

Written by Steve Raney

Survey and Housing Allocation Information can be found at: <http://www.cities21.org/pa/index.htm>

The survey effort has succeeded in raising the visibility of this important issue. 221 people have answered the survey. We have seen increased newspaper coverage of this topic, with both sides of the issue explained.

Background:

By September 25, Palo Alto and all the cities in the Bay Area will be giving feedback to the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) about the number of homes that each city is expected to build in the next eight years. Palo Alto's allocation (3,505) has been raised substantially from the last round (1999-2006), because the new allocation criteria stress job levels, job growth and transit access. This is a very controversial subject. This survey was designed to gather data on attitudes and ideas about this issue facing Palo Alto.

The State Housing and Community Development (HCD) Department requires regions to forecast future population growth. HCD approves each regional forecast and then requires regions to allocate the growth among individual cities. ABAG pursues relatively laudable goals in their allocation such as minimizing traffic congestion, pollution, and global warming. ABAG creates a rational, impartial procedure for their allocation. ABAG is an organization that represents Bay Area city governments, so it is not valid to argue that ABAG is out to harm individual Bay Area cities. The fact that most Bay Area cities are unhappy with ABAG's allocation supports the idea that ABAG has a fair, if unpopular, process. The conflict is much more basic: the region is growing but most cities do not want to grow as fast as the region. It's hard to find a villain in this conflict.

The state Climate Action Team sets statewide climate protection policy and has influenced the allocations. For Palo Alto, the Climate Action Team's "smart growth" policy can be summarized as: "build lots of dense housing for Palo Alto workers by the Caltrain stations." Compared to the 1999-2006 allocation, Palo Alto may have been given the largest percentage increase of any city.

At this stage in the ABAG process, it may be difficult for Palo Alto to reduce the 3,505 home ABAG allocation substantially. However, the state and ABAG have very limited influence over actual homebuilding in Palo Alto. For the 1999-2006 allocation, Menlo Park built only 6% of their allocation and Atherton built only 15%. It is possible that Palo Alto will avoid building most of the 3,505 homes while receiving no "punishment" from ABAG or the state.

Why the Survey?

- Three of the authors work on regional planning and sustainability efforts. The CA state Climate Action Team is counting on smart growth (jobs/housing balance, density, and transit oriented development) for a huge portion of carbon dioxide reduction to reach 2020 target levels. Palo Alto Council have been climate protection leaders, championing many green efforts. Starting in January, council members began to make statements in local newspapers in favor of restricting housing growth. One councilmember said "my top 2007 issues are restricting the amount of housing constructed ... and combating global warming." The Climate Action Team has found that this statement is contradictory – efforts to restrict housing growth in Palo Alto will harm the climate significantly.
- Hence, for a number of reasons, it made sense for the survey authors to encourage a more extensive discussion of the 3,505 home ABAG allocation for Palo Alto. Some climate protection actions are "convenient," in that they are politically popular. The 3,505 home allocation is "inconvenient," in that it is not politically popular. But the Climate Action Team is depending on smart growth for the second largest contribution to carbon reduction for 2020. Uniquely in the U.S., state Attorney General Jerry Brown is suing ultra-long-commute sprawl. The battles to stop long-commute housing and to encourage short-commute Palo Alto housing represent the two sides of the same smart growth effort.
- The State Climate Action Team and the State Housing and Community Development Department have make the broad policy recommendation that have led to ABAG asking Palo Alto to add 3,505 homes, but Palo Alto has sole authority to either abide by this policy recommendation or to "tell ABAG to stuff it." Given Council's and voters

fervent desire to protect the climate, it made sense to probe whether Palo Alto would support “inconvenient” policies. Palo Alto serves as an early test case for affluent American suburbia.

