



**NORTH VENTURA COORDINATED AREA PLAN  
WORKING GROUP  
MEETING MINUTES FOR  
WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 17, 2018**

Call to Order: 5:30 PM

Welcome and Round Table Introductions:

Jonathan Lait, the Interim Director for the Planning Department, welcomed everyone as the North Ventura Coordinated Area Plan (NVCAP) Working Group Meeting was convened. He noted it was the Planning Department that was charged with creating this plan, working with this group, reaching out to the community and presenting a document for the decision makers – the City Council, to weigh in on and ultimately take a vote on. He remarked it was not every day a planner gets to look at 60 acres of land in a city that is largely built out and thought about how this could be imagined in some other ways that would appeal to the interests in the community. This could include a little more open space, housing or some other interests for commercial development and take all that and put it together in a plan that made sense for everyone. He informed the group that the meetings were being recorded with cameras in the corners and they would be available on line. Also, everyone should feel free to get up and walk around if needed. He wanted to talk about the meeting purpose and then remarked there would be an opportunity for introductions. He thanked everyone for their patience because of several false starts with this Working Group Meeting. Everything needs to be lined up from the funding agencies and commitments before launching into this effort, but the paperwork finally came through. He thanked the Sobrato Organization for their early contribution for matching funds for that. He informed everyone they had a booklet before them but tonight was more of a kickoff and introduction, getting to know the Working Group layout, the schedule for the project going forward, receiving some feedback from the group and giving everyone a chance to get to know each other. He started by introducing himself, Jonathan Lait, the Interim Planning Director. Elena Lee was the Project Manager and point person.

Sandy Lee was with the City Attorney's Office and supported the Planning Department. She would field any questions of a legal nature that were transmitted. She encouraged everyone to send those to Elena Lee who will forward them to her.

Chitra Moitra was a planner working with Elena on this project.

Robin Ellner was the administrative support person for this project.

Mr. Lait noted there were several other planners in the audience who would be working behind the scenes.

Clare Campbell was a senior planner with the long-range team.

Chantal Cotton Gaines was with the City Manager's Office.

Nivi Das was the Senior Project Manager with Perkins + Will.

Kristen Hall was an urban designer and planner with Perkins + Will. She was the lead urban designer on this project.

Dave Javid was with Plan to Place and he would be assisting the team with community engagement.

Mr. Lait noted there were many other consultants and they would come forward with their pieces in the future. He asked that the Working Group members introduce themselves.

Angela Dellaporta lived in the Ventura neighborhood. She was an English teacher and had never done anything like this before.

Gail Price lived in Barron Park. She had about 25 years of experience in City Planning and eight in Transportation Planning. She was a City Council Member and School Board Member.

Siyi Zhang (c-e) was a midtown resident and lived across the street from the Ventura Neighborhood. She had lived in Palo Alto for three years and was a problem manager at Tesla.

Rebecca Parker Mankey was a lifetime Palo Alto resident and lived on Ventura. She worked at Gryphon Strings and her husband was a special education teacher in the school district.

Keith Reckdahl was on the Parks and Recreation Board. He lived near Ventura and was very interested in the open spaces and recreation for this development and how this would fit into the neighborhood and be usable for the residents of the neighborhood.

Heather Rosen lived just outside the area but had grown up in the neighborhood. She was a lawyer briefly and now works in executive recruiting.

Alexander Lew had been on the Architectural Review Board for the last ten years. He grew up in Palo Alto and had been going to the site when it was Maxi-Mart. He worked on new urbanist transit villages and studio apartments at Stanford.

Terry Holzmer was a 25-year resident of Palo Alto. He was the vice-president of his home-owners association. He was interested in the traffic impacts and walkability.

Kirsten Flynn was a life-long resident of Palo Alto. She was involved in Safe Routes to School and PTA. Her mother worked for the school district.

Tim Steele represented one of the primary property owners, the Sobrato Organization.

Lund Smith represented WCA Properties. They were the former owner of the Fry's site and still owned some properties on the periphery.

Doria Summa was on the Planning and Transportation Commission.

Carolyn “Cari” Templeton moved into the Ventura neighborhood in 2005. She currently lives in Barron Park and still made use of the North Ventura space. She was a consultant to a company that is next door to Fry’s.

Mr. Lait noted there were two alternates sitting in the audience.

(no audio)

Mr. Lait introduced Lydia Kou (City Council member)

(no audio)

Mr. Lait thanked Lydia. He asked if there were any questions from the working group.

Mr. Smith noted he looked at the map of North Ventura on tab 2. He thought there was some discussion about the properties along Lambert being part of the plan and not being part of the plan and asked if they were a part of the plan or not.

Ms. Lee responded that the last time this went to Council they did extend it to include Lambert and it also extends all the way to El Camino Real where it did not in the past.

