how to stop that. I'm not
38 going to stop the screen share. I'm just going to (interrupted)
39

40 Chair Templeton: It's fixed. It's fixed.

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1
2 Ms. Tanner: Ok [unintelligible – bad audio]. So, is that they first developed the different types
3 of building typology that are feasible. And so, this is not to complicate things, but let's say
4 there... a building had 100-units and there were five of them in Alternative One. Those would
5 be five financially feasible buildings that would be suggested and so that's kind of the building
6 types that are financially feasible in and of themselves. And then the Strategic Economics also
7 took a look at the overall alternatives to understand the interplay so there's multiple dynamics
8 that go into the feasibility. There's the building type and then there's the overall scheme of how
9 they're laid out.

10
11 Commissioner Alcheck: Ok I think I understand. I just... if I'm... if we're going to have a
12 discussion at some point about these numbers and we're going to say ok if Alternative One
13 realistically could result in 500-units. Maybe if you could just help me understand how would
14 you evaluate the... how those units would be delivered if the Feasibility Study showed you that
15 the only likely... somewhat likely product type would be townhomes? If... are we to conclude
16 that the 500-units (interrupted)

17
18 Ms. Tanner: So, there... that's it. Yeah, so when we say realistically yield in that scenario, that is
19 talking about the tiers of the properties. So, Jean was mentioning that we have the properties
20 sorted into tiers and so then depending on that tier, right? So, if it's a green site we think that's
21 likely to redevelop. If it's orange it's Tier Two and then Yellow is Tier Three. So, under
22 Alternative One and Jean you can correct me, the green sites are being included. And then as
23 you go to the Alternative Two and Three, you're including more and more sites because the
24 incentives are such that we... that it would yield and lead to those sites turning over and being
25 redeveloped. So, you're seeing more development occur based on what is allowed to happen
26 on those sites. Does that make sense?

27
28 Commissioner Alcheck: Ok, more development of the townhome product type as opposed to
29 what in Alternative One? A mixed-use would be unlikely, is that (interrupted)

30
31 Ms. Tanner: I don't know that it's saying more or less that it's townhomes, but for example, in
32 Alternative One, 340 Portage is envisioned to have a limited number of housing units, or some
33 parcels may not turn over at all and may not yield any housing because folks may look at that
34 and say well, I'd rather just keep what I have and not build something because these new
35 standards aren't leading me to want to build a mixed-use building or a townhome or anything.
36 And so that's what the maximum and realistic are really saying. Yes, if everybody decided to
37 build under these scenarios, that's the maximum, but based on what we think would happen,
38 given the characteristics of the plan, what do we think realistically may come to fruition based
39 on the incentive package that is the plan? Does that make sense? Maybe we can continue
40 (interrupted)

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1
2 Commissioner Alcheck: I don't want to take more time so I'll wait to ask more questions to the
3 Staff after.

4
5 Ms. Tanner: Ok. Sorry if it's confusing.

6
7 Chair Templeton: Thank you. Thank you, Commissioner Alcheck. We have three other people
8 lined up. I encourage you to focus on questions that are specific to Ms. Eisberg's presentation
9 and I feel confident that Ms. Tanner will be able to answer any questions that come up after
10 Ms. Eisberg leaves. So, Vice-Chair Roohparvar you're next followed by Hechtman and Lauing.

11
12 Vice-Chair Roohparvar: Sure, a quick question. Can you go back two slides? What's... sorry,
13 what's the time horizon that you used for the... no, for the graphs. For realistically getting that
14 500, the realistic potential, what's the time horizon on that? What was that based on? When
15 are we going to have that? In 5-years, 10-years? Is that (interrupted)

16
17 Ms. Eisberg: Maybe Rachael can... may Rachael can speak more to the total time horizon of the
18 plan. This was just based... I threw out there a 20-year estimate. Some of that's just based on
19 how the traffic model... frankly how the traffic modeling works in the County.

20
21 Vice-Chair Roohparvar: Got it. Ok, that's helpful I think, so 20-years?

22
23 Ms. Eisberg: But sometimes this takes a generation.

24
25 Vice-Chair Roohparvar: Yeah because we can't force right, but we can't force homeowners to...
26 you can only incentivize and tie together the different types of development in order to get the
27 results we want, but we can't force people. Ok, I think that answers my question, 20-years.

28
29 Chair Templeton: Thank you. Commissioner Hechtman followed by Commissioner Lauing.

30
31 Commissioner Hechtman: Thank you. On the next slide, I'm trying to understand how the
32 calculation of residential population was made. So, if you can flip over one slide. Oh yeah, right
33 there. So, let's just take Alternative Three, 3,610, and if you look at the footnote by the heading
34 it says it looks like the calculation is based on 2.55 persons per household. But when I divide
35 3,610 by 2.55 I get something like 1,415-units total, but when you back one slide. Then you look
36 at Alternative Three, the realistic is 1,490 added to the 142 so that's 1,632. So, I'm just not
37 understanding the relationship between those two.

38
39 Ms. Eisberg: Sure. So, we typically assume 5 percent vacancy rate in terms of housing units.
40 That's pretty standard and so yes, we've multiplied out based on the current household side

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 and assumed a 5 percent vacancy rate. So, there's a difference between households and having
2 units.

3

4 Commissioner Hechtman: Thank you.

5

6 Chair Templeton: Thank you. Commissioner Lauing.

7

8 Commissioner Lauing: I didn't know Bart [note – Commissioner Hechtman] was going to be so
9 fast. Sorry. Staying on that slide I had one other question there before going back up to the
10 previous slide and when you're calculating the office jobs there in Alternative, let's see
11 Alternative Three. You're figuring that all that office space only results in 430 because I think
12 you're using the VTA estimate of 295-square feet per person, but that's old and high. There was
13 like for example there's a question on the Wayfield Study in '17 that it had actually gone down
14 to 194. So, if you use that number it's actually 653 so we should have some agreement, not
15 tonight but sometime, as to what we really think the average size per person is because the
16 difference between 430 and 653 is material. So, I would just point that out and we should figure
17 that one out.

18

19 Back up on Table... unless you wanted to comment on it, I'll just go on? No?

20

21 Ms. Eisberg: Good comment. Great point.

22

23 Commissioner Lauing: So, then back up on Table 1, a couple of questions. Again, I think it's wise
24 for you to be doing realistic as opposed to maximum so we're not getting out ahead of
25 ourselves. That's really solid. I'm trying to plot... I get why the BMR is always staying at 15
26 percent, but I'm trying to plot how much more office in your model, or the economic model as
27 well, is needed to get more housing. So, in the first one where... Alternative One is 500. If we go
28 up to 1,170, that's the ratio of about 2.34, but we have to go up almost four times the amount
29 of office space to pull that off to get another say 600-units. If we go higher it gets even wilder,
30 so if... just to get the difference in realistic housing 1,170 to go up to 1,490. If I'm doing this
31 right, we need to have almost four times the amount of office compared to what we need at
32 the 1,170 number. So, I guess... and I'm just looking at your overview here. I'm not digging into
33 the numbers, but at some point, I'd like to see how you get there and what we're calculating.
34 Why we have to quadruple the office just to get basically 300-units? So, you can pass on that or
35 you can give me a headline and we can go back to it later.

36

37 Ms. Eisberg: I can try to give you a headline. It is not perfect math. This is one based on, as
38 Rachael goes to the alternatives, the direction of the alternative, the vision of the alternative,
39 and so for example in Alternative Two. We're really just replacing the amount of office that's
40 there now and allowing some additional professional small format office. Think of medical,

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 dentist office, or architect office 5,000-square foot versus Alternative Three where, as you
2 alluded to, using office essentially as an incentive to get more housing. Perhaps they even move
3 in tandem. So, we don't have the exact metric for what that is. How much office do you need to
4 give or allow in order to encourage the housing units? So, we can't... we haven't suggested that
5 we're calculating that the same way across each of all the alternatives.
6

7 Commissioner Lauing: Ok. I'll look forward to what's underneath the headline because at this
8 point it still looks like we're quadrupling office space to get 300 more housing units. And that
9 starts to get questionable in terms of the alternative use of the space. Again, it's supposed to
10 be a grant neighbor.

11
12 Ms. Tanner: And we can get more into that both today and then also in January when Ms.
13 Eisberg will be able to join us again.

14
15 Chair Templeton: Yes, and it's getting close. If you can wrap it up, Commissioner Lauing. She's
16 [unintelligible] (inaudible)

17
18 Commissioner Lauing: I'm done, I'm done.

19
20 Chair Templeton: Oh ok. Great, so thank you so much Ms. Eisberg and I think we can come back
21 in more depth, like Ms. Tanner said, after the conclusion of the remainder of the presentation.
22

23 Ms. Tanner: Great, thank you so much. So, I'm going to walk through at a somewhat high level. I
24 do get carried away because I'm very invested in these alternatives and I think there's a lot of
25 richness here that we want to talk about. What I do want to say before as an overall statement
26 for all three is you go from Alternative One to Three, you see more development increasing
27 with Alternative One, Two, and Three. And I really want to honor the work of the Working
28 Group that has 17 times over the last 2-years through the summer, through Shelter in Place, in
29 multiple iterations, and we've had just really strong participation, really great discussion, and
30 dialog and I think really earnest work. And so, one of the things we really wanted to do with
31 Alternatives One, Two, and Three is trying to present different perspectives and as you see
32 from the Strategic Economics, not all of them were seen to be financially feasible perspectives,
33 but we wanted to bring to the PTC and the Council the hopes and the aspirations of the
34 Working Group. And didn't... weren't able to get to 100 percent consensus from the Working
35 Group or even a supermajority I would say of recommending one alternative over the other.
36 And I think each of them represent different kind of groupings of members and different
37 preferences packages and so we'll... that will become clearer I think as I explain a little bit about
38 each alternative.
39

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 And so Alternative One reflects a desire to retain the history office... history 340 Portage
2 building which was a cannery and part of the tradition of our community as part of the Valley of
3 Hearts Delight. It was owned by Thomas Foon Chew who was one of... a very successful Chinese
4 businessman and a very important feature of our history here not only in Silicon Valley and in
5 Palo Alto, but really for the world and for the Chinese American community. And so, because of
6 the cultural events associated with him and with the building is deemed historic for the events.
7 There's also a small office building here that is also deemed historic and so this alternative
8 focuses on the retention of 340 Portage. The building is retained. It is retained either and used
9 as its current uses which is mixed of R&D, office, and retail, or it could be adaptively reused into
10 housing. You can see on the parking lot... what's currently the parking lot of 340 Portage, in that
11 bright yellow color abutting Matadero Creek. That would be envisioned to become housing and
12 then surface parking remaining behind.

13
14 You see on the other major parcel which is current occupied by an office building where the
15 major tenant is Cloudera and that blue represents the outline of that current office building
16 that's there. And there's currently a parking garage and this green berm and kind of tree-lined
17 area that currently exists and is used by many neighbors as a park and as a place to walk your
18 dog and to kind of have some recreation. So, it's envisioned that that parking lot could
19 potentially add some housing, potentially townhomes on that parking lot.

20
21 And then you'll see that something that carries through each of the alternatives, sorry, is along
22 El Camino Real and Page Mill. Kind of concentrating some of the higher density and higher
23 heights, particularly on the corner of... near El Camino and Lambert Avenue, some of the higher
24 heights. And where you see that 50/70, that's where we're talking about the 70-foot being the
25 limit for 100 percent workforce or 100 percent affordable housing and those would be deed-
26 restricted units. You can see behind, 35-foot height limits here which again represents some of
27 the Working Group members who preferred that as their maximum height that they were
28 comfortable with and you also see that reflected in the northern part here on the corner of
29 Park Boulevard and Lambert Avenue a 35-foot height limit. And those are envisioned to be
30 mixed-use where there could be some retail uses. In particular, you'll see carried throughout
31 the alternatives and envision that Portage Avenue could be a retail corridor. An area that there
32 is a signalized intersection there. It could be kind of become this main street for the Plan Area
33 where there's retail, amenities, and a place where folks can gather. The... in part of what we see
34 in this alternative is... and it relates to the question that Commissioner Lauing was asking which
35 is really trying to move away from having office uses here. And so, as office uses redevelop,
36 they are no longer going to be allowed. So, that's one reason why we show the existing
37 Cloudera building remaining in that the property owner would likely want to retain that
38 building because if it was demolished. That property owner would not be able to rebuild that
39 office space in a new building and so overtime trying to have office use exit the Plan Area and
40 yet still allowing for some small format office like a dentist office, optometrist, some neighbors

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 serving offices like that versus large format kind of corporate headquarters that we see
2 currently. And so that's why the office is very low in this plan alternative.

3
4 In Alternative Two, this reflects a desire to have a little bit more change as you can see. The 340
5 Portage building, the historic building here is envisioned to be removed and replaced with
6 multi-family housing with a height up to 50-feet. The office that they currently have, the square
7 footage, would be reconstituted into a new office building. That would be here towards the
8 corner of Portage and Ash Street. And one of the reasons we put that building there is there's a
9 real desire to really make sure that Park Boulevard becomes and is even elevated further as a
10 bike boulevard and a major bike thoroughfare throughout the plan, throughout all alternatives.
11 And so, wanting to put uses that might be more destination, further away from Park Boulevard,
12 or to have limited curb cuts onto Park so that it can again, become a better bike and pedestrian
13 area. And so, in this way cars would be encouraged to come off of El Camino onto Portage and
14 go to the parking facilities for that office building. And then we also, as you remember from the
15 transportation plan, look at having kind of a [unintelligible] here that would encourage really
16 slow speeds for cars and it wouldn't be a place that you're going to drive through if you're
17 trying to get someplace quickly. With the park adjacency here and having these passageways
18 that if the building's not there, that allows some porosity and movement across the site. Really
19 this becoming a destination for recreation for residents for hanging out and for spending your
20 leisure time. We envision that the improved Matadero Creek would be a centerpiece of this
21 park. Right now, the creek is channelized, it's not very attractive, you barely know it's there, it's
22 behind some bushes, and so we really want it to become a more prominent feature and really
23 an asset to the community. On the Cloudera site, you see here similarly the existing office
24 square footage reconstituted into a new building and then to see some multi-family residential
25 there. Again, with more park space as well on Park Boulevard. The Working Group really did
26 feel strongly one, that we want to get to that, as close to that 4-acres per 1,000 as we can. So,
27 we want to keep pushing that and that having the parks adjacent to Park Boulevard. Not only is
28 it in the name of the street, but again with that biking activity that we see. That again, it's really
29 a place where people are biking along, they're stopping at the park, maybe they're going to
30 some of the retail that's nearby and enjoying themselves and really having a European style
31 town square where there's housing adjacent to these parks and they're really activated and
32 livened by those residents. You can see that the office building on Cloudera site is also most
33 adjacent to the train station. Again, for commuters, that makes it an easy place to get to for
34 their commuting. And then you'll see in this alternative, single-family homes here would be to
35 remain of course but they could be also up zoned to allow four plexus, allow four units per lot.
36 So, a modest re-zoning that would allow a design that still resembles a single-family home
37 where it's kind of has that neighborhood character that we want to retain but does add some
38 modest density for those property owners who would like to have that change. One thing I do
39 want to note and again is constant throughout. You see here that the buildings on the corner of
40 El Camino Real and Page Mill, this corner here, are listed at 35-foot height limits and that is a

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 height limit that already exists in our code. That when you're approximate to single-family
2 homes, you need to have a height transition of about 150-feet where it's at 35-feet. And so, we
3 wanted to respect that and maintain that buffer zone and that transition zone near to the
4 single-family homes. And so, you see that reflected here, really reflecting the current zoning in
5 that we would want to continue to have that persist. Likewise, you see that these parcels here
6 are zoned as kind of an industrial office designation and we propose to retain that. And that
7 provides again a buffer between those properties and the single-family homes and then the
8 new residential which might be a higher height. But with this building stepping back or stepping
9 down to 40-feet again, as it begins to abut the single-family homes, or possibly four plexus but
10 again, maintaining that 35-foot height. So, even if it was four units on a lot, we want that house
11 like character to persist in that area of the plan. And we'll go to and you'll see here compared to
12 Alternative One, we have the heights at 50-feet for this mixed-use district here.