Recommendation 1

- The affluent South Bay cities that are unhappy with their housing allocations {Palo Alto, Menlo Park, Atherton, Mountain View, Sunnyvale, Cupertino, Redwood City} should sponsor one or more ABAG forums on the topic. ABAG should be invited to explain regional trends, their objectives, and their formulas. ABAG should also explain how they expect cities to mitigate the impacts of this growth (school funding, traffic, city services, water, etc). Survey responses indicate disagreement over facts, planning theory, and policies, so more dialog will help lead to more informed decision-making. It is clear that Palo Alto’s voters must become more “land-use conversant” for important issues that will come up over the next 40 years. Palo Alto, with its leadership position on climate protection, enjoys a strong relationship with California’s Climate Action Team. The Climate Team should also be invited to defend their smart growth policy (density, TOD, job/housing balance) and to explain the role smart growth plays in achieving 2020 carbon reductions. Entities such as the Palo Alto Chamber, League of Women Voters, and SVLG could be co-sponsors for such forums. More questions that should be covered in forums:
 - The survey reveals that jobs/housing balance is a concept that is not fully understood. Please explain the concept.
 - Why can't we simply meet 2020 carbon reductions with light bulbs and hybrid cars?
 - Please explain whether Palo Alto is “built out” or not.
 - Is there really a “free market” for housing?
 - Please explain what sorts of residents pay the most (and the least) for city services. What is the fiscal impact of various housing types? How many school children are produced for each new unit of various housing types?
 - Are all developers more evil than Voldemort, or are they only as evil as Death Eaters? Do the sprawl developers and in-fill developers speak with a unified voice? Who is ABAG? Is ABAG a tool of these development interests?
 - How do we make public transit work better? How much can telecommuting contribute?
 - What would be the economic consequences of stopping Bay Area population growth? Would a permanent depression ensue?
 - If Palo Alto tells ABAG to stuff it, what will the consequences and penalties be? What funding sources will be closed off to Palo Alto (FOCUS)?
 - Is ABAG's housing allocation an unfunded mandate?

Recommendation 2

- Council should a) acknowledge the strong Global Warming <==> Land Use link, b) indicate willingness to explore creative solutions (citing past and recent Palo Alto innovations), and c) ask ABAG, HCD, Climate Action Team, and other suburbs to fund a “Creative Housing Allocation Implementation Study / Housing Element Update Study.” Such a study should explore three or more implementation scenarios, with economic impact analysis. The survey’s Scenario 1 (tell ABAG to stuff it) and Scenario 2 (add 3,505 homes while creatively mitigating negative impacts) might be worth studying.

Survey Analysis

- The multiple choice answers are very interesting. One measure of the passion for these issues is the willingness of respondents to spend the time to write essay answers. The sentiments in the essay answers for most questions run roughly 55% reflecting a neighborhood protection perspective, and 45% reflecting a regionalism perspective.

- There was only a smattering of viewpoints advocating zero world population growth or even world population reduction. World population is not top-of-mind for most Palo Altans.
- Silicon Valley is a hot belt of entrepreneurial capitalism, but Palo Altans have mixed feelings about the local "capitalistic growth imperative," where local employment continues to expand. There is no ambiguity about capitalism's real-estate development sector - every respondent seems to hate developers. There is widespread support for reducing the profits of these "greedy developers."

Item by Item Survey Analysis is available below. Click on "view" to see every essay response for that item:

Thanks for taking this short survey.

Please provide name and either e-mail address or phone number below. We do not accept anonymous responses as they are less thoughtful and less polite.

- We will not spam you. We will protect your privacy.
- Do not submit more than one survey response per person.
- We may contact you to ask if we can attach your name to your survey comments in a newspaper article on this survey. Otherwise, we may use your survey comments in a newspaper article, but will keep you anonymous.
- We may make all the survey responses public (via an on-line spreadsheet), less name, e-mail, and phone. We may submit these survey responses to Palo Alto City Council and to the Association of Bay Area Governments.

