

CITY OF EAST PALO ALTO

MEMORANDUM

DATE: July 3, 1986

TO: The Honorable Mayor and Members of the Council
FROM: East Palo Alto 2000 Committee
SUBJECT: FINAL REPORT

The members of the East Palo Alto 2000 Committee are pleased to submit the attached Final Report which represents efforts of the Committee and City staff over the period May 22, 1985 through July 3, 1986. We believe that the report is substantially responsive to the specification of Committee Functions set forth in Resolution No. 00152 and that it will serve as a useful tool for the City to guide overall development as we move into the next century.

We appreciate the opportunity to have served on this Committee and look forward to providing additional assistance as needed to further explain our recommendations as well as how they were derived. To facilitate the latter, we would recommend one or two meetings at which members of other boards and commissions along with the general public can discuss the report in detail and provide comments for consideration by the Council.

FAH:jk

Rosalie Clark
John C. Schum

Bonnie Sivato
Edward R. Beck

4/9/86
4/9/86

**FINAL REPORT
OF THE
CITY OF EAST PALO ALTO 2000 COMMITTEE**

Presented to the

EAST PALO ALTO CITY COUNCIL

Barbara A. Mouton, Mayor
James E. Blakey, Jr. Vice-Mayor
Ruben Abrica, Councilmember
John B. Bostic, Councilmember
Warnell Coats, Councilmember

EAST PALO ALTO 2000 COMMITTEE MEMBERS

City Boards and Commission

Onyango Bashir*	Planning Commission
Bradford Stamper	Parks & Recreation Commission
Bomani Siwatu*	Arts & Culture Commission
Faye M. Knox	Arts and Culture Commission (Alternate)
Nobantu Ankoanda*	Human Services Commission
Peter Evans	Public Safety Commission
Ruthie Renee Glover*	Rent Stabilization Board
Elna R. Tymes	Economic Technical Advisory Committee

Other Organizations

Edward Becks*	East Palo Alto Chamber of Commerce
Dennis Scherzer*	East Palo Alto Sanitary District
Finn Halbo	West Bay Sanitary District
John Inglis	West Bay Sanitary District (Alternate)
Othene Thomas	Ravenswood City School District

Community At- Large

Rosalie Clark*
Tikisa Anderson*
Sylvester Coleman, Jr.
Beverly Royal
Glenda Savage

*-Represents members who attended more than four meetings or completed work assignments

COMMITTEE STAFF

Frederic A. Howell, City Manager
Don Provost, Community Development Director
Rod Barger, Senior Planner
Stephanie Barnes, Planning Intern

Executive Summary

The East Palo Alto 2000 Committee undertook its mission - primarily to project and evaluate alternate buildout scenarios for the City in the Year 2000 on May 22, 1985 with eleven participants. Subsequent meetings and Council action, at the request of the Committee, resulted in a solid working group of between five and seven regular, active participants. The Committee functioned as a working group, utilized consensus as its decision-making format, and never elected officers. The Committee was staffed primarily by the City Manager with additional support provided through the Community Development Department.

Initially, the Committee reviewed and analyzed existing zoning, the Community Plan and EIR, development conditions and practices in the City, and various projections of housing and employment for the Bay Area. A decision was made early on to develop optimal scenarios for the year 2000 in the seven major policy areas contained in the Community Plan and EIR. Individual members completed assignments in these areas, then requested from staff buildout scenarios containing the fiscal implications of agreed-upon residential and industrial configurations. These were provided and reviewed, but the question of ultimate population remained unanswered

A subsequent staff assignment generated an inventory of vacant and underdeveloped land in the City which then led to alternate buildout populations based upon specific policy choices regarding "low", "medium", and "high" population targets. The significance of this portion of the Committee effort was that projections of population surfaced as the principal driving force in all related formula and policy construction. Additionally, the inventory provided an accurate and up-to-date instrument that is both necessary and suitable for a broad range of future planning applications in the City. The inventory alone is a major product from the East Palo Alto 2000 Committee.

Included among other key issues that the Committee addressed and incorporated into the final policy recommendations were quality of life and community character, business development, subventions and other revenue sources, employment, and service delivery capacity. However, even while assessing these other issues, population repeatedly proved to be the central variable in establishing alternate policies for consideration.

