

Arthur Keller Replies to 2016 City Council Candidate Questions

1. **Reason for running:** What are the top three goals you want to achieve in the next four years on the city council?

I am running for Palo Alto City Council because I want our city government to be the best it can be. Our City government must be responsive to the needs of its residents and businesses, and responsive to changing conditions. Our residents and businesses need a moderate and thoughtful approach to managing development and growth that does not outpace the capacity of our schools, parks, and infrastructure. I support growth at a rate we can absorb.

Housing. Palo Alto does need new housing. We must be realistic and realize that we cannot have housing for all who want to live here. We need more housing for seniors, so our seniors can stay in our community as we age. Additional housing must also focus on those most in need, including more affordable housing units. We can follow the lead of San Francisco and increase our minimum percentage of affordable housing from 15 to 25%. We can explore housing for new teachers, as suggested by proposed legislation, and for first responders and utility workers. We must also do our part for emergency preparedness.

State law does allow Palo Alto to consider school impacts of changes to our policies, though not individual development projects. The City must start to consider school overcrowding. Our high school sites were originally designed for 1200 students each and are now planned to hold nearly double. Our Middle Schools are already at capacity. The School District can build two-story school buildings, but we cannot have two-story playing fields.

Development, Traffic and Parking. Rapid growth in jobs is the root cause of our housing and traffic problems. We have allowed office space and jobs to grow dramatically, resulting in worsening traffic congestion and parking spilling over into neighborhoods. We must manage growth and reduce its impacts. By tying the rate of growth to a requirement to address the impacts of growth, landowners can be motivated to work with commercial tenants to minimize project impacts. Not all growth is good. I am in favor of maintaining the annual growth limit on office space — a “speed limit” on growth.

Clogged arterial streets encourage drivers to divert to and speed in local neighborhoods. This is unsafe and reduces neighborhood livability. For example, we can tie future growth of the Stanford Research Park to achieving binding targets for reducing traffic congestion on access streets. (See <http://news.stanford.edu/news/2001/september19/mayfield-919.html> about a previous agreement with Stanford regarding growth at the research park. Playing fields were the ultimate use instead of the JCC of the Page Mill Road/El Camino Real site.)

I led the successful effort to insert into our updated Comprehensive Plan the requirement that all new developments supply parking to meet the demand they generate.

Enforcing our laws. I support fully enforcing our requirements for Planned Community benefits, zoning laws, Conditional Use Permits, conditions of approval, Transportation Demand Management (TDM) programs, etc. I support improving our code enforcement process and adjusting penalties and fees to reflect the true costs of the community of these violations of our laws. And I support being clear that to the staff and the public that we will expect compliance and take appropriate measures when there is lack of compliance. I want periodic reporting on code complaints and how they were adjudicated.

2. Experience:

Non-incumbents: Describe your personal experience with Palo Alto City government and recent issues that have come before public hearings at the city council or other board and commissions. What was your role? (For example, did you send an email, speak to the Council, lead a group of citizens, etc.?) How extensively were you involved?

Incumbent (Kniss): What have been your major initiatives on the Council? Describe your role and the results.

I have served for eight years on the Planning and Transportation Commission. I worked on the Zoning Ordinance Update, the Comprehensive Plan update, the Bicycle+Pedestrian Plan, the Baylands Master Plan, Planned Community reform, as well as a variety of rezoning and quasi-judicial matters.

I have served for the last year as co-chair of the Citizens Advisory Committee on the Comprehensive Plan Update. I led the effort to include in the Transportation Element a policy that new projects include sufficient parking to meet the demand they generate, a policy to retain Level of Service as a traffic congestion metric to evaluate new development and a program to revisit and tighten the Level of Service thresholds for determining when there are significant traffic impacts. Our current traffic congestion metrics are inadequate because (1) the baseline for prior traffic conditions from a project assume that the prior development is fully occupied at its highest possible use (even if that exceeds what the building ever generated), and (2) too much additional traffic is needed before mitigations are required.

The proposal for a housing development at Page Mill Road and El Camino Real indicates that even with a moratorium on Planned Community zoning we are still facing requests for spot zoning. However, this new request does not come with public benefits would come from the value capture model I proposed for Planned Community zoning. The parking reductions proposed for this project are not based on experience with multiple comparable developments but are based on aspirational reductions in car ownership. With only 6% of Palo Alto households not having any car, this is a recipe for spillover parking in the surrounding neighborhood, which does not have a Residential Parking Permit Program.