13
14 And then lastly Alternative Three we have again very similar to Alternative Two. The main
15 difference here is that we're allowing more office space with the idea that having more office
16 space that can... having more office space would allow and incentivize some property owners to
17 build the housing and to achieve the park space and some of the other amenities that we'd like
18 to see. So, you see this office building is a little bit bigger, I think it's about 100,000-square feet
19 in addition to what is currently on the site and you still see the housing units, the parkland, and
20 similarly, the office on the 340 Portage site is also increased. But other than that, the site is...
21 the plan is pretty much the same as Alternative Two with those exceptions. And then we do
22 want to point out what is drawn out in the plan and will be talked about on a later slide. This is
23 the area that is currently shown and zoned for kind of that industrial use. And just here at the
24 corner of Park... Page Mill and Park Boulevard, we had a relatively recently built-off...
25 combination of office, a little bit of retail and there's a café and housing that's been I think fairly
26 successful. And there's an idea that that type of housing pattern could continue, or should we
27 retain the industrial zoning that's here as a buffer between the train tracks? There'd be the
28 industrial use and those residential uses. And as I said before, many people live near train tracks
29 and it's just a fine place to live, but also could be that we want to lean towards retaining that
30 use which is not very prominent in the City and maybe we want to protect that type of use. So,
31 that's a discussion that we hope that the PTC will have today.

32
33 I do want to just go over a couple of notes and I will try to be brief so we can get to our public
34 comment and discussion. There was a preference for Alternative Two amongst the Working
35 Group. Again, we didn't have I would say a supermajority that shows one alternative over the
36 other but that was a slight majority that did prefer Alternative Two with some folks preferring
37 Alternative One and only one Working Group member preferring Alternative Three. Although,
38 the PTC has received correspondence from obviously other community members who do
39 support Alternative Three.
40

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 Parkland, the desire for parkland to be equivalent to the 4-acres per 1,000 envisioned in our
2 planning documents, our Master Planning Documents, is something that the Working Group
3 really, really wants to see. Understanding that all of that cannot be born by private
4 development but then seeking to have for example any park fees collected either spent within
5 the Planned Area to acquire more parkland or immediately adjacent to the Plan Area in areas
6 that are walkable. So, not across El Camino Real, not across Page Mill, not across the train
7 tracks, but really walkable to the Plan Area and that would be at least within a quarter mile or
8 less adjacent to the Plan Area.

9
10 They were supported for higher densities along El Camino Real with the exceptions that we
11 talked about and a desire again to retain those transition heights between the single-family
12 home and those lower height district and the higher height district. There was also a great
13 support for the transportation improvements. Really, really wanting to emphasize that bike and
14 pedestrian connectivity is a primary and I would say there's consensus amongst the Working
15 Group to really prioritize bikes and pedestrians to try to minimize car access to and car traffic
16 through the site. And really making it a place where you're really only going to drive your car
17 because you need to get to a destination. Not because you're trying to get through the site or
18 use it as a short cut. There is a tremendous support for having low or below-market-rate
19 housing. Presently, we're still maintaining the 15 percent BMR that's required across the City.
20 We will be asking Strategic Economics, and they of course did the BMR study before, if they can
21 look at what can we do to increase that level of affordability of inclusionary. One of the
22 challenges of that inclusionary rate is the depth of affordability it reaches and so what can the
23 City do to have more 100 percent affordable housing? A lot of those tools are more on the
24 financing and policy side and less on the zoning side in terms of how the City can actually
25 support the development of more affordable housing. And we do want to see those pursued
26 both Citywide and some of those would impact the Plan Area. There is a desire for more traffic
27 analysis which we explained would be part of further study and there was a community online
28 survey and there was a preference in that survey for Alternative Three for higher densities and
29 higher residential uses. Primarily wanting to see more housing really achieved through this
30 planning process.

31
32 I'm not going to go over this slide, but you have it in your Packet. Just trying to weigh the
33 wealth of benefits and impacts. One note that we do want to say is the Vehicle Miles Traveled
34 here is not the VMT analysis for CEQA. We're really just trying to think about trip generation
35 and the Parking Demand Management parking here does not reflect the impacts of a TDM
36 program. So, if we develop a Transportation Demand Management Program we may be able to
37 both impact VMT. Overall impact the number of trips and impact the circulation of this area
38 using that type of tool to impact policy and again, you have these slides it... these... this in your
39 Packet as well. Really trying to weigh the alternatives against the community or sorry,
40 community; the City Council adopted goals and more checkmarks mean an indication that we

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 believe and have assessed that that alternative provides more of that benefit and meets that
2 goal to a greater extent than the other alternatives.

3
4 We talked a little bit about financial feasibility and hopefully, my explanation here will make
5 things clearer. We'll see. We really had two analyses. So, in January analysis was published with
6 the first set of three alternatives that were developed by the consultants, and they... part of
7 what they did is they said what are five financially feasible building typologies that could exist
8 that we see being built in areas around Palo Alto and that we believe could be financially
9 feasible in this area? And that ranges from three-story townhomes to eight-story multifamily
10 buildings and some of those designs include ground-floor retail. I looked at Park Fees, found
11 that Park Fees are more viable than Park Land Dedication. That additional ground-floor retail
12 might require incentives. In some ways, ground floor retail is seen as an amenity, not a
13 moneymaker for the developer, but more of an amenity to the users of that space.

14
15 There is a need to overcome the value of existing office uses and so this is something that we
16 want to continue to look closer at. There's the financial feasibility of housing development in
17 and of itself. Does this development make what we believe is enough profit that it would
18 incentive a developer to say yes, I will build that building because I know it's something that I
19 can use to generate the income that I'm looking for? So, that's one measure of feasibility, but
20 the other thing that we're facing here is existing uses, right? Someone is generating revenues or
21 income from an existing use and we need to have zoning and other incentives that say hey, I'm
22 going to go from this use that I have to another use. And so, we've asked Strategic Economics
23 to really look at that and they did do some work and we're hoping that they can continue to
24 build on that to really see what would it do... require to overcome I guess the inertia of the
25 existing uses that are there and, in some cases, those are office uses.

26
27 They identified Alternative Three which they look at of these last three draft alternatives, the
28 latest ones, to see that that's one of the financially feasible alternatives. That efficient housing
29 types and lower parking requirements led to supporting some of the greater financial
30 feasibility. It has greater mixes... mix of uses allows for more office and has the highest
31 opportunity to achieve the community benefits again because we believe we will see more
32 development take place under that alternative.

33
34 Traffic and transportation, we're going to study this in the future and our future studies are
35 going to include traditional intersection Level of Service Study, the Vehicle Miles Traveled
36 Analysis, and looking really at all modes, bikes, and pedestrians as well as vehicles. How they'll
37 move to and through the site and what are the impacts going to be generated from those trips?

38
39 We talked a little bit about the industrial zones parcels and we look forward hearing what the
40 PTC has to say about those parcels and finally Matadero Creek. So, again Matadero Creek is

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 there. A great natural asset that we want to turn from a channelized asset to a natural asset.
2 We had a consulting firm look at the feasibility kind of what would it take to naturalize the
3 creek both in terms of could it be done? Do we have the space? What it would require? What
4 are some preliminary estimates of cost and they developed several concepts, five concepts, of
5 naturalization? And three were technically feasible in that they could sustain the water and
6 actually prevent the flooding and make sure that there is no damage to property or loss of life
7 or anything. So, of those concepts, Concept 3 was preferred by the Working Group, and
8 Concept 1A was preferred and is recommended by Staff.

9
10 So, Concept 1A, which you see here in the slide, would use... would stay within the boundaries
11 of the creek easement and the creek is managed by the Santa Clara Valley Water District but it
12 is not owned by them. They have an easement across the length of the creek with the private
13 properties that abut the creek. And so, this stays within the boundaries of that private... of that
14 easement and really works within those boundaries. And it is across this... across the street,
15 across Lambert Avenue into Boulware Park. Including the expanded Boulware Park and we've
16 been working with Parks and Rec to think about how that would impact the designs that they're
17 putting together for the expanded park and renovated park. And then it would require a new
18 bridge here at Lambert Avenue. It would need to be widened to sustain the water flow and
19 then go here and the across Park Boulevard and on out of the Plan Area.

20
21 Alternative... Concept 3 is much more expanded and it requires more area and so this provides
22 the greatest opportunity for naturalization and really restoring the creek to a natural flowing
23 creek that can change direction and have different character over the course of its life and from
24 season to season. However, it would require a significant amount of private land, which would
25 either need to be purchased or an easement developed or some type of agreement where the
26 property owner would be willing to engage with that. It would also take up a significant part of
27 both the new Boulware Park and the existing Boulware Park and that wouldn't be available for
28 other things like ball fields, playgrounds, etc. which the community has been working to design
29 recently.

30
31 So, again the next steps, we'll come back in January. We will then go to the City Council. Our
32 consultants will be engaged again to refine the alternatives and to do... conduct our studies and
33 then we'll return to City Council with that analysis and information for refinements and
34 direction Staff... well, they will direct Staff to prepare the draft plan and to begin developing the
35 scope for the EIR and conducting the EIR.

36
37 So, that is a lot of information. We have also developed a Miro board this evening for
38 discussion. We're going to try it, see if it's helpful, but we may end up coming back to the slide.
39 So, I'm going to stop sharing my screen at this time and turn it back over to Chair Templeton.

40

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 Chair Templeton: Thank you very much. This is indeed very exciting work that has been done
2 here. Before we go to public comment I wanted to give the Commissioners one more shot at
3 any clarifying questions on the material that has been presented? I see Commissioner Riggs
4 hand up. You get to go first.

5
6 Commissioner Riggs: Great, so Rachael, I... my... I have some questions about the creek and
7 where other alternatives looked at and particularly where... it seems like all the alternatives are
8 daylighting. Was there an alternative assessed that actually completely undergrounded?
9

10 Ms. Tanner: Well, the creek is not underground now so I think (interrupted)

11
12 Commissioner Riggs: I know. Did... was there alternatives assessed that culverted the creek?
13 Completely culverted Matadero Creek?
14

15 Ms. Tanner: No, the assessment was to naturalize it. To explore further naturalization of the
16 creek so we did not explore undergrounding it.
17

18 Commissioner Riggs: That was just an assumption?
19

20 Ms. Tanner: The desire and the direction of the study from the Council was to explore
21 naturalizing the creek so we did not look at other options.
22

23 Chair Templeton: Alright, any further questions Commissioner Riggs? Oh, we may have lost him.
24

25 Commissioner Riggs: No, no, that was... I mean I... that was it. That... I mean I don't want to
26 opionate at this point.
27

28 Chair Templeton: That's... I appreciate it. Commissioner Lauing followed by Commissioner
29 Alcheck.
30

31 Commissioner Lauing: Yeah, just a couple quick questions on what Ms. Tanner just discussed.
32 So, is the creek cost calculated in the feasibility at this point?
33

34 Ms. Tanner: No. If the cost... and I will say the estimates don't take into account some
35 significant costs like purchasing the land that would be needed for the creek and things that I
36 think are difficult to estimate at this time, or certainly would be negotiated and so it really is a
37 rough estimate. I do love [unintelligible] but they are not the best at estimating sometimes. It
38 did not employ the services of the cost estimator formally for that cost estimation.
39

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 Commissioner Lauing: Ok and then the overall... on the product types the overall feasibility was
2 the probable rent or purchase price calculated in that. Is that how you ultimately got the
3 feasibility?
4

5 Ms. Tanner: Yes, that includes what they believed the rents would be, and again, of course, all
6 of this is pre-COVID. I think there is an assumption that may need to be adjusted, but it's just so
7 early to tell what those adjustments would need to be in a post-COVID rent purchase
8 environment.
9

10 Commissioner Lauing: Right, sure, and that all came from the consultant? It didn't come from
11 talking with developers, right?
12

13 Ms. Tanner: The consultant did interview developers and so that was part of the formulation of
14 the feasibility both in terms of what they're seeing as their rents and purchase prices and then
15 what types their building. You know again, what are they actually bringing to market in Silicon
16 Valley?
17

18 Commissioner Lauing: Do you know how sensitive the yellow going to green is? When we saw
19 this in the last we got BMR calculations, they were showing it as almost impossible, but when
20 you drill down it was 100th of a point relative to the return on cost. So, I'm just wondering if
21 they... about that sensitivity, and also the thing that they pointed out is that in the particular
22 project, a given project if they got \$2 million from somewhere else. It radically changed all the
23 factors so is that probably what we're looking at here?
24

25 Ms. Tanner: Yeah, it would be very similar and I think we're fortunate it's the same firm. So,
26 we'll be talking apples and apples when we're talking about the analysis.
27

28 Commissioner Lauing: And then lastly you talked about El Camino staying at 35-feet if it was
29 going... because of the transitioning all along El Camino there and that's except if we get an
30 affordable housing project that would go to 70?
31

32 Ms. Tanner: So, yeah, so it's almost that. So, adjacent to the single-family home zoned parcels it
33 would be 35-feet. The portions that are further towards Lambert I think it's basically after
34 Acacia, would be at the 50-feet and that in those areas as well, Acacia south, there would be a
35 bonus program that would be up to 70-feet for 100 percent workforce and 100 percent
36 affordable housing. That would also be allowed on the Cludera parcel on Page Mill. That bonus
37 on the part that is abutting Page Mill Road.
38

39 Commissioner Lauing: Ok so there are specific areas carved out. Only those areas can be the
40 70-foot.

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1
2 Ms. Tanner: That is the proposal. PTC could propose something different but that's where we're
3 coming in as Staff with (interrupted)

4
5 Commissioner Lauing: No, I just wanted to know the thinking as of now. Thanks very much.

6
7 Ms. Tanner: Yep, that's great.

8
9 Commissioner Lauing: Back to you Chair Templeton.

10
11 Chair Templeton: Thank you so much Commissioner Lauing. Alright, Commissioner Alcheck,
12 you're next.

13
14 Commissioner Alcheck: Hi. A couple questions for Staff. When was the last NVCAP meeting?

15
16 Ms. Tanner: We had one yesterday to preview the... today and try to answer any clarifying
17 questions that our Working Group members had and before then I think it was August.

18
19 Commissioner Alcheck: How many meetings since the alternatives were released?

20
21 Ms. Tanner: Well, we've had a number of alternatives. The very, very first ones were released in
22 January. These most recent ones were developed and I think we... Doria [note – Commissioner
23 Summa], maybe you can help me, I think it was in August that we showed this most recent
24 iterationish. Something around I think (interrupted)

25
26 Commissioner Summa: That sounds about right. I'm bad with dates but that sounds about right.
27 I will say because of the number of people involved in the meetings. I mean you could always
28 take more time to discuss these things and I think that to get to... I think that that's what we
29 need to do later tonight after we hear from the public, also is to identify areas where there may
30 be things that we want from some... one of the alternatives in the other alternative and those
31 kinds of refinements because there's never enough time to talk about these things.

32
33 Ms. Tanner: That's very true.