The Committee has recommended that a "medium population target" policy be encouraged and that a maximum population of 25,748 be set for the City in the Year 2000. This means that the Community will remain largely in its present configuration with respect to mix of residential types and industry, that the community will remain largely residential, and that all types of development will occur within the framework of recommended development policies. Stated otherwise, development in the City of East Palo Alto is

expected to occur through the year 2000 in consonance with recommended policy and with no major changes in either zoning regulations or the General Plan.

These and other recommendations of the Committee were developed on the basis of several underlying assumptions and a principal rationale that combined to produce the following concerns:

- there IS an optimal population for this community and efforts can be made to ensure that it is not exceeded;
- the community should remain primarily a residential community without large-scale, multiple-family developments;
- the City's capacity for an adequate service delivery system and the ability to pay for it; and
- the importance of the City's image and the critical necessity to improve as well as market that image.

Although a larger number of recommendations was made by the Committee in conjunction with the medium population target, provided below is a summary of the major recommendations.

1. Set a maximum population for the Year 2000 at 25,748;
2. Develop programs to facilitate home ownership and rehabilitation;
3. Implement programs to protect the rights of tenants;
4. Focus commercial development in the University Circle Area and the University Avenue Corridor;
5. Encourage industry that is nonpolluting and ensure that it is buffered from residential areas;
6. Provide for the expanded utilization of shuttle buses;
7. Support expansion of the City's park system; and
8. Move toward the consolidation of utility services under operation of the City.

Details of the Committees charges, work assignments, processes, deliberations, assumptions made, and added assignments are contained in the full report. Provided in the exhibits are materials specifically related to the detailed aspects of this overall effort. The final recommendation of the Committee is to hold one or two community meetings targeted primarily to members of all other appointed boards and commissions, but open to the public for purposes of clarifying the report and obtaining feedback for consideration by the Council.

EAST PALO ALTO IN THE YEAR 2000

As it enters into the twenty-first century, the City of East Palo Alto will be a thriving community, a clean comfortable place to live and work.

LAND USE

Two and one-half miles square, East Palo Alto will be a residential community much as it is today. Commercial activity will be centralized in the University Circle and the University corridor areas. Light industrial and research and development activities will be located in and around the Ravenswood Industrial Park.

POPULATION

In the year 2000, the population of East Palo Alto will be approximately 25,748. The City will continue to be a relative heterogeneous community, although it will feel increasing pressures of gentrification as it remains one of the last affordable housing markets in the Bay area.

HOUSING

The East Palo Alto housing market in the year 2000 will not only offer residents housing which is both affordable and attractive, but will also provide expanded opportunities for home ownership.

The Housing Stock

- A. Single-family dwellings will continue to constitute the majority of the housing stock.
- B. Housing in East Palo Alto in 2000 will not only be structurally sound, but aesthetically appealing as a result of City sponsored rehabilitation programs. Vacant units will not be allowed to decay and eventually fall out of the market but will be acquired through new programs, renovated and resold at affordable rates. A Citywide beautification campaign will eliminate neighborhood blight and promote civic pride.

Ownership Opportunities/Renters Rights

Home ownership will flourish in the community partly because of City sponsored programs such as mortgage guarantees and low-interest loans. The local community bank will grant mortgages to local residents.

The rights of renters in East Palo Alto will be protected through a tenant's rights program which insures that a minimum level of services is provided with each unit. Disputes between tenants and landlords will be handled by a self-sustaining arbitration board.

Affordability

The key feature of the East Palo Alto housing market in 2000 will be affordability. Low-income residents will find ample housing opportunities in East Palo Alto. Many of these units will be provided as a result of agreements between the City and developers. Costs will be closely monitored to insure continued "affordability". City programs aimed at promoting home ownership will also help reduce housing costs.

COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL ACTIVITY (ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT)

East Palo Alto in the year 2000 will have a thriving local economy built on a commercial sector which meets the needs of both community residents and others outside the community, and an industrial sector consisting primarily of light assembly, research and development, and office activities.

Commercial Activity: The Commercial Core

- A. East Palo Alto in the year 2000 will have two primary commercial centers: The University Avenue Corridor and the University Circle area.
- B. The University Avenue Corridor from East Bayshore to Bay Road will form the Downtown core.
 1. The cornerstone of downtown retail/commercial activities will be a shopping center at the intersection of Bay Road and University Avenue.
 2. Such a shopping center will contain a variety of retail uses combined with such recreational uses as a movie theatre, bowling alley, skating rink, etc.
 3. The Central Business District will be unified by a common architectural theme.
- C. University Circle will be a center of small, service-oriented businesses, with improved traffic circulation as well as fewer bars and packaged-good stores.

