Section 1
Introduction

1.1 BACKGROUND

The EIR Process Following Release of the Draft EIR

A Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR), pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), was prepared by the City of Palo Alto (City) to disclose the potential environmental effects of the Stanford University Medical Center Facilities Renewal and Replacement Project (SUMC Project). The Draft EIR, issued for public review on May 20, 2010, includes a description of the SUMC Project, an assessment of its potential effects, a description of possible mitigation measures to reduce significant effects that were identified in the Draft EIR, and a consideration of alternatives that could address potential impacts. The SUMC Project would involve demolition, replacement, and expansion of existing medical facilities at the SUMC Sites, which are comprised of the 56-acre Main SUMC Site and the 9.9-acre Hoover Pavilion Site. The SUMC Project sponsors are the Stanford Hospital and Clinics (SHC), the Lucile Packard Children’s Hospital (LPCH), and the Stanford University School of Medicine (SoM). See below for a further description of the SUMC Project.

The 69-day public review period for the Draft EIR began on May 20, 2010 and ended July 27, 2010. During this time frame, the document was reviewed by various State, regional, and local agencies, as well as by interested organizations and individuals. Comment letters on the Draft EIR were received from 10 public agencies, three City Council members, three private organizations (including the SUMC Project sponsors), and 34 private individuals. The public review period also included six Planning and Transportation Commission (Commission) hearings, five City Council hearings, one Architectural Review Board (ARB) hearing, and one Historic Resources Board (HRB) hearing, for a total of 13 public hearings. The Commission and City Council hearings were open to the public and comments during the hearings were received from members of the public, commissioners, City Council members, and members of the ARB and HRB. Please see Section 2, List of Commentors, for a listing of all agencies, organizations, and individuals who commented on the Draft EIR.

This document responds to written and oral comments on the Draft EIR that were raised during the public review period, and contains revisions intended to correct, clarify, and amplify the Draft EIR. The responses and revisions in this document substantiate and confirm or correct the analyses contained in the Draft EIR. No new significant environmental impacts and no substantial increase in the severity of an earlier identified impact have resulted from responding to comments. However, as a result of the Draft EIR review process, the previously identified significant and unavoidable level of service (LOS) impact on three Menlo Park intersections would now be reduced to less-than–significant levels through identified mitigation measures. Also, the cumulative impacts pertaining to toxic air contaminants would now be less than significant. Also, the SUMC Project’s contribution to global climate change
would now be less than cumulatively considerable with mitigation. Lastly, the numbers of Protected Trees that would be removed by the SUMC Project and Tree Preservation Alternative have been clarified. These changes to the previously identified significant and unavoidable impacts are discussed below and addressed in detail in Section 3 of this document.

Together, the previously released Draft EIR and this “Responses to Comments” document constitute the Final Environmental Impact Report (Final EIR). As the lead agency, the City of Palo Alto must certify the Final EIR before action can be taken on the SUMC Project. Certification requires that the lead agency make findings that the Final EIR complies with CEQA.

**Project Description**

The SUMC Project would demolish, renovate, and replace on-site structures, thereby adding approximately 1.3 million square feet of net new floor area, broken down as follows:

- Demolition, renovation, and construction of SHC facilities, providing a net increase of approximately 824,000 square feet;
- Demolition, renovation, and construction of LPCH facilities, resulting in approximately 442,000 additional square feet;
- Demolition of four existing SoM buildings and construction of three replacement buildings, with no net increase in square feet;
- Demolition of shops and storage space, renovation of existing Hoover Pavilion, and net addition of approximately 46,000 square feet of new medical, office, research, clinic, and administrative facilities at the Hoover Pavilion Site for medical offices for community practitioners and SUMC-related medical offices, clinical facilities, and support uses;
- Demolition of existing parking spaces and construction of 2,985 new and replacement spaces, for a net increase of 2,053 spaces to address additional demand for the SUMC Project, to be located in surface parking and above- and underground structures;
- Construction of a new road connecting Sand Hill Road and Welch Road, and provision of interior driveways and improved circulation connections, including the extension of Quarry Road to Roth Way;
- Widening of Welch Road by the addition of a third lane to accommodate left turns in both directions; and
- Related on-site and off-site improvements.

The SUMC Project sponsors have applied to the City for a Comprehensive Plan Amendment, rezoning, architectural review, annexation of 0.75 acres adjacent to the SoM, and a possible Development Agreement. In addition, the City may require a Conditional Use Permit for the SUMC Project. The
EIR is intended to satisfy CEQA’s environmental review requirements applicable to the City’s approval of each of the requested entitlements, execution of the requested or required Development Agreement with the SUMC Project sponsors, subsequent City approvals and/or modifications to the SUMC Project as proposed, approvals by other responsible agencies, and construction and operation of the SUMC Project.