#### Agenda Items:

##### 1. Introduction to NVCAP Process

Elena Lee, Project Manager noted everyone was here for the North Ventura Coordinated Area Plan. This plan was the outcome of the Comprehensive Plan update. It was discussed as a part of this throughout its process. Comp Plan 1.7 reaffirms that a Coordinated Area Plan is intended to be used to help guide development. That was a tool in specific areas to guide development in areas where significant change is possible. Program L4.10.1 specifically called for preparation of a Coordinated Area Plan for North Ventura and the surrounding California Avenue area. Basically, it emphasized that it should be a walkable neighborhood, mixed use with multi-family housing, retail, a park and interconnected street grid. All of this was in the packet, the Policy, the Municipal Code Section. In terms of the history of this project, on November 6 the City Council adopted a resolution expressing local support and commitment to this project for a Federal Grant received for the preparation of this Coordinated Area Plan. On March 5 the City Council approved goals, objectives, schedule, milestones and plan boundaries. They also authorized the formation of the Working Group. The project’s goals identified seven goals. The first was housing and land use, specified for multi-family housing and a walkable, mixed-use, transit-accessible neighborhood. The second was to create and enhance well-defined connections for transit, pedestrian and bicyclists. Third was a connected street grid, fill in gaps and especially to connect to El Camino Real and the Caltrain station and Park Boulevard. Fourth was making sure to consider and build in community facilities and infrastructure as this area was developed. Fifth was balancing community interest, community-wide needs and also being respectful of the neighborhood. Sixth was making sure there was a good urban design and design guidelines to make sure the neighborhood fabric were maintained. Seventh was sustainability and environment to make sure that sustainability was promoted and the environment was protected. She noted the project objectives that the City Council approved were one, that this should be a data-driven approach; two, that this process should develop a comprehensive user-friendly document; three, this should be a guiding strategy for staff and decision makers for future

projects; four, this needed to include very meaningful community engagement; five, there needed to be a really strong economic feasibility study; six, sensitivity to the environment and respecting public health. The last thing she mentioned was that this would be really only the second Coordinated Area Plan for the City. The first was SOFA, Phase I and Phase II, which were adopted in early 2000. She noted the map which showed the expanded boundary which Council approved back in March. The boundaries were from Page Mill Road, Park Boulevard, Lambert and El Camino Real. Then the Fry site was towards the bottom. The intention was not that change was anticipated for all of these properties. The intent of putting those into the planned boundaries was to make sure there was appropriate context as the other areas were developed. The Coordinated Area Plan process was provided for in Palo Alto Municipal Code, Section 19.10. Section 19.10.10-A stated that the intent was to create and enhance opportunities for building a sense of community through public involvement with meaningful opportunities to help shape the physical components of their neighborhoods and community. The general process for the Coordinated Area Plan process was that City Council initiated the Coordinated Area Plan process and established goals and objectives which they initiated in November. They established the goals in March. A Working Group was appointed to advise staff, the Planning and Transportation Commission and City Council in preparation of the CAP. This whole process included regular public meetings, the Working Group meetings, as well as regular check ins with City Council and community meetings and other outreach efforts. The Planning and Transportation Commission would then have a hearing on the Draft CAP and associated environmental review. Finally, it would go to City Council for adoption. The CAP components, per Chapter 19.10 were that it shall include distribution, location and extent of land uses and intensity of the infrastructure to support the land uses. A program of implementation measures to make sure that the supporting infrastructure was there, which was development regulations, Public Works projects and financing mechanisms. Fourth was design and development standards and five was that it needed to be determined that it was economically and fiscally feasible. Finally, there was an environmental review to make sure that what was proposed was not going to cause an impact on the environment.

## 2. Community Working Group Orientation

Ms. Lee referred everyone to the Working Group Packet which would be available on the website. She noted this packet included the goals, objectives and the map, the Brown Act FAQ, the proposed procedures and ground rules to make sure there was a productive and civil discussion throughout this process. There were contact lists for staff, consultants and Working Group members. There was a resource list and links to good resources, various City documents that could be helpful. There was also Chapter 19.10 which provided the regulations for this process and what the Working Group's role should be. There was also a publication put out by the State of California. It was an old document but provided an overview of the planning process especially for those not familiar with it. She encouraged anyone with questions to contact them. She advised everyone that the consultant team was also working on a project-specific website and all those documents would be available on those pages also.

Mr. Lait asked if there were any questions.

Mr. Reckdahl questioned if the process was that the Group would go through and develop this CAP and the Council would eventually vote on it. He asked what the ramifications of that were. Did it change zoning or was it just a guideline for Planning and Transportation to look at?

Ms. Lee indicated that a Coordinated Area Plan was similar to what was called a specific plan or precise plan in other jurisdictions. The purpose was to establish policy and zoning regulations. She pointed out

the SOFA Plan had actual zoning designations. It could utilize existing zoning designations or new designations. There could be one for mixed use, maximum height, general distance from the sidewalk, etc.

Mr. Reckdahl asked about a situation such as if a park was wanted. As this was all privately owned, the Group could not just say we will put a park here. He questioned how the Group's desires worked into the eventual implementation

Mr. Lait indicated that was a large part of the exercise that would be gone through at subsequent meetings, the vision.

Mr. Reckdahl understood that if, in the end the Group thought portions of this would be a park for example, would the zoning be changed to encourage that or how would the desires get implemented?

Mr. Lait replied that the Group would come up with a plan that ought to include enabling regulations to help the City achieve the things talked about, such as rezoning necessary to accomplish that, then that would be part of the package that would be presented to Council.