Marina Development/Other Commercial Centers

In the year 2000, a marina will be fully developed and utilized at Cooley landing. A mixed-use project, the development will feature retail shops and restaurants, and marine-oriented recreational uses. Other commercial areas will include a cluster of small community businesses at a limited number of scattered sites located on East Bayshore and neighborhood businesses throughout the City.

Industrial/Office Activity

- A. Industries located within the City will be non-polluting and well-segregated from residential areas.
- B. Major industries will be light assembly and light manufacturing. Research and development enterprises and office activities will also be an important part of the local economy. These activities will be located primarily in the Ravenswood Industrial park area. Warehousing will be kept at a minimum and relocated on the outskirts of the City.

Employment

East Palo Alto residents in the year 2000 will enjoy expanded employment opportunities as a result of improved and more relevant educational offerings, enhanced job skills, and access to major employment centers in the surround area as well as the local community.

The Role of Local Government

East Palo Altans improved success in the job market will be primarily the result of programs sponsored by the City in conjunction with local colleges and universities. The City's youth employment agency will combat the problem of unemployment through internships and summer employment programs. Economic development programs, such as set-aside requirements, will encourage firms to actively employ local residents.

Tapping the Regional Economy

*con
catered*
In order to provide more employment opportunities to its residents, the City will tap into the larger South-Bay and Peninsula economy. One strategy will be to link employment requirements for East Palo Alto residents to federally subsidized projects in surrounding jurisdictions. Another strategy will be to solicit Silicon Valley firms for summer-hire and internship opportunities for local youths.

Miscellaneous

Landscaping/Aesthetics

- A. Landscaping of streets and medians will be done in relationship to the City's ability to pay the maintenance cost of such landscaping.
- B. Neighborhood standards will be strongly enforced through evolving and participatory aesthetic regulations.
- C. Landmark designation, historic markers, and murals will be placed throughout the City as the result of a well-coordinated volunteer program.

Community Services

East Palo Alto residents will enjoy a wide range of community services to meet their needs and enhance their quality of life. Additionally, a strong program for senior citizens will be in operation.

Parks and Recreation Facilities

The City's park system will be greatly expanded in the year 2000. Small neighborhood or "mini-parks" will be scattered throughout the community to provide maximum access to all local residents. Existing City facilities such as Bell Street and Civic Center parks will be upgraded. Certain parks would include historic artifacts and appropriate memorials.

Utilities

Nearly all utility services, including street lighting, storm drainage, solid waste, and water will be provided by the City under the direction of the East Palo Alto Department of Public Works. All utility lines will be undergrounded. Sidewalks and storm drains would be installed or improved Citywide.

Schools/Libraries

The school-age population of East Palo Alto will be served by a system of neighborhood elementary and intermediate schools. These would be feeders for one local high school. The City library will offer expanded services including an audio/visual media center.

Churches

The number of churches in the community will be more reasonably proportionate to the population.

TRANSPORTATION

East Palo Alto residents in the year 2000 will enjoy efficient and convenient transportation services as a result of improvements and innovations in the existing system.

Public Transit

- A. SamTrans buses will continue to be the major form of public transit.
 - 1. Buses will run on schedules which are closely matched to the needs of their riders. Thus, buses will run later and more frequently during off-peak hours. Weekend schedules will be extended.
 - 2. In addition to making riding the bus more convenient through scheduling changes, there also will be more shelters provided at bus stops. The lighting, seating, and shelter provisions at these stops will be improved.
- B. A shuttle bus service will augment SamTrans services by connecting areas not served by SamTrans to major bus routes. Shuttle buses also will be used to help reduce the number of larger buses on residential streets and to provide much needed transportation for the community's mobility impaired population.
- C. Commuting to the East Bay and San Francisco will be easier through the use of shuttle buses to Union City/Fremont Bart stations and the use of ferries to points along the Bay.
- D. The City and its residents will benefit from active participation in the development and operation of a light rail system serving the entire Bay Area.

Bicycles

Non-motorized transportation will become more popular as bike lanes are added to major city streets. Bike paths will promote safety as well as enjoyment of the City and adjacent scenic areas.