I am also a member of the Environmental and Water Resources Committee of the Santa Clara Valley Water District. I have been fighting for our property taxes for the State Water Project to be used for projects in Palo Alto, such as recycled water and flood protection. Palo Alto receives no water for the State Water Project; our funds are instead used to subsidize water rates for Santa Clara and San Jose.

3. Affordable Housing: Regarding building affordable housing, we are faced with several problems: lack of land, lack of interest on developers' part and the cost (one unit costs \$400-600,000). Please address:

- How do we get such housing built?
- Can we even build enough housing to satisfy demand?
- Should the City increase development fees to fund more affordable housing?

San Francisco and other cities are correct in increasing the inclusionary zoning percentage of required below market rate housing. I support Palo Alto increasing our inclusionary zoning requirement to 25%.

By maintaining an annual limit on new office space, the competition for land between office and residential uses is reduced. The reduction in housing production coincided with a shift to more office development.

I support increasing nexus fund charges to retain and build affordable housing. Because of the Palmer decision, inclusionary zoning requirements for market rate housing do not apply to rental housing. So it is appropriate to charge rental housing a fee to build below market rate housing, and to waive this fee when affordable housing is provided.

Palo Alto will never be able to build enough housing to satisfy demand. To do so would diminish the quality of our schools due to overcrowding.

We need to focus on retention of existing housing. Some focus only on what new housing we can build like accessory dwelling units while ignoring the loss of existing cottages and less expensive housing. When housing is illegally used for office space, it harms the fabric of the neighborhood and it takes housing off the market. San Francisco has a law regulating Airbnb; why don't we?

4. High-density housing: What are your thoughts on “high-density housing” in Palo Alto? How much should be built and for whom?

We need more housing for seniors, so our seniors can stay in our community as we age. Additional housing must also focus on those most in need, including more affordable housing units.

We can explore housing for new teachers, as suggested by proposed legislation, and for first responders and utility workers. We must also do our part for emergency preparedness.

State law allows Palo Alto to consider school impacts of our changed policies, though not individual development projects. The City must start to consider school overcrowding. Our high school sites were originally designed for 1200 students each and are now planned to hold nearly double. Our Middle Schools are already at capacity. The School District can build two story school buildings, but we cannot have two story playing fields.

Most of the housing built in Palo Alto since 2000 has been large townhouses, resulting in the enrollment surge in our schools and school overcrowding. Let's take a look at what type of housing we most need. Only 20% of our housing stock is studio or 1-bedroom apartments. Yet 60% of Palo Alto's households have 1 or 2 people. So we clearly need smaller units for these smaller households. And those happen to have less impact on our schools. We can also encourage larger housing units to be built at a rate that does not cause overcrowding in our schools.

When I make decisions, my priority is to ensure that the quality of life in Palo Alto is preserved and enhanced for all Palo Altans.

Dense housing means even more need for parks that their residents can walk to.

5. Jobs/Housing Imbalance: Office creation is outpacing housing development. Please address:

- How much, where *and what kind of* office space can Palo Alto sustain?
- Do you support extending the annual office space development cap?
- Should the City consider placing a moratorium on new office development?

I support making permanent the annual limit on office space growth. Not only is office space exacerbating the jobs/housing imbalance, but it is also competing for land with building housing.

The Stanford Research Park was exempted from the annual growth limit on office space without any enforceable requirement that they address the impacts of their growth. They have begun to address traffic through a new Transportation Management Association. That's a good start. We can tie future growth of the Stanford Research Park to binding targets for reducing traffic on Page Mill Road, Oregon Expressway, and the Charleston-Arastradero Road corridor.

I do not support a moratorium on new office development. I do support tying the rate of growth to addressing the impacts of growth. By tying the rate of growth to a requirement to address the impacts of growth, landowners can be motivated to work with commercial tenants to minimize project impacts.

6. Growth: There has been a lot of discussion about the demand for housing as well as potential impacts, and how fast it should increase in Palo Alto. How does this compromise the quality of life of local residents, including school enrollment, and what mitigations do you support?

State law does allow Palo Alto to consider school impacts of our policies, though not individual development projects. The City must start to consider school overcrowding. Our high schools were originally designed for 1200 students each and are now planned to hold nearly double that.

Our Middle Schools are already at capacity. The School District can build two-story school buildings, but we cannot have two-story playing fields.

