

Special Meeting
July 12, 2010

The City Council of the City of Palo Alto met on this date in the Council Chambers at 6:04 p.m.

Present: Burt, Espinosa, Holman, Price, Scharff, Schmid, Shepherd, Yeh arrived at 6:30 p.m.

Absent: Klein

CLOSED SESSION

1. CONFERENCE WITH LABOR NEGOTIATORS

City Designated Representatives: City Manager and his designees pursuant to Merit System Rules and Regulations (James Keene, Pamela Antil, Dennis Burns, Roger Bloom, Lalo Perez, Joe Saccio, Russ Carlsen, Sandra Blanch, Marcie Scott, Darrell Murray)

Employee Organization: Local 1319, International Association of Firefighters

Authority: Government Code Section 54957.6(a)

CONFERENCE WITH LABOR NEGOTIATORS

City Designated Representatives: City Manager and his designees pursuant to Merit System Rules and Regulations (James Keene, Pamela Antil, Dennis Burns, Lalo Perez, Joe Saccio, Russ Carlsen, Sandra Blanch, Marcie Scott, Darrell Murray)

Employee Organization: Palo Alto Police Managers' Association (Sworn)

Authority: Government Code Section 54957.6(a)

The City Council went into the Closed Sessions at 6:04 p.m.

The City Council reconvened from the Closed Sessions at 8:10 p.m. and Mayor Burt advised no reportable action.

07/12/10

SPECIAL ORDERS OF THE DAY

2. Selection of Candidates to be Interviewed for the Public Art Commission.

MOTION: Council Member Yeh moved, seconded by Vice Mayor Espinosa to interview all candidates for the Public Art Commission.

MOTION PASSED: 8-0 Klein absent

3. Selection of Candidates to be Interviewed for the Planning & Transportation Commission.

MOTION: Council Member Shepherd moved, seconded by Vice Mayor Espinosa to interview all candidates for the Planning & Transportation Commission.

MOTION PASSED: 8-0 Klein absent

CITY MANAGER COMMENTS

City Manager, James Keene announced the City was currently recruiting for vacancies on the Joint Community Relation Committee (JCRC) for the Palo Alto Airport and the Infrastructure Blue Ribbon Commission (IBRC). The Main, Mitchell Park and Children's Libraries now open at noon on Mondays and the Main and Mitchell Park Libraries now close at 8:00 PM Monday through Thursday. The Twilight Concert series will begin July 17, 2010 at Mitchell Park. The policy holders of the Palo Alto Flood Plain Management Program received a fifteen percent flood insurance discount off their premiums. The Greer Park renovations were continuing while the soccer field's portions had been completed and were open for use.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

Lorie Johnson, Pacifica, spoke regarding hospital negotiations for the nursing contract.

Evie Davidson, Palo Alto, spoke regarding nursing contract negotiations with hospitals.

Colleen Borges, Foster City, spoke regarding reopening the nursing contract negotiations.

Wynn Grcich, Hayward, spoke regarding the anaerobic digestion process and copper corrosion.

Palo Alto Free Press.Com, spoke regarding the first amendment right to freedom of speech.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mayor Burt noted Staff recommended that the minutes of June 7 and June 14, 2010 be pulled from the agenda in order to allow the inclusion of verbatim minutes for the agenda items related to the Stanford Draft Environmental Impact Report. The City Manager's office has stated that verbatim minutes were necessary to complete the Final Environmental Impact Report.

MOTION: Council Member Shepherd moved, seconded by Vice Mayor Espinosa to pull the minutes of June 7, 2010 and June 14, 2010 and to approve the minutes of June 16, 2010 and June 21, 2010.

MOTION PASSED: 8-0 Klein absent

ACTION ITEMS

Per Council direction the Stanford DEIR is typed in verbatim.

4. Public Hearing: Stanford University Medical Center Facilities Renewal and Replacement Project-Meeting to Accept Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR) for the Stanford University Medical Center Facilities Renewal and Replacement Project, Including an Overview of the Transportation, Climate Change, and Air Quality Chapters of the Draft EIR.

Mr. Curtis Williams, Director of Planning and Community Environment: Yes I am thank you Mayor and Council Members. I am Curtis Williams, the Director of Planning and Community Environment. We are here tonight in the latest in our series of installments of the Draft EIR for the Stanford University Medical Center Projects.

We have had a number of meetings with you before and with the Planning and Transportation, and are here tonight to talk about the Transportation, Climate Change, and Air Quality Chapters. All of these comments will be compiled along with public comments in writing or email that are due by the 27th of this month. Then the Final EIR will be produced.

A reminder again that we are not talking about the merits of the project here but we are talking about the EIR. The entitlements will be coming to you later in the year.

So the agenda for tonight, we have again with us Rod Jeung from PBS&J, our primary environmental consultant. He is going to give an overview of the three chapters that are before us. Then we also have Dennis Struecker from AECOM, the traffic consultant who will present more details on the Transportation section. Gayle Likens, our Management Specialist, will also provide a brief overview of the background of the modeling for Transportation. Then we will move to the applicant/project sponsor, Stanford University Medical Center for their presentation. Then back to you and the public for questions and comments.

Then the next steps are that we will be back to you on July 19 and 26 with other chapters for your review. I also want to note that we have been having and will continue to have meetings with or attend meetings of other cities that are reviewing the EIR. In particular we met with Menlo Park Council and we have met several times with the staff, and we believe they are going to take a recommendation on a letter here shortly. East Palo Alto we are having a Study Session with them tomorrow night to go over some questions on the project. Then on Wednesday evening Portola Valley is going to be considering their comments on the EIR and we will be attendance at that as well. So again, the comment period runs through July 27 and then we will be preparing the Response to Comments for the Final EIR. With that I will turn it over to Rod Jeung. I do want to note that also before we go to the applicant that Dan Garber from our Planning and Transportation Commission is here to provide some input relative to the Commission's deliberations. Thank you.

Mr. Rod Jeung, PBS&J Project Director: Thank you very much Curtis. Mayor Burt, Members of the Council it is a pleasure to be here again tonight. I have the pleasure tonight of speaking and just talking about the highlights related to the Transportation, Climate Change, and Air Quality sections. I did want to take a quick moment to acknowledge a couple of other key members of our team who are here tonight to help respond to any questions or comments that you might have. So in addition to the individuals that Curtis mentioned, we do have Trixie Martelino who served as our Project Manager, Michael Hendrix who prepared the Climate Change section, and Geoff Hornek who prepared the Air Quality Analysis. As Curtis mentioned, AECOM who prepared the Transportation Analysis is here. Supporting Dennis Struecker is Nicole Sou. We also have with us tonight Elizabeth Miesner and Michael Kenneth of ENVIRON who helped prepare the Environmental Health Risk Assessment. So with that let's get started.

The first topic is Transportation. What you will see on this first slide is a very familiar table. I am just going to briefly highlight the organization again. Along the left column are the various significance criteria. Then they rate across the top going from NI all the way through to SU as the various significance conclusions that were reached.

In terms of the significance conclusions, the impacts to freeways as seen in the next to the bottom row, impacts to freeways regarding US 101 and I-280 would be less than significant. In the next column to the right with implementation of various recommended mitigation measures, which we will talk about, there would be less than significant impacts for construction impacts, intersection congestion, and local circulation, as well as pedestrian and bicycle safety impacts. The column at the far right of this table shows that there would be significant and unavoidable impacts on various roadway segments all of which are in Menlo Park.

The remaining impacts considered in the Environmental Impact Report regarding Transportation those being for transit, parking, and emergency access would either be less than significant or with recommended mitigation measures they would be reduced to less than significant.

Stepping back quickly to the construction impacts, which were identified as significant there are nine different transportation mitigation measures that have been identified to handle the construction related period, or construction period impacts. These mitigation measures address a variety of different circulation concerns during the lengthy construction period, and include parking for construction crews, maintaining access for bicyclists, pedestrians, and transit vehicles, various restrictions on truck activities and haul routes, and special considerations when major events are held. Collectively all of these different mitigation measures would reduce the impacts to less than significant.

In terms of the operational impacts once the project is up and running there are five mitigation measures that have been identified to address the intersection congestion or level of service impacts. These mitigation measures include things like an enhanced Transportation Demand Management program, and traffic adaptive signal technology. These mitigation measures collectively would reduce the impact to less than significant. The same measures are recommended to reduce impacts to roadway segments including the enhanced TDM program and expanded transit service, but the streets in Menlo Park would continue to remain significant and unavoidable in terms of the traffic volumes.

There are a number of other operational impacts that were identified ranging from local circulation, pedestrian and bicycle safety, transit impacts, emergency access. The mitigation measures that have been identified for these impacts range from providing additional roadway improvements, funding bicycle, pedestrian and bus and shuttle improvements, and again traffic signal priority systems for emergency access. All of these collectively would reduce the impacts to less than significant.

Climate Change I am going to do a little bit different only because it is something relatively new to Environmental Impact Reports. So I want to give a few background pointers. As I said it is a fairly new topic that is being addressed in the EIRs. Global Climate Change refers to changes in the normal weather pattern of the Earth. These changes in weather have been shown to correlate with changes in sea level, water supply and quality, ecosystems or biodiversity, and human health specifically vector born infectious diseases.

A principle contributor to these changes in the weather patterns is the release of greenhouse gases from human activity. These greenhouse gases trap heat in the atmosphere and have been identified as a source for rising temperature levels throughout the world. Greenhouse gas includes water vapor, carbon dioxide, methane, nitric oxides, among others. Importantly, in terms of an Environmental Impact Analysis climate change is really a cumulative impact on a global scale. So any individual project in and of itself isn't likely to trigger that kind of an affect, but we do look at it from a cumulative perspective.

Again, by way of background, there are a number of recent plans and legislations that have been adopted to reduce greenhouse gases and greenhouse gas emissions, at all levels federal, state, and local. These regulations are described in the Draft Environmental Impact Report, and some of the key ones are highlighted on the slide above. Of the ones that are listed here I just wanted to draw your attention to AB 32, which is the California Global Warming Solutions Act. This law in particular requires that the California Air Resources Board implement rules to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in the state to 1990 levels by 2020. These measures and regulations are expected to be in effect by 2012.

Now Palo Alto has been in the forefront in terms of climate change sustainability and so the City has already adopted its own Climate Protection Plan. The Plan identifies the current emissions in the city and sets goals for various interim years through 2020. Importantly, these goals are aligned with the reduction goal of 30 percent below business as usual emissions that have been articulated by the California Air Resources Board.

What this table shows is that while the Stanford University Medical Center Projects include many of the strategies that are contained in the City's Climate Protection Plan the net effect of those strategies is a six percent reduction from business as usual rather than the goal of 30 percent that has been established in the City's Climate Protection Plan. As a result both from a consistency perspective in terms of how well it supports the Palo Alto Climate Protection Plan as well as in terms of reducing the 30 percent of business as usual emissions the EIR finds that this impact would be significant and unavoidable.

There are however a number of mitigation measures that have been identified. This slide shows that those mitigation measures are wide ranging, many of them again supporting the ideas and goals that are contained in the City's Climate Protection Plan. They include commissioning or maintenance of new energy systems, participating in green energy programs, greenhouse gas monitoring, performing an annual waste reduction audit. Again, these measures would significantly increase the emissions reductions, and collectively these additional measures would reduce greenhouse gas emissions to about 25 percent, but still short of the City's 30 percent target.

The final topic for tonight in terms of our overview is Air Quality. As shown in this table there would be less than significant impacts with regard to localized carbon monoxide impacts from motor vehicle traffic, toxic air contaminants, and objectionable odors. However, there would be significant and unavoidable construction and operation impacts from the emissions of criteria air pollutants at both the project and the cumulative level. Specifically construction activities would emit significant amounts of nitrogen oxides associated with the construction exhaust from the equipment and trucks. Operation of the project would result in significant emissions of reactive organic gases, nitrogen oxides, and small diameter particulate matter.

As is typical, especially for the construction related impacts, there are a series of standard mitigation measures that are available. However, given the size and the scale of this project and its duration the construction related mitigation measures would be effective but not to the point where it would reduce the impact to less than significant. There would still be significant unavoidable levels of nitrogen oxides. In terms of the operational impacts, again it is the scale of the project, especially the number of trips that are anticipated that would be substantial. As a result the significant criteria air pollutant emissions would remain significant and unavoidable. That concludes our presentation for tonight. Thank you.

Gayle Likens, Transportation Management Specialist: I would like to give a brief overview of the City's Travel Demand Forecasting Model and how it relates to this particular project and the Traffic Impact Analysis for the project.

The City's model was originally developed in about 2003, and it was for the Citywide Traffic Impact Fee Nexus Study and has been used in the ensuing years for the traffic impact studies that have been done for all of the development projects.

Starting in 2007 the model was updated to project traffic through 2015, and additionally 2025, which previously we had not had any traffic projections for that far into the future. Including the local traffic and the known projects using the Regional Land Use Data Projections from ABAG and the model was also updated to be consistent with the VTA's Congestion Management Program Travel Demand Model. So in 2007 originally this update was for both the combined projects, the Medical Center and Shopping Center Projects. Because we did have the future traffic growth numbers for the projects themselves, we backed out the ABAG projections for 2025 and 2015 from the background data.

Then in 2009, because the Shopping Center Project was withdrawn we had to readjust the model to put the ABAG projections for the Shopping Center back into the background growth projections for the City and in the model. At the same time the model also showed that we had some roadways that were over capacity so we did some adjustments to the model. We constrained some of our major roadways, there were 11 locations that were constrained, to bring the traffic on those roadways back to the capacity of the roadways and not exceed the capacity. Even so there were some adjustments that we had to make beyond that to fine-tune the model. That including looking at shifting some of the traffic on these roadways that were showing greater than capacity in numbers to the freeways and also to do some modifications that included peak spreading to result in more accurate and realistic forecasts for the travel patterns.

We reviewed this approach to the traffic model with the VTA because we do need to have a model that is consistent with our regional planning agencies. They agreed that with our approach being a conservative approach to modeling, and they felt it was appropriate. So that is a brief background on the model itself, which was used in the development of the Traffic Impact Analysis. Thank you.

Dennis Struecker, AECOM: Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council good evening. These are the study components of the Traffic Impact Analysis. Sixty-six intersections, most of them in Palo Alto and Menlo Park, some in East Palo Alto and the County. There are six freeway segments, three on 101, and three on 280. Eight residential roadway segments, and then eight roadway segments along major corridors in Menlo Park, which is a specific requirement of the City of Menlo Park.