Traffic

- A. Given that East Palo Alto will be a predominantly residential community, the automobile will continue to be the primary mode of transportation. Commercial development also will increase traffic volume within the City.
- B. To accommodate these conditions, traffic management in the year 2000 will focus on the use of additional signals and signs to improve circulation in commercial areas such as University Circle and to slow traffic on major arterials such

as the University Avenue Corridor. To mitigate the impact of traffic on residential areas more stop signs will be placed in these areas, thereby discouraging thru traffic and speeding.

- C. Heavy truck traffic will be regulated by a permit system and limited to major arterials.
- D. Because private automobiles will remain the major mode of transportation and there is a universally projected increase in fuel prices, this increase will lead to an increased use of transit and fierce competition among local jurisdictions for transit service and routes.

J6D02616

Population Projections

One of the most difficult tasks faced by the East Palo Alto 2000 Committee was to agree upon projections of population for the City in the Year 2000. Part of the difficulty stemmed from the large number of data sources available for this purpose. With concurrence of the Committee, staff utilized the Association of Bay Area Governments "Projections-85, Forecasts for the San Francisco Bay Area to the Year 2005" as a primary source for much of the analysis found in the Buildout Scenarios. This document, prepared in July 1985, projected population, households, income, and employment. Additionally, staff incorporated project alternatives from the East Palo Alto Community Plan and EIR.

Another part of the difficulty surrounding this task was the fact that nearly all of the available data were predicated on planning and land use assumptions made FOR the community rather than BY the community, in most cases prior to incorporation. Thus, the Committee felt that much of the data was somewhat unreliable. An important example of this was reflected in a Committee decision to direct staff to use Santa Clara County data instead of San Mateo County data in selected areas because the Community is more like the former than the latter.

Finally, the ultimate significance of population projections was underscored during the review of alternate Buildout Scenarios. What was learned was that population served as the main variable in determining other aspects of various Buildouts, particularly related to housing and occupancies, etc. The reason for this was because existing percentages were applied to future total populations. The Technical Supplement to the Buildout Scenarios describes many of these factors in greater detail.

Among the issues pertaining to population and discussed at length by the Committee were the following:

1. **Market Area.** The focus of this issue was on determining an appropriate population to enhance investment in the community. A total population of 35,000 was suggested as the optimum size for this purpose. However, this population was viewed in relation to service delivery capacity and the fact that the University Avenue connection to the Dumbarton Bridge provided a secondary market area that would more than offset a lower primary market area population.
2. **Subventions.** This issue served as the basis for extensive dialogue within the Committee because of its direct fiscal impact. The City currently receives both State and Federal subventions for a population of 26,838. This figure resulted from having nearly 9,000 registered voters at the time of incorporation and the applied factor of three ($3 \times 8,946 = 26,838$). The concern was that the 1990 census population would be used for future subventions and any number less than

the 26,838 could result in a subvention revenue shortfall to the City. It was determined by the Committee that this population could not be achieved by the year 1990, that the increased cost of services would offset the hypothetical gain, and that increasing the population to this extent for this reason would not be in the City's long-term best interest. Mr. White's January 22, 1986 memorandum outlines the State Subventions projected to be received in calendar year 1985.

3. Community Character. An overriding issue for the Committee was the basic character of the community and the quality of life that would be afforded to varying levels of population. There was a general feeling that improving the quality of life in the community would be easier to achieve if the existing residential or "bedroom" character were maintained than if it were changed.
4. Service Delivery Costs. This issue was raised repeatedly and it received the most attention in relation to the subventions discussion. While there were no hard data produced to resolve this question, the staff analysis suggested that nearly all of the population projections by the Committee could be absorbed within the existing budget and staffing configuration. In other words, there was no direct correlation between staffing and population - up to a certain point, that point lying beyond approximately 35,000. It was estimated that only a few additional employees would be needed, if any, in direct service categories for additional population and these would be in the areas of Police, Public Works, and Community Services.

The Buildout Scenarios contain seven separate sets of figures: existing data plus two sets each for three different buildouts. The numbers in each Buildout Scenario require some explanation because of apparent contradictions. Within each Buildout, the "A" designation reflects population projections from the Association of Bay Area Governments. The "B" designation within each Buildout is as follows (from the Community Plan and EIR):

IB - Residential Community
IIB- Adopted "Community Plan"
IIIB- Maximum Development

Buildout I assumes that some industrially-zoned land will be converted to Residential uses; thus, the higher population. Buildout II projects a population under current zoning and land-use policies. Buildout III contemplates maximum development in all categories of land use (see Technical Supplement for details). A comparison of added populations shown in the Community Plan and EIR with those used by staff for the Buildout Scenarios is provided in the table below. It should be pointed out that only Buildout III includes residential development of the Civic Center site.