Most of the housing built in Palo Alto since 2000 has been large townhouses, resulting in the enrollment surge in our schools. Let's take a look at what type of housing we most need. Only 20% of our housing stock is studio or 1-bedroom apartments. Yet 60% of Palo Alto's households have 1 or 2 people. So it's clear we most need smaller units for these smaller households. And those tend to have less impact on our schools.

When we make decisions, our priority is to ensure that the quality of life in Palo Alto is preserved and enhanced for all Palo Altans.

We should grow family oriented housing at a rate the schools can absorb without causing overcrowding and increased class sizes.

Parkland growth should keep up with housing growth. Palo Alto must maintain the ratio of population to neighborhood parks. I support setting maximum dedication of parkland under the Quimby Act, and parkland impact fees at market rates used to acquire new parkland with new housing growth.

While Accessory Dwelling Units will become more prevalent (and a new California law makes it easier to build them), we must not allow them to interfere with the quality of life of the neighbors. In particular, these must be used by long-term tenants and not for Airbnb transient use.

- 7. Cumulative Impacts:** Commercial projects are evaluated on an individual basis, without looking at the cumulative impact on intersections, traffic and spillover parking in neighborhoods. Many traffic studies seem to have a finding of “no impact,” yet traffic continues to get worse. What changes in the way we evaluate projects would you favor?

I successfully fought on the Citizens Advisory Committee on the Comprehensive Plan Update for projects to supply sufficient parking to meet demand.

I successfully fought to retain the Level of Service metric for local traffic congestion in addition to the State mandated metric of Vehicle Miles Traveled (which promotes shorter commutes even if local traffic congestion increases). When the Stanford Medical Center expansion was being reviewed, somehow Menlo Park had more intersections that would be affected than Palo Alto. Why is that? Because Menlo Park’s rules about measuring traffic congestion are stricter than Palo Alto’s. (Although Menlo Park does not seem to be enforcing them for Facebook.) I successfully fought for Palo Alto to revisit the traffic congestion standards to make them stricter. I will fight to revise these standards to make them stricter, even though there is opposition.

There is a problem with the baseline used to compare the existing traffic conditions with that of the new development. The current baseline for prior traffic conditions from a project assumes that the prior development is fully occupied at its highest possible use (even if that exceeds what the building ever generated). I want the baseline to be the actual traffic load measured no longer than two years prior to the submission of the project proposal. With the baseline being inflated by theoretical high use, it is not surprising the traffic studies find “no impact” in comparison.

With the adjustments to traffic impact rules I propose, Palo Alto will have an effective tool to control traffic growth from new developments.

- 8. Local Review:** What is your opinion of the Budget Trailer Bill 707’s (or similar bills) by-right exemption from environmental review?

I am opposed to Budget Trailer Bill 707 or similar bills. Fortunately, this bill failed. But two other sets of bills did pass the California legislature and are awaiting the Governor’s signature. AB 2501 (Bloom) amends the State Housing Density Bonus Law to restrict what documents Palo Alto can require for evaluation. SB 1069 (Wieckowski) limits city regulations of Accessory Dwelling Units.

As a result of these new sets of State laws, Palo Alto needs to update its ordinance implementing the State Housing Density Bonus Law. I support prohibition on any increase in office space as a concession.

And Palo Alto should update its Accessory Dwelling Unit ordinance to conform to State law. Not only should we prohibit Accessory Dwelling Units from being rented through Airbnb for transient use, but also we should preserve existing and new Accessory Dwelling Units and Cottages as part of our housing stock.

9. **Retail:** How would you support local retail? Specifically, how would you protect, support and possibly even extend ground-floor retail in our commercial and neighborhood commercial areas? How would you enforce existing laws?

I am in favor of vigorously defending the requirement to retain retail uses where they are now.

I propose shortening the length of time when a non-conforming use in a ground floor retail location is allowed to remain vacant without requiring enforcement of the ground floor retail uses.

I propose that the City create a list of protected ground floor retail locations, so that the City can effectively enforce the rules against conversion to non-retail uses.

I want the City not to issue Certificates of Occupancy for a non-retail use that replaces a retail use. The City should scrutinize these requests to ensure that they are retail, but without delaying the process for true retailers.

10. **Accessory Dwelling Units (aka “Granny Units”):** Do you support zoning changes to enable the creation of additional second units, such as reduced minimum lot size, removal of parking requirements? If so, which ones? How do ensure these units don’t simply become short-term (Airbnb-type) rentals?