1. Name:

	Response Count
<i>answered question</i>	221
<i>skipped question</i>	0

2. Please provide a valid e-mail address or phone number:

	Response Count
<i>answered question</i>	221
<i>skipped question</i>	0

3. Select your neighborhood or school community:

Neighborhood/Community	Count	Neighborhood/Community	Count
Crescent Park	39	Community Center	1
Duveneck/St. Francis	34	Embarcadero Oaks/Leland	1
Midtown	21	Esther Clark Park	1
Downtown North	16	Fairmeadow	1
Barron Park	15	Meadow Park	1
Palo Verde	13	Monroe Park	1
Old Palo Alto	10	South of Midtown	1
Other city	10	Triple El	1
Charleston Gardens	6	Ventura	1
Greenmeadow	5	Other Palo Alto neighborhood	1

Leland Manor/Garland Drive	5	Duveneck School	1
Evergreen Park	4	El Carmelo School	1
Professorville	4	Jordan Middle School	1
University South	4	Juana Briones School	1
Charleston Meadows	3	Palo Alto High School	1
Mountain View (city)	3	Palo Verde School	1
Adobe-Meadows	2	Terman Middle School	1
Green Acres	2	Los Altos Hills (city)	1
Palo Alto Hills	2	Stanford (city)	1
Menlo Park (city)	2	Woodside (city)	1
College Terrace	1		

Bay Area job growth is expected to lead to an increase of at least two million residents in the next 30 years. While lower levels of population growth might make traffic and environmental protection easier to handle, continued growth is expected by the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) and other organizations that study the Bay Area's future. The Bay Area's economy is expected to grow a bit more rapidly than the nation as a whole.

4. (OPTIONAL): Please provide any comments you have about this Bay Area population growth:

	Response Count
 view	123
answered question	123
skipped question	98

Selected Responses to #4:

- Regional growth cannot be limited by cities and Counties, only pushed elsewhere in the state. That's why it's so important to have regional growth management policies that direct all new growth into existing communities. This is not just an "eat-your-peas" grudging acceptance of the inevitable and an attempt to mitigate the impacts of growth. Policies that call for dense, compact, diverse, walkable communities will make our existing communities better places to live, work, shop and play.
- Palo Alto cannot house the world, nor should it be expected to do so. Rapidly the quality of life is disintegrating for those who already live here. There are not now enough basic services for the current population: supermarkets, gas stations, physicians - including primary care and pediatricians. Commute traffic to and from the industrial park, Stanford hospitals, and the Stanford Shopping Center is crippling the city and raising pollution levels to unacceptable levels. Maybe it's time to stop the influx of new residents into California. We will run out of water, gas, and electricity...and a diminished food supply. Too many people have a direct relationship to an increase in crime. It's time to draw the line.
- The Bay area will continue to grow, or it will stagnate. If it doesn't grow in ways that facilitate transportation without cars, or if it grows only to serve wealthier demographics, it will stagnate. A few of the things we MUST do to ameliorate this growth is 1) get high density housing near transportation corridors; 2) INSIST on cheap, accessible mass transportation that is well-coordinated; 3) build sufficient BMR housing to accommodate a majority of Palo Alto's lower paid workers (teachers, police and fire personnel, retail workers, etc. etc.) Last, I hope this survey is not "stuffed" by the anti-growth interests in Palo Alto. Our policy-makers must pay attention to more enlightened visions of what's possible for our city, than those who would see us turn into a solely agglutinated upper middle-class enclave. Regarding mass transit: in addition to taking the initiative to stimulate regional mass transit, we must work hard to ensure that intra-municipal mass transit is developed in a far more robust way than the current model. As our community ages, we are going to need to find ways to move older folk around. Palo Alto can lead in this effort, and show the rest of our aging country the way forward.
- The only way to avoid the fate of Los Angeles is to stop the growth of the Bay Area. Accelerating its growth is NOT the way. The ABAG serves development interests and not those of current Bay Area residents.
- I think the Bay Area, with its long-term growth trends, strong economy, limited amount of land and beautiful natural

setting, has the unique ability needs a comprehensive plan so that the area can handle many more people without degrading quality of life here. This will be difficult to do piecemeal but if jobs and housing can be clustered and transportation well-designed, it seems the area could support this growth without an adverse effect on quality of life.

