Fact Sheet: Stanford University Medical Center Development Proposal

An application has been submitted to the City of Palo Alto for the renewal, replacement and expansion of the Stanford University Medical Center (SUMC), which includes:

- SHC: Stanford Hospital and Clinics
- LPCH: Lucile Packard Children’s Hospital, and
- SoM: a portion of Stanford University’s School of Medicine.
- Hoover Pavilion

SHC, LPCH, and SoM have identified a number of program objectives, including: to meet State-mandated seismic standards (Senate Bill 1953) and to expand their facilities to meet future demand for patient care.

These facility improvements would be implemented in multiple phases over a 20-year period.

Entitlements Requested

- Comprehensive Plan Amendments
  - Change land use designation for 701 and 703 Welch Road to “Major Institution/Special Facilities”
  - Modify Comprehensive Plan Program L-3 to allow taller buildings

- Rezoning (New hospital zone)
  - Rezone land in the “Public Facilities” Zone (PF) to a new hospital zone (eg. “Hospital District”)

- Annexation
  - Pre-zone and annex small site at southwest corner of project area

- Architectural Review
  - Preliminary review and approval by Architectural Review Board to be sought.

- Development Agreement
  - To be entered into with City of Palo Alto if terms are mutually agreeable

Employment Summary *

- Existing employees (2007) 9,943
- Projected Increase (SHC) 1,160
- Projected Increase (LPCH) 937
- Projected Decrease (SoM) (106)
- Projected Net Increase 1,991
- Total at Buildout 11,934

*These numbers have been supplied by applicant and are subject to verification by City. The figure for 2007 includes staff growth associated with current renovations. The numbers for SHC and SOM include Hoover

Proposed Square Footage (Within Project Boundaries)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current sf</th>
<th>Net Increase sf</th>
<th>Total sf</th>
<th>Patient Beds</th>
<th>Building Heights</th>
<th>Construction Phases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SHC</td>
<td>1,434,444</td>
<td>823,849</td>
<td>2,258,293</td>
<td>From 456 to 600</td>
<td>Up to 130**</td>
<td>2009-2015, 2016-2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPCH</td>
<td>354,500</td>
<td>441,500</td>
<td>796,000</td>
<td>From 257 to 361</td>
<td>Up to 85*</td>
<td>2009-2015, 2014-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SoM **</td>
<td>479,874</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>479,874</td>
<td></td>
<td>Up to 66*</td>
<td>2010-2012, 2014-2016, 2018-2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoover</td>
<td>98,061</td>
<td>46,169</td>
<td>144,230</td>
<td></td>
<td>Up to 65*</td>
<td>2010-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,366,879</td>
<td>1,311,518</td>
<td>3,678,397</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The helipad on top of SHC buildings will contribute in addition to this height.

** 14,200 sf at 800 Welch Road is not part of the Project but is anticipated in the future.

Source: Tables 3-1, 3-3, Figure 4-7 of the SUMC application package.

Trip Generation Study *

- Submitted by applicant’s consultant Fehr & Peers

(Trucks, ambulances and helicopters: Round Trips = arrival + departure)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Annual Truck Round Trips</th>
<th>Annual Ambulance Round Trips</th>
<th>Annual Helicopter Round Trips</th>
<th>Parking Summary for SUMC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total 2006</td>
<td>Total at Buildout</td>
<td>Total 2006</td>
<td>New Parking Demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32,850</td>
<td>37,039</td>
<td>8,331</td>
<td>2,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total at Buildout</td>
<td></td>
<td>Total at Buildout</td>
<td>Replacement Parking Spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,060</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,357</td>
<td>Total Required Spaces at Buildout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Proposed Spaces at Buildout</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* These estimates will be subject to further analysis by Fehr & Peers and independently reviewed by the City’s EIR consultant.

For more information please go to www.cityofpaloalto.org or contact Steven Turner at steven.turner@cityofpaloalto.org
This is the plan as proposed in the application. The location and design of improvements are subject to modification through environmental and design review.

SUMC: Proposal
Fact Sheet:
Stanford Shopping Center Development Proposal

An application to expand the Stanford Shopping Center (SSC) has been submitted to the City of Palo Alto by Simon Property Group (Simon), the lessee and operator of the Stanford Shopping Center.

According to the applicant, this project has been proposed in an effort to respond to market demands and to remain competitive, with the recent surge of expanding shopping centers in the Bay Area.

The applicant indicates that this expansion is aimed at promoting a pedestrian-friendly environment by creating new public space, in the form of a new retail street and a central plaza. There will be new retail, restaurant and office proposed. Simon is also proposing a 120-room hotel and additional parking to serve the expanded uses.

### Entitlements Requested

**Comprehensive Plan Amendments**
- Comprehensive Plan Land Use and Community Design Policy L-26, to include text on proposed expansion plans.
- Comprehensive Plan Land Use and Community Design Program L-24, to revise SSC's development cap.
- Comprehensive Plan Land Use Designation, to include hotel use with existing land uses.

**Zoning Text Amendments**
- Amendment to Palo Alto Municipal Code Section 18.16.060(e), to revise existing cap on further development of SSC.

**Preliminary Architectural Review**
- Preliminary review and approval by Architectural Review Board to be sought.

**Development Agreement**
- To be entered into with City of Palo Alto if terms are mutually agreeable.

### Employment Summary*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing employees</td>
<td>3,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected (retail)</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected (hotel)</td>
<td>55 to 85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,455</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These have been supplied by applicant and are subject to verification by City.

### Parking Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Parking</td>
<td>5,801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolished Parking</td>
<td>(2,215)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Parking</td>
<td>3,449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Parking</td>
<td>7,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Added Parking</td>
<td>1,234</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Proposed Square Footage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Square Feet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Retail</td>
<td>1,412,368 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Retail</td>
<td>240,000 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Retail</td>
<td>1,652,368 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Hotel</td>
<td>120,000 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Parking</td>
<td>1,004,430 sf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### New Building Heights

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Buildings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25'-35'</td>
<td>3 buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40'-45'</td>
<td>8 buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54' proposed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54' to 56' proposed</td>
<td>2 structures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

* This page appears to be a part of a larger document, possibly a report or proposal, discussing the expansion of the Stanford Shopping Center. The text highlights the motivations and details of the proposed development, including entitlements, employment and parking summaries, and proposed square footage. The document also mentions the involvement of Simon Property Group and the city of Palo Alto in the approval and execution of the project. The expansion aims to enhance the shopping experience by creating pedestrian-friendly spaces and additional amenities like a hotel and parking facilities. The proposed development includes various retail, hotel, and parking areas, each with specific square footage and height considerations.
The plans shown below are proposed by Simon Property Group in the application. The location and design of improvements are subject to modification through environmental and design review. This scheme locates the hotel at the corner of Quarry Road and Arboretum Road.
Procedures for Determination & Payment of BMR In-lieu Fees on the Sale of Market Rate Ownership Units

Calculation of BMR In-Lieu Fees
If the BMR Agreement requires the Developer to pay the City a BMR in-lieu fee on the sale of market rate housing units, the fee amount for each market rate unit is equal to the applicable in-lieu fee rate, as specified in the BMR Agreement, times the higher of the market value (as a for-sale ownership unit) or the actual sales price of each market rate unit in the Project. The Escrow Agent shall calculate the actual in-lieu fee just prior to the sale closing. The Escrow Agent shall include in the sales price all improvements, add-ons, options, fixtures, appliances, landscaping, equipment, furniture and other items that the buyer purchases from the Developer, or the Developer’s contractors, prior to close of escrow and transfer of title to the unit to the buyer. Developer shall inform the Escrow Agent of the prices for such items, even if the items will not be paid for through the escrow transaction, so that the Escrow Agent can correctly calculate the BMR in-lieu fee due to the City. The City reserves the right to require an appraisal of any unit to confirm its fair market value. The Developer shall reimburse the City for the cost of any such appraisals.

Process for Units Not Sold on Open Market Basis
Should any units be sold at less than fair market value or sold, transferred or exchanged to a person or entity related to the Developer, the original land owner or an investor in the Project or should Developer retain any units for personal use or rental, then Developer shall pay the City an in-lieu fee for each such unit based on the fair market value of each unit as if each unit were being sold separately on the open market as an ownership housing unit. An appraiser selected by the City shall determine the fair market value of each unit. The Developer shall reimburse the City for the cost of any such appraisals. The BMR Agreement may include a deadline by which all in-lieu fees are due and payable to the City even if all units have not yet been sold.

Timing & Process for In-Lieu Fee Payments
For each unit subject to the fee, the full in-lieu fee payment is due and payable to the City at the close of escrow for the first sale (or other transfer of title) by the Developer of that unit. The fee shall be deducted by the Escrow Agent from the Developer’s (seller’s) sales proceeds at escrow closing and immediately transmitted to the City per instructions to be provided by the City at that time. The Escrow Agent shall provide the City with the following documentation together with the check for the fee payment for each unit to verify the calculation of the fee:
1. A certified HUD-1 form for each unit’s sale
2. A list of any improvements and their prices, if not shown on the HUD-1 form
3. A calculation of the amount of the in-lieu fee

Security for In-Lieu Fee Payments
The City may require a bond from the Developer or that a note and deed of trust be recorded against the Project in favor of the City as security for the payment of BMR in-lieu fees.
VILLAGE CONCEPT
Proposed Stanford Projects
City of Palo Alto
April 11, 2008

I. VILLAGE CONCEPT
   A. Need/Basis For Village Alternative
      1. In response to proposals
         a. EIR alternative
         b. Not miss opportunities with scale of investment
         c. Think outside project boundaries
         d. Leverage benefits — economic, environmental & social
         e. Think long term to not preclude future opportunities

   B. Definition of a Village
      1. Attributes of successful villages, town & city centers
         a. Competitive, thriving, creative & innovative economy
         b. Livable
         c. Environmentally responsible
         d. Opportunities for all people
         e. Distinct identity
         f. Shared vision and good governance
      2. Key design elements
         a. Compact & human scale
         b. Higher density
         c. Locational efficiency
         d. Mixed-use
e. Attractive public urban spaces and open spaces
f. Interconnected networks
g. Pedestrian & transit-oriented
h. Auto independent & reduced parking
i. Local character and identity
j. Diversity of housing
k. Respect for environment
l. Enhanced long-term land values

C. Performance Metrics of a Village

1. Travel behavior
   a. Reduced trip generation rates
   b. Increase in Non-SOV mode split
   c. Shifting trips off-peak
   d. Reduced Parking
   e. Reduced VMT

2. Other economic, social & environmental benefits & measures

D. Village Concept as Applied to Project

1. Intent
   a. Support city comprehensive plan
      i. Well designed, compact city
      ii. Attractive pedestrian scale centers
      iii. Variety of retail and commercial services
      iv. Focal points and community gathering places
      v. High quality employment districts with distinct character contributing to City as whole
      vi. Well designed buildings
      vii. Coherent development patterns enhancing city streets and public spaces

   b. Support historic and current academic campus planning initiatives & campus identity
      i. Place a part
      ii. Sense of higher purpose
      iii. Leadership and innovation
      iv. Growth

   c. Enable projects and advance project objectives

   d. Address the transitional area that links campus and community together on multiple levels – health care, research, employment,
shopping, transportation services, economic/fiscal benefits, and community amenities...

e. Evolve the existing, single use, auto-oriented suburban environment to be more walkable, mixed-use and livable, which emphasizes an attractive public realm

2. Strategies

a. Locational efficiency

i. Synergy
   • Between regional centers (medical center, shopping center) and among adjacent areas (university, downtown and neighboring residential areas)
   • Types
     1. Direct market support – sales & use
     2. Indirect support – amenities, identity & marketing
     3. Placemaking -- -- new addresses & destinations, whole greater than sum of parts

ii. Transit-oriented development
   • Density
   • Mixed-use
   • Shared & reduced parking

b. High Quality, Attractive Public Realm

i. Pedestrian-oriented design
   • Sequence of destinations
   • Connections
   • Mixed pedestrian/auto environments
   • Access from parking

ii. Attractive visible public places
   • El Camino Real
   • Quarry Street and El Camino Real intersection to the Center’s Main Pedestrian Way
   • Neiman Marcus to Arboretum
   • Arboretum to Nordstrom's and Crate and Barrel
   • Andronicos/Nordstrom’s to the Medical Center
   • Medical Center to Stanford Barn

iii. Identity, access & parking
   • Arrival sequences by car, transit and walking
iv. Street frontages
   • Quarry Road
     1. Parking structures
     2. Shopping center to Hoover building and undeveloped sites on Quarry Road
   • El Camino Real
     1. Boulevard & Gateway
   • Arboretum
   • Sand Hill
     1. Housing across Sand Hill Road to the center
Planning and Transportation Commission
Verbatim Minutes
April 23, 2008

DRAFT EXCERPT

Stanford University Medical Center and Stanford Shopping Center Projects: Study Session to review progress on the projects, including revisions to the Stanford University Medical Center application and plans, a review of Area Plan objectives for the projects, an update on the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) schedule and a discussion of potential EIR alternatives, including the Village Concept alternative.

Mr. Steven Turner, Senior Planner: Good evening Commissioners. I am the Project Manager for this project. We were last in front of the Commission back in November of last year, about five months ago, and at that meeting we provided an overall project update. We reviewed community input related to some of the key planning issues we were discussing. We took a look at some of our approaches to mitigations and community benefits and we gave an overall status of the environmental and entitlement reviews. So that was back in November.

At tonight’s meeting we wanted to go over four items. First I just wanted to provide an update with regard to the projects and the project elements. Then I will go into just a brief update about our work on the Environmental Impact Report. I will talk briefly about general project alternatives that are typically part of Environmental Impact Reports. Then we will go to really the heart of the discussion tonight which is the Village Concept Study and you will be hearing from the City’s Urban Design Peer Reviewer as well as from the applicant in regards to our thoughts and work with regard to a Village Concept Study.

So in terms of kind of an introduction and update as you know we are in phase two of this application process. Phase two began with the submittal of formal applications by the applicants back in August of 2007. Staff has summarized the project elements on a series of fact sheets that are attached to your Staff Report. We have discussed the elements of each application at previous City Council and Planning Commission meetings so we won’t go into those tonight. The fact sheets list a summary of the different entitlements that each applicant is requesting, it provides an overview of some of the project facts such as floor area, an initial count of potential trips and employment, it also includes a brief reduced size site plan on the back of those.

Since the applications have been submitted in August there have been a couple of changes. The most recent change came for the Stanford University Medical Center application. There are two main elements to their revised application that was just received about a week or so ago. One is that there is no net new change in floor area so they haven’t asked for any additional floor area in this recent revision but they have moved about 140,000 square feet from the Hoover Pavilion site over to the main hospital site. So the main hospital site will be essentially 140,000 square feet larger than what the previous application had described. The Medical Center site plan a building massing for the main hospital has been adjusted slightly as well. Staff will be going forward and updating the fact sheets for the Medical Center.
On the Shopping Center side the change there is not really a change but more of a stated
preference for the location of the hotel. The Shopping Center’s preferred location for the hotel is
at the corner of Arboretum and Quarry. The other possible location that we were looking at is at
the corner of Quarry and El Camino. The applicant has expressed their preference for the
Arboretum and Quarry site and so we will update the fact sheets for the Shopping Center as well
to reflect that.

I want to also give you a status on our work of the EIR. As you know, CEQA requires us to do
an environmental analysis and that began with the formal submittal of the projects. Also soon
after the submittal of the projects the Staff prepared a Notice of Preparation and that was
published in late August of 2007. We held scoping sessions with the Planning Commission and
the City Council in September. The purpose of those meetings was to receive comments
regarding the scope of the environmental issues and alternatives to be evaluated in the EIR.
Those comments are being considered throughout our environmental review process.

Our work on the Draft EIR is ongoing. We have hired a number of consultants including PBS&J
who is our main consultant preparing the EIR. We have also hired consultants with regard to
studying traffic, historic resources, housing, and visual simulations. As you can imagine these
projects require a lot of coordination and cooperation amongst a wide range of people. We have
representatives from most City departments participating on the review of the Environmental
Impact Report. It is an exciting process in that we are getting lots of different people together to
comment on the various sections.

We are continuing our review on this. It is taking a little bit longer than what we expected in
terms of releasing a Draft EIR. Our current projections now have a draft EIR being released in
November of this year.

 Concurrent with the environmental review there is also a Fiscal Impact Analysis being prepared
for the projects. The Fiscal Impact Analysis is expected to be released at the same time as the
EIR. So in November you will be getting the Draft Environmental Impact Report and the Fiscal
Impact Analysis.

I want to talk briefly about the EIR project alternatives and a little bit about the more standard
alternatives first that are required in an environmental document. CEQA requires that an EIR
contain an evaluation of alternatives to provide decision-makers with an understanding of the
key environmental tradeoffs between development options. There are three key elements as part
of alternatives. They have to reduce or avoid significant impacts that the projects may bring.
They have to meet most of the project’s objectives, and they are alternatives that can be feasibly
implemented. For the Stanford projects as we have begun our thoughts and discussions about the
types of alternative that we will be placing within the EIR we will be having this more standard
alternatives including a No Project Alternative, a Reduced Intensity Alternative, and then what
we feel is called the Village Concept. I will talk a little bit more about the Village Concept in a
minute. I did want to go over briefly about our thoughts about what might be a No Project
Alternative and a reduced intensity alternative for each project.
For the Medical Center we have two No Project Alternatives that we are looking at. Before we get into that, as you have heard from the applicants as they have introduced the project to you a main driver for the applicants is SB1953, the provision that requires hospitals to come into compliance with state and seismic regulations. Hospitals have to retrofit or replace facilities not meeting these criteria by 2013 and make further modifications to meet structural and nonstructural requirements by 2030. So they have to do these things, however, they don’t necessarily have to have this project to do so. So the EIR is going to be looking at if there was no project and what would that mean to the Medical Center. So under a No Project Alternative we have identified two that may be possible. There is a Retrofit Only Alternative and a Replace Noncompliant Buildings with the Same Square Footage Alternative.

