



# City of Palo Alto

## City Council Staff Report

(ID # 6592)

---

**Report Type: Action Items**

**Meeting Date: 2/22/2016**

**Summary Title: Comp Plan Draft EIR and Scenario 5**

**Title: Comprehensive Plan Update: Discussion Regarding Development of a Fifth Scenario With an Improved Jobs Housing Balance for Inclusion in the Environmental Impact Report and the Overall Project Schedule**

**From: City Manager**

**Lead Department: Planning and Community Environment**

### **Recommendation**

Staff recommends that Council provide guidance on the following aspects of the Comprehensive Plan Update:

- a) potential development of a “fifth scenario” for analysis in a supplement to the Draft Environmental Impact Report, including potential mechanisms to address the ratio of jobs to employed residents; and
- (b) the schedule and topics of Citizen Advisory Committee and City Council meetings.

### **Executive Summary**

On January 18<sup>th</sup>, 2015, the City Council and the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) held a joint meeting to review the upcoming release of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR or Draft EIR) for the Comprehensive Plan Update. The DEIR, which is available for public review at <http://www.paloaltocomplan.org/eir/>, analyzes four planning scenarios at an equal level of detail, describing a range of potential land use and transportation policy decisions, and assessing the impacts they would have on traffic, greenhouse gas emissions, and other environmental resources.

At the conclusion of this meeting, the Council adopted a motion (Attachment A) asking staff to return with a fifth scenario aimed at improving the City’s ratio of jobs to housing, which is commonly expressed as the ratio between jobs and employed residents. At a high level, this goal can be addressed by increasing the amount of housing, decreasing the amount of jobs projected between now and 2030 or some combination of the two.

Tonight’s discussion is an opportunity to discuss how the policies and regulatory changes assumed in each of the four planning scenarios could be supplemented or modified to stimulate housing growth or to decrease job growth (or to do both things), and to talk about the next

steps/schedule for development of a fifth scenario and completion of the Comprehensive Plan Update.

## Background

Palo Alto has long had an imbalance between jobs and housing, with almost three times as many jobs and employed residents in 2014, as shown in Table 1.

**Table 1. Existing Jobs and Employed Residents (2014)**

	Jobs	Employed Residents	Ratio
City of Palo Alto	95,460	31,165 <sup>1</sup>	3.06
City + SOI <sup>2</sup>	100,830	36,004	2.80
Santa Clara County	988,278	865,822	1.14
Bay Area	3,613,052	3,491,584	1.03

Notes:  
 (1) US Census Bureau, American Community Survey, Demographic and Housing Estimates 2011-2013 3-Year Estimates, Table DP03, Selected Economic Characteristics  
 (2) SOI = Sphere of Influence (includes a portion of Stanford lands)

Sources: Data extrapolated from *ABAG Projections 2013* except where noted.

The City’s imbalance between jobs and employed residents contributes to local and regional traffic, greenhouse gas emissions, and other impacts, as some workers travel long distances between their residence and workplace. The imbalance is projected to grow if the City does not take affirmative steps to address the issue. Scenario 1 in the Draft EIR depicts what is expected under a “business as usual” scenario if there are no policy changes and the current Comprehensive Plan and implementing regulations remain in place, as shown in Table 2.

**Table 2. City of Palo Alto Projected Jobs & Employed Residents in 2030 “Business as Usual”**

City of Palo Alto 2030 “Business as Usual” (Draft EIR Scenario 1)	Jobs	Employed Residents	Ratio
	110,940 <sup>1</sup>	34,697 <sup>2</sup>	3.20

Notes:  
 (1) ABAG Projections 2013 for the year 2030. ABAG forecasts jobs based on their understanding of the Bay Area economy as well as adopted general plans and zoning. While planning staff believes ABAG’s projection is high, we do not have a basis for our own projection of future job growth, particularly because job growth is not solely dependent on the addition of new non-residential square footage.  
 (2) 48% of total population projected based on the number of new dwelling units expected by 2030. (Palo Alto relies on its own projection of housing growth rather than ABAG’s, and bases that projection on the long term average of new dwelling units produced per year. The percentage of 48% is derived from *ABAG Projections 2013* for the year 2030.)

The other three planning scenarios in the Draft EIR test potential policy changes that are projected to result in incremental changes as summarized below in Table 3 below. The assumed policy changes are not meant to be directive or exclusive of other possible policy changes and scenarios, but illustrate some affirmative steps that could be taken to encourage housing, slow job growth, or both. Table 4 in Attachment B contains a further comparison of

the quantitative characteristics and impacts of the four scenarios as presented in the Draft EIR. It's expected that the preferred scenario that is ultimately selected for adoption in the form of the Comprehensive Plan Update will not be identical to any one of these scenarios, but will draw from them and the data/analysis provided in the Draft EIR.

