Stanford University Medical Center: Recommendation to City Council to certify the Final Environmental Impact Report (Final EIR) for the Stanford University Medical Center Facilities Renewal and Replacement Project, including a statement of Findings that the Final EIR complies with the California Environmental Quality Act.

Mr. Steven Turner, Advance Planning Manager: Thank you very much Vice-Chair Lippert and good evening Commissioners. My name is Steven Turner, Advance Planning Manager for the City of Palo Alto’s Department of Planning and Community Environment, and the Project Manager for the Stanford projects. I am very pleased to be able to present the Final Environmental Impact Report to the Commission tonight. It is a result of many years of work by Staff and our consultants, and many of those folks are in the room tonight. I wanted to say a special thank you to those folks that really assisted the City in the development and review of the Final EIR.

There is one person that is not in the room tonight and that is a member of the consultant team PBS&J, Trixie Martelino. She has been the Project Manager for the EIR portion since the beginning, for about three years now. She has left PBS&J to take a position in another organization. We really appreciate her time that she gave to the City in the development of this EIR. In her place we have Kristen Chapman who has been working on the project along with Trixie for many years. Of course, we have Rod Jeung from PBS&J assisting as well.

We also want to extend a special thank you out to members of the public and the Boards and Commissions that have spent a lot of time reviewing the Draft EIR and providing very thoughtful comments for us to respond to. That is really showing the level of participation and interest by the community on this project and we really want to thank people for their participation.

So I wanted to go over the agenda tonight in terms of our presentation. I am going to be starting off with a little bit about the project timeline and where we have been with the project, and the evolution of the project with respect to tree protection and the Village Concept. Then we will actually had the presentation over to Rod Jeung, Senior Manager, PBS&J who is going to go over in a little bit more detail about the Final EIR and provide an overview about the background of the document, the review process, and highlighting some of the elements of the Final EIR itself. After Rod’s presentation we will hand it over to Cara Siler, Senior Assistant City Attorney, who will be giving an overview of the CEQA findings and also talk a little bit about the Staff recommendation that Vice-Chair Lippert alluded to. I will come back with some Next Steps and where we go from here, and then we will follow that up with a presentation from the Stanford University project sponsors regarding the overall architecture and design of the project.
So where have we been. The projects were first introduced to the City way back in December of 2006. No applications were submitted at that time but it was a presentation by Stanford University and I think followed soon after that by Simon Properties for development of the Stanford University Medical Center, and an expansion at the shopping center as well. That really kind of started what we called at the time the Phase 1 process, which involved a number of community meetings, study sessions with Boards and Commissions, development of the Area Plan that was required by Comprehensive Plan policy, we did a number of community outreach workshops and sessions to gather public input about what we should be analyzing and what the projects should contribute to the City of Palo Alto. That took us to August of 2007 when the formal applications for the projects were presented to the City. The City then prepared a Notice of Preparation and that really kicked off the environmental review of the project, which continued through 2007, 2008, and into 2009.

A significant change occurred to the project in April of 2009 when Stanford withdrew the application request for the shopping center to focus solely on the Medical Center development. At that point with the EIR in a state of near completion we had to go back and make adjustment to the EIR in order to take out the shopping center elements and focus solely on the Medical Center project itself.

Throughout that time the Architectural Review Board also held study sessions and preliminary reviews regarding the project design and components, and the project has really evolved over time during those meetings. That review of the project through the Architectural Review Board and the development of the Draft EIR took us up to May of 2010 where we released the Draft Environmental Impact Report. That commenced a public review period where we had a number of public hearings with the Historic Resources Board, Architectural Review Board, and of course the Planning and Transportation Commission, and the City Council. That concluded in July of 2010, and that initiated the start of preparation of the Final EIR and responding to approximately 1,000 comments that we had received during the Draft EIR public review period.

The preparation of the Final EIR lasted until February and on February 17 we released the Final EIR and really started the process for reviewing the Entitlements for the projects, the request for Comprehensive Plan change, a new zoning district, Conditional Use Permits, architectural review, annexation, and the like. That takes us up to through essentially today.

I mentioned in terms of the project itself that it has evolved over time. You would expect in a review process over three years that the project would evolve, and this project has. The slide up on the screen shows a view of the project in 2008. It is not the earliest site development plan for the project but it is important in that this plan for the Medical Center area shows, and that is around Figure 1, shows the hospital towers in a kind of a square tower configuration. This plan shows six towers that extend over Pasteur Drive and into the Kaplan Lawn area. It also shows the clinics buildings in area 2, and a version of the Children’s Hospital expansion in areas 5 and 6.

Sometime after 2008 and during the review of the Draft EIR it was determined and really proposed by the project applicant that there is probably a better way to approach tree protection with regard to this project. There was a need and desire and an effort to protect 18 protected
trees that the City found to have high aesthetic value. As a result of that analysis the applicants came back in the mid to fall of 2009 with an alternative site plan that does protect the 18 trees that we identified. This plan shows, it is a very simple plan, it is the plan I think was developed at the time that Stanford presented that to the City, but it shows essentially a more compact footprint for the Stanford main hospital. It also shows a revised footprint for FIM 1, that the School of Medicine Buildings down at the bottom of the screen. A significant feature of it is that one of the towers was removed from Kaplan Lawn thereby retaining a significant grove of oak trees on that site, as well as the adjustments to the footprint and the massing of FIM 1 resulted in the retention of trees near the FIM 1 site.

The Protected Tree Alternative also saved two trees along Welch Road that are very significant. So this plan ended up being the preferred site plan of the applicant and also Staff. The Architectural reviews that occurred since that plan was submitted to the City were really based upon the Tree Preservation Alternative plan. Going forward, it is expected that Staff’s recommendation for this project will be based upon the Tree Preservation Alternative in part that is shown here, but is more accurately and completely described in the Draft EIR.

Kind of concurrent with the development of the Tree Preservation Alternative and while we were developing the Draft EIR Staff developed a plan for the Village Concept, which the Commission is aware of. Part of that analysis for Village Concept was a desire to have an alternative that really addressed the potential for housing in the vicinity of the Medical Center and shopping center sites, but also, to introduce key pedestrian and bicycle linkages between the project and the City. The next two slides show those connections that we had envisioned as part of the Village Concept Analysis. Staff and the applicant actually worked very well and closely together to develop these plans to the extent that we could understand what might occur as part of the Village Concept Analysis.

Some of the key connections that were part of the Village Concept Alternative include connections between the planned Everett tunnel near the Caltrain tracks and the El Camino Real and Quarry Road intersections. That is what this slide shows. It shows pathways that would connect the tunnel through El Camino Park up through the Palo Alto Intermodal Transit Center, and then across El Camino Real and onto Quarry Road. The second component of the bicycle and pedestrian linkages as part of the Village Concept was a connection between the Lucile Packard Children’s Hospital and the Stanford Shopping Center adjacent to the Stanford Barn. Staff and the applicant worked together to identify preliminary plans on how that might be accomplished.

Other components of bicycle and pedestrian linkages that we have been looking at include enhanced signalization in the project vicinity, and also public right-of-way improvements along the Quarry Road corridor. All of those are part of what we are calling the Village Concept Alternative that really Staff and the applicant have identified as important to the overall success of this project. It is so important that in addition to the Tree Preservation Alternative recommendation for approval that Staff will be presenting Staff is also recommending that the bicycle and pedestrian linkages that are described in your Staff Report also be part of the project approval.
Before we can get to the project approval though we do need to review the Final EIR and get that Certified. I want to hand this portion of the presentation over to Rod Jeung from PBS&J, again to give us an overview and highlights of the final EIR.

Mr. Rod Jeung, Project Director, PBS & J Consulting: Thank you Steven. Good evening members of the Commission, members of the public. As Steven mentioned we do have other representatives from our team here today to help respond to some of the comments and questions that come up a little bit later. So, real quickly, we have Heather Dubois, who assisted with the Climate Change. We have Dennis Struecker and Nicole Sou on the Transportation Analysis. There are Charles and Jodi also from ARG to help respond to comments or questions regarding the historic architecture and anything related to the Hoover Pavilion or the Stone Building.

With that as an introduction I do want to say how delighted I am to be here. It has been a very intense eight months. We managed to create two more volumes for you to digest. There is a lot of interest, as Steven mentioned, regarding the comments and the discussion that has been held by the community. That is something we truly value and we have done our level best to try to respond to those comments as best we could.

In terms of what an Environmental Impact Report is and what the Final Environmental Impact Report is quite simply it is the Draft Environmental Impact Report plus the responses to comments. As you recall, the Draft Environmental Impact Report disclosed the potential environmental impacts associated with the Stanford University Medical Center project. Subsequently, when the public review period occurred and we received all those various comments it was our obligation working with City Staff to develop responses to all of those substantive comments. All of those comments are addressed in what is known as the Response to Comment document. So the combination of that Response to Comment document plus the Draft, together comprise the Final Environmental Impact Report.

What is important to note, and I want to bring this up early on, is that following the review and consideration of all those comments there were no new significant environmental impacts identified, and there were no substantial increase in the severity of any impacts that were identified in the Draft environmental document. So that is just something that is important to note.

For a quick review of the chronology of this process, and this is sort of telescoping a little bit into what Steven presented a little bit earlier. This is focused solely on the environmental process. As Steven mentioned we kicked off the environmental review effort with the release of the Notice of Preparation back in August of 2007. The Draft EIR was released in May of 2010. There was a 69-day review period to receive comments, to hold hearings, etc., which concluded towards the end of July. Then over the course of the last seven months on Valentine’s Day we celebrated with the release of the Final Environmental Impact Report.

During the course of the public review, and I have to again say how impressed I am with the level of comments and the discussion that was held on the document, there were 13 public hearings that were held and convened by the City for City officials, for the public, and you can see here the distribution of the various meetings that were held before the Planning and
Transportation Commission, the City Council, the various review Boards. Over the course of
those 69 days we received 63 different comment letters, and those included representatives or
comments from various public agencies, organizations, members of the Councils, and individuals
within the community.

All told as Steven mentioned we did receive based on our last tally 1,099 comments. The vast
majority of those came up during the public hearings where we had a whole series of rounds of
transcripts and a lot of public participation during those hearings. As one would imagine in
preparing those responses there were a lot of comments I would say that came up with common
themes, common questions, common topics. So working with City Staff and thinking about how
best to prepare the responses we came upon sort of three discrete ways or three discrete types of
responses.

The first are what we called Staff -Initiated Changes. Those are changes and additions to the
Draft environmental document that City Staff identified as necessary to correct errors, revisit
impact assumptions, and to offer further explanation on some of the analysis that was contained
in the previous document. There were eight Staff-Initiated text changes and they ranged from
the cumulative toxic scare contaminate emissions to the Hoover Pavilion as an historic resource
to protected trees.

The second major category of responses were those that we referred to the as the Master
Responses. These are responses to comments that were raised frequently, repeatedly. In order to
provide a comprehensive response in one location in the document so that people could really
understand the full nuances of a particular set of comments these Master Responses were
created. So there are 12 Master Responses, six of them I believe have to do with transportation-
related concerns, and others talk about jobs/housing, etc.

The third set of responses really had to do with those individual responses that didn’t fall within
one of those Master or larger responses that were either Staff-Initiated or as part of a Master
Response. So each comment letter was bracketed and identified and those discrete comments
were specifically addressed and responded to.

Obviously, as Steven mentioned earlier, a project of this size and of this duration morphs over
time, it evolves over time. As we prepared the environmental document and began to respond to
those comments we realized that there were a number of revisions that needed to be made to the
Draft Environmental Impact Report. These revisions were again intended to clarify, update,
clarify assumptions. They did not introduce new, significant information or change the
significance of any of the impacts. So there is a section of the environmental document simply
titled Revisions to the Draft Environmental Impact Report, and in that one section it contains all
the various modifications to the Draft document.

The one thing I wanted to be sure all of you were aware of, and was highlighted for the record, is
that in preparing those Staff-Initiated Changes and the Master Responses there were certain
significance conclusions that did change. They didn’t get worse they got better. Better in the
sense that where the Draft Environmental Impact Report identified 17 significant and
unavoidable impacts of which 11 were project-related and six were cumulative, by the time we
got through responding to the comments, reexamining some of the assumptions, going back and testing some of the things that had been done the number of significant unavoidable impacts had been reduced from that 17 down to 12. What I will do on the next slide is just highlight what those changes are.