34
35 Commissioner Alcheck: I'm going to continue at the questions real quick. So, I'm just sort of
36 curious from the perspective of someone not on that Committee. Are the alternatives... have
37 the alternatives evolved a great deal or are they sort of following a... could you tell that they're
38 cousins?

39

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 Ms. Tanner: Well, I think that... I don't want to avoid your question. I feel that they have
2 evolved significantly but they're not... I don't think they're radically different from what we
3 unveiled in January of this year and what we brought to the PTC. But I think there have been
4 some significant and important changes both in the layout that you see in a plan view but also
5 to the substance of what policy proposals are behind some of the ideas.

6
7 Commissioner Alcheck: I presume that property owners inside the NVCAP area saw the latest
8 alternatives when they were published in August. Do you think that's safe to assume?

9
10 Ms. Tanner: I feel like most folks that we've talked to have been following somewhat closely or
11 at least tangentially are aware.

12
13 Commissioner Alcheck: Ok. I guess the thing I'm most surprised about is that you guys haven't
14 gone in-depth yet or maybe you haven't shed light on the Planning Department's perspective
15 on... I'm piecing this together myself, but 2-weeks ago the largest single parcel in this area but
16 forth an application that freezes the current zoning in place to develop 85 units. Presumably,
17 they saw your alternatives, spent 3-months with them, and determined that they weren't
18 particularly attractive. So, I guess I'm curious if Staff feels the same way I do which is that the
19 development of the 85 units blows up this entire NVCAP situation? That if that largest parcel
20 goes the direction that the landowner is proposing it go, that all of this work is in jeopardy.

21
22 Ms. Tanner: I certainly think that the proposal that's been put forward for 200 Portage would
23 preclude any of the designs for any of the alternatives for that parcel. So, Alternative One, Two,
24 or Three as it relates to that particular parcel which is 12-acres would not be able to come to
25 fruition under that proposal at least not as conceived. I will say some of the mobility elements
26 are included, I think some of the efforts to have the street grid reconnected and have some
27 park space are conceived of and carried forward through that proposal. There are
28 representatives from that Sobrato organization that owns the parcel and they has been a
29 representative on the Working Group has participated consistently in the Working Group
30 dialog. I won't speak for the developer and if the Commission decides, later on, they could
31 direct questions if those representatives are willing and in line to answer questions about that
32 proposal and explain their reasons for bringing that forward. I think part of what we have been
33 working to do as Staff has really helped the Working Group to understand that this plan has to
34 be developed in collaboration with property owners. This is 100 percent privately owned land
35 with the exception of the streets and so if property owners are not partners in bringing this to
36 fruition. It will not come to fruition. I think there is some challenge in that some of the
37 alternatives maybe don't reflect that reality and concern from some property owners of what
38 they may or may not do if they do become the zoning and rules and would they be able to
39 enact and bring to light those alternatives. So, that's a long way of saying that Staff was
40 surprised, took a little bit of the wind out of our sails but there are additional 48-acres in this

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 Plan Area that are not insignificant and there are other property owners. We just had that pre-
2 screening for the property proposal on El Camino between Pepper and Olive. And there are
3 folks who want to build housing and who want to play ball if you will with the plan and so we
4 are a little... we're happy to see 85 townhomes. It's housing units that we haven't seen and
5 that's great. We're happy to see some of the connectivity and other things. Certainly, some of
6 what everyone wants to see. Some of the building is being retained including the monitor roofs.
7 Some of the building is demolished which some folks do not want to see, but we don't think its
8 reasonable to give up hope for the entire Plan Area.

9
10 Commissioner Alcheck: I have another question for you. Do you think that the current zoning is
11 most similar to Alternative One, Two, or Three?

12
13 Ms. Tanner: I would have to consider that for a minute. I'm not (interrupted)

14
15 Commissioner Alcheck: And I guess my question is are any of the alternatives more restrictive?

16
17 Ms. Tanner: Well, certainly Alternative One would propose to not allow the reconstitution of
18 new office space so you wouldn't be able to build new offices, or to rebuild any office that you
19 demolish.

20
21 Commissioner Alcheck: Does it... I don't know this... is Staff concerned that in... that the
22 likelihood of development of let's say a product type with 78 units was deemed unlikely under
23 Alternative One and Two and yet the largest parcel owner is proposing doing just that. Does it
24 concern Staff that the Feasibility Study might be... does it create skepticism in your mind?

25
26 Ms. Tanner: Well, I think part of what the Feasibility Study included is land acquisition costs. So,
27 for those who are already holding property if it's not changing hands, it does create a little bit
28 of a different scenario, and so that is a little bit different. Townhomes were shown to be
29 feasible though, a feasible product type. So, it just happens that one of the larger parcels is
30 choosing a lower density or proposing a lower density product type that is also feasible for that
31 site that could potentially sustain a larger density but they're choosing a lower density product
32 type.

33
34 Commissioner Alcheck: Ok the... it... well, I appreciate that there may be representatives of the
35 property owners in the room, but is there... how do I ask this question of Staff? Is there an
36 effort afoot in the last 21-days since you received the application to engage the property owner
37 in a conversation about embarking on the adventure that this is, or has that process not been
38 initiated yet?

39

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 Ms. Tanner: We did meet with the property owner and representatives from 340 Portage and
2 had a good conversation. Again, I think they've been partners all along and participating and so
3 I think that what I think many could read is that... from this situation is that the direction of...
4 was not maybe satisfactory to what they had in mind for the future of their land.
5

6 Commissioner Alcheck: Ok and then my last question, you had the consultant that was... that
7 had to leave early, suggested that the timeline for her realistic estimates was approximately 20-
8 years. Does... if... I'm sort of looking at the alternative... the... these graphs that you created. If
9 you remove the 200 Portage site, could you clarify what the realistic number is? How those
10 would be impacted based on what you allotted those sites for housing?
11

12 Ms. Tanner: I think we do have those numbers (interrupted)
13

14 Commissioner Alcheck: And I just want to make one other point which is, is it safe for me to
15 assume... because you had said this a minute ago... that you have to rely on turnover and land
16 acquisition and sort of volunteer... they have to volunteer into this opportunity. Is it safe to
17 assume that the expectation of development for units not including 200 Portage were weighted
18 on the second half of the two-decade timeframe? Right, so Portage seemed like the most likely
19 to get redeveloped in the near term and the 8,000 potential maximum units for example in one
20 of the scenarios I would... is it safe to assume that those were weighted in the final year? So,
21 two questions there.
22

23 Ms. Tanner: We didn't develop a phasing approach where we said like when we think they'll
24 develop, but really just trying to think like over the next 20-years. So, it wasn't that we said well
25 in year 15 we thin this parcel will turn over. We didn't get to that specificity but more kind of
26 thinking what's the... again, what's the overall time horizon that we're looking at the planning
27 coming to fruition.
28

29 Commissioner Alcheck: Ok. I'm not expecting an answer tonight but I do think that it would be
30 really helpful if at the following meeting, which would take place in January when we have
31 more time to chat if we could get a breakdown of the... I don't have... I don't have the graph on
32 my Packet right now but the graph that she had put up. If we... that consultant had put up. If
33 200 Portage results in 85 units of housing, what would the numbers be in the alternatives
34 assuming they were even feasible or as attractive to developers if for example the density on
35 the largest site was so diminished.
36

37 Ms. Tanner: And we have begun that analysis and we're happy to share that with PTC.
38

39 Commissioner Alcheck: Ok, that would be helpful I think because it's kind of hard to debate the
40 numbers if we're unsure about maybe a big portion of them. Thank you.

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

Chair Templeton: Thank you very much and then after Commissioner Alcheck is Commissioner Summa followed by Commissioner Hechtman.

Commissioner Summa: Thank you. I had a question for Staff about the application from 200 Portage I guess it is for the 85 townhomes and that is... so that's under SB330. How does that affect the historic aspect of the building? My assumption is that somewhere later in the year when the environmental review is being done. There will be a feasibility study for the historic assets and is that changed at all by the application, the pre-application for the townhomes?

Ms. Tanner: SB330 does not exempt projects from a full environmental analysis that's required and so in this case with the historic resource the environmental analysis would be required which would include the historic resource. So, there's no exception to CEQA and to the... that type of consideration.

Commissioner Summa: Ok, thanks and then well, I guess that's all I need to ask now because we're going to discuss later.

Ms. Tanner: Ok, thank you.

Chair Templeton: Thank you, Commissioner Summa. Commissioner Hechtman.

Commissioner Hechtman: Thank you. So, when we met on this in April and we were reviewing the initial three alternatives, which incidentally I did take some time comparing those three to the three that are presented with this Staff report, and there is a tremendous amount of I would call it progress and change when you compare those two sets and that's something that we can dive into later. But what I wanted to know is in April I remember when we met the Working Group who has really done as you mentioned Ms. Tanner a tremendous amount of work, 17 meetings. They had just come up with an alternative and I think it was just before our meeting and so one of the things that was mentioned in the meeting is we really haven't even really had a chance to look at that. So, I can't remember if it was this morning or maybe it was yesterday, we were forwarded what I'm going to guess is an updated version from the... some members of the Working Group. It's not clear to me that it's all of them. I think it's called Alternative M, like Mary and so we've had the Staff presentation on the three alternatives coming from Staff, and I was hoping that there might be... and I don't know if it's planned as part of the public comment, or I don't know if Commissioner Summa who's our liaison of that Committee. I'm hoping somebody will take a little bit of time and walk us through Alternative M so that we can get our arms around that the same way I feel I have with the three alternatives that are in the Staff Report. Is that part of the planned process?

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 Ms. Tanner: That is not part of the planning process. We had a number of alternatives
2 developed by the Working Group so if we were to talk about Alternative M we would need to
3 talk about I think it's Alternatives maybe D through M. So, there would be a number so I think
4 that... while that was developed by two members of the Working Group and one member of
5 the public. It is not represented by the entire Working Group.

6
7 Commissioner Hechtman: And there is no Alternative D through M that is representative of the
8 [unintelligible](interrupted)

9
10 Ms. Tanner: What we've done over the summer is work with the Working Group to understand
11 areas of consensus and areas where there's no consensus. Alternative One does reflect
12 retention of the building which was a key part of Alternative M. What it does not reflect is
13 eminent domain of that building by the City, to purchase it and turn it into affordable housing.
14 It does not also reflect, and I think none of the alternatives do, a significant new source of
15 funding for affordable housing. If the Commission wanted we could talk about sources for
16 affordable housing. Does the City want to do a bond? Does the City want to do a Tax Measure
17 to generate funds to purchase any land, including that building, and turn it into affordable
18 housing? This plan and none of them do conceive of that, but the Alternative One does retain
19 the building and only allows two uses. It's current existing use or adaptive result of the building
20 into affordable housing or into multi-family housing so that's a key part of it.

21
22 That alternative also looked at really focusing on the existing housing opportunity sites as sites
23 turn over for redevelopment. And so those are included in all of these alternatives but also
24 obviously other sites are also included for development. So, I think some of the key features,
25 perhaps not all of Alternative M are in one of the alternatives, but again we hope that Working
26 Group members find a little bit of their alternatives in all of them. No one person will probably
27 find all their preferences in any single alternative.

28
29 Commissioner Hechtman: [unintelligible – no audio]

30
31 Chair Templeton: Alright, thank you, Commissioner Hechtman. Commissioner Summa, I see
32 your hand raised.

33
34 Commissioner Summa: Only if somebody wants further explanation of Alternative M and why I
35 sent it to everyone today, but we... I don't want to derail the public's time either because I feel
36 like we'll have time to discuss that later.

37
38 Chair Templeton: Exactly, I agree with you. Alright, I don't see any more hands up for technical
39 questions. I had a couple of real quick ones. That spaces that we have for light industrial

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 between Park Boulevard and the tracks. Is that something that you could consider to increase
2 the amount of parkland in that area instead of more housing or is housing a better use there?

3
4 Ms. Tanner: It certainly could be an area for parkland. I think part of it depends on how is the
5 parkland being obtained. So, any of the parkland that's featured in green and even the idea that
6 a certain percentage of any parcel that is redeveloped would have some parkland dedicated.
7 Even if it's just 5 percent like a pocket park or something is the idea that that parcel is being
8 redeveloped and some portion of that parcel is becoming parkland. So, could the entire area
9 become parkland? Sure, if we can get some money up to buy it and turn it into parks, but there
10 would likely be some development in concert with that becoming a parkland. So, maybe not all
11 of it but certainly some of it could.

12
13 Chair Templeton: Ok, that makes more sense. I appreciate that and then why was that
14 channelization of the creek done and do these two new concepts address those issues? I seem
15 to recall it's some flood protection?

16
17 Ms. Tanner: Yeah, there's certainly... in certainly part of the purpose... the creek's purpose
18 going way back. It's to catch water and get it to the ocean, but certainly part of the
19 improvements of the modern era are to try to prevent flooding. And even in 1998, I believe
20 there was massive flooding and so a lot of the improvements really are for that which is why
21 the feasibility was needed to say like well if we're going to have naturalization and also the
22 flood mitigation properties. How do we have those two things working together? So, that was...
23 that needed to be maintained for any of the alternatives for the creek.

24
25 Chair Templeton: That makes sense. Sorry, I have a bunch of questions about the creek so the
26 one that... well, do both them... you said they were near the Boulware Park. My kids played
27 there when they were growing up and they do like to run. Do you envision that the safety for
28 small kids playing at the park would be part of your improvement proposal as well?

29
30 Ms. Tanner: Certainly, it would be and I should say one of the benefits of either of the... any of
31 the concepts that are feasible would be allowing more access to the creek where people could
32 have walking paths, biking paths, get up near the water. As you know it is more seasonal as we
33 have in California and so it isn't like a big gushing flowing river. So, certainly, we would want to
34 have some safety measures, but I think it would in some ways be much safer because there
35 would be more access and openness. Right now, there's been some complaints of some crime,
36 it's kind of out of the way. You know it can be (interrupted)

37
38 Chair Templeton: So, it's an overall improvement? Ok.

39
40 Ms. Tanner: Yeah, yeah.

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

Chair Templeton: Great. Two more questions. The Pepper Avenue, the homes on the Page Mill side of Pepper Avenue that about that little L shaped area of residential retail mixed-use. Just you touched on it earlier and I wanted to make sure I understand it. So, the height limits that are in this proposal are not a change from the current height limits for (interrupted)

Ms. Tanner: That is correct. They are not an increase or decrease in the current height limits.

Chair Templeton: Because that little niche of houses, the red... the R1 houses there looks intimidatingly surrounded by other types of uses so I wanted to make sure that their needs were addressed. Ok.

Great, ok and then last thing, I just wanted to agree with something that Commissioner Alcheck mentioned. That when you do come back in January I would love to see these charts have like in parenthesis beside the height, the approximate number of homes or people or whatever is the right unit, but just so that we can start to understand where these qualities and that trade-off that might happen if certain parcels develop differently. That... if that's possible. If you had that number, that would be really cool to see it.

Ms. Tanner: That's a great suggestion. We can certainly do that.

Chair Templeton: Alright, so Commissioners normally around 8 o'clock we do a pulse check and see if we want to take a break.

Commissioner Alcheck: Are we going to... are we taking public comment?

Chair Templeton: We are taking public comment. That's what I was getting to. Hold your horses there. Since we're about to enter into what looks like potentially 30 to 45-minutes of public comment. Do we want to take a break or just head right in and then Commissioners can drop in and out if you need to go refill your water or whatever? 5-minute break? I see several nodding your heads for that. Ok, we are going to start whether everybody's back or not so I hope you can really keep it tight. So, 7:46? See you then, thank you.

