



**NORTH VENTURA COORDINATED AREA PLAN
NVCAP WORKING GROUP
AGENDA**

WEDNESDAY, April 17, 2019

City Hall – Community Meeting Room
250 Hamilton Avenue
Palo Alto, CA 94301
5:30 PM TO 8:30 PM

Call to Order: 5:30 PM

Jonathan Lait, Interim Director for the Planning Department called the Working Group meeting to order today, April 17, 2019.

Roll Call:

Present: Alexander Lew, Angela Dellaporta, Doria Summa, Gail Price, Heather Rosen, Kirsten Flynn, Lakiba Pittman, Terry Holzmer, Tim Steele, Waldek Kaczmariski, Yunan Song, Keith Reckdahl, and Siyi Zhang.

Absent: Lund Smith

Welcome and Housekeeping

Mr. Lait acknowledged Waldek Kaczmariski, who had been one of the alternates, and thanked him for joining the group.

Mr. Lait noted they had heard comments at the Town Hall Meeting and other working group meetings that there was an interest in having some public comment time before the meeting and at the end of the meeting. What was now planned was to offer a 15-minute window at the outset of the meeting to receive public comments. After that time period, if there were additional public comments, those could be expressed at the end of the meeting.

After the public comments there would be a slight deviation from the regularly scheduled agenda to allow an opportunity for discussion of a debrief on the Town Hall Meeting. Also, some emails were received from the Working Group members expressing a desire to talk about subcommittees and other related matters in terms of how this was being approached. Fifteen minutes would be spent on that.

Oral Communications

ADA. The City of Palo Alto does not discriminate against individuals with disabilities. To request accommodations, auxiliary aids or services to access City facilities, services or programs, to participate at public meetings, or to learn about the City's compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990, may contact 650-329-2550 (voice), or e-mail ada@cityofpaloalto.org. This agenda is posted in accordance with government code section 54954.2(a) or section 54956. Members of the public are welcome to attend this public meeting.

Ken Joye was the first speaker. He thanked everyone for hearing public comments. He commented that he had been difficult for residents of the neighborhood to know what to expect from the group. He had posed a number of questions to the group and only a small number had been addressed either in discussion with this body or answered by staff or consultants. He asked, wherever possible, that resident questions be addressed. He felt his most important question was the fact that in the grant proposal for this project, there was specific mention of 395 Page Mill Road, commonly referred to as the Cloudera parcel. He questioned why the owner of that parcel was not considered a stakeholder, why this group was not discussing that parcel more. Also, in the grant funding proposal it said there would be quarterly updates to VTA and MTC and he asked if those were being posted to the project website? Where could the quarterly updates be found? He also noted in the slide deck for today's meeting there was discussion about bear left turns onto Ash from Pepper Olive prevents neighborhood intrusion and cut-through traffic. He questioned if that would have the unintended consequence of adding motorist traffic turning left onto Park Boulevard which is a designated bike boulevard and any impact to that should be mitigated. He felt that proposal should be examined very carefully. He went on to call out the Existing Conditions Section of Staff Report 9921 which described transportation choices of employees of businesses located in the study area, as well as residents. He asked if there was any TDM data showing how existing employees at Cloudera, etc. commute to work? He noted it said driver load share for study area residents 52% was lower than that for Palo Alto as a whole, 71%. He asked if the same was true for employees of businesses in the study area. It appeared to him that the new crossing being discussed at Ash and Page Mill did not meet the VTA standard for across barrier connections and he wondered if continued reference to this crossing had to do with the continued references to Sarah Wallis Park. He had questioned a number of items in the Perkins + Will contract, one of which was if there were going to be GIS maps with layers and information available from the NVCAP website. He has not yet seen that.

Todd Collins was the next speaker. He noted he was a member of the School Board but not speaking as a representative of the Board today. At the last meeting he asked that the schools be given a role in this process, as it is difficult to discuss rebuilding a neighborhood with discussing the role of schools in that neighborhood. He noted the School District formally asked for a seat at the table and had not been granted one. He hoped that would be discussed, as the School District would like to participate in the process. He said he and the Chief Business Officer had met with Mr. Lait and Ms. Lee and had a good discussion about some of the issues facing the group and some of the considerations regarding schools. That alerted the School Board to some of the complex issues with school sites and the difficulty of working with a 60-acre parcel and all the landholders. He believed this made it even more important for the School Board to be involved in this project. He noted this was a part of the growth of the City and if school sites were not planned for as neighborhoods grow, there would not be school sites in the neighborhoods. Children would be crossing El Camino, Page Mill and Alma to get to school or taking cars to get to school, unless something is done to preserve neighborhood schools, which has been a core foundation as a stated value of the Palo Alto School Board for 50 years. He urged those who care about the schools to speak for the schools.

Karen Holman spoke next. She commented that she had not seen an economic analysis, and she thought that was really important. There seemed to be some assumptions made based on comments made by various members of the public or Working Group Members. She believed there really needed to be a professional economic analysis performed. SOFA was often mentioned, that was done for SOFA, it's done for Comprehensive Plan Programs. As a coordinated area plan, this would be highly appropriate. She stated she had heard a question come up several times at Working Group meetings, as to the basis

ADA. The City of Palo Alto does not discriminate against individuals with disabilities. To request accommodations, auxiliary aids or services to access City facilities, services or programs, to participate at public meetings, or to learn about the City's compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990, may contact 650-329-2550 (voice), or e-mail ada@cityofpaloalto.org. This agenda is posted in accordance with government code section 54954.2(a) or section 54956. Members of the public are welcome to attend this public meeting.

from which the Working Group is founding their recommendations. She noted the zoning on the properties RM30 and if this runs the same as SOFA, RM30 is the baseline zoning, so anything that was granted above that would be part of a give and take. Someone had talked about negotiations and that could be done in a coordinated area plan, but it would have to be a give and take. There were no assumed rights beyond an RM30. She acknowledged that was her experience in what seemed appropriate. In the same scenario, she advised there had been a lot of redevelopment going on while this process was ongoing, and during the SOFA Plan, all the development and redevelopment stopped. Otherwise it's a moving target. You don't know what your baseline is, what you're working with, what is there to build upon. She asked that the target stop moving. She appreciated the historic analysis for the Fry's Building and the office building. She encouraged the consultants to also do interviews with the local residents who are descendants of the family that started the cannery there. She added that uniqueness of architecture was one of the criteria for historic evaluation, and the Fry's Building in particular was certainly a unique building, not only in Palo Alto but in a larger geographic area. Along with that it was also an important opportunity to celebrate our Chinese culture and history. The owner of the cannery was such a successful businessman, he was the wealthiest Chinese person in possibly the country when he passed away. To put that into context, who now could he be compared with. She encouraged recognition and appreciation of what the value and importance was of the cannery and the people who founded that cannery. She also felt, along with the Fry's site, is to understand what's possible with the Fry's Building, some kind of information of what the square footage is, the heights. With a building like that, it's important to look at what could happen in that building in terms of adaptive reuse. To look at just the X-FAR or X square footage isn't really informative to most people. It doesn't really foster creative ideas of what it could be used for. Industrial buildings could be regaled, featured and enhanced. She also indicated she had not seen a list of potential funding sources. There were potential funding sources for renaturalization of the creek. To understand what is feasible and what isn't, so ideas aren't just cast aside as not affordable, can't ask property owners, she recommended getting on the table what the potential funding sources were for different ideas.

The next speaker was Mark Moninow. He remarked that he moved into Palo Alto this month and is renting. He stated that \$1500 gets you about 86 square feet and when you have smaller units, things become relatively more affordable. He felt Palo Alto needed to address the fact that there was a need for affordable housing and what could Palo Alto do to make sure it is doing well. He suggested looking at the implicit costs that went into making buildings and units. Part of this was land costs, which not much could be done about. Other implicit costs, the bigger you make it the more expensive it is going to be per square foot. He noted one very important implicit cost was parking costs. When parking on site is required, that corresponds directly to being more expensive for people who live there. Should this just be mandated to keep cars off the street? Congestion is a very real issue and you can't just let people park everywhere. He believed Palo Alto needed to address the issue. As places densify, the more people there are, the less street parking is available. He didn't believe the answer was to require parking on site. This just passed the expense to the renter and other occupiers. He remarked there were many people without a car. If parking is not made convenient or required, people would find ways to get around without a car, which he has done. He asked for this area, looking at ideas of not going with outdated modes of how to require parking and look at how to make things more affordable and convenient to get around without a car.