The first one has to do with the intersection Level of Service impacts that were identified in the Draft document in the City of Menlo Park. As you can see in this table the Draft Environmental Impact Report identified those concerns, those impacts, at those intersections would be significant and unavoidable. Subsequently, pursuant to conversations with the City of Menlo Park and better understanding some of their traffic signal technology, and what was already being applied, those impacts were identified to be significant but there was a way to mitigate them. Those mitigation measures that were previously thought to be infeasible were considered to be feasible. So the results were that those impacts went from significant and unavoidable to less than significant with mitigation.

The second area where impacts changed are in terms of the cumulative emissions of toxic air contaminants. Again, in the Draft environmental document this was identified as significant and unavoidable. In the Final Environmental Impact Report that was changed to less than significant and the primary reason for the change is that in the Draft document the analysis was done based on a qualitative assessment prior to receiving a specific methodology by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District. Once we applied that methodology and quantified the impacts per their approach, and per their assumptions, the impact was determined to be less than significant.

The third area where the significance conclusions changed had to do with greenhouse gas emissions and the contribution that this project would have to some of the cumulative impacts associated with climate change and greenhouse gas emissions. Again, at the time the Draft Environmental Impact Report was released this was identified as significant and unavoidable. Subsequently, in the further analysis by Staff and consultants that was change to significant with mitigations it could be reduced to less than significant. Here the big changes, the big reasons why the analysis resulted in a different conclusion is that there was an ability to take into account more detailed information that was provided by the project sponsors, there was a different treatment of how patient and visitor trips would be tallied, there was a change in recognizing state mandated measures to implement AB 32, and with the mitigation measures that were already being suggested by the City the impact changed from significant and unavoidable to less than significant.

Finally, in terms of the Next Steps, and this is something I am sure your City Attorney will get into in greater detail, we are at the point right now where we are beginning the hearings to Certify the Environmental Impact Report. To me that really means two basic fundamental questions. The first is has this document, has this effort complied with the spirit of CEQA? Have we done everything we possibly could to provide for full disclosure, and to respond to the comments, and to acknowledge the potential impacts associated with this project? The second question is has the City exercised its independent judgment in preparing this analysis? Those are the fundamental questions that have to be addressed when you Certify the environmental document.
The other steps that are identified here are those that are related to the project approval, but they evolve out of the environmental document. So to the extent that we have identified mitigation measures that are feasible those need to be identified in a Mitigation Monitoring Report. At the time the project is approved those are typically attached as conditions of project approval and we need to be sure that the project sponsors will then go ahead and implement those mitigation measures to reduce the potential effects.

There is also a Statement of Overriding Considerations. This is the City’s deliberations on the fact that the project will have significant and unavoidable impacts but those are overridden by other factors that suggest that there are community benefits related to going ahead and approving the project.

Finally, as I mentioned earlier, there are Conditions of Project Approval that the City will be developing and attaching to the project approval. So with that, thank you very much. Look forward to the questions later.

Ms. Cara Silver, Senior Assistant City Attorney: Thank you Rod. As Rod and Steven have mentioned we are really at the tail end of the CEQA process. We have now completed the Final EIR. As you know, before you can really take any action on the formal project you must first Certify the EIR. To do that what you need to do is adopt a Resolution. Resolution, as Rod mentioned, contains four major aspects. It contains a statement of various legal findings that need to be made with respect to all of the impacts that have been disclosed and analyzed in the Environmental Impact Report. The Resolution is contained in Attachment B to your packet. It goes through all of the legal findings. It is a very nice summary of the EIR. It discloses all of the impacts, all of the mitigation measures that have been discussed and analyzed, and determined to be feasible in the Environmental Impact Report. Then it concludes with respect to each one of those findings after the mitigation measures have been imposed whether that eliminates the environmental impact, whether it reduces the environmental impact, or whether the environmental impact still remains. To the extent that the environmental impact still remains you need to make a finding that there are no other feasible mitigation measures or other feasible alternatives to the project. With that then if you were to approve the project if there were some residual impacts that cannot be mitigated either through mitigation measures or project alternatives then you need to make a Statement of Overriding Considerations. The Resolution that is attached to your packet does not yet contain the Statement of Overriding Considerations. That is still being developed and we will bring back a full Resolution to you with all of the components at the next meeting.

At this point, what we are asking you to do, turning to the Staff Recommendations, is to focus in on the Resolution that is attached as Exhibit B. If you have any questions about the technical aspects of the findings in the Resolution the consultant are here to answer those questions. Again, we are not asking at this point for you to make a formal recommendation on the Resolution in particular because Menlo Park has requested a little bit more time to make formal comments on the Resolution and on the Final Environmental Impact Report, and also because we are planning on coming back to you later with the Statement of Overriding Considerations so that you will have an entire Resolution and all of its pieces to review for final recommendation to the full Council.
So with that I will turn it over to Steven and he will discuss the Next Steps.

Mr. Turner: Thank you Cara. With that I will also nod over to Zach to let him know that he should queue up his presentation. I wanted to conclude the Staff presentation to talk about Next Steps and our timeline.

Up on the screen we have an illustrative version of a very aggressive schedule to get us through City Council review at the middle of May. We presented to City Council at a Study Session at the end of January of this year where we talked about the Development Agreement with the Council. A very similar type of schedule that essentially would conclude the public review process and Council review prior to the start of budget negotiation period with Finance Committee and City Council. So there was really an acknowledgement by the Council that they supported a very aggressive schedule in order to conclude the review of this project by May.

So this shows a couple of months that we have already passed. In January again we met with the City Council for a Study Session on the Development Agreement and presented this schedule. In early February we met with the Historic Resources Board and Architectural Review Board to talk about the latest changes to the Hoover Pavilion renovation project as well as the other site development happening in the Hoover Pavilion area, namely the 60,000 square foot medical office building and approximately the 1,000 space-parking garage. Near the end of February was the release of the Final EIR. At that time we also brought forward to the ARB the latest plans for the Stanford main hospital.

Coming into March we are up at today’s date of March 9 of reviewing the Final EIR with Planning Commission. We are not seeking a recommendation as Cara mentioned, at this point. On an almost parallel track we are going to be heading to the Finance Committee next week for a review of the Development Agreement. That is on the 15th. The 24th of this month we are going to be returning back to the ARB for what would essentially be their final review and recommendation to Council on the Children’s Hospital extension, the School of Medicine FIM building, the Welch Road improvements, and the overall design guidelines for the project.

In early April we will be going back to the Historic Resources Board for a final review on the Hoover Pavilion renovations and they will have their opportunity to review the final sets of plans for that project. The next day, on the 7th, we will be going to the ARB for their final review of Hoover Pavilion renovations and site development, as well as the other components of the project including the Stanford main hospital and clinics. On April 12 we will be going to the Policy and Services Committee on the Development Agreement. So we will be hitting kind of all of the Council Members regarding the Development Agreement either in Finance Committee on March 15 or the Policy and Services Committee on April 12.

That will then be followed up a Planning and Transportation Commission review. We are hopeful that this would be the final review for the project. We would bring back to you, as Cara mentioned, the request for Certification of the EIR along with the Development Agreement, recommendations to Council, and all of the other entitlements that I mentioned before the Comprehensive Plan, the zoning, the annexation, and the Conditional Use Permit, etc. Then
finally we are anticipating to go to Council in the middle of May. We have a tentative date of May 16 whereby they would be making their final decision on the project. So that concludes the Staff Report. With that I think I will hand it over to the project applicant to provide an overview of the projects themselves.

Vice-Chair Lippert: With that Mark Tortorich is going to be making the presentation. Is that correct? You will have 15 minutes.

Mr. Mark Tortorich, Vice President, Design and Construction, Stanford Medical Center: So Chair Lippert, members of the Commission I am Mark Tortorich. We have a very comprehensive but brief PowerPoint presentation to give you an update on the progress made with the designs for the Medical Center program. Then if time permits we actually have two videos, fly-through videos, of both major hospital projects. So technology permitting we can get through all of that in 15 minutes. Are we ready? Great, good.

Our first slide really sort of reminds of what are the five top reasons why we need to rebuild our facilities. The first obviously is compliance with seismic safety laws, SB 1953. If you look at the recent events in New Zealand, Christ Church you realize that a major seismic event is in our future. If you don’t have appropriate facilities certainly as first responder or hospital they won’t be able to respond. Second, we need to replace our 1970’s era emergency department. It is woefully undersized. It is about 15,000 square feet. It supports about 48,000 emergency visits per year. Third, we need to replace hospital beds that are housed in our Eisenhower era facilities, our 1959 facilities. For Stanford Hospital that is about 40 percent of our capacity is really in obsolete facilities. Four, we obviously need to meet the demand for increased hospital beds in our community. That is for both hospitals pediatric medicine as well as adult medicine. Then five, it is the issue that really makes Stanford medicine unique, and that is the close proximity of research and patient care. So you really can go from the bench to the bedside on one campus. Very different than the development of most academic medical centers around the country and it is one of the things that make Stanford a special place.

So we have had some guiding principles that I have tried to summarize here in the development of the designs, and hopefully you will see that these principles really rang true in the final architecture. One is to design modern facilities that integrate with the landscape and the surrounding architecture. Stanford is one of the greatest landscaped campuses in the world. Certainly the buildings here in the Medical Center need to connect with the landscape of Stanford and with the architecture of Stanford even though they are very technology driven facilities and their typology is very different than the campus buildings that you would see on the university campus. Second, we need to strive for energy efficiency and environmental sustainability. I think we have done some very unique things here in the building. Some of those energy and environment issues are apparent with the architecture and some are hidden because they are just more efficient systems. Three is to preserve the landscape whenever possible. I can’t think of another major academic medical center project that was redesigned to preserve trees, but we have done that here. I think the design has benefited from some of that reworking but it is a very significant commitment we have made to preserve the landscape. Four, we want to support and encourage non-vehicular transportation to the facilities. I think you will see some very specific improvements to the adult hospital design from the last time you
have seen that, to really encourage the bicycle and pedestrian movement to the facilities, and reinforce the fact that these hospitals sit in a campus. Then five is to have very flexible designs that are adaptable to our future innovations in medicine. We don't know what the future of medicine is we just know that it will be different than it is today. We have to have facilities that are flexible to accommodate those future innovations.

Next. Just to summarize the public hearings that we have gone through with the building design, and I think you will see that the design reflects the input that has occurred at these various hearings whether it was at the Council, here at this Commission, Architectural Review Board where we have had over 30 meetings, Historic Resources Board, and so on.

Next. To summarize the project components, the three facilities on the Hoover Campus, the renovation of the Pavilion, the new medical office building and parking structure, the facility for Lucile Packard Children’s Hospital, hospital building expansion and parking. For Stanford Hospital and clinics the replacement hospital building, which will be constructed in phases as well as the future clinics buildings to replace those 1959 era facilities. Then our research buildings for our Stanford School of Medicine, the Foundations in Medicine, the FIM 1, 2, and 3 buildings, the strategy to incrementally replace the laboratories in that 1959 building. The two site plans here show you existing conditions to the left, and then the proposal to the right. This is not the Tree Preservation Alternative but the site plan that was first analyzed in the EIR.

Next. This second site plan shows you the adjustments made through the Tree Preservation Alternative. Primarily the elimination of the Pavilion here on Pasteur Mall so we can preserve the green space and the oak trees that reside there.

Next. We will take you through the project sites one at a time. The Hoover Campus, renovating the Pavilion and the addition of the 60,000 square foot medical office building and parking structure.

Next. We have taken obviously a very deliberate effort to preserve the historic viewshed from the corner of Palo Road and Quarry Road of the Pavilion, which is why the medical office building is setback, the parking structure to the back of the site.

Next. Then here is the rendering of finished product. So we will really be cleaning up the Pavilion, moving all the window and air conditioning units out of the building, having a centralized mechanical system on the roofs of both of the buildings. If you go by the Pavilion you will see there are external pipes that provide medical gas and plumbing and other sorts of components, we are removing all of those restoring the historic fabric of the exterior of the building, and making it a very useful, vital facility for a long time to come. To the right of the slide you will see the 60,000 square foot medical office building which truly is a modern building but tries to pick up some of the elements of the Pavilion and create a campus-like environment here on that site.