[The Commission took a 5-minute break]

Chair Templeton: Alright, thank you Commissioner Summa for returning in a timely fashion. I appreciate that. If other Commissioners are back, please turn on your video so that we can see that you're here and once we have a quorum we will resume the meeting.

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 Commissioner Summa: Are we... Chair Templeton, after we take public comment are we going
2 to have some discussion or just continue the meeting at that point?

3
4 Chair Templeton: I think we should do a check-in and see because we now have 15
5 commenters, but I think we should at least have one round because we'll want to give some
6 feedback to Staff and of course well need to make a motion to continue at some point. Ok,
7 thanks.

8
9 Chair Templeton: Thank you. Oh, the hands are raising. Ok, let's see, there's Commissioner
10 Riggs. Vice-Chair Roohparvar, Commissioner Lauing, are you guys back yet? Commissioner
11 Alcheck? Alright. Let's get one more and then we'll get started. Ok, I think we are ready, to
12 begin with, public comments and I'll just repeat what I said as we were heading to our quick
13 break. Many of you are affiliated with the North Ventura Coordinated Area Plan Working Group
14 and if you want to say so at the beginning. Not all of our Commissioners necessarily won't
15 recognize the names of and associate with the group... the formal group itself. So, if you want
16 to disclose that, that would be super helpful to understand your perspective and if you have
17 some other affiliations like property owner, homeowner, a renter, Ventura resident, any other
18 kind of thing like that, you can share that as well. It's certainly helpful to understand the
19 context of your comments, of course, that's always optional. So, let's get started. Mr. Nguyen,
20 are you available?

21
22 Mr. Vinhloc Nguyen, Admin Associate III: Yes. It looks like so far, we have 18 raised hands, and
23 as soon as the timer... there it is. Ok, so our first speaker will be Rebecca Sanders.

24
25 Ms. Rebecca Sanders: Oh wow, this is an honor. So, I'm Rebecca Sanders, Becky to many of you
26 and I live in Ventura. I am involved in both the Ventura Neighborhood Association and the Palo
27 Alto Neighbors. An umbrella organization connecting neighborhood associations across the
28 City. I'm here to state for the record that both of these organizations favor creative solutions
29 and out of the box approaches to building as much housing as possible on the site, but still
30 providing adequate park and community amenities for these new residences.

31
32 Super concerns we have is that none of these alternatives have adequate parkland as called for
33 in our Comp Plan. It's been pointed out even by Rachael. Thank you, Ms. Tanner, so again
34 Ventura will be stiffed on parks. Really tired of that. Even with the addition of Boulware, thank
35 you so much, we are still lagging for parks so that's a real problem for us with all three of the
36 alternatives.

37
38 And there's been no real transportation analysis. All three alternatives promote cut-through
39 traffic by having Portage go all the way to Park now instead of creating a bikeable and walkable
40 community. That is one thing that the entire Working Group agreed on. None of these plans

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 encourage drivers to do something other than just zig-zag and zip along the streets of Ventura.
2 So, I'm bummed out about that.

3
4 And plus, I am one of the geniuses behind Alternative M. I take credit along with Keith and
5 Terry. You know housing for people that need it the most, housing that is not being built. We're
6 ahead in the game of luxury and at market-rate but we're way behind the eight ball and missing
7 middle BMR truly affordable. So, yeah, PAN specifically endorsed Alternative M which was
8 brought forward by Working Group members and me, but it never seriously got looked at. It
9 doesn't pencil out. Building housing without a profit motive never pencils out. Building a... so
10 how can it? So, that's why we recommend bolds strokes to build the housing we want there.
11 Let's do a partnership, let's get into the business of building housing as a community. Other
12 Cities do it.

13
14 Now I know many of us are panicking about the pandemic, but we do need a long-range plan.
15 We... why would give up and just take the path of least resistance when we have this amazing
16 opportunity and so housing has to cancel office space. I really hope you will see that.

17
18 Also, many of us are panic about RHNA, which as you all know is way out of proportion this
19 cycle to what Palo Alto can even reasonably sustain. Former Council Member Greg Schmidt did
20 a ton of research, communicated with City Council, RHNA process is suspect and the RHNA
21 numbers have been arrived at using a faulty methodology. So, they may well change and so
22 density on El Camino Real is one thing but massive massing drive toward Park is a real concern
23 for me. I would like for Ventura to have parody with other neighborhoods so please just don't
24 oh my gosh, drop a large spaceship in the middle of North Ventura.

25
26 And then also I'm super bummed out about the proposed Sobrato and the other project being
27 built in the Plan B Area Plan Area which completely just throws everything... a monkey wrench
28 so thanks so much, everybody.

29
30 Mr. Nguyen: Thank you Rebecca for joining us tonight. Our next speaker is Waldek. Waldek if
31 you're there, can you please unmute yourself?

32
33 Mr. Waldek Kaczmariski: Hi. So, I'm a member of the Working Group. I also live across the street
34 on the numbered avenue so I am facing the future development and I'm very disappointed with
35 the newest development with 200 Portage. And that's why I would not comment on other
36 aspects of this plan except for the things that apparently the City can't control which is streets
37 and dedicated parkland.

38
39 So, two things, the Ventura Neighborhood was originally industrial area and therefore it's
40 lacking public infrastructure that historically was provided to other neighborhoods. And I

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 believe that this thing should be fixed if possible. If we could afford this thing in the past, then
2 we should be able to afford this thing now and bring Ventura to pair with the rest of Palo Alto.
3 And therefore, I am actually surprised that we did not reach the guidance as far as the park
4 averages for all neighborhoods. The neighborhoods should not be... the park averages should
5 not be proportional to the area. It should be proportional to the number of the residences. We
6 want a lot of people to live here so we should provide them with the parkways.

7
8 The other aspect is that Park Boulevard, it's my personal preference so I believe that there was
9 quite consensus in the Working Group that the Park Boulevard should be pedestrian and bicycle
10 spine for the whole Ventura Neighborhood. Connecting Ventura to California Avenue and that
11 to become a really nice through boulevard. Therefore, any car approaches to that street should
12 be limited and the street should be widened as far as the pedestrian walkways and should be
13 surrounded by the landscape created really like a boulevard. Thank you.

14
15 Mr. Nguyen: Thank you for joining us tonight. Our next speaker is Gail Price.

16
17 Ms. Gail Price: Good evening. Dear Chair Templeton and PTC Commissioners, my name is Gail
18 Price, I'm Co-Chair of the Working Group, but I'm here tonight speaking as Board President of
19 Palo Alto Forward and a Barron Park resident.

20
21 I urge you to fully explore and expand Alternative Three. Both the Staff Report and the findings
22 of the Strategic Economics Financial Feasibility Study recognize that Alternative Three, housing
23 intensity and variety, combined with mixed-uses including office uses, and community benefits
24 is the most economically feasible.

25
26 The Working Group, Staff, and community have worked on this subject area for over 2-years.
27 The ultimate result of this effort are already being compromised by the piece mill development
28 proposals. It's clear that the Portage pre-ap proposal is a keystone property in the study area
29 and impacts the TIRE boundary area and definitely impacts the potential to develop housing.

30
31 Alternative Three captures the potential and great benefits for the Ventura/ California Avenue
32 area that could be achieved as a more inclusive, thriving, and vibrant part of Palo Alto. The
33 Working Group has revisited circulation, land use, density, and development standards many
34 times, but little will be accomplished until a bolder and more ambitious alternative or
35 alternatives are chosen. To actualize the vision, serious changes to development standards
36 including density, parking, and height limits are necessary to enable the production of housing
37 that can be built. We are in a housing crisis and it remains very critical.

38
39 Intensification of the NVCAP with a planned horizon of 5 to 20-years is critical to Palo Alto
40 demonstrating our willingness to meet both RHNA Regional Housing Goals and many

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 community benefits that could accrue. I encourage you to look at this seriously and to be open-
2 minded as you provide policy guidance to the City Council.

3
4 We also support all of the policy strategies identified and believe further ones are necessary to
5 examine new funding sources and negotiations and strategies that have been used successfully
6 with developers to get outcomes the community needs and wants.

7
8 Thank you very much and just a reminder that the feasibility of Alternative Three when it was
9 reviewed also is directly aligned with the impacts and benefits identified in the Comprehensive
10 Plan. Basically, Alternative Three, I believe should be expanded and is aligned with pre-existing
11 policies, initiatives, and practices in the City of Palo Alto. Thank you very much.

12
13 Mr. Nguyen: Thank you for your comments. Our next speaker is Kirsten Flynn. Kirsten, if you're
14 there, please unmute yourself.

15
16 Ms. Kirsten Flynn: I had to get my cursor over there. Ok, I'm Kirsten Flynn. It's been a privilege
17 to be selected and an honor to serve on NVCAP Working Group. Over the 2 ½-years, I have
18 learned so much, listened so much, read so much, watched more City Planning videos than I
19 ever thought I would in my life. I did this because I want to help create a plan that helps the
20 neighborhood I love, the region I love and the City where I have lived my whole life and where I
21 and 11 members of my family live and work, and where I run my small business.

22
23 The Working Group has engaged in a respectful process and has come to hard thought
24 consensus embodied in the three plans you see before you. I would like to speak to three of the
25 top priorities that emerged during our long process for your consideration.

26
27 First of all, we are cognizant that these plans might have more height and density than some
28 members of our community are happy with. But one idea that came through very clearly from
29 our outreach and from within our group was that are our neighbors put a very high value on
30 affordable housing. Our neighborhood for years has been the most affordable in Palo Alto. Our
31 neighbors understand what it is like to scrape to make rents so you can stay in a town where
32 your children will get a good education or to save hard to buy a house that is near your family.
33 They're willing to put up with some increased height and some increased traffic to help Palo
34 Alto to get to its RHNA targets, but only if it leads to truly affordable housing and does not
35 exacerbate our jobs/housing imbalance.

36
37 Secondly, our neighborhood has traditionally been under-resourced. It is bound on three sides
38 by railroad tracks, El Camino Real and Page Mill. So, it is a challenge to walk to anything, but it
39 does not have viable retail, a neighborhood school, or enough parkland. This has to change.
40 This is a social equity issue. You cannot expect the most affordable neighborhood in our City to

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 absorb the traffic and buildings that exceed height limits in order to achieve the City's housing
2 units' goals without providing mitigation and a high quality of neighborhood life. Parks are
3 important to that quality of life and so is the place making allowed by preserving historical
4 structures as in Plan Two, which preserves the monitor roofs section of the historic building.
5

6 Finally, we must keep the bike boulevard safe as we increase density in our neighborhood. This
7 was a top priority that we heard over and over again as we deliberated and got feedback from
8 the public meetings. Many moved to the neighborhood partly so that they could access a
9 bicycle commute. In order to create a low carbon neighborhood bikes, need to be a safe means
10 of transportation. This is especially true in the last mile of commute from Cal Avenue Train
11 Station to a workplace.
12

13 So, to summarize, important priorities are affordable housing, not just low-density market-rate
14 housing, parks, and other amenities, and keep our bike boulevard safe. We respectfully ask that
15 you consider these as top priorities as you evaluate these plans.
16

17 Mr. Nguyen: Thank you for your comments. Our next speaker is Angela Dellaporta.
18

19 Ms. Angela Dellaporta: [note – audio cut in mid-sentence] a residence of and a homeowner in
20 Ventura Neighborhood and I'm a member of the NVCAP Working Group. First, I want to thank
21 City Staff for their hard work, patience, and expertise in preparing this report and in attempting
22 to include all the wishes and opinions of the Working Group which was no easy task. The
23 alternatives in the report to reflect many of the Working Group's recommendations for the
24 NVCAP area. However, I'd like to reiterate and highlight two issues that Ms. Tanner has
25 mentioned that are most important to the Working Group and to local residents.
26

27 First, affordable and middle-income housing is very important to everyone in the Working
28 Group. The Working Group with the help of City Staff compiled a document detailing a variety
29 of ways in addition to density bonuses through which more affordable housing could be
30 achieved. And I would like to see that document as well as the need for affordable housing and
31 middle-income housing predominately featured in the alternative that is eventually presented
32 to the City Council.
33

34 Second, park spaces as everyone has been mentioning. Palo Alto Comprehensive Plan and its
35 Park's Master Plan both wisely require 4-acres of park space for every 1,000 residents. At this
36 time Palo Alto, unfortunately, falls far short of this goal at I think only about 2.7-acres per 1,000
37 residents where it should be 4. Both San Francisco and Mountain View have far more park
38 space per resident than Palo Alto currently has. Because of the concern that property owners
39 would not be satisfied with the financial profitability of park space, these alternatives presented
40 tonight provide only 1-acre to at most 1.5-acres of park space per 1,00 residents. That ratio for

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 the NVCAP area would push Palo Alto's park space ratio even lower than it already is. In high-
2 density areas such as these recommended in these alternatives, park space is even more
3 important than in neighborhoods where residents already have their own tree-filled back yards.
4 To crowd 3,000 people into the NVCAP area and not provide plenty of park space, it seems to
5 me would simply be wrong.

6
7 I'm sure that we all want Palo Alto to be a City that makes room for residence with a variety of
8 income levels and for plenty of public park space. I'm also confident that the City can figure out
9 how to do this. The alternative which might please developers, but no one else, would be a
10 crowded area of expensive condos with apostasy of green space. I think Palo Alto is better than
11 that. Thank you.

12
13 Mr. Nguyen: Thank you for your comments. Our next speaker is John Wizard.

14
15 Mr. John Wizard: Hello. Good evening. Thank you for the opportunity to address the
16 Commission. My name is John Wizard. I'm a representative of VMB Law, a 501C3 non-profit
17 corporation and our mission is to increase the accessibility and the affordability of housing in
18 California.

19
20 I'd like to thank Assistant Planning Director Tanner for her comments earlier related to
21 opportunity sites listed in the Housing Site inventory and the need to up zone them to
22 accommodate the RHNA. And also, her acknowledgment of the opportunity to remove those
23 opportunity sites and how that would necessitate a rezoning to satisfy the no-net loss rule or
24 law rather in California.

25
26 I prepared a letter that I sent into the Commission earlier but I'll read now for the benefit of the
27 other members attending... the members of the public attending. Yimby Law supports, or I'm
28 sorry, submits this letter to inform you that the City of Palo Alto has an obligation to abide by all
29 relevant state housing laws and evaluate the above-referenced planning area. That being the
30 NVCAP. California Government Code § 65583.2, Section (c), Section (3), Section (B), Section (iii)
31 requires the City to maintain an inventory of land suitable for residential development during a
32 given planning period and that those identified sites be sufficient to provide for the
33 jurisdiction's share of the regional housing need for all income levels. Furthermore, in order for
34 sites identified in this inventory to be reused during multiple planning periods or Housing
35 Elements, the City must not only zone these sites for a minimum of 20 units per acre but also
36 provide for residential use by right so long as 20% of the proposed housing is for low-income
37 households. If the current zoning for these sites does not conform to these provisions of the
38 Government Code, the city must develop and implement policies and programs with specific
39 tasks to be completed in no more than two years that will achieve compliance.

40

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 Given the Sixth Cycle of RHNA coupled with the City's trend in permits and expected yield for
2 the identified sites on the Housing Inventory, the Yimby Law encourages the city to upzone all
3 of the sites in the NVCAP to better accommodate a diverse range of housing types and income
4 levels. In addition to the requirement to affirmatively further fair housing, pursuant to AB 686
5 by Member Santiago, preventing the continued gentrification of this area and the displacement
6 of BIPOC residents it's of the utmost importance that the City not locate all of the low-income
7 housing on a site with groundwater contamination and that the City's 10,058 new housing units
8 as identified through the RHNA would not be focused in this area but instead spread out over
9 higher amenity area such as the downtown. Thank you very much for the opportunity to
10 address you this evening and I hope that the Commission will pursue an even greater quality of
11 housing and amenities for this region so as not to force it into other parts of the community
12 where members may not want it. Thanks again.