As noted during the staff presentation on January 19<sup>th</sup>, development of the DEIR began in June of 2014 with the notice of preparation and initial "scoping" of the document and the scenarios were developed using input from public workshops in the summer of 2014. In December of 2014, the City Council authorized preparation of an impacts study in the form of a Draft EIR to assess the potential impacts and trade-offs associated with the policy choices that will have to be made as the Comprehensive Plan Update planning process moves forward this year. The DEIR was introduced to the Council on January 19<sup>th</sup> and was released on February 5<sup>th</sup>.

Members of the public are encouraged to review and comment on the Draft EIR, and it's hoped that the information contained in the document and the companion fiscal study will inform the City Council's discussion of key policy issues like the jobs/housing balance, growth management strategies, the location and density of housing sites, prioritization of transportation investments, and desired sustainability measures for inclusion in the Comprehensive Plan. The public review period for the Draft EIR will last 90 days (twice the required period), or until the close of business on May 5, 2016. All substantive comments received on the Draft EIR will be responded to in a Final EIR, which must be certified before a final decision can be made to adopt an updated Comprehensive Plan.

**Table 3. City of Palo Alto Projected Jobs & Employed Residents in 2030 with Comprehensive Plan Draft EIR Planning Scenarios 2-4**

	<b>Policy Changes Assumed</b>	<b>Jobs</b>	<b>Employed Residents</b>	<b>Ratio</b>
<b>Scenario 2 Slowing Growth</b>	<p><u>To encourage housing:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Housing Element implementation</li> <li>• Policies to encourage smaller units</li> </ul> <p><u>To slow job growth:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Citywide annual limit on new office/R&amp;D square footage</li> <li>• Reduce Commercial FAR in the CC-2 zoning district by 25%</li> <li>• Possible adjustments in zoning to reduce commercial FAR downtown</li> <li>• Require CUP for new office/R&amp;D to regulate employment densities</li> </ul>	105,310	34,697	3.04

	Policy Changes Assumed	Jobs	Employed Residents	Ratio
<b>Scenario 3 Housing Tested</b>	<p><u>To encourage housing:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Housing Element implementation</li> <li>• Policies to encourage smaller units</li> <li>• Eliminate housing sites on San Antonio/South El Camino in exchange for increased densities near Cal Ave and downtown, possibly based on PTOD zoning “by right’</li> <li>• Heights of 55 or 60 feet allowed downtown for residential units.</li> </ul> <p><u>To slow job growth:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continue current interim annual limit on new office/R&amp;D square footage in a portion of the City</li> <li>• Reduce Commercial FAR in the CC-2 zoning district by 25%</li> <li>• Possible adjustments in zoning to reduce commercial FAR downtown</li> <li>• Require CUP for new office/R&amp;D to regulate employment densities</li> </ul>	108,215	35,578	3.03
<b>Scenario 4 Sustainability Tested</b>	<p><u>To encourage housing:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Housing Element implementation</li> <li>• Policies to encourage smaller units</li> <li>• Eliminate housing sites on San Antonio/South El Camino in exchange for increased densities near Cal Ave and downtown, <i>and</i> add new housing sites along the El Camino Real frontage of the Stanford Research Park and Stanford Shopping Center</li> <li>• Heights of 55 or 60 feet allowed downtown for residential units.</li> </ul> <p><u>To slow job growth:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Require CUP for new office/R&amp;D to regulate employment densities</li> </ul>	110,940	36,547	3.04 <sup>1</sup>
Notes: (1) Projected jobs, housing, and employed residents in the City of Palo Alto under Scenario 4 are derived from ABAG Projections 2013.				

Source: Comprehensive Plan Update Draft EIR, February 2016 (Section 4.11).

## Discussion

The term “jobs/housing balance” relates to the ratio between the number of jobs and housing opportunities in a given geographic area. Because there may be more than one job holder in any given household, this ratio is best examined using employed residents rather than housing units.

The existing number of jobs and employed residents in a given area are derived from US Census data. Projections of future employed residents are based on the number of housing units expected at a given point in time, and the expected number of job holders per household, which may change over time due to changes in demographics, housing costs, etc.

As noted in the Background section above, *the City of Palo Alto has an existing ratio of jobs to employed residents of around 3.06 and this ratio is expected to increase to 3.20 by 2030 unless*

*affirmative policy changes are made to address the issue.*<sup>1</sup>

Typically there are three ways to improve the ratio of jobs to employed residents (assuming that there are more jobs than employed residents as in Palo Alto):

- Increase the rate of housing production
- Decrease the rate of job growth
- A combination of the two

Any decisions made to increase the rate of housing production or decrease the rate of job growth can be highly contentious because of fears they will affect a community’s character, its place in the larger region, and/or other economic and social concerns. As a result, Scenarios 2-4 in the Draft EIR were crafted to illustrate the potential outcomes and impacts associated with possible policy changes, and inform policy discussions like this evening’s.