The last speaker was Cedric De la Bougedare. He echoed what Ken Joye said, Park Boulevard was a very important bicycle route. There was already a lot of traffic on that road that was not being properly ADA. The City of Palo Alto does not discriminate against individuals with disabilities. To request accommodations, auxiliary aids or services to access City facilities, services or programs, to participate at public meetings, or to learn about the City's compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990, may contact 650-329-2550 (voice), or e-mail ada@cityofpaloalto.org. This agenda is posted in accordance with government code section 54954.2(a) or section 54956. Members of the public are welcome to attend this public meeting.

addressed by the City, so that should not be made worse. He agreed that if only the cut-through traffic is dealt with on Ash, Pepper and Olive, that would drive traffic towards Park. If that was done, there would definitely need to be a right-turn lane on El Camino to Page Mill. He has asked for that for a number of years. When watching traffic patterns, the reason there was a lot of cut-through traffic was because there were people driving straight through who were stopped at that right-most lane. He also agreed that the crossing at Page Mill was unnecessary and efforts and funds would be better applied to crossing the train at Alma at Matadero Creek. That crossing is on the City's Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Plan. Regarding office and housing space, his research found that 120 square feet is about the minimum for office per person. This took into account common space. It looked like the minimum housing was about 300 square feet per person. That roughly equates to needing three times the square footage for housing to office. Open space for housing would be good, which would increase that ratio. He remarked that he found missing from the summary of comments, was a call for rooftop gardens accessible to residents of that space. Private open space was important to personal wellbeing. He thought widening and naturalizing the creek was the superior option. The usable edge didn't really help the ecosystem. Currently, the native frogs can't get down through the concrete channels and into the creek to breed. There has been a steep decline of the amphibian populations in the City over the course of the past decade. He suggested this would be an opportunity to widen that channel into what was currently the Fry's parking lot, make that into a park, a natural habitat area. He also encouraged the group to look at underground parking and podium and not waste surface area on parking of cars. Digging down into the soil might find contaminated soil, and that would be an opportunity to clean that soil. He hoped the City would look at cleaning the soil instead of shipping it off or sealing it in.

Mr. Lait thanked the speakers for their comments. He remarked that he was speaking to Ms. Lee about looking at how to respond to those in a form where the speakers get a response. They will look at identifying those questions on the website and give a staff response to them so everyone can see that there had been acknowledgement and effort to respond to the questions. Staff is also available after the meetings and between the Working Group meetings for further following as needed.

WG Comments and Questions

Mr. Lait called on Angela Dellaporta because she had sent an email initiating a question and representing a number of other board members. He asked that this be kept to about 15 minutes with some opportunity for dialogue with staff and the Working Group.

Angela Dellaporta noted she would be addressing a lot of things the public had just addressed. She stated Kirsten Flynn would be doing this and they would be asking for opinions about all of this for feedback and ideas.

Kirsten Flynn indicated this presentation was for discussion purposes. They found they were asking some of the same questions and thought it might be worth presenting it to the whole group to see if they had the same questions. She remarked the Group had a challenging job. There was a huge amount of material to be absorbed in a relatively short time. They wanted to come up with a plan that everyone would be happy with. To that end, they created a proposal. Studies had shown that the most effective group decision-making process emphasizes collaboration, dialogue and discussion to create true consensus, and prevents mistrust and resentment amongst the stakeholders, speed the process toward a solution and create a solution that is widely acceptable and pleasing to all. They want to make a final ADA. The City of Palo Alto does not discriminate against individuals with disabilities. To request accommodations, auxiliary aids or services to access City facilities, services or programs, to participate at public meetings, or to learn about the City's compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990, may contact 650-329-2550 (voice), or e-mail ada@cityofpaloalto.org. This agenda is posted in accordance with government code section 54954.2(a) or section 54956. Members of the public are welcome to attend this public meeting.

plan that has buy-in from everyone concerned which will facilitate it not being held up by people who think they have not been heard.

Angela Dellaporta presented what she called a diagram describing the different levels, the spectrum of involvement that people might have in a process like this. This was handed out to everyone who wanted one. This diagram described the different levels and she pointed out specifically collaboration, which was needed because that would lead to the best result overall. Under collaboration the Working Group would partner with the public in every aspect of the decision, including the development of alternatives and the identification of the preferred solution. The Working Group, the City and the consultants would work together to formulate solutions and incorporate advice and recommendations to the maximum extent possible. She noted that was different from just keeping people informed. It was really working together, and that was what they were aiming for and what the process was described as. The first proposal had seven parts which will be gone through as quickly as possible and then ask for questions or comments. This is not saying this has to be done this way, but they want ideas. The SOFA Working Group was extremely successful and Mr. Lait has said they want to model this group on that process. In SOFA I and SOFA II there were two phases. After SOFA I the Working Group realized they wanted a liaison between the Working Group and the City and the consultants. They elected two co-chairs from the Working Group, one from among residents and one from among property developers. The co-chairs acted as liaisons, dealt with the communications needs and helped to set the agenda for each meeting. That was recommended by the SOFA Group. It was hoped this would aid in the process and help everyone feel they are collaborating and not just being informed. She stated another thing they were aware of was that more information will usually lead to a better decision. They wanted to get a full and complete Existing Conditions Report. There was an Existing Conditions Report in the second meeting which had a lot of important information but the SOFA Working Group had a lot more detailed information before they started making decisions or designs. Ms. Dellaporta felt more information would help the group make better decisions.

Kirsten Flynn explained they would like an Existing Conditions Report that had information on hydrology, including the creek; vegetation and wildlife; public and environmental safety; public services and utilities; cultural and historical resources; visual quality and design; geologic and seismic hazards; detailed marked feasibility study, which was essential and the public asked for that; noise map; complete detailed zoning maps that may be down to the parcel level; existing, recently completed and approved buildings, square feet, which speaks to the permit process, with information on the number of square feet of offices in the building, the number of housing units, the number of retail units, and comparison to that density in Downtown Palo Alto; requirements and restrictions regarding development in this area, i.e. open space required as per the Comprehensive Plan and other City guidelines. She understood some of this might be so native to people who do planning all the time that they don't realize not everyone knows this. They would like to have that information as they start to make decisions about the NVCAP area.

Ms. Dellaporta also felt that questions regarding the Draft Existing Conditions Report should be addressed at the Working Group meetings, because that was the way everyone could hear the answers to the questions asked. It would also make sense that the Draft Existing Conditions Report should be amended where necessary before designs are made, because it didn't make sense to make designs based on flawed or incomplete information. Several neighbors had asked to see the full Existing Conditions Report, not just a summary, so that should be available to all the Working Group Members

ADA. The City of Palo Alto does not discriminate against individuals with disabilities. To request accommodations, auxiliary aids or services to access City facilities, services or programs, to participate at public meetings, or to learn about the City's compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990, may contact 650-329-2550 (voice), or e-mail ada@cityofpaloalto.org. This agenda is posted in accordance with government code section 54954.2(a) or section 54956. Members of the public are welcome to attend this public meeting.

and to the public. This is a lot of information but it was available to the SOFA Working Group and it was felt this Working Group would make better decisions if they had that information.

The next point was presented by Ms. Flynn. This was, communication between the Working Group Members and staff should be easier and frequent. Questions should be answered promptly. All relevant information obtained by the City and the consultants should be readily available to the Working Group Members. She noted one example might be that the transcripts of the stakeholder meetings would be very informative to the Working Group Members.

Ms. Dellaporta indicated that the only time that the Working Group as a whole can discuss the issues that need to be discussed was in this room, in front of the public. They also know that dialogue and discussion are crucial for a really good plan that everyone will feel comfortable with and accept. Ample time needed to be allotted during the meetings for this dialogue and discussion. This might seem counterintuitive, but they felt that ample time in these meetings to iron out any problems will save time at the end, because there would be full buy-in from the public, no resistance, no one would feel left out.

The next point was put forth by Ms. Flynn. This was that designs should reflect and be responsive to the expressed project goals and opinions of the stakeholders, residents, Working Group Members, the City and the property owners. They understand that there would be project limitations and constraints on what could be done, but they want to know more about what they were so solutions would meet as much of everyone's wish list as possible. The only way to do that is to know what the wish list was and what the constraints were.

Ms. Dellaporta listed the next point and noted this was in originally, and not just in response to Mr. Collin's request. They heard what he said at the last meeting, and agree that a representative from the School District should be on the Working Group to act as a liaison and help make decisions about schools in the Ventura neighborhood.

Ms. Flynn noted the last point was that a clear statement should be made describing: the definition of a successful outcome; how decisions on the final recommendation would be made; who would be writing it; responsibilities and contributions expected from each individual or party to this group.