13

14 Ms. Nguyen: Thank you for your comments. Our next speaker is Cedric.

15

16 Mr. Cedric: Hello. I'm Cedric. A long time... born and bred in Palo Alto. I live in Barron Park. So,
17 first on creek naturalization, I support Option Three with maximum width and naturalization.
18 This eats into private property. Private property was the first to eat into the natural creek
19 channel for private gain without any consideration for the impacts on the natural ecosystem.
20 The full naturalization does the most to restore the balance and provide the best parklike
21 experience for this valuable natural resource. Development of adjacent parcels will require
22 open space contributions so we can just require them to go into the creek for essential open
23 space benefit rather than a bunch of less useful micro parks. Some tell you that it's too
24 expensive, but if we can find money to build a \$37 million parking garage and \$5 million train
25 grade separations. Then we can certainly find money to naturalize the creek. A naturalized
26 creek is a beneficial addition to Boulware Park as exemplified by the popularity of the creek
27 access in Boul Park. Real estate acquisition cost were included based on recent assessments of
28 roughly \$4 million an acre and the feasible naturalization option of those which would not
29 cause flooding.

30

31 On transportation, I urge the City to work with Caltrans to add a dedicated right turn lane from
32 northbound El Camino Real to eastbound Page Mill. This would dramatically reduce cut-through
33 traffic through the neighborhoods and increase bike safety on Park Boulevard. I support the
34 one-way converses of Pepper and Olive to support this change. Also, we should not have a
35 through car traffic in the heart of the Fry's area and instead focus on pedestrian and bike
36 spaces.

37

38 In regarding to building forms and density. Throughout this process, I have advocated for
39 rooftop gardens and stepped back building's forms. Yet the plan essentially does not mention
40 these typologies. Stepping back every floor or every other floor would maintain pedestrian

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 scale and allow higher densities without oppressive. This form could be incentivized by zoning
2 and ordinances. The benefits of rooftop gardens including on the stepped back levels and on
3 large balconies would be to provide residents access to private open space. Satisfying the need,
4 the human right of access to nature. It's more attractive to the residents and to the public. It's
5 more supportive of the natural environment by providing from a bird's eye view gardens
6 instead of blank roofs. The extended quarantine highlights the need for access to private space.
7 Particularly for our apartment dwellers and places where buildings have been built with roof
8 gardens has spurred other developers nearby to mimic this pattern because they were so
9 popular with residents of those buildings.

10
11 In terms of historic, I would like to preserve the monitor rood section. There was no discussion
12 in the plan of community facilities of what could be included and where, but in early
13 community meetings there was a lot of support for things like senior centers, maker spaces,
14 etc.

15
16 Finally, message to the clerk, I would encourage you to announce the next two speakers when
17 naming the next to speak so that people know that their turn to speak is coming up soon. Thank
18 you very much.

19
20 Ms. Nguyen: Thank you Cedric for your comments. I think that is a great suggestion. Our next
21 three speakers will be Chris Colohan followed by Rebecca Eisenberg and then followed by Lund.

22
23 Mr. Chris Colohan: Hi, my name is Chris Colohan, and I'm a homeowner in the Community
24 Center Neighborhood and I am totally new to this whole process. And so, I'm just attending
25 today's meeting because I'm curious and interested. And I'm blown away by the levels of
26 complexity that is going into this process and the amount of thought and effort that goes into
27 this and I really appreciate what I'm hearing tonight. It's pretty amazing and like a lot of the
28 speakers, I want everything. I want us to have more housing, to have low density, to have high
29 density, and to have tall buildings and short buildings and everything. I want it all, but I can't get
30 it so I just thought I'd tell you what my personal top priorities which is we should go big or go
31 home. I mean go big or build homes that is because quite frankly, we need to lower the cost of
32 housing somehow in the City and the only way that seems economically feasible to me is to
33 build more houses anyway we can and everywhere we can. Because that will get us to the point
34 where things are affordable for people to live here and I want my young friends to be able to
35 afford to live in the City. I want my kids to be able to afford to live in this City and to that, we
36 need to build more homes and so that's really all I've got to say so I'll just pass the baton on to
37 the next person. Thank you.

38
39 Ms. Nguyen: Thank you Chris for joining us tonight. Rebecca is our next speaker.

40

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 Ms. Eisenberg: Hi there. I am grateful to be able to speak. I'm speaking on behalf of the 8,000
2 Palo Alto residents who voted for me to be City Council Member last month. First, I insist that
3 you consider Alternative M. As Mr. Wizard earlier said, the RHNA numbers are not optional. It's
4 the law. The state is just one step away from imposing personal liability for local officials who
5 violate this law. Do you want to risk that because that is what you continue to do, violate the
6 law, each time you prioritize billionaire commercial developers and private schools over legal
7 compliance and housing?

8
9 North Ventura use to be the most diverse neighborhood in Palo Alto before John Sobrato family
10 bought up 50 residential acres, including many homes from African American families and he
11 and his family now seek to impose this exploitative property agenda on the area. You don't get
12 to be worth \$10 billion by providing low-income housing. We need a new way to fund
13 affordable housing and Alternative M proposed quite a few ones that are at least worth
14 investigating. Yet somehow Commissioner Alcheck lobbies for Mr. Sobrato and Ms. Tanner
15 refuses to call him by name. This is public record. It's John Sobrato who bought 50 residential
16 acres in Ventura, North Ventura.

17
18 Now I'm very grateful to Chair Templeton who asks for facts and numbers and not just these
19 generalities. I have a degree in math so here I am giving you a few. First of all, Commissioner
20 Lauing was correct when he said that the numbers about employees per square foot... feet is
21 off. And I know because I actually handled the building and moving into facilities for several
22 high-tech companies when I was their general counsel and here's the actual rule of thumb.
23 Each employee needs only 100-square feet to qualify for OSHA compliance. That is what most
24 technology companies believe. Stop asking the developers what they think. Ask around. You're
25 data's bad. Once... 100... one employee per 100-square feet means that 100,000-square feet
26 office development creates 1,000 jobs. 1,000 jobs while 100,000-square feet of homes
27 development creates 50, 2,000-square foot homes, or 100, 1,000-square foot homes which is
28 pretty small for that neighborhood. So, each 100,000-square feet of office space, are you going
29 to approve and designate 1,000 homes? Somehow, I doubt it. That will put you even further
30 into breach of the law. Build homes, not office space. They don't even pay taxes. Thank you.

31
32 Mr. Nguyen: Thank you for your comments. Our next three speakers will be Lund followed by
33 Robert Chun followed by David Meyer. So, up next is Lund.

34
35 Mr. Lund Smith: Thank you. This is Lund Smith. I am one of the NVCAP members and I just
36 wanted to start off by thanking Staff and the other group members. As it's been mentioned
37 we've had almost 20 meetings and it's been a lot of work and there's been a lot of thought and
38 effort put in by Staff, by the working members, also by consultants and it's been a great
39 opportunity to be part of it.

40

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 I feel like the... really one of the main reasons why I joined the group, to begin with, and I
2 should also add that I'm one of the two developers that's part of the group. And I've viewed
3 this... I've really viewed this area as a huge opportunity for housing and I feel like the
4 alternatives that are before you tonight, Alternative One, Two, and Three. They do go part of
5 the way towards offering more housing but I also tend to agree with what Gail Price mentioned.
6 That they're... Alternative Three has the most dense housing and provide opportunities but it's
7 also... anyways, I feel like there is some left on the table with Alternative One and Two. Just
8 anyways, there obviously trade-offs in the variety of the alternatives and they're trying... and
9 Staff did a great job trying to accommodate all of the different opinions of all the Working
10 Group members. But anyway, just overall comment I think housing, like as has been said
11 tonight is a huge priority for the area.

12
13 I wanted to focus in on specifically Olive Avenue. We have been... I represent ownership that
14 owns nine homes on Olive. In the three alternatives, there's three different designations I
15 wanted to kind of bring to Staff's attention and also to the Commission. So, in Alternative One,
16 Olive Avenue is shown as R2. It's important to note that R2... we have substandard lot sizes on
17 Olive and the way the R2 is currently written. Any lot size that is less than 7,500-square feet can
18 actually only accommodate one house. So, I think it's important to note the general impact for
19 our specific sites is that that would not increase the density at all and to be honest, R1 with the
20 current state law with ADUs and JADUs. We have looked at concepts for when we can
21 potentially put three units on one lot size and in Alternative One it actually would potentially
22 downsize the use of what we could right now so it would allow for potentially less housing.
23 Alternative Two and Three, although the concept is to allow duplexes, fourplexes, and even six
24 plexus if combining lots. I think that a lot of that depends on the details. Can we in fact merge
25 lots and get more units or not? So, I just wanted to bring to the Commission's attention and
26 Staff's attention that actually leaving the zoning at R1 may actually result in more units being
27 built on those sites. Thank you.

28

29 Mr. Nguyen: Thank you for your comments. Our next speaker is Robert.

30

31 Mr. Robert Chun: Thank you very much. My name's Robert Chun. I'm a graduate student at
32 Stanford. This is my 7th year living or working in Palo Alto area. First, I want to echo the
33 comments other folks had made. Thank you to the planning Staff, thank you to the Commission
34 Members, the Working Group Members for the hard work on the NVCAP proposal. It really
35 shows as a renter, as a millennial, I think this is a really, really exciting opportunity if we can get
36 NVCAP right. It's a huge step towards a more affordable, walkable, welcoming Palo Alto.

37

38 So, my comment tonight is pretty simple and it echoes what others have said. I would really ask
39 that Alternative Three really be used as the baseline scenario and that other scenarios build and
40 expand on it. In my view, we really need this proposal to reflect the urgency of our housing

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 crisis. Especially given Palo Alto's new RHNA goals and I'll just say, I find it a little disappointing
2 when two of the three alternatives presented in the report, Alternative One and Alternative
3 Two, are scenarios that independent experts have concluded to be financially unworkable. I
4 mean it sounds obvious but it's true, right? Like a home's not going to help anybody if it only
5 exists on paper. Palo Alto families need real homes in transit-rich, walkable neighborhoods, and
6 right now only Alternative Three is even coming close to that goal.

7
8 So, I'll just end by saying are we serious about making sure Palo Alto is affordable? Are we
9 serious about letting teachers, firefighters, police officers live in the communities that they
10 serve? If so, let's make sure the NVCAP is aligned with that vision. Let's only proceed with
11 scenarios that enable financially viable development and let's build and expand on Alternative
12 Three so the proposal reflects the urgency of the housing crisis. Thank you very much and I
13 yield the remainder of my time.

14
15 Mr. Nguyen: Thank you for your comments. Our next speaker is David.

16
17 Mr. David Meyers: Thanks very much. My name is David Meyer. I represent Silicon Valley at
18 Home which is an affordable housing advocacy organization that works across Santa Clara
19 County. Also, in the before times before COVID, I use to bike pretty much all the time through...
20 directly through Ventura Neighborhood on the way to see my wife at Stanford. Something I
21 obviously don't do much of anymore.

22
23 I really appreciated the work Staff has done to get us to this point and the work of the Working
24 Group Members who've really dedicated a lot of time to this process. And at the end of the day,
25 the goal of a planning process like this is to find the right balance of incentives and guidelines
26 that are going to enable successful redevelopment that are meetings the community's needs
27 and goals. And I think it's just clear that the North Ventura area is an important opportunity for
28 the City of Palo Alto to create new housing opportunities for people of all incomes. It's near
29 transit, Caltrain, it's near existing shops and restaurants along Cal Avenue, it's in the center of
30 really one of the region's largest jobs centers. So, SV to Home really urges the City of Palo Alto
31 to study at a minimum Staff Alternative Number Three and actually consider opportunities to
32 increase the amount of housing beyond what Alternative Number Three even envisions.

33
34 As... Alternative Three currently envisions... it's creating the most new housing, it's creating the
35 most opportunities for deed-restricted affordable housing and it's also resulting in the potential
36 for the largest amount of open space and resources for other key community benefits. All the
37 Staff analysis, all this work is clearly showing that a housing rich vision, mixed-use vision like
38 Alternative Three is key to achieving all these different housing goals the City has.

39

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 We know kind of three key points, right? More housing is leading to more community benefits.
2 There's that relationship between the benefits we can achieve and our decisions to provide
3 incentives for more housing that are going to result in more fees that are going to help us pay
4 for the daylight at Matadero Creek. They're going to help us pay for deed-restricted affordable
5 housing. They're going to help us pay for parkland. Also, as many people have mentioned, more
6 housing... this Alternative Three is associated with greater feasibility. We can create a plan of
7 whatever we want, but if developers don't have any incentives to redevelop in the way we
8 want. We're not going to get those fees. We're not going to get any parks. We're not going to
9 get any affordable housing. We really want to advance a plan that's actually going to result in
10 the vision that we're discussing here. And also, as some people have mentioned here already,
11 more housing is going to give us greater flexibility for the City of Palo Alto to meet its state
12 housing requirements under RHNA. We're not proposing dumping all these requirements into
13 North Ventura. That's certainly not something that we want to do, but at the end of the day,
14 going bolder is going to give the City more flexibility down the line.

15
16 So, I'm so glad to hear all the support in the community for affordable housing, but the City
17 wants to really figure out how to get more affordable housing. You're going to have to raise
18 money. We're going to have to plan bolder. If the City wants to get to 20 percent affordability
19 or wants to get more standalone affordable housing which is something we certainly support.
20 We're going to have to give more incentives. We're going to have to allow more density. We
21 have to be bold or else it's just not going to happen so thank you.

22
23 Mr. Nguyen: Thank you for your comments. Our next three speakers will be Kevin Ma followed
24 by Kelsey Banes and then followed by Jeff. So, up first is Kevin Ma.

25
26 Mr. Kevin Ma: Good evening PTC Members. My name is Kevin Ma and I am a renter in the
27 Ventura Neighborhood. I support Staff and the NVCAP and with all the work they have done
28 with this effort. I will note that of all the efforts we're going to do, at the end of the day it really
29 depends on it getting done which means there needs to be financial incentives to happen
30 because we can make plans all we want, but if there's no money and there's no pressure on it.
31 It's just going to end up like a [unintelligible] like the Bascom Plan where a lot of good projects,
32 none of them offered because we know that the City is going to face a lot of questions over
33 how this COVID financial crisis is going to long given that our revenue for the City is relatively
34 low and we're going to have massive projects like the grade separation project which has also
35 been taking quite a while to go through. So, we have to be making sure that we have the
36 finances to actually support things.

37
38 The neighborhood supports a Boulware Park that is integrated with nature, but we recognize
39 that the Alternative Three of Boulware Park is going to be expensive. And if we do not have a
40 funding source that is usually derived from Developer Fees it's not going to be built. And I

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 recognize that there's some questions over the transportation impacts. We also have to remind
2 ourselves that this is within walking distance of a Caltrain station. There's only two Caltrain
3 stations and Caltrain is going to be much more faster given that Measure R passed and they're
4 mentioning electrification and faster services to the point maybe like BART in the future. If so
5 it's going to be a waste of... it's a lost opportunity if we leave the area so close to transit so
6 underutilized because we recognize that transit is going to be necessary to address climate
7 change because land use is very much connected to climate change. And if we just leave it
8 alone and just continue sprawl because you know the people who work at your stores need to
9 find a place to live and if we find any place here. They're going to find when somewhere else
10 that usually cheaper and usually cheaper means living in the whoowie [note – phonetics] and
11 that's not something that anyone wants.