**Significant Unavoidable Environmental Impacts**

**Significant and Unavoidable Impacts.** Section 21100(b)(2)(A) of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR identify any significant environmental effects that cannot be avoided if the SUMC Project is implemented. Most impacts identified for the SUMC Project would either be less than significant or could be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. However, the Draft EIR, on pages S-93, 4-1, and 5-2, identifies the following significant and unavoidable project-level and cumulative impacts, some of which would no longer be significant and unavoidable per revisions to the analysis:

- Deterioration of intersection LOS during Peak Hour conditions at three Menlo Park intersections (Middlefield Road and Willow Road, Bayfront Expressway and Willow Road, and University Avenue and Bayfront Expressway). However, per revisions to the LOS analysis, all significant intersection impacts from the SUMC Project would now be reduced to less-than-significant levels with identified mitigation measures, and the SUMC Project would no longer have significant and unavoidable intersection LOS impacts;

- Increased average daily traffic on four Menlo Park roadway segments, on Marsh Road, Sand Hill Road, Willow Road, and Alpine Road;

- Emission of criteria air pollutants (NOx) during construction, on both a project level and cumulative level;

- Emission of criteria air pollutants (ROG, NOx, PM\textsubscript{2.5}) during operation, on both a project level and cumulative level;

- Contribution to cumulative emissions of TACs. However, per revisions to the cumulative TAC and fine particulate matter analysis, cumulative TAC and fine particulate matter and emissions would now be less than significant and the SUMC Project would no longer have significant and unavoidable cumulative TAC and fine particulate matter impacts;

- Emission of greenhouse gases. However, per revisions to the climate change analysis, the SUMC Project’s greenhouse gas emissions would be less than cumulatively considerable, and the SUMC Project’s consistency with the City of Palo Alto Climate Protection Plan would be less than significant with identified mitigation measures. As such, the SUMC Project would no longer have a significant and unavoidable contribution to global climate change;

- Temporary but substantial noise during construction, on both a project level and cumulative level;
- Emission of ambulance noise along a new route along Sand Hill Road into the proposed Durand Way extension, so that noise levels at roadside residences would increase by a level considered unacceptable under the City’s Comprehensive Plan;

- Demolition of an historical structure, the 1959 Hospital Building complex (also referred to as the Stone Building complex), which is a significant and unavoidable impact on both a project and cumulative level; and

- Removal of up to 74 Protected Trees, as defined in City of Palo Alto’s Tree Protection and Management Regulations, which is a significant and unavoidable impact on both a project level and a cumulative level. While the Draft EIR identified the loss of up to 71 Protected Trees, per revisions to the analysis, this number has been corrected to 74 Protected Trees.

Additionally, the analysis of the Tree Preservation Alternative included pile-driving activities during construction. It has been determined by the SUMC Project sponsors that pile-driving may be required in order to construct the replacement SHC Hospital. Also the SUMC Project sponsors have identified the Tree Preservation Alternative as a preferred site plan such that, going forward, refinements to project design would focus on the site plan for the Tree Preservation Alternative. As such, the Draft EIR addresses pile driving impacts under the Tree Preservation Alternative scenario. The Draft EIR indicates that potential pile-driving activities would result in significant and unavoidable noise effects to nearby residents.

**Revisions to the Previously Identified Significant and Unavoidable Impacts.** As indicated above, some revisions to the previously identified significant and unavoidable impacts have resulted from responding to comments on the Draft EIR. This Responses to Comments document addresses the following revisions:

- First, the significant and unavoidable LOS impacts during Peak Hour conditions at three Menlo Park intersections (Middlefield Road and Willow Road, Bayfront Expressway and Willow Road, and University Avenue and Bayfront Expressway) has now been reduced. After receiving input from the City of Menlo Park, the City of Palo Alto has now determined that the impact these intersections would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. Please refer to Staff-Initiated Change 2 in Section 3 of this document for a detailed explanation of this change to the Draft EIR.