(Male) (inaudible)

Mr. Lait clarified that they were looking at the whole urban planning, the street networks, pedestrian, scale and size of buildings, all the areas of interest.

(Male) asked if all this would be put into a document.

Mr. Lait replied that was exactly what it was going to be. A document would be produced that identified the project goals, the objectives, how those would get implemented, what ultimately were the objectives, such as the number of housing units, the size of buildings. All the details would be put into a plan document that was ultimately reviewed by the City Council.

Ms. Lee indicated there was an example of it in the SOFA Plan and one of the links in the packet was a link to the SOFA Plan. That would give an idea of what this may turn out to be. It may be different but that was an example of what had been done in the City.

Ms. Price asked if there was a link to any other precise plan or specific plan that Perkins + Will had produced in the last five to ten years. She thought that would be helpful to see the kinds of results they had created.

Mr. Lait stated that the Working Group had an agenda and after these items were gone through, there will be an opportunity for public comment. He wished to emphasize some comments Ms. Lee had made. On tab four there was more information about the Working Group's role in this effort and some ground rules. For those who had some familiarity with the Citizen's Advisory Committee of the Comprehensive Plan, this was a decidedly different process. That group was responsible for reviewing and editing and even wordsmithing on some level some of the Plan documents. This group was an advisory group to the City Staff and staff would present some information and engage the Group in a conversation of their interests and thoughts and visions for this area. Staff would take this feedback and with the consultants would put together some plans. They would bring that back to the Group and test some concepts and wanted to hear the Group's feedback and thoughts to see if it was right or were there areas that needed

to be modified. This would be a process. The Group would be given some data and analysis in advance and asked to look at it and give their comments about it. There would be some conceptual plans to look at. There would be a conversation about tradeoffs when looking at the 60 acres and all the different interests there. The plan would be refined and shared with the Committee and ultimately the public and Council. He explained, also on tab four, there were a lot of ground rules. He summarized: one, these were public meetings and were subject to the Brown Act. The Group would be asked to come prepared and staff would get information to them the Friday before the meeting. He requested Members bring an open mind and problem-solving solution to the approach. There could be a number of issues anticipated that would need to be tackled. He asked for an honest expression of the Group's interests. As participants in this Working Group, all members had a vested interest in the success of this document. The timeframe was 18 months to have a plan drafted due in part to some funding constraints. One of the agreements for getting the amount of funds was that this was going to be a process that was completed in roughly in an 18 to 24-month timeframe. Staff felt, as stewards of the City's money, and taxpayer's money, that this timeframe be adhered to so as to not have to reimburse any of the money already received through grants. The Group was encouraged to join with staff in the interest of this being an 18-month process, understanding that as it went through Council it might be taken to the 24-month timeframe. He asked that the rest of the ground rules be looked at by the Group Members and if there were any questions these could be talked about and then changes made if necessary. He informed everyone in the audience that if they had an interest in staying informed about this effort and had not received an email from staff, they were probably not on the email list. There was a sign-in sheet at the table if they wanted to continue to receive emails. He confirmed the PowerPoint presentation would be posted on line as well as the links to Perkins + Will. He noted that Lakiba was here. She was another alternate to the Working Group.

Lakiba Pittman was born in Palo Alto and was now living in her parent's home which was in the North Ventura area. She was a doctoral student and she taught at Menlo College and Notre Dame de Namur and she was a former Chair of Leadership Mid-Peninsula and the Human Relations Commission.

Sandy Lee from the City Attorney's Office delivered a PowerPoint presentation. She started with the historical background of the Brown Act, the basics, what were meetings, what were the agenda requirements and what were the public comments and then discussed the issues that had challenged cities with respect to emails and social media use. She indicated there were real-world problems that would come up and they would be fact specific, complex and if there were issues that came up, she requested that the Group ask by forwarding questions to Elena Lee and she would send them to her. She presented information on how the Brown Act came about. This was the open meetings law for the State of California and was adopted in 1953. The key aspects of the Brown Act were to allow public access to meetings, give them notice of the meetings, including the items of discussion, and give the public an opportunity to participate in those meetings. The Brown Act applied to elected bodies, appointed bodies, standing committees and new members not yet seated. The bodies not covered were ad hoc committees and meetings amongst staff and the public. The Municipal Code required that any working group subcommittee would be noticed and open to the public. The Brown Act did not apply to meetings and communications between members and the public such as individual contact with members of the public, contact with three and four members and a member of the public as long as the member of the public did not act as an intermediary. It also did not apply to meetings between working group members of less than a quorum and staff. Group members should not ask staff and staff cannot communicate the thoughts of other members of the working group. She informed the group that under the Brown Act a meeting was the majority of the members at the same time and place to hear, discuss or deliberate on any matter within their subject matter jurisdiction. This could include using an