As shown in Table 3, above, some of the possible policy changes were assumed to generate more housing (and therefore employed residents) than the “business as usual” projection for 2030, and some were assumed to slow the rate of job growth, resulting in fewer jobs than ABAG projected for 2030. The potential policy changes included in the scenarios were derived from public workshops in mid-2014 and City Council discussions over the course of 2014 and early 2015 and include those listed in Table 5, below.

**Table 5. Potential Policy Changes Tested in Draft EIR Scenarios 2-4**

To encourage housing	To slow job growth
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Housing Element implementation</li> <li>• Policies to encourage smaller units</li> <li>• Eliminate housing sites on San Antonio/South El Camino in exchange for increased densities near Cal Ave and downtown (may include PTOD zoning “by right”)</li> <li>• Possible new housing sites along the El Camino Real frontage of the Stanford Research Park and Stanford Shopping Center</li> <li>• Heights of 55 or 60 feet allowed downtown for residential units.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adopt a citywide annual limit on new office/R&amp;D square footage - <i>or</i> - continue current interim annual limit on new office/R&amp;D square footage in a portion of the City</li> <li>• Reduce Commercial FAR in the CC-2 zoning district by 25%</li> <li>• Possible adjustments in zoning to reduce commercial FAR downtown and replace with residential FAR</li> <li>• Require CUP for new office/R&amp;D to regulate employment densities</li> </ul>

Source: Comprehensive Plan Update Draft EIR, February 2016

<sup>1</sup> Because the number of employed residents in 2030 is derived from the projection of housing units in 2030, the fact that Palo Alto has developed and uses its own lower projection of housing growth than ABAG, means that the City’s projection of the ratio between jobs and employed residents for 2030 (3.20) is worse than ABAG’s (3.04). The City does not have its own projection of job growth, but may be able to develop one in the future based on data collected through the new Business Registry.

The idea of perpetuating the City’s limit on non-residential development in “monitored areas” of the City (Comprehensive Plan Policy L-8) does not appear on this list, but is inherent in Scenarios 1 & 2. The City’s recent history has shown that job growth is not solely dependent on new square footage. Nonetheless, the Council will be discussing this policy in upcoming meetings, and in both that discussion and tonight’s could choose to perpetuate the limit and/or consider implementing regulatory (zoning) changes.

Tonight’s policy discussion is an opportunity for the Council to provide direction on other potential policy changes that should be considered. In addition, Council may wish to articulate a particular ratio of jobs to employed residents they would like to incorporate into the Comprehensive Plan Update as an objective for 2030.

As described in the DEIR orientation booklet and the January 19<sup>th</sup> Council meeting, the DEIR scenarios are not intended to be static or stand alone; instead, it was staff’s expectation that a preferred scenario would take ideas from each and incorporate new ideas. As such, the preferred scenario that is ultimately crafted for adoption in the form of the Comprehensive Plan Update may have a somewhat different jobs/housing ratio than the DEIR scenarios. Also, the Comprehensive Plan Update may articulate a more aspirational objective than is conservatively projected in the EIR.

For example, choosing the “slow job growth” tools in Scenario 2, and combining them with “encourage housing” tools in Scenario 4, would result in a lower ratio of jobs to employed residents (2.88) than any of the scenarios, as shown in Table 6, below.

**Table 6. City of Palo Alto Jobs & Employed Residents in 2030 with a Hybrid of Draft EIR Scenario 2 & 4**

	<b>Jobs</b>	<b>Employed Residents</b>	<b>Ratio</b>
<b>City of Palo Alto 2030 “Hybrid Scenario”</b>	105,311	36,547	2.88

Source: Comprehensive Plan Update Draft EIR, February 2016

Staff’s analysis has confirmed the difficulty in reducing the ratio in a much more significant way, because so much of the ratio is determined by existing land use patterns (the base of existing jobs and housing), rather than by changes (new jobs and housing) that may occur over the next 15 years. To illustrate this point, staff took the average number of employed residents for each of the four Draft EIR scenarios, and assumed that there would be no job growth in the City over the life of the updated Comprehensive Plan. The result was a jobs to employed residents ratio of 2.66.