12
13 And we also need to recognize as an equity issue. There's a lot of people in the City that work
14 here but can't afford here. I'm a tech worker and I even have questions of whether I'm going to
15 be staying here long term until like the classic joke of oh, a [unintelligible] then you can afford a
16 decent condo for a family because you know everything else in this valley is so expensive.
17 [unintelligible] because of housing because if your caretakers can't live here, well guess what,
18 you're... the money you're going to need to spend is going to be much higher.

19
20 And that... really... we also talk about percentages. Percentages don't matter if the units don't
21 get built. Renters need places, future neighbors need places, that's why the City must focus on
22 doing the best it can to actually make this place affordable and livable for everyone. Rather
23 than lawyers and rich people. Thank you.

24
25 Mr. Nguyen: Thank you for your comments. Our next speaker is Kelsey.

26
27 Ms. Kelsey Banes: Thank you, Commissioners. My name is Kelsey Banes. I'm with Peninsula for
28 Everyone. I am a Palo Alto resident, former renter, currently dependent on my partner for my
29 housing but so I feel like a renter in spirit, but like many of the previous speakers before me. I
30 think this is a great opportunity for housing that serves all the residents of the community in
31 terms of providing housing for people across the lifespan of various incomes, various ability
32 levels. Like Kevin who just spoke before me, I am someone who is contemplating my future
33 being able to stay in this region. So, if we don't take advantage of opportunities like this, it will
34 impact people like us who are trying to plan for being able to stay here.

35
36 So, given all that I support Option Three as a compromise but I do wish we had some higher
37 density options that had some more innovative approaches to things like parking. And while I
38 appreciate a lot of the positive comments about affordable housing, I think it is vital that we
39 consider feasibility if our concern is actually getting people into homes because people can't
40 live in affordable housing that doesn't get built.

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1
2 And I think also for the sake for our Housing Element, we also need to think about what is going
3 to be feasible to get built within individual housing cycles... sorry... because if the housing can't
4 get developed by 2030. We really can't include it in our next Housing Element as an opportunity
5 site and I do think it is possible that our RHNA numbers may change, but I think we can only
6 expect them to go up. It is reasonable to expect that ABAG might allocate some of the
7 unincorporated Santa Clara County allocations to Palo Alto as a City within their sphere of
8 influence. So, I don't think we're going to see these numbers go down. If anything, I think we're
9 going to see them go up.

10
11 And then I just want to talk about density. One of the most important inputs to feasibility is
12 density and while density isn't sufficient for affordability. It is absolutely required so it makes
13 me sad when I see that Alternative M says beautify, don't densify because density allows for
14 more open space. And if we plan appropriately, density also can support a car independent
15 lifestyle and it can also be very pretty. So, yeah, I think embracing density is really important if
16 we want to actually achieve a vision of having inclusive housing. Thank you.

17
18 Mr. Nguyen: Thank you for your comments. Our next speaker is Jeff.

19
20 Mr. Jeff Levinsky: Good evening Commissioners and Staff. My name is Jeff Levinsky and I was a
21 renter in Ventura Neighborhood for years. I've walked every block and street in the North
22 Ventura area many, many times. I've attended NVCAP meetings and followed its progress. I
23 have to say unfortunately I feel all three alternatives before you don't reflect our community
24 needs very well and will likely be rejected by the public.

25
26 I'd like to point to three problems. First, traffic reduction is a top City priority. Seven years ago,
27 a Traffic Study showed that a proposed expansion on the current Cloudera site and nearby
28 would create significant traffic impacts including for commuters on Oregon Express Way. That
29 project than did not go forward. The three NVCAP proposals from Staff seem likely to generate
30 even more traffic and yet there's been no Traffic Study at all. It would have made more sense to
31 start with how much extra traffic the Ventura area and the City as a whole can tolerate and
32 then develop plans with that in mind.

33
34 The second problem is that these plans don't preserve R1. The Staff proposals would rezone
35 single-family home parcels, likely forcing current residents to have to leave the neighborhood
36 and possibly our City. We heard tonight that City Staff is reaching out to landowners and having
37 a private meeting with them. I didn't hear that they are offering residents of the area any kind
38 of similar privilege access. It's unfair and it's not consistent with our community values.

39

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 And finally, a huge problem with these alternatives is that they're ignoring true affordable
2 housing. Our RHNA targets require that most of the new housing that we build for affordable
3 housing, the... at the 80 percent AMI level or under, but the 15 percent inclusionary housing our
4 City requires only creates housing for people earning more than that. So, all three alternatives
5 for NVCAP may actually generate no housing whatsoever towards our largest ABAG goals. So,
6 we go through this 20-year process and end up totally missing the biggest target.

7
8 Worse the three alternatives up zone and does make land more expensive and harder to
9 purchase for true affordable housing and also parkland. Alternative M is the only one I've seen
10 where it addresses this 80 AMI issue and below. Yes, it costs money but it also proposes where
11 to get every dollar that's needed.

12
13 So, summing up, I think the NVCAP process can be saved, but it needs to refocus. It needs to
14 look at our top community goals of traffic reduction, protecting neighborhoods, and creating
15 true affordable housing. Thank you.

16
17 Mr. Nguyen: Thank you for your comments. Our next three speakers will be David Adams
18 followed by Paul Bickmore and then followed by Terry Holzemer. Alright so up next is David.

19
20 Mr. David Adams: Good evening honorable Members of the Planning and Transportation
21 Commission. Yeah, I'm an independent owner on Olive Avenue. So, the Staff Packet does state
22 that the original... an original goal of the NVCAP was to minimize the displacement of existing
23 residents. At the combined NVCAP/City Council meeting, April the 17th 2019, Councilor DuBois
24 moved and Vice Mayor Fine at the time seconded to update the project direction of NVCAP to
25 include and I quote, preventing displacement of existing residents. Ok, preventing displacement
26 of existing residents. This motion passed unanimously. Additionally, at that same meeting
27 Councilor Cormack stated and I quote, I'm going to list a few things I really want to see in this.
28 What if we keep all of the single-family housing on Olive?

29
30 Ok, so I live in the NVCAP area and I've been following this process closely. I've attended all the
31 meetings and it's become pretty clear that Staff have made no effort to follow that City Council
32 direction. As you can see from the fact that all three alternatives propose rezoning of Olive and
33 the consequential displacement of existing residents.

34
35 As a background, Olive Avenue has some of the most affordable single-family housing in Palo
36 Alto and Staff's proposal to tear this housing down and replace with market-value... sorry,
37 market-rate housing is just extremely short-sided. It may make the housing numbers look
38 better but it's basically gentrification.

39

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 So, the cheapest housing that we've got is basically our existing housing. So, I urge the Council...
2 sorry the Commission to prevent Olive Avenue from being rezoned and hence save some of our
3 existing and most affordable housing. Thank you for your consideration.

4

5 Chair Templeton: Mr. Nguyen?

6

7 Mr. Nguyen: Yes.

8

9 Chair Templeton: I think we should take the remainder... the remaining five people who've
10 raised their hand in comments today and then go to the Commissioners. So, if there are people
11 who haven't raised their hand yet, I'm going to ask you to wait until January. Thanks.

12

13 Mr. Nguyen: Ok. So, the last five speakers we have here are Paul Bickmore followed by Terry
14 Holzemer followed by Keith Rechdahl followed by Rohin G, and then Anita. So, up next is Paul,
15 and looks like Paul just lowered his hand. Paul, did you still want to speak? I will unmute you
16 now.

17

18 Mr. Paul Bickmore: Yeah, yeah, thank you. I hit that by mistake. I thought it was unmuting.
19 Yeah, I'd like to echo comments earlier that Alternative Three is a bare minimum and really
20 insufficient if we want to deal with our housing crisis. I'm a renter. In most places, I'd be doing
21 pretty well but now I'm getting squeezed just because of our refusal to build enough housing
22 and we're going to have to catch up in the next few years by building a lot. And Alternative
23 Three really needs to be expanded upon in terms of housing density and that means that our
24 City is going to have to look different. And I think one of the other things that we've been
25 talking about is just the realistic things right now with the Coronavirus recession. We can make
26 things a lot more flexible I think if we got rid of the parking requirements. I don't think there's
27 really any excuse for parking requirements ever, but when you add more housing in as we need
28 to in this area. Parking requirements are just inviting more cars instead of housing. It's just
29 inviting more pollution, inviting more machines that kill people and endanger pedestrians and
30 kids on the streets. So, parking requirements massively increase costs, and again, we need to
31 recognize that things are going to have to look different if we're going to have to deal with our
32 housing crisis. So, one of... another way is replace the office in Alternative Three with more
33 housing in addition to increasing the density since we have a lot of jobs. Creating so many jobs
34 without the housing is why we're in the problem that we're in.

35

36 And again, with density, you cannot plan around cars. I saw them mentioning that in Traffic
37 Studies they're considering using LOS as a metric. Well, LOS is a terrible metric. It's completely
38 counterproductive and doesn't take into induced demand. So, this... and VMT isn't that much
39 better. Instead of the transportation... we need to be planning around pedestrians if we're

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 going to add this necessary density which again, is not sufficient even with Alternative Three.
2 So, more housing, less parking, and more walking. Thank you.

3
4 Mr. Nguyen: Thank you for your comments. Our next speaker is Terry. Terry, it looks like you're
5 using an older version of Zoom so I actually can't unmute you. Instead, I'm going to temporarily
6 promote you to panelist so you can turn on your microphone.

7
8 Mr. Terry Holzemer: Hello. Can you hear me?

9
10 Mr. Nguyen: Yes, we can hear you. Thank you.

11
12 Mr. Holzemer: Ok. As an NVCAP Working Group member for the past 2-years., I wanted to take
13 a moment. I think other people have said this already, but I want to thank Staff for their hard
14 work and efforts and all the reports that they've given us. And especially I want to say
15 something about my... the volunteers. The other participants in this group that have done so
16 much and have worked so hard and I have appreciated their efforts as well even though we
17 haven't always agreed.

18
19 I personally over the last 2-years have taken this very seriously and with considerable thought.
20 And I come to speak to you tonight about two key points. The first point is about the unique
21 historical aspects of the Bay Side Cannery structure and the second one is a request to seriously
22 examine and take your time thinking about Alternative M. Which was really constructed by
23 Working Group Members for the benefit of our entire community.

24
25 Overlooking... you know more than anything else, the historical aspects are overlooked and I
26 hate to say that. I'm a history teacher myself. I teach and I think that today's society of Silicon
27 chips and smartphones doesn't realize that over 100-years ago this valley was known as the
28 Valley of Hearts Delight. It was one of the most important, if not the most important, fruits and
29 vegetable growing areas in the world. Not just in the United States but in the world. Part of that
30 was the Cannery business of course of which Palo Alto and the Bay Side Cannery, which was
31 established by Thomas Foon Choo who is likely California's first significant Chinese American
32 entrepreneur, and that grew into one of the largest cannery operations in the entire world. The
33 third largest and it started in 1911.

34
35 Beyond what Mr. Choo accomplished, however, is what this site represents historically to the
36 community. It is not just an old industrial building. It is one of the last of its kind in this entire
37 State of California. It's unique and clearly one of the last. It's worth saving and adaptively
38 reusing which brings me of course to Alternative M.

39

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 Alternative M is a serious attempt by several Working Group members, myself included, who
2 have tried to look at this area and figure out how could we adaptively reuse a historic building
3 but still achieve many of the City's own goals; which includes, of course, our need for below-
4 market-rate housing. I seriously hope the City... I know my time is up, but I hope that you will
5 take your time to look at Alternative M and study it and see if it's truly feasible because our
6 group did not. Thank you.

7

8 Mr. Nguyen: Thank you Terry for your comments. Our next speaker is Keith.

9

10 Mr. Keith Reckdahl: Hello. I'm a working member, member of the NVCAP and I think these
11 alternatives, unfortunately, all fall short in some areas that were important to the Working
12 Group. I'll talk about two of these, parks and affordable housing.

13

14 Parks are an important part of life in Palo Alto and this really is an equity issue. Parks are just
15 not important in North Palo Alto, they're important of all Palo Alto. In fact, they'll be even more
16 important in North Ventura where much of the new housing will be high density without yards.
17 And for those residents, many traditional backyard activities will become park activities. The
18 Working Group doesn't believe that developers necessarily pay for all the parkland. The City
19 must be the one to take the lead in planning the parkland. You know back in the days when
20 Palo Alto was formed, land still wasn't free, but the community joined together and found
21 money and bought the land and built our parks. Today, the City must show initiative, do the
22 planning, and find the money to build parks in North Ventura.

23

24 Another issue important to the Working Group is affordable housing and these alternatives do
25 nothing for the lowest two housing categories. The alternatives 15 percent inclusionary units
26 will be built at 120 percent AMI. Will there be no units in the 50 percent and 80 percent
27 categories? Palo Alto is building almost no units in these bottom two categories and none of
28 these alternatives change this. The alternatives bonus for workforce housing is great, but
29 workforce housing is not a replacement for BMR housing. And once again, the Working Group
30 doesn't believe that the developer should necessarily pay for all of the affordable housing. The
31 City must take the lead to ensure that the area supports housing across the income spectrum. It
32 won't be cheap, but it is feasible and it's worth our money.

33

34 So, both parks and affordable housing are important to the working group and I just wish the
35 alternatives better reflected this. Thank you.

36

37 Mr. Nguyen: Thank you for your comments. Our next speaker is Rohin.

38

39 Mr. Rohin G: Hi Planning Commission. My name is Rohin. I am a student at Palo Alto High
40 School and I think I would like to speak today about my belief in our City's extreme need for

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 more housing in general. And I think that all of these alternatives do fall short and of them,
2 Alternative Three is the one that's get closest to being an actual reasonable bare minimum. We
3 need to build as many new homes as possible here and build them dense and make sure that
4 that is how we get those Impact Fees that pay for affordable housing.

5
6 I've seen far too many teachers have to move out because there isn't enough housing at a
7 reasonable price around here. I've seen friends have to move out, I've... and I think myself and
8 most of my peers understand that we likely will not be able to afford to live here when we are
9 adults in the community we have grown up in.

10
11 That combined with the fact that most housing in North Ventura means more foot traffic for
12 small businesses on Cal Ave which we all know that those small businesses need foot traffic to
13 be able to come out of the economic crisis that we're in and recover. So, with that, I would just
14 argue that Alternative Three is the one that should be considered the bare minimum here and
15 should be what we base our planning process off of.

16
17 Further than that someone earlier pointed out that a good open space idea is rewilding the
18 creek corridor and I would like to say that I think that is a great idea. Thank you and I yield my
19 time.

20

21 Mr. Nguyen: Thank you for your comments and our last speaker tonight is Anita.

22
23 Ms. Anita Lusebrink: Hi. I'm Anita Lusebrink and my family owns a house in Palo Alto. I grew up
24 since junior high school here so I do have some history here. Just a few questions and thoughts
25 to throw into the hopper. There's a lot going on and so this is just more stuff to think about.
26 First of all, affordable housing seems to be the highest priority for the citizens that have been
27 speaking up so I think that's really important to take into consideration as the governmental
28 body that responds to the citizens of Palo Alto. And the... we could... you know if you're
29 concerned about finances, the government is not only a money-making proposition. It is for the
30 citizens again so I think we could combine a private, public, and non-profit coalitions to make
31 these ideas happen to benefit more of a range of people. I know I work personally since I have a
32 niece with a developmental disability which who I'd love to have live much closer to us. She is
33 helped by Palo Alto Housing Developers, Housing Choices Coalition, EAH Housing. They all
34 would love to develop more affordable... not only affordable, but BMR housing because
35 obviously affordable in Palo Alto is way above the norm of most people probably in this state
36 and BMR is probably still above many people in the state.