We need to update our Accessory Dwelling Unit ordinance to reflect the changes in California law when the Governor signs SB 1069 or companion bill AB 2299.

I am opposed to Accessory Dwelling Units being used at all for Airbnb transient rental use. We need a regulation of Airbnb or other transient uses in residential areas.

The Legislative Counsel’s Digest of SB 1069 states:

This bill would replace the term “second unit” with “accessory dwelling unit” throughout the law. The bill would additionally find and declare that, among other things, allowing accessory dwelling units in single-family or multifamily residential zones provides additional rental housing stock, and these units are an essential component of housing supply in California.

The Planning and Zoning Law authorizes the ordinance for the creation of 2nd units in single-family and multifamily residential zones to include specified provisions regarding areas where accessory dwelling units may be located, standards, including the imposition of parking standards, and lot density. Existing law, when a local agency has not adopted an ordinance governing 2nd units as so described, requires the local agency to approve or disapprove the application ministerially, as provided.

This bill would instead require the ordinance for the creation of accessory dwelling units to include the provisions described above. The bill would prohibit the imposition of parking standards under specified circumstances. The bill would revise requirements for the approval or disapproval of an accessory dwelling unit application when a local agency has not adopted an ordinance. The bill would also require the ministerial approval of an application for a building permit to create one accessory dwelling unit within the existing space of a single-family residence or accessory structure, as specified. The bill would prohibit a local agency from requiring an applicant for this permit to install a new or separate utility connection directly between the unit and the utility or imposing a related connection fee or capacity charge. The bill would authorize a local agency to impose this requirement for other accessory dwelling units.

San Francisco requires registration of Airbnb hosts and regulates Airbnb rental. Other cities do as well. Palo Alto should too.

- 11. Parks:** The current Comprehensive Plan calls for the city to maintain 4 acres of in-town park space for every 1,000 residents. The actual ratio is now below this ratio as our population has grown. What should we do?

Palo Alto must maintain the current ratio of in-town park space to 1,000 residents as more housing is built. The need for in-town park space increases for dense housing. There continues to be a shortage of playing field space for soccer games and the like. See, for example, <http://archive.peninsulapress.com/2013/02/26/sports-field-shortage-prompts-palo-alto-to-change-reservation-rules/>

Parkland growth should keep up with housing growth. I support setting maximum dedication of parkland under the Quimby Act, and parkland impact fees at market rates used to acquire new parkland with new housing growth.

We have not been acquiring new parkland, with the sole exception of the Stanford Mayfield Playing Fields. My priority is to create new parks as we grow.

- 12. Dewatering:** What policies should the City set regarding the discharge and loss of water (as well as land settlement problems in neighboring properties) when basements are being built?

Dewatering should be minimized through improved construction techniques.

Consideration of water table level, such as near flood zones, should be part of the evaluation of basements.

There should be a storm drain fee associated with dewatering, as recommended by the Storm Drain Blue Ribbon Committee.

A study is needed on the impact of dewatering on adjacent properties and on permanent changes to groundwater flow "downstream" of the basement. For example, I've seen a well going dry several hundred feet from a dewatering project.

Water is a critical resource. We need to manage it better.

- 13. Single Family Individual Review (includes SSO, Eichler preservation):** Please address:

- What type of design guidelines should be developed to preserve neighborhood character?
- Is the current process working?
- If so, give examples. If not, what should be changed?

The Individual Review guidelines are not working effectively. They are ambiguous and not sufficiently clear. By changing the guidelines to clear rules, they can be better enforced.

When the plans do indicate that textured glass or opaque windows are required, the Building Inspectors sometimes fail to enforce these rules.

Eichler neighborhoods are especially vulnerable to loss of privacy from two story houses. And when those new buildings are in a flood zone, elevation of the building above the Base Flood Elevation, as required by FEMA rules, exacerbates the privacy problem.

- 14. Traffic/Commuters:** With so much traffic spreading into many neighborhoods, and with a lack of regional transportation plans, what do you propose Palo Alto should do to address employee traffic into town? How do you propose to ease the congestion on our arterial streets — especially during the rush hours — so fewer commuters will try to take unsafe short cuts through our residential neighborhood streets?