Next. You can see that well within the composition of the parking structure, the existing Pavilion, and then the daycare center that exists on the site that is in the foreground, creating sort of a campus quad here between the Pavilion and the parking structure.
Next. The Lucile Packard Children’s Hospital, the expansion of the facility, this is about
521,000 square feet but we have subdivided it within that facility to have both inpatient
environment and clinics.

Next. Again, a building that is designed to link with the landscape to build on the themes
established in the original Lucile Packard Children’s Hospital built in 1991 that is really a truly
wonderful building that integrates with the landscape, and connect on those themes and move
those forward into the next century.

Next. So here it is in the site plan, the courtyard that connects the new hospital building with the
existing hospital building. Again, a very significant move that was made as part of the Tree
Preservation Alternative that is to preserve the corner at Quarry and Welch with the native
vegetation that is there, and actually expand it and create it as an open space and entry to the
hospital building.

Next. This is a view from the video animation that you will see later. How that landscape really
opens up at the corner of Quarry and Welch, how that building provides a presence and a sort of
a secondary entry to the Medical Center campus, but really weaves its way into the landscape.

Next. The entry forecourt sort of blurs that edge between indoor and outdoor as you enter into
the building. You really sort of come into a space that is neither indoor nor outdoor before you
finally get into the lobby. The other elements of covering up some of the steel columns at the
entry canopy with wood, all of those feelings of trying again connect this building with the
landscape.

Next. Then the interior environment truly is a children’s hospital.

Next. The story nook corner here, which is right off the waiting room, which I think will be just
a wonderful space, a very unique space here in the Children’s Hospital.

Next. Then the nighttime view.

Next. For Stanford Hospital and clinics we have two major components of the project. The first
is the new hospital building, 1.1 million square feet, although we will be building that in two
distinct phases. Then there are the future clinics, 429,000 square feet of space, which will reside
on the site of the current 1959 hospital.

Next. The theme that we have at Stanford Hospital for rebuilding the facility is really where
science serves humanity. Our new CEO Amir Rubin has added one patient at a time. This really
is an approach and a philosophy that has woven its way into the architecture. So if you go to the
next slide, the concept sketch from Rafael Vinoly really talked about the garden as that interface
between science and humanity. So you have seen this concept before, our two-story diagnostic
and treatment platform, which is really where all the heavy technology spaces are housed, and
then our patient rooms up in the upper stories, and then that garden that really separates those
two.
Next. The site plan, this the first phase of construction. It is about 820,000 square feet of the 1.1 million square feet, organized here with Pasteur Mall to the front. This is the area where we removed the Pavilion to preserve the oak trees, a main vehicle and pedestrian drop off that will connect to both the existing hospital that will remain in operation as well as to the new hospital building. Then a parking structure with a roof garden.

Next. This is the view elevated slightly as you come into Pasteur Mall. The parking structure to the left, you can see the towers elevated above the landscape garden on the third floor.

Next. Then again a still photograph from the animation. We spent an awful lot of time looking at how to detail the base of the buildings so that it becomes more accessible, more friendly, and more accommodating to the pedestrian coming to the building.

Next. You can see we have done an awful lot of work I think since the last time you saw that, wrapping the base of the building into becoming a very friendly, very accessible space.

Next. Spent an awful lot of time developing spaces along the promenade that connects the Children’s Hospital, the adult hospital, and the School of Medicine, which is truly a pedestrian/bicycle pathway. You will see in the animation we actually start our journey taking your pedestrian path through the promenade instead of coming to the hospital by vehicle.

Next. This is a diagram that will show you the two phases or the multi-phases of construction the hospital building and then the full build out with the 1.1 million square foot hospital here and then the future clinics in this location.

Next. Our School of Medicine buildings FIM 1, 2 and 3 are really building designed as a kit of parts to feed on themes that have already been established with the School of Medicine buildings that have just been put in place. You can see these three buildings, 1, 2, and 3. They are done this way because the existing 1959 structure needs to remain in place while these new replacement facilities are started to be constructed.

The kit of parts fits well within the School of Medicine environment and also works well with the new hospital environment that will be right across Pasteur Mall. This is a view of FIM 1 looking from the Pasteur Mall. You can see I think one of the oak trees that are preserved through the redesign.

Keep on going. Then a final shot between the existing CCSR building and FIM 1. So again, obviously this is a much more pedestrian oriented environment given the campus environment that we have there.

Next. So if Zach can start up the videos we will start first with the Lucile Packard Children’s Hospital. This is the nighttime shot. So each animation is about two or three minutes? It looks like we may have ignition. There is even music if we can get it to play.
It shows you the existing buildings at the corner of Welch and Quarry, 701 and 703 Welch. Amazingly we can build this building in just seconds. You will also notice that there is a little bit of animation of the wind turbine which is really not going to generate an awful lot of energy for us there at the entry but as a demonstration to the children coming to the building that this all about sustainability and the environment.

Passing through the vehicle entry forecourt you can see the gardens that will be the focal point of the entry lobby behind the glassed wall that story nook will be within that lobby.

You are looking at now office space and support space to the patient bedrooms with our overviews that will actually be outdoor terraces where families can get outside, out of the patient unit.

Off of Quarry Road this will be a faculty and staff entry to the building. This will be a staff plaza on that side of the structure. You can see a very large component of bicycle racks. So we anticipate a lot of arrival to this facility by bicycle and by foot. This is not an emergency department entrance but just where ambulances would bring patients that are brought to this facility through transfer from other hospitals.

Now we start to look at the gardens in the courtyard between the existing hospital and the new hospital building. This is the meditation chapel here that we are looking at. Please note the water feature, which is the focal point of the meditation chapel.

This is courtyard that will have south and western exposures so it will be very sunny, very light. You can see the sun control devices that are on the exterior of the building that will provide us some passive cooling to the building and allow our displacement ventilation system to operate very efficiently.

It springtime, all the flowers are in bloom. This is a dining terrace off of the café that you see.

Passing by the overviews.

That is our Children’s Hospital expansion project.

So what you will see for Stanford Hospital and clinics is the video animation of the full build out, so the 1.1 million square foot hospital as well as the future 429,000 square foot clinics. As I mentioned, if I remember right, we start this video animation on the promenade as if you are walking or bicycling from the Children’s Hospital.

So the new hospital building to the right, and the existing hospital buildings obviously to the left. This is the bridge connecting the two buildings.

You can see that we have established a compartment of retail space facing the promenade. This will be a ground floor café and here is the hospital entrance. The plaza is designed obviously to be comfortable for both the pedestrian and the vehicle. We will have a separate discharge lounge on Pasteur so we will take some of the vehicle traffic outside of that inner circle.
Kiosks, book stands, maybe an information kiosk about Stanford University, the emergency
department to the right side that you are just passing. This is the medicinal garden that is outside
of the emergency department. As we get past this garden shot we will turn around and start to
look at the development.

Here is where you can really get a sense of the landscape and the integration of that landscape on
the third floor separating the science and humanity.

In this video we do not observe traffic laws so we will just drive right through that stop sign.
Parking structure 4, the 1,000-car structure, is below grade here. That facility already exists and
we will use that for our patients and visitors coming to the hospital.

The future clinics building in the background, the hospital obviously to the left. Then the new
entry drive we are creating to the hospital entry.

That is our presentation. We will certainly be available to answer any questions you might have.

Vice-Chair Lippert: You have a minute if you want to wrap up if you have anything else to say.

Mr. Tortorich: I think that we pretty much told our story. We are very excited obviously about
the prospects of receiving approval in May and starting construction. We have contractors ready
to start as soon as we get approval.

Vice-Chair Lippert: Great, thank you very much for your presentation. With that I will do is we
will return to the Commission and if there are any Commissioners that have process questions
let’s get those out first. Then while we are doing that any members of the public that wish to
speak please fill out a speaker card and give it to one of the Staff members. We will begin the
public hearing immediately after Commissioner questions. We will begin with Commissioner
Fineberg, you have five minutes.

Commissioner Fineberg: Thank you. I am thrilled that we are not going to be making a final
recommendation on this project today given the letter from Menlo Park. Also, because this
going from Draft to Final took the applicant and Staff a year, and this body, the Commission, and
members of the public have had two weeks, it is a big nut to crack in two weeks. So having
enough time for people to be able to examine what needs to be looked at and respond
appropriately I think is a huge part of running a good process.

I have a couple of specific process questions. Can Staff walk us through the role of the
environmental review versus that sort of next step into project review where it involves hybrids
of the various alternatives? So we have for instance the Tree Preservation Alternative and the
Village Concept Alternative and both have pieces that I think if blended would have the best
outcome. Do we need to consider that in our discussion of the adequacy of environment review
or how does that work?
Ms. Silver: The project as currently defined actually includes what Staff believes to be the best pieces of some of those alternatives. This is exactly what the environmental review process is designed to do is to flesh out various alternatives with the hope that some of those alternatives will rise to the surface and can be incorporated into the main project. So what the applicant is moving forward with is as I believe Steven mentioned in his opening presentation is actually not the main project as originally proposed but instead is one of the what we would deem to be an environmentally superior alternative, the Tree Preservation Alternative together with some aspects of the Village Concept Alternative, the linkages and connections. So the anticipated findings that Staff has prepared actually include both the Tree Preservation Alternative and those components of the Village Concept Alternative that Staff and the applicant have been working on.

Commissioner Fineberg: Okay, so it is the findings then that support the sort of taking of the best pieces from the different alternatives.

Ms. Silver: Yes that is correct. Those findings have been incorporated into the Resolution already.

Commissioner Fineberg: Okay, thank you. I would also like to ask for a clarification of the differences between the mitigations that are required by CEQA and community benefits that are negotiated in the Development Agreement. Which of those, for instance, how do we know what the whole list of mitigations is, what their value is versus we have seen the Development Agreement, which I think has sort of both, and then values are blended. Do we have anything that is a straight list of mitigations and what their costs are versus the Development Agreement, which am I correct would include the required mitigations and then the bonus? So can you talk about that? I am not clear on how that all works. Thanks.

Ms. Silver: Sure. The complete list of mitigations is contained in your Staff Report. It is called the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program. It is actually an attachment to the Resolution. So that is the complete itemization of all of the mitigations that the EIR has determined to be feasible.

You have not yet seen a final list of all of the community benefits that will be included in the Development Agreement. Those community benefits will come to you I believe April 13 or thereabout when you review the Development Agreement. We will have some more cost information both on some of the primary mitigation measures and community benefits at that time.

Vice-Chair Lippert: Is it just one more question?

Commissioner Fineberg: Yes, and it specifically relates to that. So will we have, if there is a community benefit that is a not required mitigation but that it mitigates an impact, will we know about that before we have to determine the adequacy, or we must decide the adequacy based on only required mitigations?
Ms. Silver: Well, perhaps required is not the best word to describe the mitigations. Mitigations are typically defined in terms of feasibility. So you look at whether a particular mitigation is feasible in terms of economic, physical, and other factors. Then the other aspect that you look at is whether the City has the legal authority to impose those conditions or those mitigations. Typically that authority is exercised through the permit or the entitlement process. On the other hand, the Development Agreement contains other terms that may not have a direct nexus to the particular project and they typically are not determined to be project mitigation measures. So we do try to separate out between environmental mitigation measures on the one hand, and sort of non-related project sort of enhancements that we define as community benefits on the other hand.

Vice-Chair Lippert: Commissioner Keller.

Commissioner Keller: Thank you. So I understand that we are having public comment tonight. I also understand that at some point in the future this item will come back to us. Does that mean that there will be an opportunity for public comment when this item comes back to us? Are people who commented the second time allowed to comment if they have commented now or will people be able to comment again if they comment tonight?

Vice-Chair Lippert: Well, we are going to leave the public hearing open after this evening. My understanding is that if members of the public have commented tonight they can come back and comment again in the future. They can speak to any item that is on our agenda.

Mr. Williams: You do have some discretion to close a hearing and not have that comment, but I think our intent is to bring this item back to you at the time that the Entitlements come back too so you do see the Development Agreement at the same time. So you then can act on certification sort of knowing the project as well, and they certainly would be able to speak at that time in any event because the Entitlements will be before you. So that’s fine. If you were to continue the item to a different meeting, yet another meeting before the Entitlements come to you, you would have to make that determination on the extent to which you wanted to entertain the public commenting. Unless there is new information at that point in time you may or may not want to have additional public comment or you could limit the time for speakers who had spoken already. That is pretty much at the Commission’s discretion.