intermediary to discuss an item, communicating by phone, email, fax, text, other messengers or social media. Meetings could include retreats or workshops of the legislative body, informal gatherings or serial meetings, in which not everyone was in one place, but one member talked to another, who talked to another until a majority was included in that deliberation. She stated what were not considered meetings were individual contacts with constituents or staff, conferences or community meetings that were open to the public and noticed as long as a majority of the Working Group did not talk amongst themselves at those conferences or meetings, meetings of other legislative bodies such as the City Council and purely social or ceremonial events as long as members did not discuss Working Group business. Serial meetings were prohibited. Examples were when a majority had discussed an issue within the legislative body's jurisdiction outside of a physical meeting. This could occur when there was a common person who talked to a majority of others. Another example was when one commissioner talked to another commissioner who talked to another who talked to another until a majority has been involved, information was exchanged and a collective concurrence was reached. She noted some areas to take care with were forwarding or responding to email, not sending an email the rest of the body, sending this to staff who would collect the information and included that as part of the public packet. She reiterated Group members not reply "all" to an email from staff. She covered conversations versus social media. If all members were all on the same social media platform and someone made a comment and another member commented in any way, this could be a violation of the Brown Act. She recommended everyone be cautious about participation on social media about business of the Working Group. She reiterated that the requirements for meetings were establishment of a regular day, time and place and meetings for this body needed to be in Palo Alto. Meetings required a notice and agenda. The agenda had to include the time and place of the meeting and a brief general description of the items to be discussed, informing the community of what would be considered. The agenda would indicate whether the items were action items or discussion items and the agendas would be posted 72 hours in advance on the Brown Act Board and the City's website. If an item was not on the agenda, the body could not take action or discuss that item. There were some very limited exceptions such as if a member of the public made a comment during public comment, a member of the Working Group could make a very brief response to the comment. The working group could discuss scheduling of future items; however, the substance of those items could not be discussed. Working group members could make some brief announcements and ask questions of staff or respond to the public but this must be very brief. She explained regarding public comments that Brown Act bodies must allow for public comment at regular meetings, including comment on specific items that the body would consider and general public comment on anything within the subject matter jurisdiction of the body. A reasonable time limit on public comment could be imposed but must be applied consistently. She noted there was a process for Brown Act violation. Before a lawsuit could be filed against the City there was a requirement for potential litigants to send a demand letter to cure or correct the violation. Fixing the problem could mean rehearing the item after it had been properly noticed, rescinding an action then rehearing it with proper notice. The courts had certain remedies. Criminal prosecution would be in a very extreme case. She asked the group if they had any questions.

Ms. Mankey stated did not understand the intermediary. She asked if someone from work or a parent started talking to her about something, how you knew if that person was not talking to everybody about it.

Ms. Lee replied that you did not need to know. A violation typically occurred if somebody tried to share information about what other members were thinking. If they said they had talked to several members and tried to tell you what they thought, try to stop them. Do not let anyone try to communicate the views of other Working Group members. Focus on their opinion and your opinion. You could tell

someone your own opinion. She reiterated that members of the body should not ask for information about what other members were thinking, and if somebody tried to provide that information, to try to put a stop to it.

Ms. Mankey questioned a situation where she talked to somebody and remarked for example, that she liked trees and thought there should be trees. If that person talked to other members of the Working Group and remarked that Parker said trees were needed, Parker understood that she herself would be okay because she made her comment but did not hear what anybody else thought?

Ms. Lee responded that was correct.

(inaudible)

Ms. Lee stated that she would act as a member of the Group for purposes of the Brown Act.

(Male) asked how many members were in the Group and what constituted a quorum.

Ms. Lee replied that there were 14 members in the Group, a majority was eight and she believed a quorum was seven. In general, if a body had what is called a Brown Act Group, it was not expected that members would be isolated contemplating issues about the CAP. Members could talk to other members, but to keep the number limited.

Ms. Price asked for clarification about if a member of the public made a comment during the open period then there was a decision made to make a brief comment, she assumed the staff will make a brief comment but questioned if this could be a brief comment by staff or a member of the committee in response to a question or comment by the public.

Ms. Lee responded that the Brown Act did not prohibit a member of the Working Group from making a brief comment. This could be staff or the Working Group but she reiterated that if more than one person wanted to comment on that item, staff would need to step in and stop it before it became an ongoing discussion.

Ms. Price inquired if a comment came up, what was the process for determining if it should be on a future agenda.

Mr. Lait responded that staff set the agenda for these meetings in concert with the Working Group and would make every effort to make sure if an issue or concern needed to be addressed, staff wanted to hear those so they would be scheduled on the agenda.

Ms. Price clarified her question, which was, that if a member of the public makes a comment about a suggested topic that was related, was a vote taken or did staff make a determination if it should be on a future agenda?

Mr. Lait reiterated that ultimately staff made the determination if it would go on the agenda, but if there was a public comment on something that was being discussed or feedback from the Working Group was heard that this should be discussed, it would be done. The whole point was open dialogue and transparency. He then reported that Kristen Hall had some brief comments about schedule and what to expect at future meetings.