The analysis year was 2025. It coincides with the approximate build out of the project, and it is consistent with the horizon year of the City's Travel Demand Model.

The analysis scenarios we looked at were existing traffic counts that were collected from 2006 through 2009. Although not included in the EIR itself, for information purposes we looked at existing plus project in the Traffic Impact Analysis. The future was 2025 and then the future with project added the project traffic to the 2025 volumes.

This is the magnitude of the project in terms of trips, 10,000 daily trips, approximately 650 in each the AM and PM peak hour. This shows you the 66 intersections spread throughout Palo Alto, Menlo Park, and East Palo Alto. These are the residential roadway segments that we looked at both in Palo Alto and Menlo Park. These are the specific ones, shown in green, the specific collector and arterial corridors that are required to be looked at in Menlo Park based on their criteria.

In 2025 if you add the hospital projects to No Build you end up with five intersections that are significantly impacted, closely around the project itself, around the project area itself. For the PM peak hour, as you can see we have the same project, the intersections around the project itself but we also expand impacts into the central part of Palo Alto, into Menlo Park, and onto the Bay Front Expressway.

We looked at four priorities of mitigations and we build each one on top of the other. So the first priority was to look at traffic adaptive signal technology. The second priority was to add new pedestrian and bicycle under-crossings to the first priority. The third one is to add TDM measures. The fourth is to add physical intersection improvements.

For the Priority 1, the traffic adaptive signal technology, we still have four AM impacts and nine PM impacts. They were five and 12 if you recall. So we reduced one in the AM and three in the PM. When we added Priority 2, the pedestrian and bicycle under-crossings we have three AM impacts and nine PM impacts. So we got rid of one more AM impact. When we add

Priority 3, the Transportation Demand Management measures, we end up with zero AM impacts and we still have four PM impacts. Then when we look at adding Priority 4, the intersection improvements, on top of that we end up with all the AM and PM impacts mitigated.

The four intersections that remained impacted on the last slide are Middlefield-Willow, which the EIR identified as infeasible, the mitigation is infeasible. Menlo Park has stated that they think there are feasible mitigation measures at that intersection. Arboretum-Galvez was identified as being feasible. The mitigation there is to signalize that intersection. Bay Front and Willow the EIR identified that to potentially feasible and again Menlo Park has said that the improvements at that location are feasible. Bay Front and University the EIR identified the mitigation to infeasible but again Menlo Park has stated that they believe mitigation measures are feasible at that location.

Dan Garber, Chair, Planning and Transportation Commission: The Commissioners reviewed these various chapters with the Staff and the consultant, and had some broad-ranging discussions. I will try and rollup some of the broad comments here.

I will start first with a couple learnings specific to the Transportation Chapter. One of the learnings was that a large part of the transportation impacts come from patient trips as opposed to staff and/or construction along the way. Second is that the projected increase in the population of Santa Clara has interestingly a larger impact over our street than the project will have at its conclusion, which isn't to state that mitigations shouldn't be pursued, because they should.

Relative to impacts in both the Transportation Chapter as well as the Air Quality Chapter there was significant conversation around the impacts that the construction has on our community, and the need for the DEIR to more fully understand what those impacts are. I will just name a couple of things. First of all, it needs to better consider the impacts of the transportation of the construction workers themselves to and from the site over the course of 12 years. It needs to take a closer look at the impacts and the opportunities on the mitigation side of the equation to coordinate the actual construction work that occurs over those 12 years relative to where the mitigations happen and what happens on the campus itself. Then finally, the other topic concerning construction was the truck routes to the site. they have been identified in the DEIR, but some additional work we believe the DEIR should do is looking at time of day, and which truck routes are used when, because depending on the time of day and which ones they use they will have more or less impacts both on our business district of the University Avenue,

and/or impacts on our high schools and transportation during early mornings and afternoons. Those things can be mitigated through proper planning.

One of the things that raised some concern on the Commission, there was quite a bit of discussion about it, is the reliance of many of the mitigations on the Caltrans GO Pass to achieve the less than significant ratings of a variety of the impacts that were identified. In particular that was a concern given the questions that have been raised about Caltrans recently and their future plans, and what happens if the GO Pass is no longer available at some future point? How do we then deal with those impacts if that goes away?

Relative to Climate Change again there is a broad-ranging kind of discussion about that. Let me just highlight two topics there. One is the recognition that most of the DEIR report addressed emissions, emissions during the construction phase and to a lesser degree emissions during the actual operation of the hospital itself. Although it is less in terms of the overall carbon footprint, the overall lifecycle assessment, what was not addressed were the embodied carbon footprint of the materials that were actually being created and brought to the site, which is potentially worth up to 15 to 20 percent of the overall carbon footprint in the overall lifecycle. That should be considered, and we suggested that the DEIR should include an evaluation of the embedded energy in addition to the operational emissions or the energy that is created through emissions, even though that is not an easy calculation to make.

Finally, I would just like to note that one of the City's consultants suggested at the end of this particular discussion on the Climate Change Chapter that the City consider taking its Climate Plan and turning it into a qualified to help the City better deal with the emission offsets and meet its own climate protection goals, as a way of separating the responsibilities of Stanford and Palo Alto and assigning responsibilities between those two. That's it.

Mayor Burt: Dan, could you explain that last aspect again?

Commissioner Garber: The City's consultants?

Mayor Burt: Yes, on the Climate Protection Plan and the bifurcation.

Commissioner Garber: It was a comment that was offered by the City's consultant I think in response to one of Commissioner Fineberg's questions or comments regarding the impact not just on Palo Alto but regionally. Although I am not familiar with the components of a qualified plan versus the plan that we already have in place, and I believe Staff will be looking into that as part of their response that they have to prepare for the entire

DEIR. The suggestion was made that by creating a qualified plan the criteria could be parsed between Stanford and Palo Alto, and that would be a benefit to Palo Alto because it would have a more manageable set of criteria that would be applied to it as opposed to it and Stanford. I may entirely wrong and perhaps or one of the consultants can give you a better understanding of that particular issue.

Mayor Burt: Thank you. Curtis, does that conclude Staff presentation?

Mr. Williams: Yes it does, Mayor.

Mayor Burt: At this time the applicant has a presentation to make. Welcome.

Bill Philips, Senior Associate Vice President, Land, Buildings, and Real Estate, Stanford University: Good evening Mayor Burt and Council Members. Tonight we have a comprehensive but hopefully brief, even though it will be comprehensive, presentation on Transportation and Sustainability. On the Transportation section Brodie Hamilton, who is Director of Parking and Transportation Services will join me a little bit. What we want to focus on is the TDM portion, the GO Pass portion of this program. Brodie gives me credibility, but he also is probably the foremost expert on how these things work and how they can be made most effective.

Next slide. The context of what we are talking about here is both the force of what we want to do at the City, and what we want to do at Stanford. That is use a multimodal approach to address traffic congestion. That means utilizing Transportation Demand Management, and some of the other priority features that Dennis mentioned as opposed to simply increasing roadway capacity. We know at Stanford that the importance of Transportation Demand Management, and this also applies to the SUMC, the hospitals, because they use all of the same TDM programs that Stanford uses, except for the GO Pass. The reason we do these is we want to achieve environmental sustainability, we have obligations that we acquired and that we welcomed under the General Use Permit with the County, and we do focus a lot of our University attention and a lot of hospital attention on employee well being.

Brodie is always emphasizing to me that the most successful TDM systems have to varied, there have to be a lot of choices, they have to be flexible, you have to be able to move between choices depending on the time and the nature of the surroundings, and they have to adapt to what people want to accept and are willing to embrace.

We think it has worked pretty well because the mode split when we did the data collection in 2006, which is most of what we used for the DEIR was that the University's drive alone mode was only 54 percent. The Caltrain mode split was 15.8 percent. For the hospital at the same time drive alone split was 77 percent, the Caltrain mode split should be 3.6 percent, I apologize for that being off one percentage.

So understanding the hospital employee population as you look at that above comparison to see whether something as good as what Stanford is able to do in these various areas is achievable. It is important to note that the hospital employees commute for the most part during the evening and on weekends. Eight-nine percent of them work on weekdays during typical daytime hours. In addition, of the approximately 9,000 hospital employees almost 70 percent are located on the peninsula, meaning in the prime Caltrain service counties. Of those 65 percent live in locations proximate to Caltrain, which means close to Caltrain cities, which is actually higher than the 52 percent relationship that we see at the University.

Next slide. Brodie is going to go through this little list.

Brodie Hamilton, Director of Parking and Transportation Services, Stanford University: Good evening Mayor and Members of the Council. I am going to fly through this very briefly to give you an overview of our program, which is one of the most comprehensive you will find in a University or jurisdictional setting. We have a Commute Club, which is made up of individuals that have committed to not driving alone. In 2002 there were roughly 3,400 members of that and today there are over 8,000 members in the Commute Club.

The Marguerite has grown significantly over the years. We now have 41 buses, provide over 1.4 million trips per year. We have 14 routes and about 160 stops around the area. VTA Eco Pass provides, I think as most of you know unlimited ridership on the VTA services in the area. We have been providing GO Pass for a number of years, actually providing it before it was GO Pass. The University and Caltrain established the U Pass or University Pass back in 2003 and ran that for two years. They felt it was viable and created the GO Pass from that to extend to other employers in the area.

Line U was established to make connections with the East Bay, the ACE Train, and the BART system with regional Measure 2 monies. AC Transit was able to come up with some trans-bay buses as well as some operating monies so we partnered with AC Transit to establish the Express to the East Bay and we have about 350 people a day that are doing that.

I think most of you know we have a very extensive bicycle program both in terms of facilities available on the campus, as well as all the educational programs and outreach efforts that we have in order to encourage people to commute by bike. Right now if we look at all of our campus commuters, people actually coming from off campus about 22 percent of our commuters are via bike.

We have vehicle rental and car-sharing programs on campus. They are there primarily to provide options for individuals that have used alternative transportation to get to the University. We have the biggest car-sharing program at a University in the nation. Right now we have 34 cars. We are presently trying to get some located over near the train station to help out the City connection as well.

Charter bus service, we have about 1,200 charters a year. A lot of that is directed towards getting conference attendees from hotels to the campus so we don't have a lot of people driving on their own.

The other is flexible work hour options. We have a lot of people that have altered their commute so that they are coming in either before or after the peak commute times, which has helped us significantly.

I think most of you are familiar with the emergency ride home program, a very important part of any complex or comprehensive transportation program. Basically, if somebody has an emergency and needs to get home and they have used alternative transportation if they are within 20 miles we will give them a taxi ride home. If they are beyond that we will give them a rental car for free to get them home. Again, we have a variety of other programs but these are the big ones.

Next slide. This is how we measure the success of our program. The campus commute mode split is a biggie. If we look at commute mode split for University employees in 2002 it was 72 percent for drive alone, and this year we just achieved 48 percent for University employees. If we look at all of our commutes including graduate students and postdoctorals we are down to 43 percent. Annual cordon counts, each year we have been able to stay below the base count that was done in 2001. Actually the peak hour trips in the afternoon are the biggest ones and we are currently approximately 400 trips below the baseline there. I mentioned the Commute Club before. We have gone from a participation level of 3,400 in 2002 up to over 8,000 today. Parking permit sales, if we look at our commuter parking permits, if we look at all the commuter parking permits that we sell in our peak of 2004 we were selling just shy of 15,000 and this year, mid-February we were around 12,500. So we have dropped dramatically in the number of people

that are buying commuter permits. I mentioned already the Marguerite ridership. Just four years ago the ridership was a little over a million and we are up to a 1.4 million now. For vehicles miles traveled and carbon footprint from commuters, our estimates are that we are already down to the 1990 levels and getting lower. In terms of cars parked on campus, another measure again confirming the number of people that have jumped into alternative transportation. In 2004, our peak year, we had about 17,700 cars parked on campus. In 2009 we had about 15,000 cars parked on campus. This was looking at a snapshot during a mid-February so a considerable drop there. I think that is all I need to say. Thank you.

Mr. Philips: So focusing on the GO Pass, I would like to say that with Brodie here tonight and also Robert Eckles of Fehr & Peers, our traffic consultant here tonight, both of them have dealt a lot with Caltrain. I think if there are specific questions like the ones Dan raised about the future and viability of Caltrain I would encourage you to ask them and get their input and thoughts about that.

The DEIR for the TDM, which is the enhanced TDM that includes the GO Pass, for the hospital projects shows as being 21.1 percent. That is all the transit not just the GO Pass or Caltrain. The Caltrain portion is forecasted to be at 15.8, which was the University level in 2006.

One of the things that really make the Caltrain GO Pass work is the way the Stanford Shuttle Program adjusts to it to provide the connectivity that is required and the capacity demands that are needed. We do that primarily through route changes, and also by having additional vehicles. GO Pass applies to both the existing and the new hospital employment. That is something that sometimes gets lost but it is so important. All of these hospitals employees will now have a GO Pass and that will be the thing that causes this dramatic reduction as forecasted in the DEIR of a little over 500 peak hour trips. When you combine it with the other Priorities that Dennis mentioned, adaptive signals and pedestrian improvements, the TDM and GO Pass that eliminates four AM and eight PM peak hour intersection impacts from that total of 17. The GO Pass alone mitigates three intersections in the AM and five intersections in the PM. Obviously doing that decreases vehicle miles traveled by a significant amount. That 500, actually it is 505-peak hour trip reduction translates into a 65.9 percent reduction in the project's peak hour trips. Thank you.

The final point of the presentation is just to respond a little bit to what we heard Planning and Transportation Commission comment on. A particular concern they had was the capacity if so many people are going to be utilizing the GO Pass and switching to Caltrain is there going to be sufficient capacity

at Caltrain to handle that increased ridership. So a few of the statistics that we put together show that based on the 2010 Caltrain Ridership Survey the northbound peak time capacity is 51.4 percent, southbound 41.1 percent. The evening peak period ridership survey also shows the northbound at 42.8 percent of capacity and southbound at 56.9. There are very few individual trains that ever reach the 85 to 95 percent of packed capacity at their maximum loading point. It is important to point out that the maximum loading point usually occurs north of Redwood City not in the Palo Alto area. The maximum seating capacity we are talking about for these trains is 650 passengers. So we believe there is sufficient capacity available within the system. Also the way the employees at the Medical Center tier their time around this peak period suggests that we will be able to smooth this capacity issue out even more because they don't concentrate themselves in the primary employee peak hour periods. That is my presentation. We will go to Sustainability with Mark Tortorich.