Ms. Dellaporta requested a few minutes to discuss these ideas to see if anyone agrees with them, and make a decision about whether or not some of these ideas should be used. She explained she had handed out a sheet which listed all of the points under Proposal One so anyone could ask questions or make comments about them.

Mr. Lait stated a time check was needed. He thanked Ms. Dellaporta and Ms. Flynn for their work on this. He was heartened by the fact that there didn't seem to be a lot of misalignment in their interests and what she was reporting. Communication has been a challenge in some areas. He noted all the studies listed in number two, were being done. The question was when. He got the sense that the Working Group was at the place where they were being talked to a lot about trying to set the foundation for the conversation that he wanted to have at this meeting, getting thoughts and ideas around what the area looks like. He didn't know if it was a sequential type of discussion where all this information was needed upfront before beginning to explore some of the other areas. He felt it might be helpful if staff met with Ms. Dellaporta and Ms. Flynn if there would be another conversation outside

ADA. The City of Palo Alto does not discriminate against individuals with disabilities. To request accommodations, auxiliary aids or services to access City facilities, services or programs, to participate at public meetings, or to learn about the City's compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990, may contact 650-329-2550 (voice), or e-mail ada@cityofpaloalto.org. This agenda is posted in accordance with government code section 54954.2(a) or section 54956. Members of the public are welcome to attend this public meeting.

the Working Group to go over each point in a little more detail. Some of these points they are getting to, some of them the Council didn't direct them to do that. This might be some misinformation. The economic study done was of the existing conditions. A very robust economic analysis will be prepared, but if there was not enough economic interest in redeveloping the Fry's site specifically, there isn't much of a plan. The whole North Ventura Coordinated Area Plan had identified the Fry's site specifically as the housing opportunity site where there could be more housing. There is probably a fair amount of revenue being generated by the existing building where there may not even be enough incentive for the property owner to even want to redevelop the site. So that may be a very real scenario and whether or not there was enough interest in the community to tolerate something that would be able to encourage redevelopment of that property. That is a discussion he wanted to have at this meeting to begin to understand all the different areas that have been talked about in this, a hugely important issue, a lot of emotional interest. This would need to be explored to the reality of what it would take to daylight that and the constrained space available and the costs that may be involved, and meeting the hazard issue that underlie the area. He didn't want to stifle Working Group participation in this or the next proposal. He would make himself, Elena and Geeti available outside the Working Group meeting to go over this proposal in great detail and understand where there might be areas of alignment to work together, and areas where a question would need to be posed to the City Council, to say there is interest that has been expressed, and this is what it would mean in terms of schedule or cost or improving the trust in the outcome, which was essential. If there wasn't that, where was not point in spending all this time away from families. He felt a lot of these questions could be answered and maybe report back on them at the appropriate time by email before the next Working Group meeting.

Ms. Flynn asked if there were more than six people from the Working Group who wanted to take this offline, who may support this, would there be a Brown Act issue? Would that have to be a Brown Act meeting? She indicated they were not the only ones interested. They were just the ones talking.

Mr. Lait didn't want to make this a meeting that was subject to the Brown Act. He felt representative interest could be identified, Ms. Flynn, Ms. Dellaporta, Mr. Holzmer, Ms. Summa, maybe others who would want to be a part of that discussion. He didn't believe a scheduled Brown Act meeting would be needed for that.

Mr. Lait noted the irony was that this meeting was poised to do the kind of thing they were asking for, and the more the process and questions were talked about, it was taking time from getting into that. He was worried there would not be enough time. He asked the group if they wanted to talk more about the process and the other proposal or just get into it.

Mr. Lait noted the constraint was that going into this, it would be an aggressive schedule. He questioned if this was a grant they even wanted to apply for, because he wasn't sure Palo Alto could adhere to the two-year time schedule in which to draft a coordinated area plan.

Mr. Lait responded that they were starting from when they started, not back in January. He stated there weren't a lot of months available for decision making in the community between vacations, summer, elections. These all factor into when decisions get made. He sympathized with the time constraint because staff was feeling it, as well as the consultants because this was something they were all trying to make happen.

Ms. Dellaporta asked if other members of the Working Group felt comfortable with the idea of postponing a decision on proposal one, until the next meeting after some members meet with City?

ADA. The City of Palo Alto does not discriminate against individuals with disabilities. To request accommodations, auxiliary aids or services to access City facilities, services or programs, to participate at public meetings, or to learn about the City's compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990, may contact 650-329-2550 (voice), or e-mail ada@cityofpaloalto.org. This agenda is posted in accordance with government code section 54954.2(a) or section 54956. Members of the public are welcome to attend this public meeting.

Terry Holzmer noted he had some trepidation about it. He understood there were time limits and restrictions on time because the Council said a plan was needed by November.

Mr. Lait responded that it was not just the Council. The Council was responding to requirements of the grant. In accepting \$650,000, the commitment was made to deliver a plan within two years.

Mr. Holzmer indicated he understood that, but he felt if a plan was created that the community was not behind, that people had problems or issues with, there would be much bigger issues than losing \$650,000. He worried there would be a loss of public trust. He thought maybe some push back on time might be needed. He would be willing to go to Council and tell them more time was needed, if that was necessary. He also felt they needed to do the best job they could with the information given and part of the reason several members got together was because they felt there was not adequate information and frustration with that.

Mr. Lait agreed. The type of analysis the group wants has not been done yet. Existing conditions was done, familiarity with the site, understanding the circulation, the access of different areas by various modes of transportation. He noted they were trying to understand all of the decision that would go into redesigning or planning for a neighborhood.

Ms. Flynn hoped they were trying to offer solutions.

Ms. Dellaporta indicated she hoped a decision could be made on Proposal One at the next meeting and most people nodded. She put forth Proposal Two. She realized there was a lot of information that needed to be gathered. She felt it made more sense to divide up the work the come back and report to everyone on the in-depth research necessary for large amounts of information. She shared the idea of creating some subcommittees with fewer than six Working Group per subcommittee. These subcommittees would team up with local experts. There were already several local experts known who were interested in helping gather information and do some of the research so the subcommittees could report back to the group.

Ms. Flynn explained the subcommittees would become sort of the knowledgeable body on the following six subjects: the creek hydrology, flood control, possibility of renaturalization; historical and cultural preservation; maintenance of the diversity that everyone is committed to in the neighborhood character; financial analysis of neighborhoods serving retail on small office, what has worked in other cities with similar developments; financial analysis of housing, partner with financial analyst here, how many units could be reasonably expected, what kind of profit could be expected from this type of development; research on potential income sources, for example, tech companies sometimes were willing to step in to help with worker housing category of housing; environment, how dangerous was the toxic plume, how can it be mitigated, how is it safe during construction, environmental building standards and ideas; modalities, transportation. This subcommittee would study parking, car traffic, walking, biking and public transportation.

Ms. Dellaporta interjected she hoped they could come up with some nice plans and designs. This would all be to compliment the work already done, in addition to and to help and support that work from the citizens' side. She pointed out on the back of the hand out there was Proposal Two, and if anyone was

ADA. The City of Palo Alto does not discriminate against individuals with disabilities. To request accommodations, auxiliary aids or services to access City facilities, services or programs, to participate at public meetings, or to learn about the City's compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990, may contact 650-329-2550 (voice), or e-mail ada@cityofpaloalto.org. This agenda is posted in accordance with government code section 54954.2(a) or section 54956. Members of the public are welcome to attend this public meeting.

interested in being on one of the committees, they should indicate somehow which subcommittee they might be interested in serving on with their name on the bottom. Because of the Brown Act, she asked Ms. Lee to communicate and let everyone know who is interested in which subcommittees. She offered to talk to anyone and answer any questions after the meeting.

Gail Price noted Proposal Two was important and detailed and was also related to what happens to Proposal One. She stated there were many core issues that still needed discussion. She questioned the idea of subcommittees, from the point of view of the consultants and staff, would staff be required to attend those meetings or would this be a type of free-standing committee structure to bring things back to the Working Group?

Ms. Dellaporta replied that it was their idea that it would be free-standing and from the citizens' point of view. It would compliment the information the City brought to the Group.

Ms. Price commented that the consultants were being paid to do much of this work and they had the expertise. Citizens have creative ideas and it might be preferable to consider having that input once the core pieces were there to respond to because of the timing pressure. Her view was to give the consultants and staff a chance to put things out there that can be responded to. She felt this would be jumping too fast.

Ms. Dellaporta responded that they were told the SOFA Group had all that information, an economic feasibility study, and all the other information before they started. This was very helpful because it's hard to make decisions without this information.

Tim Steele stated he was not familiar with the SOFA. He asked how it was funded and what was the time period it happened.