Ms. Hall noted the plan for this Group was to be working, not to be talking at the Group. She stated they had a schedule that identified an 18-month plan to keep a pace to get through the process which hopefully would keep the Groups interest and momentum and match the Group's level of effort. She explained the schedule the consultant group would be using. There were to be a series of nine working group meetings which would track along with the work the consultant team did in the background. This was a phase of discovery, so learning about the site, all the existing conditions, market analysis, transportation studies would be shared with the Group and get feedback asked from the Group. That would be at the next meeting. The next amount of time was about the development of some options, what the future of this site could be. This would be talked through with some evaluation of those options. Those options would then lead to a draft plan which the Group would give the consultants input on the table of contents, the outline of the content that went into that plan. Then there would be a period of review. After the seventh or eighth Working Group meeting there would be a quiet time while the environmental impact report studies were done. After the plan was developed, the work would slow down while those studies were done. The group would then meet, share the results of the studies, confirm the plan, make any refinements before it went to Council. There would be big pushes of effort related to the periods of working time, and the consultants would be very involved with the Group in the process of developing those ideas. There would also be two community workshops which would be opened up to a much bigger audience with interactive engaging workshops. Before those, the consultants would work with the Group to make sure the content of those was right and the right questions would be asked at the workshops. She then asked if there were questions.

Ms. Dellaporta asked what kind of data would be collected and how that would be collected.

Ms. Hall replied that they would be using a lot of census data. The consultants were doing transportation analysis. Economists were doing market research and they could speak specifically to the tools and methods they would be using. She inquired if there was any specific data Ms. Dellaporta would like to see.

Ms. Dellaporta responded that she was very interested in what the residents in North Ventura care about and what they are most interested in having and what they are most worried about. She was also interested in the transportation analysis and how that happened and what it included.

Ms. Hall suggested that at the next Working Group meeting the consultants would make sure they had a clear explanation of the transportation study for the group and how it was gathered.

(Female) inquired about the community workshop and how it was different from the Working Group member meetings in terms of the content and the goals and objectives and should the Working Group members be there.

Mr. Lait clarified that the Working Group was working with staff and the consultants monthly or as scheduled. This was open to the public but it was the background work that needed to be done before there was a conversation with the community about plan options. Homework needed to be done to make sure that reasonable options for consideration were presented. Those were public meetings and there could be around 100 people attending. The consultants would help set up those meetings and the process to get feed back in different ways from the participants. That would be their first real chance to get plugged into the process. People can watch, go on the website, listen to the Working Group meetings but the community meetings are the public outreach efforts. There would also be other things

like little popup stations at the Caltrain stations and other things to solicit more feedback from the public. He felt Working Group members should be at those meetings. He also noted they would make sure there were no violations of the Brown Act. These would be noticed as public meetings.

Ms. Lee agreed that the Code says the Working Group would schedule and notice at least one community update forum.

Ms. Lait remarked that some members may be tasked with a station to talk about things as a resource to help communicate this to the public.

Ms. Hall indicated that was one of the ways they hoped to get more information about the hopes and dreams and thoughts of the community about this plan.

Ms. Dellaporta noted that it took place after the data collection, during the development of alternatives.

Ms. Hall indicated that the development of alternatives and the data, because the Working Group was a body that they were meeting with on a regular basis, it was an opportunity to develop a lot of shared knowledge together to make sure that if there were important things that need to be communicated to the community or to get information back from them, that this will happen.

(Female) asked if there was any coordination with the City Council throughout this process to make sure that the ultimate plan was adopted and not denied.

Mr. Lait responded that on the schedule there was a meeting with the Working Group and the City Council scheduled for February. That would be a joint meeting where this body along with the then seven Council Members would have an opportunity to hear from the Council about their objectives and goals and the Group could share things they had learned up to that point. Hopefully, there would be some feedback and guidance from the Council. Along the way the Group and staff would look for opportunities to provide information to the Council so they were not surprised at the end of the process. The Group and staff would be working with Chantal from the City Manager's Office and others, a consistent feedback loop would be maintained with Council through such things as information reports.

Ms. Hall noted there were a total of four sessions with Council. One was the joint session, but there were three others planned to keep them updated.

Ms. Flynn commented that this was a huge project, unusual for a project of this size to take place within a built-out City like Palo Alto. She questioned if this was enough time and enough meetings. She felt the best outcome was when everyone's best work was being done and everybody had a chance to process the large amounts of information that a project of this size required. It seemed to her like a compressed timeframe.

Ms. Hall explained that they had done large area plans in this timeframe before. She acknowledged what Ms. Flynn said about the timeframe and wanting to balance the momentum and making sure there was enough momentum and not so long between meetings that things were forgotten. They had found that with it being in this timeframe and then continuing at this kind of interval of engagement this tended to work the best in terms of getting to the finish line. If they find along the way that it felt like these sessions were not working, the way they engage at the meetings could be revisited.

Mr. Lait added that in his experience that was correct. He noted the Comprehensive Plan was a very protracted process. He felt this would not be a ten-year process but he wanted to make sure there was a commitment to look at the data and work through this and try to adhere to the time schedule that had been set forth. He emphasized they were thinking about opportunities for additional meetings if needed. This was not inflexible. There were contingencies and means to address things that popped up or required further study and were prepared to implement that if necessary. There would be a lot of information and staff would do their best to get it right working with the Group. He was worried about getting too much past 24 months.

Ms. Templeton added that she thought the point was to make sure there was enough time to get the appropriate level of community involvement and she felt a very robust marketing plan was needed to work with this schedule. She shared that not all major projects had the awareness level until after they were implemented which created a lot of difficulty.

Mr. Lait explained there would be opportunities to weigh in and comment on the efforts on the website and branding and communications. There would also be tools available to solicit feedback through interactive ways.