Under the Retrofit Only work would really only be performed to retrofit the buildings to meet the state seismic requirements by 2013. Under a Replace Noncompliant Buildings with the Same Square Footage those buildings would be replaced with new conforming structures of approximately the same square footage and the development would be consistent with the FAR under existing zoning. There are a lot of tradeoffs with this. There would be minimal impacts as a result of these projects but it may not meet all of the applicant’s objectives with regard to them.

For the Shopping Center essentially a No Project Alternative would be a no build alternative. The Shopping Center is either at or very close to their development cap as described in the Comprehensive Plan and in zoning. So essentially a No Project Alternative means that the Shopping Center would stay pretty much the way it is right now.

The other category of alternative is a Reduced Intensity Alternative. This is an alternative that describes a possible project that would be less than what the applicants have proposed to the City. For the Medical Center we have identified two possible Reduced Intensity Alternatives. One is right-sizing the facilities without adding any beds and the second one would be to right-size the facilities and then add beds in an amount less than the proposed project. So for right-sizing without beds essentially that project would be replacing the noncompliant structures and adding minimum square footage to the facilities to allow for right-sizing. Right-sizing as you have heard from our hospital peer reviewer is to come up to current hospital standards. The hospital peer reviewer indicated that the way hospitals are going these days is that it is a vertical orientation and for private rooms. So hospital rooms get larger in order to accommodate a single patient room and to be more compliant with today’s standards. So that is essentially what right-sizing is. The second Reduced Intensity Alternative would be right-sizing with fewer number of beds. It is a variation of the one above, they would be replacing noncompliant structures, they would add additional space for that right-sizing, and they would add some but not all of the proposed increase in square footage to partially meet existing and future demand.

For the Shopping Center side essentially it is pretty simple. The Reduced Intensity Alternative would just be a smaller shopping center with a smaller hotel and a reduction in parking.

That leads us then to the Village Concept Alternative. This is again where I hope we can spend most of our time discussing tonight. As we have heard from the Commission and the Council and the public in meetings that we have had so far we have heard a strong message from those groups that the projects really should not be solely inwardly focused but really should connect
with each other and to the larger community. So that got Staff thinking about how we can incorporate that into the existing projects. We thought of one possible strategy to have what we are calling a Village Concept Alternative.

There are a number of objectives we wanted to see happen in this Village Concept Alternative. The first one is that we wanted to make sure that we incorporated the key planning objectives listed in the Area Plan. As you may remember, and the Staff Report summarizes those key objectives, those objectives focused on traffic solutions, strategies for housing, provisions of open space, pedestrian linkages, efficient vehicle movements, green building and sustainability, emergency surge capacity, and space for community practitioners. Those were the key planning objectives that relate directly to the hospital but since those linkages and issues really go beyond the hospital we felt that these key planning objectives could also incorporate the Shopping Center as well.

As part of this Village Concept we also wanted to make sure that we allowed a variety of uses that provided a cohesive urban environment that the Village Concept would address potential direct and indirect project impacts, and that would relate to housing demand, air quality, climate change, provisions of open space, parking and traffic. We wanted to make sure that it focused on connectivity and linkages. We feel that is an extremely important part of the Village Concept.

We saw the Village Concept as a basis for long-term planning in the area. We didn’t think that these projects would necessarily create a village automatically but it would be something that we could look out beyond the projects and make sure that we are planning well in the future. We wanted to make sure that we identified key areas for change in the project areas where we should focus our efforts. We wanted to make sure that the concept does not preclude further opportunities. So we wanted to make sure that this concept was going to allow the Village Concept to either expand or come to fruition.

So that is kind of our thoughts about the Village Concept. We are going to get into a little bit more detail now with some presentations by Bruce Fukoji, who is our Urban Design Peer Reviewer. He is going to go over kind of the definition of a village, what a village needs, the application of a village, and performance measures that could be used to evaluate a village. Then we are going to hear from Charles Carter, the Director of the Stanford University Planning Office. He is going to go over some maps that you have at your places that look at the existing Medical Center and Shopping Center sites, and an area beyond that and look at the existing land uses in the area, and try to evaluate whether or not the pieces of the Village Concept puzzle may or may not already be in place. Then finally we are going to give it back to Bruce to take a look at some of the focus areas that we may want to look at first as part of this Village Concept and also look at some opportunities that we might be able to build into the projects. So with that I am going to hand it over to Bruce.

Chair Holman: Steven, do you have some kind of concept of how long the presentations will be? Also I do not have a card from Charles Carter so that would be helpful to have.

Mr. Turner: I think these presentations will be ten to 15 minutes.
Chair Holman: Each?

Mr. Turner: Total I think.

Chair Holman: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Bruce Fukuji, Fukuji Planning and Design: Good evening it is a pleasure to be here and it is a real blessing to be able to advise the City and to consult with the City on these projects of Stanford University, and particularly to address this question about what is it that really creates a village and then what are the opportunities for what lessons we can learn from villages and how we can apply them.

So there are really two questions that I am going to be addressing and one question that Charles is going to be addressing. The first one is really what makes great livable villages and what lessons can we learn from them? Charles will be talking about inventory of existing conditions on a site and in the area. Then I will come back and talk about what are the opportunities that we have to apply these lessons that we are learning to shape a village alternative and to create some of the benefits that you have with a village.

I think that this is a preamble here that part of my role here is to work collaboratively with the City and with the applicants around how to look at something like this. So this is really kind of an update in terms of where we are in our process more than presenting a village alternative concept. There are two parts to this. One part is what is possible with the existing projects as they have been proposed and what modifications might be appropriate. There is also thinking long-term that when you look at how an area like this can infill over time. How could you do that in such a way to ensure the village type environment can be created? So this sort of mix between what would be a village alternative and what can you do with the project and we are still looking at these two different questions.

So I am going to start off with what is it that we love about villages. I think that what makes great livable cities and places that have real character and identity and that we all kind of universally love, I will talk about that first, is these traditional ones. They are known really to be like a clustered pattern of human settlement. They all have kind of unique identity and sense of place and it is expressed in the way that the architecture and the arrangements of the streets and open spaces are created. There are some very special things about how that has actually been done historically that is what makes them so wonderful and I am going talk a little bit about that.

Over the last 15 years I am sure you are probably all aware of this but there is really a national trend that is taking place around creating villages. A lot of this stems from a reaction to kind of business as usual development and urban sprawl. Its major proponents are New Urbanism and smart growth planning that we have all heard a lot about. Now New Urbanism is evolving into sustainable urbanism in terms of what to do to really address global warming and other climate change issues. What has emerged over the last ten to 15 years really are urban villages, town centers, main streets, and these transit villages. They all have a few things in common. They really look at how to concentrate activity instead of the dispersion of activity which has been the predominant pattern with sort of single land use, urban patterns of suburban development. The
other main thing I think to look at about this is that major real estate investment trusts, major
financial groups, developers, and companies and organizations such as General Growth, which is
a major retail real estate investment trust have adopted this as a major direction for how they
want to look at developing. General Growth for example has over 200 properties that they have
identified that they are now going to be looking at changing shopping centers into being more of
a walkable, urban, main street village environment. So there is a major commitment that has
happened nationally around wanting to do this because of not just the benefits of creating a
wonderful, walkable place but because there are changing demographic needs in terms of what
people want in terms of their housing choices. There are changing trends around where people
want to live and where they want to work. There are the needs that are going on and being
driven around transportation issues or people want to be able to have a lifestyle choice and not
just have to drive everywhere. So there are several things that are actually coming together to
have this be a good model for urban development. You are seeing this happen here in the Bay
Area there are many examples of that already.

When you look at villages from yesterday and villages from today I think that there is this urban
planner in Australia, David Anguish, and I think he summed it up quite well. Really what
villages are, they are this amazing invention to maximize exchange, which could be good or
services or friendship, they can also be experiences like love, support, whatever you might need,
but to maximize exchange and really minimize travel. That is really about how to concentrate
things in a way to kind of allow people to have as much connectivity in their life so they can
generate real meaning in their life, and value in their life, and be in the flow or the circulation of
that. That happens when you are not segregated in separate places but where it is very easy and
it is facilitated to connect around being able to do that. So that is the major idea behind that.
There are some really wonderful things about what facilitates exchange, what actually allows
people to make connections with one another, what makes that easier for people to be able to do
that instead of more difficult, and what takes out the intentionality of always having to pick the
phone up and call someone to be able to make a relationship or an engagement or choice, and
how to have that be kind of a world of opportunity that is available to you without having to
think about it or make a decision about it, but then have it be part of your life. So part of being
able to have those kinds of connections is about attraction and how do you make things
attractive, attractive for people to want to be in and to meet and connect. So those are sort of the
major themes. What comes out of that is you find there are certain places that help facilitate that.
When you have open-air, outdoor farmer’s markets, for example in Berkeley you have a three
times a week and I run into more people there during the week than I could possibly imagine if I
had to call them and make arrangements to do that. Then you have other places now like in
Southern California you are seeing that shopping centers are having kind of parks integrated into
the design of the center so that parents can get a cup of coffee, the other parent can go shopping,
and they can watch their kids in their environment. People who are having dinner can overlook
watching a beautiful environment and they can see other people or activities going on. So we
have started to look at how to create a multiplicity of reasons to be in a place besides just
wanting to shop.

So what does that all mean? It means that when you are sitting down to plan or design a village
there are certain intentions that you want to have in mind in terms of how you actually execute
doing that. The key things are really how do you build a kind of multiplicity of opportunities to
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attract a diversity of people together at a place? The second thing is how to really make it
inviting or welcoming to make connections and transactions? The other part, I think the hardest
part to do, because you see all these places that are creating villages and are trying to be villages
and they don’t quite get this next piece right, it is how to shape and scale urban space to
concentrate and enable spontaneous interactions and exchanges. This scale issue is really a
tough one as a design problem because we have such an odd oriented environment. How do you
do that? So it is about creating opportunity by design.

So that said, villages have a certain number characteristics that are very common throughout
them. This is sort of a basic list of them. They are also in the memo that was written in the Staff
Report. Traditionally, you look at cities and livable cities and they have a kind of core area that
is centrally located and within that core area there are a certain number of public gathering
places. This core area is not really isolated, it is not a project, and it is really very well connected
into surrounding neighborhoods and districts. So it makes people who live around it very easy to
be able to walk, or bike, or take transit, or stroll to be able to get to it. The other thing that is
really important is how streets are designed. Streets are really looked at as having a dual
purpose, one sort of mobility and the other part is really exchange or accessibility. There is
attention to how you design streets and the details of all that is a very special part I think about
what makes successful villages or what makes an unsuccessful village. We can talk about that at
length about what really works and doesn’t work even with examples here that have been done in
the last ten years in the Bay-Area. Then overall they are compact, they are higher density, they
are mixed use, and they have a diversity of housing, and they are all walkable, bikable, and
transit oriented. The transit oriented piece is really essential because it allows and facilitates
people from outside the area to get to the area to be able to use it. So those are the key pieces of
that.

With all that said the question is okay, do a village and how does it perform? What can we
expect from it? What do we know that it can do? What we are seeing is there is a phenomenal
amount of research that has now been done on the travel behavior benefits of doing villages.
You have reduced trip generation rates. There is a recent study that has now been completed that
looks at transit oriented development in terms of housing and comparing that to ITE trip
generation rates and it is like almost 50 percent less trip generation rate for residents that live in
the TOD for example. You have an increase in the non-SOV mode split. So you have higher
transit, walking, and biking, significantly higher. Then you also have a shift of trips that are off-
peak through trip chaining and linking, and you have a reduced amount of parking. We can go
over what the details are or the specific numbers of all these things. The key thing is that when
you look at sustainability issues globally the issue really is how to reduce VMT and villages and
transit oriented development districts are able to reduce VMT 40 to 60 percent compared to sort
of business as usual practices. So it is a very significant strategy for how to reduce that. Then
there are other economic, social, and environmental benefits and measures. In this case I just
wanted to touch on the transportation benefits of them. So that sort of describes how a village
operates.

Mr. Charles Carter, Stanford University, Director of Land Use and Environmental Planning:
Thank you Bruce, Steven. Bruce has given a fairly detailed and good definition of what the
attributes and components of a village are. I think it was pretty interesting that the City recently
sponsored a workshop on New Urbanism where they were talking about many of the same
concepts and components of urban planning. It was timely I think to our discussion this evening.

So Bruce gave a very good overview and definition of village attributes and components. We
have simplified that a lot to do this inventory at a very high level looking at the land use and
other components of a village. So just to sort of reiterate, it is a walkable area and what does
walkable mean? Well, commonly you think half a mile is a walkable distance. If you look at the
project area the project areas themselves are about a mile across so if you look out a little more
within a mile radius I think you get a more representative picture of the actual district of the city
we are talking about here. Then there are mixed uses, as Bruce pointed out, there are residential
uses, commercial uses, employment centers, civic uses, cultural uses, recreational uses, and
landscape and access to transportation that all work together to make a village work. So we have
tried to map what we think of these components occur in the project area.

So let’s start off with the land use mapping that we did. First we took a look at housing, and
again very high level, we looked at single family housing, multi-family housing, and special
purpose housing. The yellow being the single family housing, the brown being the multi-family
housing, and the orange areas being special purpose housing, primarily senior housing in the
Hyatt project and some of the senior housing facilities in Downtown Palo Alto. We have also
identified future sites including the two Quarry Road sites that are identified in the Stanford
General Use Permit as housing sites, and a site that was created with the Sandhill projects and
other approved housing sites within the one-mile radius of the project center.

The next land use we mapped was sort of the civic and cultural uses, the community serving
uses, the institutional uses including schools. The dots tend to be the elementary and high
schools and those sorts of things, special purpose schools like the Children’s Health Council, the
University of course is a major cultural and civic amenity, and the hospitals themselves and other
healthcare facilities such as PAMF, we included Palo Alto High School and the entertainment
and cultural facilities embodied in the Stanford athletic facilities as pictured here.

Then we took a look at the commercial. Obviously the Shopping Center is a commercial. You
have the smaller maps that you can refer to but what we also tried to do is to pinpoint those kind
of everyday commercial serving facilities that are within the study area, things like shoe repair,
grocery stores, hardware stores, and as you can see within the one-mile radius there is a number
of those including the main retail area of Downtown and the Shopping Center, and the Menlo
Park commercial areas which are all actually quite close together.

The next component of land use we mapped was again looking at a high level the landscapes or
the open spaces that generally serve the area. We distinguish between two types the natural and
improved landscapes, the two primary natural features being the San Francisquito Creek corridor
and the Stanford Arboretum. Then there are the improved types of landscapes where more active
types of recreation occur such as El Camino Park and the playfields on the west side of the
campus. The oval, which is a ceremonial improved open space, actually gets quite a bit of use as
a park. It is a popular area for volleyball and Frisbee and those sorts of things.
Then we started to look at what are the transportation elements that support these. The roads,
Bruce made the point about automobile dependent development so we didn’t get into looking at
the roads. The road system is fairly self-evident on the maps. We did start to map the transit that
is available, the yellow being the area covered by Marguerite routes. I am sorry about the quality
of the slide. There are some blue areas that show where the public transportation is but they tend
to focus along El Camino and move slightly up into Stanford and a few routes serving Palo Alto,
and of course the Intermodal Transit Center near the middle of all this.

Then the last component we looked at were pathways, primarily pedestrian and bike pathways,
because we are talking about walkable communities here or communities where alternative types
of transportation are available and the barriers, the creek, El Camino Real, we have a grade
separated crossing at Palm and University, and the railroad tracks all tend to be barriers. Then
we tried to highlight the places where the connections and the linkages occur. The vehicular
linkages are shown in the blue and not very visible on this slide the pedestrian and bike linkages
which are more numerous but certainly not complete. What we didn’t try to represent in this
drawing was the effectiveness of these linkages. Now, these linkages exist because there are
streets that go through but obviously not all of them work as well as they might. I think what
Bruce may be talking to as he discusses opportunities and planning is how some of these
linkages might be improved and where linkages that should exist to make these various land uses
that we have mapped more accessible and where additional linkages might be provided. Bruce
will talk about those opportunities now.

Mr. Fukuij: As I was saying earlier kind of initial way of looking at this is what kinds of
opportunities are there with the projects as they are proposed and then see what evolves out of
that. Often you think about a village and it is mixed use and higher density and we didn’t really
want to look at how to increase the density around these areas but we can certainly talk about
that. There are certain things in terms of sites that are not on the project applicant sites where
higher density might make sense. We wanted to really start off with looking at how do you
really create the right kinds of attractive sort of destinations. How do you get the right pedestrian
scale? How do you make sure you ensure there are publicly visible places? This is very
important, build on the connectivity points that Charles started talking about. Then really look at
street frontages and what is involved with doing that.