Mark Tortorich, Vice President, Design and Construction, Stanford University Medical Center and Lucile Packard Children's Hospital: Good evening Mayor, Members of the Council. We just wanted to review with you briefly a few sustainability features of our hospital Renewal and Replacement Program. We believe these sustainability features will help reduce greenhouse gas emissions and help our projects achieve the City's and the State's goals.

So first, designing hospital buildings has particular challenges. We obviously have very strict infection control requirements to meet. Air, water, and dirt are enemies of the infection control program. So those sometimes conflict with sustainability goals. We have very strict oversight by the State of California and OSHPD in everything that we design, and everything that we build. And, we are a 24-hour operation obviously being a medical center.

The traditional measurement in sustainability would be a LEED standard. LEED was designed as a standard more for office building type occupancies. There is a special standard being established for healthcare facilities, the Green Guide for Healthcare or LEED for Healthcare. Our LEED designer of the Children's Hospital, Robin Gunther, was one of the authors of the Green Guide for Healthcare and we are using that as our guidebook for this facility. Additionally our LEED engineer, Walt Vernon of Massetti Engineers was a co-author of the Green Guide for Healthcare, and he is the engineer responsible for both hospital projects.

Finally, the Draft EIR concludes that with mitigation the project will result in approximately 25 percent fewer greenhouse gas emissions than business as usual. We believe that there actually are maybe some technical adjustments that could be made in the Draft EIR based upon our current data that we can

provide the consultants that will demonstrate that we are much closer to 30 percent reduction in greenhouse gases. Primarily that is through the use of more energy efficient designs for our hospitals, which will then allow us to use less chilled water or hot water from the Stanford Central Energy Plant, and therefore reduce greenhouse gas emissions through the production of chilled water and hot water.

Next slide, please. So we really looked at 15 big ideas of sustainability in the design of these projects. I would like to focus on the top six. Next, Steve. Then spend a little bit of time talking about each of these big six ideas.

Next. So first, as I mentioned Walt Vernon of Massetti Engineers has really challenged us to achieve very ambitious energy conservation goals in the hospital design, and we have accepted that challenge from the engineers. That is to achieve Energy Star scores of 90 to 95, which really means that we are designing these buildings to be better energy consumers than 90 to 95 percent of similar hospitals. Now, again, many of these ambitions that we have, and many of the design features we are submitting to the State of California for approval will require either building code changes or approval by the State for deviations of the building code to accommodate energy performance. We are designing the hospitals to use 35 percent less energy than typical hospitals and 20 percent less than a hospital designed to current energy standards. Again, I will explain some of those features. The School of Medicine buildings that are also part of our Renewal and Replacement Program are being designed to be 30 percent better than traditional buildings designed to current standards. So obviously with these features and with our commitment to sustainability we think we will really help reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

Next, please. So what are we doing? So for our HVAC systems, our mechanical systems that ventilate these building, and remember these being hospital buildings the buildings are entirely mechanically ventilated. They cannot be naturally ventilated through operable windows because of infection control issues. We are using a new system, Displacement Ventilation, which is something that will allow us to generate or to use less energy to displace the air within the patient rooms and within the operating rooms, and the other critical care spaces of the facility more efficiently. We are using variable air volume systems. We are allowing occupants to control the temperature of the rooms. Obviously when a room is not occupied we will be shutting off the systems there.

We are also connecting to Stanford's Central Energy Plant for chilled water and hot water generation. That is tremendously efficient for us. That plant

already exists we just need to make utility connections in Welch Road, and we believe there will be significant economies in doing that.

Next. So what is Displacement Ventilation? Basically, there is an airflow reduction system. The typical dilution systems where you introduce fresh air from the ceiling and you also extract air from the ceiling makes you pump a lot of air into the space to dilute the existing air and then remove it. A displacement ventilation system actually introduces the new air at the floor. By doing that, your natural convection will allow for distribution and separation of air through the system. To accommodate a displacement ventilation system we will actually have to pay particular attention to the building façades.

Next slide. What we are doing for the building façades is we are actually employing two different systems. One for each hospital appropriate to the needs and the character of the design, but we are designing a very high-tech curtain wall system for both hospitals. Again, they have different architectural expressions. This is for the new Stanford Hospital building. We are investing a considerable amount of time and capital in designing a double curtain wall system. So there is a gap between the two layers of glass that will actually have horizontal sun control devices between those two layers of glass. Those horizontal shades will be controlled by an automation system to make sure that we don't have hot spots on the floor from the solar exposure.

Next slide. At the Children's Hospital we are designing a similar performing system, but again it is expressed very differently because of the very different nature of the pediatric environment. At the Children's Hospital the system is a much more passive system, and it is also one that is expressive on the outside of the buildings. So those horizontal sunshades are actually attached to the exterior of the building in a fixed position, and then we have also animated the façade by landscaping outside of each of the patient rooms to help provide the solar shading that is necessary to make the displacement ventilation system efficient.

Next. Obviously we are studying green practices and green materials. Just in the paving that we use and in the green roofs that you have seen at both hospital projects will obviously reduce heat island effects and make these much more energy efficient buildings.

Next. Our architects have developed a rather novel approach to staying up-to-date on new building materials. They have established a precautionary list. So those products and materials that they should actually stay away from that are non-sustainable materials in the design and specification of

these features. Given the long period of time between design and construction and implementation of the buildings many of the finishes that we look at specifying today won't be in existence and they will be constantly updated. So this interactive website is a good way to stay up-to-date on what is available in the marketplace.

Next. As I mentioned, we are also looking extensively at how are we rejuvenating the spaces that we are taking over? This is for example at the Lucile Packard Children's Hospital where to the top of the slide you will have Welch Road as well as Quarry Road, but you can see that the site is predominantly asphalt parking and roofscape.

Steve, if you go to the next slide, you will see how we are transforming that into really a green space. We are creating about 3.5 acres of greenspace with the facility. Obviously, with our open Emerald Court here at the corner of Quarry and Welch, and then by putting a green roof on top of our surgical platform here between the hospital expansion and the existing facility.

Next slide. We are also very aggressive in our practices of sustainability and Christine Hansen from our General Services Department is here if you have any questions about how we maintain our sustainability beyond the construction practices for this project.

Next. Now, finally, water conservation, which I know is a very important topic here. First, obviously we are looking at the marketplace and using the best features available from the marketplace to conserve water, including low-flow fixtures, dual flush fixtures. Obviously going to an all-private model the use of water within the restrooms is a very important issue for us and making sure that we minimize the water use as much as possible.

Next. We are also looking at the landscape features, obviously those green roofs of being drought tolerant landscaping, and talking other sustainability practices on how we maintain the landscaping.

Next. One feature again subject to State approval is our ability to capture rainwater in cisterns for irrigation, but also our ability to capture condensate water from the mechanical equipment that will be cooling the building in the summer. If you look at graph at the bottom of this slide you will see that our peak production of condensate water matches quite well with our peak demand for water. The volume of condensate water that we can produce matches very closely with our irrigation demand at the Children's Hospital. So again, we will be proposing storage tanks for the condensate water that we can then recycle into irrigation.

Next. Our estimates of water use. We have estimated for the project that overall we will consume, again this for the total project, both hospitals and the future clinic buildings as they are built out, approximately 177,000 gallons per day but with conservation measures we can reduce our use to slightly below 100,000 gallons per day. We believe that, and the EIR has concluded that, there is sufficient water supply within Palo Alto to support the projects.

Next. We have obviously benchmarked, as has been requested and as is appropriate, these facilities against other comparable modern facilities not only in the State of California but also around the country. It is a pretty consistent average that it is about .20 or .2013 in the case of Packard, of gallons per day per square foot of facilities. We have also estimated the use for our clinics buildings and for our School of Medicine. One of the things that is interesting about our two facilities is because of the high acuity of the patients that we see we do have a higher proportion of interventional and treatment spaces per bed. So our water use, you would typically expect it to be higher than a comparable facility but we are still falling within the ranges of other comparable centers around the state.

Next. So again, that concludes our presentation. We obviously have staff here to answer any questions that you might have.

Mayor Burt: Thank you. So this evening we have a big Agenda. We have quite a few members of the public who wish to speak. I should mention that because we actually have three different aspects to the Draft EIR that we are discussing tonight the applicant was allowed to aggregate their time on the three different elements. If members of the public wish to speak to more than one element, if they would like they may ask that of the Chair and we will extend their time to five minutes. I have a lot of cards, so I am not encouraging everybody to take five minutes. The standard time is going to be three, but if you wish to speak to more than one of the elements then please note that.

The other issue is right now we ordinarily go to Council Member questions before proceeding to the public. Out of courtesy to the many speakers who are going to be up late we can take some hopefully brief questions from the Council, as long as we can keep them to true direct questions and not rhetorical questions or statements of position. So if that is okay, we can go forward and take a few questions, then go to the public, and if we have some additional questions and comments we can do that after the public has spoken. Does that seem like a reasonable approach? Okay. Colleagues, questions of the Staff or applicant. Council Member Shepherd.

Council Member Shepherd: Thank you. I don't even know where to start on this particular segment of the Draft EIR. I just want to say first that I am very impressed by all of the strategies that are coming into play in such an important project, particularly when it comes to the Climate Change and Air Quality Chapters. My questions pertain tonight primarily to traffic.

One of the last questions I asked of Staff earlier today was we are being asked to compare between the employees for the hospital and the University employees, and how it will shift when it goes to the GO Pass, and the expectation of reducing peak periods of traffic by people riding Caltrain. When I asked this question, I was given an answer that there are 11,000 University employees today. Yet the report that I am looking at in Appendix C, Appendix H, which is double appendix, notes that the University employees there are 9,156. So I just wanted to know has there really been a 20 percent increase in University employees.

Mr. Struecker: No, the table you are looking at is just the peninsula employees. So if you look at the – it goes down to Gilroy and goes up to San Francisco but it does not include anybody from the East Bay. So it is just the peninsula ones.

Council Member Shepherd: Okay. That helps explain that then. Then I was trying to figure out how I was supposed to correlate this. The other question I have right now is the numbers that we are looking at are 2006. How significant of a change is there from 2006 to say 2009? I do worry about that a bit as well.

Mr. Struecker: What we are looking at is location of residences of the employees. So I think that is pretty minor. People don't change their location or where they live that frequently. It is not a volume it is a percentage or a location of percentage.

Council Member Shepherd: Right. One question of our Staff. When I was chatting with our Safe Trips to School Rep for PAUSD she explained there is a two percent creep in traffic every year. Is that true or can you give me any information on that? So every year we have a two percent increase in traffic on our city streets?

Mr. Williams: Thank you Council Member Shepherd. I believe that is kind of a maximum. We have looked at the trends over time and they tend to be less than two percent. They may have a wide range to them but they averaged, I think last time we were before you we talked about like 0.6 to

1.6 kind of a range typically. It has gone higher than that from time to time.

Vice Mayor Espinosa: Just a quick question about GO Pass. I have comments about it too. So much of the transportation creative thinking focuses on GO Passes and then inherently Caltrain. There has been a lot of discussion that we have seen in recent weeks and months about the viability of Caltrain and the possibility of it not being around in one to three years. I think it is a large enough agency and there is enough commitment that it will be, but I just wonder in our planning what considerations we gave for that, and what are the Plan B options? How does that exactly work when you look at these types of studies?

Mr. Struecker: Well, the way we wrote the mitigation measure was that we needed to get to the 21.1 percent from where the transit is today. So if Caltrain wouldn't be there there would need to be a lot of head scratching on what else we would do to get to that percentage. As long as we get to that percentage somehow in non-drive alone vehicles it essentially achieves the same result. One of the things we looked at for informational purposes was remote parking lots so you intercept the traffic before it gets to the local streets. There are a lot of issues with that but maybe we have to explore that avenue a little bit more. Maybe there is an expansion of the Marguerite Shuttle that it goes around into Menlo Park and northern Mountain View, and Palo Alto, and places like that. Yes, we would need to think about that. The idea is to get that percentage. As long as you get that percentage then you get the benefits of that.

Council Member Scharff: Thank you. I actually had some technical traffic questions as well. On page 3.4-65 it says there are three feasible intersection improvements in Table 3.4-18. I only noticed two, which were 16 and 37. I could not find the third. I guess I was wondering if that was 62 because I couldn't see why 62 would not be feasible as it says the exact same thing as 37.

Mr. Struecker: Yes, 37 is feasible, and 16 is feasible. I think at one point in time we said that Bay Front, 52 was feasible and it got changed to potentially feasible because it is outside of the jurisdiction of Palo Alto. We don't have control over that intersection even though the improvement is ... So I think it is 52 that is the third feasible one.

Council Member Scharff: So 52 is feasible even though it says potentially feasible.

Mr. Struecker: Yes, we identified it as feasible in the traffic report but in the EIR, because it is in another jurisdiction they took a little bit more conservative approach.

Council Member Scharff: When you say it is in another jurisdiction you mean Menlo Park, because if it says jurisdiction – Caltrans we don't consider that to another jurisdiction, correct?

Mr. Struecker: No, because of Menlo Park.

Council Member Scharff: Then 37 that we thought was feasible was in Santa Clara County. So we are okay with that? That is not in Palo Alto.

Mr. Struecker: It is a traffic signal and pretty easy to do. So we listed that as feasible.

Council Member Scharff: So why is 62 only potentially feasible when it says the same thing as 37? I don't mean to be difficult I am just curious why it is.

Mr. Struecker: I guess because 37 is within the Stanford campus. This is part of their project. It is a good point.

Council Member Scharff: Okay. So when I see potentially feasible should I assume that there is a good likelihood these could be done, or does potentially feasible mean it is going to be difficult to do these?

Mr. Struecker: The potentially feasible ones are ones that in my opinion are highly likely. The ones that are infeasible are because of right-of-way and cost issues are much more difficult.

Council Member Scharff: What makes number 10 so difficult that it is not feasible?

Mr. Struecker: The cost and the impacts to right-of-way requirements in just creating those improvements.