Because of the Bay Area’s expected population growth, the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) has asked Palo Alto and Stanford to add a total of 3,505 new homes by 2014. Many Bay Area cities besides Palo Alto have been asked to add significantly to their population, and almost all of these cities are unhappy about this request (especially Menlo Park, Atherton, Cupertino, Piedmont, Pleasanton, and Larkspur). ABAG’s policy is to encourage new development in and around existing city and suburban centers with an emphasis on reducing overall car traffic, preserving open space and reducing the percent of workers living outside the region.

5. “It will be very hard to accommodate 3,505 new homes in Palo Alto”

	Response Percent	Response Count
strongly agree 	57.0%	126
agree 	22.2%	49
neutral 	4.5%	10
disagree 	9.5%	21
strongly disagree 	6.8%	15
	<i>answered question</i>	221
	<i>skipped question</i>	0

#5 reveals solid agreement.

6. “Building these 3,505 homes in Palo Alto will make a contribution to reducing global warming and regional traffic”

	Response Percent	Response Count
strongly agree 	14.9%	33
agree 	18.6%	41
neutral 	16.7%	37
disagree 	16.3%	36
strongly disagree 	33.5%	74
	<i>answered question</i>	221
	<i>skipped question</i>	0

The responses to #6 show that ABAG and the Climate Action Team need to do a better job of making the land use <==> global warming link. Hence recommendation #1.

7. “Building these 3,505 homes in Palo Alto and in cities like Palo Alto in the region will increase our attractiveness for innovative companies to locate in the Valley. These homes will also help companies retain valued employees.”

		Response Percent	Response Count
strongly agree		15.4%	34
agree		25.8%	57
neutral		16.7%	37
disagree		22.6%	50
strongly disagree		19.5%	43
		answered question	221
		skipped question	0

#7 reveals some ambiguous feelings about the Silicon Valley capitalistic imperative.

8. "Adding these 3,505 homes will increase pressure on the schools, roads, libraries and other public facilities"

		Response Percent	Response Count
strongly agree		70.6%	156
agree		21.7%	48
neutral		4.1%	9
disagree		2.7%	6
strongly disagree		0.9%	2
		answered question	221
		skipped question	0

#8, no controversy here.

9. "Palo Alto residents have some obligation to plan for these homes as part of supporting regional environmental and economic goals"

		Response Percent	Response Count
strongly agree		22.2%	49
agree		27.2%	60
neutral		13.6%	30
disagree		15.4%	34
strongly disagree		21.7%	48
		answered question	221
		skipped question	0

Steve Levy's July Weekly Guest Opinion and Weekly Editor Jay Thorwaldson's historical perspective make the 3,505 homes issue a moral issue. Al Gore also claims that global warming is a moral issue. The Golden Rule is "do unto others

as you would have them do unto you," and the responses to #9 indicate a slight majority for that sentiment.

Weekly Editor Jay Thorwaldson started as a Palo Alto Times reporter in 1966, has covered ABAG, and has encyclopedic knowledge of historical Palo Alto land use decisions. Jay wrote a 1968 article on Palo Alto's jobs/housing imbalance, with 2.4 jobs for every household in those days. Jay's take on Palo Alto's current jobs/housing imbalance: "Well-intentioned and environmentally conscious Palo Alto has restricted housing to create a terrible environmental situation with long commutes wasting fuel. It's an insoluble situation. Long commutes damage the social fabric and create lower quality of life. Workers are forced to commute from Manteca, etc. Palo Alto has a drawbridge mentality. Compounding the insolubility, objections raised by neighborhood associations are legitimate."