Ms. Templeton emphasized that this did not just affect residents of Ventura. It was a City-wide opportunity for people to use where they worked, where they transited, where they recreated and she wanted to make sure everybody was noticed.

Mr. Lait agreed and noted one of the values of the Working Group was to let them know when something was missed or adjustment needed.

Ms. Parker asked if this went to Planning and Transportation and then to the Council or directly to the Council?

Mr. Lait answered it went to both. There would be engagement with the City Council along the way, but ultimately it would go through the Planning Commission to Council.

Ms. Parker also asked if this ran over and it took six more months do the consultants cost more, does the City have to pay more?

Mr. Lait acknowledged this was a very important question. There was a pretty generous grant to do this and matching funds, but they were finite funds. If more studies or outreach was needed and the schedule did get protracted in some way, the City would have to come up with the money to support that, so, yes there was definitely a connection between the two. However, there was a contingency with the consultant for things that were unanticipated that were within this realm of work, that could be addressed.

Ms. Dellaporta noticed that the public hearings were at the very end of the process so she was wondering what the purpose was of public hearings.

Ms. Hall responded that the vision was that the whole process through the Working Group and through the community workshops, there would be many opportunities for lots of people to engage. Those hearings were sort of formal with the Commission to make sure that, after having had the informational

sessions with them, they had a familiarity with the plan and that was the formal process to actually adopt the plan. The hope as that through the many different means of engagement, people would have many opportunities to touch the project along the way.

Ms. Dellaporta understood then that at the end it is more ceremonial?

Ms. Hall stated this was still important. It was decision making but it was a more formal process.

Ms. Dellaporta remarked that the hope was that people would get involved earlier.

Ms. Hall responded that that was the hope, and that all Group members would also be advocates within their various communities to bring people out to these meetings, to workshops, to spread the word to direct people to the website and all the different resources that were available.

Mr. Lait reported that staff would remain after the meeting to answer any additional questions.

Ms. Summa wanted to clarify the decision-maker meetings, were the four blue balls touching base with Council?

Mr. Lait confirmed that was correct.

Ms. Summa then asked if the pink chevrons were when it went through its final adoption process with PTC and Council?

Mr. Lait answered yes.

(no audio)

Ms. Hall responded that the consultant's role was to help realize this vision and bring it to life. They would work together with everyone bringing information, different thoughts, proposals and collaborating together on what that plan would look like. It was not meant to be their idea for the site. It was meant to be a realization of the collective ideas that came out of this Group. There would be tradeoffs, difficult conversations. Not everyone would necessarily agree on everything, but their job was to steer the process through that and make sure this plan represented the interests of this Group.

(Male) (inaudible)

Mr. Lait turned the meeting over the Mr. Javid.

### 3. Get to Know Your Colleagues

Mr. Javid announced there would be a quick interactive exercise to identify and get to know neighbors and new colleagues. This would look to identify what the hopes were for the planning process and this Group and what some of the fears and concerns were. He asked each member to pare up with one other member and each member would write down the hopes, fears and concerns of their partner.

[The group was broken into small groups for the exercise].

Mr. Javid called everyone back to the table and started the outcome.

Ms. Templeton noted her partner was Doria Summa and her hopes were to preserve the nature of the community and historic buildings, to find space for parkland and to create housing. Her fears were getting it really wrong and community members being displaced.

Ms. Summa confirmed her partner was Ms. Templeton whose fears were that projects would exacerbate parking and traffic problems already in the area and that the plan created results in vacancies and blight, in other words that it would not be the right thing that people wanted to use. Her hopes were that the project was seen as a benefit and well received by the public and that it was still relevant 100 years from now.

Mr. Smith indicated he was partnered with Tim Steele whose hopes and fears were related. His hope was that the vision was reasonably feasible for the site and the fear was that the vision was not reasonably feasible.

Mr. Steele noted his partner, Lund Smith's hope was that it was a timely and efficient process of the Working Group and adoption. His fear was that unrealistic expectations got adopted.

Ms. Flynn indicated her partner was Terry Holzmer whose hope was that the plan created had a balance of services, benefits, housing, etc. for the community, so it benefited the entire community. His fear was that traffic, which was impossible especially along Oregon and El Camino and Oregon and Park would get worse. Also, that it was an unbalance community with no transportation options other than just getting in cars and no infrastructure services.

Mr. Holzmer noted his partner was Kirsten Flynn, whose hopes were that significant progress was made on large problems facing the Bay Area including global warming and those types of things, that this project made one of the best neighborhoods possible and a very diverse community not just for certain types of population. Some of her fears were worry about the lack of diversity in this possible site and that the plan would not be liked by the community or come to fruition. She was worried there would not be talk about the big issues that were of concern to the community.

Mr. Lew explained his partner was Lakiba Pittman whose hope was that there was maximum openness to hearing the concerns of the public through the process. Her fear was that the community concerns would not get adequately incorporated into the CAP.

Ms. Pittman acknowledged her partner was Alex Lew whose hope was that this ended up being a beautiful idea for a neighborhood, that all things were considered, transportation, buildings, access, everybody looks happy. His fear, and he used a reference of a situation where they had a committee, it passed all the passages and then the voters voted it down, so his fear was that after several years of working on it, getting the Council to buy in, that the public would not want it.