- Second, a revised analysis of cumulative TAC and fine particulate matter emissions has been completed for the SUMC Project using the methodology and thresholds established by the 2010 Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) CEQA Guidelines. This quantified analysis replaces the qualitative analysis in the Draft EIR and yields more accurate results, which show that all cumulative estimates for cancer risk, chronic non-cancer Health Indexes (HI), and annual average PM2.5 concentration would be below the BAAQMD cumulative significance thresholds for on-site patient receptors and maximally exposed off-site residential receptors within the zone of influence. Please refer to Staff-Initiated Change 3 in Section 3 of this document for a detailed explanation of this change to the Draft EIR.
• Third, the City has reevaluated the Draft EIR analysis of the SUMC Project’s greenhouse gas emissions. The reevaluation has determined that, compared to the Business as Usual (BAU) scenario, the SUMC Project would reduce greenhouse gas emissions by more than 30 percent. Also, the SUMC Project would be consistent with the goals of the City’s Climate Protection Plan after implementation of identified mitigation measures. As such, the SUMC Project’s contribution to global climate change would be less than cumulatively considerable after mitigation. A major driver for the change in this conclusion is that the City has determined that, from a global perspective, increased patient/visitor trips would not constitute new trips that would result from the SUMC expansion. This is because patients would be expected to seek medical treatment somewhere, even if the SUMC Hospitals were not expanded. Please refer to Staff-Initiated Change 4 in Section 3 of this document for a detailed explanation of this change to the Draft EIR.

• Fourth, the City has clarified the number of Protected Trees to be removed by the SUMC Project. The City has determined that a total of 74 Protected Trees would be removed under the SUMC Project, rather than 71 Protected Trees. Under the Tree Preservation Alternative, up to 59 Protected Trees potentially would be removed. Staff-Initiated Change 6, in Section 3 of this document, provides this clarification under the SUMC Project and the Tree Preservation Alternative. The significant and unavoidable conclusion in the Draft EIR would remain.

Project Alternatives

Section 15126.6(a) of the CEQA Guidelines states that “An EIR shall describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of a project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives.” Therefore, in addition to the SUMC Project, the Draft EIR considers and evaluates seven alternatives, as well as variations on those alternatives, as enumerated below. These alternatives are described in more detail in Section 5 of the Draft EIR.

• No Project Alternative A: Retrofitting Only/ No New Structures. Under No Project Alternative A, only those Hospital facilities that could be modified to meet the 2013 and 2030 deadlines would be retrofitted. No new buildings would be constructed. In the long-term, portions of the Hospital facilities would not meet SB 1953 requirements for the 2030 deadline, and one or both of the Hospitals would be closed. Under this alternative, there would be no new construction at the Hoover Pavilion Site and the interior of the existing Hoover Pavilion building would not need to be renovated to relocate the users of 1101 Welch Road. No rezoning, annexation, or changes to existing land use designations would be required.

• No Project Alternative B: Replace SB 1953 Noncompliant Structures at Maximum Allowable FAR. Under No Project Alternative B, Hospital facilities that are not compliant with OSHPD structural standards would be replaced with new structures. New structures would be built out to the maximum size allowed under PF zoning. In addition, the LPCH
would continue to use its existing facilities, with non-structural renovations made to noncompliant critical care areas. No rezoning, annexation, or changes to existing land use designations would be required to replace the SB 1953 noncompliant buildings with the maximum allowable FAR. It is assumed that No Project Alternative B would be completed by 2015.

- **Reduced Intensity Alternative A: Right-Size SHC and LPCH Facilities without Adding Beds.** Under Reduced Intensity Alternative A, noncompliant facilities would be demolished and replaced with new structures. Construction of new Hospital facilities would be limited to the minimum additional square footage required to right-size the existing LPCH and SHC facilities without adding space for additional growth. All other uses on the Main SUMC Site would remain the same as under current conditions, subject to minor seismic retrofit work. In addition, the Hoover Pavilion would be internally renovated to accommodate additional clinic and office uses; however, no new structures would be constructed at this site. Unlike the previous two alternatives, the implementation of Reduced Intensity Alternative A would require rezoning of the Main SUMC Sites to accommodate proposed development intensities because the PF-zoned area is almost entirely built out under existing conditions.

- **Reduced Intensity Alternative B: Right-Size SHC and LPCH Facilities Plus Add Floor Area in an Amount Less Than the SUMC Project.** Reduced Intensity Alternative B would include all of the components of Reduced Intensity Alternative A, but would also include additional square footage for clinics/medical offices, research facilities, and other non-Hospital uses. The additions under Reduced Intensity Alternative B would be approximately 60 percent of the floor area of the SUMC Project medical offices and 60 percent of the floor area of the SUMC Project Hospital space above the amounts needed for right-sizing.

- **Tree Preservation Alternative.** The Tree Preservation Alternative would seek to avoid the significant and unavoidable impact from the removal of Protected Trees, in particular, Protected Trees that are considered both biological and aesthetic tree resources (as defined in more detail in Section 3.9 of the Draft EIR, Biological Resources). The Tree Preservation Alternative would have the same development program as the proposed SUMC Project, including the same site plan and square footages for the LPCH Hospital and clinic/medical office buildings and for the Hoover Pavilion Site. In addition, the Tree Preservation Alternative would include the same square footage for the SHC Hospital and clinic/medical office buildings and the FIM 1 building as under the SUMC Project; however, the site plan and building footprints for the SHC and FIM 1 would be different to avoid the removal of Protected Trees. As indicated above, the SUMC Project sponsors have identified the Tree Preservation Alternative as a preferred site plan such that, going forward, refinements to project design would focus on the site plan for the Tree Preservation Alternative.