So there are a couple of points about the existing projects. The first part is, you have seen this
map many, many times, these are the two most current proposals with the Shopping Center and
then the Medical Center and then the Hoover Pavilion. I think one of the biggest challenges
around trying to create a village here since walkability is kind of a key to begin to change any
kind of behavior is just the scale of this environment and what can you really expect given the
scale of this environment. Here is the Caltrain station, the Intermodal Station, and this is a
quarter-mile walk from here to here. Really to walk from the Downtown if you are at Alma and
University and you walk down through here and come back up that is an eight or nine minute
walk and then there is another two or three minutes to get to the front door of the Shopping
Center. So that walk from here to here is already about ten minutes or more. This shows that it
is within a five minute walk if you go straight through here. So already there is quite a barrier
just in getting from the Downtown to access the Shopping Center.
Here is a half mile. That is the ostensible ten minute walk. Once you start from within the
Shopping Center and you walk from Bloomingdale’s and the entrance all the way to Neiman
Marcus that is about five minutes if you are not just strolling and shopping and just kind of let
me get through the Shopping Center. So you have some real challenges. Here already 15
minutes into your walk and you haven’t even gotten to the Medical Center yet. This is a mile out
here. So one of the first things in this village idea is this isn’t really going to be one village. I
think it is going to have to be separate destinations. I think that one of the great benefits that you
have here already is because Stanford University has a Marguerite Shuttle service you have a
shuttle system that takes you from the transit center to other destinations. I think that looking at
how to combine walkability and shuttle service is probably the right kind of overall approach to
think about this structure here, that and bike access. In five minutes on a bike you can get from
Downtown all the way to the Medical Center without too much of a problem. So the scale here
is really kind of the number one kind of challenge.

The second kind of big opportunity looking at this is the Medical Center will build out and have
something like 12,000 employees so it is a major employment center in addition to being a major
community service. So with that number of employees and then you have the Shopping Center
and it has something like 3,000 to 4,000 or almost 5,000 employees you have quite a few people
working in this environment. So how do you look at what to do to kind of do some shifting of
trips kind of off the peak hour a little bit to help reduce congestion? That is sort of the other
thing, how do you do some trip internalization? How do you get people to go from the Shopping
Center or from the Medical Center to the Shopping Center and back to help relieve the acuteness
of the peak time is sort of the other major opportunity. So that really starts to look at what are
the connections between and how do you improve the connections between the Medical Center
and the Shopping Center? We are going to look at that in more detail.

Given the scale and that when you are trying to create a village you want to create kind of people
places that attract people together. It seems like one of the strategies would be to look at how to
create a sort of sequence of attractive places. So what this map here shows you is – I will walk
through all these different places, all these little circles. There are some that are more important
than others. They all have like a five minute walking radius around them. I think this is going to
be kind of a key way to think about this. You need to have some kind of – here is Nordstrom’s,
Crate & Barrel, and Andronico’s. I will talk about the specifics but if you have something that is
in that zone for example that is within a five minute walk of the Children’s Hospital and seven or
eight minutes of the hospital. That might actually be something that is a feasible place where
you can start creating some activity to link people into the whole center. I mean here is the
Caltrain station you can walk to in five minutes. Really, what to do here at El Camino and
Quarry, how to make that a place that is attractive so that people who are Downtown will want to
walk there and how to get there, and people on El Camino will be able to see that and have
something that is at the center of an entrance to the main Shopping Center. Also how do to
something around where Neiman Marcus is these are real opportunity places. Then how to really
make this connection between Neiman Marcus and Nordstrom’s, that environment a more
walkable connected environment than it is right now. People walk there, you can walk there,
people do walk there, but there are some things that can be done more to make those like
attractive destinations to help attract people. So these are sort of like a chain of places that could
be linked together as sort of the heart of where people could be.
So then there are these questions of how do you actually get to those things and how do you bridge the connectivity gap that we have here with the barriers that you already have of the rail line, the San Francisquito Creek, El Camino. So what has come out of this is starting to look at how to make improvements for example like Quarry Road ends up becoming a very important circulation street because it becomes kind of an entryway to the Shopping Center and then with having housing sites here and here, where you will have people living here and how do they connect into the Shopping Center? How will they be able to connect to the Downtown and to the Intermodal transportation center and then infill some of these areas with medical office? Then you start looking at how do you create these kinds of connections from Arboretum for example into the Shopping Center, from the housing into the Shopping Center, from here and also from El Camino. There are sort of these different ways of connecting the public streets and frontages into the center and become a key question about the design of this thing, and how do you make those things publicly visible places and how do you turn those into attractive kinds of environments? That is kind of where we really are in terms of how we have started this conversation.

I think that a couple of other things that are very important are looking at Welch Road right here and how to really bridge this connection. Right now you have two lanes of traffic and you have a street crossing when usually you have a person who is there actually who facilitates crossing the street. You then have to cross through the parking lot that is where the Stanford Barn is and then you come across the street, and then it is pretty narrow with the two lanes and a small island. Then you have the loading docks for Nordstrom’s and the loading dock for Andronico’s and the entrance, but it is kind of a corridor as you go in through here. So having this point right here be a place where if you are in this zone that you could see that that’s actually the entrance to a walkable environment that leads you into the Shopping Center and could be really very powerful in terms of helping encourage walkability. Then when you get to this point actually having the front door of that center actually being the front door of a whole chain of experiences for being able to have people places would be really quite wonderful. Then what to do with this whole zone right in here. So we haven’t gotten to the point in the conversation about how to do these things. We are just talking about where it would it make sense to start doing these things, and is this the right set of places to do that? So this is kind of where we are in this process.

Mr. Turner: That concludes the Staff Report and certainly we would answer any questions.

Chair Holman: I think we have but four cards from members of the public and I see there are a couple of others coming. What I would like to do is take the speakers first and then come back to the Commission for questions and comments. So our first speaker, and if you could line yourselves up to be ready that would be helpful, Dr. Bruce Baker to be followed by Craig Barney.

Dr. Bruce Baker, Palo Alto: Thank you. I serve on the community resource group for the Stanford General Use Permit and am here speaking simply for myself and not for that group.

I just have a couple of comments tonight. The term ‘right-sizing’ sort of bothers me because there is something about that word ‘right’ that gives it positive intonations and to me it was non-
expanded sizing. So if that term is well accepted in your occupation that is fine but it does sort
of grate on me a little bit with respect to the use of the word ‘right.’

As a reflection I think medieval village planners would be very interested in this tonight if they
could transport themselves in history to tonight’s situation because most of our traditional zoning
contradicts the idea of the village concept. I think all of us love to see the traditional villages in
European countries and other places. So it is kind of a revolution in a way to think what this
does to all of our zoning principles.

One other thing I wanted to comment on is it is sort of popping up again in the material that is
here and that is that there should be no new net trips to the Stanford Shopping Center or the
hospital. That never appeared in any of these original documents. I think it is a bit unrealistic to
have that sort of suggestion or goal in the material that is perpetuating itself as we get through
the various iterations of this. I think it is unfair. It is an unrealistic requirement and I think it is
unfair to Stanford or the Stanford Shopping Center managers and developers to keep harping on
that. We are still stuck with the traditional form of transportation that is unfortunately one
person per vehicle. Even if you have a bicycle if you are going to a shopping center it is pretty
tough with our type of bicycles, we would have to get the Vietnamese versions, to restrict
yourself to purchasing much of anything if you are on a bicycle.

That is all I had to say tonight but I think the more I see the types of iterations that occur the
more I realize how much work Stanford and others have put into this effort and I think has been
a very good cooperative effort. Thank you.

Chair Holman: Thank you. Our next speaker is Craig Barney to be followed by Elaine Meyer.

Mr. Craig Barney, Palo Alto: Thank you. I have been a resident of Palo Alto for 18 years now.
When I selected Palo Alto as my residence Stanford Hospital was a major element in my
decision-making. I have spoken before to the committee and to the Planning Commission
regarding my concerns. Mainly that Stanford Hospital does grow and develop because we are a
growing and developing community. I had the same reaction when I heard about right-sizing
that perhaps the hospital would not add new beds. I did not see how that was possibly right.
When we project out into the future and especially when we plan for disasters and emergencies I
just cannot see how not expanding the hospital could in any way be right.

I want to comment the Commission actually on the work they have done so far on the EIR. I
think it is wonderful that they have made progress. It is disappointing that it is taking longer
than originally planned to me personally because I do think we have to have a sense of urgency
about this. I do think we need to proceed with all due haste to get the project going.

I have mentioned this before but I think it is worth mentioning again. When considering the
impacts of this project, the hospital, it is very important to consider that it in and of itself is a
mitigation because it does mitigate a need we have in our community, which is to provide
medical care for our people here.
I think those are the final things I had to say. This Village Concept is something I was not ready to discuss and I have to admit it seems on the surface intriguing but it is impossible for me to imagine how this could possibly work. Maybe I am just learning about it. Thank you.

Chair Holman: Thank you Mr. Barney. Our next speaker is Elaine Meyer to be followed by Tommy Fehrenbach.

Ms. Elaine Meyer, Palo Alto: Good evening Chair Holman and members of the Commission. Our city infrastructure is sometimes described as maxed out and we are about to spend some very large sums to build a new police building and libraries. Now, the Stanford Hospital and Shopping Center are expanding and going to bring in thousands of new people. Some obvious effects on us will be the need for housing and traffic, and of course you know about that but there is more. In order to figure out how the city will be impacted we need to know for example how will the police and fire departments be affected. Does Stanford have police and fire departments adequate to the increased responsibilities? How much additional responsibility will our departments have? Is the new police building needed to take care of this increase in population and responsibility?

Also, how many Stanford children attend our schools now and what how much of an increase can be expected? How many Stanford people use our libraries and how much of an increase can we expect? How many additional people will be using our parks?

I know that you have probably considered some of these but I just wanted to summarize them myself. Then, how is Stanford’s usage affecting us now and how will the increased population change it? Having this information in the EIR will be very helpful for the public. There is one additional matter that I don’t believe is being covered and that is what are Stanford’s plans for additional expansion in addition to this one billion dollar project? It is known that they are planning Medical Center enlargement and increases in development in the not very distant future. I think it is essential that that information be covered in the EIR. Thank you.

Chair Holman: Thank you. Our next speaker is Tommy Fehrenbach to be followed by Michael Griffin.

Mr. Tommy Fehrenbach, Palo Alto: Greetings and thank you for providing me with an opportunity to speak tonight. I live and work here in Palo Alto. Although I am involved with several organizations and clubs in town I came here tonight to speak on my own behalf.

Since making my way to California in 2001 I have lived in several of the great cities on the peninsula here. I decided to stay in Palo Alto for many reasons that are kind of more immediate like proximity to work, strong community organizations, a vibrant Downtown, the diversity of things to do and people to do them with, etc. I also looked ahead. I want to plant my roots here in Palo Alto because of the incredible opportunities here for learning and personal growth. This is a city that can raise tomorrow’s leaders to solve tomorrow’s problems. In order to continue to be great today’s Palo Alto leaders, especially its Commissions and Council, must have the vision to think ahead to the future of our community. The Stanford Hospital, the Lucile Packard Children’s Hospital as well as the School of Medicine represent that cutting edge in a way that is
very real and very global on a world scale. I am proud to live in a community that is home to such a place. Although I have thankfully never had to visit for my own emergencies I have had some friends that are alive today because of Stanford Hospital and clinics. I find great comfort knowing that this world class facility and these world class people are close just in case.

I hope that you will put special emphasis on the future when you make your decisions and recommendations on this project. I for one would like these hospitals, these incredible assets in our community, to continue to be viable and to be allowed to expand to meet the demands of our community and the needs of so many people in the world that benefit from what goes on there. Although things found in an Environmental Impact Report do affect us no one wants more traffic, noise, etc. There are places that people need to live. I hope though that you will properly weigh the benefits that the hospitals will bring us all on so many levels. I ask you to look ahead to the days of the next generations so that in the days of my children and my children’s children and my children’s children’s children we will still have a world class hospital in our backyard.

Thank you.

Chair Holman: Thank you Fehrenbach. Michael Griffin is our next speaker to be followed by Brian Schmidt.

Mr. Michael Griffin, Palo Alto: Good evening Commissioners. I really enjoyed the presentation this evening particularly in regard to this new concept of a village approach. I followed that discussion and I would encourage everybody to keep on keeping on that. It looks like a nice direction worthwhile pursuing.

I know that the Staff Report that we are looking at tonight is still pretty much a big picture in its nature but there were a couple of items that I would hope that Commissioners would be able to discuss and perhaps quiz Staff in more detail. On page three there is a mention of grade separations and I would be interested in having a better feel for where those grade separations might be and what they might consist of, that was on page three. On page four there is a discussion or a mention of connections. The Staff presentation here on the Village Concept did discuss connections and it was quite helpful but the current focus here is on internal connections and I have to tell you that I am wondering probably more about external access. In other words, how are we going to accommodate the 12,000 employees for the Medical Center and the 4,000 to 5,000 employees for the Shopping Center? How are those folks going to get in and out of town?

On page three there is also a mention of meetings that are taking place between Staff and Stanford and I am wondering if there are any meeting notes that would be made available providing details of those meetings. On page six there is a mention of future further use intensifications and additional uses that set me back a bit. I didn’t anticipate that there were plans over and above what we were looking at here immediately. Evidently that is the intent and it would be interesting to know how much more additional use intensification and additional usages we are going to be talking about. Hopefully they would be studied properly in the EIR.

Also offsite parking options, there was no discussion of that and that would be interesting to have you folks quiz Staff a little bit about if there are any new developments in that regard. I
was quite happy to see the reference to the no net new trips as still being a concept that
apparently we have not lost sight of. Thanks.

Chair Holman: Thank you for coming back to visit, Mr. Griffin. Brian Schmidt to be followed
by Tom Jordan.

Mr. Brian Schmidt, Palo Alto: Good evening, Brian Schmidt for Committee for Green Foothills.
I thought I would establish my credibility here. I will start by talking about the Village
Alternative Concept. I might stray from that a little bit. It seems like a very interesting concept.
I am glad to see the City is exploring that. A lot of times when they look at the EIR alternatives
it is just a cursory process of going through the motions and the City does not seem to be doing
that. I would also like to congratulate Stanford which also seems to be taking it seriously from
Charles' presentation. One thing that did come out during the presentations was when you are
talking about half-mile versus a mile distance it might be better instead of using distance as a the
crow flies use distance as a person walks. I think that might even be possible to do. It shouldn't
be too difficult to get out there and measure it or do it through computers.

The Village Alternative Concept is going to be useful for dealing with the EIR and the many
significant environmental impacts that are likely to occur. One of the most significant is housing
impacts and the need to deal with the issues of housing. There was mention of that in the
discussion of the Village Concept. I am not sure exactly how that is going to be worked into the
concept. The Committee for Green Foothills is talking with the City of San Jose which is
actually trying to have still more jobs than it has employed residents and that city has been the
bedroom community for places like this. It is a recipe for sprawl. It is very difficult for me to
tell them not to do that when the City of Palo Alto is receiving applications that are having the
same effect, adding jobs without adding housing.

A couple of other things I would like to add, the issue of no net new trips, I would respectfully
disagree with my friend Bruce on that issue. It was done with the 2000 GUP not as a firm barrier
but something that said you have to do this or certain other mitigations would come into place.
The problem with the Stanford General Use Permit with the County is those other conditions
they would have to do in terms of improving roads, not necessarily things that we would like to
see happen. So if there is some way to get around that issue I think it would be important.

To wrap up, there are three other quick things. Attachment A, Employment Summary, in the
middle has a starred footnote. If you read the starred footnote it is regarding the current
employment numbers. It says these numbers have been supplied by applicant and are subject to
verification by City. Figure for 2007 includes staff growth associated with current renovations.
This is a relevant issue to the baseline that would be used for EIR analysis. The baseline should
use present level of jobs or 2000 level of jobs. It should not be adjusted upward to include
additional people that do not currently work there at the baseline. That would artificially reduce
the impact from the project.

I am very interested in understanding the medical office space that is part of this project. Is this
just another revenue generator for Stanford? Another type of industrial research park that is
being used for medical office space, is it entirely appropriate for that to be there?
And finally, somebody had asked a question about build out and other projects at Stanford. Stanford is required as part of the 2000 General Use Permit to create a sustainability study that would discuss its full build out. Stanford is already in initial discussions with the County over this issue. We would like that to be an open public process and that might help the City as well understand what is going on with Stanford and what the build out for Stanford will be. Thank you very much.

Chair Holman: Thank you, Mr. Schmidt. Tom Jordan to be followed by our final speaker, Bob Moss.

Mr. Tom Jordan, Palo Alto: Good evening. I have lived here about 45 years. I would like to address the fiscal impact study. To me that is absolutely at the heart of it. In spite of many speakers coming up and speaking as though people are throwing their bodies in the way of the hospital being built I have never spoken that way. I really have only heard one or two people suggest that. The real impact is not the size. The real impact is the fiscal impact on the community. I will name four but there are many. One would be obviously the jobs and impact that will have on housing imposed on us by ABAG. Secondly, will be traffic and the improvements that will cost money so that the traffic will flow properly. The third will be impact on public services, police, fire, library, recreation. The fourth will be schools, which from a fiscal impact study you certainly can study. I realize that from a land use planning point you may not deny any permit based on school growth but you can be aware of the fiscal impact because we also have here a Development Agreement, which does not restrict you from imposing something in the Development Agreement regarding school growth. Specifically one of the things you will want to know is how many children attend Palo Alto schools from households that pay zero tax and how many more will be increased by the 3,000-plus housing units that Stanford will be building on campus for their students and how many more from other sources.