10. (OPTIONAL) Please provide any comments you have about questions or your answers on this page:

	Response Count
 view	109
answered question	109
skipped question	112

Selected Responses to #10:

- So now Stanford has dropped the other shoe - a 'hospital district'. Is anyone surprised? Palo Alto is being ruined and the quality of life destroyed for the people who already live here. Palo Alto cannot be expected to house all of the jobs created on the west side of El Camino by building on the east side of El Camino. THERE IS NO ROOM.
- We bought in Palo Alto for the schools, quiet streets, and neighborhoods. If we want heavy traffic, high density housing, etc., we would have bought in San Francisco. Adding more homes in Palo Alto will destroy what Palo Alto is known for.
- I think that ABAG should not assign quotas if these quotas are not attached to guarantees that transit and other infrastructure dollars will follow in proportion to the required growth. It has been Palo Alto's experience that regional transit dollars spent in this community have been continually cut as we have complied with ABAG quotas better than many communities by approving infill projects. We have fulfilled our responsibility to provide housing, but the county and state have failed to return a reasonable amount of our contribution to their transit coffers to our community. The recent \$1,000,000 proposed VTA cuts in Palo Alto are an excellent example of this. Just as the city has approved 976 new housing units in south PA on the VTA 88 bus route, the line that serves this area gets cut. Recent Caltrain commitment to bullet trains also reduced service to the San Antonio train station that serves this area. CPA approves housing, and the county agencies cut the transit. In fact, in the twelve years that I have lived in PA I have seen nothing but overall cuts to transit service in CPA. It is a disappointing track record. Although historically I have been a proponent of smart growth and public transit, I am losing faith that regional transit service will ever deliver to CPA adequately to support the level of growth that ABAG proposes to mandate. That is an unsustainable model.
- By building high-density condos and townhomes, the developers maximize their profits, to the detriment of Palo Altans. Families don't want these small "apartments" with no green area and no backyard. Children shouldn't have to live in these tenements. The houses should be stand-alone, single-family homes with a backyard and areas to play in. The developers are getting it TOO EASY. They should pay for park areas, library enhancements and new school campuses. By building condos, it only makes the older, single-family homes with backyards more valuable and more expensive. The developers don't care about the environment, but only about profit. My neighborhood, Greenmeadow, was designed in the 50's by Eichler. He understood what families want and he implemented it. He built a park with neighborhood pool in the center of the development. He understood what a community is. Today's designers design high-density crap that just leads to more cars on our roads. It doesn't matter if the condos are built near the RR. People still just drive their cars anyway. The whole argument of being near transit is a TOTAL LIE and the people of this area know that.
- Higher-density and infill growth is preferable to continued sprawl for many reasons. Palo Alto has the sound infrastructure and government to manage and pace this type of growth. Blind nimby-ism, if successful, would only push the new homes out onto the foothills, further destroying our views and our open space, and raising costs for everyone from the need to create ever more freeway lanes and ever longer commute distances and times. Sensible Palo Altans should welcome well-planned infill and high-density developments; new residents who are not

driving long distances to work only improve our tax base and create greater variety and convenience of both commercial and public services.

- Palo Alto's planners, city council and residents will never allow 3500 units to be built. They will try to force Stanford to finance the housing and infrastructure, build the streets, sewer lines, fund city-wide transportation, donate the land for and build the schools, and will still complain about it.
- I am very concerned that Palo Alto is already overbuilt and that this was done without proper long-term infrastructure planning. The Palo Alto schools are already at capacity and the children are learning out of trailers, rather than well-built, functional facilities. We tried to get one of my children into the neighborhood school but were unsuccessful in doing so due to overcrowding. If Palo Alto continues to add housing, the inevitable outcome will be a decline in property values. Cities such as Atherton, Los Altos and Menlo Park recognize that their communities can only assimilate a certain amount of high density housing - and as a result, these communities continue to thrive and prosper, whereas Palo Alto is in the beginnings of an overall decline. We have lived her for 8 years and Palo Alto is already a much busier place - and the reason we purchased here was for our children to enjoy a first class public education. The reality has been very different for us and we are saddened by the decisions that have been made here over the last several years.
- Communities should be able to control factors that affect their quality of life, including housing density. I feel no obligation to increase housing density here because of an imbalance of jobs and housing. Let the free market sort that out.

11. (OPTIONAL) Many residents support ABAG's goals of environmental protection and reducing the overall amount of auto travel. Yet they are concerned about the impacts on their own neighborhoods and cities. If you do not think Palo Alto (and Stanford) should plan for these 3,505 homes, where should they be built?