- **Historic Preservation Alternative.** The Historic Preservation Alternative would seek to avoid the SUMC Project’s significant and unavoidable impact from demolition of the Stone Building complex, which is considered a historic resource. Under the Historic Preservation Alternative,
the Stone Building complex would be used as clinics, medical offices and SoM research labs, and not used as hospital buildings, as defined by the Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development (OSHPD). As such, all Hospital functions would be moved out of the 1959 Hospital Building complex, as is contemplated under the SUMC Project, and the new SHC and LPCH Hospital buildings would be constructed.

- **Village Concept Alternative.** The Village Concept Alternative would include the SUMC Project as proposed, but in addition would provide opportunities to enhance the SUMC Project by creating a more walkable, bikeable, mixed-use, transit-oriented, and well-connected urban environment. The Village Concept Alternative includes City recommendations that 490 previously approved, but not yet constructed, housing units along Quarry Road and Pasteur Drive, on Stanford lands, be affordable units that would be dedicated for occupancy by SUMC Project employees. Under the City’s recommendation, these housing units would be constructed within two to four years after the issuance of building permits for the SUMC Project. The Village Concept Alternative would also include specific pedestrian linkages between the SUMC Project, the Stanford Shopping Center, Stanford University, the PAITS, and downtown, with corresponding urban design recommendations.

In addition to the No Project Alternatives, the Draft EIR identifies Reduced Intensity Alternative A as the environmentally superior SUMC Project alternative. The alternatives as presented in the Draft EIR are examples of potentially feasible alternatives that would reduce the impacts of the SUMC Project, attempt to meet the majority of objectives, and promote a functional site plan. Therefore, the alternatives included in the Draft EIR represent a range of reasonable alternatives to the SUMC Project, but are not meant to limit the City Council and the Commission in determining the best option for the SUMC Project. It is at the discretion of City Council whether to approve portions of the proposed alternatives that would mitigate or avoid significant environmental impacts, while rejecting the alternatives that are deemed to be infeasible. As such, the final SUMC Project could be the SUMC Project as proposed in the Draft EIR, an alternative to the SUMC Project, or a combination of the SUMC Project and different alternatives.

### 1.2 PURPOSE OF THIS RESPONSES TO COMMENTS DOCUMENT

Under CEQA, the City is required, after completion of a Draft EIR, to consult with and obtain comments from public agencies having jurisdiction by law with respect to the SUMC Project, and to provide the general public with an opportunity to comment on the Draft EIR. As the lead agency, the City of Palo Alto is also required to respond to significant environmental issues raised in the review and consultation process.

This Responses to Comments document has been prepared to respond to public agency and general public comments received on the Draft EIR for the SUMC Project, which was circulated for a 69-day public review period, May 20, 2010 to July 27, 2010, and to respond to comments received at the 13 hearings that took place during that same time period. This document contains the public comments...
received on the Draft EIR, written responses to those comments, and changes made to the Draft EIR in response to the comments.

The Responses to Comments document provides clarification and further substantiation for the analysis and conclusions presented in the Draft EIR. Additionally, the responses correct and remedy minor technical mistakes or errors identified in the Draft EIR. The purpose of the Responses to Comments document is to address concerns raised about the adequacy of the Draft EIR and the process by which the City of Palo Alto conducted the CEQA process. Comments that express an opinion about the merits of the SUMC Project or SUMC Project alternatives, rather than the adequacy of the Draft EIR of the SUMC Project’s compliance with CEQA, are not examined in this document. This document does not provide a response regarding the merits of the SUMC Project or SUMC Project alternatives. Section 15088 of the CEQA Guidelines stipulates that responses should pertain to major or significant environmental issues raised by commentors. As explained earlier, the previously released Draft EIR and this “Responses to Comments” document constitute the Final EIR.