37
38 Two, development really has to focus along El Camino Real, and maybe the other option would
39 be 101 and this has to be high density. You know I think suburbia along the peninsula is really
40 kind of no longer viable. The two-car garage, the personal lawn, all that's got to be really be

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 rethought because it's just not current. And higher housing, I like the idea of the tiered higher
2 housing so the top couple-few floors could be very market-rate. You know, what do you call
3 that? Penthouse housing and the bottom floors could be BMR and I think it should be graded
4 from El Camino and Oregon down to the smaller houses that are existing on this site. And again,
5 we have to really look at how the COVID situation has made housing into offices. We don't
6 need to build more office space. There's still a lot of office space being built but people are
7 working from home now and they're walking and riding bikes and enjoying fresh air in public
8 spaces which would be the parks. So, I hope all these ideas maybe could be considered in your
9 continuing look into what we need to do there. Thank you so much.

10
11 Mr. Nguyen: Thank you for your comments. Chair Templeton, that concludes public comments
12 for this item.

13
14 Chair Templeton: Thank you so much. Ok, I'm glad we were able to get to so many public
15 commenters tonight and so many members of the North Ventura Coordinated Area Plan
16 Working Group. I guess I should start by saying thank you to all of the people that have put
17 effort into getting this project this far. It's really exciting to see where it's gone.

18
19 We are planning to continue this to January 13th I believe it is. To the first meeting in January
20 and we can have a more in-depth discussion. What I'm hoping to get from the Commissioners
21 tonight and I hope to be helpful to Ms. Tanner in preparing for the January meeting is just some
22 areas where you might want to see more feedback, or if you have specific questions. And then
23 that way Staff can have an opportunity to look in those and bring it back. For the members of
24 the public who want to speak up who did not get a chance to this evening. We will reopen
25 public comment at that time. We expect that Staff will also be preparing additional materials
26 for us as well.

27
28 So, with that said, Commissioners let's try... we're a little bit over time of what we planned for
29 tonight and some people may have conflicts. Let's try and keep it brief and we'll do one round
30 with everybody. And then anything else you're welcome to send comments to the
31 Commissioner email alias or directly to Ms. Tanner if you were not able to get them tonight. So,
32 I see some hands raised. Commissioner Hechtman.

33
34 Commissioner Hechtman: Alright thank you. I'm going to actually just ask a procedural
35 question. I'm not really understanding why we're starting Commission deliberation in the
36 middle of public comment. I think that's unusual.

37
38 Chair Templeton: They're going to... well you're right. It... technically if we want to continue
39 versus give her feedback and then they can bring it back. It's a matter of whether it's
40 continuance or a separate meeting. Is that your question?

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

Commissioner Hechtman: No, my... the question... I mean I'm ready to provide some substantive comments, but I'm hesitant to do that before the conclusion, the real conclusion, of the public comment which is going to be some time on the 13th.

Chair Templeton: You are not required to have any substantive comments tonight. If you want to wait till public comment complete. The reason we're not... I want to allow people to speak because the way that the agenda was written may it ambiguous over whether all public comment would be closed tonight. It literally says we're going to continue this until January 13th.

Commissioner Hechtman: Right and I have no problem with more public comment on January 13th. My question is, is why are... other than asking questions. I understand if people have questions they want to ask of Staff so that Staff is ready to respond on January 13th. That's fine but when I read our Staff report it seems like what it says is take the Staff report, take the public hearing and continue to January 13th. Now, I haven't read the notice that went out to the public but that's what our Staff report suggests.

Chair Templeton: You are welcome to make a motion to continue now if you wish. A few Commissioners have (interrupted)

Commissioner Riggs: I will second that motion to be candid. I feel like that's (interrupted)

Chair Templeton: Please, don't interrupt Commissioner Riggs. Please wait till I'm finished.

Commissioner Riggs: Sorry.

Chair Templeton: So, a few Commissioners have indicated that they wanted to ask a couple more questions and we did talk about it earlier. I think it's courteous to offer that opportunity, but like you said if you want to have this substantive discussion in January that's fine too. So, we can put it to a vote. I encourage Commissioners to speak up one way or the other about if they want to have additional comments tonight. So, do you want to make a motion?

Commissioner Hechtman: No, no, I want to... I think I've... everyone knows how I'm feeling about this so I'm interested and I don't want to cut off anybody that does have a question that they want to tee up for Staff so Staff is ready later. Thank you.

Chair Templeton: I will just add I also am holding my substantive comments until January, but I did have a couple of things that I thought would be helpful for Staff to bring forward. Ok, we've got a tone of hands up. Vice-Chair Roohparvar.

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

Vice-Chair Roohparvar: Great, I had a question. That was exactly my intent. So, Staff when you come back in January I know that we just got the application for SB330 was recent. Can you please explain the impact that that SB330 application has on our deliberations regarding NVCAP? You said in your report that it was significant and I continue to read but I couldn't really tease it out. So, when we come back in January could you provide greater guidance on what that (interrupted)

Ms. Tanner: Yes.

Vice-Chair Roohparvar: The impact. It's the practical impact it's going to have if that goes through and legally and it's not a conversation for tonight and I don't anticipate you guys are ready for that right now.

Ms. Tanner: We can provide that and what we can provide both just explanation of SB330 itself. You know, how it works, what it is in this [unintelligible – audio cut out] clear but then also just maybe numerically and qualitatively. Essentially if that parcel is 85 units and the remainder is office which is about 140,000-square feet. How does that change some of the tables that we showed and what would (interrupted)

Vice-Chair Roohparvar: Exactly.

Ms. Tanner: What would [unintelligible] resulting development look like in the other parcels?

Vice-Chair Roohparvar: Exactly. That's what I wanted to know. Thank you.

Chair Templeton: Thank you, Vice-Chair Roohparvar. Commissioner Summa.

Commissioner Summa: Thank you, Chair Templeton. You know I hadn't thought about it before, but I do think Commissioner Hechtman makes a good point. That we might want to and I don't think it's Staff's... Staff can answer this. I don't think Staff's... it was their intention to change anything between own obviously since it's a continued meeting and the 13th. So, it is really on the 13th that the conclusion of the public hearing that we should be... we will be most informed to make out comments I think. So, that does... I see the sense of that. I just wanted to share.

Chair Templeton: Alright, I appreciate that and I sense we're going to have a motion here shortly. Commissioner Riggs, do you have additional comments?

Commissioner Riggs: I don't... I had a question that can be answered at the next meeting. I'm curious if the, and this is maybe a... I'm not sure this may be a sub-consultant question if the

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 geometry of the parcels being dictated for at Ash and Lambert. If that's really an efficient
2 geometry given the adjacency to the street? So, I'd just like to understand whether or not that
3 geometry actually works with a physical building. Clearly, it's just a land-use designation but I
4 think putting some practical... yep. So, I'd like to understand it actually is functional geometry.
5

6 Ms. Tanner: Is that the north or south of Lambert?
7

8 Commissioner Riggs: Sorry, southwest Ash and well, I mean I think you could look at that
9 whole... I mean I'd like to understand the analysis of all those parcels around the park and the
10 geometry with which they... is its functional geometry to actually build something?
11

12 Ms. Tanner: We can definitely talk about that.
13

14 Chair Templeton: Great, thank you, Commissioner Riggs. Commissioner Alcheck.
15

16 Commissioner Alcheck: Yeah, I will... I respect the decision and the idea here of not commenting
17 on the alternatives or the NVCAP item presented to us until our following meeting. But since we
18 still have 28 attendees in the room and several of them are members of the NVCAP, potentially
19 leaders of the NVCAP Working Group, I think I'd be remiss if I didn't sort of share just one
20 comment.
21

22 You know Palo Alto is unique. This Working Group is an absolutely unique effort and I think we
23 heard a lot of consistency in a lot of the comments tonight. I would encourage the members of
24 the Working Group not to wait until January to consider reaching out to this property owner
25 who has submitted an application if... I don't want to be an alarmist, but if the single property
26 owner that has 20 percent of the land builds 85 units on 12-acres. I think every alternative is in
27 jeopardy. I don't believe that the visions and the ideas that were discussed tonight appeal to
28 people will be realized if the single most developable piece of property in this area goes
29 forward without even participating in this process. And so, while I think the NVCAP Working
30 Group has achieved some allottable results, I am very, very concerned that this will not be a
31 productive process if we don't figure out a way to get everyone to maybe put the brakes on
32 their plans and see if we create by in. And I'm really worried about and I look forward to having
33 a conversation about which alternatives speak loudly towards the goals of the City. And I think
34 we could have a very vigorous discussion, but if in 6-months' time under SB330 the largest
35 property owner moves forward with 85 units. I think that the many of the... I don't think the
36 vision statement can be realized and I don't think it's safe to wait one month. I think your
37 timeframe... the clock is ticking under SB330 here for this application and I don't necessarily
38 think that the responsibility to begin that discussion should be exclusively in the Planning
39 Departments' hands. This was an NVCAP Working Group. Maybe you guys can figure out how to
40 fix this, but I'm a little worried about that and I don't know how to address it. I don't know who

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 to email because I don't have a relationship with anyone involved in this and so but it is... I am a
2 little concerned. I think this is our one... this is one of the most... this is one of the sites with the
3 greatest potential for addressing an issue that clearly speaks to many people and I'm really
4 concerned that the ship is sort of sailing without us so that's all I have to say tonight.

5
6 Chair Templeton: Thank you so much, Commissioner Alcheck. I'll go next and then I would ask if
7 Commissioner Hechtman could wait after Commissioner Lauing before making his comments
8 because Commissioner Lauing hasn't gone yet.

9
10 So, my comments really... I guess I'm echoing something that a member of the public said and
11 that something Commissioner Riggs mentioned which is understanding the dynamics at El
12 Camino and Page Mill. And why the cut-throughs were happening and are there proposals that
13 we can drive either through this NVCAP process or externally with transportation to improve
14 that intersection? I think that the lack of a right turn lane is causing a lot of problems there and
15 I thought that for many years. I think that that has to be solved before any kind of development
16 in that part of the North Ventura area could happen. So, I would love to hear any... even a brief
17 update from the transportation team about what that would involve and if can be tied or if it
18 should be done separate? That type of thing.

19
20 Alternative Three, I think Commissioner Lauing brought this up earlier. Why did we have to
21 quadruple the office space in order to add a couple 100 more homes? What could we do
22 instead to get more housing? Is there a housing heavier version of that plan? You know, I mean
23 just going into a bit more detail about why is... why did it come to us looking like that and what
24 could we flex there?

25
26 Somebody from the public also brought up contamination on this property and would it be
27 suitable for development? I assume it would or we wouldn't have gotten this far, but I would
28 love to hear a brief comment from Staff about that next time as well.

29
30 And then clarification about the R2 versus the R1 on Olive and whether that does complicate
31 the number of homes that could be built. I think it would be great to explore that a little more
32 in detail.

33
34 So anyway, thank you for all that you've done. I know that it's a huge project you've worked on
35 for years so congratulations on getting this far. It is a huge milestone worth celebrating so
36 thank you all. Alright, we'll go next to Commissioner Lauing followed by Commissioner
37 Hechtman.

38
39 Commissioner Lauing: Yep, thanks. I want to make a couple comments particularly because we
40 had most of the public comment tonight, but my concern still is that the... after this many years

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 and all that work that we're not really addressing a couple of the primary objectives that were
2 set forth for the Working Group by the City Council and I point particularly to .1 and .5 in the
3 NVCAP Goals. Add to the City's supply of multi-family housing including market-rate, affordable,
4 missing middle, senior housing, walkable, open space. It's very specific and a number of the
5 members of the public tonight talked about the fact that we could get... we could squeeze more
6 housing in there. The objective of the study was not to see how many houses we could get in
7 there. It's not a housing project. We want housing in there, in a neighborhood that's basically
8 reimaged and rebuilt. And what's drastically missing here with the current proposals is that
9 we have 15 percent BMR at some number that doesn't address Objective Number One as a
10 number of members of the public have said and we're only going to get whatever that other
11 number was. Of the 500 units of where ever that thing is right... here we go. Of the... the BMR is
12 down to like 180 units on Alternative Two. That doesn't match with that objective because we
13 want all of the segments of below-market-rate. It doesn't match with the RHNA that everyone's
14 concerned about appropriately. We need a lot more of true affordable housing and just
15 building more housing does not mean you're going to get lower-cost housing. Unless it's deed-
16 restricted, you're going to get market-rate housing. That's a really important concept that I
17 don't think that a lot of folks are getting their arms around. We can't just put up a number of
18 houses and therefore rents are going to go down. Demand is almost insatiable for apartments
19 and homes in Palo Alto by people who want to live here for all the right reasons. So, it's not just
20 a quantity of more housing and apart from that, the assignment here is not to build housing
21 with 2,000, 3,000, 4,000 units on this spot. It's to reimagine the neighborhood so the concepts
22 that are missing are primarily that we need more segments and there has to be this walkable,
23 livable, open space park area. That definitely applies to diversity in that neighborhood and it
24 applies to diversity in our City with the number of folks that we want to bring here who need
25 more affordable housing that is sort of dictated in that regard.

26
27 So, relative to before next week, I don't think the consultant can go back and do anything. The
28 conclusion that... where was it?... the conclusion on Page 22 that the feasibility of office space...
29 let me get that here. The report identifies office uses as the most financially feasible use in the
30 NVCAP area. We knew that before that started because we're using the old model of we have
31 to get offices to pay for all the amenities in the area. Alternative M and others of us have been
32 discussing over the last few months that we can't use that old model anymore. So, that's not
33 pointing fingers at the consultant or at Staff or anything. It's just that we have to get outside
34 the box. We have to start looking at partnerships with other companies. Facebook announced
35 today, today, \$150 million that they want to put into affordable housing in the hood here.
36 Google has done it to a billion etc. etc. etc. I won't go into it. That was even covered in the same
37 article. So, doing those kinds of partnerships is one way to do it and it's incumbent upon us and
38 I say us starting with Council to find different ways to finance these things because we have to
39 do it right. And just adding more and more and more office, which obviously takes up more

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 space that could be used for parks, it just isn't going to work. So, I'm not pointing fingers at
2 anybody. I'm just saying that we have to get a lot more creative about how we do this.

3
4 And then the other kind of minor point related to that is that understanding the sensitivity
5 analysis of what was described as feasible or not feasible. What else would be helpful because
6 it might be the matter of a million dollars a project which is a tiny, tiny number in the scheme of
7 getting these things up. So, I had more comments but that's what I wanted to comment on
8 today in the context of the public comment.

9
10 Chair Templeton: I appreciate that, Commissioner Lauing. I see Commissioner Summa has also
11 raised her hand. Do you want to go now Commissioner Hechtman or would you like to go after
12 Commissioner Summa?

13
14 Commissioner Hechtman: Oh actually, I just have a question so I can go now.

15
16 Chair Templeton: Ok, go ahead.

17
18 Commissioner Hechtman: I'm not... I didn't raise my hand to make a motion.

19
20 Chair Templeton: Left it open because I wasn't sure.