Council Member Scharff: Isn't it on Stanford land? So wouldn't the right-of-way have to come from Stanford?

Mr. Struecker: Yes, it is probably mostly Stanford land, yes.

Council Member Scharff: So obtaining the right-of-way probably wouldn't be that difficult I would guess.

Mr. Struecker: Probably not. It also contradicts, as it says there in the last sentence, contradicts the City's general plan policy to do physical improvements. That is one of the reasons it is probably listed as not feasible.

Council Member Scharff: So would that be the primary reason then?

Mr. Struecker: Yes.

Council Member Scharff: Alright, thank you.

Council Member Yeh: Thank you for the presentation. I also just had some questions on Caltrain and GO Pass, and a follow up on Vice Mayor Espinosa's questions. I appreciated that the data that Stanford had shared in its presentation on understanding the SUMC employee population. I know that it carves out that 89 percent of SUMC employment base works on weekdays, but 11 percent of an increment of 2,000 still is about 220 new trips, and that is on weeknights and weekends. If I understand correctly the proposed Caltrain reduction in service kind of is concentrated within those timeframes. So I am just curious, you mentioned some head scratching that would be going on in the event that something were to happen to Caltrain service. I think we have an opportunity between the DEIR and the Final Environmental Impact Report to do some of that head scratching. I saw charter buses listed as some of the TDM program solutions. I am curious if Stanford has looked at or why have some of our local companies gone to charter bus models for the employees in different cities?

Mr. Struecker: Off the top of my head I would say it is probably a cost issue.

Council Member Yeh: Has there been a cost analysis to compare charter buses versus GO Pass?

Mr. Struecker: We have not done that as part of this work, no.

Council Member Yeh: Given the concern with the with the level of service I know because there is upwards of \$100 million dedicated to GO Pass whether or not that analysis would be merited at this stage of the Environmental Impact Report process as opposed to later on.

Mr. Struecker: Yes, we could do some more analysis to determine what charter bus have as opposed to GO Passes.

Council Member Yeh: The only reason is, I don't know for friends that work at Facebook or some of the other local companies, it sounds like it is a cool thing. So I don't know, aside from that factor I am trying to understand the economics of it and seeing if there is this opportunity to look at an alternative model. I know the intention is to get up to that percent to divert ride alone or just within car transportation is the goal. If that is the goal then fully exploring all the alternatives at this point so that it is just a smooth transition to another model if that need ever arises.

The other question I did have was about the truck routes. The Planning and Transportation Commission had mentioned that and just discussed it as part of their questions. I just wanted to see if you had any preliminary responses to the 'during construction phase,' for truck routes.

Mr. Struecker: The DEIR identifies the existing City truck routes or the City truck routes that are adopted by ordinance now, and those are the truck routes that construction traffic would have to adhere to. So that is the information that is in the DEIR right now. I believe the comment also included looking at or determining the volumes. That has not been done as part of this work. If we had some information on construction duration and the type of activity that was going on at any one point in time it could be done.

Council Member Yeh: Thank you.

Council Member Price: Thank you very much. I appreciate your presentation. A question. In the development of the Draft EIR could someone define for me 'funded improvements?' What is the duration of that assessment? The second question I have is in terms of feasibility of for instance if there were an intersection improvement, which is the lowest priority of various mitigation measures, the feasibility being engineering feasibility, funding feasibility, programmatic feasibility? There are two different types of questions. The one is how are defining funded improvement, particularly because this project is over a significant time period.

Mr. Struecker: The feasibility is probably a combination of about anything you can think of. As I mentioned, the City does have a policy against expanding roadway capacity, so there is one. Political feasibility, funding, the availability of right-of-way, the removal of several mature trees is something that goes against City policy. So I think those are the things that went into the idea of whether the improvements are feasible or not.

In terms of funding, or in terms of funded improvements, the travel model uses funded improvements. For instance, the auxiliary lanes on 101 would go into the travel model to determine the capacity of the roadways to accommodate existing and future traffic. I don't know if that answered your question or not.

Council Member Price: Yes, partially. I guess the question is when we say funded improvements again the duration or potential implementation of this project it ten or 15 years. So I guess I am trying to get a clearer understanding of what does funded improvements mean. Some of these improvements may or may not be in CIP projects, the full assessment may not have been done yet. So that was my question in terms of how we are using that phraseology.

Mr. Struecker: The only improvements that I know of that are funded or partially funded are the ones that Menlo Park included as part of their traffic impact fee. They have identified, and as I mentioned they have identified improvements that they think are feasible that we think are not feasible.

Mayor Burt: I have a couple of TDM questions for the applicant. First is regarding bus service to East Palo Alto including off peak and night hours. What service is there currently and what is planned to enhance that service?

Mr. Hamilton: At this point the nighttime service that is available during the academic year is something we call the Shopping Express, which takes students down El Camino to the San Antonio Shopping Center. We have service that provides.....

Mayor Burt: For East Palo Alto you are referring?

Mr. Hamilton: No, we don't have anything that goes beyond the train station.

Mayor Burt: So my question wasn't just what Marguerite does. What is the bus service that is being supplied? I know that SamTrans expanded that service I think some time after the cancer center went in, and I want to get the current status. My understanding is that a lot of service employees for the hospital development are from East Palo Alto. You run three shifts. There were past issues on public transit to serve those employees at off hours, and I was trying to get an update on that, and what is the baseline and what is in the plan here.

Mr. Hamilton: I don't believe there is any expanded service in the plan at this point. I could not accurately respond to what is available right now.

Mayor Burt: The other question is out of your really comprehensive trip reduction measures one that is in use in a lot of cities, some in North America but certainly more and more in Europe is the bike rental programs, and the automated systems on that. Do you have any comments on that? That is the one that we have not seen Stanford do. You have done almost everything else.

Mr. Hamilton: Well, we do it in a little different way, which is often the University way. We have a lot of programs available on the campus that are characterized as bike sharing. Right now we have about 13,000 bikes on the campus every day. Often times you will find a bike-sharing situation where you don't have bikes readily available. We do have rentals available on campus through the bike shop. We have a lot of departments that have their own departmental bike fleets that allow staff to use that. The alumni visitors' center has about 30 bikes that are available for any individual alums.

Mayor Burt: Let me in the interest of time jump to what bike sharing programs if any are planned for the hospital and the hospital expansion?

Mr. Hamilton: From what I have seen I don't think there is anything formal.

Mayor Burt: Okay. Thank you. For our environmental consultant, was there any analysis on bus service to East Palo Alto, and what mitigation measures that might provide?

Mr. Struecker: No. There was no bus service expansion to East Palo Alto of the Marguerites. No.

Mayor Burt: Okay. Then my final question. When we look at the climate impacts we are looking at vehicular CO2 emissions as one of our largest sources. That is one of the impacts that was significant beyond what could be mitigated. What is the baseline that is being used in CO2 emissions per vehicle mile traveled? Are we using 2010 average vehicle emissions and vehicle types? We have a large transformation that is occurring in vehicular travel.

Mr. Michael Hendrix, PBS&J: Good evening. I am Michael Hendrix and I was the author of the Climate Change section. The vehicle fleet that we used we got out of M-FAC for year 2010, and then future years. The vehicle fleet within that M-FAC assumes a bell-shaped curve as far as older vehicles coming up to newer vehicles. That is based off of the smog certificates that

people get for the older cars, and what they estimate the California average on the vehicle fleet is.

Mayor Burt: So that addresses the portion that has to do with the amount of emission for a vehicle that was created under older emission standards and getting those off the road and that is valuable. The thing I am focusing more on is the transformation that has been starting to happen and what is anticipated over the next ten or 20 years in significantly different emissions from vehicles. Is that factored in in any way?

Mr. Hendrix: The M-FAC model does factor in the renewing of the vehicle fleet as the years go by. So the 2025 analysis and the 2020 analysis show a newer vehicle fleet.

Mayor Burt: The new vehicle fleet, you are alluding to a newer vehicle fleet but I am trying to quickly get to the key aspect. What does that assume in a new vehicle fleet?

Mr. Hendrix: That assumes that as an example for 2020 that a certain percentage of those would be brand new vehicles. That a fairly large portion of those vehicles would be one to three years old, a significantly smaller proportion would be five years or older.

Mayor Burt: I am sorry, but that is all age. I am not getting to the point. Does it assume that among those newer vehicles that in 2025 a certain percentage are going to be hybrid, a certain percentage are going to be electric?

Mr. Hendrix: No, those are all gasoline driven vehicles. At this point it would be a little bit speculative to figure out what that ratio is. We are getting a little bit better handle on electric. Hydrogen has been slower than anticipated. We took a conservative analysis only using M-FAC, which looks at gasoline driven vehicles.

Mayor Burt: Quite conservative, thank you.

Public Hearing opened at 9:55 p.m.

Mr. Walt Hays, Palo Alto: Good evening. I am speaking as the Co-Chair of the Friends of Stanford Hospital and Clinics. I am speaking only on the issue of Sustainability. I looked back at my computer and I have been working on sustainability in Palo Alto since 1993. Back at that time June Flemming was our City Manager and she did not allow the Staff to use the word 'sustainability.'

Through some dedicated Staff people and getting the right people elected to the Council we have come a long way since that time. I worked on a lot of campaigns that helped that happen. I have also been either the Chair or a judge in Acterra's Business Environmental Awards program for many years. Corporations apply for awards in various categories including sustainability. So I can't say I am a professional on sustainability but I am certainly a dedicated volunteer.

Now with that background I would say looking at what Stanford is proposing here it is one of the strongest statements of sustainability on issues that I have ever seen. It goes far beyond legal requirements. Just to give one little example, I am also the Chair of the Sustainable Schools Committee. We were shocked when we were told, because we were starting to try to reduce energy there that Palo Alto High School uses one-third of all the electricity that is used by the entire district. We were trying to figure out why that was and it is because they have classes at night among other things. They also have a lot of old buildings that are poorly insulated, but it was the night classes that were the big factor.

Now a hospital has to operate 24 hours a day as was very briefly pointed out. So they do have some major challenges and I think they have taken incredible steps to deal with those challenges. So I hope you will recognize that in your deliberations. Thank you.

Arden Anderson, Palo Alto: Hello, my wife and I have resided and voted in Palo Alto for 36 years. This is my third time to address the Council urging the adoption of this project.

I want to first mention what a valuable resource this hospital is to our community. I have for the last five years been volunteering in the Intensive Care Units, the pediatric ICU, and the Cardiovascular ICU working with parents as their children are having heart transplants, liver transplants, and so forth. I can see the tremendous value that this institution is providing our community and our Bay Area at large and the state.

On a more personal note, 15 years ago our granddaughter was born with Biliary Atresia. Her bile ducts did not connect properly to her liver and she needed a liver transplant. I commend the Council years ago that allowed Packard Hospital to be built because we had a live-saving resource right in our backyard. We did not have to go to Pittsburg, Pennsylvania, which was the center of excellence for liver transplants at that time. Our granddaughter has now completed her freshman year in high school, and for that we are eternally grateful.

The last point I want to make is what seems to be lost in all of this is the seismic retrofit that is mandated by the state. As I say, this is my third time to come before the Council asking for passage of this plan. The first time was in 2007, three years ago. Most experts predict not if we have another earthquake, it is when we are going to have another earthquake. So over the three years the Earth has been moving and I would like to see the City Council move a little faster, and stay ahead of the Earth so we don't have a catastrophic earthquake that will take lives. Thank you.

Mayor Burt: I should have clarified for speakers that this evening our comments are focused on the Draft Environmental Impact Report and the three areas related to Transportation, Climate Change, and Air Quality. We will have a whole series of additional hearings including as we go to the Development Agreement where there will be additional opportunities to speak on the merits of the project as a whole. Just as an encouragement to the speakers to focus on those three aspects of the DEIR.

Ray Bacchetti, Palo Alto: Thank you for that clarification. I will come back another time.

Mayor Burt: You will be welcome. Paula Sandas followed by Harry Dennis.

Paula Sandas, CEO, Palo Alto Chamber of Commerce: I am following in Mr. Bacchetti's footsteps. Thanks.

Mayor Burt: You are inspirational. Harry Dennis followed by Hal Mickelson.

Harry Dennis, Palo Alto: Mayor Burt and Members of the Council, thank you for giving me this opportunity to comment on the proposed updating and expansion of the hospitals nearby. I don't take any credit for it, but I was born at Hoover Pavilion. I grew up in Palo Alto, and nearby. I have been practicing pediatrics at the Palo Alto Medical Foundation for just about 20 years now. Before going to medical school I worked for a rabble-rousing group up in San Francisco called Friends of the Earth. So issues of growth and the impact of development on our quality of live have always been important to me, and continue to be so.

I have reviewed a summary of the Draft EIR and I do see that we can expect some adverse impacts from the project not all of which can be fully mitigated. As I ride my bicycle around town, I bike to work, I see the Marguerite buses, and I know that they are doing what they can there. My daughter, who is currently an employee at Stanford, I could never get her to ride her bike to high school but she rides her bike to Stanford because it

costs her too much to drive and she gets a little extra money if she rides her bike.

I do believe that environmental impacts need to be balanced against other community needs. Living next door to Stanford it is easy to become complacent about the quality of care to which we all have access. We all benefit from the proximity to the pioneering care they have. To have a child go home two days after repair of a ventricular septal defect, a congenital heart defect, would have been unthinkable 15 years ago, but it is routine now. The team there is excellent overall and in many cases second to none.

I have had many times when patient's surgeries have needed to be delayed because of lack of space in the operating rooms. We have patients who sit in the emergency room sometimes for 16 or 20 hours waiting for a space to open up in the hospital. Stanford has done what they can by opening space at El Camino Hospital to help out but if you are a Palo Alto parent with a very sick child you don't want the added stress of having to drive down to Mountain View when you go back and forth between your home and seeing your sick child. So I hope that we will be able to get approval of the expanded capacity that they need. It does serve a larger community than just Palo Alto but the only way that we are going to have the kind of quality that we get there is by having an institution, which draws from a larger area. Thank you.

Hal Mickelson, Palo Alto: Thank you for the opportunity to comment this evening. Like many other residents I am impressed by the effort and thoughtfulness that has gone into these sections of the EIR. I believe the Council should be confident that the hospital and its advisors are dealing with the potential impacts and mitigations in these three areas very thoughtfully and very creatively.