	Response Count
 view	118
answered question	118
skipped question	103

The outside world may view Palo Alto differently than Palo Alto residents view their city. Palo Alto is an affluent suburb with great schools, so the difficult challenges facing Palo Alto may be viewed with less sympathy externally. Compared to their current city, residents of other cities may be very happy to live in Palo Alto and face Palo Alto's challenges.

Many of the essay responses to #11 might be well-received at a dinner party within Palo Alto, but might seem appalling to non-Palo Altans who live in cities facing greater challenges. It is doubtful that Palo Alto's answers differ much from those of any other affluent place, it's just that these underlying neighborhood protection attitudes rarely surface with this level of detail.

Selected Responses to #11:

- ABAG is proposing an unfunded mandate.
- They can be built in areas which are less densely populated and much of the work can be done remotely. ABAG's research and therefore, its suggestions, are flawed.
- Why should they have to be built at all? Why can't we commission a study that examines what are acceptable limits for building housing in the Bay Area to preserve quality of life. The Bay Area is under no obligation to keep endlessly building houses just because people want to move here. Other cities around the country have said no, and we should band together with other peninsula cities and say no, too.
- If we have to build them, then build them on Stanford lands. Stanford uses & takes from Palo Alto but does not really reciprocate in kind or in full, always with some kind of exemption due their hospitals or campus. They impact this area greatly yet do little to actually help surrounding communities cope with the effects to the surrounding streets, traffic, etc. Let them use some of their lands to provide this dense housing that will be the future of the whole bay area if laws make the cities add this much housing to already overbuilt cities. Even the people who live in dense housing do not want to live in dense housing. It's a losing proposition. It should not be forced on us but should be a city's choice.
- I am shocked and saddened that the city and developers are now using the "environmental" card as a marketing ploy to gain approval for 3,505 new homes. How convenient it is to imply that if you are against the new homes,

you must be against helping our environment. This is simply unacceptable and we should not be lured into this loosely veiled attempt to shift the focus away from the real issues that adding these new homes does for Palo Alto.

You are now at the end of the traditional part of the survey. The questions on this page cover "visioning scenarios" and are optional. (One of the survey authors has a special interest in such scenarios.)

SCENARIO 1:

By 2014, Palo Alto stays pretty much the same as in 2007. The 3,505 new homes are built in Manteca, Modesto, and Merced, not in Palo Alto. Cities such as Menlo Park, Atherton, and Cupertino also avoid their unpopular housing allocations. Palo Alto traffic levels stay the same, but regional auto usage increases. By year 2020, California GHG (greenhouse gas) levels are 33% more than 1990 levels.

12. (OPTIONAL): Please rate Scenario 1

	Response Percent	Response Count
1 (very good) 	8.3%	15
2 	6.7%	12
3 	3.9%	7
4 (neutral) 	17.2%	31
5 	11.7%	21
6 	18.9%	34
7 (very bad) 	33.3%	60
answered question		180
skipped question		41

13. (OPTIONAL): Please add any comments you have about Scenario 1:

	Response Count
 view	106
answered question	106
skipped question	115

Respondents rated Scenario 1 as "bad," somewhat contradicting the previous responses to #6. Scenario 1 was designed to make the the tradeoff between neighborhood protection and global warming as starkly apparent as the state Climate Action Team is making it.

About half of essay respondents questioned Scenario 1's assumptions or commented that the scenario was biased.

Selected Responses to #13

- This is the old 'make me feel guilty' routine. So these employees must take mass transit like buses. By 2020 I'll be ninety-one. I'll someone else worry about this. However, with all these autos one way or the other, I probably won't be able to breathe. Tell Stanford to start figuring out the problem and come down off of its ivory tower and "throne".
- Scenario 1 is carefully constructed so that the only possible "moral" answer is "very bad."
- Watch the End of Suburbia. such plans are insane with the end of oil. homes 60-150 miles from jobs are not viable

for more than 10-20 years in the future.