A discussion of the desired ratio of jobs to employed residents should not lose sight of the fact that making more dramatic changes over the next 15 years than illustrated in Table 6 would require significant commercial downzoning<sup>2</sup> and/or more and denser housing opportunities. As described at the start of this section, potential policy changes necessary to meaningfully affect the projected ratio of jobs to employed residents is a difficult conversation. Potentially controversial concepts necessary to improve beyond the ratio of 2.88 in 2030 (as shown in Table 6) include the following:

- Increased housing densities - The City's zoning provides for a maximum of 40 units/acre in its R-40 zones (not including density bonuses, the use of PTOD zoning, or other tools). Council could consider creating new zoning districts with higher units per acre, change allowable density increases under the bonus or in PTOD overlays, or other tools to allow much higher densities.
- Increased areas under existing maximum zoning rules – The Council could expand those parts of the City under the R-15, R-30 and R-40 zones, to expand increases in housing units.
- Additional regulation of employment densities – Councilmembers have asked if there is a way to regulate the number of employees per square foot. Scenarios 2-4 suggest requiring a conditional use permit for new uses, which would allow the City to place conditions on projects regarding the number of jobs. The City Attorney is reviewing whether there are other mechanisms that could be used to regulate employment in new (or even existing) uses.
- Additional commercial downzoning – As noted above, Scenario 2 and 3 contemplate limited changes in commercial FAR in addition to annual limits on new office/R&D development. Council could consider downzoning to reduce allowable non-residential densities more broadly in the City of Palo Alto. If this is something that the Council would like to consider, staff will have to conduct an analysis of possible adjustments, including the parcels potentially affected, quantitative reductions in development potential, and likely impacts on job growth.

## Timeline

Per the request of Council, staff has prepared an updated master schedule for the Comprehensive Plan update (Attachment C). This updated schedule incorporates Council's desire for additional meetings to discuss broader issue areas, a reflection of the need to move certain items to better accommodate those discussions, and other changes. Staff would welcome the Council's input on this schedule and would like to pass on the Community Advisory Committee's desire for more joint meetings with the Council, particularly as it relates to the topic of housing.

---

<sup>2</sup> As noted in Table 3 and 5, Draft EIR Scenarios 2 and 3 include modest adjustments in the CC-2 zoning district (25% reduction in FAR) and suggest that some (unspecified) commercial FAR in Downtown could be converted to residential FAR. Other than these examples, the scenarios do not propose "downzoning" per se, but rely on growth control measures like an annual limit on new office/R&D to slow job growth.

Also, staff has tentatively identified April 11 for a public hearing on the Draft EIR, and the public comment period is scheduled to end on May 5, 2016. Assuming that the Council would like to consider public comments prior to deciding on their preferred scenario, one or more additional meetings will be needed to refine the fifth scenario and/or an alternative preferred scenario.

The City's consultant, Placeworks, has indicated that an estimated six to eight months will be necessary to provide a level of analysis for any additional scenario(s) that is similar to that provided in the Draft EIR. This analysis can be completed concurrent with review and finalization of the elements of Comprehensive Plan Update and circulated for a 45 day public comment period prior to preparation of the Final EIR. Based on the current schedule, the Final EIR and the Final Comprehensive Plan Update would be considered for adoption by the Council around May of 2017.

### **Resource Impact**

Analysis of an additional scenario(s) in the form of a supplement to the Draft EIR will require additional resources. Placeworks, the consultant working with the City on the Comprehensive Plan Update and the DEIR, estimates the need for an amendment to their contract for at least \$150,000 to cover the cost of analyzing a new scenario at the same level of detail as other scenarios in the Draft EIR. Also, approximately \$50,000 would be required for each additional scenario after that.

Based on Council's direction this evening, staff will bring forward an amendment to the Placeworks contract including additional funds for the required analysis and for increased staff support needed due to Jeremy Dennis' impending departure.

If the Council would like to make changes to the project schedule and add meetings of the Council and/or CAC, these will require a further assessment of staff and consultant resources. Also, if the Council requests an analysis of potential zoning changes beyond those currently being considered, staff will have to assess the time and cost to prepare this analysis.

### **Policy Implications**

The City's current Comprehensive Plan contains policies that support measured non-residential growth appropriate to the scale and character of the City (Policies L-8 and L-5), new housing (Policy H-2.1), and Palo Alto's image as a business-friendly community (Policy B-10). One question before the City Council this evening, is whether they wish to consider an aspirational goal or objective related to the ratio between jobs and employed residents in the Comprehensive Plan Update, and how such a goal could be supported through policy changes and implementing programs (i.e. changes in zoning regulations).

### **Environmental Review**

This agenda item seeks Council's direction on potential policy changes for future analysis and Council's direction does not constitute a project requiring review under the California



Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The Comprehensive Plan Update is the subject of a Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR), which can be found at <http://www.paloaltocompplan.org/eir/>. Public comments are welcome until the end of the comment period on May 5, 2016.

**Attachments:**

- Attachment A: City Council Action Minutes for January 19, 2016 (PDF)
- Attachment B: Summary of DEIR Key Characteristics & Impacts (PDF)
- Attachment C: New Comprehensive Plan Update Timeline/Schedule (DOCX)



# CITY OF PALO ALTO CITY COUNCIL ACTION MINUTES

Special Meeting  
January 19, 2016

The City Council of the City of Palo Alto met on this date in the Council Chambers at 5:00 P.M.