Mr. Lait replied that question was asked a lot and he didn't know the answer.

Elena Lee indicated that one of the key differences with SOFA was that there was a large property owner who was involved and owned a significant part of the SOFA, so they paid for a portion of it.

Tim Steele asked how long that whole community process and development of the plan take?

Ms. Lee thought it lasted three to four years.

Karen Holman explained that it lasted quite a long time, and that was why it was divided into Phase One, which was where there was a significant property owner, the Palo Alto Clinic. They were not the exclusive owner of property there, but they were a primary. Here there are several primary property owners. SOFA was divided into two phases because it was taking long enough and it was unique. Almost the only criticism of that Working Group and the process was that it took so long. They went through four or five planning directors in that period of time so there were long gaps. SOFA II happened in a much more timely fashion and multiple property owners. She was a co-chair of SOFA II as a resident, and Larry Hasser who was both a property owner and business owner.

Mr. Lait thanked Ms. Flynn and Ms. Dellaporta for bringing their ideas to the discussion. He felt it was important to continue this dialogue. Everyone wanted this process to succeed and there were some opportunities to enhance communication among staff and the Working Group in terms of expectations and roles and how to get more of the things everyone wants sooner or when to expect they will play out down the road. Where there might be something contrary to the course laid out, checking with the Council would be needed. He indicated they were checking in with the Council in May to report back on the Town Hall direction received, so that could be a good opportunity to raise some of these issues at that meeting to get Council guidance.

Mr. Lait responded that he was expecting more exchange of ideas at that meeting, and when the moment presented itself, it didn't happen. That was a unique meeting, a Town Hall. The meeting in May will be a formal Council meeting.

Doria Summa thanked Ms. Price for her comments. She noted when they were working on this, that they might be getting a lot of the materials they asked for. From her point of view, the problem was how few meetings are left to have a dialogue and there was a lot of concern that it would end up with a lot of people surprised not in a good way by what was being proposed. She suggested adding meetings, and she would be happy to make that commitment. It was getting too close to the end of the project and there hasn't been a dialogue amongst themselves.

Schedule update and What We've Heard

Kristen Hall stated today there would be a schedule update and then talk about what has been heard over the last few meetings as a way to set up framework for planning. Members would be given some background. Looking at the list that was proposed on the elements of the subcommittees, it was their hope to make everyone sort of mini-experts in the topic areas and give the knowledge needed to help understand the tradeoffs in decision making for all the elements. There would be discussion about the historic context, about what's happening with the creek, some ideas about open space and mobility and layout what could be called an urban design framework upon which everyone will start picking up elements, putting them down together and then having conversations. There will be discussion about the different building types that could happen, potential uses. There would be three tables and three groups. Each group will together work through this planning game and then report out. The economic consultant and the transportation consultant were present to help answer questions. There would be a wrap-up at the end to get some feedback on the ideas shared from the consultants.

Discussion Items

Planning Framework Presentation

Ms. Hall referred to the timeline. Currently April 17 was in the middle of Develop Plan Options. It started with existing conditions, moved into some visioning exercises, places that might be good examples to borrow some ideas from. Then there was the workshop with a lot of feedback and a first chance to get hands on a plan. Today's meeting will be getting hands on more intensely. At the next Working Group Meeting, after taking the three plans and distilling them into two, to get feedback and input on those ideas. That same material will be taken out to the community for feedback and input from them. This is

ADA. The City of Palo Alto does not discriminate against individuals with disabilities. To request accommodations, auxiliary aids or services to access City facilities, services or programs, to participate at public meetings, or to learn about the City's compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990, may contact 650-329-2550 (voice), or e-mail ada@cityofpaloalto.org. This agenda is posted in accordance with government code section 54954.2(a) or section 54956. Members of the public are welcome to attend this public meeting.

working towards two plans that will bracket the different options and that is what would be studied with an economic feasibility and many elements on the list, noise, environmental quality. After the community workshop the move will be into the preferred plan development, taking elements of that to decide what to keep. Throughout this time, they will be going to City Council for periodic check ins. Looking at some of the things heard here and at the community workshop, there was a lot of interest in keeping this a diverse place in terms of the existing diversity, ethnic diversity, income diversity, diversity of types of housing and types of places. There has been a desire for really high-quality mobility infrastructure, specifically bikes and walking; a desire for street trees, a desire for beautiful architecture, elegant and inspiring. There is a desire for comfortable streets that don't feel like canyons. There have been ideas on how to do that around setbacks and different kinds of design guidelines. There has been a lot of feedback about the creek, the opportunity of the creek, the desire for this to be a showcase for the creek. There has been a lot about housing, a need for housing, a desire for affordable housing and diverse types of housing.

Rachael Cleveland offered some foundations to the planning framework. This will start with the Historic Context and everyone received the draft report of the Historic Resource analysis. Basically, the report looked at two structures, the Fry's building and the office building on Ash Street. Also highlighted was the railway spur, as this also had historic significance because it served during the period when Fry's was operating as a canning facility. The two rectangular red squares were just to highlight the two architectural features that were quite compelling and they represent the two areas of significance. The red rectangle to the northeast was from the Chew Family era, with the monitored roof structure. To the southwest was from the Sutter Packing era, with the bell and truss featured architecture. In terms of the Historic Context, the plan area was in the Town of Mayfield formed in 1855 and annexed by Palo Alto in 1925. The Fry's building, which is a complex of different warehouses, was added over time and currently, very important, it was not listed on the National Register or the California Register. However, due to the events that occurred here, it is eligible for listing on the California Register at the local level. The events have to do with the canning industry. There aren't many buildings in the area that represent the canning industry, so it is something that could really showcase the canning industry in Santa Clara County, understanding and acknowledging the events that occurred here. No other buildings within the NVCAP boundary are eligible as historic resources. She stated the first important thing to acknowledge is that the plan needs to help tell this history, tell this story to understand what the options are. She noted there was no specific criteria for what has to be done in terms of what part of the building to retain or whether or not the railway spur would be highlighted. The idea is to come up with some plans that communicate to everyone this historic interest and importance. Part of the building could be retained, potential to retain the office building and part of the Fry's building. All options are on the table and the point is to study those together to make a compelling case for interpreting and communicating this history. Because it's eligible, the proposal and plan will be reviewed as part of the CEQA process for its historic resource. Next, she spoke about the Matadero Creek. Basically, the creek is under the jurisdiction of the Santa Clara Valley Water District, so inclusive of the creek, there is a 60-foot easement. That is all under the jurisdiction of the Water District. It provides a 100-year flood control for the Matadero Watershed. Any change that would happen, any type of naturalization or design change would still need to maintain that function. There is a contamination plume beneath the site. Currently, it is not actually beneath the creek, but there is the potential for migration of that plume, so it important to understand what the implications are. She stated they are assembling a team of consultants to analyze the feasibility of three scenarios. That team of consultants will have a hydrologist, a landscape architect, biologist, environmental engineer to create a very thorough study of the feasibility of these

ADA. The City of Palo Alto does not discriminate against individuals with disabilities. To request accommodations, auxiliary aids or services to access City facilities, services or programs, to participate at public meetings, or to learn about the City's compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990, may contact 650-329-2550 (voice), or e-mail ada@cityofpaloalto.org. This agenda is posted in accordance with government code section 54954.2(a) or section 54956. Members of the public are welcome to attend this public meeting.

options and a cost analysis. This would include how much land needed to be acquired to make these options viable. The first option was naturalization and the removal of the concrete channel within the plan area. The second scenario was partial naturalization and partial removal of the concrete channel. The third option was retention of this engineered concrete channel, but with occupiable landscaped space adjacent to the channel.

Mr. Steele asked to offer a fourth option. Put a top on it and use that as public space.

Keith Reckdahl commented that Boulware Park was just down the road and that borders on Boulware Park. He asked if they were looking at just the portion of the creek that was on the Fry's property or also the impacts to Boulware Park?

Ms. Lee responded that there were coordinating with the Public Works Department, so that will also be considered.

Rachel indicated the next foundation was open space. This is important as a community amenity and the existing open space of Sarah Wallis Park and Boulware Park were not necessarily adequately serving the community and particularly the middle of the site was underserved even if Boulware Park was extended. The extension had to do with the City putting in an offer for that part of the AT&T parcel, which was outlined in red. If that extension were to happen, it would bring Boulware Park up to a little over two acres, which is about the size of a neighborhood park. They are also looking at potential open space within the plan area. They have heard a lot of interest for a linear park along the creek, and that was part of what is being studied right now. They are also looking at the potential for using the historic railway spur as an opportunity for open space. These were two suggestions or recommendations.