Clogged arterial streets encourage drivers to divert to and speed in local neighborhoods. This is unsafe and reduces neighborhood livability. One proposal I've made is to tie future growth of the Stanford Research Park to achieving binding targets for reducing traffic congestion on access streets.

A transportation impact fee could be used to promote traffic reduction efforts, with potential credits for those companies that demonstrate that they have taken successful measures on their own.

The Stanford Research Park and Downtown Transportation Management Association should each obtain from each of their employers a census of all employees by residence zip code and working hours. The City can then lobby the VTA to increase Express Bus service from those residence zip codes with a large number of employees within Santa Clara County. Stanford University has done that successfully for matching carpooling (but not getting VTA Express Bus service). Credit on the transportation impact fees for measures taken can be dependent on participating in providing employee census data to the TMA confidentially.

- 15. Parking (RPP):** Do you support an expanded Residential Parking Permit Program? Please address:

- How should it be structured to protect neighborhoods?
- Should neighborhoods get determine which type of program is appropriate for them?
- What alternatives or additional mitigations do you support?
- Will you keep in place the commitment to phase out non-resident parking in the Downtown RPP district in 10 years?

For the Downtown RPP program, I support excluding worker permits from those areas added in Phase 2. I also support distributing worker permits to even out the workers, with fewer worker permits issued adjacent to the downtown core because of the greater number of 2-hour parked cars in that area.

Neighborhoods should be able to choose College Terrace-style (no outside worker permits) RPP programs. In particular, Evergreen Park and Southgate (and Ventura if they want one) neighborhoods should be eligible for College Terrace-style RPP programs.

I support phasing out non-resident parking in the downtown RPP district within 10 years other than for low-income workers. (I suggest reduction by 200 permits per year from the previous year's sales of full-price employee parking permits, so it may take fewer than 10 years.) Unless and until we have a low cost permit program for low-income workers, I would retain their permits. Businesses in commercially zoned areas within the RPP district should continue to be eligible for employee permits.

Only businesses on the Business Registry should be eligible for employee permits.

Businesses and residents located in new buildings, which are supposed to be fully parked, should not be eligible for RPP permits.

16. Caltrain/HSR: What is your view on Caltrain's electrification plans, High Speed Rail and grade separations?

I support Caltrain electrification. I support extension of Caltrain to the San Francisco Transbay Terminal.

We must have grade separations prior to Caltrain increasing service to 8 trains per rush hour per direction. I have supported a trench, covered where appropriate, since 2008. I called it "cut-and-cover" then. See <http://www.paloaltoonline.com/print/story/2008/09/26/tunnel-or-trench>

I want to explore dedicated funding for Caltrain, like BART has, instead of relying on funding from San Francisco, San Mateo, and Santa Clara Counties.

Those developments that claim reductions in parking because of proximity to Caltrain, can pay a "value capture" fee of the avoided parking cost to be used to pay for Palo Alto's contribution to grade separation costs.

Palo Alto must ensure we get our fair share of Measure B funds for grade separations, and that it is not transferred to BART as other promised funds have been.

I do not support High Speed Rail. The latest business plan for High Speed Rail is not realistic, including cost and ridership projections. High Speed Rail would entail major impacts on the Peninsula without payment towards mitigations (such as grade separations).

I support studying Dumbarton Rail as a means for reducing traffic congestion across the Dumbarton Bridge. Regional Measure 2 in 2004 funding for Dumbarton Rail of \$91 million was allocated to the BART Warm Springs extension. However, any rebuilt Dumbarton Rail project should be sensitive to the tidal marshland it would cross. Unfortunately, when the Dumbarton Bridge was rebuilt in the 1980's, no provision was made for mass transit or carpool lanes. "Regular "mixed-flow" lanes are never converted to carpool lanes." See <http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/paffairs/faq/faq79.htm>

17. VTA: What will be your strategy in dealing with the VTA to stop their proposed severe reduction of VTA bus service within Palo Alto, and to persuade them instead to improve their service in Palo Alto so more commuters working in Palo Alto will take VTA buses to their jobs in Palo Alto.

I led the successful fight against the VTA the last time they tried to cut the 88 bus. Instead of cutting the 88 bus, they connected it to go from Midtown to the Veterans Administration Hospital and added service for Gunn High School through special runs for the 88 bus and the 88L and 88M bus routes. The service to Gunn High School carries over 100 students to and from Gunn High School each day, even more on rainy days. This critical reduction of cars on Arastradero Road during school commute hours that is important for a congested residential arterial route serving multiple schools and the Stanford Research Park. Even though my twin daughters graduated from Gunn High School several days ago, I continue to serve the Gunn PTSA as Transit Coordinator. I ensure that the timing for bus service for Gunn High School adjusts when the Gunn High School schedule changes, such as for state exams and early dismissals. I have a good working relationship with the VTA staff and Gunn staff to make and announce these schedule adjustments in a timely manner.