- This is a ridiculous scenario. It makes no room for alternative options. This is a pure scare tactic designed to get people to cave in to ABAG., A real solution takes all matters into consideration, negative and positive. Who wrote this scenario - the housing developers?
- That is exactly what HAS BEEN happening the last 20 years. I find this scenario very credible, and very unattractive.

SCENARIO 2:

Palo Alto adds 3,505 new "innovative growth" homes by 2014.

In the past, Palo Alto City Council helped pioneer green, traffic-reducing policies on Stanford and Stanford West Apartments. Stanford West residents produce 75% less GHG (greenhouse gas) than the average Palo Alto resident, primarily because they drive much less. As a condition of adding the new homes, Palo Alto imposes similar traffic-reducing policies on the new housing. (Palo Alto also ensures that energy-saving "green building" best practices are followed.) New housing is created especially for deserving local workers, such as Stanford Hospital nurses. Palo Alto also implements further traffic reducing policies for Palo Alto workers, shoppers, and residents. As a result, traffic and total auto trips remain at 2007 levels, despite increased population. Because of Palo Alto's inspired model, cities such as Menlo Park, Atherton, and Cupertino follow Palo Alto's lead. By year 2020, despite large population growth, California GHG levels are back to 1990 levels. Even though significant new housing is added in the Bay Area, the foothills remain preserved. In order to balance the city's budget, Palo Alto copies recent suburban Bay Area funding innovations to ensure that city services, parks, infrastructure, and high quality education are fully funded.

14. (OPTIONAL): Please rate Scenario 2

		Response Percent	Response Count
1 (very good)		32.2%	57
2		15.8%	28
3		10.7%	19
4 (neutral)		13.0%	23
5		5.7%	10
6		10.7%	19
7 (very bad)		11.9%	21
answered question			177
skipped question			44

15. (OPTIONAL): Please add any comments you have about Scenario 2:

	Response Count
view	118
answered question	118
skipped question	103

Scenario 2 is an attempt at a win/win scenario that is empathetic to the neighborhood protectors as was as to regional interests. It asks, "what if we could grow without negative impacts?" Is there a solution that a majority of Palo Altans

would be either in favor of or neutral to? If Recommendation 2 is followed and Scenario 2 is found to be financially feasible, then responses to #15 indicate that such growth is palatable to Palo Altans.

More than half of essay respondents questioned Scenario 2's assumptions.

Selected Responses to #15:

- Pie in the sky. You are more delusional than the Bush administration
- I am not responding to your completely biased and misinformed question deliberately. I am rapidly coming to the conclusion that this survey is garbage.
- This is truly inspirational and is the fitting scenario for the home of innovation. Palo Alto should be leading the way, not lagging like it currently is. Palo Alto should form alliances with other like-minded cities and share best practices and help the state start moving in the right direction.
- Give me a break. The GUP is an unmitigated pain in the neck for Stanford and requires that the university spend money on housing instead of academic programs. Stanford provides the Margarite shuttles, paying for it with annually increasing parking fees, in a desperate attempt to delay reaching the trips to campus limit. Administrative staff are being moved off campus. The city's shuttle service is far less extensive. The probable elimination of the Route 88 bus route in North Palo Alto already has the city saying that it cannot extend its route to compensate for the loss of mass transit.
- This scenario is all about greedy developers. Schools weren't even mentioned in this scenario. WHY??? The prices of condos that the developers hope to sell are closely related to the quality of the local school district. Developers would rather take their money from higher sales prices than to actually help out the school districts. For every 500 homes, the developers should have to purchase a new school site and help the local district set up the new school. They should have to pay money toward expanding the local library and other city resources. It's unfair that they can build new homes, crowd these cities with more people and cars and then just cash their big profits.

Thanks very much for your participation.

- Irvin Dawid, Sierra Club California Air Quality Committee, University South neighborhood
- Steve Levy, Center for Continuing Study of the California Economy, University South neighborhood
- Steve Raney, Cities21, Crescent Park neighborhood
- Scott Ward, Classic Communities, Downtown North neighborhood