Tim Steele remarked that the 1.2-acre piece was not very thoughtful yet. If you look at what the shortfall was of what the parks were, if you're looking at redeveloping the whole site, there might be a better way to approach what they're looking for by establishing the 1.2 acres comes out of whatever design comes into the part versus just willy-nilly picking an old rail spur that was closed in 1968 that goes nowhere that affects your ability to develop the remainder and not necessarily achieves a cohesive park because it goes from nowhere to park. He challenged that that wasn't the correct approach to talk about open space and the future development of the site.

Rachel responded that today part of the game was to talk just about that. These are really suggestions, but by no means where open space will be put.

Tim Steele felt it was misleading to put it on the map.

Ms. Flynn asked what the guidelines were for how much park land a neighborhood should have.

Keith Reckdahl responded it was 4 acres for every 1,000 residents.

Ms. Flynn understood that Boulware Park also counts for the residents outside of the Plan Area.

Rachel asked if questions could be saved for after the presentation.

ADA. The City of Palo Alto does not discriminate against individuals with disabilities. To request accommodations, auxiliary aids or services to access City facilities, services or programs, to participate at public meetings, or to learn about the City's compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990, may contact 650-329-2550 (voice), or e-mail ada@cityofpaloalto.org. This agenda is posted in accordance with government code section 54954.2(a) or section 54956. Members of the public are welcome to attend this public meeting.

Autumn Bernstein is a transportation planner and a native of Mountain View, California. She noted they had spent some time thinking about mobility. They put together the Existing Conditions Report. She wanted to highlight some things they thought were important. These were not recommendations at this point. These are constraints and opportunities that will need to be balanced as part of the overall plan. She encouraged everyone to think about these as things to keep in your head as working through the plan as opposed to specific recommendations. She wanted to talk about El Camino and Oregon, site access and internal connectivity as this a unique site that is bifurcated currently from a transportation perspective. She wanted to talk about Park Boulevard, parking, Portage Ave and traffic calming in the existing Olive and Pepper neighborhoods. In terms of El Camino Real and Oregon Expressway, there are a lot of things being planned already for this area. Particularly, the County is looking at adding carpool lanes for Page Mill going westbound towards 280, not on the Oregon Expressway side as far as they know at this point. There is no specific timeline or very many details about those improvements, but they are in the works. From her analysis, they think the right turn from El Camino onto Oregon Expressway for anyone trying to get to 101 really backs up in the morning, and that was a factor that was driving a lot of the cut-through traffic in the neighborhood. They think it was worth looking at potentially a new right-turn lane from El Camino onto Oregon Expressway, so people can move through that intersection and not be stopped by everyone who is just waiting to go through the light. That was a key piece and along with that it was important to think about bicycle and pedestrian crossings, because it's known there are a lot of conflicts in this area. There are people who use El Camino Real on bicycles and crossing these major streets is a big hazard. There is also the possibility of a bike/ped crossing at Ash. They factored this in because when they did the observations for the Existing Conditions Report, they saw multiple pedestrians and at least one bicyclist trying to carry his bike up and over the center divider. This is a concern from the perspective that people are doing this currently. Also, as connectivity is improved across the site, there could actually be more people trying to cross here if they were coming through from a new development on the Fry's site. This could be a problem that gets worse in the future if something is not done about it. A crossing might be quite expensive and cost-prohibitive, and if it is something that is not feasible, thought needs to be given to how to discourage people from crossing there by directing them to other places that are safer to cross, and potentially making it difficult or impossible to cross on foot. This was something that needs to be thought about and aware of. In terms of thinking about improvements at this intersection, the Palo Alto Grand Boulevard Safety Study that recently came out was looked at and it was felt they had a very compelling vision for improving this intersection for bicyclists and pedestrians. It involves having protected bike lanes on El Camino, where there is a physical separation between bicycles and cars for several blocks because there are many people coming from Stanford Research Park and trying to get across to California Avenue train station, people crossing for schools. This is an area that, if possible, can be made safer for bikes will really help a lot. There are many bicycle and pedestrian collisions in this area. She wanted to highlight that study as something members of the Working Group might want to look at and think about, if there were recommendations there they would like to incorporate into the plan.

Ms. Bernstein replied yes, in this case, and pedestrian. She acknowledged it was a little hard to see. The green areas would be stripped, but there were actually continuous separated bike lanes on both sides of El Camino all across the diagram. She then moved on to Park Boulevard. She noted they heard from many that improving bicycle and pedestrian travel on Park was really important. They came up with the idea, and later realized that the City was also thinking about the idea, of a two-way cycle track on the north side of Park. That is the side that is closest to the railroad tracks, having bikes go both directions on that side of the street, and then have a physical barrier between them and the cars. The reason they

ADA. The City of Palo Alto does not discriminate against individuals with disabilities. To request accommodations, auxiliary aids or services to access City facilities, services or programs, to participate at public meetings, or to learn about the City's compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990, may contact 650-329-2550 (voice), or e-mail ada@cityofpaloalto.org. This agenda is posted in accordance with government code section 54954.2(a) or section 54956. Members of the public are welcome to attend this public meeting.

think that made sense was because there are a lot of left-hand turns. If they're going on Park towards California Avenue, people make left turns to get onto Oregon Expressway. With the new development in the site, there would be people making left turns to get into the Fry's site. So, by having it on the north side, bicyclists can more through this area. There are driveways that would need to be looked at because that could create potential conflicts, but, hopefully, that will help avoid and minimize conflicts to bicyclists passing through the area as the site builds out. This needs to be studied, but it was an initial idea.

Sylvia, Transportation Manager wanted it made clear that that cycle track was not already planned by the City. It was an idea that was thrown into play, but is not actually planned.

Rachael noted as part of that they might want to think about consolidating driveways as future development happens on the north side of Park Boulevard to minimize conflicts, and also at Portage and at the turn onto the Oregon Expressway. Traffic signals would be something that they would want to think about. Currently there is no Portage. It is basically the entrance to the Fry's parking lot. If that becomes a way that people are getting in and out of the site, it would likely need a signal. At the Oregon on-ramp, or Page Mill as it's called, there may be a need to have a signal that has a left-hand turn, because you could anticipate more people using that intersection, depending on traffic goes in and out of this site. She next talked about Portage Avenue. She noted this was really the primary route now in and out of the Fry's site, because it has a signalized intersection at El Camino Real. It is also a very important bicycle and pedestrian ramp because Hansen Way on the other side of El Camino is a way that a lot of people come and then cross and make a funny zig-zag from Hansen across El Camino onto Portage. This is an area that they think needs a lot of study, thinking about with future development there would be more cars and also it needs to be safe for bicyclists who are also using that crossing quite a bit. The Palo Alto Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan also calls for a Class 3 bike lane from El Camino to Park on Portage, so that is something that is an existing plan that has not yet been implemented. That is something that has been identified as a priority. Portage doesn't go all the way to Park right now, it dead ends at the Fry's parking lot so thinking about continuing that all the way to Park is an important question. That will have impacts on Park Boulevard if there are cars from the site using Park Boulevard as access versus keeping it as a dead end and having all the cars just using Portage to get in and out of the site. The site currently has fairly limited connectivity, so thinking about where cars should be going in the future is an important question because there are so few ways in and out of the site. The next slide was an aerial of the current intersection of Portage and Hansen and El Camino. It is a weird kind of zig-zag currently, and they think there may be ways to improve the way this intersection is designed and/or operated to make it safer. It is a hot spot currently for bicycle collisions, so making it safer was also identified in this Grand Boulevard Safety Study. The next slide was a design the Safety Study developed, which would allow bicyclists to go basically straight across at Portage and then have a protected way to get over the Hansen. This is planning work that has been done.

The next slide dealt with Olive and Pepper traffic Calming. There is a lot of cut-through traffic in the neighborhood. One suggestion was to ban left turns onto Ash from Pepper and Olive, which would prevent people from getting to Oregon Expressway, which is what they are trying to do currently. There was a question raised about what the impact that might have on Park. Would that encourage more people to go to Park? That is a possibility, but the reason they think that's not likely is because it's not going to be as fast. In order to get onto Oregon Expressway, if you take Olive you have to make a left on Park and then another left to get onto Oregon Expressway, and left turns are just more congested and more difficult. The way people are coming through now, they make that easy right turn onto Pepper,

ADA. The City of Palo Alto does not discriminate against individuals with disabilities. To request accommodations, auxiliary aids or services to access City facilities, services or programs, to participate at public meetings, or to learn about the City's compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990, may contact 650-329-2550 (voice), or e-mail ada@cityofpaloalto.org. This agenda is posted in accordance with government code section 54954.2(a) or section 54956. Members of the public are welcome to attend this public meeting.