The main point here, by far the main question is the fiscal impact. The EIR is important but the fiscal impact study which they said would not be released until the Draft EIR, let me point out a few things that are vitally important that this group have as heavy a hand, as strong a hand as you can. Number one, I read as much as I can on this and I have no idea who our fiscal impact team is. It would be nice to know. It would be nice to know a schedule of their meetings even if we can’t attend them. It would be nice to know who they are meeting with and what topics they are considering. It would be nice to know, and another example would be the EIR is governed by statute as to what they must study so there is no question there. The fiscal impact is not. They will study what you and the City Council tell them to study and they will study this carefully and with whatever expert help that they need as you take part but there is no structure for the fiscal impact. I am asking you to take a heavy part and be sure – because the heart of it will be when we get down to that last period and the Draft EIR is out and the fiscal impact study. It is vitally important that the citizens have full confidence that every impact was looked at and every impact was quantified. Now who pays for it can be argued later. That is not the job of the fiscal impact study but they must be looked at and they must be quantified as closely as they can every one of them. That is the heart of the matter. It is not how big is this going to be it is who pays for it. When that time comes we can have the debate and Stanford will try to push some of the cost on
us, the City. Then we will have the debate do we accept it or not. If it is not studied and we
don’t have trust in the figures then there will be great discomfort in the citizens and really you
can’t even have a legitimate debate on the topic. So I hope you take a strong part and make sure
that fiscal impact study is done as well and as thoroughly as possible. Thank you.

Chair Holman: Thank you, Mr. Jordan. Our final speaker is Bob Moss.

Mr. Robert Moss, Palo Alto: Thank you Chairman Holman and Commissioners. First I want to
say I agree with comments of Tom Jordan and Elaine Meyer about the impacts and the cost to
the community from this project.

This is a regional project. It is going to serve an area much, much, much larger than just Palo
Alto but Palo Alto is going to bear the great majority of the cost and the burden of servicing it.

Let me address a few points in the EIR. The first is in Attachment A there is a picture of the
layout. It is significantly different than what is on the board. You heard they are taking 140,000
square feet and moving it from Hoover Pavilion to the two hospitals. It is impossible to tell what
that movement was from looking at any of these drawings. So I would like to see the EIR or the
drawing or something specifically say we are reducing this spot on the Hoover Pavilion map and
we are increasing it on the hospital side so it is clear what we are talking about. Right now you
can’t tell whether this or that is correct.

On the EIR itself when you talk about right-sizing they say we will consider having no expansion
in beds, and having what they are talking about, and maybe something in between. I suggest you
look at three different options for the in between. Right now for example the hospital is
suggesting going from 456 to 600. Maybe we should look at 525, 545, and 600. The third one
would be to have say more beds added to the hospital and fewer beds added to the Children’s
Hospital. So the total number of beds you can fiddle with but have them rearrange how they are
proportioned. I don’t think we should be looking at just none, maximum, and some arbitrary
number in between.

The other thing that I am concerned about, as a lot of people are, is the traffic. This projection
shows an increase in peak-hour evening traffic of about 55 percent in round numbers and
morning traffic in round numbers of 60 percent. If we are talking about no net increase in traffic
that means on a practical basis reducing the amount of single occupant car trips by
approximately 70 percent. Also, the hospital portion doesn’t take into account the additional
traffic from the proposed expansion of both the new hotel we are talking about, 120 units, and
the additional 240,000 square feet of shopping center. That is going to have both employee
traffic and shopper traffic. If the Shopping Center is expanded and you don’t draw more people
coming in to use it that doesn’t pay the bills so you have to assume you are going to have more
people going in to shop.

Another thing I would like to see taken a very careful look at is where is that traffic going to
flow? There have been a lot of developments in the past which have created significant traffic
impacts on neighborhoods like Downtown North and then created the impetus to try to get
basically a freeway put along an extension of Sandhill Road. I think most of you may not have
been around when it was discussed almost 40 years ago but the reason 101/Alma exists was to
put a big spike in the road so you couldn’t put a freeway from 101 to 280 along basically San
Francisco Creek. You are going to see that issue come up again.

Where are the people going to live? How many of them are going to be able to live in Palo Alto?
What impacts is that going to have on other streets if they live, let’s say three or four miles away
but still within the city, and what is the traffic flow going to be? What is the requirement going
to be to service them? All those issues should be talked about in the EIR.

One of the things people seem to be overlooking, we talk about we are going to go across El
Camino, we are going to have some kind of an overpass, is money. If you are talking about a
vehicular overpass you are talking about between $75 and $100 million. If you are talking about
a pedestrian/bike overpass you are talking about between $10 and $15 million. So who is going
to pay for that? Where is it going to come from? Are we going to get it from the Governor?
Are we going to get it from the state? They are picking our pockets they are not going to give us
any money. So how are we going to mitigate all of these problems, who is going to pay for it,
and when? Will the mitigations be done before we build or after everything is built and we are
totally congested up to here? Those are important. The process and the schedule have to be
upfront so everyone understands where we are going and how we are going to pay for it.

Chair Holman: Good timing. Commissioners, it is 8:15 and Commissioner Sandas has had an
unavoidable circumstance that constrains her availability this evening. So with the
Commissioners’ forbearance I am going to let Commissioner Sandas go with her questions and
comments both if she would care to do so right now.

Commissioner Sandas: Thank you very much Chair Holman. I have several sort of semi-
clarifying questions. Before that I will just make one comment. I want to say thank you Steven
Turnery and Whitney McNair for a well-produced report tonight. Much appreciated.

The first question I have has to do with the changes to the proposed site plan. It is indicated that
the tower configurations of Stanford Hospital would be changed but unless I missed it, I didn’t
see what those changes might be, or is that still not determined?

Mr. Turner: No, the applicants have submitted a kind of revised site plan that shows the general
changes in the building footprints and it also alludes to the changes in the massing although they
have not submitted elevations or sections that we have been able to provide to you that show the
different heights of the different aspects of the hospital at this point.

Commissioner Sandas: So just a heads up at this point.

Mr. Turner: That’s right.

Commissioner Sandas: Okay. I was intrigued by a comment of one of our community members
and I am wondering if anyone can speak to additional increases at SUMC beyond what is being
proposed in this project?
Mr. Turner: We don't have any information about additional project increases beyond the project timeline. Again, we are looking out to 2030 for the completion of the Medical Center projects. So we don't have any information with regards what might happen after that point.

Commissioner Sandas: Thanks. One other question has to do with the Area Plan identifying strategies for accomplishing housing with a focus on below market residential units. If I can be reminded of our definition of BMR again I would like to know more in the future, I don't need that definition here in the moment. I would like to know more in the future about the number of employees who will qualify for BMR and how that might play out. I think it is premature to know that answer now but I know it is in the idea phase and I would like to know more.

Mr. Curtis Williams, Assistant Director: I want to say we have commissioned and are pretty far along in analysis of breaking down all the employees into different income groups and all of that. So we will have all of that kind of information and have estimates specifically by income group and what we consider to be within affordability categories and how many that would be versus how many would be market rate type of needs. So that is all well underway and will be available.

Commissioner Sandas: Great, thank you. Two more questions. I am a little bit confused about the no project alternative notion. I am hoping that is just a requirement of CEQA and they say you just have to list it and tell us what that means.

Mr. Turner: It is.

Commissioner Sandas: However, it generated one question for me. The Area Plan now includes both the Shopping Center and the Medical Center, thank you very much I am glad to see that. Are these projects handled independently or as one in terms of the no project alternative?

Mr. Williams: The Area Plan does not technically include that. The maps we drew included that but the policies and the real focus of the detail in the Area Plan, which you saw some months ago, was the Medical Center but then it did acknowledge the surrounding area and there were some policies that certainly link the two together particularly those as far as connectivity and that kind of thing. The EIR addresses both of them definitely. The alternatives could be broken out into reduced alternative for one and not reducing the other project, it could be reductions in both together, we have not quite decided how that works. However, it is all one EIR, there could be quite a number of alternatives and they may be combinations of individual components.

Commissioner Sandas: Okay, I guess I misunderstood then what I had read about them being one but it is just for the EIR pretty much. Okay.

So the final question I have is on page six, the middle of the bottom paragraph regarding the Village Concept Alternative, it states that the Staff recognizes that some of the elements of this alternative may be outside the City's or the applicant's control to implement. I was curious about that. I would like to know a little bit more about who is in control? What are the mechanisms that need to be in place to be able to implement that concept?
Mr. Williams: That statement recognizes that this whole concept of a village is not a project. One project doesn’t make a village kind of thing. It is an integrated network, planning and design network, and I think Bruce has explained that very well. I look at Downtown Palo Alto and near in areas as a village to me, it embodies a lot of those concepts and that is hundreds of individual projects that make that up. So that is what is integral. So in this case we know there are other things outside the boundaries of this project that are going to be integral to that in terms of connections, and some of them are open spaces like San Francisquito Creek. Some of them are local serving retail connections like to Downtown and even to Town & Country and places like that. Some of them are housing. We have identified two of the General Use Permit sites as potential housing sites that are immediately adjacent but they are not right within the project. Now, there may be through the Development Agreement some connection so they get brought into the projects and the transit center and what happens within the transit center if there is housing or a mix of uses around that. That is something that to a large extent is beyond the boundaries and probably the scope of this project about we want to recognize that those opportunities are there too. We want to anticipate that we may have the needs to make those connections to those areas and have it all integrated. That is what is really going to help form a village connection.

Commissioner Sandas: So in a nutshell this is a really innovative and interesting suggestion more or less.

Mr. Williams: It is and I think as Bruce has characterized what we want to do is identify which elements and opportunities are part of these projects or could be part of these projects. We can’t probably identify all of what else might be there in the future. In responding to Mr. Griffin’s question about potential intensification there may be some, there are not any specific plans for that at this point. We want to be sure we are not precluding opportunities if that is desirable in the future to happen with what happens here. So we probably wouldn’t want to cover the whole Shopping Center for instance with one-story buildings that couldn’t be taller than that or something like that. So we want to be sure we are not precluding those potential opportunities. I don’t know if Bruce has any more.

Commissioner Sandas: Thanks. In that case, without having had the opportunity to hear questions and other comments from my colleagues I did just want to offer up a couple of comments. The one thing is that I am really interested in learning about the strategies and tactics for the no net new car trips, in particular vis-a-vie the Stanford Shopping Center. I just think that is going to be really tricky and I am keeping the faith.

I also appreciate your keeping up with the work to get the Draft EIR to us in November. I recognize the amount of time and energy that is put into this which is why the whole notion of the no project alternative looked really scary. You have done so much work already if that were an actual alternative it would be pretty disagreeable.

Finally, I just want to say that I agree with Mr. Jordan on keeping up with the fiscal impact issues and keeping that in the forefront of all of this for us here in the city. I think that is important. With that I will conclude.
Chair Holman: Thank you, Commissioner Sandas. I don’t have any lights from anyone so Commissioner Lippert would you care to start? We will go through the question phase first.

Commissioner Lippert: I have a couple of questions for Staff. With regard to the transfer of the square footage from the Hoover Pavilion to the hospital Medical Center target site, would some sort of covenant or restriction be placed on the Hoover Pavilion site that would not allow for future development of that?

Mr. Turner: At this point there is no discussion about that of restricting future development on the Hoover Pavilion site. Perhaps that would be an issue that is discussed through the Development Agreement process but that is currently not part of Stanford’s application to the City to limit further development at that site.

Commissioner Lippert: I guess my assumption is that because the Hoover Pavilion is historic and we are trying to keep that pristine in terms of a recognizable historic site or that the square footage of the site, if you took the lot area that would normally be developed that is being transferred or considered part of that parcel, am I making those assumptions or are those the kinds of assumptions that you are making?

Mr. Turner: Well, those are assumptions at this point and we have not concluded whether or not they are historic properties. We are still going through that. Once we do have that information then we will look at mitigations that might address those issues but at this point we are not at that point to determine whether or not we have significant impacts.

Commissioner Lippert: I have one last question. I am glad you brought up the Development Agreement. What is the relationship of the material that we have reviewed today in relationship to the Development Agreement? How is that going to work in the process?

Mr. Williams: I will make one brief comment and then see if Cara has more to add. Most of what we are looking at today deals with the EIR so the alternatives are specific to the EIR. The Village Concept Alternative in particular being in the EIR can only be there if it is addressing significant impacts. Any of our alternatives have to be addressing significant impacts or potential significant impacts that are identified in the EIR. There are components, design components, land use components, other things in the Village Concept that may not be EIR specifically related. If there are elements of that or the connectivity or something else that the City feels strongly are necessary then the Development Agreement is a mechanism that allows us to try to work that into the project. So it is more along the lines of it will incorporate some of the things from the EIR but it is also available to be a possible avenue to require certain amenities, features of the projects such that do not relate specifically to mitigation measures. So to that extent this discussion could relate to Development Agreement as well but what we are focused on now is the EIR and trying to address, we don’t know all the impacts of the EIR, but we certainly know there are going to be significant traffic impacts, which is I think the main area where we have potential through some of this connectivity to respond to those impacts.

Commissioner Lippert: Thank you.
Chair Holman: Because I went straight to the public there are a few questions I should ask of
Staff to get on the record and for everybody’s edification. The amount of information that is
available at this point is I believe less than what was anticipated at this point in time. Perhaps
Staff would care to state what the timeline is now for the delivery of the DEIR.

Mr. Turner: As we stated, we are projecting that we will complete our internal review and
analysis and our work with our consultant and have a draft document that is released to the
public in November of this year.

Mr. Williams: I might add that we are also anticipating some interim work products that
hopefully we can bring to Commission to at least apprise you of data on traffic and housing
needs and that kind of thing to get responses on those between now and that point as well. That
was what we kind of had targeted this meeting as we have talked before about but we do not
have that information. It was not ready yet. As Steven mentioned the timeline has been
extended.

Chair Holman: So stated another way this will not be our only crack at the topics that are
addressed in the Staff Report. Once we get more information we will have another opportunity
to comment on this.

Mr. Williams: That is what we anticipate.

Chair Holman: Okay. The plan objectives that are referenced in the description are not included
so none of that has changed from prior deliverables to the Commission and public I am
presuming.

Mr. Turner: That is correct.

Chair Holman: Okay. Any other business Commissioner Garber that you can think of that we
need to attend to?

Vice-Chair Garber: No.

Chair Holman: Commissioner Keller, you light was on next.

Commissioner Keller: Thank you. Is it correct that both the Hoover Pavilion site and the
Stanford Hospital site are now at maximum FAR for current zoning or pretty close to it?
Therefore both of them would need to be increased in order to accommodate the growth
including adding the 60,000 square feet at Hoover?

Mr. Turner: I think that we are approaching the site not looking at individual kind of parcels and
FAR on each individual site. I think we are looking at it as sort of a project-wide site and
determining how much floor area is being added but at the same time part of the application
entitlements is requesting perhaps a new form of zone district that would be specifically for
hospital and medical office related uses. So it would essentially have specific development
standards that would accommodate the project.
Commissioner Keller: I am not sure but that seems to be a change because on the hospital we were originally talking about FAR of 1.0 and at the Hoover Pavilion we were talking about FAR going from .25 to .50 or something along those lines. So aggregating the square footage for both separated groups of parcels if you will, I am not sure of the extent to which they are individual parcels, but from the Medical Center portion and the Hoover Pavilion portion aggregating those is some thing new that wasn’t originally, at least in what I read a while ago, so that is why I am confused about that. It would be helpful to actually identify the FAR for the Hoover Pavilion and the FAR for the hospital specifically because I think those were cited in earlier reports.

With respect to the No Project Alternative I note that there are things with respect to the 2013 deadlines. I am wondering the extent to which one of the new No Project Alternatives might include making it so that there were no critical patient care units, which I believe is that correct? The 2013 deadline refers to no critical patient care units in noncompliant buildings. I think that is what is going on and if that is correct then I am wondering whether that should be one of the 2013 deadline project alternatives, removing all critical patient care units from noncompliant buildings. Is that one of the alternatives being considered?

Mr. Turner: Well, we can certainly take that under consideration.

Commissioner Keller: Thank you. In the Staff Report it said that one of the possibilities of a smaller alternative was a smaller Shopping Center increase and still a full-size hotel but that didn’t match what was on the summary on the slides. So I want to make sure that that’s still one of the possibilities.

Mr. Turner: Again, these examples are really examples of what a reduced project alternative could be. We have not come to any conclusions on what a reduced project alternative would be at this point. So that is certainly something we can continue to consider.

Commissioner Keller: I appreciate that. It is just that the Staff Report specifically called those two alternatives out as reduced project alternatives and they were not in the presentation.

I am wondering the extent to which internal traffic impacts such as circulation between the Hoover Pavilion as the Medical Center facility and the Medical Center being separated by, it looks like a pretty far distance I am not sure if that is half a mile or three-quarters of a mile I don’t know what the scale is there, but it is certainly a far distance for walking. With the reduced amount of medical office there I was told that one of the reasons that it was okay to have the Hoover Pavilion be a medical facility is because they would be able to have all these lab tests there so that you wouldn’t have to go to the main medical center. With the movement of 140,000 square feet of medical center office to the main campus of the Medical Center I am wondering whether that is no longer a viable alternative and whether there would be a lot of traffic going back and forth between those two sites. I am wondering the extent to which that internal traffic impact is going to be considered.

Mr. Williams: We will pass that along to the EIR consultants. They are looking at the traffic now in conjunction with our traffic consultant. This has just recently been presented so they will
be looking at the difference that that makes in terms of the traffic particularly on Quarry Road probably.

Commissioner Keller: Yes, in particular Quarry Road is a route that is used for ambulances so the impact on emergency service vehicles is important. With respect to that impact repurposing Hoover Pavilion as a hotel may be an appropriate mitigation for that impact in order to sort of concentrate the medical office uses and medical services uses all within the main Medical Center complex. Thank you.

Chair Holman: Commissioner Fineberg a couple of questions?

Commissioner Fineberg: I have a number of questions tonight. I will ask my top three or four and then if time allows I will come back to it later.

My first question is on the Staff Report, Attachment A. It talks about the Comprehensive Plan Amendments that are entitlements requested. Why is it that we need to modify the Comprehensive Plan Program L-3 to allow for taller buildings? Let me read L-3 and then if you could take a crack at that. Program L-3, maintain and periodically review height and density limits to discourage single uses that are inappropriate in size and scale to the surrounding uses.