Comparison of Added and Total Populations

<u>Buildout</u>	<u>Community Plan /¹</u>		<u>Staff /²</u>	
	<u>Added</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Added</u>	<u>Total</u>
I	20,300	38,500	19,176	37,876
II	7,200	25,400	8,556	27,256
III	14,000	32,300	12,706	31,405

1. -based upon "existing" population of 18,200

2. -based upon existing population of 18,700

The Buildout Scenarios proved useful to the Committee in reviewing the effects of different populations based upon a wide range of assumptions. By varying any of the assumptions, it was possible for the model to generate many different results. It was precisely this problem that led the Committee to request from staff an inventory of vacant, residentially zoned land. The basic intent of this request was to identify the potential population of the City assuming that there were no land-use policy or zoning changes and that all possible residential development occurred.

The survey ultimately prepared by staff was responsive to the Committee's request, but it also generated questions which resulted in some critical assumptions being made by the Committee for completion of this major task. In addition to residentially zoned land, the survey identified other properties on which residential development would be allowed. These included properties zoned "Neighborhood business" (C-1), "Office" (O), and "Office/Residential" (OR). A total of 142.533 acres was identified and the development potential was shown to be 2,010 units. A detailed breakdown of the acres and units by zoning is provided in the table below.

SUMMARY OF VACANT AND UNDERDEVELOPED LANDS
ALLOWING RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

<u>Zoning</u>	<u>Total Acres</u>	<u>Development Potential/ Total Number of Units</u>
R-1	81.898 acres	658 units
R-3/S-2	1.54 acres	66 units
R-3/S-3	5.58 acres	189 units
R-3/S-5	39.53 acres	684 units
C-1/S-2	1.64 acres	64 units
C-1/S-3	7.194 acres	249 units
C-1/S-7	3.213 acres	27 units
O/S-2	1.33 acres	57 units
OR	0.608 acres	16 units
<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
Total	142.533 acres	2010 units

One of the first questions raised, and the resulting assumption made, related to Second Units. Based upon existing statues and the City's experience to date, the Committee assumed that only 25 percent of the potential number of Second Units would be developed on single-family zoned properties. The Committee also assumed that population per household density for these units would be two persons per unit. The Committee next assumed that only one-third of all nonresidentially zoned properties that could accommodate residential development would actually be developed with some residential uses.

A major question centered around the number to use for the City's existing population. It was determined that the State Department of Finance Population and Housing Estimates would be used for this purpose. Consequently, the January 1, 1986 figure of 18,939 was applied. This same data source also addressed the vacancy rate question and provided a current population per household figure. The latter figure provided by the State actually exceeded the 2.4 to 2.8 range used in the Buildout Scenarios. This was also true for the vacancy rate; however, the Committee decided not to use vacancy rate in projecting future population for the City. In fact, this decision was consistent with the formula construction for determining the buildout population because it related to ultimate capacity.

The 1980 census data reflected a population of 18,200 and a total of 6,848 housing units. This produced a population per household of 2.656 without vacancy rate, group quarters, mobile units, etc. factored in. Similarly, the January 1, 1986 State Department of Finance data included a population of 18,939 and a total of 6,894 housing units. This produced a population per household of 2.747 for purposes of calculating a defensible number for the Committee.

The Committee decided - in keeping with the three Buildout Scenarios of low, medium, and high - to use the capacity resulting from the vacant and underdeveloped land survey as the medium or Buildout II figure, the no-new-development figure for Buildout I, and the differential between I and II to be applied against II for Buildout III. The result of this decision is that Buildout II can occur without any substantial changes in current land-use policy or zoning while Buildouts I and III can only occur with such changes. The population projections for each Buildout are shown in the table below.