Commissioner Keller: Thank you. Depending on how this comes back whether it comes back as a continuation or whether it comes back with the Development Agreement and the Entitlements and all of that will the various consultants be here then? How will that work?

Mr. Williams: We expect that not all of these consultants will be here for the Entitlements. There may be some of them that are here for the Entitlement hearing. If you were to continue it to a date between now and the Entitlement hearing I don’t think we would anticipate the consultants being at that meeting. Is that right? Perhaps Rod maybe, but certainly not the support consultants.
Commissioner Keller: Not the cast of thousands. Thank you. To what extent are the assumptions that went into the preparation of FEIR made explicit? For example, I noticed in reading it that there are some assumptions about uniform distributions or things like that.

Vice-Chair Lippert: Excuse me we are doing process questions not substantive in terms of content here yet.

Commissioner Keller: Okay. I am wondering where those assumptions came from. Are they stated and whether those came from any particular place?

Mr. Jeung: I am going to take a note. We will get to that during the substantive comment period. If I may, uniform distribution in terms of what?

Commissioner Keller: I noticed uniform distribution. I don’t want to go into detail about this because it will come up later.

Mr. Jeung: I just want to be prepared for it.

Commissioner Keller: I noticed uniform distribution with respect to people using Caltrain that you assume that it will come uniformly instead of some sort of non-uniform distribution. So in general my question is about assumptions and where those came from. In particular I notice that the Business as Usual is from the Staff-Initiated Change. Did that come from Staff, the Business as Usual, or did that come from the applicant? I am wondering where that came from, the notion of adding Business as Usual.

Mr. Jeung: We will be prepared to address that later.

Commissioner Keller: Great. In terms of the community benefits that are being proposed was that negotiated? Was that something that occurred between Staff and the applicant? Was some City Council policy involved in that? To what extent was any input that we provided a year ago involved in that?

Ms. Silver: Let’s see, all of the above actually. There have been several hearings both in front of the Planning Commission and in front of the City Council. The hearings in front of the City Council were Study Sessions so no formal action was taken. However, we did solicit comments from all of the City Council Members and we developed a series of guiding principles and vetted that with the Council. Based on the guiding principles and the input that we have received from the two public bodies Staff has been negotiating the Development Agreement conditions. The negotiations are of course subject to additional input from this body and from the Council. Staff is not complete with those negotiations at this point.

Commissioner Keller: So can I ask one follow up to that?

Vice-Chair Lippert: Is that your last question?

Commissioner Keller: Yes.
Vice-Chair Lippert: Okay.

Commissioner Keller: The follow up is you mentioned that those public benefits in terms of the Development Agreement are not finalized it is still in negotiation. This is going to come to us and we will get to review it I think first in the middle of April. So what extent if we have preferences or suggestions on changes to the nature of the public benefits to what extent will that be changeable at that point in time?

Ms. Silver: You will be making a recommendation to the Council. So the Council hearing will come after your hearing on the Entitlement package.

Commissioner Keller: Thank you.

Vice-Chair Lippert: Commissioner Martinez.

Commissioner Martinez: Thank you. I understand that the meeting tonight is to review and comment on the process of moving from the Draft EIR to the Final EIR. Then there is the Resolution to the Council, which goes into much more detail. I was wondering whether we were going to consider any of that tonight. For example, the recommended changes to the Comprehensive Plan, when are we going to take that up?

Ms. Silver: We have not yet discussed the recommendations on the Entitlements. So there will be separate hearings on the Comprehensive Plan and the Zoning Ordinance and the Conditional Use Permit. We have scheduled those tentatively for April, which is another reason why we are recommending at this point that you not make a final recommendation on Certification of the EIR and the Resolution. At this point we just wanted to preview with you some of the issues and then you will have an opportunity to see the whole package in April.

Commissioner Martinez: Okay, thank you.

Vice-Chair Lippert: Commissioner Garber.

Commissioner Garber: My questions were not dissimilar from Commissioners Fineberg, Keller, and Martinez. So let me try this and you can tell me where I am wrong. This evening, and potentially if we continue this meeting, we are asking questions regarding this proposed final document here to test its completeness and the degree to which it has addressed all of the possible environmental impacts that we can at least imagine as a community. The test of that is how comprehensive that has been. It is not to argue for or against any particular alternative that may be presented here. The time for us to have a conversation about alternatives or what pieces are in or out, etc. is as you have just mentioned presumably in April. If I am hearing you correctly we would both have or your are proposing that we would do both the Certification, which is just of how comprehensive the environmental impact is, and then also to then create recommendations that same evening that would also go to the Council for how the Council would actually approve then the entire project. Those things are being combined. So even if we
continue this meeting, at the end of the next meeting we wouldn’t be doing that Certification because that all comes in April.

Ms. Silver: That is correct. Of course this body doesn’t do the final Certification but you would be making the recommendation to Council.

Commissioner Garber: Okay.

Vice-Chair Lippert: Commissioner Tanaka? No. Most of my questions have been asked by the previous Commissioners. I have one other question, which has to do with this letter that we received this afternoon at places from the City of Menlo Park. I just want to understand how their input will meet up with our reviewing this FEIR. Maybe the Director can go into that and how we will receive that feedback.

Mr. Williams: I think we will have to see what comes out of that discussion. It is not just that discussion. We are having discussions with Menlo Park about the report as well. So it is broader than just this hearing. I think they have a meeting next week to their Council or a committee of their Council is meeting to talk about it too. So our anticipation is that we have the Final EIR before you that what Menlo Park wants to speak about or some of the specific mitigation measures and at this point we don’t know if that would have any impact on the EIR or if it is really going to be a impact on the project, and conditions of approval, or what. So it is a little difficult to tell right now whether there would be any impact on the FEIR that is before you. Certainly if there were you would know that the next time you looked at it and before you make Certification findings.

Vice-Chair Lippert: Basically, I guess what I am saying is it would be premature for us to Certify before we have that feedback. Is that correct?

Mr. Williams: I think it would. I think we want to provide that opportunity to consider whatever Menlo Park has to say before asking you to make that final recommendation.

Vice-Chair Lippert: Great. Thank you very much. Okay, at this point it is now a little bit before eight o’clock. We started our meeting this evening at six o’clock. We are almost at the two-hour mark. What I would recommend that we do is take a seven-minute break, and then what we will do is immediately go into the public hearing. I have three speaker cards. So this is an opportunity for anyone else who wishes to speak to fill out a card and give it to Staff.

I will open the public hearing. I have three speaker cards here. I am going to give everybody five minutes. We are going to start off with George Mader followed by Michael Griffin. If you would introduce yourself.

Mr. George Mader, Portola Valley: I served as Town Planner for Portola Valley from 1965 to 2010. That is a 45-year period. I am now serving as a Planning Consultant to the town. So I appear here representing the Town of Portola Valley. I also live in Ladera, which is accessed on Alpine Road.
Most of the Portola Valley residents come in on Sand Hill Road or Alpine Road. Alpine Road is a major way to leave Portola Valley. The major concerns that we sent in our response to the Draft EIR are related to intersections, and overloading of intersections. As you know, in the EIR the northbound off-ramp from 280 to Alpine Road is an issue. The intersection of Alpine and Junipero Serra Boulevard and Santa Cruz is an issue. Then the Santa Cruz-San Hill Road is an issue. All of those are difficult intersections.

We have read the Response to Comments. It is interesting that some of the response to comments are hard to deal with because they are along the lines of a ‘use transportation demand management, we will start the GO Pass system, we will have adaptive traffic signals, will have pedestrian and bicycle facilities.’ Those are put forth as a mitigation measure. You can’t really identify exactly how they work on some of the intersections. But the major point I want to make is one, Alpine Road between Junipero Serra Boulevard and 280 is one mile long. In the evening hours it often backs up for the entire mile on that two-lane road. So people wanting to get to 280 wait, wait, wait. There is a real bottleneck there. Also in the mornings it can back up considerably but not as bad as in the afternoon.

Now the response given to the County of San Mateo about the conditions on Alpine Road was that, and I will quote, well essentially it said that there would be a decrease of about 375 cars on that Alpine Road in response to the project. I don’t know how the decrease comes but I believe it is a combination of these various factors or approaches that I mentioned.

What we would ask is that there be a mitigation measure that would call for the monitoring of that to determine the accuracy of that particular statement, because it is an important one to Portola Valley. Now 375 cars may not solve the issue but the point is that the statement is made that we have ways in which that will decrease and we would urge a mitigation measure that would simply say that that be verified at certain periods of time, what the solution should be at that time would be another question. We would urge that that not be dropped but be looked at and perhaps added.

I didn’t realize that you might carry this to another meeting or we might have had more comments. I wrote this very quickly for the town and checked with them to get it to you tonight. I have given a copy of this to Steve to put into the record. I appreciate the opportunity to make these comments for Portola Valley. Thank you.

Vice-Chair Lippert: Thank you very much. Michael Griffin followed by Robert Moss. If there are any other people that wish to speak this evening please get a speaker card in.

Mr. Michael Griffin, Palo Alto: Good evening Commissioners. After that entertaining film I am going to ask you to bear with me here because I am going to give you the contrarian point of view.

It was with astounded disappointment that I read the Final EIR of what appears to me to be the wholesale retreat from traffic mitigations. Backing away from what I thought were pretty reasonable measures in the Draft version EIR simply seems counterintuitive to me. All it takes is to look at the crush of cars waiting to crawl down Page Mill from 280 every morning. As the
gentleman from Portola Valley said on Alpine Road as well, the backup of cars trying to get
down Willow Road to 101. It makes me wonder what will happen with the addition of 2,000-
plus car trips to this already sticky mix.

We certainly appear to be betting all in on the validity of the Palo Alto traffic forecast model. I
hope we know what we are doing here, with all due respect to Staff. Then we are admonished in
the EIR not to worry about Caltrain capacity or even its continued viability. Again, I certainly
hope they are right.

Meanwhile regarding the EIR’s dismissal of the need for offsite parking I will point out that the
Ardenwood park and ride lot is full. Saying that Stanford will do their best to get AC Transit to
lease another 75 parking spaces for the Dumbarton Express isn’t going to work in my opinion
because the spaces don’t exist. Please, I encourage you to drive over to Newark and check me
out on this.

The EIR says 19 percent of Stanford’s employees come from the East Bay, which is more or less
2000, for which we get perhaps 75 parking spots depending on finding some other lot other than
Ardenwood to put them on. Perhaps the Development Agreement can fine-tune this issue to
make the U-Line a more attractive solution to East Bay employees and to keep their cars from
having to sift through the Palo Alto neighborhoods trying to get to the project each day, and
again at night.

Finally, here this evening Steven, reading your Staff Report on page 2, the first paragraph at the
bottom there talks about Mitigation Measure TR-7.2 has been revised to clarify project sponsors
shall fund expansion of the Marguerite Shuttle service between the train station and the project,
and this is the part I want to bring to your attention, and shall make a fair share financial
contribution to the cost of expanding the U-Line bus service. I did go to Mitigation Measure TR-
7.2 and that was not my reading. So perhaps you could help clarify that at some stage. Thank
you, Commissioners.

Vice-Chair Lippert: Thank you, Mr. Griffin. Robert Moss.

Mr. Robert Moss, Palo Alto: Thank you Vice-Chair Lippert and Commissioners. I am
becoming increasingly concerned about the fundamental way this project is being moved
forward. That is that when we get all done going through the EIR and looking at the various
mitigations and everything one of the final results is an entitlement given to Stanford to build the
project. This is a project, which is going to be ongoing for 15 or 20 years. But there is no way
that anybody can predict what is going to happen in the next 15 or 20 years including things that
neither Stanford nor Palo Alto has any control over that could have adverse impacts.

Let me give you two examples. We all know about the problems Caltrain is having and the fact
that they are seriously considering significantly reducing service. There are even mumbles that
they may shut down all together. There is mitigation, we all know about the GO Pass, in order to
reduce traffic impacts. As a mitigation it says, well if Caltrain has problems we will put buses in
and we will carry the workers in buses. Well there are a number of potential problems. The first
one is that the buses are not going to have the capacity that Caltrain has. So how many buses are
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you going to have run and where are you going to have to run them from? Then of course buses run on the streets. So they are going to create traffic impacts. So is this going to really overcome a problem with Caltrain or not? My guess is it will not.