Olive and then an easy right turn from Ash onto Oregon Expressway. There is no traffic on Ash, so the left turn is fast for people to do that. It would not be as fast to try to do that by making a left onto Park and then another left onto Oregon Expressway. That is an assumption and people who live in the area may know better. Another idea was, rather than doing the left-turn thing, if that's a potential concern, is to make at least Pepper, and potentially even Olive, one way towards El Camino. People literally would not be able to make a right turn. From Pepper you would only be able to go towards El Camino. That would obviously have impacts on the residents of those streets. It would be a pretty effective strategy to calm the traffic in the area. She noted there is a planned signalized crosswalk across El Camino Real at Olive. This is a required mitigation measure for some of the new development that's happening on the corner of Olive and El Camino. As part of that, traffic calming is needed because that will become a new way for people to get across El Camino who are on bike or on foot. That needs to be made safe for them, continue the zone of safety by having speed bumps on Olive and other traffic calming to make sure Olive is a safe place for bicyclists and pedestrians once they have crossed El Camino. The next slide dealt with site access and internal connectivity. The site was divided in two from a transportation perspective because there is a barrier southeast of Olive Avenue. They have thought about ways to increase connectivity within the site, the idea of potentially having a connector extending Ash from Olive all the way through to Acacia. This could be done just as a bicycle and pedestrian path or potentially something vehicles could go through. This would have some very big implications for the existing neighborhood, cars going through that area. If it was just a bicycle and pedestrian that could possibly be done as just an easement through someone's property to turn that into a bicycle and pedestrian path. There is also the question of extending Portage to Park. This was all put on one slide to raise the point that when new development happens in this area, there would be the question about where you would want the traffic associated with that. Should it all come out to Portage onto El Camino Real, which is quite congested in the morning. Should it go onto Park, which is a bicycle and pedestrian priority area or should it go across Olive onto Ash onto Oregon Expressway. This would be the most direct way to get cars onto Oregon Expressway, but would mean there would be more cars passing through the existing neighborhood. There are all tradeoffs that the Working Group will have to think about making the most sense. The idea would be to do everything possible to minimize the amount of new traffic that is generated by making it as bikeable and walkable and connected to Caltrain as possible. The last slide had to do with parking considerations. The impacts should be considered. Right now, parking utilization in the area is extremely low. There is plenty of on-street and off-street parking, but that will change in the future with the buildout of this site. It is important to consider impacts that would be created by new development on the existing neighborhood and for the build-out of the Plan Area, really being thoughtful about managing on-street parking so people are not parking on the street all day, and making sure there are Transportation Demand Management requirements in place for new development. This could include free transit passes for residents and secure bike parking and all the known things that encourage people to drive less or give up their cars. She noted she could go into more detail about that at a later time and if there were questions about it.

Kristen Hall next discussed parcel ownership. The slide showed a previous map with more detail. The colors corresponded to ownership. The purple areas are owned by the same person, and so on. There is a pattern of ownership which hints at some different potential ways things might be developed over time, given shared ownership and adjacency. On the next slide, the dark orange outline is the urban design framework which combines all the elements previously shown onto one map. This is the map on the table to work with. The dark orange outline is the common ownership, the blue intersections are the external intersections identified by Autumn, and some potential north-south connections are shown,

ADA. The City of Palo Alto does not discriminate against individuals with disabilities. To request accommodations, auxiliary aids or services to access City facilities, services or programs, to participate at public meetings, or to learn about the City's compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990, may contact 650-329-2550 (voice), or e-mail ada@cityofpaloalto.org. This agenda is posted in accordance with government code section 54954.2(a) or section 54956. Members of the public are welcome to attend this public meeting.

potential east-west connections, the dashed outlines for the potential green areas. This is all to help remember the places that have been talked about while doing the exercise.

Mr. Kaczmarek asked about Cloudera parking lot and its use.

Ms. Hall responded that was added. It is currently a parking lot. Being bold, they said, what if that parking lot could be something else. It is out there as an opportunity. There is nothing there right now except for surface parking.

Rachael clarified that the dotted areas are suggestions of connectivity, not saying this would have to be the geometry to be taken. That is highlighted in orange. There is the easement Autumn talked about. There is the capacity to have a north-south connection through Ash where you wouldn't remove any houses. This is just a suggestion of connectivity.

Ms. Hall noted that when the break-out groups are sitting in front of the maps, this can be talked about any questions that come up.

Mr. Steele asked for clarification for the outline of the proposed open space.

Ms. Hall responded that it is just a suggestion, the idea of linking to that potential historic traces of the rail line. It may not be something anybody feels is an interesting connection. This is just tracing outlines of things talked about at this meeting to help remember geographically where they are.

Rachel explained these should be thought of as opportunities, but there are also constraints. This is not saying that is where the open space has to go.

Ms. Hall continued with the next slide which dealt with building typologies. Everyone will be given cards with different building typologies on them. The slides discussed building types. The first was townhomes, which are what are currently permitted on the site. This is about 30 building units per acre, 35 feet in height. Typically, people purchase these as homes. They tend to have parking with the unit. The next slide showed pictures of several townhome types. Another possible building type is a multi-family residential or mixed use, called Type V in architecture parlance as described on the next slide. This is approximately 85 dwelling units per acre, can range anywhere between 45 feet and 65 feet. There could be an option to include ground-floor retail. There would be a requirement for at least 15% of the homes to be affordable. Parking is typically below grade or in the podium. The next slide showed pictures of this type of building. The next slide described a multi-family residential or mixed-use, Type III rental units. They are more affordable to a broader range of people because there is no down payment required. There are 120 dwelling unit per acre, and these can be 85 feet in height but tend to be more in the 75-foot height limit. There is an option for ground-floor retail in this type of building. Again at least 15% affordable units. Parking is below grade or in the podium. Pictures of this type of building are on the next slide.

Sujata Srivastava, the economic consultant spoke next. She noted the following slides had been presented in November. The State requires that cities plan for their housing growth and the City has a certified housing element from 2017 that established goals for housing production. The slide showed where Palo Alto was as a city in meeting its 2015 to 2023 goals for housing, which is about halfway through right now and 22% of the way towards meeting its goals. The City was doing better at producing

ADA. The City of Palo Alto does not discriminate against individuals with disabilities. To request accommodations, auxiliary aids or services to access City facilities, services or programs, to participate at public meetings, or to learn about the City's compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990, may contact 650-329-2550 (voice), or e-mail ada@cityofpaloalto.org. This agenda is posted in accordance with government code section 54954.2(a) or section 54956. Members of the public are welcome to attend this public meeting.

above moderate-income housing than the more affordable housing types. In terms of current housing that would be enabled by the zoning as it exists today, it would be more of the townhouse style, probably a for-sale type of product. That could change, particularly with the new housing incentive program and other types of strategies that could be put into place in this planning area that could allow for higher densities and different kinds of housing products. This would depend on how much redevelopment potential there is, given that most of the site is already occupied, and those opportunity sites have already been discussed as commercial properties for the most part. Some analysis of affordable housing potential housing has been done. What is known from their work is that it is very difficult to find funding sources for below market rate housing. Typically, currently the construction costs are about \$800,000 per unit for an affordable unit and cities typically need to contribute 20 to 25 percent of that to make the projects work. It is often difficult to put together the funding sources. Affordable housing developers also say that to be able to access the sources of such cities at the Federal, State level, tax credits, it is ideal to have a density that is higher, about 120 units per acre.

Ms. Srivastava responded that it was just about having enough density on the site to be able to access the tax credits and other types of funding sources, to really be able to get the economies of scale that are required to be able to put together the funding packet. It is also about the competition, most of the funding sources available are competitive. A lot is really tied to how competitive you are going to be against other communities in California that are also competing for tax credit funding. The City has approved Wilton Court, which will be the first 100% affordable housing unit very close to this site. The City has a policy currently that for for-sale product, 15% of the units need to be affordable to moderate income households. There is also a rental housing impact fee on rental developments that generates funding for the local funding gap for affordable housing. There is also a commercial linkage fee also. There are funding sources in place at the local level that can help meet the affordable housing needs, not just at this site but Citywide. There might be the potential to exceed that 15% in certain areas or under certain circumstances, particularly if going higher density. The office market is high for the entire Bay Area, commanding very high rents for office R&D. Right not at the site there are some properties that are renting office for between \$8-9 per square foot. In thinking about that, the attractiveness of redevelopment an existing leased office building into housing, there are some financial feasibility issues there, if you are not able to compete with those types of rents that are currently gotten with those properties, factoring in the construction costs and other things needed for a redevelopment project. This will be looked at when doing some financial feasibility analysis, what is the likelihood of redevelopment and what would be required to do something that is more comprehensive.