To me it is worth noting that Stanford has earned a high degree of credibility with its very well established record of Transportation Demand Management, providing the Marguerite Shuttle, which is a great resource and notable in comparison with what other institutions are doing, and also, promoting the use of bicycles, Caltrain, and other forms of transit. In my view the credibility that the University has earned in these areas carries over to Stanford's commitments regarding high Energy Star scores, use of green and recycled materials, green roofing, rainwater harvesting, and all of the rest. So I believe the Council should have a high degree of confidence in this process. I believe that Stanford deserves the credibility that it has earned. Thank you.

Michael Griffin, Palo Alto: Mayor and Council Members good evening. I have several questions concerning the adequacy of the Medical Center DEIR relating to traffic impacts. First, Stanford knows the home location of all its employees by zip code both on the peninsula as well as in the East Bay. There is no attempt to correlate the East Bay zip code data with the Traffic Demand Management scheme. The mitigation proposal as you know is Caltrain-centric only helping peninsula employees living in a city served by Caltrain. Question: why is there not a similar solution for East Bay employees to financially assist them in riding East Bay transit thus keeping cars off peninsula roads?

Secondly, why is there no analysis on whether Caltrain will have the financial ability to deliver the required new capacity to make a go of the GO Pass? Why propose a Caltrain mitigation that is beyond Stanford's ability to deliver it? Will there in fact even be a Caltrain when we need it? Why then is there no discussion of a backup plan should Caltrain for whatever reason be unable to perform?

Thirdly, the trip distribution map on page 48 shows that the majority of regional traffic attempts to access Stanford from the east, basically, exiting off 101 and then sifting westward through the neighborhoods until finally reaching Stanford. Why doesn't the DEIR suggest incentivizing motorists to access Stanford off of Highway 280 in the west? Why wouldn't offsite park and ride lots at SLAC and behind the berry farm for example be of benefit in accomplishing this? Why was there no discussion of encouraging the use of western access thereby avoiding traffic impacts throughout Menlo Park and Palo Alto?

Fourth, why is offsite parking classified as an alternative to the GO Pass rather than as an adjunct to it? Especially considering the uncertainty of the Caltrain solution it seems this would make an excellent plan B.

Lastly, why is there no discussion of the no net new trips? No net new trips are a requirement of Stanford's General Use Permit. Why doesn't the DEIR discuss the applicability of this requirement to the Medical Center? The Medical Center is Stanford, is it not? Thank you.

Traci Fallecker: Good evening. I am a nurse at Stanford. I was here two years ago in support of our doctors and nurses to tell you how badly we needed a new hospital. I left very confident that the leaders in this community knew how important it was and how it was the sooner the better. Then when I caught up with my friends later on who are business owners here in Palo Alto they pretty much laughed at me saying nothing moves through the muck. I am here because I am still confident that we are going

to be able to move this through before, as the other gentlemen had mentioned, some catastrophic earthquake decides to hit us.

So I have worked at 21 hospitals and healthcare facilities in this country as a travel nurse. I have to tell you that Stanford delivers probably the best care in this country if not the world. I find it incredibly shameful that the City has not quite embraced it and the need for a new building. It is interesting we are asked what can you do for us besides possibly save your life. I am trying to find a reasonable explanation for what the holdup is, and though I very much appreciate all the information that the EIR has provided, I myself like to work, I think the EIR is somewhere around 900 and some pages, took two and a half years to formulate, and I realize we are talking about Sustainability and Transportation. I wasn't here for the Housing piece and I do apologize, but what I could understand from it is the EIR stated that there will be no adverse affects on housing. Yet we are still being asked to pay money for that. I found out that the hospitals are actually offering \$23.1 million despite the fact that we are exempt from doing so.

So I am a little confused as to why the hospital is continuing to be asked for things other than to provide excellent healthcare to you and your families. I am also curious to know in the EIR that there is graph to show how many more lives would actually be saved if we could keep the ED open. Because we have to close it several times because we are full. So I appreciate all your time and effort. I think making a decision and moving this through a little bit sooner rather than later is very important. Thank you.

Caren Chappell, Palo Alto: I live in the south of Palo Alto. I do most of my local transporting of myself by bicycle. I don't go to Stanford very often. I have not been there since I was sick and that was now more than five years. I like to see the emphasis on bicycle transportation. Possibly not real helpful for acute care patients but certainly for families and for people who are just going for medical appointments. Thank you.

Alan Grundmann, Palo Alto: I too came here with the idea of speaking I guess off point. So I won't bore you with it, except to tell you that I was going to compliment the new Council on a professional, business-like interactive way of dealing with Stanford, instead of debating. We are all in this together. So keep it up.

Michele Grundmann, Palo Alto: Good evening. I will be a neighbor to come over time because next week I shall be in the hospital at Stanford to acquire a brand new knee. I just wanted to say that the Stanford Hospital has been wonderful. We have lived in Palo Alto for 49 years next month. The hospital was two years old and was a formidable asset at the time. I think really now

a renovation and a replacement of some buildings is absolutely a must. I hope that it will be done well before I go to some other place. This is what I want to say. Also, I feel optimistic because what I heard tonight from these people who worked very, very hard and planning the construction of the new hospitals really I was dazzled by what goes on, and water conservation, the green space allocation, the GO Pass. I happen to be a great fan of Caltrain. I think that is great. Thank you.

Nancy Peterson, Palo Alto: Good evening. Palo Alto has been my home for almost 20 years. I am strong supporter of the hospital renewal project and I wanted to be here this evening specifically because I am also an advocate for alternative transportation.

I have worked on the Stanford campus for the past four years. Like many people here this evening I ride my bike to work. For me it is unless the weather is really lousy, and when it is I take the Marguerite, which is just a great shuttle system. I was really glad to see the Draft EIR has such a thorough analysis on traffic impacts. I was really actually surprised that the mitigations can really neutralize the impacts for local intersections.

Of the many positive things in the Draft EIR and certainly as part of the Development Agreement the hospitals have offered a lot of improvements. I wanted to point out the ones that I think are important for cyclists and pedestrians. A couple of those are along Quarry Road and the Everett Undercrossing. These measures I think are really important because they are going to give those of us who bike and ride the confidence that we can do that safely.

On the subject of bicycle safety, I think some of you know that I suffered a pretty serious accident on my bike almost three years ago today. It was at a time that quite fortunately for me the Stanford emergency room had space for me and could admit me. We all know that I couldn't take it for granted then and we can't take it for granted now, the reason we are all here tonight is because the emergency department needs to be expanded. The bottom line is the hospital needs to be safe for the next earthquake. Thank you very much.

Boyd Smith, Palo Alto: I won't be here next week. I think my comments touch on the major subject but I perhaps will go a little bit off. I have lived in Palo Alto since 1956. I have been admitted to the Stanford Hospital three times, one very serious. Most of our children and many of grandchildren were born in Lucile Packard Children's Hospital. On two occasions there were serious complications. My parents were both treated at Stanford and I

have been down to the emergency room with them and others many, many times.

Several weeks ago I made a visit to the Stanford Hospital to a very prominent member of this community who has made an enormous contribution to this City. He had been admitted for serious medical reasons. He had been there for some time. As I left I thought, my goodness, how grateful I am to be close to the Stanford Hospital when something serious occurs.

I have heard and read that there are those in this community who would like a smaller hospital, one that doesn't have to be large and not so comprehensive in its medical capabilities. Such a smaller hospital would generate less traffic, less pollution, require less housing, employ fewer people, and therefore be more convenient and less disruptive to their lives. They believe it is a bother, an inconvenience to have such a preeminent medical center in their midst. When they talk about that I think about the definition between a major and minor operation. A minor operation is when it is on someone else. A major is when it is on you.

I submit that when complex medical issues confront you or those you love you will want to be very close to Stanford Hospital and Lucile Packard Hospital. Traffic and housing and pollution issues will fade into insignificance. You will want the best and the brightest and that is what Stanford offers.

One more thought. I am aware there are many among us who would look at Stanford as a cow to be milked. The hospital expansion is an opportunity to help Palo Alto deal with its own financial problems that are unrelated to this renovation and expansion. I hope you won't let those ideas creep into your decisions, and will resist the urge to take advantage as some would do to play Stanford's dependence upon Palo Alto for all it's worth. Thank you.

Norman Beamer, Palo Alto: Thank you. I am President of the Crescent Park Neighborhood Association. I am confident that most of the Crescent Park residents are very supportive of the expansion of Stanford and think very highly of it, much along the lines of some of the speakers here tonight.

On the other hand, the people in the neighborhood are concerned about traffic. So we want to make sure that the proper mitigation measures are taken. Given the uncertainty of Caltrans and the uncertainty of traffic predictions I would like to suggest a mitigation measure that might be considered. That is a technological solution, which has been tried for example in London. The EIR talks about traffic adaptive signal lights but I

have in mind something like what the City of London does to manage traffic congestion. I would like to handout this brochure, if I may, which describes it. So if I run out of time at least you will know what I am talking about.

In London there is a congestion control area and any nonexempt car that enters must pay a daily fee. There are hundreds of TV cameras in the area that take pictures of the license plates, which are electronically scanned and identified. The owner of any car that is detected that hasn't paid the fee is charged extra. Apparently this system is very accurate.

This might be used in the hospital situation as follows. Hospital employees who drive from outside the city would be told to approach the hospital via routes or during time periods that minimize congestion. Stanford would provide the City with the license plates of the employees, the cameras would monitor for compliance, and noncompliance would result in extra payments by Stanford to the City. That is one way I think that might ensure that the traffic is mitigated to the maximum extent possible.

It is true, Palo Alto enjoys the benefits of the hospital but so does the whole area, the whole state, the whole country, but we are bearing the costs and the detriment. So we ought to be entitled to get them mitigated to the maximum extent possible. Thank you.

Stephanie Munoz, Palo Alto: Good evening Mayor Burt and Council Members. In listening to previous speakers I was reinforced in my thought that we need a somewhat richer context and a somewhat more holistic acceptance of the problems and the possibilities of a wonderful new hospital in our midst. I don't think it will work to move them, to try to fragment the problems, which are interrelated.

Although, for Transportation specific, so I intend to speak about something else but I hope I won't take more than three minutes. Anyway, as for bicycles I am here to tell you that last summer my kids went up to a place called Sun River, which is their idea of recreation. I tried out bicycles for the first time in many years. I would like everybody to know it is not as easy to ride a bicycle as you might think. Many of the people who come to the hospital they are obviously not going to be able to ride bicycles, but nobody expects them to. It is the workers that a very rosy expectation that they will ride any bicycles. But furthermore, you have no way of knowing that the cities and the other entities are going to cooperate. With all praise that we give to those worthy's that ride the bicycles, Caltrain tells them after soliciting their business frequently that they can't get on the train with their bicycles. These are people that are going to work. I really do not understand how Caltrain gets away with that. I don't understand how a

person – however, Stanford could do one thing and should do one thing, and it is really very easy. They should run a jitney for the late, late hour people, the midnight people, and the seven in the morning people who will not be taken care of by any other kind of transportation, to East Palo Alto, which is the main part of their low-income employees. You may wonder sometimes when you hear the Democrats talking about the minimum wage and how they have made it seven dollars an hour. Who works for seven dollars or eight dollar an hour? It is hospital employees. They do not live in Burlingame. They do not live in San Mateo. As for people changing their residence to take these new jobs it is not going to be Google employees who ride bicycles actually, who make \$60,000 or \$80,000 a year and have been laid off. It is not going to be those people.

Second point. As to the other qualities faced by the EIR that Palo Alto is concerned with they are all related in that they all take money. Palo Alto has many good ideas about how to improve the quality of life and the quality of air in spite of increased density. They are not going to take place without any money. The simple fact is that Stanford, wonderful though it is, we have degrees in our family from Stanford, more than one. Wonderful thought it is Stanford is a moneymaking enterprise. It is a big money-making enterprise. They have managed to work the mixed up health system so that somebody is coming out on the top and it is Stanford. Well, okay.

When you allow Stanford to build a tall building, taller than this building, I thought that was sort of undiplomatic. When you do you are giving Stanford the square feet that for ordinary people would be spread out over a much, much wider area. A million square feet approximates about half of the Downtown business area. That is millions of dollars a month in rents that Stanford can then collect from doctors, lawyers, pharmacies, Silicon Valley entrepreneurs because they don't have to use up their other space for that density. It is a practical way to do it. I want to remind you however that this very Council, well the Council once before, went that Jewish Community Center-living center opened they were not allowed to go another flight up. I stood here and said you know those elderly people will find it much more practical to go up and down in an elevator than to walk with their walkers long distances, and they were not allowed to go up over that amount, nor were the parking garages. I think Stanford ought to go up because it is more practical, but they also ought to give back to the community the open space that they are being able to add to their financial profit.

Tom Jordan, Palo Alto: Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council. I want to address the Transportation section only. The Transportation section is 87 pages and there is not one word in the 87 pages about one of the most significant things that should have been mentioned and dealt with. That is

Stanford's 2000 General Use Permit that it obtained from the County. Now why is that important? It is because it is a project that is even bigger, if you can imagine, than this hospital project before you. It is 2, 035,000 square feet of academic space, 3,018 living units, 2,000 for students, 350 for medical students and postdoctorals, and 668 for faculty. That equates to about 5,000 new people on campus. That is 5,000 new people more. What is in front of you is 2,242. So it is really much bigger. Now why is it important? Well, number one it is only about half built. So there is more to come. If it is only half built why isn't it discussed?

Secondly, there are quite a few things in the Permit from the County, 36 pages. There are quite a few things that Stanford is required to do. It would be nice to know that they have done them. Now on how much is built and have they done them I have inquiries myself on those points, but a single citizen shouldn't have to do that. It should be in the EIR and it isn't. I say its absence makes it inadequate.

Probably the most important thing being inadequate is the structure that the County Board of Supervisors imposed on Stanford at the time it gave them this General Use Permit. It is 36 pages and nine pages have to do with transportation. On page 13 there is a requirement of no net new trips. Now that is something that the Board of Supervisors imposed on Stanford even though they don't own many intersections, and they don't have urban populations near Stanford. You do. If the Board of Supervisors imposed it and imposed it with teeth, on page 16 it says if you don't comply you actually have to stop construction. So it is not only a requirement but it is one with teeth. So what I would suggest is that perhaps it is not an inadequacy of the EIR but you should have from your Staff why your requirement is not the same as the County's. There is an interrelation. For instance in 2005 Stanford was within just a few trips of violating that. We saw in the screen tonight 776 more commute hour trips. They were within 14 trips in 2005. There needs to be an interrelation of those two things and there isn't. Thank you.