VTA 35 bus is an important transportation backbone for Palo Alto residents. It provides access to several community centers, libraries and schools and provides access to both Palo Alto and Mountain View downtowns.

Cuts to VTA 35 and 88 buses can also result in cuts in Outreach paratransit service because, by Federal law, rides must be provided within ¾ mile of a VTA transit route.

Penny Ellson and I have been making presentations to Gunn High School students, the Gunn High School PTSA (Parent-Teacher-Student Association), the PAUSD Council of PTAs, and senior communities, including Stevenson House and Avenidas about the risks of cuts from the VTA Next Network project to VTA 88, 35, and Outreach paratransit services. We have started an online petition at <http://tinyurl.com/Save-35-88-Outreach>

- 18. Budget:** How do you plan to fund the city's long-term pension and health benefits liability, which currently stands at \$500 million? How serious is the impact of this liability to the City's ability to provide services and amenities to residents?

To fix this problem, we have to understand how we accrued this large liability in the first place. A decade ago, pensions were raised for existing as well as new employees by raising the retirement benefit for each year of service. This move, made to recruit new City employees, resulted in a windfall for employees of long standing and many of them retired. CalPERS, the California Public Employee Retirement System reduced (or stopped) annual contributions from Palo Alto and other cities because the stock market was up and was expected to keep going up. The stock market crash and recession of 2008 showed the error of CalPERS' policy

CalPERS' actuarial calculations include an estimate of the annual rate of growth of these investments. Even though the stock market is at record highs, CalPERS investment return has been grossly inadequate. See <http://www.ocregister.com/articles/calpers-722198-year-percent.html>

So our long-term liability might be even higher.

Palo Alto has taken measures to reduce the impact. Although State law does not allow pensions to be reduced for existing employees, even the rate of increase of pensions for future service, it does allow smaller pensions for new employees. Palo Alto does offer smaller pensions for new employees.

Compound interest has been called the most powerful force in the Universe. See <http://www.snopes.com/quotes/einstein/interest.asp> Prepaying our pension obligation eliminates years of compound interest and can dramatically lower our long-term pension liability.

Increasing employee contributions towards their pension can also reduce the Palo Alto's contribution, and can decrease our long-term liability by using the savings to prepay our pension obligation.

Of course, retired employees do not make contributions towards their retirement, so Palo Alto taxpayers have that liability.

Retiree health insurance is also a significant liability. Palo Alto can consider entering into a Section 218 agreement so that its employees are covered by Social Security and Medicare, thereby reducing the retiree health insurance obligation. See <https://www.ssa.gov/pubs/EN-05-10051.pdf> Palo Alto could instead pay for employees' and spouses' Medicare Supplement (Medigap) premiums. See <https://www.medicare.gov/supplement-other-insurance/medigap/whats-medigap.html> This cost may be less than our retiree health benefits liability for those over 65.

19. Stanford: What is the most important aspect of the City's upcoming negotiation with Stanford regarding its General Use Permit?

We must first acknowledge the landmark deal that the 2000 General Use Permit (GUP) represents. See https://lbre.stanford.edu/sites/all/lbre-shared/files/docs_public/SCC_SU_GUP.pdf In exchange for significant growth, Stanford University traffic incurred a "no net new trips" limitation. I note we are still waiting the mitigation to add a westbound right turn lane and change shared left/right turn to exclusive left turn lane at El Camino Read and Churchill Avenue as shown in Table 4 (page 15). So we must ensure that the prior agreement has been fully implemented. I acknowledge the hard work of then County Supervisor Liz Kniss in negotiating this agreement.

Unfortunately, Palo Alto negotiated a less strict deal for dealing with the impacts of the expansion by the Stanford Medical Center, where traffic reduction is effort-based (e.g., issue Caltrain passes) rather than outcome-based (e.g., no net new trips).