Second, High Speed Rail. If it actually comes through the peninsula and we end up having them take additional right-of-way width and Alma gets reduced to three lanes that is going to have a huge traffic impact, which is going to spillover onto not only El Camino but also a number of other residential streets. That is not going to be our fault, not going to be Stanford’s fault, but it is going to have a real nasty adverse impact. What do you do?

Third possibility, Stanford Hospital is going to be drawing people not just locally but from all over the US and even overseas. So you can have people who are coming to Stanford with their family coming for a patient, and they have to be here for months. So they will want to live in the area while the patient is at Stanford. Where do they live? I can foresee Stanford for example taking over one of the local hotels and making it a living area where people can come in, have their family members at Stanford getting treatment, and they live in the hotel. Well, that is going to have a number of impacts. It is going to change traffic patterns because people are going to be going from the hotel to Stanford that had not been planned on before. It is going to reduce the hotel tax because people who are in a hotel longer than 30 days don’t pay the tax. It can have other impacts on the entire community totally unforeseen. How do you fix it? How do we have something in the Entitlement Agreement that says under these circumstances we want to withdraw part of the entitlement? We want to renegotiate with you. I don’t see that in here. I think it is a real major omission. So we ought to have some way of addressing issues that we can’t foresee.

Second, let me talk a little bit about specifics in the mitigations. VQ-7 and 8, Visual Character and Views is not going to have any impact. Oh boy, do I disagree with that one, especially with the picture we saw today. It is going to have a huge impact, massive building, extremely tall. It is going to block out the sun. I disagree with that.

PH-1, the population increase is going to be small for the region. How big a region are we talking about? Nine counties or just Palo Alto? I think it is going to have a significant impact on the population in Palo Alto, which as we talked about ABAG earlier this evening, is ABAG then going to require another 2,000 homes in Palo Alto to accommodate the people who work at Stanford? Where are you going to put them?

PS-8, Schools. We can have an impact but it is not significant. The School Board doesn’t think so. They are quite concerned about the addition of jobs and housing in Palo Alto.

I don’t think that saying that the intersection improvements are going to improve traffic adequately. I have real doubts about that. But if they are tried and it doesn’t work what is the alternative? How do we fix it?

I think we have to look at ongoing problems.
Vice-Chair Lippert: Thank you very much, Mr. Moss. Okay, with I don’t have any further cards so I am going to return to the Commission for Q &A. We are going to specifically focus in on technical aspects of the sufficiency and the content of the FEIR. Specifically, we are not here to talk about the Entitlements. We are not here to talk about the Development Agreement. We are not here to talk about the rezoning on the property or anything like that. We are going to focus specifically on the sufficiency of this document. We are not here to rewrite the document. We are here to go through and look at and ask questions to make sure that we understand what this document is about, and we are going to direct those questions at least on the first go around to either Staff or consultants. Primarily I would like to focus in on the consultants because we only have them this evening.

What I am going to do is throw the Commissioners a little curveball. I am going to go in the order that we went in the last round. So we will begin ladies first. Commissioner Fineberg.

Commissioner Fineberg: Thank you. I would like to start with a high-level comment and then I will drill down into some comments and questions. This is the two volumes that comprise the Final EIR in combination with something equally as thick that was the Draft. I find it to be an absolutely extraordinary document in particular way. It is lengthy. It is full of a tremendous amount of very exact legal, very exact technical, and very exact scientific and empiric analysis, and throughout its entirety in all the comments, in all the questions I believe there were over 1,000 comments and questions. In all cases there was not a single significant impact that was new, or a significant impact or impact that was increased. I find that absolutely phenomenally extraordinary to the point I can characterize that is just absolutely unbelievable. I am not sure that is a positive or a negative because logic tells me that with that many eyeballs on a document and with that many people looking at things, somebody is going to find something somewhere that can’t be dealt with with a new mitigation or a dismissal through legal, technical, and analytic empiric jargon.

I am going to try to raise a couple of those places where I am seeing that maybe I don’t understand why the responses are correct, but that I find it difficult to accept the dismissal of certain comments. One area was, we mentioned it briefly tonight, on the Business as Usual scenario for explaining why the greenhouse gas emissions went from I believe they were significant and unavoidable to not having a significant impact. In a nutshell it is in the Staff Report on page 3 as a Staff-Initiated Change number 4. Then in volume one it is on page 3-65. In the Staff Report it says, “The analysis of greenhouse gas emissions has been revised to omit visitor and patient vehicle trip emissions from the comparisons of the Stanford University Medical Center Project-generated emissions to a Business as Usual (BAU) scenario.” So as soon as I am done with this comment I would love to have an explanation of what that scenario means, where it comes from, what validates it as an acceptable method. Is it acceptable under CEQA? I have never heard of it. Whether it applies to all visitor and patient trips or just the extra ones that were created on the margin by the additional space created in this project.

Maybe just as a layperson my take on that, what it says is in volume one page 3-65, it says, patients and visitors are a function of need rather than a function of the Stanford University Medical Center Project. Even if the SUMC project is not implemented the patients and visitors would need to go to another facility. So therefore, because they have to go to a doctor they are
going to go somewhere else so there is no contribution to greenhouse gases and there is no impact. Well, by that kind of logic I could build anything anywhere. I could build a million houses and people would have to drive home so there would be no impact. I could build millions of square feet of offices and people would have to drive somewhere else to their jobs. So by that logic there is no impact of doing anything anywhere so what is analysis? Why is that wrong? What am I missing that that is not what you are telling me?

Mr. Jeung: I just want to understand the process. Do you want us to go ahead and provide responses as the questions come up like this now?

Vice-Chair Lippert: Yes, that is what we prefer.

Mr. Jeung: Okay. So let me start off with the Business as Usual because it is also the same question that Commissioner Keller brought up a little bit earlier. While I am giving this introduction to that response I am going to ask Heather to be ready to talk about it, because it is a very, very specific term. It does not come out of CEQA. It specifically is driven by AB 32, which is the state law that talks about the types of greenhouse gas emission reductions local jurisdictions and agencies are expected to accomplish. So Heather, with that as the introduction do you want to give the better explanation of what the Business as Usual is?

Ms. Heather Dubois, PBS&J Consulting: I was working on the Climate Change analysis. Business as Usual as said was based off of AB 32. It is commonly accepted as the – it is what the project would be under baseline conditions. Basically, as if it was built now under minimal or what the minimal regulations are and do not take into account any reductions that the project is implementing to reduce emissions or that mitigation that is added to the project to further reduce mitigations. So that is the basic definition of Business as Usual.

As far as when you are talking about the patient and visitor trips it is essentially need. If the project doesn’t go through and they can’t expand to meet demand the trips are going to have to go elsewhere, which could actually increase – there is potential for increase of emissions based on that. There is a potential for decrease depending on where it is. However, when you are looking at it from a point of function the hospital is needed. You don’t necessarily need another officer building there are already buildings that are there. A hospital is a very unique type of function and it can’t be satisfied by the building next door, and that is what that is trying to take into account. It also is taking into account a baseline of the actual impacts from the employees and their – and so because the patients are going to be there regardless of where the hospital is place. I don’t know if that helps.

Vice-Chair Lippert: Thank you. Commissioner Keller followed by Commissioner Martinez.

Commissioner Keller: Thank you. Why don’t you stay up there because I am going to follow up to that if I may? So this is my understanding of what you are saying, and correct me if I am wrong. My understanding is that patients go to hospitals because they need to go to hospitals, although some of the patient trips go to doctors and some of the patient trips are doctor visits as well as hospital visits. There is a well-known analysis that says that the more doctors you have
the more doctor visits you have in a given population. In other words, capacity breeds demand.
So I am wondering whether you have taken that into account first.

Secondly, it seems to me that you are saying that if they don’t go here they will go somewhere else, and if they go somewhere else there will be so many miles, and it might increase and it might decrease so I am going to ignore it. It seems to me that that is not an analysis that is basically saying I don’t know what is going to happen so I am going to ignore it.

So let me point out one particular thing. Stanford University Medical Center is a world resource. Therefore expansion of the Stanford University Medical Center both the hospital and the Children’s Hospital those expansions are likely to bring more patients from around the country and around the world. If those patients didn’t come here they might stay in their local communities to a lesser institution. So I am wondering why you didn’t take in to account the greenhouse gases merely of the increased population of patients that are coming from around the country and around the world from the increased capacity. If you simply extrapolate and say I don’t know maybe ten percent of the patients are coming from out of the area, or 15 percent, I have no idea what the number is, but you could say something about the number that are coming from within ten miles would have to go somewhere else. The ones that are coming from 100 miles away they are not coming here. The ones that are coming from Chicago or coming from Denver or coming from New Orleans those are not coming here and they wouldn’t go as far presumably. So I would assume that the airplane greenhouse gases, I presume that the greenhouse gases for non-local people should be directly considered, and dismissing that seems to be unnecessary. So perhaps you could address that for me.

Before I mention that because my time is probably going to expire during your response, I am going to say that I had mentioned to the Chair that I believe Staff should probably have an opportunity to respond to the comments from the three members of the public. The Chair mentioned to me that I could ask those questions. I am not sure why I should have my five minutes taken up by asking questions from a member of the public, because I think it is important to do. So I think that should be done generally not from my five minutes. Thank you.

Vice-Chair Lippert: Excuse me Mr. Keller, you have as much time as you need but we are breaking things up into five-minute bites. So it may require that we come around for another round of questions, but you do have the time to ask as many questions as you like it is just it is going to be done in a five minute period of time.

Commissioner Keller: I appreciate that but I don’t have any special role in terms of getting the public to have their questions answered. I think that is a Commission function as a whole, and I don’t think that just because I am interested in having the public be served by the questions being answered that I should take that on myself rather than the Commission doing it as a whole.

Commissioner Garber: Gentlemen, let’s move on.

Mr. Jeung: Heather, maybe if I can interject first because I think both Commissioner Keller and Commissioner Fineberg are asking sort of a higher bethanalogical question just in terms of the logic and the methodology for why certain trips are now being excluded from the analysis when
it seems like perhaps it should be, and the notion of these trips are going to occur regardless
needs a little bit more explanation before we get into any calculations of the greenhouse gas
emissions. So if I may, Rick Jarvis served as an outside legal counsel in reviewing and
supporting the environmental documentation, and was involved a lot of the discussions on the
methodology, and I am not necessarily punting but I would like to have the benefit of his
expertise.

Mr. Rick Jarvis, CEQA Consultant Partner, Jarvis, Fay & Doporto: Sure. I am outside legal
counsel for CEQA issues for Palo Alto I want to speak just to the general – I think an important
point to keep in mind is historically CEQA was never used to analyze or to do this type of global
analysis. When we are talking about greenhouse gas impacts you are talking about how an
individual project is going to influence the global environment. So there are a lot of agencies
separately and independently trying to reinvent the wheel, trying to figure out the best analysis,
the best way to approach a global impact of this as opposed to a localized impact.

Stanford Hospital coming in will bring people to this area that will have localized traffic issues,
that will have localized air quality issues, and CEQA has always – there are established
methodologies established for dealing with those local types of issues but not for dealing with
the global type of issues. You could make the argument or you could make the suggestion that
because of this expansion there will be more people flying airplanes over to Stanford, but you
could just as easily make the assumption or the presumption that those people who are going to
fly an airplane over to Stanford is there was not that capacity there would take an airplane and go
someplace else. If it is that type of an issue where they are going to go out and seek that level of
medical care, I think it is subject to quite a bit of speculation whether or not this expansion is
going to increase the number of people who use extraordinary methods of travel to deal with the
urgent medical needs that they find require a world class type of organization.

As a general conceptual matter, the expansion of Stanford Hospital provides more opportunities
to have people come to one location versus having to go further away. I guess I would submit
just looking at it from the lay perspective that there is not a model out there that can analyze, do
that type of analysis. It is kind of subject to raw speculation whether or not there will be more
flights or more greenhouse gas emissions from patient trips because again this issue of need.
Patients are going to go to a hospital somewhere. So I guess you could make arguments. You
could make speculations. You could make assumptions as to what is going to happen, but I
don’t know that CEQA can or there is a model that can really accurately and fairly analyze that.
Well, I would say because it is subject to speculation and because there is not enough
information from which to draw the conclusion that there will be an increase of global emissions
as a result of this that there isn’t sufficient evidence to find that there is an impact there.