21
22 Commissioner Hechtman: Yeah, no, a question. So in the Staff report at Packet Page 24, one of
23 the issues that Staff has asked for our input on regards the six parcels identified as opportunity
24 sites that have current zoning of General Manufacturing, GM and Staff poses the question to
25 us. We may want to consider whether the City should retain such properties for R&D light
26 industrial uses and that's something that we can discuss next time. But... and I want to discuss
27 that but when I look through the Staff Packet I couldn't actually find any of the maps that
28 identified which parcels those six are. And so, I wanted to ask did I just miss it and if I didn't, I'd
29 like for Staff to provide that for our next meeting so I know which six parcels, where they're
30 located so I can engage in that conversation.

31
32 Ms. Tanner: That's a great question Commissioner. Those are the parcels that are... I'm not
33 sure if you have your printed or your digital Packet with you right but if you look, for example,
34 it's first highlighted on Alternative Two which is Packet Page 32. And you'll see at the top of the
35 page it says office/light industrial with rezone option could be redeveloped and rezoned so
36 that... to multi-family residential, MFR. So, those parcels at the northern portion abutting the
37 train tracks are those areas.

38
39 Commissioner Hechtman: Oh, so it's all six... they're assembled?
40

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 Ms. Tanner: There is one as well and then Chitra, can you help me? I believe that also there is
2 those four or three little blue parcels that are on Ash Street between Ash and between Olive
3 and Page Mill. If you see those and that has a little bubble that says retain office/industrial
4 designation and some of those parcels I believe also have that same industrial designation as
5 (interrupted)

6
7 Ms. Chitra Moitra, Planner: Yes, you are right. Those are also GM.

8
9 Commissioner Hechtman: So, on Alternative Two it's three smallish blue bubbles are three of
10 the parcels and then the other three are contained in the wedge between Park and the railroad
11 tracks?

12
13 Ms. Tanner: Yes, that's correct.

14
15 Ms. Moitra: Yes.

16
17 Commissioner Hechtman: Thank you.

18
19 Ms. Tanner: Yep, great question.

20
21 Chair Templeton: Alright, one we could answer today. I appreciate that. Commissioner Summa.

22
23 Commissioner Summa: Thank you. Just a couple things at a high level since we're not... we're
24 saving most of this discussion for January, but actually, along Park Boulevard the General
25 Manufacturing use has eroded over time. And I think there's only one left and really what they
26 are, are offices and there's two big residential buildings. One in the NVCAP, the kind of
27 Mondrian blue, yellow and red building which is commercial on the bottom and then a large
28 residential building above. It was always my intention to continue that use which is preferred
29 over what have become general office for all of those GM Zones. So that was... that kind of
30 might... maybe might help a little bit.

31
32 And then I want to say I don't think I missed any of the NVCAP meetings and I... its been a long
33 process but I think that Commissioner Lauing is correct when he said that we didn't get to the
34 knot of what we were trying to do here. And I would like to suggest also that we need to look
35 at... like math and financial feasibility is not really my biggest thing. Equity and treating people
36 right and zoning is something that I understand more, but I would suggest that we already have
37 evidence that we don't need to have office to get housing. And I think what evidence of that is
38 the VTA project on the corner of Page Mill and El Camino which is an all housing basically
39 project and also the new one that Council just approved on San Antonio. Those are actually
40 evidence of housing creating, penciling out for even more housing, and I think we need to look

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 at those. And I think we also need to be considering... and I'm not sure why... this was always a
2 missing part of the NVCAP discussion for me. I think we need to be considering our multi-family
3 zones. Now currently the one we have is... the largest is RM40 which is 40 units per acre and I
4 think we need a higher density per acre zone. And we need to figure out where we want to put
5 it, but we also need to consider the development standards that would go along with it. So, we
6 are creating places where people really will thrive and enjoy living, even if they're denser, but
7 still have the things people need to create also... to improve, restore and create a lovely
8 residential area.

9

10 And I do think one of the Working Group members also mentioned trees and I think that should
11 definitely be apart of this. That area is... has a porosity of street tree (interrupted)

12

13 Chair Templeton: Thank you.

14

15 Commissioner Summa: So, I just wanted to get some of those ideas out.

16

17 Chair Templeton: Yeah and I think it will be interesting to dig into some of these ideas in more
18 detail after we close the public comment, but thank you for previewing your thoughts,
19 everybody.

20

21 Alright, I think at this point I am interested in a motion to continue. Vice-Chair Roohparvar.

22

23 MOTION

24

25 Vice-Chair Roohparvar: Sure, I'll make it, but you got to help me out, Chair Templeton. I'm
26 going to move (interrupted)

27

28 Chair Templeton: About moving the Staff motion?

29

30 Vice-Chair Roohparvar: Ok, yeah, can I move the Staff motion that for us to continue
31 discussions on this topic too (interrupted)

32

33 Chair Templeton: January 13th.

34

35 Vice-Chair Roohparvar: The next meeting in January and we will keep public comments open.

36

37 Chair Templeton: We'll reopen public comments then.

38

39 Vice-Chair Roohparvar: We will reopen public comments then.

40

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 Chair Templeton: Perfect. Any second? Just shout out.

2

3 Commissioner Alcheck: I had a quick clarification. Are we going to reopen public comments so
4 to those who haven't spoken only?

5

6 Chair Templeton: Correct. I (interrupted)

7

8 SECOND

9

10 Commissioner Riggs: Second, second.

11

12 Chair Templeton: Ok.

13

14 Commissioner Riggs: Sorry, I was waiting on Bart to make the motion.

15

16 VOTE

17

18 Chair Templeton: Everybody's hand's up still from last time so it's hard to tell. I saw
19 Commissioner Riggs, you seconded. Commissioner Lauing, I think also wanted to be supportive
20 of this motion, is that right? Ok. So, motion was made by Vice-Chair Roohparvar, seconded by
21 Commissioner Riggs. Any comments? Any more clarifications? Thank you for staying overtime
22 so that we could hear everybody who showed up today. That was really nice of everybody. Ok,
23 Mr. Nguyen, would you please conduct a vote?

24

25 Mr. Nguyen: Yes. Commissioner Alcheck?

26

27 Commissioner Alcheck: Aye.

28

29 Mr. Nguyen: Commissioner Hechtman?

30

31 Commissioner Hechtman: Aye.

32

33 Mr. Nguyen: Commissioner Lauing?

34

35 Commissioner Lauing: Yes.

36

37 Mr. Nguyen: Commissioner Riggs?

38

39 Commissioner Riggs: Aye.

40

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 Mr. Nguyen: Vice-Chair Roohparvar?

2

3 Vice-Chair Roohparvar: Yes.

4

5 Mr. Nguyen: Commissioner Summa?

6

7 Commissioner Summa: Yes.

8

9 Mr. Nguyen: Chair Templeton?

10

11 Chair Templeton: Yes.

12

13 Mr. Nguyen: Ok, the motion carries 7-0.

14

15 MOTION PASSED 7(Alcheck, Hechtman, Lauing, Riggs, Roohparvar, Summa, Templeton)-0

16

17 Chair Templeton: Thank you, everybody.

18

19 **Commission Action**: Motion to continue by Roohparvar, seconded by Riggs. Pass 7-0

20 **Approval of Minutes**

21 Public Comment is Permitted. Five (5) minutes per speaker.^{1,3}

22 3. November 4, 2020 Draft PTC Meeting Minutes

23 Chair Templeton: Alright so now we are on to approval of the minutes. We have minutes for
24 the 4th and the 18th. Have they been amended? Mr. Nguyen or Ms. Tanner? Do you... have you
25 received amendments?

26

27 Mr. Vinhloc Nguyen, Admin Associate III: Yes, Commissioner Hechtman did send us some
28 revisions which I have forwarded to the Commission.

29

30 Chair Templeton: Excellent. Commissioner Hechtman, would you like to make a motion
31 regarding the minutes?

32

33 Commissioner Riggs: I have a question before we do that.

34

35 Chair Templeton: Oh, go ahead. Yes? Commissioner Riggs.

36

37 Commissioner Riggs: Mr. Nguyen, did... I believe I had comments on the 4th that were... as well?
38 This was a while back. We did comments on the 4th, is that correct?

39

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 Commissioner Hechtman: I think your comments might have been on October... the... October
2 28th.

3
4 Commissioner Riggs: Ok, maybe that was it. Ok, alright.

5
6 Commissioner Hechtman: I think at the last meeting which you weren't able to attend.

7
8 Commissioner Riggs: Yeah, the 18th.

9
10 Commissioner Hechtman: Yeah, we moved those minutes with your changes and mine.

11
12 Commissioner Riggs: Ok can... then can we split up the two sets of minute... the motion on the
13 two sets of minutes, if that's ok Commissioner Hechtman?

14
15 MOTION

16
17 Commissioner Hechtman: So, I will move adoption of the revised minutes for November 4th.

18
19 Chair Templeton: Any second?

20
21 SECOND

22
23 Commissioner Riggs: Second.

24
25 Chair Templeton: Alright, can you please conduct the vote, Mr. Nguyen?

26
27 Mr. Nguyen: Yes. Commissioner Alcheck?

28
29 Commissioner Alcheck: Aye.

30
31 Mr. Nguyen: Commissioner Hechtman?

32
33 Commissioner Riggs: He said...

34
35 Chair Templeton: Can you say it louder? I think you're muted.

36
37 Commissioner Hechtman: Aye.

38
39 Mr. Nguyen: Commissioner Lauing?

40

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 Commissioner Lauing: Yes.

2

3 Mr. Nguyen: Commissioner Riggs?

4

5 Commissioner Riggs: Yes.

6

7 Mr. Nguyen: Vice-Chair Roohparvar?

8

9 Vice-Chair Roohparvar: Yes.

10

11 Mr. Nguyen: Commissioner Summa?

12

13 Commissioner Summa: Yes.

14

15 Mr. Nguyen: Chair Templeton?

16

17 Chair Templeton: Yes.

18

19 Mr. Nguyen: Ok the motion carries 7-0.

20

21 MOTION PASSED 7(Alcheck, Hechtman, Lauing, Riggs, Roohparvar, Summa, Templeton)-0

22

23 Chair Templeton: Thank you.

24

25 **Commission Action**: Motion to approve by Hechtman, seconded by Riggs. Pass 7-0.

26

27 4. November 18, 2020 Draft PTC Meeting Minutes

28 Chair Templeton: Commissioner Hechtman?

29

30 MOTION

31

32 Commissioner Hechtman: I move that we approve the minutes of our November 18th meeting
33 as revised.

34

35 Chair Templeton: Any second?

36

37 SECOND

38

39 Vice-Chair Roohparvar: I'll second.

40

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 Chair Templeton: Thank you very much. Mr. Nguyen, would you please conduct the vote?

2

3 Mr. Vinhloc Nguyen, Admin Associate III: Commissioner Alcheck?

4

5 Commissioner Alcheck: Aye.

6

7 Mr. Nguyen: Commissioner Hechtman?

8

9 Commissioner Hechtman: Aye.

10

11 Mr. Nguyen: Commissioner Lauing?

12

13 Commissioner Lauing: Yes.

14

15 Mr. Nguyen: Commissioner Riggs?

16

17 Commissioner Riggs: I'll abstain.

18

19 Mr. Nguyen: Vice-Chair Roohparvar?

20

21 Vice-Chair Roohparvar: Yes.

22

23 Mr. Nguyen: Commissioner Summa?

24

25 Commissioner Summa: Yes.

26

27 Mr. Nguyen: Chair Templeton?

28

29 Chair Templeton: Yes.

30

31 Mr. Nguyen: Ok the motion carries 6-0-1.

32

33 MOTION PASSED 6(Alcheck, Hechtman, Lauing, Roohparvar, Summa, Templeton) -0 -1(Riggs
34 abstain)

35

36 Chair Templeton: Thank you so much, everyone.

37

38 **Commission Action**: Motion to approve by Hechtman, seconded by Roohparvar. Pass 6-0-1
39 (Riggs abstain)

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 **Committee Items**

2 Chair Templeton: Next is Committee items so any updates other than what we covered all
3 evening? Ok. Thank you, Commissioner Summa, I see her shaking her head no. Also, we are
4 working on... the XCAP we're working on our report and iterating on chapter drafts there so
5 you're welcome to read it... those if you are interested. Anything else? I see no hands raised.

6 **Commissioner Questions, Comments or Announcements**

7 Chair Templeton: Commissioner questions, comments, announcements or future agenda
8 items? I'll start here by just pointing out that a tentative schedule has been included on Packet
9 Page 7 for 2020-21 dates. I ask you to please take a look at those dates and see if there are any
10 that are considering with holidays or other outages that we should make the Commission
11 aware of before we kind of limit to the schedule for Staff. You don't have to do that today. You
12 can bring those back next year. Alright, anything else? Commissioner Hechtman.

13
14 Commissioner Hechtman: So, with this meeting, I'm completing my first year on the
15 Commission and I just wanted to state publicly what a tremendous experience this year has
16 been for me. We have a phenomenal Staff that I didn't have experience with before this year.
17 This is a great group of Commissioners, very diverse and I learn a lot from each of you all the
18 time. And I particularly want to call out Commissioner Lauing and Summa. I know that there's a
19 reappointment about to happen. I sincerely hope that you're both reappointed because I think
20 you both add immeasurably to our dialog in part because you don't think the way I think and
21 that really helps me think through issues more fully. So, I just wanted to thank you all for a
22 great experience.

23
24 Chair Templeton: Awe, that's wonderful. On that note, I should say happy holidays and happy
25 new year and I look forward to seeing everybody on the other side. Time seems to sort of have
26 no meaning under Shelter in Place, but I am grateful that we were able to continue our work for
27 the City during this very unusual year. So, and thank you, I'm glad you had a good first-year
28 Commissioner Hechtman. Ok, I see Commissioner Summa has raised her hand.

29
30 Commissioner Summa: Whoops. Just wanted to thank Commissioner Hechtman for the kind
31 words and to thank everybody else and to wish everybody a safe holiday. It's a scary time right
32 now so hopefully, it's nowhere but uphill from now on.

33
34 Chair Templeton: The vaccines are coming out starting this month. It's an exciting inflection
35 point I think, but we got to get through until there's enough so everybody do please be safe.
36 Ms. Tanner.

37
38 Ms. Rachael Tanner, Assistant Director: I just wanted to know Chair if you wanted to mention
39 the year and review that you... letter you plan to prepare for the Council. It's incoming. We may

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.

1 circulate that in advance and of course not violate the Brown Act by replying to all for folks to
2 review and comment on in January.

3

4 Chair Templeton: Thank you for reminding me of that. I remember last time that we had a
5 wonderful wrap-up letter that Chair Riggs at the time put together for us and that there was a
6 sentiment of getting more feedback and input on that. We did not agendize it for tonight
7 because we were a little time constrained but I did ask Ms. Tanner if we could find another way
8 to collect your input. So, you can email me directly if there's something that you'd like to
9 highlight. I will also, in advance of our next meeting, send a draft out in enough time for you to
10 provide feedback on that draft as well so you could either way. You could send me something in
11 the next couple of weeks that you'd like to see included and you could also alternatively
12 provide comment or feedback on the draft before we come to our meeting. And so, then we'll
13 approve that together and send it to the new Council. Does that sound good? Alright, thank you
14 so much. On that note... did I get everything? I think I did. The meeting is adjourned.

15 **Adjournment**

16 9:26 pm

-
1. Spokespersons that are representing a group of five or more people who are identified as present at the meeting at the time of the spokesperson's presentation will be allowed up to fifteen (15) minutes at the discretion of the Chair, provided that the non-speaking members agree not to speak individually.
 2. The Chair may limit Oral Communications to 30 minutes for all combined speakers.
 3. The Chair may reduce the allowed time to speak to three minutes to accommodate a larger number of speakers.