Robert Moss, Palo Alto: Thank you Mayor Burt and Council Members. I am concerned about the traffic and Transportation issues but they also spillover to Air Quality and Climate Control. The number of additional cars, over 10,000 a day, is going to have some significant impacts on generation of carbon dioxide, it is going to hurt the atmosphere, and it is going to also make it more difficult to achieve climate control.

So why do we have these problems and how do we resolve them? Well, the mitigations that Stanford is proposing for traffic I think in many cases are dubious. We have heard about the problems with Caltrain and the fact that

the proposals may not actually be viable five years from now. Caltrain may not even be here but there are other issues. We talked about some of them like not having transportation to East Palo Alto, nothing to the East Bay. The distribution of employees they have today is not necessarily the distribution they are going to have five or ten years from now. Because somebody happens to live in Burlingame and go down to Stanford today doesn't mean that five years from now they aren't going to be someplace else. Let me give you an example. Years ago my secretary lived in Mountain View. They rented a house and worked in Palo Alto. They had an opportunity to buy a house in Tracy. So they moved out of Mountain View and moved to Tracy and commuted 45 minutes each way into Palo Alto. You may find people doing that in the future. Nobody knows where the new 2,000 to 2,500 employees they are going to hire are going to be living. So the projections for being able to mitigate traffic I think are very optimistic.

When the Stanford project was proposed years ago, going on five years ago, things were different than they are in the hospital business today. Let me give you an example. *New York Times* had a very interesting article in yesterday's paper about how hospitals are using new techniques based on kaizen. It is called CPI or Continuous Performance Improvement. The automotive and aerospace industries have been this. The hospital they gave as an example is Seattle's Children's Hospital. Let me give you some of the things they have been able to do. By using this, and only in the last couple of years, they have been able to eliminate \$180 million in capital improvements. They were able to increase the number of patients they saw each year from 27,000 a year to 38,000. They were able to reduce hospital stays from 20 days to ten. MRI examinations, which took as long as 25 days for non-emergencies are now one or two days. There were able to reduce the amount of transportation of patients along the hospital corridors to get from the beds to the operating rooms and care areas. These ways of improving performance have been proven. This is just one hospital that is doing it. They gave a number of others, Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center in Boston, Park Nicollet Health Services in Minneapolis, Virginia Mason Medical Center in Seattle. All of these hospitals have successfully adopted CPI in just the last couple of years and found they have been much more efficient, and needed much smaller hospital facilities in order to operate. This is new.

Stanford should be looking at these new techniques and approaches and seeing if they really need to expand as much, to have as many additional rooms, to have the hospital configuration that they are proposing in light of these new technologies. In this article they talk about how literally hundreds of representatives of hospitals all over the country have come to Seattle to look at how well it is working. This is not theoretical. This is actual and this

effective. So I think it is time for everybody, Stanford and the City, to step back and see if the scope of expansion is really necessary if something like CPI was adopted, and is as effective as some of these other hospitals have found it is. I will leave this with the City Clerk and she can pass it around for you to take a look at.

Public Hearing closed as 10:34 p.m.

Mayor Burt: Thank you. So before we begin Council discussion and comments I should say it is after 10:30. We have several other items on our agenda. Mr. City Manager, you were suggesting to me a moment ago that we might have some alternatives on how we could arrange the schedule. Next week we have what appears to be a lighter schedule. The Stanford item is on Seismicity, Hydrology, Hazardous Materials, and Utilities, which are probably inherently much less contentious and complicated than the ones that we are addressing tonight. This is both first a question for you and then for colleagues whether we should rollover this segment wrapping it up next week on these three items, or alternately look at postponing any items that remain on the agenda for tonight. Does Staff have any comments before we hear from colleagues?

Mr. Keene: Mr. Mayor, I think you expressed it well. I guess you would know better how to assess how long you would continue to discuss the current item tonight, and you can see what else you have on your agenda. As it relates to next week separate from a Closed Session we really have just Consent items, the Stanford EIR item that the Mayor mentioned, Review of Project Safety Net Community Task Force Report, and then the Update on High-Speed Rail, essentially the extension to the Capital Advocates contract, which we don't think would be very complicated. So to the extent that that helps you sort of figure out how to apportion items between the remainder of tonight, and next Monday.

Council Member Scharff: I think we should finish this item up as it is somewhat technical. I know at least I forget things after week.

Mayor Burt: Okay, so if we go that route we have to face the reality of what remains in Items 5 and 6 really, 7 should be very brief, and the Consent should be brief.

MOTION: Council Member Scharff moved, seconded by Council Member XXX to move Agenda Item Nos. 5 and 6 to July 19, 2010.

MOTION FAILED FOR LACK OF A SECOND

Mayor Burt: Do we have any other suggestions other than staying here past midnight?

Council Member Schmid: What about setting a deadline of say 11:30 and at 11:15 we can decide where we are and complete what we can do.

Mayor Burt: Well, if this item continues until 11:30 then I would expect that we are going to be here after midnight. My question is what would we stop?

Council Member Schmid: My suggestion is we go to 11:15, stop at that point, and say do we want to continue this, do we want to complete it, and move everything else.

Mayor Burt: Okay. Are any of the other items time sensitive of Items 5, 6, or 7?

Mr. Keene: I am looking to see whether there is anything on Item 7. I am assuming the Consent Calendar could be passed given that there are some time sensitive items on that.

Council Member Shepherd: Does this mean that if we don't get to the rest of the business by 11:15 then we will not? Because it is very important to me to see number 5 and number 6 addressed this evening?

Mayor Burt: That's right. We really have a choice as best I can estimate it between deferring the balance of this item or getting to Items 5 and 6.

Council Member Shepherd: Then I would like to see us get to Items 5 and 6.

Council Member Holman: My concern about not finishing this item tonight, and I am understanding about the need and desire to hear a couple of other items, my concern about not finishing this item tonight is a balance between us being fresh enough to do a good job, but when we continued a Stanford item once before it got short shrift at the second meeting. So how do we best balance that? Do we have a notion of how long 5 and 6 would take this evening?

Mr. Keene: Mr. Mayor I can tell you that Item 7 we can just automatically carryover to next week.

Mayor Burt: Okay. I would say 5 and 6 would take a moderate amount of time. I think we need to be realistic. Maybe they will take less than we budget for. There are pros and cons to each. I know my mind is focused on

this right now, but we have I think realistically that choice. If we want to proceed on this item we could go at 11:15 and look at where we go from there. I would estimate that we have 45 minutes in the other items if we move them along pretty quickly. Okay, so then let's go ahead. I think if everyone can try to be as succinct as possible.

This process, just to remind everyone and this goes for the Council Members as well it is not about commenting extensively on the merits of the project. If we can just focus on specific elements to the Draft EIR that we think should be addressed differently from what is already in there that is really the task before us.

Council Member Price: Thank you. I wanted to follow up on comments made by several colleagues. Within the Draft EIR I do think there needs to be a more thorough and complete assessment of the issue of the future of Caltrain and how in fact that will impact the opportunity to expand the GO Pass option. Clearly the TDM measures are very critical to this whole project. It seems to me that there needs to be a section within the Draft that talks about some of the uncertainties around funding and operations of Caltrain. Related to that, I think there needs to be language in the Draft EIR and perhaps the Development Agreement that specifically defines the problem as that is emerging over the next few years, and clearly identifies the process that will be used to come up with alternatives, alternative transportation options that will be able to make up for and address the issue of capacity. What I am suggesting is that if in fact the Caltrain services are reduced or eliminated what will be the alternatives that are viable, that are feasible, and that are fundable to provide this option to reduce trips in single occupancy vehicles.

I think if the Draft EIR does not address this I think it is really woefully incomplete because this issue is not going to be determined in a year or two. It is something that we are going to have to have a plan that is clear in terms of addressing these problems if they emerge. So that would be my recommendation.

The other thing is any reference to Palo Alto Shuttle I think we need to look at one of recent budget items and actions to make sure any language around Palo Alto Shuttle reflects current actions by the City Council, and to recognize that the evolution of that service we can't say with specific certainty which way we are going. I personally would like to see it expanded, absolutely, but we have to have the ability and the resources to do that.

So those are my two major points. I appreciate the work that has gone into the preparation of the Draft EIR and all the consultants and Staff, thank you.

Council Member Holman: This is quite a major undertaking and I appreciate all the additional effort that has gone into it. I have a question that may relate to the emission offsets that the Commission referred to. They relate to both traffic and to air quality. If there are intersections that don't reach the significant unavoidable impact because of the failing grade of those intersections, can we do I guess it would be an offset to that to require improvements at other intersections that would improve the air quality because of the emissions put out by the traffic? I don't know if that is a CEQA directly related issue or if that is something we would have to determine outside of CEQA.

Cara Silver, Senior Assistant City Attorney: The air quality impacts are not necessarily linked to particular intersections. So that doesn't seem to be an appropriate offset.

Council Member Holman: But there is an accumulation of them. So you don't see any way though that we could address those in a cumulative way as part of the DEIR or EIR?

Mr. Jeung: Maybe I can try clarifying a little bit for Council Member Holman. The issues that you are identifying at the local intersections where we have congestion and there are air quality related emissions, those emissions are considered localized emissions related to carbon monoxide. The emissions that are more related to the longer distances and the traveling along major corridors are other types of criteria pollutants. So the mitigation measures that would be effective for the intersections don't necessarily relate to those other emissions that are being considered as part of the longer trips.

Council Member Holman: Actually, that was a question I had too. On the analysis it talks about how I think it was less than significant impact as a result of low speeds traveled and congested areas. I think it is a comment you can address later. . I wasn't understanding how it will be a much more congested area, how that could be a less than significant impact when we are obviously going to have much more congested intersections.

In the air quality impact was the removal of the trees that are a part of the current preferred Tree Preservation Alternative, was the removal of those trees and the air quality impact of those removals considered as part of the Air Quality Analysis? I don't believe it was.

Mr. Jeung: You are correct. It was not included.

Council Member Holman: It seems as though it should be since those large trees do contribute quite a bit to purifying the air.

Parking and counting trips. It has been perhaps generations long, but certainly a decade's long issue of overflow parking in the College Terrace neighborhood. I am wondering if Staff has any count on how much of that spillover parking that is Stanford related, how that relates to the number of trips that actually occur going to Stanford. In other words, people stop in the College Terrace neighborhood and then take a bicycle or bus onto the Stanford campus. So those trips are not necessarily counted. Maybe Staff has some count of how much of the parking in College Terrace neighborhood is Stanford related because those are trips.

Something that is often overlooked and it seems to be overlooked now is the impacts of mitigations. Several of the mitigations for Air Quality have to do with watering of construction sites, and I will just use that one as an example. That construction is going to go on for a good number of years so it is an awful lot of water that is going to be consumed to keep construction dust down, again as an example. Is that water use considered as a part of the water impacts? I will stop there for now.

Council Member Schmid: Good data makes good decisions. The assumptions in the traffic model seriously understate future traffic growth. According to the Palo Alto traffic model that is used in the DEIR almost 85 percent of the traffic increase between 2005 and 2025 in eight intersections surrounding the Medical Center project will come from "other baseline growth." At the extreme, the traffic model says that the intersection of Durand and Welch, an intersection that doesn't exist today and only will be built to help the Medical Center, only eight percent of future traffic will be accounted for by the new project. Yet this is a project that will be increasing parking places from today's 932 to 2,985.

The assumptions embedded in the model that produce such a hard to believe outcome are that baseline growth comes from ABAG, and is driven by the California Department of Finance's Population Forecast. This state cohort component model forecasts future growth on the basis of past statewide demographic patterns and then allocates that total among regions to regional councils such as ABAG.

ABAG is distributing the State's high population jobs and housing forecasts through a statewide allocation formula. Thus Palo Alto's traffic model "baseline forecast" already includes growth extrapolated from the existing jobs/housing ratios. That is most new ABAG extrapolated jobs in the

Stanford core are baseline. The only other identified major cause of significant growth near the Medical Center project is the expansion of the main campus northward toward Sand Hill Road but they are under a no net new trip agreement.

Please, come back to us with a traffic model that contains clear, understandable, and reasonable assumptions about traffic impacts, and that does not use ABAG extrapolations as their baseline assumption.

Council Member Scharff: Thank you. I had a couple of comments on the traffic again. I do think that traffic is the thing that most concerns me about this project in terms of affecting the quality of life in Palo Alto. So one of my concerns is when we look at the intersection improvement, which is that most of them were written as not feasible, and yet four of them are in Menlo Park and Menlo Park says they are feasible. If Menlo Park says they are feasible I think we should rethink that and think they are feasible.

Then I was also somewhat concerned that some of the ones in Palo Alto are considered unfeasible because of Policy T-27 in our general plan. There may be some good reasons to have that policy for a number of projects. However, the Stanford project is different. We have recognized that the Stanford project is different in that we are going to look closely at removing the 50-foot height limit just for this project. Just like that, we should probably not apply Policy T-27, which is increasing road capacity. Where can increase capacity, which is fixing the intersection is deemed increasing road capacity as far as I can tell on this, we should do that. We should make traffic flow as smoothly as possible. Not to do that in this opportunity seems to me to be a fairly silly thing to not do.

So I am hopeful when we look back at this EIR and look at the Final EIR we can look at those and try and get those done and not say that they are infeasible just solely because we have a policy. If we are going to look at other policies we can look at this policy as well. I think that should be a Council decision at the end of the day.

The next concern I had on this was it talks about the fair share that Stanford would only have to pay the fair share. Now obviously I only think Stanford should have to pay their fair share in things, but on the other hand I want to make sure that these traffic improvements get done. Maybe you give a little explanation because I am not sure I understand what that means. Does that mean that none of these could be done if there is not money available? How are we going to determine what a fair share is? What this means? How do we ensure as Council that this happens so we don't have these unmitigated traffic impacts?

Ms. Silver: I am happy to answer it Council Member Scharff. There are two different ways to approach fair share allocation. One is to have the applicant fund 100 percent of the improvements, and then as other projects come online the future developers will reimburse the applicant. The other approach is to accumulate money from this applicant and future applicants and when it is fully funded then perform the improvements at that time.