1.3 HOW TO USE THIS REPORT

This document addresses substantive comments received during the public review period and consists of six sections: (1) Introduction, (2) List of Commentors, (3) Staff-Initiated Changes and Master Responses, (4) Responses to Written Comments on the Draft EIR, (5) Responses to Oral Comments on the Draft EIR, and (6) Revisions to the Draft EIR. Section 1 reviews the purpose and contents of this Responses to Comments document. Section 2 lists the public agencies, organizations, and individuals who submitted comments on the Draft EIR. In addition, Section 3 provides Staff-Initiated Changes and Master Responses to comments that were raised on multiple occasions and warrant a single comprehensive response. Following the Staff-Initiated Changes and Master Responses, Section 4 contains each comment letter and written response to the individual comments. Section 5 contains comments made by speakers at the public hearings during circulation of the Draft EIR, and the responses to these comments. In Sections 4 and 5, specific comments within each comment letter or oral testimony at the public hearings have been bracketed and enumerated in the margin of the letter or transcript. Each commentor has been assigned a discrete comment letter or speaker number, as listed in Section 2. Responses to each of these comments follow each comment letter in Section 4 and follow the transcripts reproduced in Section 5. For the most part, the responses provide explanatory information or additional discussion of text in the Draft EIR. In some instances, the response supersedes or supplements the text of the Draft EIR for accuracy or clarification. New text that has been added to the Draft EIR is indicated with underlining. Text that has been deleted is indicated with strikethrough. Finally, Section 6 provides a comprehensive listing of the text changes to the Draft EIR that have resulted from responding to comment or staff-initiated changes.
2.1 WRITTEN COMMENTS

Comment letters on the Draft EIR were received from 10 public agencies, three City Council members, three private organizations, and 34 individuals, as listed below. The public agencies, organizations, and individuals listed below are in the order that their comments are presented in Section 4 of this document. Following this list, an alphabetized list of these agencies, organizations, and individuals is provided in order to help the commentor find their responses more easily.

Public Agencies

1. Governor’s Office of Planning and Research, State Clearinghouse and Planning Unit, Scott Morgan (letter dated July 7, 2010)

2. Department of Toxic Substances, Andrew Berna-Hicks, P.E. (letter dated June 7, 2010)


3a. Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority, CMA Planning Department, Robert Swierk, AICP (letter dated July 27, 2010)

4. Local Agency Formation Commission of Santa Clara County, Dunia Noel (letter dated June 17, 2010)

5. County of San Mateo Planning and Building Department, Jim Eggemeyer (letter dated July 27, 2010)

6. County of San Mateo Manager, David Boesch (letter dated August 2, 2010)

7. City of East Palo Alto Community Development Department, Planning Division, Brent Butler (letter dated July 26, 2010)


City Council Letters

12. Councilmember Karen Holman, City Council (letter dated June 14, 2010)

13. Councilmember Nancy Shepherd, City Council (letter dated July 12, 2010)
14. Councilmember Nancy Shepherd, City Council (letter dated July 12, 2010)
15. Councilmember Nancy Shepherd, City Council (letter dated July 12, 2010)
17. Councilmember Greg Schmid, Mayor Patrick Burt, and Councilmember Nancy Shepherd, City Council (letter dated July 12, 2010)
18. Councilmember Karen Holman, City Council (letter dated July 27, 2010)

**Private Organizations**
22. Stanford University Medical Center, Michael J. Peterson (letter dated July 27, 2010)
   22a. Stanford University Medical Center, Barbara Schussman (letter dated February 24, 2009)
   22b. Stanford University Medical Center, Michael J. Peterson (letter dated July 27, 2010)
   22c. Stanford University Medical Center (letter dated January 9, 2010)
   22d. Stanford University Medical Center, Barbara Schussman (letter dated July 27, 2010)
   22e. Stanford University Medical Center (letter dated July 20, 2010)

**Individuals**
24. Dorothy Bender (letter dated July 23, 2010)
27. Irv Brenner (letter dated July 21, 2010)
32. Janet Davis (letter dated June 22, 2010)
34. Natalie Fisher (letter dated May 25, 2010)
35. Margaret Fruth (letter dated August 26, 2010)
36. Michael Griffin (letter dated June 24, 2010)
37. Michael Griffin (letter dated July 12, 2010)
39. David Haray (Letter dated July 19, 2010)
40. Alan Hess (letter dated July 26, 2010)
43. Tom Jordan (letter dated July 15, 2010)
44. Tom Jordan (letter dated July 21, 2010)
45. Yoriko Kishimoro (letter dated July 15, 2010)
47. Libby Lucas (letter dated July 27, 2010)
52. Doug Moran (letter dated May 24, 2010)
54. Stephanie Munoz (letter dated June 29, 2010)
55. Sidney Overland (letter dated July 22, 2010)
59. Steve Schmidt (letter dated July 6, 2010)
60. Jeannie and Tony Seigman (letter dated July 25, 2010)
62. Soa Tsung, MD (letter dated May 28, 2010)
63. Jaya Virmani, MD (letter dated May 28, 2010)
Alphabetical List of Public Agencies, City Council, Private Organizations, and Individuals Submitting Written Comments on the Draft EIR