The citywide 50-foot height limit has been respected in all developments since it was adopted in the 1970s only a few exceptions have been granted for architectural enhancements or seismic safety retrofits to noncomplying buildings. So if this is being done for seismic safety retrofits and that is specifically called in the Comprehensive Plan why do we need to modify the Comprehensive Plan Program L-3 rather than grant an exemption?

Mr. Williams: I think if we took the position that that covered this the argument the other way would basically be well, you can so a seismic retrofit of the building without the additional height. So the additional height relates to more than just the seismic retrofitting. It is a design, it is a hospital design that is at this point desirable, but you are right it isn’t specific. The trigger for the whole project is seismic retrofitting but that doesn’t mean that it has to be that high just because you are seismically retrofitting. There are a lot of factors that go into that in terms of today’s more modern hospital design and the increase in number of beds and those kinds of things too. So when we did look at that issue, and it is a very good question, we debated it a lot as far as internally, but we thought that it would be better to try to more specifically address when some kind exception above the 50 feet was appropriate. It might also be for public safety facilities or something like that. We want to keep it very narrow obviously but it didn’t seem that the seismic safety thing and of itself was justified. Also the Children’s Hospital is going to be over 50 feet, it is not 130 feet but it is still more than the 50 feet and it is not just an architectural feature. So for that purpose as well it would be necessary to address it. At least that is the request at this point in time by the applicant is to make that modification.

Commissioner Fineberg: So what is the advantage of amending the Comprehensive Plan? What would that language be? When would the timeframe be for the review of that and the implementation versus City Council granting an exemption to current requirements?
Mr. Williams: That will be part and parcel of the language of that in the zoning language will be part and parcel of the overall project entitlement that came to you with the Final EIR for your consideration. So it will all be meshed together.

Commissioner Fineberg: Then if it is in the project entitlement documentation would that language then apply to another hospital in a hospital zoning district someplace else in the city?

Mr. Williams: It depends on how it is worded and written and that is something you will be reviewing and determining whether that is appropriate or not.

Commissioner Fineberg: Thank you. I want to take a step back to a big picture. Comprehensive Plan authorizes 3,250,000 square feet of new nonresidential construction through its time horizon. I know these numbers have been requested or discussed before but can you update us on where we are now in that cap and then how this I believe it is about 1.5 million of new developed nonresidential space fits under those caps?

Mr. Turner: We have done some preliminary numbers with regards to where we are with the cap. With these projects which include the Medical Center project at approximately 1.3 million square feet, the hotel at 120,000 square feet, and the expansion of the Shopping Center at 240,000 square feet we get into approximately 400,000 square feet of the citywide cap. So if these projects were approved we would be within approximately 400,000 square feet of the cap.

Commissioner Fineberg: So that is getting pretty close, thank you.

Chair Holman: Commissioner Fineberg, we will come back around. Vice-Chair Garber.

Vice-Chair Garber: The fiscal impact statement who actually prepares that and who reviews it?

Mr. Williams: The city will prepare that. There was a lot of information that Stanford had put together as far as their estimate of both the Shopping Center and the Medical Center as far as the potential impacts from their projects. We have hired an economic consultant who is doing two things. One is reviewing all of that information and consolidating all that into what will become ultimately the fiscal report and also doing some additional hotel study analysis as to the potential for not just this proposed hotel but perhaps a larger size hotel here. So that is being put together. There was a question about the fiscal team and Lalo Perez, our Administrative Services Director, is the head of that team. It has other members of his staff on it, representatives from various City departments, the Attorney’s Office, the Planning Department, Public Works, Utilities and a group of them will meet occasionally with Stanford’s folks to exchange information and get updates so we have the most current information to work from in that analysis.

Vice-Chair Garber: Does the Commission have the opportunity to see and review that?

Mr. Williams: Yes, you will be getting that like we said with an Environmental Impact Report. It will be a Draft Fiscal Study as well.
Vice-Chair Garber: Second question, the physical impacts group, is that a group and who
composes it?

Mr. Williams: There is not a ... it is the fiscal.

Vice-Chair Garber: Mr. Jordan has mentioned that there was a physical impact study group.

Mr. Williams: I think he meant fiscal, f-i-s-c-a-l. Yes, he is nodding. Sometimes it sounds like
that when I say it too.

Vice-Chair Garber: Okay. Finally, I would be interested in seeing what the actual wording is
that contains the language regarding Stanford’s limits on net new trips and what the mitigations
are at whatever the trigger points are.

Mr. Williams: For the County permit?

Vice-Chair Garber: Yes.

Chair Holman: I will step in for a couple of questions here. The Village Concept, can Staff
explain why the Village Concept is an alternative as opposed to a design approach?

Mr. Williams: In many respects it is both. It is an alternative because we believe it responds to
some of the impacts that the project is likely to have particularly again as far as traffic and
probably housing generated by the new employment that is proposed. So this is an opportunity
for us to address some of those with this alternative.

It also is a design element of our review because much of the design issues we are looking at
certainly focus around wanting to attain better connectivity and a good mix of uses and the
pedestrian and bicycle and transit amenities and open space amenities that we would expect from
a design perspective. So it gets back again to the fact that there may be some components of this
that are outside the boundary, not the physical boundary, of the projects themselves but are
beyond what necessarily fits in the impact review, and that are good design concepts in any
event. I think ARB certainly will be looking for a number of those things, you will, the Council
will, and I think the applicants are working with us to try to as much as possible incorporate
them in their revisions as they move through iterations and design and working with us. I think
Bruce has already seen some cooperative efforts to try to incorporate some of those things in the
design. So our goal and ultimate hope would be that much of this concept is embodied in the
design that ultimately comes to you.

Chair Holman: I do see the perspective that it could be either or both. Here is the quandary that
I face and maybe Staff can respond to this. At least what is stated in the Staff Report in
Attachment C, I read your Attachment C and listened to your presentation, and it all is well and
good, although I do have some questions about Attachment C. It seems as though this is one
alternative so where is the scalability of this, I am going to call it a design approach or design
principle. The Commission and Council have both said and I think you indicated that the ARB
would want this as a principle too so why not adopt this as a principle and say this is what we
want to see and not rely on one alternative, as I read it, one alternative that is a Village Concept that is not scaled? As I read this we are getting one Village Concept, one size. The reason I say this is because it only says one Village Concept. Also on page two, D-1-c, under Village Concepts as Applied to Project, it is enable projects and advance project objectives. Well, a scaled project won’t necessarily accomplish all of the project objectives. So that is where I am having difficulty here between alternative and design approach.

Mr. Fukuiji: Could you explain what you are saying about scale and scaling? Could you explain so I have a better understanding of what that is?

Chair Holman: Sizing. In other words, there are no project alternatives and there are reduced size, scaled back, projects. When it comes to the Village Concept it looks like there is one Village Concept being researched so that doesn’t say to me that there are right-sized, downsized alternatives also being looked at as part of the Village Concept. That is why I am trying to understand why this is an alternative or is this several alternatives and it is just not clear in the Staff Report or I am just not understanding it that way.

Mr. Fukuiji: It is a wonderful question. I think that we haven’t quite decided on what that is. I think the way we are looking at it is it is principles in terms of how to think about something. It is a design approach as you said but we haven’t come to some place where we have made a decision as to what the scale of something like this would be. I think that is partially because we are exploring these ideas with the applicant to see what is feasible, what is not feasible, what are they open to or not, what makes sense, what are some of the technical issues that would have to be overcome in order to be able to do those things, and we are letting that process kind of generate how far it goes with the intent of looking at how that would shape the project application itself, as opposed to looking at what would be a kind of village larger-scale, bigger picture village that would include multiple sites outside of the context of the project, and what would all that be. We didn’t really take it on as a planning exercise to kind of explore all that. What we are looking at is a way to make sure that the project as it is being conceived would not preclude being able to do those things. We have had some questions about there are these two projects, the Shopping Center and the Medical Center application, and what is coming up are a lot of questions about is this a different project to define what a village is because it includes areas that are not in the specific applications. So we are having an ongoing conversation about what that would be. I think it would be useful to hear what your positions are around that. Part of this is in response to questions that have been asked why not look at this as a village? So it might be helpful for us to hear what you would like to see be in a village concept or how you would like to see that framed or thought about. Then we can talk about how to incorporate that in what we are doing. That would be wonderful information and guidance for us.

Chair Holman: Thank you. Commissioner Lippert, questions.

Commissioner Lippert: Just continuing along the same lines, early on I think one of the alternatives that was mentioned here was to look at an alternative that would comply with the underlying zoning that is currently there. I understand there is an application to have a new zone created. So why isn’t there an alternative there that looks at using the PF zone in terms of redevelopment of the site?
Mr. Williams: Basically because the PF zone, as I think was sort of referenced over here in an earlier question, wouldn’t basically allow very much in the way of additional development. So essentially a no project alternative is the PF. Now under the existing PF zone what you could build is the no project alternative.

Commissioner Lippert: Okay, so will that be identified in the EIR?

Mr. Williams: It says the no project alternative.

Commissioner Lippert: Okay. Then the second question is with the rezone or the proposed application for a rezone to a new hospital and medical office zone where does that stand in the process? You talked about the EIR coming forward in November will this rezone be heard prior to the Draft EIR or after the Draft EIR?

Mr. Williams: The ultimate action on the rezoning would be at the time of the final entitlements. What we anticipate is before we get the Draft EIR out having sessions with the Commission to talk about the zoning and sort of zoning options and ways to frame what goes on. We have some constraint in that it is not an open book, we have a proposal on the table so we have something to deal with, but we want to come to you with that just before the Draft EIR comes out and have some discussion about that before we release the Draft. So I think we had talked at one point about maybe establishing a subcommittee of the Commission that could work with us a little bit on that and bring it forward to the full Commission.

Commissioner Lippert: That raises a very interesting question which is if we are entertaining a rezone, a new zone, could those development regulations and uses make use of a village concept?

Mr. Fukui: I think that there are a lot of tools that you can use in zoning or coding in order to be able to shape the physical environment to be more village-like. We haven’t really looked at that or explored what that might be. I think we have been looking at the project application as a site plan itself and what is going on with that and how would that work. We have not gotten to the point where how would you create a framework for that. Both applicants have been proposing design guidelines for the Medical Center and also the Shopping Center and I think that is the area where I think that any of these concepts could find their place in terms of how they would be implemented would be in those documents more than in the zoning. The zoning would probably refer to that and that is in concept how we are framing it at this point.

Commissioner Lippert: Okay. I will cede my time and you can come back to me.

Chair Holman: Commissioner Keller, a couple of questions.

Commissioner Keller: Yes. One of the things that came up earlier in the discussion I think was the issue of connectivity between the Medical Center and the Shopping Center. There was an observation that there is a pedestrian crossing along Welch Road and how that is not conducive to actually getting to the Shopping Center. Now I note that there is the Barn which provides
some sort of connectivity between the Medical Center and the Shopping Center that isn’t part of the Shopping Center boundary but apparently it is not. There is a parking lot in between without much ability for pedestrians. I am wondering if one of the design things that is being considered is to possibly relocate that Welch Road pedestrian crossing to try to create some sort of pedestrian or bicycle connectivity through the parking lot or adjacent to the parking lot that is much more friendly that connects you over to Andronico’s and Nordstrom’s and whatever.

Mr. Turner: We haven’t come up with specific proposals or a specific solution for that. If you look at it, I think you have noticed it, it seems like a logical place for that to happen but we haven’t approached or had those discussions with the applicant yet on what specifically those connections could look like or where exactly they would be. There are a number of constraints on the applicant’s side that they will discuss with us on how that is or is not possible but we have not had those full discussions yet.

Commissioner Keller: I noticed some members of the public talked about no new net trips. One thought it was an unrealistic, I think was the word that was used, and several thought that somehow it was a reasonable thing to do and referenced the 2000 Stanford County General Use Permit. I am wondering to what extent will you be considering the potential for in lieu mitigation so that if you somehow reduce the total amount of traffic on Palo Alto roads for example through transit use or for example through providing additional transit services in Palo Alto or for example in connecting the Marguerite Shuttle to connect all the way to go through Palo Alto or to extend the Palo Alto Shuttle to connect with the Shopping Center or the Medical Center. Are those the kinds of things you would be considering in terms of mitigations that could achieve no new net trips?

Mr. Williams: Those may very well be some. We have not gotten to the point of identifying those specific mitigations because the traffic study is not complete. You have mentioned those previously and they are definitely on our radar. I would just like to mention that I don’t think that is really the focus of tonight’s meeting. I think we are trying to address the alternatives part of this and the updated plan. We do have those definitely on our radar and have taken those down from your previous comments about concepts of mitigation. We had those workshops and follow up with the Commission and I recall that specifically being one that we did put down for the consultant to consider.

Commissioner Keller: Thank you. The last question I will ask now is the one some members of the public complained about the schedule slipping as if somehow that is our fault. It certainly isn’t the fault of people on the Commission. I am not sure whose fault it is but the interesting thing is there was a proposal from Stanford to Palo Alto to do some project. I am wondering to the extent that the timing of that with respect to the timing of SB1953, is part of the reason that we are feeling so compressed that there was a long time from when SB1953 was passed to when a proposal was actually given to Palo Alto to consider?

Mr. Williams: I don’t think we are feeling that compression. We are moving as quickly as we reasonably can but with all due caution and with wanting to prepare a very thorough and complete environmental document that will withstand any legal scrutiny. I think that is the
primary reason why there are time delays. These are two very complex, huge projects and as we
move through some of this analysis there are ultimately gaps in data that we maybe didn’t
anticipate and more complex analysis that needs to occur. That is very simply I think the reason
why there is more time being taken. I don’t think Staff is feeling like the time is compressed
because of that. We are just moving ahead as quickly as we can but being sure we cover
everything.

Commissioner Keller: Thank you.

Chair Holman: Commissioner Fineberg.

Commissioner Fineberg: I would like to go back and talk about the Village Concept. I think it is
an absolutely fantastic concept. It is a way to improve the quality of life. It is a way to
implement good stewardship of our built and natural environment. I would love to see it be part
of this project. But, I am confused about how having it as an alternative in the Draft EIR
benefits anyone. Maybe I just don’t understand it yet but we have an applicant, they have
submitted a project, it keeps changing, and at some point they have to lockdown what it is going
to be. We can have a project that has absolutely no correlation to the most magnificent project in
a Draft EIR analysis. So how do you get the two, how do you get the project, the real thing that
is being built to incorporate the wonderful things in the Village Concept? The one idea I heard
tonight that would accomplish that is by building those principles into the zoning designations.
So is there a timeframe administratively how would that be done so we don’t come up to the end
with a project that doesn’t reflect and then we make the zoning regs fit what the applicant is
proposing? I think we can manage that if that is what should happen if we plan early. So what is
the timeframe on seeing how that might happen?

Mr. Williams: I think there is some potential to integrate some of this with the zoning but I think
the main area where this occurs is in the plans that are approved and they are being approved
simultaneously with the zoning with some flexibility in there in terms of design guidelines. Some
of these components have to do with streets and open spaces that are not necessarily going to be
addressed by zoning. So I think the plans are a better place to actually identify a lot of these
concepts. That said there are certainly some design concepts that could go into the zoning. Our
intent again is to have that and have the Commission look at that before the Draft EIR is in front
of you so that we can embody that as part of the kind of zoning package that is under review and
coming to you. So I think we have an opportunity to do that to some extent in both the zoning
and in the specifics of the plans that are coming to you, because there are development plans
associated with both of these things and to the extent they can incorporate any of these linkages,
open spaces, other uses if necessary then we have really kind of nailed some of those things
down. Then maybe the zoning and design guidelines get at some of the details about how some
of those design connections are made.

Ms. Cara Silver, Senior Assistant City Attorney: If I could just add as well, CEQA requires the
City to look at the actual project that is proposed and that has changed over time. We just
recently received an updated application and it will probably change a bit in the future. At a
minimum we do need to evaluate the project that is proposed. There are certainly some zoning
and design guideline changes that we can incorporate on a parallel path with the entitlements that
are being requested. We think that putting some type of village alternative in the EIR will allow
the City more flexibility as ideas come to the front that may not be properly placed in zoning or
in design guidelines to then be able to incorporate those ideas into an actual EIR alternative that
will be studied so that if the Planning Commission and Council do like that alternative there will
be a basis for moving forward with that and you won’t have to go through a new CEQA process.

Chair Holman: Vice-Chair Garber, do you have any more questions? I have some more
questions. One is participation by, I am curious because this meeting was noticed and we have
yet to see anybody from Menlo Park or see any comments from people from Menlo Park. So
what is the status of their involvement and their concern, consideration, input?

Mr. Turner: Over the time that we have been reviewing these projects even before the
application came in both Staff and the applicants have been reaching out to our neighbors with
regards to these projects. Most recently Staff held a luncheon for representatives from
neighboring jurisdictions to come to the City so that we could inform them about the project,
provide them updates, and answer questions that they may have. We have also made ourselves
available to go out to the different jurisdictions and present to their Planning Commissions and
Council. We have done that with Menlo Park’s Council twice already. Just yesterday I received
an invitation from Portola Valley to come to speak to their Council with regard to the project.
We are making an effort to reach out to our neighbors and keep them informed about the
projects. They seem to like the idea of Staff and the applicants coming to them and providing a
presentation and overview of the projects.

Chair Holman: Is it possible that Commission and Council and ARB can be notified of when
those meetings are happening? It would be informative I think for us to be able if available to
attend those meetings and get what their input is. Like tonight I am still mystified that there is
nobody that has come to a meeting yet at the Commission at least from any of the commercial
districts and that is just mystifying to me. So I am not saying you are not doing outreach, I am
certainly not saying that, but I am just baffled by it in addition to no one coming from Menlo
Park especially. So is it possible that you can notify us as to when those meetings are if you are
making presentations to the Menlo Park City Council for instance those are public meetings but
we don’t always watch the agendas for other cities.