Stanford also paid \$100,000 for the Residential Parking Permit program for College Terrace, with remaining funding used for a parking study in Southgate and Evergreen Park neighborhoods. (Ibid., page 20.) We must ensure that this money is fully expended for these purposes or it will revert to Stanford. There was also funding for neighborhood traffic studies. (Ibid., page 16.) We must ensure that these were performed and that all mitigations are done.

Moving forward, we must build on the 2000 General Use Permits by retaining the "no net new trips" limitation and reducing Stanford's impacts on the surrounding community. For example, I notice that southbound traffic on Alma Street approaching the Meadow and Alma Village traffic lights backs up significantly farther when Stanford is in session. Palo Alto must engage in traffic studies both while Stanford is in session and while it is not, so we determine a lower bound on Stanford University's contribution to traffic congestion.

Stanford University has a significantly higher jobs/housing ratio (as a measure of jobs to employed residents) than Palo Alto. And this does not include the Stanford Medical Center and Stanford Research Park, both of which are part of Palo Alto. Stanford should reduce this ratio as it grows. And it should be required to make land available to PAUSD and/or provide a monetary contribution to expand our school capacity to accommodate the new students.

20. (Optional) Unasked Question: If there is a question you think we should have asked, ask and answer it.

How do we know you won't advocate moderate growth before the election and then pivot to promoting growth after the election?

My track record on the Planning and Transportation Commission is well known. Gennady Sheyner of the Palo Alto Weekly reported, "the computer scientist is known as much for his wonky, detail-oriented approach to new development projects as for his staunch criticism of commercial growth." <http://www.paloaltoonline.com/news/2016/07/28/arthur-keller-enters-city-council-race-in-palo-alto>

But I am not opposed to all growth. I made the motion and cast the deciding vote in favor of initiating the PC Zone for the Maybell low-income housing project, while Commissioner Tanaka opposed it. <http://paloaltoonline.com/news/2013/02/13/planned-senior-housing-complex-wins-key-vote> I along with others on the Planning and Transportation Commission (PTC) did encourage the Palo Alto Housing Corp to reduce the number and size of houses on Maybell Avenue when the plan came back to the PTC, which the Palo Alto Housing Corporation did not do. Commissioner Tanaka and I were absent for the final vote.

<http://www.paloaltoonline.com/news/2013/05/22/divisive-maybell-avenue-proposal-wins-zoning-victory> I did sign the letter supporting the current plan for this site that fits into the neighborhood.

Planning and Transportation Commission Chair Adrian Fine, who is an ex officio member of the Citizen's Advisory Committee (CAC) on the Comprehensive Plan Update (which I co-chair with Dan Garber), said at the CAC meeting on May 17, 2016 (<http://www.paloaltocompplan.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/CAC-Draft-Minutes-05.17.2016.pdf> page 31):

6 Adrian Fine: To start on the height limit, I'm in support of removing the cap for a few reasons.
7 One is it's from the 1970s, and 50 feet is pretty arbitrary. It was just kind of chosen out of thin
8 air at the time. Even though there is a lot of buildable space across the City, it's not always in
9 the best places. Removing the height limit not only allows density in transit and service-rich
10 areas, but it'll also provide future real estate value which can be taxed and diverted to services
11 such as transit, retail preservation, parks, whatever you name it. One other thing. If you're
12 going to talk about the environment and sustainability, tall buildings are way more efficient.
13 There's a funny policy in the Comprehensive Plan I actually wanted to comment on; it's not a
14 big thing, saying promote infill development in Palo Alto. All we do in Palo Alto is infill
15 development. There's actually nothing else. It's kind of funny to actually promote that and
16 then not even consider building up or building more efficient structures. For those reasons, I'm
17 in favor of removing the cap. Finally, I actually like some tall buildings in the mix. I think it adds
18 diversity to the City, and it's a nice thing. In terms of growth management, I'm also kind of on
19 the pro development spectrum here, where I'm in favor of Option 5. I'm a strong believer that
20 Palo Altans are not against growth itself, but rather the negative effects of that growth. I think
21 performance zoning and management has proven to be really effective particularly with office,
22 research and industrial uses, maybe a little less so with residential uses. For me, it comes
down

23 to the fact that Palo Alto really is a world-class place because we have supported innovative
24 and efficient and new businesses, which are increasingly unable to locate in Palo Alto due to
25 costs. Recent office prices have reached a massive high; they're some of the most expensive
in

26 the world per square foot office rents, which leads to a monoculture of business types. I don't
27 think that's healthy for the City economy. I'm in favor of Option 5 and growth management.