Table of Population Projections

	<u>Buildout I</u>	<u>Buildout II</u>	<u>Buildout III</u>
A. Existing Population	18,939	18,939	18,939
B. Second Units*	859 (1,718)	1,024 (2,048)	NA
C. New-Single-Family Units	NA	658	NA
D. New Multiple-Family Units	NA	939	NA
E. New Units in Nonresidential	NA	136	NA
F. Subtotal of New Units	0	1,733	NA
G. 2.747 x "F"	0	4,761	13,155
H. Total Population**	<u>20,657</u>	<u>25,748</u>	<u>32,094</u> ***

* - Calculated on the basis of two persons per unit for all Second Units (25 percent of all single-family zoned properties).

** - includes A, B (population), and G

*** - based on .24645 differential between I and II

EAST PALO ALTO 2000 BUILDOUT SCENARIOS

	Existing	Buildout I		Buildout II		Buildout III	
		A	B	A	B	A	B
A. PEOPLE							
Population	18,700	19,691	37,876	20,261	27,256	20,944	31,406
Population Mix (% Pop)							
Black	61%						
White	19%						
Latino	14%						
Asian/Pacific Islander	6%						
B. HOUSING							
# of Households	6,600	8,163		7,578		7,443	
Household Pop	18,600	19,593					
# of units (total)	6,926	8,367	14,192				
PPH	2.8	2.4			2.66	2.8	
SF Units	3,402	4,000	6,954	3,713	4,504	3,738	5,823
MF Units	3,524	4,163	7,238	3,865	4,688	3,891	6,061
Owner Occupied	3,100	3,675	6,386	3,496	4,136	3,433	5,348
Rental	3,826	4,602	7,806	4,272	5,056	4,196	6,536
C. INCOME							
Mean Household Income	\$22,300	\$25,199		\$26,091		\$26,983	
% of households below poverty	14%	12%		10%		8%	
D. EMPLOYMENT							
Employed Residents	9,200	11,421	21,968	12,359	16,626	13,195	19,786
Unemployment Rate	9.8%	8%		7%		6%	

	Existing	Buildout I		Buildout II		Buildout III	
		A	B	A	B	A	B
E. FINANCIAL							
Assessed valuation	248,336,559	334,228,312		386,900,267		447,240,113	
Total Revenues	2,689,575	4,190,277		5,591,438		7,420,618	
Property Tax	1,250,000	1,947,463		2,598,663		3,448,788	
Service Charges/ Fees	6,616	20,951		55,914		148,412	
Sales Tax	84,154	177,849		362,054		646,038	
Grants	92,540	125,708		111,829		111,309	
F. LAND USE (acres)							
Residential							
Total	666		865		774		742
Low/Med	557		513		605		485
Med/High	16		107		82		42
High	93		245		97		215
Commercial/Office	39		42		41		86
Industrial Total	79		53		130		132
General	43		39		89		119
Total	36		14		18		13
Buffer	0		0		23		0
Other (park/rec, open space, instit, conservation)	573		397		412		397

Technical Supplement

A. People

1. Existing figure is based on estimate from the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) Projections 1985
2. Buildout I: based on 5.3% population growth rate between 1985 and 2000.
3. Buildout II: based on 8.35% growth rate (1985-2000)
4. Buildout III: based on 12% growth rate (1985-200)
5. San Mateo County: 4% increase between 1985-2000
Santa Clara County: 12.7% increase between 1985-2000 according to ABAG projection

B. Housing

1. Household population = $.995 \times$ total population
2. Total no. of households = hhl pop/pph
3. a. Total # of housing units = # of households + 2.5% (2.5% represents margin for vacancy).
b. In 1980, the vacancy rate in East Palo Alto was 4.4% compared to a County figure of 1.3%. Staff assumed a 2.5% vacancy rate for 2000.
c. The current single family/multi-family ratio is 49/51 according to the Community Development Institute's Toward a Community-Oriented Housing Policy in East Palo Alto, California, Report 83-2. Buildouts assume that this ratio is constant

Single family = $.49 \times$ total units
Multi-family = $.51 \times$ total units

d. Occupancy Characteristics:

Based on the above-referenced CDI report, the ratio of owner-occupied to rental properties is 45/55. Buildout assume that this ratio is constant

Owner-occupied = $.45 \times$ total units
Rental = $.55 \times$ total units

C. Income

1. Mean household income:

The 1985, mean household income for the City is estimated at \$22,300 (ABAG Projections 1985)

2. By the year 2000, ABAG also projects that

San Mateo County mean household income will increase 13%
Santa Clara County mean household income will increase 21%

3. 2000 Mean Income in East Palo Alto: $Y = 1985$ figure

a. Buildout I: $13\%(Y) + Y$
assumes 13% increase in average income

b. Buildout II: $17\%(Y) + Y$
assumes 17% increase in mean income

c. Buildout III $21\%(Y) + Y$
assumes 21% increase in mean income

4. Percent of households below poverty level.

a. According to the 1982 Community Plan, 14% of existing East Palo Alto households were below poverty level.

b. Based on the economic development expectations, this percent should decrease by 2000. Buildouts are based on estimates of what the percentages might be.