Council Member Scharff: Would Council be making that decision then or how do we see that going? Is that a question that will come up and we will vote on that at some point?

Ms. Silver: Yes, that will be defined in the mitigation measures.

Council Member Scharff: So when the EIR itself comes out will there be dollar amounts associated with this so we have a sense of what these improvements will cost Stanford, and how much we are voting? Obviously that plays some role in this.

Ms. Silver: To the extent financial feasibility is going to be an issue we will attempt to cost those out in the Final EIR. Not all mitigation measures are costed out in the EIR.

Council Member Scharff: I noticed there weren't other traffic improvements that may affect us, and one of them that came to mind was obviously when you drive down Embarcadero it narrows to three lanes under the bridge and then it goes back to four. If you ever are around on game day you clearly see it would be nicer to have four lanes there. So I guess the question is do we look at any of those kinds of traffic improvements or are they just cost prohibitive or we just didn't look at them because of our Council Policy T-27?

Mr. Williams: Yes, Council Member Scharff, there in that one particular instance particularly with Embarcadero that was not looked at because there no significant impacts identified to address. So it may be something that again in a bigger sense is useful to address in some way, but as far as being a mitigation measure it wasn't really triggered by the significance criteria to go there.

Council Member Scharff: Right, fair enough. I just meant that as an example of the kind of thing. I was asking if there were roadway segments, because I think there were a few roadway segments here for instance that are immitigable according to the EIR. My question was if Embarcadero was immitigable that would be something we would look at. My question was, not having driven those roads every day, Embarcadero comes to mind, are

there things in the City of Palo Alto that we didn't look at that we could have done or outside the City of Palo Alto on some of those segments that would fix those problems of those immitigable roads that we could do?

Ms. Silver: Council Member Scharff, I don't believe we had any immitigable impacts to roadway segments in Palo Alto. Certainly in Menlo Park.

Council Member Scharff: We had it in Menlo Park, right?

Ms. Silver: Right.

Council Member Scharff: I guess then my question is on those Menlo Park roadway segments are there things that could be done to increase capacity that would mitigate that area that we didn't look at for some reason, or is it just not possible to do it?

Ms. Silver: To my understanding, Menlo Park is taking up this issue at their next meeting and Menlo Park City Council will be reevaluating their existing policies and looking at that issue pretty closely.

Council Member Scharff: Alright. I also wanted to comment briefly on Mayor Burt's comments about electric cars and hybrids. I tend to agree that clearly we are going to make much more of a transition by 2025 to that. Was it just a matter of being more conservative or would it be inappropriate to do some sort of an analysis where you look at that, where it would basically show that as an impact? I know that when I drive around Palo Alto I see probably one out of ten cars is a Prius.

Mr. Hendrix: Currently we don't have good statistics on the growth of hybrids, or more particularly on the growth of electric vehicles or hydrogen vehicles. So it would be hard, without being speculative, to figure out what that growth would be. That would be something – a whole other study that would need to be done to augment the greenhouse gas analysis.

Mr. Jeung: Let me go ahead and interject that just as Council Member Scharff has suggested on other comments and Council Member Price, we can introduce information to acknowledge that there is a trend that is occurring, and that the analysis that is currently included in the environmental document is particularly conservative. To the extent that we can provide some information that suggests and indicates how the car fleet is changing we can certainly do that.

Council Member Yeh: I think I just wanted to start off with my comments. I did want to echo some of the comments that were shared by members of

the public just about the sustainability measures that have been proposed by Stanford. I think it is to be commended with some of the thoughtfulness that has been put into some of the measures.

I think from a height perspective there is a visual impact. But when you have the different viewing perspectives of the proposed hospitals and buildings you do see the intention for this holistic environment for healing. When you have living roofs or you have views for patients that objective is not lost on me, where the primary function of the hospital is for this healing environment. So I do want to commend Stanford for coming forward with those designs

My questions remain on the Transportation side. In terms of prioritizing I know we have talked about traffic adaptive signal technology, and new pedestrian and bike under-crossings, TDM measures, and intersection improvements. I am just curious as it comes forward how the cost analysis will relate to this prioritization and seeing the effects on mitigation the traffic impacts. If that level of detail will come back in the next round for the Final EIR, and I would be interested in seeing that. I think the reason being that just as all of the impacts are seen and the potential solutions have been identified, to start tying these particular solutions kind of going outwards from the project, those intersections immediately surrounding the project all the way out to where we have a kind of impact on our streets and under our authority within the City of Palo Alto, and those that are regional. Just tying really specific options and allowing for some policy input on those would be really beneficial. I think it is helpful where creating options really does allow for different perspectives to get onboard with different potential mixes of solutions. I think that will be really important as we get closer to our Development Agreement and a final decision on what the project mitigations are versus what we are determining are within our Development Agreement to see what – we need to maximize flexibility in a collaborative process.

Under Sustainability I do have one question. I just don't recall, I wonder if Staff can remind me who handles the hospital's garbage and solid waste. I just don't remember.

Ms. Silver: That is within Palo Alto's service area. So Green Waste picks up the solid waste.

Council Member Yeh: Is there going to be any additional analysis on that coming forward in a future session for us to discuss? With the expansion of the hospital my assumption is that there is going to be some impact on solid waste. I know that there is hazardous waste associated with some and just

want to make sure we have an opportunity to understand some of those streams.

Ms. Silver: Yes, some of that analysis is already contained in the EIR. There certainly was landfill capacity analysis discussed in the EIR, and there is also some hazardous materials discussion in the EIR.

Council Member Yeh: That was the extent of our opportunity to discuss some of this, just making sure that we understand the level of proposed participation within some of the zero waste goals that Palo Alto in terms of its policy? I don't know if that is a future session that you envision? I see some nods.

Mr. Williams: Yes, Council Member Yeh we did discuss it and that is in Utilities. So that is next week's session.

Council Member Shepherd: I will speed-talk then. First off I wanted to acknowledge, a couple of times Stanford has not only in the Draft EIR, but then even this evening talked about expanding the Marguerite service. That is something that I am pretty darn passionate about. Just looking at the location of how many people live in the vicinity, the Palo Alto, Mountain View, Menlo Park, Los Altos, Stanford, and East Palo Alto communities. It is not likely people, I don't know if people from Mountain View are jumping on the train or if they are just jumping in their car. I don't know. It is something that I think can be a real big win/win for this community. As a citizen of Palo Alto I have to protect the interests of the quality of life in this process, and I think that would be a major input for not only just the employees but the students on the campus to get back and forth between hopefully some hot spots in our community, and also patients going back and forth. So I would like to see that expanded and actually implemented.

This leads me to the next comment that I have, which is the fact that we have had to cutback on our own shuttle service, the Midtown Shuttle. This was a difficult decision to make during I think Finance Committee, but then also Council discussion a couple of weeks ago. It begged the question then, and I think even more now to actually do a study on the shuttle and where it can be most effective to collect people and deliver them where they need to get delivered so that we can get people efficiently over to the hospital.

The one thing that I am not completely convinced about is the expectation of those that will be transferring to GO Passes partially because the relationship between the GUP where there are no new net trips and yet this is outside the GUP. The no new net trips are probably more driven by the fact that there just isn't enough space to get everybody over there. Our arteries

going into Stanford are old. They were decided to have three lanes I guess under Embarcadero Road subway at some point in time in our history. That right now might be choking a possibility of perhaps looking at relieving traffic that many, many people I know come up through Central Expressway into our Alma and can only transfer over to El Camino on Oregon Expressway or Churchill and they cannot do that on Embarcadero. Then the last one for Palo Alto is University, which has its own complexities. So at this point I would like our Staff to seriously take a look at working with Stanford to do a borderless type traffic study. I have noticed that Council Member Schmid has also wondered what we could do between Alma and El Camino on Embarcadero Road based on his questions. See if we can't really look at this strategically for the 21st Century basically. To not just look at an isolated project but to see if there is a way we can get this traffic really understood and unwound so that we can support the no net new trips but also support having good traffic flow through the local municipalities.

Finally, I was very impressed with looking at the park and ride locations both at Ardenwood in the East Bay to get people over on the Dumbarton Bridge, also up on Sand Hill Road. I know that those are possibilities. They are not written into the Draft EIR at this point so I would like to see them become a little more material as we move forward with this project. I think that this is possibly more of a style of a hospital employee. The only reason why I say the style might be different than the University campus that this is more of a nine to five type job. People do like to get in their car and relax on their way home. So anything we can do to help them do that without impacting traffic in Palo Alto and the vicinity is really important to me. Thank you.

Vice Mayor Espinosa: Thank you for the presentations. Thank you for everybody staying so late this evening. I was very much looking forward to tonight's conversation for two reasons. One is I think there is probably no other area where I have heard more from the public and from community members about the impact that Stanford will have the impact that this project will have on their quality of life than traffic. I think that people see that as a worry.

The second point though is that Stanford has been, as we have acknowledged tonight, a real leader in alternative transportation policy and projects. So I was very interested to see how the discussion would go and to really dive deep into this part of the DEIR. I think there was a lot of creative thinking that went into this, and it was exciting to see it all come together.

As we look at what we are going to flush out a little bit more before we come back with a Final report my concerns are I think we did an interesting study,

Council Member Scharff looked into that, on intersections. Obviously that is a key component of understanding the traffic impacts.

The second though in really understanding ridership and looking at reducing trips is where my concerns lie. I think that obviously I raised the GO Pass in the questions part of these comments tonight. If you are looking either at really diving into where employees live and modeling out where we think employees will live over time, understanding who is on the corridor and not. If you are going to think about so much of your trip reduction, ridership reduction, traffic reduction programming based on Caltrain then you really need to think about how many of those employees realistically are going live along that corridor and are going to use that model. I am not sure that we end up with a deep enough understanding of whether or not those numbers will stand over time.

So I think that as we move forward having a better understanding of that both on the front end of really understanding where employees live, modeling where we think they will live over the next ten, 15, 20, 25 years. Then really thinking through Caltrain, its ridership numbers over time, its levels of service over time, its frequency over time, and whether or not this is really going to be a sustainable model for us.

In the big picture, I just want to acknowledge the great work that I think was done. Again, Stanford on so many different levels has been a leader across the country in transportation policies and programs. I think the concerns that have been raised tonight, from my perspective, are all ones that we can really work through and address. I just want to make the point that this was the area that was most important to me, the area that I think was most important to so many citizens. I think we end up at a place this evening where I can see us getting there. There isn't this huge delta in terms really being able to address those traffic impacts. I think it is really understanding though what programs are going to make the most sense, and making sure that we are dealing with data that is really going to hold true over time. So thank you everybody for their work.

Mayor Burt: I will make a couple of broad comments and then some more specific ones. First, I think that this project is radically better, a more sustainable project, than what we first saw four years ago in a whole variety of ways that colleagues and the Staff and the applicant have all laid out. If there is a lesson learned it is in this era, the 21st Century, lead with sustainability on a project. Don't wait until three or four years into it before putting your best foot forward. I know that some of this you didn't have your best foot at the time. It has taken a lot of work to get to the specifics of what you have. The first project that we had for the first year or two

there was almost no discussion of sustainability, and a lot of community angst that has come about in opposition to the project that now has to be reconciled and we are in a positive track could have been mitigated if we had had the concepts of sustainability even before we put the meat on the bone on what that would be, and the design of the project.

Our task tonight is principally to help make this DEIR better, and more complete, and more accurate. I think frankly it is a good EIR. I have seen a lot of them over the years and I think this is a very solid one. I think it has done a thorough job in a lot of ways. So I will just cite a few aspects of specifics. One is that I think the offsite parking is not a very progressive measure. It should be a last resort. It may need to be a last resort to try to further mitigate the impacts that otherwise cannot be adequately mitigated.

I also think that we need to include a post-project environmental analysis. We had this on the Sand Hill Road Corridor. As is customary in EIRs it is important to err on the high side on impacts and be cautious on assumption on mitigations. That is the way we are supposed to do it. Apparently on the Sand Hill Road Corridor, which was supposed to have post-project analysis, the traffic impacts as I understand it were less than what the EIR had projected. Either way it is one thing to go through this whole extensive process and then never look back and see how close we were. This is not a crystal ball process.

Next, I think that we should look at the bicycle rental program. One program may work effectively on campus and a different campus in the medical centers. I think that we should look at greater mitigations through public transit to East Palo Alto. That is a lot of the employee base, and it has been traditionally underserved by transit. We were not able to have much of an update here as far as what level of service there is, and what would be the cost effectiveness of additional service to mitigating trips. I think we also do need to look during construction at the hours of heaviest truck use. In the end, we are looking right now at a project with 2,000 additional parking spaces. Frankly, that is the bottom line on the additional impact on trips. You can measure it that way.

My final point on this issue that we have spoken about on the vehicle types, I think that the climate change impact from the vehicle trips is probably being significantly overstated. The car trip impact is a major portion of that. I think it is just silly in this era to not have a methodology that would look at the trends in vehicular trips. I think that is stale methodology and I am very surprised that professionals in this field have not adopted changes to that methodology that would reflect that range of impacts.

Now out among the experts in the field there is a range, anywhere from a high end to a low end. I have no problem with a conservative number being used, but not a non-number where we say that we are all going to be driving the same gas-guzzlers in 15 years that we are now. That just makes no sense to me, and it is not accurate. I am not expecting that we can have something other than a conservative estimate within a reasonable range, but get it in the range. I think that is the most egregious error in the report.

Council Member Holman: Yes, and I will be pretty brief. I support the comments of other Council Members in regards to traffic and quality of life. I guess even more than that for me one of the biggest, biggest concerns is the air quality. While it is not specifically an environmental impact, the result of the environmental impacts here I am really interested in knowing how that translates to increased incidents of asthma, if there is any data that is readily available for that for instance. It is our job that we see that we do no harm. I have serious concerns about what the health impacts are of the air quality impacts.

Then just a couple of overall comments. The three dimensional model that was asked for by prior Councils, we are at now July 12 and the comment period ends July 27, and we still have not seen a three dimensional model. So I am really looking forward to seeing that.

I understand that there are better visuals, and more visuals that are available, but we have not seen them. They have not become public. So I am interested in seeing those. We do still have opportunity to see what the impacts are on the visual quality of Palo Alto post-project.