Present: Berman, Burt, DuBois, Filseth arrived at 5:05 P.M., Holman, Kniss arrived at 7:20 P.M., Scharff, Schmid arrived at 5:05 P.M., Wolbach arrived at 5:02 P.M.

Absent:

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

# ACTION MINUTES

6. Joint Session With the Citizens Advisory Committee for the Comprehensive Plan Update: Introduction to the Comprehensive Plan Update Draft Environmental Impact Report & Review of Next Steps in the Planning Process.

Council Member Kniss left the meeting at 10:54 P.M.

**MOTION:** Council Member DuBois moved, seconded by Council Member Holman to:

A. Direct Staff to present an updated schedule of Citizens Advisory Committee for the Comprehensive Plan Update (CAC) and Council meetings relating to the Comprehensive Plan Update, as soon as possible with check ins in April, May and September with a goal of delving into key decision areas on job and population growth assumptions, growth management, traffic, and a final Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR); and

# ACTION MINUTES

- B. Direct Staff to move forward with a Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) of various scenarios, replacing Scenario Four "Sustainability Tested" with a scenario which shifts the jobs/housing balance by limiting office expansion and replacing some commercial use with housing.

**INCORPORATED INTO THE MOTION WITH THE CONSENT OF THE MAKER AND SECONDER** to replace Part B of the Motion with, "direct Staff to move forward with a Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) of various scenarios, adding a fifth scenario which shifts the jobs/housing balance by limiting office expansion and replacing some commercial use with housing."

**INCORPORATED INTO THE MOTION WITH THE CONSENT OF THE MAKER AND SECONDER** to add to the Motion Part A, "as Action Items" after "May and September."

**INCORPORATED INTO THE MOTION WITH THE CONSENT OF THE MAKER AND SECONDER** to replace Part A of the Motion with, "direct Staff to come to the City Council Retreat with a more definitive schedule of when the variety of issues discussed this evening will be scheduled for Council consideration."

**INCORPORATED INTO THE MOTION WITH THE CONSENT OF THE MAKER AND SECONDER** to replace Part B of the Motion with, "direct Staff to return to Council with the DEIR as well as a possible fifth scenario which lowers the jobs/housing ratio and the implications that will have on the timing and process of completing the Comprehensive Plan Update."

**AMENDMENT:** Council Member Wolbach moved, seconded by Council Member XX to add to the Motion, "Council empowers the Citizens Advisory Committee for the Comprehensive Plan Update (CAC) if it so chooses to establish small sub-committee meetings that do not require Staff support."

**AMENDMENT WITHDRAWN BY THE MAKER**

**MOTION AS AMENDED PASSED:** 8-0 Kniss absent

**MOTION:** Council Member Wolbach moved, seconded by Council Member XX to add to the Motion, "council empowers the Citizens Advisory Committee for the Comprehensive Plan Update (CAC) if it so chooses to establish small sub-committee meetings that do not require Staff support."