D. Employment

1. Employed Residents

a. Currently, 50% of East Palo Alto residents are employed.

b. Buildouts are based on the following percentages:

Buildout I	=	58% of population
Buildout II	=	61% of population
Buildout III	=	63% of population

2. Unemployment Rate

a. According to the State Employment Development Service Monthly Labor Force Data, the average unemployment rate in East Palo Alto in 1984 was 9.8%

b. Buildouts represent the alternate employment rates for the year 2000.

E. Financial

1. Assessed valuation

a. Existing \$248,336,559 (1985)

b. Prop. 13 limits increases in assessed value to 2% per year unless property is sold in which case property is reassessed at 100% of market value.

c. Buildout I. $AV_{2000} = AV_{1985} \times (1.02)^{15}$
assumes only 2% (minimum) increase in AV

d. Buildout II: assumes 3% annual increase in assessed value
2% + 1% contribution from reassessment

$$AV = AV_{1985} \times (1.03)^{15}$$

e. Buildout III. assumes 4% annual increase in assessed value
2% + 2% contribution from reassessment

$$AV = AV_{1985} \times (1+.04)^{15}$$

2. Total Revenues

Buildouts are based on the following increases in total revenues:

Buildout I 3% increase/year over 15 years = current total $\times (1.03)^{15}$

Buildout II 5% increase/year over 15 years = current total $\times (1.05)^{15}$

Buildout III 7% increase/year over 15 years = current total $\times (1.07)^{15}$

3. Property Tax

Buildout amounts are based upon the same assumptions regarding increases as used for Total Revenues. The existing amount is from the Adopted Program Budget for FY 1985-86.

4. Service Charges and Fees

a. Currently service charges and fees comprise .3% of total revenue.

b. Buildouts assume that the share of total revenue will increase to

0.5% of TR for Buildout I
1% of TR for Buildout II
2% of TR for Buildout III

5. Sales tax

a. Base year figure = 84,154

b. Year 2000 = BY + % recapture of estimated \$60,000,000 "leakage", compounded at given rate of increase over 15 years (leakage figure from CDI Report).

Buildout I: 5% recapture rate/3% annual increase
Buildout II: 15% recapture rate/ 5% annual increase
Buildout III 25% recapture rate/7% annual increase

Buildout I Tax revenues 2000

BY + 5% (60,000,000 x (1.03)¹⁵
Buildout II BY + 15% (60,000,000) x (1.05)¹⁵
Buildout III BY + 25% (60,000,000) x (1.07)¹⁵

F. Land Use

Buildout I

Source: Environmental Impact Report, East Palo Alto Community Plan

Assumptions:

1. Focus on residential use as primary land use, East Palo Alto as "bedroom community"
2. Scheme assumes that:
 - a. Industrial park is converted to medium-high residential use except for existing industrial areas.
 - b. Large lot areas will be infilled with high-density residential uses.
 - c. Floricultural areas would be high-density residential.
 - d. University Avenue Corridor is redeveloped to accommodate both commercial and high-density residential uses.
 - e. Cooley Landing: no project.

This buildout would generate the following impacts on housing and population.

Housing Units:

Medium Density	3,900
Medium High Density	1,392
High Density	<u>8,900</u>
TOTAL	14,192

Population:

Based on projected household sizes of-

3.5 persons per medium density unit
3.0 persons per med-high density unit
2.2 persons per high density unit.

Total Population	37,876
Existing Population	<u>18,700</u>
Total Net Additional Population	19,176

Buildout II

Source: EIR, East Palo Alto Community Plan

Assumptions:

1. Buildout is based on the policies stated in the Community Plan.
2. Scheme assumes the following land uses:
 - a. Industrial park: light industry except for three existing heavy industrial uses.
 - b. Cooley Landing: developed into a Marina
 - c. Large Lot Areas: infilled at Medium to High Densities
 - d. Floricultural Areas: Medium-High Density Residential
 - e. University Avenue Corridor: Commercial/Residential (Medium Density).