Then lastly, and unless I hear contradiction by other Council Members I just want to make sure that we are all clear that what we are doing here is not say yes or no to a project. We are not trying to impede a project. What we are trying to do is get informed about the impacts of the project and the lack of impacts of the project. The reason I am saying this is because I just want to make sure that we are all clear that what we are asking of Staff and the consultants is to help us help the community understand what the impacts are, so that we don't end up at the end of the day with surprises. That is not to abdicate. The intension here and this comment is not to abdicate the Council's responsibility, it is just to say we need to all be partnering in making sure that we don't have any surprises at the end of the day. So if there are impacts that we need to be better informed about, or that need to be brought to our attention to a greater degree than we are catching or picking up on, then I am asking for that support by Staff to help educate and inform us and the community.

5. Recommendation of High Speed Rail Committee for Council Review of and Direction Regarding Draft Scope of Work and Creation of a Task Force for Palo Alto Rail Corridor Study.

Deputy City Manager, Steve Emslie discussed the Scope of Work including the Corridor Study which enabled the City to take a proactive and longer range look at what was happening with the CalTrain right-of-way.

Director of Planning and Community Environment, Curtis Williams stated Staff requested to add a third recommendation; to have Council direct Staff to create the Task Force outlined in the second recommendation.

Council Member Schmid asked why there was a reference to the California Avenue/Ventura neighborhood in the Corridor Study.

Mr. Williams asked for clarification on whether the question referenced was to the Rail Corridor Preliminary Boundary.

Council Member Schmid stated yes.

Mr. Williams stated the Rail Corridor Preliminary Boundary covered the area from Mountain View through to Menlo Park. The neighborhood in question was an area that possibly would be affected by the rail station.

Council Member Schmid questioned why the East/West split was so varied on the western side at 2,000 to 2,800 foot margin yet on the east side there was only a 200 foot margin from the rail. He stated he felt a corridor had equal separation from either side of the rail.

Mr. Williams stated there would be impacts on either side of the rail although not equal. The numbers presented were illustrative for a starting point.

Council Member Scharff asked for clarification on the purpose of the Corridor Study. He asked whether there was a specific plan being implemented or was it a hybrid review of the impacts of the High Speed Rail (HSR) and CalTrain. He stated it appeared to be focused on the development, the density, and the intensification of land use.

Mr. Williams stated Staff was reviewing both the land use potential, the transportation potential, and how the corridor could change from a proactive standpoint as well as potential impacts of the rail system.

Council Member Scharff asked whether historically a Citizen Task Force was created for projects of this magnitude.

Mr. Williams stated yes.

Council Member Scharff asked whether the previous Citizen Task Force members were appointed by Council.

Mr. Williams stated the SOFA II Task Force was Staff appointed while the Comprehensive Plan Task Force was Council appointed.

Mayor Burt stated SOFA I was a Council appointed Task Force.

Council Member Scharff asked whether there was a Council Committee that dealt with a specific plan or had it always gone to the full Council.

Mr. Williams stated a Council Committee did not take action. Council needed to be the entity the action was taken direction from. In this case, due to the information being directly tied into the Comprehensive Plan, the Planning & Transportation Commission (P&TC) would need to make a recommendation to Council.

Council Member Scharff stated the Task Force was structured in CMR 307:10; it read the High Speed Rail Committee and the P&TC make recommendations to Council. He stated adding a High Speed Rail Committee seemed superfluous.

Mr. Williams stated he was unaware of how previous Task Forces were structured although the structure was at Council's purview.

Council Member Scharff asked the reason behind the Staff recommendation for the Committee.

Mr. Williams stated the High Speed Rail Committee was the one to review the plan and would assist in directing the initiation of the Corridor Study. The anticipation was the members would follow the process and supply valuable insight to the public, the P&TC and Council as to the goings-on from the corridor perspective.

Mayor Burt clarified historically there had been Council sub-committees on various in-depth evaluations. There was a history of AdHoc Council sub-committees when there was a major focus, and that sub-committee was expected to spend more time on the evaluation, bring themselves up to speed, and ultimately the full Council would vet the project in its entirety.

Council Member Scharff stated the Staff report read as though the Council had approved the project. He wanted to be clear just because Council accepted a budget request action, they did not adopt the project attached to the request.

Mr. Williams stated the intent was not to imply preliminary approval by Council. Staff understood the budget action taken was contingent on the authorization of the Corridor Study.

Council Member Holman stated the P&TC should be leading the effort and performing public outreach as an alternative to creating a task force. She stated in CMR 307:10, under section d. Public Outreach; the members were to act as a conduit for supplying information to the public. It seemed a great responsibility and authority to be granted to a Citizen Task Force. She stated as part of the first phase there should be identification as to what the implications of the CalTrain electrification would be. She stated the CMR appeared to draw conclusions as to the changes being made and she asked how conclusions could be drawn of the changes to occur before the project had been approved.

City Manager, James Keene stated given the time constraints with Council break, the thought was to expedite the process by having Staff appoint the Committee to be more efficient. There were numerous technical issues and questions that were reactive to both the HSR and CalTrain projects where the Committee was working in parallel with the issues that would be incorporated into the Corridor Study.

Council Member Price stated her thought was the original intent of the Task Force was to give the community more opportunity for informed discussions. By having the High Speed Rail Committee and the P&TC involved jointly gave the community ample opportunities to engage. With a project of this magnitude there needed to be a couple avenues for participation.

Herb Borock, Palo Alto, stated the Municipal Code clearly depicted the role of the P&TC as the appropriate arena to regard land use and zoning determinations. He was concerned with having multiple groups for a single item, he noted it was confusing to the public since they would be uncertain as to which meeting was the appropriate for their needs.

Sara Armstrong, CARRD, spoke regarding the level of service increasing per the CalTrain 2025 service plan and the implications of traffic flow without grade separation. She stated there needed to be a solid vision for the corridor to assist in formulating a strong foundation.

Stephanie Munoz, Palo Alto, spoke of her concerns regarding the corridor running through the urban centers and suggested running the corridor between the urban centers.

Nadia Naik, CARRD, stated in the event the High Speed Rail project went away CalTrain remained and Palo Alto needed a vision for what was best for the City.

Council Member Yeh stated there was a lack of information on how the community interfaced with the corridor at its present position and how that would change in the future. He felt the Youth Council and the Parent Teacher Association (PTA) should be involved in the discussion of the corridor. He requested there be a calendar set-up to show the due dates of when information was being discussed with the P&TC and Council. He suggested having the information available on-line, to give the community a vision of what the options were.

MOTION: Council Member Shepherd moved, seconded by Council Member Price to direct Staff to proceed with the study, including issuance of a Request for Proposal for consultant services and the creation of Rail Corridor Task Force.

Council Member Shepherd stated it was important to remember this was a Rail Corridor Study and not a High Speed Rail Corridor Study. The Corridor Study was in response to the fact that CalTrain was electrified and that they had their own EIR which was to be certified soon.

Council Member Price stated the Rail Corridor Study was timely, appropriate and it complimented the Comprehensive Plan. The development of the Task Force was an opportunity for the community to get further engaged in the transit project.

Council Member Schmid stated concern for the south of California Avenue area on the Corridor Study map. He noted if there was to be a true Corridor Study there needed to be equal amounts of residents on either side of the rail line.

INCORPORATED INTO THE MOTION WITH THE CONSENT OF THE MAKER AND SECONDER to have Staff return with a map showing the corridor on both sides of the rail line and focus on building a Task Force that represents those living and working on both sides of the rail line.

Council Member Holman asked for clarification on the final make-up of the Task Force.

Mr. Williams stated details had yet to be finalized. The description of the Task Force presented to Council was in initial format. Based on the comments of Council the composition may be altered.

Council Member Holman stated she understood the project time constraints associated and the reason for the creation of the Task Force. Although, she felt the Council should appoint the Committee and it should be run through the P&TC.

Mayor Burt asked whether the perspective stakeholders affected by the High Speed Rail were notified of this evening's discussion.

Mr. Williams stated no.

SUBSTITUTE MOTION: Mayor Burt moved, seconded by Council Member Scharff that the Council direct Staff to proceed with issuing the RFP for consultant services and return to Council at a later date with the formation of the Task Force.

Council Member Scharff clarified the initial creation of the High Speed Rail Committee was to handle high speed rail issues and the purpose of the P&TC was to handle land use and zoning. If the Task Force was to be involved with the land use aspect then they were no longer a High Speed Rail Committee.

Council Member Shepherd supported the Substitute Motion and asked when Staff would return to Council.

Mr. Keene stated Staff would return to Council prior to their break in August.

Council Member Price stated she supported the Substitute Motion. She noted there could be cost implications if the model being considered was different than what had previously been discussed.

Mayor Burt stated the original Motion did not incorporate cost whereas there were costs involved in the consulting phases.

SUBSTITUTE MOTION PASSED: 8-0 Klein absent

6. City Clerk's Report Certifying Sufficiency of Charter Amendment Petitions Regarding Adding Article IX Fire and Emergency Medical Services Minimum Protection and Adoption of a Resolution Calling a

Special Election for November 2, 2010, Submitting to the Electorate for Special Election an Initiative Measure to Amend the Charter of the City of Palo Alto to Specify Minimum Staffing and Service Levels for Fire Department Personnel and of Fire Stations and Fire Station Locations and Require a Referendum Vote for any Proposal to Reduce Such Levels.

City Clerk, Donna Grider stated the Election Code dictated the certificate of sufficiency be brought before the governing body.

City Manager, James Keene recommended the Council continue this item to the August 2nd meeting.

Mayor Burt asked whether the City Clerk had a presentation to correlate with the results.

Ms. Grider stated the petition was found to be sufficient and she wanted to acknowledge the election costs had increased. She noted the invoice for the fire fighters petition verifying signatures was \$22,780.

Mayor Burt asked the total cost for the election.

Ms. Grider stated the total cost would be \$212,780.

MOTION: Council Member Scharff moved, seconded by Council Member Shepherd to continue this item to August 2, 2010.

Council Member Schmid asked whether there was a legal time a decision needed to be made.

Ms. Grider clarified there needed to be a certified Resolution to the County by August 06, 2010 in order to place an item on the November ballot.

INCORPORATED INTO THE MOTION WITH THE CONSENT OF THE MAKER AND SECONDER to change the date of continuance to July 19, 2010.

Council Member Price stated she did not support the Motion and felt the August 2, 2010 date was sufficient.

Vice Mayor Espinosa stated he did not support the Motion.

SUBSTITUTE MOTION: Council Member Yeh moved, seconded by Council Member Price to continue this item to August 2, 2010.

Mayor Burt stated this was not a Council initiated initiative and he did not feel it should be used as a bargaining tool where concessions would be offered in negotiations. He did not support the Substitute Motion.

SUBSTITUTE MOTION PASSED: 6-2 Burt, Scharff no, Klein absent

Herb Borock, Palo Alto, spoke in response to Council Member Prices comment regarding the proponents needing more time. He clarified once a petition had been submitted; the proponents no longer had control on whether or not it went on the ballot. The issue was whether the petition qualified; which it had and whether there was a sufficient challenge to the subject matter.

Senior Assistant City Attorney, Cara Silver stated under Elections Code 9605 there was the ability to remove an initiative after the 83rd day prior to the election which would be August 11, 2010.

Council Member Scharff stated he thought once the Council placed the initiative on the November ballot the petitioner lost the ability to remove it.

Ms. Silver stated if the Council had passed a Resolution ordering the election, the ability to withdraw remained valid; although, the Council would then need to rescind the election Resolution.

7. Approval of Three Year Software Consulting Services Contract with Sierra Infosys Inc. in the Amount of \$750,000 for the Support and Maintenance of SAP Industry-Specific Solution for Utilities, SAP Financials, Customer Relationship Management System, Business Intelligence System and Utilities Customer Electronic Services

MOTION: Council Member Yeh moved, seconded by Council Member Holman to continue Agenda Item No. 7 to July 26, 2010.

MOTION PASSED: 8-0 Klein absent

CONSENT CALENDAR

MOTION: Vice Mayor Espinosa moved, seconded by Council Member Scharff to approve Consent Calendar Item Nos. 8-13.

8. Approval of three Contracts with: 1) Navigant Consulting Inc. for Electric Regulatory and Technical Consulting Services for a Total Amount Not to Exceed \$245,000 for Fiscal Years 2011, 2012, and

2013; 2) Flynn Resources Consulting Inc. for Electric Regulatory and Technical Consulting Services for a Total Amount Not to Exceed \$230,000 for Fiscal Years 2011, 2012, and 2013; 3) Navigant Consulting Inc. for Gas Regulatory and Technical Consulting Services for a Total Amount Not to Exceed \$325,000 for Fiscal Years 2011, 2012, and 2013.

9. Approval of a Memorandum of Understanding With the Santa Clara Valley Water District to Provide up to \$271,785 Per Fiscal Year for a Total of \$815,355 Over Three Fiscal Years for the Continued Administration of and Funding for Water Conservation Programs and Rebates for City of Palo Alto Utilities' Customers.
10. Approval of a Contract with J.J.R. Construction, Inc. in the Amount of \$525,232 for the 2010 Street Maintenance Program College Terrace Area Concrete Capital Improvement Program Project PE-86070.
11. Approval of a Contract with TruGreen LandCare for a Period of Three Years for Tree Maintenance Services with Funding for the First Year Approved in the Not to Exceed Amount of \$280,000 and a Total Amount of \$840,000 for all Three Years
12. Resolution 9075 entitled "Resolution of the Council of the City of Palo Alto Expressing Appreciation to Marc Marchiel for Outstanding Public Service as a Member of the Library Advisory Commission."
13. Approval of Amendment No. Three to Contract No. C07116703 Between the City of Palo Alto and C-Way Custodian Services to Increase the Annual Compensation Amount by \$141,144 for a Total Annual Compensation Amount of \$718,951 Per Year (for the Remaining 1.4 Years of the Contract) to Provide Custodial Cleaning Services at Selected City Facilities.

MOTION PASSED: 8-0 Klein absent

COUNCIL MEMBER QUESTIONS, COMMENTS, AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Council Member Yeh reported that he will be traveling to China this week to represent the City of Palo Alto as part of our low carbon cities program.

Council Member Schmid spoke about the City of Palo Alto cooperating with other cities in the area as it pertains to emergency response.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at 12:24 a.m.