Ms. Rose stated her partner was Ms. Mankey and her hope was that this turned into something that was very Palo Alto, that embodied the Palo Alto Community and really got the essence of the area. Her fear was that it would be too commercial and look like every other mall in the area and be terrible.

Mr. Reckdahl noted his partner was Waldek Kaczmarek and his hope was that it would create a connection between the Ventura Neighborhood and Cal Ave. Currently there was kind of a gap there

and this could be a good bridging between the two neighborhoods. His concern was that this would be too successful and have too much car traffic.

Mr. Kaczmarek stated he was paired with Keith Reckdahl and his hope is that it would be a wonderful project that balanced the needs of the City as a whole with the needs of the local community. His fear was that the plan would not be implemented.

Ms. Mankey reported her partner was Heather Rosen and her hope was that a space was created that was artistic and had a lot of character, to realize the painter's vision to make it a beautiful place. Her fear was that it would end up not being a place we wanted to go, and we would get another gym.

Ms. Zhang noted she was partnered with Gail Price whose fear was that there would be a reluctance to this mixed-use design and the Group not being bold or creative for this one-of-a-kind opportunity in Palo Alto. Her hope was that home-run, brilliant, comprehensive area plan would be created that could be replicated by other communities.

Ms. Price stated her partner was Siyi Zhang (c-e) and her fears were horrible traffic that might be the result if this is not planned really well and she commented that transit-oriented development was critical. Her hope was that the results of the NVCAP would underscore the values of the Ventura Neighborhood, neighborliness and an example of diversity and inclusion and that this would be in line with the results of the groups efforts.

Ms. Dellaporta reported her partner was Yunan Song and her fears were that all the neighbors would have a lot of criticisms about what the Group eventually came up with and that they would not like it and might blame her. She was also concerned about traffic congestion. Her hopes were that the group managed to create a plan that would make a place where people wanted to come together and wanted to be there and also that the plan finished on time.

Ms. Song noted her partner was Angela Dellaporta and her hope was that this could be a really open space and green space, a community in this Ventura Neighborhood. Her fear was that there would not be an opportunity to get enough data such as transportation, especially when the hearing is at the very end. She was worried that people would show up at the end and say this whole planning didn't make sense and it would not pass and also that neighbors would not like the project.

Mr. Javid thanked everyone for their cooperation. He felt it sounded like many wanted a balanced, pleasant, attractive, desirable place that supported the community's vision. Some fears included traffic and congestion and impact on the community in different ways, and getting through this process in an efficient manner. He reported that all of this would be recapped in the summary that was sent out to everyone.

#### Oral Communication:

Mr. Lait noted this was the part of the agenda to hear from the public. He asked if anyone wanted to speak, that they fill out a card and turn it in. Each speaker would have three minutes.

Ken Joye informed everyone he had lived on Park Boulevard since 1992. He noted the map showed something called a PTOD which was done because of the California Avenue Caltrain station but he felt if you drew a radius around the station, development is only looked at in one quadrant, which is his and

his neighbors' quadrant. He charged the Group to mitigate the impact of this very large and promising development. He felt it would add a lot to the community but hoped it could be done without too much affect on the people who already lived in the Ventura Neighborhood. He was very encouraged that this was a coordinated area plan because he believed that meant instead of trying to look at individual projects one by one, they would be looked at together. He encouraged everyone to consider how the development within the boundary would be tied to the existing Boulware Park. He indicated it wasn't clear to him when Kristen went over the schedule, what data collection was currently taking place. He also asked whether there was a definition of stakeholders, because there was a meeting marked for January 2019 to discuss stakeholders and he did not find a definition in his review of the documents.

Mr. Lait stated that all the speakers would be heard and then respond if needed.

Becky Sanders indicated she was the moderator of the Ventura Neighborhood Association. She pointed out the valuable history of this site and wanted to make sure this rich history was honored. She did some investigating and talked to Steve Steiger the City Historian, Brian George of the Palo Alto History Association, Karen Holman on the City Council. She discovered that Fry's was an old cannery building that was once home to Bayside Cannery and she gave a history of this company and its founder, Thomas Foon Chew. She hoped this history was honored in some way, incorporating older buildings into new developments and other ways. She indicated the Ventura Neighborhood was probably the most diverse neighborhood in Palo Alto.

Claire Elliott commented that diversity was one of the things she loved about her street. She learned that this street was one of the few areas where non-white people could own a home. Her hope was that affordable housing would be part of this plan, because this area was no longer affordable. Her other concerns were environmental. There was an area that had one of the first nice storm water management systems and she wanted to see more of that. She would like to see the creek out of the concrete channel at least through some parkland strip and bike friendliness.

Sandy Lockhart noted she lived in the area for 45 years. She commented that about 30 years ago there was a charrette where local landscape architects and architects came together for about a week. The landscape did quite an involved design to have traffic routed in a beautiful way and that has all disappeared. Traffic had gotten worse and worse. She suggested that information be looked at. She asked about where the grants were coming from and where were the matching funds coming from? She also stated that recently in the newspaper her street was called a blighted area and she was quite offended by that.