Housing Units:

Medium Density	4,800
Medium-High Density	992
	<u>3,400</u>
Total	9,192

Technical Supplement
To East Palo Alto 2000 Buildouts
Page 6

Population (based on same average household sizes as Buildout I)

Total Population	27,256
Existing Population	<u>18,700</u>

Total Net Additional Population	8,556
------------------------------------	-------

Buildout III

Source: EIR, East Palo Alto Community Plan

Assumptions:

1. This buildout represents the maximum development of East Palo Alto in a range of land uses.
2. Scheme makes the following assumptions:
 - a. Industrial Park: Light Industry.
 - b. Large Lot Areas: High-Density Residential.
 - c. Ravenswood High School Site: High-Density Residential
 - d. Floricultural Areas: Commercial/office
 - e. University Avenue Corridor: All commercial

Housing Units:

Medium Density	3,700
Medium-High Density	200
High Density	<u>7,984</u>

TOTAL	11,884
-------	--------

Population (based on same average household sizes as Buildouts I and II)

Total Population	31,406
Existing Population	<u>18,700</u>

Total Net additional population	12,706
---------------------------------	--------

LIST OF EXHIBITS

1. December 17, 1984 Resolution No. 00152 establishing the City of East Palo Alto 2000 Committee
2. January 22, 1985 Howell letter to Boards/Commissions requesting appointment of representatives to 2000 Committee
3. Log of responses from boards/commissions re representatives to 2000 Committee
4. February 2, Anderson letter re participation in EPA 2000 as Community-at-large member
5. February 7, 1985 Blodgett letter requesting investment toward the CF/NML Model City Charter project.
6. March 7, 1985 Crowley re Model City Charter
7. August 5, 1985 memo to East Palo Alto 2000 Committee members re Charter City
8. February 12 Inglis letter re appointment of Halbo as representative of West Bay Sanitary District
9. March 6 Glenn letter re appointment of Dennis C. Scherzer as representative from East Palo Alto Sanitary District
10. March 18 Hoover memo re Arts & Culture and Human Services Commissions' appointments of representatives to 2000 Committee
11. April 8 Howell letter to Ravenswood City School District requesting RCSD participation as a member of EPA 2000 Committee
12. April 15, 1985 Resolution No. 00170 appointing Rosalie Clark to the Committee
13. May 16, 1985 Howell letter to members of 2000 committee re initial meeting.
14. July 15, 1985 Resolution No. 00205 appointing Silvester Coleman, Jr., Beverly Royal, and Glenda Savage to the Committee
15. Resolution No. 00212 amending Resolution No. 00152
16. September 3, 1985 Action Minutes re Resolution No. 00212
17. Notes from May 22, 1985 meeting
18. Notes from June 12, 1985 meeting

19. Notes from June 26, 1985 meeting
- 20 June 26 Assignments and Additional Reading Material
21. Notes from July 1, 1985 meeting
22. Notes from September 11 meeting
23. Notes from December 7, 1985 meeting
24. Notes from meeting of December 18, 1985
25. January 22, 1986 White memorandum re subventions received by the City
26. May 1986 City of East Palo Alto Vacant and Underdeveloped Land Survey
27. Assignments and Recommendations by Individual Committee members
28. May 1, 1986 State Department of Finance, Population Research Unit letter re population and housing estimates
29. City of East Palo Alto Proposed General Plan Work Schedule
30. November 2, 1985 Bay Area Poll
31. Bay Area Housing
32. Populations changes in San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties 1/1/85-1/1/86
33. Quality of Life Indicators
34. December 19, 1985 San Francisco Examiner article titled Where the Future's Jobs will be
35. December 23, 1985 San Francisco Examiner article titled The Growing Clout of the Elderly
36. Future Trend (San Mateo County Criminal Justice Council futures task force) - October 3, 1985
37. June 6 Davis Enterprise article titled Americans Rediscover Joys of Small-town Living
38. Excerpts from Government Code Sect. 3400
39. May 29 San Francisco Chronicle Article titled Late Marriages expected to Keep Us. Families Small
40. June 4 San Francisco Chronicle Article titled Hefty Increase in Bay Jobs Predicted.