Mr. Steele noted with office leasing all the expenses are the tenants. On the residential, the \$5 is before about 33 percent is taken out for expenses. To compare the two, the \$5 should be dropped to \$3.50 at best.

A question was asked for comparison of retail rentals.

Ms. Srivastava noted for retail rents, it depended on the location. Typically for ground floor retail space it's usually between \$3-4 per square foot, unless it is a major tenant. There are some areas getting \$5 a square foot when it's really a premium retail site.

Mr. Steele agreed the size and location of the space made a difference. Another factor was how many Tenant Improvement dollars they need to put into their space that is specific to their use and would be disposed at the end of their term. This could be if a tenant needed all kinds of special lighting and decorations, the next tenant may not use any of it. That would need to be recouped in the rent schedule. The number goes down with the larger spaces because there are fewer of them. Fry's at 80,000 square feet would probably be looking at \$1.5 to 2 at best and it probably wouldn't be an 80,000 square foot, instead, three or four 20,000's.

Ms. Srivastava moved to retail. Many have observed the way retail is changing. Many big-box stores are shutting down. That isn't the future of retail so it would probably be very difficult to retenant exactly that same amount of retail space in a big-box format. There are many examples of breaking down those spaces, redeveloping them and turning them into something different. Some thinking needed to be done about if you were to try to preserve a larger amount of retail on this site, what would be a feasible type of retail format that would work. There are also some issues with the internal nature of the Fry's site relative to El Camino which has much more visibility for cars, easier to get in and out. Those are more desirable characteristics for the typical retailer. Much of the analysis they have done so far suggested that the amount of additional retail that could be supported in this site will be highly tied to how much additional activity can be gotten here, the new residents, new workers that can contribute that. There is also existing retail at California Avenue, El Camino, many other smaller retail centers. What could be possible here may be a little bit more neighborhood-serving types of retail, really for the new residents and workers.

Ms. Dellaporta asked who is going to help the Working Group in understanding the tradeoffs.

Ms. Srivastava replied that some of that work had been done in the Existing Conditions Report. That will be looked at closer as work is done on the alternatives. If you have this many housing units and this much office, how much retail spending could that potentially support and what the tradeoffs might be.

Ms. Hall noted all this information was from the Existing Conditions Report.

Ms. Price asked if the feasibility study is looking into condoization of retail or office spaces.

Ms. Srivastava replied that the building types and scenarios still needed to be developed that will be testing the feasibility analysis on. They would be looking at a Performa analysis that is based on some typical building types or prototypes related to the typologies Kristen shared on the housing. If thinking about the possibility of new office in this area, that could be something tested as well, the possibility of maybe more incubator type of spaces, something a little different from the traditional office R&D.

Ms. Price asked if different ownership patterns like coops are being considered.

Ms. Srivastava responded that they were looking at a more traditional model for what the investment would look like, but that didn't mean that they couldn't explore some examples of nontraditional building types.

Ms. Summa felt the Sarah Wallace Park should be taken off. It has no relevance to the North Ventura area. It is a very small park. She asked why they went from 30 dwelling units per acre in that analysis and skipped to 85? Why not 40, which is in existing zoning, or 60 or 70? Eighty-five seemed like an odd choice.

Ms. Hall replied that those were typical average numbers for those types of buildings. Each of them represented a range and if there is a different range you would like to be represented, that can be noted on the cards everyone will receive.

Mr. Kaczmarek asked a question. You give a type and associate units with it. But you could take very tall buildings and put less of them. Will they be able to relate the types of units to the site to see how many units, what density, in case they want to mix the type.

Ms. Hall responded that at this point what they are trying to obtain is sort of a policy direction, a sense of ideas around organization of space, organization of circulation, types of density, types of heights. Not getting into the level of designing everything in a detailed way yet. She asked him to share any ideas he had about that during the exercise.

Ms. Dellaporta remarked that it was said the parking lot at the Cloudera site is sort of up in the air. She asked if it was possible to put housing there or not, what the options might be.

Ms. Hall replied that they haven't spoken to them at all about this. This is representative of a piece of land on the site that is vacant. They aren't here to represent themselves and they haven't been talked to about this. She indicated if they were not comfortable putting anything on that site, they didn't have to.

Ms. Dellaporta asked if there was a reason they haven't been taking a part in this.

Mr. Lait stated they were not a part of the working group. He suggested more outreach to see their level of engagement. There are a lot of parking lots in this area, and if they were looking for increased housing opportunities, this might be one that could be considered. It could be part of the plan. Cloudera's short-term or medium-term interests might not be aligned with that, but the Working Group is looking for the long view. Mr. Lait suggested taking one more question then go to the breakout groups. Those discussions could be focused on particular interests.

Ms. Dellaporta asked about affordable units. There are many levels of affordable and asked if there would be more information about that.

Ms. Srivastava replied that the City's policy was very explicit about this. She thought it was a mix between 80 and 100 percent area median income and between 100 and 120 percent of area median income. Those were the targets for for-sale products for the inclusion area requirement. The rental housing impact fee funds housing that goes from zero to 80 percent of area median income.

Ms. Dellaporta asked if it was possible to consider something in between? Something a little higher but not as high as full market rates?

Ms. Srivastava stated the 15 percent requirement is what it is. If you wanted to go above that, you could define if you wanted something like, what we really need is more middle-income housing and maybe there is a strategy related to that. It could be something that is a target. There are many different ways to address that. She shared that if you did market rate housing at different densities in this area, based on current sales prices and rents, the sales price right now for a townhouse development is in the range of \$1.3 million. That would be affordable to a household that is earning \$260,000. That is about 200 to 250 percent of AMI, depending on how big the household is. If you wanted to do rental housing in a medium density or higher density project, those rents, talking about the \$5 per square range, that would be affordable to a household that is earning \$170,000 a year. That is at 130 percent of the area median income for a household of four. That gives you a sense of how decisions about what product type is promoted would serve different income groups. None of these would be below market rate, unless the inclusionary requirement was done or some sort of housing impact fee or something that would help produce those lower income housing types.

Mr. Lait noted the higher the percentage of affordability on site, the relationship to the number of units provided.

Ms. Srivastava stated that if you do a condo development, that is a little higher density than a townhouse development, then 15 percent of 50 units is a lot more than 15 percent of 20 units. So, thinking about the total yield of how many affordable units you could get, if you're assuming 15 percent, the higher density your project the more units would be available.

Ms. Flynn asked how many units per acre a typical condo development was.

Ms. Srivastava replied that the one they looked at was 85. There was one that was about 60 units per acre.

Ms. Srivastava thought it was a three- or four-story building.

Ms. Dellaporta remarked that she wanted to emphasize how important it was to think about the middle-income houses and the affordability for teachers and nurses to buy into this community because they work here.

Rachael pointed out the planning board. The idea was to cut up the pieces, annotate the pieces, be creative. They suggested a framework, and asked everyone to be as expressive as possible. Things will move around so don't tape until the end. Starting at number one, the idea is to go through and prioritize the main public realm improvements. There are street improvements, intersection improvements, the idea for public open space with paving and green space, bicycle infrastructure improvements, some kind of pedestrian path if that was wanted. She suggested thinking about a theme to guide the land use. Maybe affordability, maximize housing, maybe an innovation district, keeping small business. She encouraged the group not to be constrained by existing zoning. That theme should guide placement of the different typologies that have been gone through and facilitators are available to help answer questions. This could include community use, office, retail. Compatibility of adjacent uses could be considered, proximity to transit, the mix of uses. Once ideas are put in place they could be revised and then

once it is organized, the pieces can be taped down. It is really important to understand some of the key themes that were discovered through this process and note them on the board.

Plan Alternatives Development

The group broke into three smaller groups for developing plan alternatives.

Plan Alternatives Report Out

Ms. Dellaporta want to have a very mixed use, mixed levels of housing, mixed cost of housing, highly available for bicycles and pedestrian. They want to direct cars to the outer edges, Lambert, El Camino, Oregon. They want to improve some intersections on El Camino. They want to see a lot of open space and a place where people can gather, a community gathering place. They want to try to retain the Fry's building because of its historic value and perhaps use it as a community gathering space and create some outside areas where people can gather.

Ms. Price noted her group had different feelings about the degree of preservation of the historic buildings, adaptive reuse was an idea. They want to make sure the history was documented in a variety of ways, using architectural elements to carry some of those themes to other buildings. The point was they looked at a variety of ways to do this. It was not a uniform opinion about it. There was a lot of discussion about the importance of developing housing capacity, different ownership models, different types of housing as was mentioned.