Mr. Turner: Absolutely. We will keep you informed about any sort of outreach beyond Palo
Alto that we are involved with.

Chair Holman: That would be very helpful. I think probably right now we will take a seven or
eight minute break. We have been going for a couple of hours. Then we will come back, finish
up any questions and then go to our comments. Thank you.

Okay, if you all will take seats we can reconvene. Commissioner Lippert, you have additional
questions.

Commissioner Lippert: Yes. Mr. Fukuji, you talked a little bit about walking distances from
public transportation. Really walking distance is more a factor of I guess the intensification or
how urban an environment would be. Somebody who lived and work in New York City might
walk several miles whereas somebody who lived in a suburban environment would in fact find walking maybe a quarter of a mile quite tedious. Is there any direct relationship or are there any documents or studies done where it showed the intensification of land use and its relationship in regard to walking distances?

Mr. Fukujii: That is a great question. There has been a lot of research done on that. Professor Robert Savaro at UC Berkeley has done quite a bit of research on that topic. It comes down to sort of the three D’s, density, diversity, and design are the things that actually really shape an environment that encourages walkability. So those are kind of the key things. The other part is people like Bob Gibbs who is a national expert in sort of how main streets can learn from shopping malls has talked a lot about walking distance and the sort of level of intensity of activity that needs to happen. He says that for Americans it is sort of an eight second rule, if you don’t have something interesting every eight seconds then they turn around and walk the other way. So it is a bit of a tough challenge because Americans don’t walk as much as Europeans in other parts of the world. The key thing is when you look at transit oriented development you want to concentrate employment that when you arrive at a work trip how far can you walk. You really want employment to be within 600 to 800 feet kind of within a quarter-mile. For housing on the other end of the trip people are willing to walk a lot further knowing that on the destination end, once they get on the train or whatever the form of transit is, and they get off that they can easily walk to that end. So on the housing end of it is more like a half-mile. When it gets beyond a half-mile then people look at other modes to be able to get to a station depending on the environment. So it depends on the land use, it depends on the trip purpose, and it depends on the environment. Having the connectivity is the essential thing. In many places you can’t actually get to where you want to walk to so the first part is having direct, easy ways to get from one place to another.

Commissioner Lippert: I guess looking at that that is where the Marguerite Shuttle or local buses would begin to play a role. I have two questions here. The first one is the linkages and you showed a very good illustration of the linkages and they were like little asterisks as you go through the Stanford University Shopping Center leading to the Medical Center. Is there a way to enhance those linkages? What I am thinking of is just the other day I was walking through Johnson Park and Baskin & Robbins happened to put an ice cream cart in there just for the day. There was a soccer game going on and it was very exciting and drew a crowd. I am thinking of ways of bridging or being able to get from the transit center to the hospital. Are there ways of creating those little pieces of activity going through a parking lot or crossing El Camino Real or just on the other side of El Camino Real where the transit center is and where El Camino Real is?

Mr. Fukui: Part of the creative challenge is how to overcome these really long distances. So you want to break the scale down and create kind of multiple smaller events or destinations that can help lead you from one place to another. I think that for a lot of people it is a time issue. They think about how much time it is going to take them to get from one place to another. If you were at the transit center and you want to go to the Medical Center and if you walk it is 15 minutes, but if you take the Marguerite Shuttle and time it right it is only a couple of minutes, if you ride your bike it is like five minutes. These time issues are really essentially. I think the thing that is difficult about this is you have to look at who the different people are and what their propensities are for different travel modes and how they actually want to travel. If you have a
young urban professional person who is kind of trying to get things done they are going to want
to do the fastest thing they might want to do. If you have other people who might be older, no
longer employed they might have a little more flexibility around their time and if it is a low cost
way to go they might want the exercise and walk. So you have to create opportunities for all the
different people who want to use it and give them different choices around how to get from one
place to another. I think the key here is how to create the right diversity of choices about how to
do it. It is all about making sure you are creating the right opportunity so you are not missing
things. I think with this you have to look at each step of the way.

For example, at the Palo Alto Medical Foundation they have that below grade crossing of the
tracks. I think there are a lot of things about that that are actually really great. It really reduces
the amount of time you take to walk from Downtown to get to the Medical Center. So things
like that when an Intermodal Center, if there are improvements that happen to that and that being
able to have some other ways to get underneath the tracks to be able to get to the shopping
center. I think things like that would help. That would reduce that really difficult kind of long
walk that is one thing that I think would be really good. That is not really part of this project. It
is part of some other planning exercises that we have been talking about and how do you find a
place for that kind of thing.

For the parking lot and getting across the parking lot I think you have to like bringing buildings
closer to the street so you don’t have to feel like you are crossing along 300 feet of parking
would really, really help. I think there are some initial steps that are done. PF Chang tries to do
that. I think that more things along that line could help with being able to do that.

Commissioner Lippert: One other question. Again, going back to the transportation issues about
a year ago I had the opportunity to go to Copenhagen. In Copenhagen they have a free bicycle
shuttle system. Is anything like that feasible say between the transit center and the hospital? I
know when I miss a bus I get really upset about having to wait for the next bus. If there were
some sort of individual transit mode and it was a nice day I have no compunction taking a rental
bicycle. Is that a possibility?

Mr. Fukuji: I think it is a very lovely idea. Copenhagen is a great example of a city that is really
urbanized and become more pedestrian and transit oriented as it has intensified. It has become
less car dependent in how it has done that. So it is a very good urban example to look at. I think
a program like that could be wonderful. It has a lot of management and maintenance issues but it
is certainly something that could be explored.

Mr. Williams: Independent of the whole Village Concept that is certainly something to look at
as a mitigation measure possibly on the traffic side.

Commissioner Lippert: It could work both ways too. People who drive to the hospital for the
day working there that wanted to get to the Downtown quickly could then take one of those
bicycles.

Chair Holman: Commissioner Keller, questions.
Commissioner Keller: Yes. Let me just confirm that water use and utility use will be evaluated as impacts for each of the alternatives considered.

Mr. Turner: Yes it will.

Commissioner Keller: Thank you. I am wondering whether the appropriate amount of medical office space as needed for doctors who are community doctors and work at the Medical Center at either the hospital and meet patients at the hospital or the Children’s Hospital, whether those are being considered as part of this.

Mr. Williams: They are being considered as part of the project. I am not sure to what extend they are being considered as part of the EIR. That was one of our policies in the Area Plan was related to that and I think we need to probably revisit that issue given the latest change in the plans, which is taking area that was specified near Hoover Pavilion for those medical practitioners and incorporating it into the hospital site. So there may be some change there so we probably need to have that conversation with the applicants to determine how that affects those practitioners.

Commissioner Keller: In particular the number of trips for medical practitioners traveling from their medical offices to the Stanford Hospital or the Children’s Hospital in order to be able to visit their patients. That number is affected by that.

There was a mention of the Stanford General Use Permit for the County in terms of build out and sustainability study. Does it make sense to piggyback onto that and do a similar study for the portion of the Stanford University complex, if you will the Medical Center and all that, does it make sense to participate in that for the portion of it that is not part of the County unincorporated land but it is part of the City incorporated land? Does it make sense to include that?

Mr. Williams: I know we have had some of these discussions. You are talking about a longer term build out.

Commissioner Keller: Yes, the longer term build out that is being considered for.

Mr. Williams: That is the 2030 timeframe and I am not sure what the GUP timeframe is.

Commissioner Keller: It may be worthwhile looking into that and I won’t belabor that right now.

The next thing is with respect to the height.

Chair Holman: Are these still questions? It sounds like you are going to comments.

Commissioner Keller: No, these are still questions. In terms of the height increase I am wondering if you will divide that up into the height increase that is needed for the seismic retrofit, the height increase that is needed for the so-called right-sizing of rooms, and the height
increase that is needed for expanding the number of patient beds. Does that seem like a
reasonable way of dividing up that height increase or is that inappropriate?

Mr. Turner: That might be a pretty difficult challenge to try to do. I think we can try to attempt
to work with the applicants to see how each component of either right-sizing or increasing the
hospital size might relate to overall height and how that might contribute to the height of the
project. I think we can take a look at that and provide that to you. That could be a possibility.

Commissioner Keller: I am wondering if that can be done as part of if you will, massing
numbers and so it gives you an idea of how much mass is due to each and then you can figure
out the height accordingly.

Mr. Fukuji: Just in my experience around these hospital projects and the seismic upgrade the
increase in height really has a lot to do with the increase in the floor-to-floor heights. There is
just a lot more service area that has to be done and interstitial space that is needed, and structural
space that is in that. That is really what is contributing more to increasing the floor-to-floor
height than maybe the seismic work of it. I think it is very difficult to analyze what the
contributions would be for each of those parts and what is increasing the building height overall.
The other part is that they are shifting the way they organize space that is more efficient to be
more vertically organized in terms of how hospitals are being constructed now. So there are
several different trends that are all coming together that are leading to the increased height
request. It might just be useful to hear from the applicant in more detail all the different factors
that are contributing to the height increase.

Commissioner Keller: I think that we are talking about an increase in the number of patient beds
from 400-plus to about 600. You can compute how much additional height is needed for that
increase.

Mr. Williams: Part of the analysis of alternatives is to look at the impacts. You don’t look at
them in necessarily the same level of detail as the proposed project. In looking at the right-size,
no project alternative that would be or in a reduced alternative we would assess what the height
of that would likely be or a range that that would be and then you could compare that to the
project as it is proposed.

Commissioner Keller: Thank you. With respect to a comment made by a member of the public
with respect to the current baseline for Lucile Packard which is the one that is currently
undergoing expansion. I notice it says renovation but it is actually expansion. I think renovation
is sort of odd term when you are actually adding square footage and beds as well, from 216 to
267 I believe. I am wondering to the extent it makes sense to count the actual current baseline of
physical bodies you can count in terms of employees and trips or whether you are doing some
sort of projection saying if we had additional beds and we had additional employees and they this
additional trip then you are going to create some fudge factor for what the current baseline is. So
I would like to understand why we are not using actual figures for employees and trips and such
and what kind of fudge factor is being used.
Mr. Williams: We are not ready to address that. I am going to have to check with the consultant about how we are dealing with that. I am not sure.

Commissioner Keller: My final question for now is there was a question by Commissioner Fineberg with respect to the cap in the Comprehensive Plan for nonresidential development. I believe that it was mentioned that we would be within 400,000 square feet of the citywide cap of nonresidential development. I am wondering whether that figure takes into account the promises that were made to Stanford for expansion in the industrial park as a result of the Mayfield fields, the soccer fields that are over there. I am wondering whether you are taking into account that promised expansion or whether you are not taking into account that. Do you understand what I am saying?

Mr. Williams: Yes, and some of that has already been granted and approved and that is taken into account but I don’t think all of it is. I think there might be a couple hundred thousand square feet that is not underway yet.

Commissioner Keller: So it would be helpful to actually know the extent to which we are approaching that cap taking into account the commitments that Palo Alto made to Stanford with respect to the expansion that Stanford can do at the industrial park and see how much of the cap is leftover after that essential entitlement for that. I am wondering whether Palo Alto also committed to Stanford with respect to water allocation for the Mayfield playing fields and the extent that that deals with the restrictions that are coming down from the state in terms of water allocation in the future.

Mr. Williams: I am not prepared to answer that and I think we are going a field of the focus of tonight’s meeting. I would suggest that if you have questions or suggestions for additional things that we haven’t covered in previous sessions, because we have had several sessions on scoping and things to take into consideration in the project and the EIR, you certainly can send them to us as you sent a few today and we will forward those onto the EIR consultant to be sure they are addressed if they need to be addressed or that there are responses to those. Tonight we are trying to focus on the alternatives and get your input on specifically the alternative discussion not the EIR and what impacts should be addressed and what mitigations should be considered and that kind of thing.

Commissioner Keller: Thank you. The reason I am bringing that up is to the extent that there is an increase in water use at the Medical Center or the Shopping Center to the extent that there was a promised increased allocation from Palo Alto to Stanford, to the extent that some of the increased allocation would be usable for tributing to any increases needed at the Stanford Shopping Center and Medical Center might use up part of that allocation as opposed to having a new allocation issued. That is the gist of my issue. Thank you.

Chair Holman: Commissioner Fineberg, additional questions?

Commissioner Fineberg: Would it be possible for Staff to provide us with the listing of the commercial properties that makeup the amount that was available to build and then with the
addendum that Commissioner Keller has mentioned of the commitments that are entitlements so
it could be reviewed and made available to the public also?

Mr. Turner: We will have a reasonable accounting of that to provide to the Commission.

Commissioner Fineberg: Thank you. Way-finding by vehicles, finding your way to the hospital
in a car, will that be considered in all of the alternative scenarios and the proposed project?
Specifically if you are coming north on El Camino how do you get to the hospital?

Mr. Turner: This wouldn’t necessarily be looked at as an alternative they are a design aspect of
the Shopping Center and the hospitals. We want to make sure that there is appropriate way-
finding for people to get to those facilities. So I don’t see that necessarily as an alternative but
just a good design aspect that we need to employ in each of the projects.

Commissioner Fineberg: Forgive me, maybe I wasn’t clear. I didn’t mean that it would be an
alternative but if the route as it exists now is analyzed in a make no change alternative versus if
the hospital grows there is no left turn at Sandhill so traffic overshoots it, goes into Menlo Park,
makes a U-turn at Cambridge. So that is going to have different impacts versus reworking the
intersection. I won’t begin to suggest now what that rework might look like and it wouldn’t be
an easy project but do we need to take a look at that and not miss an opportunity to make it
better?

Mr. Turner: We definitely want to take a look at all opportunities that are out there and make
sure that we are looking at the right solutions for these issues.

Commissioner Fineberg: Good, so that analysis will be in the DEIR in maybe different ways in
different alternatives depending on what is called for?

Mr. Turner: Yes, that type of analysis will appear in the EIR.

Commissioner Fineberg: All right. Will the different alternatives include an analysis of the
school impacts specifically in the alternatives with the highest amount of increase? Will it
consider the need for a new school being built in the district?

Mr. Turner: The projects will be reviewed and analyzed on their impacts to the schools and it
will be determined whether or not additional area at the schools would be needed. The
alternatives to the projects will look at either a no project or reduced project alternative that
would reduce those impacts. For example if the need for an additional school would reduce
those impacts to less than a significant level.

Commissioner Fineberg: So is there a possibility that the proposed project would trigger a new
school and if it looks like in the analysis it does the EIR would look at the impacts of that new
school site?

Mr. Turner: That is correct.
Commissioner Fineberg: Thank you. There is an idea in planning called a LULU, Locally
Undesirable Land Use, it is applied to things like airports and garbage dumps. Things that might
have magnificent regional benefits but very localized negative impacts. I want to say that I
believe that Stanford Hospital and Stanford University are magnificent resources in the
community. They are incredibly desirable. They are wonderful institutions and I cast no
aspersions on that. However, they are regional in nature, the hospitals and the mall draw people
from well outside the bounds of Palo Alto but there are impacts and unintended consequences
can be very local, the demand for Palo Alto to provide housing, the traffic on our streets. Is there
any way that the three different alternatives can consider ways to mitigate those impacts across
the region rather than just in Palo Alto? Maybe thinking outside the box in some of the same
ways that the San Francisco Airport will mitigate local impacts and the cost are born regionally.
Do we have any opportunity for that within the scope of the project, within the DEIR?

Ms. Silver: I think we can look at some of those issues and some of the alternatives. We have to
be specific about some of the impacts. Of course Palo Alto doesn’t have the legal jurisdiction to
require that impacts be mitigated outside of its own jurisdiction so there is some limitations on
that. We do have some flexibility with the Development Agreement to structure certain maybe
mitigations which cannot be legally imposed but can part of the Development Agreement. So
perhaps the alternatives could look at some of those options and then those options can be folded
into the Development Agreement ultimately.

Commissioner Fineberg: Thank you.

Chair Holman: I have a few more questions left. On the Village Concept to go back to that
again, on Attachment C, page one it says need and basis for Village Alternative and the response
proposals. So that is 1-A-1-c it says think outside project boundaries. I guess I need a little bit of
a clarification for that. What causes me to have some need for clarification on that and some
maybe concern is something that was brought up by Commissioner Lippert and I believe Brian
Schmidt brought it up as well. The radius circles that are drawn and as the crow flies miles as
opposed to how long it actually takes somebody to get somewhere. So I guess what I am
wanting to make sure of is that a part of that ‘think outside the project boundaries’ is two things.
One is that we are not going to be relying on some other jurisdiction, which is also mentioned in
the report, to provide housing for instance. The other thing is, and I will use housing as an
example, at what juncture would that housing be implemented or created? Are those being
considered as part of these EIR alternatives and in what way are they being considered in the
alternatives?

Mr. Williams: Bruce can talk to the ethicacy of the direct connections which is certainly
something that he is trying to address, taking that nine or ten minute connection and turning it
into a five minute connection through various techniques. As far as housing and other things we
don’t want to be relying on somebody else to provide them. If they are things that are already
there that is fine. If it is something like what is in the county, housing sites, I think there are
some obligation for us to try to make some tie there if we are going to have a housing site
development that is something that we are considering, it is going to help serve the employment
that is being generated, then we need to talk about how that timing occurs and that will probably
not be part of the Village Alternative it is probably part of the Development Agreement I assume
to try to make those kinds of connections if that is where we come down. So I think to the extent these things get tied together and timing is an issue than we should address it but I don’t think the timing issue is necessarily addressed, it is addressed to some extent in the EIR as well. So it is probably both places.