Vice-Chair Lippert: Thank you. We will go onto Commissioner Martinez followed by Garber.

Commissioner Martinez: I have a question about Staff-Initiated Change 1 on page 2 of your
report. It was talking about the impact on Caltrain of increased ridership and there is a number
used that there would be 98 increased riders. I was sort of confused by that because later on it
talks about the potential of a 15.8 increase in ridership using GO Passes. Am I missing
something in that argument?
Mr. Jeung: Let me ask representatives from AECOM, Dennis, to help clarify those different percentages for your benefit.

Mr. Dennis Struecker, AECOM: The question was the increase of Caltrain ridership?

Commissioner Martinez: On the Staff-Initiated Change 1, I don’t know whether you have that. It talked about the increase being only 98 riders, 47 in the morning and 38 at night. I don’t know how that adds up to 98 but that is not a big deal. I was trying to reconcile that with the statement later that use of GO Passes would increase ridership from Stanford employees by 15.8 percent. I think I am missing something in your argument because it seems too obvious that that doesn’t follow.

Mr. Struecker: I am not following the 98. I can’t see that the Staff-Initiated Change 1. The peak hour Caltrain ridership by the project would be 540 passengers. It is in Table 3.2-2 on page 3-4. If GO Passes are given to all existing and future employees.

Commissioner Martinez: I understand that and that sounds encouraging. Could I get perhaps Staff to respond to the Staff-Initiated Change 1? I think I might be misreading it.

Mr. Jeung: You are seeing a reference to 98. There is a reference to 981 peak hour trips.

Commissioner Martinez: Fine. Okay, that kind of clarifies it because I was saying if it were increased by 15.8 percent that might be more in the neighborhood of 1,400. It is a much larger number than what I was reading. So I just kind of read it too quickly.

I had another question about the changes to the greenhouse gas significant impact because the Stanford project would reduce its greenhouse gases by 30 percent. That is 30 percent over what exists now? Is that the model we are following or is it 30 percent of something else?

Ms. Dubois: It is 30 percent without mitigation. It is 36 percent below Business as Usual. So if we built the project with what laws are on the books now without any project design features that reduce emissions, or without any of the mitigation, that is your Business as Usual. Once you take the project design features it will reduce the emissions by that 36 percent.

Commissioner Martinez: So is that better than what they are doing right now?

Ms. Dubois: Right now is existing. There is nothing we can do about right now. We have to move forward with what we can – it is basically we are looking at the project. So the project is the new construction and the renovations that are going on. So if we built it right now we are going to reduce it. So that would be – it is just the project.

Commissioner Martinez: It is not like traffic where we have a certain traffic impact right now and when we build the project it may increase 30 percent. It is looked at differently. It is looked at in isolation as only the new project, correct?
Ms. Dubois: Right. Right.

Commissioner Martinez: Can we talk about the overriding considerations or is that for another day?

Ms. Silver: We have not prepared the overriding considerations findings yet. If you have a question about the process that would be fine.

Commissioner Martinez: I will do it next round since I am out of time. Thank you.’

Vice-Chair Lippert: Commissioner Garber followed by Commissioner Tanaka.

Commissioner Garber: Just one question about one of the members of the public. Are there examples where entitlements are made conditional upon future events? It is extraordinary that we have a project that is going to last two decades. To my knowledge I have not encountered an entitlement that is conditional upon future events but maybe there are.

Ms. Silver: It is possible. Certainly mitigation measures are typically drafted in a way that requires periodic monitoring and adjustments over time if there are changed circumstances. So for instance, the Transportation Demand Management Program the way that program is structured if certain targets are not met then the program provides for an alternative measure to be implemented. So it is possible to draft conditions in that way.

Commissioner Garber: It seems to me you would have to be careful because presumably some of the entitlements have to do with square footage, which may already be in place. So not prescribing anything, it just seems to me a great deal of care needs to be done such that we can actually create real life alternative scenarios to actually be realized should we do down that.

I have not set my timer for myself but that is the Vice-Chair timer’s prerogative. I noticed on I think it is volume one, page 3-67, a bunch of little things here. The Mitigation Measure CC-1.2 mentions that this mitigation measure has been revised to indicate that the SUMC project sponsors would be required to participate in renewable energy program but not the City’s Palo Alto Green Renewable Energy Program. So am I reading that correctly that they could use that program or they could use any other program, or how am I to understand that? Why wouldn’t they use the City of Palo Alto’s?

Ms. Silver: I can actually respond to that particular question. I believe the Mitigation Measure as originally drafted prescribed that particular program, the Palo Alto Green Program. At the request of the applicants the measure was broadened to include other programs. Certainly if they wanted to subscribe to the Palo Alto Green they would be able to.

Commissioner Garber: Okay, so that is the way that I was hoping to do it. I will pass the remainder of my time and catch my next set of questions on the next round.

Mr. Jeung: I will add to what the City Attorney said that in the revised Mitigation Measure it does say that the program that Stanford submits is to be reviewed and approved by the City.
Commissioner Garber: Thank you.

Vice-Chair Lippert: Commissioner Tanaka.

Commissioner Tanaka: Thank you. I thought my fellow Commissioner brought up a good point about addressing some of the comments from the public. So let’s start with the first one from the Portola Valley representative. He made the comment about observing some of the traffic on various intersections to see if they matched the projection, the traffic model. I was thinking that perhaps that is actually not a bad idea to do it for all the major intersections. I was thinking was that not already contemplated or is that something that is not going to be done right now?

Mr. Struecker: Correct me if I am wrong Rod, but generally we don’t do mitigation monitoring on the projected Level of Service at an intersection.

Mr. Jeung: That is correct. Typically, what happens on a project like this and of this scale there is tremendous concern more localized with the impacts on some of the local intersections, the driveways, etc. So monitoring programs are often times, especially for hospitals, setup to look at the immediate vicinity and the driveway counts. So for roadways like Alpine Road between Junipero Serra and I-280 that is not typically monitored. So if there is an identified mitigation measure that is recommended, that is expected through the Mitigation Monitoring Program that there is some demonstration that whatever mitigation measures are appropriate are implemented, but then it is not monitored.

Commissioner Tanaka: So if let’s say the counts are double what is expected it is too bad, or what is the situation?

Mr. Jeung: I don’t want to say it’s too bad. I think there is a tremendous effort at the outset to take all the reasonable cautions and the best available information to make the forecasts about what the travel patterns are going be. Hopefully with the science that we have in traffic modeling it is not that far off, but we don’t typically monitor afterwards.

Mr. Struecker: If I could add, there are quite a few locations where today we are pretty congested as everybody experiences. As we move into the future you can’t get past a level of one, where demand equals the capacity. So then what happens is you just have more hours of the day that experience that level of congestion. So it just has to kind of spread out but it can’t get any worse during one period of time.

Commissioner Tanaka: I understand that. I was just thinking about the comment earlier. I don’t know if our Chief Transportation Official has anything.

Mr. Williams: I just want to add to that that we have a number of intersections around the city that we monitor on a pretty regular basis. So we have information. This is not one of them in that it is outside the city. If you were to monitor it and it was somewhat different than what was projected then the question of is that because the project is not doing what it is doing or is it something other. There could be a lot of other factors, other development that had not been
anticipated at this time, or something like that. We certainly could monitor things it is just that to take it back from that point, say ten years down the road, and it is not the same numbers as were projected here the project may be doing all the things it is was supposed to do and their traffic may be less, but the impacts on the roadway may not change because of some other factors. To try to monitor specifically what leaves this site and ends up at that intersection is not impossible but it is difficult. So we don’t typically do that. Then of course if there were a difference then it is generally difficult to do anything other than like we are doing with some of the other TDM measures, basically saying if you are not achieving these numbers, these percentages of reduction then you have to do some other things. So that is kind of our backstop here is that we have to monitor the trips coming out of the site regardless of where they are going, and if they are not making that 35 percent reduction from TDM then there are some more things they need to do, and we keep going with that and ultimately some contributions to programs the City would implement.

Commissioner Tanaka: Okay, so it sounds like the answer is not too bad but there is some sort of mechanism where there would be some sort of assurance that we are not going to have – if the modeling let’s say is off there is going to be some sort of feedback in the process as this goes out for a couple of decades that will correct the problem.

Mr. Williams: It will be less the modeling issue than it will be the monitoring of the TDM program to be sure that it is reducing trips as prescribed.

Commissioner Tanaka: I see, okay. Thank you.

Vice-Chair Lippert: I am going to conclude with this round and then we will do another round. I am going to go to the Master Response 4, Construction Traffic. The section I am looking at is on page 3-174. I read through the section. I understand that what we are looking at here is the cumulative impacts from construction traffic. Basically Stanford has a number of other construction projects that are going on through the GUP. As those projects wind down we will be gearing up for this hospital project, if I understand this correctly. Mine is a technical question. Are we allowed to reach into the GUP and just adapt that language? In this case, if let’s say another city like Mountain View or Los Altos were doing a sizable project could their General Plan or their Comprehensive Plan, which is basically what the GUP is, allow for us to then adapt that to build a larger project in the Stanford Research Park? So is the GUP transferable in terms of their impacts and them mitigating those impacts as those projects wind down, are those transferable to Palo Alto, which is under its own Comprehensive Plan?

Mr. Jeung: I would not be able to respond to that, but I need a little bit more clarification. I understand that the GUP through Santa Clara County has a certain cap of development that is allowed on Stanford lands. There is a certain set of monitoring activities that occur with that. Then your point being if Los Altos or some other …..

Vice-Chair Lippert: No. I guess my point is that the hospital is in the City of Palo Alto. Well, both Los Altos and Mountain View have their own Comprehensive Plans that allow for or deal with traffic flows. If they are allowed to increase and build say a big facility for say Google or some other company in their town, as that project winds down would Stanford then be allowed to
adapt that portion of Mountain View or Los Altos’ Comprehensive Plan to allow for us – would we then be allowed to adapt that for our own city in terms of our own analysis of construction mitigation? What I am just simply looking for is here even though it is on the periphery of Stanford land can we in fact do that, cite the GUP for projects that are underway that will be winding down and then adapt them for Palo Alto?

Mr. Jeung: I think I will have to think about that one a little bit more. I am still trying to wrap my mind around what that question means. You are suggesting I think that as projects are winding down in those other communities where there may have been a large facility, a regional facility, that draws a lot of traffic and the construction related impacts are then taken care of and mitigated by those projects by those local jurisdictions then the part about adapting it to Stanford is just the part I am not understanding and being able to wrap my mind around, and maybe it is just because I am tired.

Vice-Chair Lippert: Well, okay that is what I am trying to understand here too. Here we have the GUP that allows for these construction projects to be mitigated on Stanford land, and even though this is Stanford land it is Palo Alto, it is not County land.

Mr. Williams: It allows them to be mitigated how in the GUP?

Vice-Chair Lippert: Well, that is what I am trying to understand here. It says that they currently have certain projects.

Ms. Silver: If I could try. The GUP of course covers the County of Santa Clara boundaries. For the most part that includes the academic campus. The academic campus has entitlements and construction projects that are ongoing. So there was a concern raised in some of the comments that those projects may have overlapping impacts with the neighboring jurisdictions, primarily this project. So I think that the intent of this Master Response was to address those types of comments about the cumulative impact really of other construction projects in the immediate vicinity, and really focused in on the other GUP projects.

Vice-Chair Lippert: Got it. I understand that. Great, thanks. Okay, we will go with Commissioner Fineberg followed by Keller.

Commissioner Fineberg: Thank you. As a quick follow up on Chair Lippert’s comment on page 3-174 where it talks about the cumulative construction period traffic impacts, it talks about the bioengineer and chemical engineering building construction wrapping up earlier than expected. Then it dismisses any impacts of the Bing Concert Hall because it says, “which is not located near the SUMC sites.” Now I understand we are not conducting an analysis of global construction impacts, but if we are talking about a construction vehicle going to Stanford’s campus there are only three or four possible routes it can go in. So the fact that within the campus, Bing Concert Hall, and Stanford University Medical Center are maybe as the crow flies half a mile apart, I don’t understand how that can be defined as not located near. They are going to take one of the few truck routes in, so the definition of nearness I think is a dismissal that doesn’t adequately consider whether there is a real and ongoing cumulative impact. I believe there were other comments that talked about cumulative impact where there were other projects
going on beyond the borders of Stanford’s campus, and the idea of nearness being hundreds of feet is kind of ludicrous when you are talking about the tons and tons of materials that will be going in an out of the site.