Dorothy Bender (letter dated July 23, 2010) – Letter 24
Andrew Berna-Hicks, P.E., Department of Toxic Substances (dated June 7, 2010) – Letter 2
David Boesch, County of San Mateo Manager (letter dated August 2, 2010) – Letter 6
Beth Bunnenberg (letter dated July 22, 2010) – Letter 28
Brent Butler, City of East Palo Alto Community Development Department, Planning Division (letter dated July 26, 2010) – Letter 7
Richard Cline, Mayor, City of Menlo Park (letter dated July 27, 2010) – Letter 8
Katrina and James Currier (letter dated July 21, 2010) – Letter 30
Janet Davis (letter dated May 22, 2010) – Letter 31
Janet Davis (letter dated June 22, 2010) – Letter 32
Janet Davis (letter dated July 27, 2010) – Letter 33
Jim Eggermeyer, County of San Mateo Planning and Building Department (letter dated July 27, 2010) – Letter 5
Roland Ekstrand, City of Palo Alto Utilities Department (letter dated August 2, 2010) – Letter 11
Margaret Fruth (letter dated August 26, 2010) – Letter 35
Michael Griffin (letter dated June 24, 2010) – Letter 36
Michael Griffin (letter dated July 12, 2010) – Letter 37
John Guislin, Middlefield North Neighborhood Association (letter dated May 21, 2010) – Letter 21
Ken Hake (letter dated July 21, 2010) – Letter 38
David Haray (Letter dated July 19, 2010) – Letter 39
Alan Hess (letter dated July 26, 2010) – Letter 40
Karen Holman, City Council (letter dated June 14, 2010) – Letter 12
Karen Holman, City Council (letter dated July 27, 2010) – Letter 18
Karen Holman, City Council (letter dated July 27, 2010) – Letter 19
Tom Jordan (letter dated July 15, 2010) - Letter 43
Tom Jordan (letter dated July 21, 2010) - Letter 44
Yoriko Kishimoro (letter dated July 15, 2010) – Letter 45
Doug Moran (letter dated may 24, 2010) – Letter 52
Scott Morgan, Governor’s Office of Planning and Research, State Clearinghouse (dated July 7, 2010) – Letter 1
Stephanie Munoz (letter dated June 29, 2010) – Letter 54
Dunia Noel, Local Agency Formation Commission of Santa Clara County (letter dated June 17, 2010) – Letter 4
Michael J. Peterson, Stanford University Medical Center (letter dated July 27, 2010) – Letter 22
Michael J. Peterson, Stanford University Medical Center (letter dated July 27, 2010) - Letter 22b
Councilmember Greg Schmid, City Council (letter dated June 30, 2010) – Letter 16
Councilmember Greg Schmid, Mayor Patrick Burt, and Councilmember Nancy Shepherd, City Council (letter dated July 12, 2010) – Letter 17
Steve Schmidt (letter dated July 6, 2010) – Letter 59
Barbara Schussman, Stanford University Medical Center (letter dated February 24, 2009) – Letter 22a
2.2 Comments Received at the Public Hearings

Comments were received at six Planning and Transportation Commission (Commission) hearings, five City Council hearings, one Architectural Review Board (ARB) hearing, and one Historic Resources Board (HRB) hearing, for a total of 13 public hearings. In delineating the discrete comments received at the public hearings, the following codes have been used to identify commentors and comments; these codes are reflected in the transcripts from the public hearings:

- **PTC** – Comments made at the Planning and Transportation Commission hearings
- **CC** – Comments made at the City Council hearings
- **ARB** – Comments made at the Architectural Review Board hearing
- **HRB** – Comments made at the Historic Resources Board hearing

**PTC1 – Planning and Transportation Commission hearing (June 2, 2010)**

The following commissioners provided comments on the Draft EIR during this hearing:

- Daniel Garber – Chair
- Susan Fineberg
- Eduardo Martinez
- Arthur Keller
- Lee Lippert
- Greg Tanaka
In addition to the commissioners, the following members of the public provided comments on the Draft EIR during this hearing:

Robert Moss
Sherri Sager

**PTC2 – Planning and Transportation Commission hearing (June 9, 2010)**

The following commissioners provided comments on the Draft EIR during this hearing:

Daniel Garber – Chair
Eduardo Martinez
Arthur Keller
Greg Tanaka

No members of the public provided comments on the Draft EIR during this hearing.