Cedric Pitot stated he was also concerned about bicycle traffic with much development on Park, which was designed as a bicycle boulevard. He would like the group to be proactive in ensuring a safe bicycling and pedestrian experience. He would like to have the creek be restored with some native plants. He suggested rooftop gardens and open space using native plants, rainwater infiltration, green building materials, net-zero carbon. The City had 12 years to cut down CO2 by 40-50 percent. He supported affordable housing, don't worsen the jobs/housing imbalance, foster and support locally owned business if possible. He liked the idea of popup stations and hoped they would go out to areas where neighbors frequent, not just the train station. Regarding the community meetings, he wanted it to be really eliciting the dreams, shared visions and concerns, achieving a unity of vision as opposed to increasing polarity. He appreciated the history of the Brown Act.

David Adams understood that staff needed to report back to the City Council periodically. He asked if there would be notice beforehand when that happened so members of the public could be at those meetings? He questioned the proposed schedule, specifically the stakeholder meetings, and asked who was a stakeholder, who decided this? If someone in the public thought they should be a stakeholder but wasn't, was there any recourse? It looked like 15 stakeholder meetings and two community workshops and he asked if there was enough outreach to the public. He asked if stakeholder meetings would be individual meetings with each stakeholder or with a group? He echoed other comments about how to do this without displacing existing residents and the comments about the bike boulevard on Park.

Kelsey Banes informed everyone she was a psychologist working at the VA but was not here representing the VA. She worked with the homeless but was also struggling to see her future here due to the housing costs. She hoped for this site there would be quite a lot of housing in close proximity to transit and the services such as California. She feared there would be too much free and subsidized parking and encouraged the Group to be forward thinking about parking given the existing traffic issues in Palo Alto. She hoped there would be focus on inviting people and creating a community for people who wanted to live a car-free lifestyle, increase looking at ways to increase access to transit, make biking safe and having more protected walking paths. She hoped the environment would be protected and open spaces maximized, rooftop open space, higher FARs, taller building to create more dense housing.

Mr. Lait acknowledged that there were good questions asked. He responded to the questions regarding stakeholders, he believed there wasn't a list yet identifying these but stated there would probably be about 15 stakeholders. That list would be published on the website. The intent of the meetings with stakeholders would be that they would be meetings with one or two people at a time. Regarding the Council engagement, there were four and would absolutely be advertised and noticed on the agenda so the public can speak at those. Other information transmitted to the Council probably would not be noted. That would be more of a communication, an update as opposed to getting direction from Council.

Ms. Lee presented information about the funding. Staff applied for basically a Transportation Fund for party development area which this project was part of. It was basically transportation-related funds for development of plans close to transit. The matching fund which was a requirement of the grant from the Department of Transportation was provided by Sobrato, along with additional funding for the environmental review which the grant money cannot be used to pay for.

Ms. Hall addressed the question about data scheduling. Right now, the economists were working on their market studies to understand what market demand was and what the potential development opportunities would be from an economically feasible perspective. The civil engineers were starting to analyze existing infrastructure, the capacity and condition of that infrastructure and its ability to support development and challenges around flooding and stormwater. The urban design team was starting to analyze the different edges and constraints and boundaries and potential opportunities, to understand what the qualitative aspects would be of the current environment and what some potentials would be for improvement. They were starting ecological opportunities around the creek and stormwater.

Ms. Das acknowledged they were looking at the transportation data and would do several surveys in the area in the very near future. All the files and data were being collected and consolidated. The information would be put on a map to understand the existing conditions. She hoped by the next meeting most of that data would be collected and could be talked through.



Ms. Hall stated the group members would be receiving a booklet in addition to the information they already received. This was more background on the planning process up to this point and more information for the Group. There was a walking tour noted in this booklet and it was hoped that the group could take this tour before the next meeting. It asked several questions at stops meant to provoke some thoughts. She encouraged the members to take someone who may have a different perspective such as a child. The members were asked to bring that information back to help get at the qualitative understanding of what was going on at the site currently from members' perspectives. The next meeting would be November 15 at the Downtown Library.

(Male) noted his concern was that there was a lot of development happening in this area and with the Group meeting for the next 24 months, would this Group still be relevant if the construction continues. New buildings would not be knocked down and rebuilt just to meet the Group's plans. He asked if there was a plan for some kind of freeze for new development in this area until this group concluded their findings.

Mr. Lait replied not at this time and as far as he knew there were no active development applications on file in the study area but he would double check that.

#### Staff Comments:

Mr. Lait noted the time and suggested they conclude and if anyone had questions afterwards, they could answer these unless it was felt they should be shared with the Group.

Ms. Mankey directed her question regarding the alternates and how they should interact with the group. Do they interact as the public or have some intermediary stage?

Mr. Lait indicated he will speak with the attorney and look at the rules. He explained that it may be the Working Group is the primary voice and the alternates are more listening and hearing like a juror alternate. The feedback would be coming from the core Working Group.

Ms. Lee also noted that all the packet materials are all on the website.

#### Future Meetings and Agendas:

Next Meeting: November 15, 2018

Location: Downtown Library – El Camino Real Room

Ms. Hall requested that if possible everyone could make it through the booklet and return with any questions and also do the walking tour.

Adjournment: 7:30 PM

Note: Copies of meeting materials will be posted on the City's project website: <https://bit.ly/2OtGFJG>.