On another point, Staff Change 5 talks about the Secretary of the Interior’s Report concluding that the Stanford project would not be consistent with two of the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic properties. It then goes on to talk about how the Hoover Pavilion would retain good integrity and the physical characteristics that convey its historic significance. It continues further to say that the project would not render Hoover Pavilion ineligible for listing in the NRHP and the CRHR, which are the federal and state historic registries, and would therefore have a less than significant impact under CEQA. So is it correct that the only significant negative impact on an historic property under CEQA’s criteria is a change that would render it unable to be listed?

Mr. Jeung: I am going to ask representatives from ARG to help respond to that, but typically when we do the historic resources evaluations if we have a facility, a property, a resource that is at that level then we are looking at two things. We are looking at the direct impact associated with the project that might cause some alteration, demolition directly to the project, or we are looking at indirect effects that might change the audible, visual setting. All of those then tie back to what is actually driving and causing and providing the rationale for that facility to be listed on those registers. So to the extent that the alteration either direct or indirect is such that it does change that eligibility that becomes our criterion for significance.

Vice-Chair Lippert: If the consultants from ARG will introduce themselves.

Ms. Jodi Stock, Architectural Resources Group: I am Jodi Stock from ARG. I completely agree. I think you said it well that yes that is the threshold you are using. If something meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards then it is considered mitigated to a less than significant level, but when something doesn’t meet the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards it is not necessarily a significant impact. It is only if it compromises those characteristics, which make the property eligible.

Commissioner Fineberg: Even given the statement earlier that the project would not be consistent with two of the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards, so I am dueling with why are we not applying the analysis for significance for consistency with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards and only saying that the minimum threshold is that it not be de-listed?

Mr. Charles Chase, Architectural Resources Group: The evaluation is done as we look at the – there are a number of standards within the Secretary’s Standards. There are actually ten of them. In doing that analysis what we provide is which of those standards apply to the condition that the project most affects. So there are two issues here. I think Jodi can describe them to you but those two issues are evaluated separately. So they have to meet a threshold. I don’t know how to explain it.
The standards are applied based upon what the project proposes to do. I think we could talk about both of them in more detail, but the reference is that the project does not reach a level that would reduce the value of the historic resource.

Ms. Stock: If it helps, when we are writing these often what we think of is we go through the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards first. If the project meets those standards then great, we are done. We can say it is mitigated to a less than significant level. If it does not meet those standards then we need to look at it again, and say okay it doesn’t meet the standards but does it compromise the resource in a way that it is no longer eligible? That is what then is the definition of a significant adverse impact.

Commissioner Fineberg: So just as a confirmation, there is no significant adverse impact unless it eliminates the ability, and before I said de-listed and I should have said to un-list. If it could not be listed that would be the only impact even though as a City we have policies and rules about following the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards. I don’t know if this can be resolved tonight but that is an area where I just don’t understand how this analysis is handling that issue.

Ms. Stock: It is my understanding that for CEQA that is the threshold you use, whether it is de-listed or not, which doesn’t preclude the City from having different requirements, but for CEQA that is the threshold.

Vice-Chair Lippert: Maybe the City Attorney can clarify this for us. I believe that that is where the Statement of Overriding Consideration probably would come in.

Ms. Silver: No, because we have not determined that there is a significant impact. Where it could come in is in the Historic Resources Board review process. As we have discussed in the past for the most part the HRB only has review over designated projects that are listed on our local inventory. So we are considering though in this particular HD zone, and again we will discuss this more when we discuss the Zoning Ordinance. We will be suggesting that there be some HRB review in the HD zone with respect to Hoover Pavilion.

Vice-Chair Lippert: Okay. We will go onto Commissioner Keller. As long as it is a quick one, we have a lot to go through.

Commissioner Martinez: You did a review on the changes to the building and the impacts. Did you look at changes to the site with the construction of the new building?

Ms. Stock: Yes we did.

Commissioner Martinez: What was your conclusion on that?

Ms. Stock: Our conclusion was that in general there was no impact except for the siting of the medical office building. That is where it was not consistent with two of the standards. It was just the siting of the medical office building.

Vice-Chair Lippert: Commissioner Keller.
Commissioner Keller: Thank you. First I would like to thank Commissioner Tanaka for bringing up one of the issues from the public. Let me follow up with the consideration of the siting of the medical office building. Are you suggesting that siting the medical office building in the proposed location is inconsistent with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards or such an historic building?

Ms. Stock: Yes.

Commissioner Keller: Where should the medical office building be sited in order to avoid such an impact?

Ms. Stock: Well, for example, like the parking structure, which does not block either of what we consider the primary façades of the building, we didn’t consider an impact. So it is positioning it away from the primary façades.

Commissioner Keller: So what I am wondering are a couple of things. First of all, I hear this thing about eligible for listing. Does that mean it actually is listed? Does that mean it should be listed? What is the relationship between eligible to be listed and actually being on such a list?

Ms. Stock: It is a good question. Basically, it is a way for us, the consultants, to acknowledge that we can’t actually list it. So we can say that something appears to be eligible for listing but we can’t actually list it ourselves. So if it is listed it would go through the State Historic Resources Commission and all that process.

Commissioner Keller: Yes?

Mr. Jeung: I just wanted to add that it means that property satisfies the criteria for a property to be included on the national Register or on the California Register. So in an evaluation that a firm like ARG would perform, and looking at the integrity, the age, and the other features of that building, the character defining features, would it qualify if someone were to nominate it for inclusion.

Commissioner Keller: So I am wondering whether it should be a condition that it should be listed rather than merely that it is eligible for listing, and stays eligible rather being listed. Let me just put that out there without necessarily needing an answer.

Secondly, with respect to HRB review it seems to be that any building in the City of Palo Alto, which is eligible for listing on the state or federal registries should be under HRB purview. If the rules don’t allow for that the rules are stupid.

So with respect to the issue of Portola Valley and Alpine Road I understand that TDM measures are attempting to address that, but I am wondering if TDM measures would be more likely to affect traffic approaching from the east rather than traffic approaching from the west. Traffic approaching from the west from 280 is less likely to be transitioned to transit than traffic that approaches from the East Bay or from San Francisco or whatever. So I guess traffic from San
Francisco would not be taking Alpine it would be more likely taking Sand Hill. So I am really not understanding how the TDM measure affects this. I don’t know the extent to which a traffic light at the intersection of 280, the northbound ramp of 280 and Alpine Road, whether the warrants for that traffic light might make sense. I don’t know the answer to that. That should be considered.

Vice-Chair Lippert: Do you want them to answer them? The consultant I believe was getting ready to answer.

Commissioner Keller: You have an answer to that?

Mr. Struecker: With respect to the signalization, yes both ramps the northbound and the southbound ramp, meet signal warrants and could be signalized by Caltrans. First of all, there is really very little traffic from this project, probably no traffic from this project that comes southbound on 280 and gets off at Alpine. They will get off at Sand Hill. The reverse movement to go south on 280 there is a loop ramp so they don’t go through the intersection going to the south at the end of the day.

With respect to the northbound ramp at Alpine it also meets signal warrants but there is not a project impact at that intersection because there is traffic that would come from the south on 280 that could use the GO Pass from San Jose, Santa Clara, and points to the south. So the analysis found that there is not an impact there. So even though the signal is warranted it is not something that is subject to project mitigation.

Commissioner Keller: So in your analysis of the traffic on 280 was that based on zip code analysis and was it based on an understanding of for example for existing employees if you just extrapolate and assume that the existing employee distribution will be the same as the new employee distribution?

Mr. Struecker: Yes.

Commissioner Keller: Did you take into account the zip code analysis and how far away people were from Caltrain? For example somebody who lives in Los Gatos and took 85 to 280 was very unlikely to take Caltrain, and depending on where they lived to the south on 280 their likelihood of talking Caltrain was actually fairly small.

Mr. Struecker: Correct. There is a table in the Draft EIR that groups all those cities on the peninsula in three groups. Group 1 are the ones that we assumed would use Caltrain because they are the ones with Caltrain facilities located in that jurisdiction. Group 2 cities are ones that don’t have Caltrain, and I believe the Group 3 cities are the ones such as Palo Alto and Menlo Park and Mountain View where just the time of getting to Caltrain, and then waiting for Caltrain, and then getting off is too great. They are too close to their ultimate destination to make it make sense.

Commissioner Keller: I think that is very interesting. I doubt very many people will take Caltrain from Sunnyvale or even Redwood City. I think that you will probably have to get –
because of the overhead involved in going to Caltrain you probably have to be significantly far from Stanford in order to take Caltrain. You probably have to be significantly close to Caltrain to take it. In terms of my own analysis of Caltrain what I have seen is that most of the transit on Caltrain is people going between the San Francisco terminus and the Palo Alto station. Relatively few people are coming from the south. Most people are coming from the north, from San Francisco, at least that seems to be the bulk of the traffic from my analysis of that. I am not sure how that matches yours.

Vice-Chair Lippert: Okay, well we will go onto Commissioner Martinez here. Thank you.

Commissioner Martinez: I kind of want to think inside the box. If we have a ledger, on the asset side we have Stanford Hospital. Great institution, wonderful service, provides patient care to 35 percent of people who live in Palo Alto, and that probably will be growing. We have a real need to replace that hospital for public safety reasons and that is a great concern of all of us. We have the School of Medicine and the research facility and Nobel Prize winners and the wonderful doctors and nurses. We all know someone from there. Those are sort of the assets of the overriding considerations. I want to talk just sort of general on that.

On the debit side there is this large, looming debit of a major institution, a major new facility that is basically landlocked. It is tough to get to it from east or west, or any other direction. There are a lot of impediments to get there, the traffic on El Camino, the traffic on the Embarcadero, traffic on Sand Hill Road. We know that as the debit.

The EIR takes it in little pieces and says well, there is going to be some hazardous waste but we can overcome that. If not, there is this overriding consideration of community benefit and like this. It sort of doesn’t play fair. We know that there is going to be a major impact of some degree whether it is increased traffic, noise, construction noise, but we don’t know exactly what. We are taking little pieces of it and mitigating it or we are using some language that is kind of glibly saying we are minimizing the loss of the Stone Building by these mitigations. How do you mitigate demolition? You just don’t.

I am fully in support of this project and Stanford, the hospital, and all the good things that they do now and will be doing in the future. I just sort of get lost at the way in which we either have these little mitigations that will improve an intersection to make this little piece better or little historic mitigations to make that little piece better, and if we don’t quite get there we have these overriding considerations. I just feel that at the end of this we are going to go forth with the project as we should, but we are going to be left with these lingering doubts about what have we done, and what do we have to look forward to. That really concerns me. I think the idea of having the ability to revisit the mitigations at a future time is something that we should seriously consider. Thank you.

Vice-Chair Lippert: Commissioner Garber, questions for consultants.

Commissioner Garber: A question for our parking consultant or traffic and parking, anything dealing with cars. I think easily three years ago when some of the first traffic analysis was presented to us one of the surprising learnings, at least to me, was that the demographic growth
of the immediate population was going to have a significant impact on the traffic. My recollection is that we were looking specifically at intersections along El Camino, and that the various intersections, their grades, I think ten years or 15 years out I am not remembering exactly which ones they were but it was the population that was driving those grades to be reduced. The Level of Service grades for those intersections. The surprising learning was that the impact that the project would have was incremental to what the impact the population growth would have. It is three years later, or whatever the time period is, is that in still fact the case? I am thinking specifically of, and I am not finding the list right here in front of me, but there was a list of the sort of critical intersections, seven, ten, 17, I forget how many. I am thinking specifically of those critical intersections that have been studied.

Mr. Struecker: Well, the analysis looks at future conditions, the 2025 conditions, without this project. Three years ago it assumed that both the hospital project and the shopping center project were not in the background growth. This analysis now assumes that the shopping center is in the background growth. The projections for 2025 are analyzed based on the expected characteristics of the intersection at that time, and then the project is compared to that, the project traffic is added onto that and then those two are compared to determine if there is a project impact. I don’t know if I am getting to the answer of your question or not.

Commissioner Garber: Let me try it this way. What I am interested in is what the impact of the project is after the growth, the analysis, the background is filtered out. How many of those intersections are impacted?