**PTC3 – Planning and Transportation Commission hearing (June 16, 2010)**

The following commissioners provided comments on the Draft EIR during this hearing:

Daniel Garber – Chair
Arthur Keller
Lee Lippert
Eduardo Martinez
Susan Fineberg
Greg Tanaka

In addition to the commissioners, the following members of the public provided comments on the Draft EIR during this hearing:

Michael Griffin
Robert Moss

**PTC4 – Planning and Transportation Commission hearing (June 24, 2010)**

The following commissioners provided comments on the Draft EIR during this hearing:

Daniel Garber – Chair
Arthur Keller
Lee Lippert
Eduardo Martinez  
Susan Fineberg  
Greg Tanaka  

In addition to the commissioners, the following members of the public provided comments on the Draft EIR during this hearing:  

Michael Griffin  

**PTC5 – Planning and Transportation Commission hearing (June 30, 2010)**  

The following commissioners provided comments on the Draft EIR during this hearing:  

Daniel Garber - Chair  
Arthur Keller  
Susan Fineberg  
Greg Tanaka  
Eduardo Martinez  

In addition to the commissioners, the following members of the public provided comments on the Draft EIR during this hearing:  

Robert Moss  

**PTC6 – Planning and Transportation Commission hearing (July 7, 2010)**  

The following commissioners provided comments on the Draft EIR during this hearing:  

Arthur Keller  
Eduardo Martinez  
Susan Fineberg  
Lee Lippert  
Daniel Garber – Chair  
Greg Tanaka  

In addition to the commissioners, the following members of the public provided comments on the Draft EIR during this hearing:  

Robert Moss
CC1 – City Council hearing (June 7, 2010)

The following City Councilmembers provided comments on the Draft EIR during this hearing:

  Sid Espinosa – Vice Mayor
  Karen Holman
  Nancy Shepherd
  Gregory Scharff
  Greg Schmid

In addition to the Councilmembers, the following Commissioner and members of the public provided comments on the Draft EIR during this hearing:

  Eduardo Martinez – Planning and Transportation Commissioner
  Larry Taylor
  Crystal Gamage
  Stephen Player
  Stephanie Munoz
  Mark Lawrence
  Brian Steen
  Joseph Hopkins
  Jim Rebosio
  Alison Cormack
  Craig Thom
  Susie Thom
  Robert Moss

CC2 – City Council hearing (June 14, 2010)

The following City Councilmembers provided comments on the Draft EIR during this hearing:

  Patrick Burt – Mayor
  Karen Holman
  Gail Price
  Gregory Scharff
  Greg Schmid
  Yiaway Yeh
In addition to the Councilmembers, the following Commissioner and members of the public provided comments on the Draft EIR during this hearing:

- Eduardo Martinez – Planning and Transportation Commissioner
- Stanley Mayerson
- Brian Schmidt
- Robert Moss
- Stephanie Munoz
- A. Gladys Stavn

**CC3 – City Council hearing (July 12, 2010)**

The following City Councilmembers provided comments on the Draft EIR during this hearing:

- Patrick Burt – Mayor
- Sid Espinosa – Vice Mayor
- Karen Holman
- Gail Price
- Gregory Scharff
- Greg Schmid
- Nancy Shepherd
- Yiaway Yeh

In addition to the Councilmembers, the following Commissioner and members of the public provided comments on the Draft EIR during this hearing:

- Daniel Garber – Chair
- Walt Hays
- Arden Anderson
- Harry Dennis
- Hal Mickelson
- Michael Griffin
- Traci Fallecker
- Carn Cappel
- Alan Grundmann
- Michele Grundmann
Nancy Peterson
Boyd Smith
Norman Beamer
Stephanie Munoz
Tom Jordan
Robert Moss

CC4 – City Council hearing (July 19, 2010)

The following City Councilmembers provided comments on the Draft EIR during this hearing:

    Patrick Burt – Mayor
    Sid Espinosa – Vice Mayor
    Karen Holman
    Gail Price
    Gregory Scharff
    Greg Schmid
    Yiaway Yeh

In addition to the Councilmembers, the following members of the public provided comments on the Draft EIR during this hearing:

    David Haray
    Beth Bunnenberg

CC5 – City Council hearing (July 26, 2010)

The following City Councilmembers provided comments on the Draft EIR during this hearing:

    Patrick Burt – Mayor
    Karen Holman
    Gail Price
    Gregory Scharff
    Nancy Shepherd

In addition to the Councilmembers, the following Commissioner and members of the public provided comments on the Draft EIR during this hearing:

    Daniel Garber – Chair
Michael Weiland
Adele Ullman
Paul Cole
Bonnie Balfour
Mary Ann Carmack
Bruce Codding
Fred Taleghani
Richard Greene
George Liddle
Howard Wolf
Beth Bunnenberg
Raymond Neal
Bruce Baker
Robert Moss
Herb Borock
Stephanie Munoz

**ARB1- Architectural Review Board Hearing (July 1, 2010)**

The following Architectural Review Board Members provided comments on the Draft EIR during this hearing:

- Alexander Lew – Chair
- Clare Malone Prichard – Vice Chair
- Judith Wasserman
- Heather Young

**HRB1- Historic Resources Board Hearing (July 7, 2010)**

The following Historic Resources Board Members provided comments on the Draft EIR during this hearing:

- David Bower – Chair
- Natalie Loukianoff – Vice Chair
- Martin Bernstein
- Beth Bunnenberg
Alphabetical List of Commissioners, City Councilmembers, ARB Members, HRB Members, and Individuals Submitting Oral Comments on the Draft EIR

Arden Anderson, Public - CC3
Bruce Baker, Public – CC5
Bonnie Balfour, Public – CC5
Norman Beamer, Public – CC3
Martin Bernstein, Board Member, Historic Resources Board – HRB1
Herb Borock, Public - CC5
David Bower, Chair, Historic Resources Board- HRB1
Beth Bunnenberg, Historic Resource Board – HRB1
Beth Bunnenberg, Public – CC4, CC5
Patrick Burt, Mayor, City Council – CC2, CC3, CC4, CC5
Caren Cappell, Public – CC3
Mary Ann Carmack, Public – CC5
Bruce Codding, Public – CC5
Paul Cole, Public – CC5
Alison Cormack, Public – CC1
Harry Dennis, Public – CC3
Sid Espinosa, Vice Mayor, City Council – CC1, CC3, CC4
Traci Fallecker, Public – CC3
Susan Fineberg, Commissioner, Planning and Transportation Commission – PTC1, PTC3, PTC4, PTC5, PTC6
Crystal Gamage, Public – CC1
Daniel Garber, Chair, Planning and Transportation Commission – PTC1, PTC2, PTC3, PTC4, PTC5, PTC6, CC3, CC5
Richard Greene, Public - CC5
Michael Griffin, Public – PTC3, PTC4, CC3
Alan Grundmann, Public – CC3
Michele Grundmann, Public – CC3
David Haray, Public – CC4
Walt Hays, Public – CC3
Karen Holman, Councilmember, City Council – CC1, CC2, CC3, CC4, CC5
Joseph Hopkins, Public – CC1
Tom Jordan, Public – CC3
Arthur Keller, Commissioner, Planning and Transportation Commission – PTC1, PTC2, PTC3, PTC4, PTC5, PTC6
Roger Kohler, Boardmember, Historic Resources Board – HRB1
Mark Lawrence, Public – CC1
Alexander Lew, Chair, Architectural Review Board – ARB1
George Liddle, Public – CC5
Lee Lippert, Commissioner, Planning and Transportation Commission – PTC1, PTC3, PTC4, PTC6
Natalie Loukianoff, Vice Chair, Historic Resources Board – HRB1
Michael Makinen, Boardmember, Historic Resources Board – HRB1
Eduardo Martinez, Commissioner, Planning and Transportation Commission – PTC1, PTC2, PTC3, PTC4, PTC5, PTC6, CC1, CC2
Stanley Mayerson, Public – CC2
Hal Mickelson, Public – CC3
Robert Moss, Public – PTC1, PTC3, PTC5, PTC6, CC1, CC2, CC3, CC5
Stephanie Munoz, Public – CC1, CC2, CC3, CC5
Raymond Neal, Public – CC5
Nancy Peterson, Public – CC3
Stephen Player, Public – CC1
Gail Price, Councilmember, City Council – CC2, CC3, CC4, CC5
Clare Malone Prichard, Vice Chair, Architectural Review Board – ARB1
Jim Rebosio, Public – CC1
Sheri Sager, Public – PTC1
Gregory Scharrff, Councilmember, City Council – CC1, CC2, CC3, CC4, CC5
Greg Schmid, Councilmember, City Council – CC1, CC2, CC3, CC4
Brian Schmidt, Public – CC2
Nancy Shepherd, Councilmember, City Council – CC1, CC3, CC5
Boyd Smith, Public – CC3
A. Gladys Stavn, Public – CC2
Brian Steen, Public – CC1
Fred Taleghani, Public – CC5
Greg Tanaka, Commissioner, Planning and Transportation Commission – PTC 1, PTC2, PTC3, PTC4, PTC5, PTC6
Larry Taylor, Public – CC1
Craig Thom, Public – CC1
Susie Thom, Public – CC1
Adele Ullman, Public – CC5
Judith Wasserman, Boardmember, Architectural Review Board – ARB1
Michael Weiland, Public – CC5
Howard Wolf, Public – CC5
Yiaway Yeh, Councilmember, City Council – CC2, CC3, CC4
Heather Young, Boardmember, Architectural Review Board – ARB1
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