## Comprehensive Plan Update 2014-2030 Draft EIR Scenarios: Key Characteristics &amp; Impacts \* (1 of 2)

Key Characteristics/Impacts	2014 Existing Conditions <sup>[01]</sup>	Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3	Scenario 4	Scenario 5 <sup>[02]</sup>	DEIR Page
		"Business as Usual"	"Slowing Growth"	"Housing Tested"	"Sustainability Tested"	TBD	
City Population	65,685	72,285	72,285	74,120	76,140		3-24,33,38 & 44
City & Sphere of Influence (SOI) Population	80,805	90,210	90,210	92,045	94,065		3-24,33,38 & 44
City Housing Units <sup>[03]</sup>	28,545	31,265	31,265	32,090	32,965		3-24,33,38 & 44
City & SOI Housing Units <sup>[04]</sup>	33,070	36,950	36,950	37,780	38,650		3-24,33,38 & 44
City Jobs <sup>[05]</sup>	95,460	110,940	105,310	108,215	110,940		3-24,33,38 & 44
City & SOI Jobs	100,830	116,700	111,070	113,975	116,700		3-24,33,38 & 44
City Employed Residents <sup>[06]</sup>	31,165	34,697	34,697	35,578	36,547		4-11-29
City & SOI Employed Residents <sup>[07]</sup>	36,004	40,595	40,595	41,420	42,329		4-11-29
City Jobs/Employed Residents Ratio	3.06	3.20	3.04	3.03	3.04		4-11-29
City & SOI Jobs/Employed Residents Ratio	2.80	2.87	2.74	2.75	2.76		4-11-29
Key Characteristics/Impacts (NET CHANGE)		Scenario 1 Δ (NET CHANGE)	Scenario 2 Δ (NET CHANGE)	Scenario 3 Δ (NET CHANGE)	Scenario 4 Δ (NET CHANGE)	Scenario 5 Δ	DEIR Page
		"Business as Usual"	"Slowing Growth"	"Housing Tested"	Sustainability Tested		
City Population		6,600	6,600	8,435	10,455		3-19
City & SOI Population		9,405	9,405	11,240	13,260		3-19
City Housing Units <sup>[03]</sup>		2,720	2,720	3,545	4,420		3-19
City & SOI Housing Units <sup>[04]</sup>		3,880	3,880	4,710	5,580		3-19
City Jobs <sup>[05]</sup>		15,480	9,850	12,755	15,480		3-19
City & SOI Jobs		15,870	10,240	13,145	15,870		3-19
Estimated Net New Non-Residential Square Footage in Policy L-8 "Monitored Areas" since 1989 (millions sq ft) <sup>[08]</sup>		~3.2	~3.2	~3.4	~3.9		
Estimated Net New Non-Residential Square Footage in Policy L-8 "Monitored Areas" 2014-2030 (millions sq ft) <sup>[08]</sup>		~1.7	~1.7	~1.9	~2.4		
Estimated Net New Non-Residential Square Footage Entire City 2014-2030 (millions sq ft) <sup>[09]</sup>		~3.3	~3.0	~3.5	~4.0		3-19
Transportation Impacts	2014 Existing Conditions	Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3	Scenario 4	Scenario 5	DEIR Page
City Total Motor Vehicle Trips	432,122	479,198	467,567	475,362	463,255		4.13-47
City & SOI Total Motor Vehicle Trips	499,013	549,691	538,480	545,826	533,336		4.13-45
City Total Average Trip Length (miles)	12.31	12.41	12.28	12.31	12.50		4.13-47
City & SOI Total Average Trip Length (miles)	12.81	12.94	12.81	12.83	13.00		4.13-45
City Total Vehicle Miles Travelled (VMT)	5,320,931	5,947,158	5,741,373	5,853,201	5,788,497		4.13-49
City & SOI Total Vehicle Miles Travelled (VMT)	6,391,293	7,110,437	6,897,508	7,000,886	11,448		4.13-49
City VMT Per Capita	33.0	32.5	32.3	32.1	30.9		4.13-49
City & SOI VMT Per Capita	34.8	34.0	33.9	33.6	32.5		4.13-49
City Mode Share for Palo Alto Daily Person Trips (%) - Drive Alone	61.5%	59.9%	60.0%	59.7%	58.5%		4.13-50
City Mode Share for Palo Alto Daily Person Trips (%) - Shared Ride	22.7%	22.2%	22.3%	22.2%	21.9%		4.13-50
City Mode Share for Palo Alto Daily Person Trips (%) - Transit	5.1%	6.8%	6.6%	6.8%	7.8%		4.13-50
City Mode Share for Palo Alto Daily Person Trips (%) - Bike	2.8%	3.1%	3.1%	3.1%	3.2%		4.13-50
City Mode Share for Palo Alto Daily Person Trips (%) - Walk	7.9%	8.1%	8.1%	8.2%	8.6%		4.13-50
	2013	Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3	Scenario 4	Scenario 5	DEIR Page
Daily Transit Boardings To, From and Within Palo Alto (Including, BART, Caltrain, VTA, Shuttles, etc.)	44,053	62,177	57,287	61,013	70,045		4.13-69

**Comprehensive Plan Update 2014-2030 Draft EIR Scenarios: Key Characteristics & Impacts \* (2 of 2)**

<b>Palo Alto Unified School District (PAUSD) Impacts <sup>[10]</sup></b>	<b>Existing Conditions Enrollments 2013-2014/2014-2015 (Capacity)</b>	<b>Scenario 1</b>	<b>Scenario 2</b>	<b>Scenario 3</b>	<b>Scenario 4</b>	<b>Scenario 5</b>	<b>DEIR Page</b>
Net Elementary School Students Enrollment Increase	5,784 / 5,677 (6,227)	388	388	471	558		4.12-04, & 11 to 13
Net Middle School Students Enrollment Increase	2,720 / 2,932 (2,950)	155	155	188	223		4.12-04, & 11 to 13
Net High School Students Enrollment Increase	3,848 / 3,840 (4,600)	155	155	188	223		4.12-04, & 11 to 13
Net Total School Students Enrollment Increase	12,352 / 12,449 (13,777)	698	698	847	1,004		4.12-04, & 11 to 13
<b>Parkland Needed <sup>[11]</sup></b>							
<b>Acres of Parkland Needed by Scenario (ac) @ 4 acres per 1,000 new residents</b>	<b>2014 Existing Conditions</b>	<b>Scenario 1</b>	<b>Scenario 2</b>	<b>Scenario 3</b>	<b>Scenario 4</b>	<b>Scenario 5</b>	<b>DEIR Page</b>
	4,384.4	26.4	26.4	33.6	41.6		4.12-45
<b>Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Impacts</b>							
<b>City GHG Emissions (MtCO<sub>2</sub>e/Year)</b>	<b>2014 Existing Conditions</b>	<b>Scenario 1</b>	<b>Scenario 2</b>	<b>Scenario 3</b>	<b>Scenario 4</b>	<b>Scenario 5</b>	<b>DEIR Page</b>
	519,517	419,914	416,058	419,533	421,842		4.6-36 to 38
<b>City &amp; SOI GHG Emissions (MtCO<sub>2</sub>e/Year)</b>							
	600,207	494,458	485,707	489,074	491,095		4.6-36 to 38
<b>Utilities Impacts</b>							
<b>City &amp; SOI Water Demand - Gallons Per Day (GPD)</b>	<b>2014 Existing Conditions (Baseline)</b>	<b>Scenario 1</b>	<b>Scenario 2</b>	<b>Scenario 3</b>	<b>Scenario 4</b>	<b>Scenario 5</b>	<b>DEIR Page</b>
	4,230,635,205	4,485,942,577	4,485,531,107	4,485,877,531	4,486,224,321		4.14-23
<b>City &amp; SOI Increase in Solid Waste Generation over 2014 Baseline (tons/yr)</b>							
	51,265	13,240	10,851	13,382	15,953		4.14-73
<b>City &amp; SOI Total Electricity Increase over 2014 Baseline (kWh)</b>							
	1,017,067,516	152,818,068	106,148,597	134,778,309	162,135,150		4.14-96
<b>City &amp; SOI Natural Gas Increase over 2014 Baseline (therms)</b>							
	31,729,420	4,493,949	3,419,165	4,286,982	5,135,532		4.14-23