Mr. Javed noted this group also brought up having some type of closing down streets for just pedestrian and bike traffic with potentially Bollards as a temporary way of getting people used to that space just being used for peds and bikes.

Ms. Flynn spoke for her group. She stated they had a couple of features which she indicated on their map. They put in a core central park. They put a pedestrian connection in. They had a car with a separated bike path. There is another bike path. She pointed out a major bicycle crossing and another on Margarita. They wanted those people to be able to through put to Park. She pointed out what would be slated to be a pedestrian/bike connection. This allows a nice flow of bicycles. In another area they directed the driveways towards a certain site. She pointed out townhomes. One area has retail underneath, one has retail and office underneath. There was already a connection in an area. The key themes were core central park, offices limited in size, retail, especially experiential retail, reuse the Fry's historic building in that way. Experiential retail isn't dying. They thought this might be the heart of the complex to draw activities at night. They wanted to prioritize planning for a school, but they didn't know where to put it.

Waldek Kaczmarek explained his group was in quite a bit of disagreement and a pedestrian connection from Park toward Caltrain and California Avenue. They talked about two improvements to the intersections and there was disagreement as to which would bring more benefit to the neighborhood and they were equal. One was an underpass under Oregon Expressway, another would be an improvement to a bridge to make the passage wider for pedestrians, so people coming from Caltrain would have a more comfortable way to connect to the rest of Park Avenue. There is an existing bicycle

ADA. The City of Palo Alto does not discriminate against individuals with disabilities. To request accommodations, auxiliary aids or services to access City facilities, services or programs, to participate at public meetings, or to learn about the City's compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990, may contact 650-329-2550 (voice), or e-mail ada@cityofpaloalto.org. This agenda is posted in accordance with government code section 54954.2(a) or section 54956. Members of the public are welcome to attend this public meeting.

connection to the Stanford Research Park and extending that all the way to Park Boulevard to allow further connection in either direction. Regarding protecting existing Pepper Avenue and Olive with one-way, no left turns, his group chose no left turn. In respect to density they chose a variety of options. He noted starting with a high building on Oregon Expressway and lower when approaching the existing residential neighborhood. He didn't think anyone actually suggested removing the existing residential but trying to build it up on the other side, starting with the lower building to the back of the residential street, then building it up the closer it gets to the creek. There was additional disagreement about how much access to the site would be allowed from Park Avenue. One wanted the connection to El Camino extended almost to the park, then stop there, not allowing connection to Park Avenue. All the road service would be from the El Camino side. The other option was that it would be equally spread between the access from El Camino or from Park Avenue and interrupted at the middle by the green space that would separate the two. There would be no drive through and the access would be divided between the two sides.

Mr. Reckdahl noted they also talked about was Park and Lambert, if there are all the one-way streets that dead end, Lambert and Park may be impacted and that was concerning.

Comparison of Alternatives

Ms. Hall explained that they had hoped to have some time for feedback from the consultants on what they heard and what some of the tradeoffs might be, but time is running out. Ms. Hall took the opportunity while everyone was taking their seats, to talk about the next Working Group Meeting. The consultants will meet and talk among themselves and with the City to understand what each table was talking about, what were the key tradeoffs that came to light and make sure they are getting a full understanding of what everybody was interested in at all of the tables. They will develop that into two alternatives that would act as bookends for the project. They will present two alternatives to the Group which will explore the different tradeoffs and opportunities. At that time, they will ask the Group for feedback.

Oral Communications

David Adams was the first speaker. He noted he sent an email with some comments about the options document. He is a property owner on Olive and they like the green space on the railway spur because it provided a buffer between the residences on Olive and the development in the Fry's site. He talked to Ms. Bernstein because he had concerns about the traffic options. He stated if there was green space the neighborhood would prefer it to be accessible to the neighborhood, not enclosed in the middle of a development. Then, regarding the creek, he wanted to see a naturalized creek. He noted his experience at the creek in February 1998. That was when there was bad flooding. San Francisquito Creek overflowed in Crescent Park. On that night he was standing on the bridge of Matadero Creek, and the creek did not overflow but the flappers on the drainage pipes going into the creek closed, so the water backed out of the drainage pipes and flooded the area. On the City website it says it is a 70 to 80 year, was a 70 to 80-year flood. In the document it said the creek can handle a 100-year flood, which he contends is not true because the water was backing out of the drains. That was a 70 to 80-year flood in 1998. With today's extreme weather that might be a 50 to 60-year flood.

Karen Holman was the next speaker. She acknowledged she felt this was a really important area. First, using SOFA as a basis, don't be constrained by what is in Title 18. Just making things up, if they think affordable housing should be 35 percent, suggest that. It would have to go through an economic analysis, but don't be constrained by the City's 15 percent. If they wanted just creation of the units and not in-lieu fees, then say so. Don't be constrained by what the current zoning is. In SOFA I, they created a whole new housing type. This is an opportunity to think creatively. In SOFA they constrained office size to 5,000 square feet for any individual office tenant, and in this area, there seems to be a lot of concern about large office development. She thought the neighborhood would think very differently about a dentist or doctor's office or any kind of community-serving office as opposed to a very large office development. What she understood in the consultant's comments earlier and what she saw playing out in the groups was, you can't just take a cultural resource and decide to just keep pieces. The Secretary of Interior Standards has requirements on what has to be kept or not kept. The Council always has the purview to make a statement of overriding considerations, but she stated they should not think they were accomplishing the retention of a cultural resource if you keep only a part of the building. Regarding retail, she has advocated for an economic development professional. There is some singular ownership and she has great respect for the property owner who, Fry's is one tenant, but there is nothing like a professional economic development person who can say what mix of retail uses and services will work together and support each other and the neighborhood. She also heard a comment about one-way street. As she lives on a one-way street, she notes they are speedways. Be careful of one-way street because cars are always going the wrong way. Something that might mitigate that could be separated bike path and the one-way street was one lane.

Loren Brown is the last speaker. He is a commercial property owner of three parcels in the area and his construction business. He asked if this effort was starting with a blank canvas and they could do anything they want in this area, or just trying to put a band aid on the existing uses, the existing problems. He felt they needed to identify whether they have the ability to start fresh and do everything the way they really want to. He went on to say there is going to be a timeline associated with whatever plan was developed, and it may take decades before 85 percent of whatever is decided is actually implemented. He got the sense at the Ventura Meeting that people have immediate expectations, so he hoped that the City or the consultants would provide a realistic timeline of how this might all unfold and how that impacted existing property owners. He asked what the current head count of both residents and business occupants in this district and what is the project head count for both residents and business that you want to plan for. Did the City have a goal that this area needs to house 5,000 or 10,000 people, that should be incorporated into the planning efforts. It seemed like a high proportion of the survey readers were residents and most of them don't want the planning effort to really impact their property, but there are some properties that go up Olive Avenue. These go right into the heart of this whole square that, if you're planning from scratch you wouldn't design it the way it is currently laid out. So, how do you solve that problem so as not to affect the existing property owners, but you want to have this comprehensive plan. The last thing is that there are two large parcels, the J. Paul parcel on the corner of Page Mill and Park, and then the Sobrato property which compose approximately 40 percent of the land area within this CAP. You have to decide what you're going to do with these. The Sobrato property may be impacted by the historic nature of the Fry's building. If you can't do much with that property, then how are you going to meet all the housing goals. The J. Paul property has a 225,000 square foot office building with a lot of surface parking and a parking garage. It was built about 20 years ago and probably has a life expectancy of another 50 to 70 years. So, if you really want this new plan to go into effect sooner rather than later, you are going to need to figure out how to incentivize somebody

ADA. The City of Palo Alto does not discriminate against individuals with disabilities. To request accommodations, auxiliary aids or services to access City facilities, services or programs, to participate at public meetings, or to learn about the City's compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990, may contact 650-329-2550 (voice), or e-mail ada@cityofpaloalto.org. This agenda is posted in accordance with government code section 54954.2(a) or section 54956. Members of the public are welcome to attend this public meeting.

like J. Paul to redevelop that property sooner. With so much office investment in there, that property is probably worth \$100 million with the current rents he is getting. To get that property owner to take 225,000 feet at \$8 a square foot out of commission for two years for demolition and site prep and building new housing, this would need triple the density of housing on that site to change it from its existing office use.

Wrap Up and Adjournment

Mr. Lait thanked everyone for their time. He hoped to continue the good conversations between the Working Group Meetings.