

**CENTER FOR CONTINUING STUDY OF THE CALIFORNIA ECONOMY**

385 HOMER AVENUE • PALO ALTO • CALIFORNIA • 94301

TELEPHONE: (650) 321-8550

FAX: (650) 321-5451

[www.ccsce.com](http://www.ccsce.com)

DATE: January 25, 2016  
TO: **CAC Members and Staff**  
FROM: Stephen Levy  
SUBJECT: Notes on Transportation Element Draft

1. I like the draft. I have some comments below but my main message is appreciation for a job well done!
2. Wherever possible in mentioning CalTrain, I would emphasize increased capacity instead of or in addition to the words now in the document—improvements and modernization, which could be ambiguous as to the need for capacity expansion.

Related to this, I encourage inclusion of a) a ridership growth chart and b) data on overcapacity (standing) on now most peak hour trains. Page T-7 is a good place to make these additions.

3. I have two suggestions for the connections section on page T-2. One is to insert a sentence after the one ending in “employs”. In turn the Housing and Land Use Elements can reduce the need for auto travel and related parking by locating housing and jobs near services, shopping and transit.

In the last paragraph, can we do better than “natural environment”? Is it possible to mention improving sustainability with relation to air quality and GHG emissions?

And, wherever possible, mention **housing as a transportation and sustainability solution.**

4. On page T-11, while it may be true in a narrow sense that “filling in gaps” is the first priority for increasing walking, I think actually it is planning to locate jobs and housing so more neighborhoods are “walkable”.
5. On page T-21 I ask is it appropriate for the CAC to take positions on parking issues?

6. There is a sentence on page T-24 that I support and want to emphasize and have us explore more. It is in the regional leadership section. **“A regional approach for some transportation issues is needed to avoid local solutions that simply shift the problem elsewhere or produce unintended results.”** My opinion is that this relates to other issues such as housing and commercial development and presents the community with both conflicts and opportunities to really be a regional partner.
7. Is it appropriate for the CAC to take positions on the items under Traffic Congestion on page T-27?
8. I do not support Policy T-1.4 as written. I find a blanket restriction of this kind on new development without evidence that it is easy to achieve is in conflict with other elements of the plan and the goal of not shifting burdens elsewhere.
9. I see that Policy T-1.12 does mention CalTrain expansion and also that it is the shortest policy statement. I think this is worth more attention and emphasis.
10. I strongly support policies 4.2.1 and 4.2.3 on page T-45 as well as most of the ideas in the parking section.
11. On page T-51 I especially like policy T 7.2 on regional collaboration. I think CAC and the council should address what I am sure is a controversial issue—whether regional collaboration is narrowly defined to transportation funding and projects or whether regional collaboration implies that Palo Alto does not pursue land use and housing policies that exacerbate problems in other jurisdictions in the region.
12. I appreciate and support Goal T-9 on traffic congestion and the associated policies.