**NOTES**

\* ALL IMPACTS REPORTED ARE PRIOR TO ANY MITIGATION

01) 2014 in most cases.

02) City Council would like to develop a scenario that improves the City's ratio between jobs/employed residents. This new scenario can also include additional housing proposed in the SOI by Stanford University

03) 2014 Housing Units (HU) - 2010 Decennial Census baseline plus HU's built between 2010 -2014 based on building permit activity

3a. Scenario 1 2030 HU forecast based on Palo Alto long term average units produced per year and known pipeline projects.

04) 2014 HU for Sphere of Influence (SOI) - 2010 Decennial Census baseline plus Stanford General Use Permit (GUP) Annual Report to Santa Clara County on Housing built for years 2010 - 2014

4a. Scenario 1 2030 HU forecast for SOI assumes full buildout of Stanford GUP by 2030.

05) 2014 Existing jobs derived from ABAG Projections 2013 Jobs forecast interpolated from years 2010-2015. 2030 Jobs forecast for Scenarios 1 & 4 derived from ABAG Projections 2013.

06) 2014 Employed Residents for City derived from US Census, ACS 3-year estimates 2011-2013

6a. To determine the number of employed residents in the scenarios, PlaceWorks assumed that 48 percent of the 2030 (city limit) population would be employed which is the same percentage of employed residents to total population as is found in the ABAG 2030 Projections.

07) 2014 Employed Residents for City & SOI derived from ABAG Projections 2013 interpolation between 2015-2010

7a. To determine the number of employed residents in the scenarios, Placeworks assumed that 45 percent of the 2030 (City Limit + SOI) population would be employed which is the same percentage of employed residents to total population as is found in the ABAG 2030 Projections.

08) "Monitored Areas" are identified on Map L-6 and referenced in Policy L-8. There are also land uses within "Monitored Areas" that are exempt from the 3.2 million Policy L-8 limits.

09) Estimated Net new non-residential square feet forecast for entire City.

9a. Scenario 1 - Includes 1.7 million sq ft in "monitored areas" remaining in 3.2 million limit in Policy L-8, 1.3 million sq ft of approved SMC expansion plus ~300k sq ft of non-res devt in other "non-monitored" areas.

9b. Scenario 2 - Includes 1.7 million sq ft in "monitored areas" remaining in 3.2 million limit in Policy L-8 & 1.3 million sq ft of approved SMC expansion.

9c. Scenario 3 - Includes 1.7 million sq ft in "monitored areas" remaining in 3.2 million limit in Policy L-8, 1.3 million sq ft of approved SMC expansion, plus ~200k sq ft of non-res devt above 3.2 m limit in Policy L-8 and ~300k of additional non-res devt in other "non-monitored" areas. Less job density type of non-res development.

9d. Scenario 4 - Includes 1.7 million sq ft in "monitored areas" remaining in 3.2 million limit in Policy L-8, 1.3 million sq ft of approved SMC expansion, plus ~700k sq ft of non-res devt above 3.2 m limit in Policy L-8 and ~300k of additional non-res devt in other "non-monitored" areas. Less job density type of non-res development.

10) Generation rates are consistent with "moderate" generation rates used in 2014 PAUSD Enrollment Projections prepared by Decision Insite. PAUSD uses "moderate" generation rates that are typical of students enrolled from existing developments of similar product type. This analysis also assumes that all new housing would be multi-family housing.