Chair Holman: Yes, because you can have impacts that exist for a period of time. I just wanted to get some clarity on that.

Mr. Williams: Yes, you don’t want to go 20 years with the impact occurring before the mitigation measure takes effect.

Chair Holman: Another question about alternatives. We mentioned at the Commission, I don’t remember how many of us did, but there is a campus in Redwood City as well. So as a part of the scaled back alternative does that assume or does it reference some of what is being proposed here going to Redwood City or is it strictly a scaled back project that is being analyzed as an alternative because they are very different?

Mr. Williams: I am sure that would be referenced if there were a scaled back alternative and if the potential was there for those employees to end up in Redwood City instead then that is something that would be acknowledged. Again, going back to the level of detail that an alternative is analyzed it wouldn’t be analyzed in the same level of detail as the project and try to quantify all the trip impacts of that and that kind of thing. There would be some basic discussion of that and what negative impacts might result from doing that as opposed to locating all of the project here.

Chair Holman: This is going to sound like a silly one, maybe. Again, as part of the alternatives and when you are looking at interconnectivity, especially the inter- as opposed to intra-connectivity, we are looking at a shopping center and a large shopping center at that meaning geographically it is a large shopping center. So is there some element that is considering the fact that people are going to walk less distances, bicycle less distance, if there is no place to stow their bags? It sounds like a nit and a silly thing but I think in terms of practical application and people being able to utilize and willing to utilize these alternatives is that being considered in the alternative?

Mr. Fukuji: It is a good idea and I think it is something we can explore in terms of how to accommodate doing that.

Chair Holman: I just bring it up because we can say people will walk this far or bike this far but if they are schlepping bags they aren’t going to do it. So maybe it is more of an impact thing than an alternative. Okay.

Then Steven, did I understand you to say earlier that there was some consideration of a larger hotel that is being proposed? Can you give me clarification on that? Again, the reason I ask on that is because if that is a part of the proposal is that making its way into the EIR and what size is being proposed?
Mr. Williams: The City has expressed interest before in a larger hotel. I think the reference you
heard before was my comment about the economic analysis and that we have a consultant on
board who is looking at Stanford Shopping Center or Simon actually when they did the analysis
for this hotel looked at a 120 room hotel and is there a market for that, etc., etc., but they didn’t
look at whether there was something bigger. So we are doing that as a City to see if that seems
to be feasible. If it is I am not sure where it goes from there. It could be potentially in there as a
suggestion but it depends. Obviously it is also the applicant’s project. So any alternative again
has to reduce impacts that is the purpose of the alternatives. So in order to consider it as an
alternative as opposed to something that is discussed as part of the Development Agreement for
instance it would have to be demonstrated to reduce impacts. So I can think of ways that that
might happen in conjunction with other components of the development but at this point it is
pretty speculative but we do want to get a handle on whether we think from a design standpoint a
larger hotel would work there and from a market standpoint whether that might work because the
City sees advantages to that.

Chair Holman: Actually as opposed to an alternative because it isn’t proposed by the applicant.
I just want to make sure that a larger hotel would be analyzed for its impacts and swept into that.
It is just the first I had heard of it.

Mr. Williams: Right. If it did become some part of a proposal in there then it would have to be
analyzed as the current hotel proposal is.

Chair Holman: My last question I do believe is the statement having to do with alternatives. It is
this thing that I struggle with every time we look at EIRs. It says that alternatives have to lessen
impacts is one point. Then another point is that they have to accomplish the significant goals of
the project. Those are just in such absolute conflict to my mind and that is one of the things I
struggle with about the Village Concept and one of the statements in it. So have at it.

Ms. Silver: There are actually three requirements of alternatives and in addition to the two you
listed they also have to be feasibly implemented. That is a struggle and that is why the
alternatives that are in an EIR are generally narrowly framed. You can’t propose an alternative
that doesn’t meet all three of these factors. So we have struggled with that ourselves and we
have come up with a list of alternatives that we think meet all three of these factors.

Chair Holman: Just to be clear the primary factor is the seismic requirements or is the primary
factor the size of the project that is proposed, for clarity purposes?

Ms. Silver: Yes. We actually view the project broadly so the whole project is both the adoption
of the Area Plan and the entitlements and the Development Agreement and of course all of the
project requests of the applicant. So within that bundle there are many different project
objectives including all of the Area Plan objectives that are listed in the Staff Report.

Mr. Williams: I would just add I know it seems constraining to you but that is CEQA law that
identifies what we consider as alternatives. Just because they are considered as alternatives
doesn’t mean that outside of sort of the CEQA framework there aren’t reasons for you to approve
something different or deny a project. There are goals of the City and the City has fundamental
goals, and this is a completely discretionary project involving Development Agreement rezoning
and other discretionary actions. If it seems to be fundamentally in contrast with some important
City stated Comprehensive Plan goals or whatever then it is certainly within the discretion
regardless of whether you find that the Environmental Impact Report is adequate and has
covered all the bases to modify the project or deny a project. So it does not take that out of your
hands it is just the framework of CEQA does limit what we can look at in the way of alternatives.

Chair Holman: Commissioner Keller, you had one more question?

Commissioner Keller: Yes. With respect to space, land if you will, there is an intensification of
use. There is an increase in density proposed for the Medical Center and for Hoover Pavilion. I
realize that there is some shifting going on there but right now they are close to their current
limits. I am wondering to the extent to which the EIR is considering how much additional land
would be needed if we were keep it this density. In other words, perhaps you would expand the
land so that it would allow for the increased development. How much additional land would be
needed? What alternative uses are there for that land if such land were dedicated for public
purposes such as open space or schools or parks or the like? Is that kind of thing being
considered?

Mr. Williams: I don’t think it is being considered as part of the EIR. I don’t think it is within the
scope of the environmental review to do that. It is certainly information that may be relevant to
your consideration of the projects as they come forward. I think we have indicated to you before
that we will try to provide an estimate of what that would be. In fact, I think we may have
already done some calculations in that regard but certainly it might be useful information to you
but it is not part of the Environmental Impact Report.

Commissioner Keller: I understand that the trips for the Stanford Shopping Center that will
come on the next go round when you come back to us.

Mr. Williams: That is our anticipation, yes.

Chair Holman: Okay. So we will move to our comments then and start with Commissioner
Lippert. However, before that we will close the public hearing. Commissioner Lippert,
comments.

Commissioner Lippert: First is a minor housekeeping item. We had received this handout at
places and I believe that we agreed at the beginning of the process that handouts would be
attributed to whoever the author was. So if it was an item from Stanford it would receive
identification for that organization. If it was generated from the City of Palo Alto it would be
identified as such.

Then also I would like to note on here there is in very small type it says ‘draft – do not distribute’
but anything that is given to us is made part of the public record and can be examined by the
public even if it is a draft document. So with that I would like begin with my comments.
The first one is despite my physical condition I was not strong armed at all by Stanford University. I do not have a conflict of interest. I did not receive medical treatment at Stanford University. I went to Valley Medical Center and I am doing just fine.

In listening to the presentation today there was a phrase that really resonated with me which was right-size. I don’t know if it is sort of the mechanics of wordsmithing or whatever but the word did seem very appropriate in terms of right-size. By that what I mean is that in terms of this facility and the description that Steven Turner gave us into what right-size means, it doesn’t mean that the facility is increasing in size to increase necessarily the load or intensify the use there.

I did go to an emergency room recently and I was treated in a trauma center. It was a very eye-opening experience. Before this I could not understand what the relationship was between planning and hospital functioning and I got it immediately. From the moment that the ambulance pulled in I was put on a bed not put on a gurney. To have this piece of equipment wheeled around and me taken around from room to room it was like driving a car. They had people pushing this thing and it was literally like being in a car and that required more space. In addition to that I was quite amazed as to the equipment that they wheeled around me. I did not have to leave this bed in order to have x-rays taken of myself. They brought the x-ray equipment in to me, they put the plates behind me, they took the necessary x-rays, they did have to move me off of this bed for a CT scan. Until I reached my room I did not have to be moved and in terms of right-size it means that all the equipment that hospitals are using and the way it is being moved around requires more space. It also requires more height and it requires that these spaces be larger even though they are not intensifying the use of those spaces.

Just in sort of summing that up, when I did get to my room it was a single occupancy room. It was a little bit smaller than a double room. I don’t know if they had any double rooms there. It appeared that all the rooms on my ward were single occupancy rooms. Again, they were able to move equipment around me and get around me and it was very easy to function. I think that is really the future of hospitals and where this is going. So the increase of floor area in terms of right-sizing is very appropriate. I experienced it first-hand.

Early on in this process I had mentioned something which was I guess the idea of the English industrial revolution, and how towns progressed and how industrial cities grew up, and that they were centered around some sort of industry. With that came the whole idea of having the manufacturing or the industry and then you had housing for the people that work there and provided different levels of housing and people being able to get around, and the whole idea of a village or a community. In reviewing the Village Alternative Concept today goes back to that early discussion that I had mentioned in one of the very early hearings, I think it was the first or second hearing. So I don’t look at this necessarily as an alternative I look at this as Staff and Stanford being able to react back to me in terms of some of my earlier comments. So I am looking at this as a working document. I am looking at it as a real possibility and there are some things in here that I think will be quite important in terms of beginning to move forward in terms of the necessary agreements, the rezoning, and the Draft EIR and reviewing those three documents. So I think this is a very important concept and it is a very important step forward and I am talking it very seriously at this point.
So those are really my comments with regard to this. I think this process is moving along very nicely and I am very pleased with what I see. I think it is beginning to bear some very nice fruit.

Chair Holman: Vice-Chair Garber, comments.

Vice-Chair Garber: May I borrow you pointer and have your slide on commercial diagram up on the board? Great, thank you.

These diagrams speak volumes and I really appreciate having them. I want to talk about two pieces here. One this purple area here which is essentially the Downtown University Avenue area and the second one obviously is the mall over here. The fact that they are separated, not together, is the great problem/opportunity that the City has to create some real synergy between these two business loci. The perception as we all know is that the University Avenue ends at the Caltrain Station and that beyond that is another district, another part of the city, and I think one of the great opportunities that we have, and I am speaking not specifically of the project here but of the Village Concept, is to extend the perception of the community beyond the Caltrain Station into the mall. That synergy represents one of the best and most dynamic opportunities for growth in the city in terms of its economic engine. It will be a focus of my interest in trying to find ways to emphasize that, cause that to happen, and make that perception become a manifest. It also then begins to speak about how we can think about creating growth, creating guidelines for growth within the mall as well as within the University Avenue and importantly the interstitial space in between.

Would you please flip to the diagram called Linkages? I am particularly interested in this heavy blue arrow that is going from University Avenue as it crosses Alma and El Camino and becomes Palm Drive. That arrow needs to be larger or the largest one on that page, again because it represents that connection, but importantly it represents the old perception which is still true today but it is an old perception about what the relationship of the city is to Stanford, the town and gowned. That there is a civic entity and that there is an educational entity. That is part of what we are fighting here. The connection that needs to be made and I think the big arrow that is missing here goes from University Avenue to the mall. Now we have two little green arrows there that are pedestrian but the reality is that connection needs to be the strongest one in my mind and needs to be the one where all focus is, and begins to suggest how it is we should support that linkage along the way.

To Commissioner Lippert’s comment people need a reason to walk someplace as well as to yours. By way of example the City of Chicago has the Magnificent Mile which is slightly more than a mile and people are bused in from all around the country when it is ten degrees above zero and they are happy to walk that mile, but then there are reasons to go and do that and we don’t have that here. So with that let me go finally to this diagram, Connectivity, Visibility, and Public Streets. If I understand this one correctly the little fuzzy circles, such as this one where PF Chang’s is, really are suggesting that there is a place as opposed to a transit zone or a pathway, a place as opposed to a pathway. I think what this diagram needs, again thinking about the Village Concept and not speaking specifically about the project, is a little fuzzy line that goes up University Avenue and back down. Then I believe it also needs a fuzzy line here. I don’t think
this is really a fuzzy line there. PF Chang's would be very happy to be perceived that way but on
a civic scale I don't think that is what that building is all about. However, the opportunity here is
to create linkages that are not just somehow jumping this big gap that is from here to here
perceptionally which is literally only a four and a half minute walk if that. It is to create some
place to be that is here, and I am not talking about the Intermodal zone, I am talking about
something that gets me from University Avenue and from the mall to someplace that is halfway
between. It is not a threshold it needs to be a place.

So there are a couple of concepts that I think are really important here in terms of what those
things are that are along that route. One is the El Camino Guidelines, which suggest that there
are buildings along this as we have in other places down El Camino that there are buildings
along El Camino at the mall. Now, Stanford will argue that where they really want those
buildings, where they really want that density, where they really want those people are inboard.
That is a strategy that supports what this is. If the rest of the mall is supporting not just what
happens here but what is happening throughout here we need to create that wall just as you had
mentioned earlier in your presentation to be able to have not only strong centers, what a village
is, but also strong boundaries because you can't have one without the other and they are both
self-supporting. In this case those buildings at the street edge support the overall concept of
what the village residential concept is that you are getting. That is one.

Two. The way this area here, this is the Red Cross area, has been indicated and talked about in
recent years as for housing. I don't think that is the right function there. That should be a public
function. It should have an opportunity to be and engage the community on a much more civic
scale and I would strongly suggest that we roll back out the study that Stanford and the City did
in 2000 that looked at entertainment and a theater center in that location. That is a very good
function, fairly low impact, utilizes resources in a reciprocal way during the day and the night,
and can operate very successfully as that sort of linkage. In terms of marketplace there are
opportunities in the marketplace for theaters of a larger size more along the Berkeley Rap or the
ACT size of 600 seats or more. By the way, this would also not conflict with the recent plans
that Stanford made public to create a musical theater which is again imbedded inside their
campus as opposed to being on the periphery of it and creating and support the linkages that we
are trying to make through there.

I have about a half dozen more comments but I have taken enough space with this one at the
moment. I will return it to others.

Chair Holman: Commissioner Keller, comments.

Commissioner Keller: First let me underscore that a number of the comments made by Vice-
Chair Garber and in particular the idea of the synergy of a performing arts center and I think a
conference facility which I think would go together very well and also provide additional uses
and synergies with the hotel and with the shopping center particularly since a lot of the shopping
center doesn't go on very much later into the evening and a performing arts center would allow
for continuation of that.
With respect to providing linkage between the Downtown and the Stanford Shopping Center I look forward to consideration of a potential high-speed rail station with hotel and shopping and car rental and bike rental and zip cars and that providing the core linkage connecting those two. There is a good chance that the high-speed rail station will be on the ballot in November. The main opposition is from the airlines which are hurting pretty badly now. However, the current polls do indicate that it is leading.

With respect to the issue of right-sizing I think that the need to seismically retrofit the hospital to the extent that there are buildings that need to be retrofit that are critical patient care units by 2013 it essentially provides the timing or the hook for doing the hospital portion of the project. It provides the timing but doesn't provide the requirement for right-sizing. It reminds me of what happened in the Berkeley Hills when they had the Oakland-Berkeley Hill fire. Basically a bunch of houses were burned down so people decided they were going to rebuild their homes. Rather than rebuilding their homes the exact same footprint and the exact same fixtures they basically upscaled them. They built bigger homes with more fancy fixtures and all those things because while you are building it, while you have the architect there, and while you have the contractor there, and while you are going through all the trouble you might as well build the biggest thing you can reasonably afford and build in that location. I think that is the kind of thing that is going on and I don't fault Stanford for doing that. It is perfectly reasonable to tie things together but I think we need to understand what is going on.

I will close with three comments which I think are very important things to consider. One is I went to a meeting last night put on by NRDC for members of Environmental Entrepreneurs. At this meeting was a discussion about the future of water and the fact that in west water is going to be a crisis. It is already beginning to be one and it is going to be more in the future. Mark Twain said that whisky is for drinking and water is for fighting over. I think we are going to have a lot more problems with water. So the thing is that with global warming or climate change we are going to have a decreased snow pack in the Sierras and that decreased snow pack is going to lead to a decreased amount of water available. There is legislation currently in the California State Legislature to basically start moving on the process of limiting the amount of water we have. One of the things is that cities are going to be told to produce plans to reduce their water use by 20 percent per capita. It is going to be hard to decrease our water use by 20 percent per capita if we are basically going to be considerably expanding the water use for our industrial base. So we are going to have to figure out how to do that. So I think that is a very severe consideration as an impact of climate change water limitations is a serious consideration. Considering that the life of this project is not merely 2030 but I would suspect that this project will be - these buildings are going to be there for 100 years or more assuming that civilization continues that far. These buildings are going to be there. So we need to think about the water availability during the life of these buildings.

The second closing comment is with respect to the trips. I understand that Stanford has been working diligently to minimize the number of trips and to stay within the limit of the number of trips from the 2000 County General Use Permit. I think that of all of the employers in the area Stanford has done a phenomenal job. It is amazing what they have done in terms of making it so that students commute by alternative transportation. Reducing the number of single occupancy vehicles from in the 70 percent range to in the 50 percent range in a span of the last few years is
phenomenal. I applaud Stanford for doing that. To the extent that we can do that in terms of the employees at the Shopping Center and the employees at the Medical Center and provide the full panoply of benefits that are provided to Stanford University employees, to those who are employees of the Medical Center and the Shopping Center seems to be a good way towards mitigating the amount of trips that are going on, also by providing public transit, expanding public transit, so that people who are in Palo Alto and other communities don’t have to make multiple changes of buses in order to get to the Shopping Center and the Medical Center and perhaps the rest of campus. There are 2,000 people who live in Palo Alto and work on the Stanford campus and that doesn’t count the number of people who live in Palo Alto and work in the Shopping Center and in the Medical Center which are considered part of Palo Alto. I don’t have any figures for that but someday we will get that. So the issue of providing connectivity of shuttle services so people don’t have to change, every change of shuttle bus, every change of bus from one mode to another, from one bus to another, from a train to a bus, when their schedules are not meshed reduces the propensity for people to take transit.