11) Neighborhood and District Parks only. Calculated @ 4 acres per 1,000 new residents.

## Comprehensive Plan Update Revised Schedule -- January 30, 2016 DRAFT – Read Down

Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) Schedule of Meetings & Topics	Date*	City Council Schedule of Comp Plan Discussions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Selection of Chair/Vice Chair (Action)</li> <li>Adoption of meeting schedule and CAC ground rules</li> </ul>	July 14	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community Services &amp; Facilities Element Policies &amp; Programs</li> </ul>	Aug 11	
	Aug 17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CAC membership, ground rules &amp; schedule</li> </ul>
	Aug 31	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Additional CAC appointments</li> <li>Comp Plan Structure &amp; Goals/Vision Statements Part I (Transportation Element)</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Revision to Ground Rules RE: Co-Chairs</li> <li>Discussion of City Council Direction Regarding Schedule and Subcommittees</li> <li>Transportation Element Part I Policies &amp; Programs</li> </ul>	Sep 8	
	Sep 21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adoption of Interim Ordinance Establishing an Office Annual Limit in Portions of the City</li> <li>Ground Floor Retail Preservation Ordinance Regarding Cal Avenue Area</li> </ul>
	Oct 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Comp Plan Structure &amp; Goals/Vision Statements Part II (Community Services &amp; Facilities Element)</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transportation Element Part II Policies &amp; Programs</li> </ul>	Oct 20	
	Nov 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Comp Plan Structure &amp; Goals/Vision Statements Part III (Land Use &amp; Community Design Element incl. Growth Management Policies)</li> </ul>
	Nov 16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Comp Plan Structure &amp; Goals/Vision Statements Part IV (Safety and Noise, Natural Environment and Business &amp; Economics Elements)</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community Services &amp; Facilities Draft Element Recommendations</li> </ul>	Nov 17	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land Use &amp; Community Design Element Part I –Planning meeting</li> </ul>	Dec 15	
January 19 – JOINT MEETING – Introduction to Draft EIR		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transportation Draft Element Recommendations Part 1</li> </ul>	Jan 26	
	<b>Feb 8</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Review of CAC work on Community Services &amp; Facilities Element</b></li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transportation Draft Element Recommendations Part II</li> </ul>	Feb 16	
	<b>Feb 22</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Discussion of DEIR “Scenario 5” and Jobs/Housing balance</b></li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land Use &amp; Community Design Element Part II Policies &amp; Programs</li> </ul>	Mar 15	
	<b>Mar 21</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Housing Sites &amp; Programs</b></li> </ul>
	<b>April 11</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Public Hearing on the Draft EIR</b></li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land Use &amp; Community Design Element Part III Policies &amp; Programs</li> </ul>	Apr 19	
	<b>April 25</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Review of CAC work on Transportation Element</b></li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Natural Environment Element Policies and Programs</li> </ul>	May 17	
	<b>June 6</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Review of CAC work on Land Use Element &amp; Direction regarding Policy L-8</b></li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land Use &amp; Community Design Draft Element Recommendations</li> </ul>	June 21	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Safety and Noise Element Policies &amp; Programs</li> </ul>	July 19	
	<b>Aug 8</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Discussion of Sustainability in the Comp Plan Update</b></li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Natural Environment Draft Element Recommendations</li> </ul>	Aug 16	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Business &amp; Economics Element Policies &amp; Programs</li> </ul>	Sept 20	
	Oct 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review of CAC work on Natural Environment &amp; Safety</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Safety Draft Element Recommendations</li> </ul>	Oct 18	
	<b>Nov 7</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Discussion &amp; Direction on Governance &amp; Implementation</b></li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>SPECIAL MEETING – Governance Element Policies and Programs</b></li> </ul>	Nov 8	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Business &amp; Economics Element Policies &amp; Programs</li> </ul>	Nov 15	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Implementation Plan</li> <li><b>Governance Element Recommendation</b></li> <li>Putting it all together/Final Thoughts and Recommendations</li> </ul>	Dec 13	
REVISED DRAFT COMP PLAN DISSEMINATED FOR PUBLIC REVIEW (Starting in December)		
	February 2017	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Final Review of Transportation Element</li> </ul>
	March	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Final Review of Land Use Element</li> </ul>
	March	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Final Review of Natural Environment and Safety Elements</li> </ul>
	April	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Final Review of Business &amp; Economics, Community Services &amp; Facilities Elements</li> </ul>
	April	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review of Implementation Plan</li> </ul>
	May	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Final Review of City Council’s Changes &amp; Errata</li> </ul>
UPDATED COMP PLAN & FINAL EIR ADOPTED May 2017		

\***Bold**–new or modified.

All dates and topics subject to change; additional meetings may be scheduled as needed. 5<sup>th</sup> scenario schedule to follow.