Finally, Palo Alto is on the hook for a huge ABAG requirement. What I understand is that a significant portion of that ABAG requirement is the expansion proposed here for the Medical Center and the Shopping Center. While not all of the employees of the Medical Center and Shopping Center qualify for below market rate housing, and I believe that that question was asked I think by Commissioner Sandas with respect to how many people are eligible for that, it does indicate the issue that the biggest portion of the housing need here is for below market rate housing in order to mitigate the impacts that are being put on Stanford through the ABAG requirements. What I understand in terms of the calculations that were done by the City Staff is that somewhere on the order of $300 million to $500 million are needed for providing the below market rate housing that wouldn’t be provided through inclusionary zoning, in other words the low and very low. I presume that a fair number of the increase in employment at the Shopping Center and some of the increase in employment at the Medical Center would probably quality for below market rate housing. Therefore Stanford providing that housing to me makes a lot of sense rather than pushing that cost onto the taxpayers of Palo Alto.

One of the things that needs to be considered carefully is we talked about housing sites that are located for example on Quarry Road, two of the housing sites located on Quarry Road on either side of the Hoover Pavilion, those housing sites are already considered for the General Use Permit. We can’t double count the housing. The housing that is required for the General Use Permit should not be counted as the housing that is for mitigating the Medical Center expansion and the Shopping Center expansion. Those need to be counted separately and they need to be distinct.

One of the things that is interesting is in terms of Palo Alto providing housing on Alma Street where we previously had an electrical substation that electrical substation was consolidated with the electrical substation on Quarry Road, which it appears to me might be where the Stanford General Use Permit wants to put housing. So I am not clear how that is going to work at all in terms of putting housing on top of an electrical substation that has simply been consolidated and I am not sure where else it is going to go.
So we need to make sure that consider carefully the issues of where housing will go and not
double counting the housing.

I think that Stanford Medical Center provides a wonderful resource for the community although I
guess some people have not used it and other people have in the community. It certainly
provides a wide range of services to a wide range of people not only in Palo Alto but to the
surrounding community. It is definitely a regional facility. So in closing I think it is important
not only to think about the fiscal impact on Palo Alto but to think in terms of the benefits to Palo
Alto and the benefits to other cities and how the disproportionate amount of fiscal impact and
traffic impact and housing impact and utility impact is on residents of Palo Alto while the benefit
accrues to a larger community. Understanding the differential in that spread of the concentration
of impact versus the spread distribution of benefit I think needs to be considered as part of the
fiscal impact study. Thank you.

Chair Holman: Commissioner Fineberg, comments to the alternatives.

Commissioner Fineberg: As I said before I think the Village Concept is great. I am not sure I
understand why it is being handled as an alternative as opposed to being applied as design
criteria in the other alternatives but I will leave that to Staff to figure out the best way to handle
that.

I would echo Commissioner Garber’s comment that we look at the general area not just the
project. I would agree with him that looking at what we do in the space between Downtown and
the front of the mall and how we treat the front of mall is going to be mission critical for the
success of it becoming a village and not just isolated places.

More generally I don’t even know if it needs to be said, it is absolutely critical that the hospital
be seismically safe. It is absolutely critical that the hospital be modernized. Whatever words are
used it needs to be one of the best medical facilities in the world. That is something that drives a
lot of the economic growth in the area and it is something that keeps a lot of us alive. So to me
discussion of that isn’t on the table.

The question is going to be then in the details of how we get there. We are being asked to
consider a lot of things that we don’t have information yet. We don’t know what the proposed
language will be in the zoning ordinances. We don’t even know how the hospital zone will be
defined. So there is a little bit of a chicken and egg because you have to have the project to
know whether it will fit in the criteria and then the criteria have to be designed to fit the project.
So that is going to be something that is going to be a little bit of a dance I think to get it right.

I think it is going to be absolutely critical that the Staff ensures that the Draft Environmental
Impact Report is perceived by the public as having real data, data that is meaningful. We will
lose confidence from our citizens, from our voters, if it looks like the emperor’s new suit. It
must be realistic and that will allow us to determine what the mitigations will be. So I am
confident that it is going to go in that direction.
Then I know this beyond the scope of the alternatives for the EIR but I would like to also
courage Stanford to continue working with our City Staff in helping to make this a win/win
process. To make it be so that we can get the best outcome for the hospital, for the mall, and for
the city because they are inseparable. If we end up with awful traffic problems, guess what?
The people commuting to Stanford are going to have awful commutes. The people that work
there are going to have awful commutes. If we don’t have the right connections onto the grounds
we are going to have people who are ill trying to get to an emergency room that can’t get there.
If we don’t get these details right there are no do-overs. So I think working in a positive,
cooperative way to make it a win/win would be a good thing.

I am also very pleased to hear that we will be having another review of this before the DEIR so
that we can get some more information as it comes into being. Frankly, I think I have more
questions leaving this than I did after reading the Staff Reports. That is a good thing. So I am
pleased to hear that it will be coming back to us. Thank you.

Chair Holman: I will take a few and then I know Commissioner Lippert and Commissioner
Garber have more comments too.

I have struggled with the Village Concept whether it is an alternative or a design principle and
have come to see it as both for very practical reasons. That said, I am not satisfied that as it is
presented in the Staff Report that it is only one alternative. That the Village Concept needs to be
applied to a scaled down project, at least one scaled down project as well. Then I have a couple
of changes I would suggest to the Village Concept as defined in Attachment C. All my
comments are really addressed primarily on page two.

Under D-1-3, there is a lack of specificity in identifying the variety of retail and commercial
services. There is also a lack of specificity not just on this page but elsewhere about mixed use.
The reason that is important when looking at the alternatives is it is the diversity of the cost of
services as well as the mix and appropriate mix of services. Stanford Shopping Center is a
wonderful facility but if we are going to have mix of housing, a diversity of housing stock there
and everything is price scaled the way Stanford Shopping Center is now it is not going to be a
village. So I think that is really an important consideration. So I would ask for some better
clarification, specificity in the definitions for mixed use and for variety of retail and commercial
to address those concerns.

Then also as I referenced earlier the EIR process does this but as a Village Concept as applied to
the project D-1-c says enable projects and advance project objectives. I am troubled by the
words ‘enable project’ in this design approach, this village approach. So analyze and advance
project objectives I think is fine because what you are doing is looking for a better way to see if
these objectives can be accomplished with fewer impacts thus an alternative. But to enable
projects I think in this Village Concept definition I think we are going to lose some credibility in
keeping that in there. So that is having to do with the Village Concept.

All the alternatives need to be well enough defined and the impacts clear enough so that we don’t
have just throw away alternatives. I have seen some DEIRs where the alternatives are three
sentences long and say it doesn’t accomplish the goals of the project and so it wasn’t a feasible
alternative. That is not acceptable from my point of view. So those alternatives have to be well enough vetted so as to be useful and informative.

Just a reiteration, we talked earlier about and I don’t know how far we can go with this on the alternatives but the three-dimensional simulations and models that those be incorporated into our alternatives because that is the only way we are going to see what the physical and aesthetic impacts are going to be.

Referenced earlier as part of the alternative that some of the development be on the Redwood City campus for instance. I am not asking for a full exploration of that but if that is the intention just so that is stated so that it is clear when people are reading the alternatives that it doesn’t say that there is no place for it to go but here. So it is just a matter of clarity.

The comments that actually Vice-Chair Garber picked up on as well, the fiscal impacts, I would like to know more when those are going to be available and if it is possible for those to be available earlier because that is also a big part of this. This is a procedural thing but if we get the fiscal impacts report, we get the DEIR at the same time that is a lot to digest. I would hope that we would get that report sooner. The fiscal impacts that Mr. Jordan mentioned I think are appropriate ones the jobs and housing requirements, traffic and improvements, public services and schools.

Then the other thing I want to make sure is included in the alternatives is the implementation. Housing is an easy example to use but traffic would be another easy one to use. Implementation so that we don’t have a phasing of a project such that the development exists and the mitigations or components happen without a timeline or sometime after so that we are experiencing the impacts without having the housing built or without having the traffic mitigations in place.

So I will stop there. I think Commissioner Lippert was next.

**Commissioner Lippert:** First of all I would like to say that I appreciate the comments of my fellow Commissioners particularly Vice-Chair Garber and his comments with regard to linkages. I support those comments wholeheartedly.

I want to go back to the housing numbers or the housing analysis for just a moment. If we required or it was necessary for Stanford to build housing associated with the expansion of the Medical Center, the additional body count or number of people that work there, the differential. I think it would be helpful to understand how many housing units would be built in the BMR category but specifically they would be required to build so many BMR units associated with the amount of housing units that they built and then in addition to that it would be helpful to know how many employees would need BMR units in order to be able to live in proximity to and work at the Medical Center, and then if there were overages above and beyond that. That would take into account employees that are not in a differential that could make use of BMR units in proximity to where they are working. So I think that there would be three distinct numbers I guess. That was really my only comment.

**Chair Holman:** Vice-Chair Garber.
Vice-Chair Garber: Several items. First the fiscal impact study, jobs, traffic, public services, and schools were mentioned and I would like to add two other bullet points to that if they aren’t already in the agenda which they may be, taxes and then obviously retail. Specifically impacts to University Avenue.

Design alternatives, several things were mentioned that I will support. One of which was looking at the impacts of different compositions of beds, more, less, allocated differently. I would expect that those conversations would occur. They may only need or require a back of an envelope sort of analysis to establish whether they are viable alternatives or not but they are good reminders for us.

Location of the hotel. I would not support a location that is further away from El Camino. I would support a location that is closer to it for the very reasons that I outlined previously. The closer that those functions and utilities are to El Camino the greater they support University Avenue and the synergy between those two pieces. I would support the hotel being bigger if the City found that that could be supported economically.

Let me leave design alternatives for a moment I will probably come back to that. In terms of the Village Concept one of the other general principles is preservation of the ground plane for pedestrian activity would lead me to remind us of some of the comments that have been voiced in previous meetings that parking lots and structured parking, above grade structured parking, do not support that. Underground parking to free the ground plane for pedestrian and other retail activities and other business sorts of activities is a far better use for a limited area particularly going forward.

I would suspect that in addition to the project measures of success which may have to do with the amount of service that the hospital provides or the amount of retail sales that the mall generates I would look to see a measure of the city’s success be the improved business synergy between the mall and University Avenue. Without that we have really missed the big opportunity here. Finding a way to benchmark that on a going forward basis I think will help drive us toward that as a driver for the project.

Development Agreement. Recognizing that the Village Concepts that have been discussed, many of which are potentially outside the nature of the project or certainly the project boundaries, the Development Agreement I expect can be molded to fit any number of different criteria in that the Agreement does not have to support an actual physical change but can be a driver of an agenda between the City and Stanford to support these issues on a going forward basis. At the very least could support and demand that the two organizations, the City and Stanford at large, the University, mall, hospital, etc., work together to drive those concepts for the support of both entities.

Let me pause there and let someone else speak and then I will come back to design alternatives.

Mr. Williams: Madam Chair, it is a quarter to eleven and I think you need to assess where you are before our eleven o’clock hour.
Chair Holman: I think we are nearly done. Commissioner Keller, you had a comment?

Commissioner Keller: Yes. First I would like to mention I agree with a lot of the comments of Commissioner Lippert with respect to housing. It is also worthwhile to consider that housing provided by Stanford has long been useful for recruitment of faculty and staff. I think that providing housing for the Medical Center will continue to be useful for recruitment of staff at the Medical Center especially considering the shortage of nursing that exists.

With respect to the fiscal impacts I think that it would be helpful to understand the quantification of the mitigations that are proposed to Stanford. The quantification of the cost to Stanford of providing the mitigations in particular as a fraction or percentage of the total project budget. So it would be helpful to know is the project budget $1.0 billion, $5.0 billion, $3.0 billion, whatever the project budget is and then understand whether a mitigation is one percent of that, three percent of that, ten percent of that so that can be quantified in appropriate scale.

With respect to the Development Agreement I think it is helpful to understand that a Development Agreement locks things down. I think that there may be possibilities to lock down some things and not others. For example it could be possible not to lock down the amount of impact fees and that as impact fees change over time then the new impact fees can be computed rather than the ones locked in at the time of the Development Agreement. So I think there may be some choices as to what actually is permanently locked down for the Development Agreement and what things are left for future analysis such as Site and Design Review.

Chair Holman: Commissioner Fineberg, you had another comment.

Commissioner Fineberg: Yes, thank you. I would like to make one last comment about the key design elements on the handout about Village Concepts. This page. There are five items bulleted. The first is Traditional Core with Centrally Located Public Gathering Places. Second is Not Isolated Project but Connected, I am going to paraphrase. Third is Streets that are Dual Purpose with Movements and Exchange. Fourth is Compact, Higher Density, and Mixed Use with Diversity of Housing. Fifth is Walkable, Bikable, and Transit Oriented. As the different alternatives are being considered and as the Village Concept is implemented I would urge that all of those key design elements be incorporated. I have seen other projects in Palo Alto that are implanting the Cottage Cluster design or other things where they select the New Urbanism ideals and we end up with a project that is only compact and higher density and higher. I would like to see that not happen with this. The benefits, the good pieces of this, are huge. If we can get it right the benefits outweigh the negatives that you get from having more compact, higher buildings. If we don’t add those other bulleted items then all we end up with is something that is tall and dense. So let’s work to make sure that we get all those pieces. Thank you.

Chair Holman: Commissioner Lippert, you had a last comment?

Commissioner Lippert: Yes, just real quickly. The City has standards with regard to what we look at transit oriented development. I think at the California Avenue station we have a 2,000 foot radius circle. I think that that same standard should probably be applied when we are
gauging or looking at these distances. In addition to that I know that there are people that take
the train to Downtown Palo Alto and they walk much further on the University Avenue side than
they might walk on the Stanford University side, the El Camino side. We really should be
looking at those as almost like mirrors of themselves when we are doing the analysis. There is
no reason why if somebody is willing to up University Avenue they should be willing to walk
equal distance and that should be promoted on the Stanford University side.

I just want to say one other comment here. I am very disappointed that you didn’t include any
images of Sienna or Venice in your presentation today.

Mr. Fukuji: This first picture on the top right is from Venice. I squeezed one in.

Chair Holman: Vice-Chair Garber, you had some wrap up comments?

Vice-Chair Garber: I do not have any comments relative to No Project Alternative. Reduced
Intensity Alternatives, the sorts of things I have been speaking about this evening are alternatives
that are not necessarily less intensive but presumably can have less impact and/or another way of
stating that the impact that they do have may lend greater benefits to the community at large. So
I am not sure if some of the things I have spoken about the El Camino Guidelines, the structuring
of the ground plane, things of that sort would apply directly to a Reduced Intensity Alternative or
simply some other alternative I don’t really know. I will leave that to you to define.

I will lend support to the Chair’s argument that there should be scaled versions of the Village
Concepts because I think they are valuable at any size scale of project. Maybe scale is the wrong
word but whatever that is these are concepts that even if they happen in part can be done in such
a way that they support a longer term opportunity.

I want to be really careful that the difference of some of the things that I have been talking about
here as alternatives versus mitigations aren’t seen necessarily as mitigations in that they are
simply different ways of coming at it as opposed to chasing the impacts here with mitigations. I
am trying to get on the other side of the table here and recognize that there are ways that the
project at an incremental cost at worst can create a higher benefit to the community and
potentially to the applicant as well.

Two other quick things relative to the Village comments and this is again in preservation of the
ground plane. The conversation about bridges spanning El Camino in particular I think I would
have a hard time supporting concepts that take people off of the ground plane, especially in
communities such as this. Doing another Homer passage or something of that sort I think all
those things are great but we should be so lucky to have as many people crossing El Camino as
cross 5th Avenue or Michigan Avenue, etc. That sort of interaction is exactly the sort of
interaction we want there.

Chair Holman: I think the last comment I will make is actually in response to your Reduced
Intensity Alternative is probably a better phraseology than scaled village concept alternatives.
One comment about page six in the Staff Report, Reduced Intensity Alternative for the Medical Center. I am being a literalist here. It says that should be determined that significant impacts related to traffic generation, housing demand, utilities consumption, and/or public service demand would occur as a result of the project then a Reduced Intensity Alternative or Alternatives could be considered. That is not an all inclusive list. I am being a literalist, I did say that. So I just want to make sure the scope is larger than that.

I guess maybe just a word to the applicant, which is that as I stated earlier the Village Concept I think is appropriate for it to be considered as alternatives but also it is a way to rather than the City responding to an applicant’s proposal it is a way for the City to drive what the proposal should be. So I think this is taking a proactive approach to that. So let them respond to what we think is the better way to approach a solution for their proposal.

Just to make sure that or hopefully that they will be continuing to work with the Shopping Center too so we have that cohesive and Village Concept that can be worked out with the cooperative efforts of everybody.

Commissioner Keller, did you have something else to say?

Commissioner Keller: Yes, quickly. With respect to the DEIR I think there was a comment made and I certainly support having three-dimensional models available of the various alternatives so that we can compare them. To give a somewhat outlandish idea we have required story poles for some kinds of things we want to understand I am wondering if there is an equivalent to story poles so that we can actually get an idea of what these hospital and the Medical Center and the Children’s Hospital will look like at such heights and structures. Something to think about to get a lot of people to understand what we are talking about. Thank you.

Chair Holman: So with that we will close item two and our minutes will be available for Council? I should have said and didn’t that I do concur with largely every comment that other Commissioners made.