Mr. Struecker: Well we did an existing plus project analysis. So if you compared the impacts of the project when it is compared to existing as opposed to comparing the impact of the project when it is compared to the 2025 background growth that would kind of give you an indication of the impacts between those two.

Commissioner Garber: I was actually hoping given the two stacks in paper that I have in front of me we could identify some of those. Maybe you can take a look at it and if you can come back to me that would be great. What I am really looking at focusing on is the intersections where the project truly has an impact above and beyond the background and what those mitigations are, if you follow my thinking here.

Mr. Struecker: I believe I do. There is a series of mitigations, I don’t know exactly the number of the impacts but the impacts were about I believe ten or so in the AM and 15 or 16 in the PM. Cole, can you pull those numbers up? Then the mitigations are a series of steps. The first step is traffic adaptive signal technology. The second step is bicycle and pedestrian undercrossings.

Commissioner Garber: I understand. I am sort of focusing in here though on the specific intersections that are impacted above and beyond what the background is in 2025 as a result of the project. Maybe they all are.

Mr. Struecker: All of those ten or 12 in the AM and 15 or 16 in the PM are impacted as a result of the project as compared to the background.
Commissioner Garber: Okay.

Mr. Struecker: Where is the table that has the numbers?

Vice-Chair Lippert: Why don’t we give the consultants time to do that and when we come back to you they can answer the question.

Commissioner Garber: Sure.

Vice-Chair Lippert: Commissioner Tanaka.

Commissioner Tanaka: Thank you. As I was going through this Final EIR it seems like a big portion of the mitigation traffic wise was reliant on the GO Pass. So I guess I have a few questions around that. One of which is one that one of the members of the public made, which is the off-street parking issue. I think it was implied whether 75 parking spots was enough given that roughly 20 percent of the employees are from the East Bay. If there are 2,000 new employees that is 400 employees. So are 75 enough for the projected 400 new employees that would be in the East Bay assuming the split remained the same if I am interpreting that correctly. So I was wondering if someone could comment on that.

Mr. Jeung: I am going to ask AECOM again. They are talking right now so I don’t know if they actually heard your specific comment regarding the parking and the reliance on the GO. So might have to repeat that. I am sorry, Commissioner Tanaka.

Commissioner Tanaka: Sure. Basically the bottom line is are 75 parking spots sufficient given that 20 percent of the projected employees are going to be from the East Bay, and there are 2,000 new employees so 20 percent times 2,000 is 400?

Mr. Struecker: The 75 spaces are what get us to the 15.8 percent. So we are applying the same mode split goal to the East Bay as we are to the peninsula that is served by Caltrain.

Commissioner Tanaka: Okay, so by that math it is sufficient then.

Mr. Struecker: Yes.

Commissioner Tanaka: Okay, that makes sense to me. I was also wondering do you know roughly how much is being spent per employee on the GO Passes. How much does it cost per employee?

Mr. Struecker: It just went up in January. It is $155.00 a year per employee.

Commissioner Tanaka: Okay. The reason why I am asking is because one of my fellow Commissioners made the point that employees in let’s say Menlo Park, or Sunnyvale, or a nearby city may not benefit from that. I realize that there are restrictions on the GO Pass program but is there a possibility to shift some of those dollars to more effective programs for local or nearby employees? Some sort of zip car or something else that makes sense that would
actually get a bigger bang for the buck versus giving someone a Caltrain pass, which is not likely to be used?

Mr. Struecker: There are other measures that could be done. The GO Pass is pretty cost effective. Obviously there are people that are either too close to the hospital to use it or they live somewhere that is not served by Caltrain. The way the program is setup it is an all or nothing. You buy it for all the employees or you are not a part of the program.

Commissioner Tanaka: I see, so there is no way to segment out local or let’s say the people in Los Gatos or people who are far from Caltrain.

Mr. Struecker: The only people that they let you discount are people that live right on campus. For the University program that is in effect right now the people that live on campus they can subtract those out of the total.

Commissioner Tanaka: I was just thinking that at $1.8 million a year probably Stanford would be one of the major participants in this program and they would probably be able to negotiate, be able to segment out the local employees. They could say for these local guys we are going to use the same dollars, the $150 a year for some other TDM measure that would be more effective.

Mr. Struecker: I guess that they could try and negotiate that but that is not the way the program is setup now. So that would be something they would have to work through.

Commissioner Tanaka: Has the question been asked of Caltrain?

Mr. Struecker: Not to my knowledge, no.

Commissioner Tanaka: Maybe that is a good idea. One other question since you are up there is I think we have all noticed that gas prices have been going up. If you look at some of the long-term forecasts for 20 years you see gas prices going up even more, a lot more than four dollars, or five dollars a gallon. Certainly people drive a lot now because gas is relative cheap especially compared to other countries. As gas prices get really high it is probably going to have a dampening effect. I was just wondering do your models take into account that gas prices are likely to go up over the next couple of decades?

Mr. Struecker: Yes, the cost of travel is an algorithm of the model too. The mode split in the model doesn’t really change all that much, and I don’t think it is probably quite as sensitive to the price as in actuality occurs. As you see prices go over four dollars a gallon it is noticeable out there. I think the congestion over the last few days is less than it was two or three weeks ago.

Commissioner Tanaka: Sure, more people are carpooling. I guess my point is in your model are you keeping gas prices steady, going down, going up, what is your projection?

Mr. Struecker: I am not a modeler, and the model was developed through the City. So I don’t have a specific answer for that.
Commissioner Tanaka: Does anyone here have that answer?

Mr. Struecker: I know cost is included in the model but I don’t know if it is on an escalating scale. I assume there is some type of inflation in there but I don’t exactly what it is.

Commissioner Tanaka: Well gas prices are projected to go way past inflation. So I don’t know if our Chief Transportation Official has feedback on that.

Mr. Rodriguez: I think what you are asking is does the model today assume a much significant higher cost for gas than it does today. Not the point I think that you are probably discussing where we are looking at a $10.00 per gallon cost. I know there is a slight expected increase in that that will drive certain changes, but it is not to that degree.

Commissioner Tanaka: That is helpful just because I am trying to understand if this model is being conservative or aggressive, and it sounds like it is being conservative keeping the prices relatively the same as today so this is probably okay. Thank you.

Vice-Chair Lippert: Well, hopefully at that point all the local people will be driving Tesla cars. I am going to close out this round of questioning and then we will go to another round.

I am going to go back to the cumulative construction period impacts and I wanted to ask our sustainability consultant about that. When Stanford did the GUP and they looked at the traffic for the other projects, particularly it was Bing Concert Hall and then there was the bioengineering/chemical building AB 32 had not come around yet. It actually it wasn’t even drafted I bet. Does the Stanford Medical Center construction look at AB 32 in terms of greenhouse gas emissions, meeting those greenhouse gas emission goals in terms of the construction traffic, or is it not looked at at all?

Ms. Dubois: We did analyze construction traffic in the FEIR as far as the construction workers coming and going to the site. So that was taken into account in the FEIR construction analysis. So AB 32 in effect that was added to the emissions as part of the, well it would not have been Business as Usual because that is construction, but it is part of the construction total annual impacts. I guess I am not quite …..

Vice-Chair Lippert: Well, what it calls for is AB 32 calls for us to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions over the next 25-year period, correct?

Ms. Dubois: Correct.

Vice-Chair Lippert: In the beginning it is not that significant but as we get further on it is more significant. So when we are in the construction period here is it taking into account AB 32 and is it in fact significant or not?

Ms. Dubois: Impacts for construction are taken into account and they are amortized over the life of the project. So when you are looking at greenhouse gas emissions it is on an annual basis. So the construction although it may occur over a course of one or two years, or ten or 20 years, the
lifetime of the project is 40, 50, 60 years. That is amortized over the expected lifetime of the
project so that it doesn’t negatively impact or artificially inflate what the emissions would be
based on construction. So yes, construction is factored into the analysis but it is on an amortized
basis so it is over the lifetime of the project and not just like the first year.

Vice-Chair Lippert: Okay. This is a phased project. As we get further along in the process it is
taking into account that in fact we would be reducing greenhouse gas emissions from
construction trucks or construction work?

Ms. Dubois: It takes into account the timeframe in which the vehicle would be or – the vehicle
emissions are based on EMFAC, which is an emissions modeling factor for the vehicles. That
takes into account the year of the vehicle, the age of the vehicle, so as we move forward and as
AB 32 is fully implemented and SB 375 is fully implemented the emissions from the vehicles are
going to be reduced. So construction people driving to the construction site on average at the
end of the construction project are going to have less emissions than those that would be driving
tomorrow. It is the way it is averaged over …

Vice-Chair Lippert: Okay, so the construction workers would be driving in Tesla trucks by then.

Ms. Dubois: Yes.

Vice-Chair Lippert: Okay. Then I have one other question for the traffic or transportation
consultant. Recently Caltrain has run into a fiscal emergency and they are going to be cutting
service on the trains, level of service. So is that taken into account in terms of the analysis of
who would be the ridership on the trains? Obviously if there aren’t trains available people are
going to be inclined to drive.

Mr. Struecker: What is actually happening to Caltrain I guess nobody knows for sure. Right
now any indications on cuts in service are not in the peak hour or the peak period actually, so
really the three hours or so in the morning and the evening. So there has not been any indication
that I know of yet that they were going to cut any of those trains. So that is what we are relying
on for the analysis in the peak hour the GO Pass will still work and still provide the traffic relief
that we are using in the analysis. If something different happens then that could change.
The other thing that should be noted is that if there are reductions say between ten o’clock and
eleven, or between two and three those people then will have to if they continue to use Caltrain
will have to shift to other hours. So you could be seeing passenger shift into the peak hour I
guess, and making the trains more crowded than they would otherwise be.

Vice-Chair Lippert: I think our Chief Transportation Official wants to say something.

Mr. Rodriguez: If I could just add I think one of the things to keep in mind is the monitoring of
the TDM program is going to be a major element of trying to determine whether or not there is
success through the GO Pass program, whether it be under a system applied to the GO Pass like
we are seeing today versus something that is more of a reduced capacity in the future depending
on whatever Caltrain – the process it goes through for its fiscal issues. So we will continue to
monitor that GO Pass effectiveness closely with the Medical Center through the monitoring program of the TDM.

Mr. Jeung: If I could add one more piece of information. Trying to be sensitive to the future viability of Caltrain and understanding that there is some uncertainty related to it the Mitigation Measure specific to the use of the GO Pass has been modified as part of the Final Environmental Impact Report. So there is additional language that says if the GO Pass is not available in its current form then there has to be some arrangement made between the project sponsor and the City to fund some other sort of program that would have the same effect. So there is that recognition that there is some uncertainty.

Vice-Chair Lippert: I guess they could fund Caltrain. Commissioners, I’m sorry.

Mr. Struecker: If I could follow up and close out that comment that we kind of left hanging. In volume one on page 3-170 it lists the existing and it list the 2025 project impacts. Page 3-170. So the first column with the diamonds says that there are six intersections in the AM that operating poorly. It says when you add the hospital projects to the existing volumes in the AM there is one intersection that is impacted. If you go to the next column there are nine intersections in the PM in the existing condition that are operating poorly. When you add the hospital projects to that five of those intersections are impacted. It is the same thing for 2025 in the AM and the PM. So we end up with four impacts in AM prior to mitigation and 11 impacts in the PM in 2025 prior to mitigation.

Commissioner Garber: Chair, may I ask a question?

Vice-Chair Lippert: Yes you may.

Commissioner Garber: Commissioner Keller had also pointed out the Table that is on 3-48. Is there a relationship between these two tables? When I look at 3-48 the only two intersections that seem to be affected are line item 69, which is Middlefield Road and Marsh, which slides from a Level of Service C to Level of Service C-.

Commissioner Keller: It starts on 3-45.

Commissioner Garber: Right. Then in the PM the only one that seems to be affected is line item 63, which is Alpine Road at the 280 off ramp, which slides from a Level of Service C to D. So I am seeing one for each AM and PM. I see your numbers one, five, four, and 11 on page 3-170. So let me just ask what is the relationship between these two tables?

Mr. Struecker: I am sorry, which is the table we are looking at?

Commissioner Garber: The Table that you cited at 3-170 versus the Table that is on 3-48.

Mr. Struecker: 3-48?

Commissioner Garber: Yes, which is Revised Table 3-4 of Appendix C.
Mr. Struecker: 3-48, that Table starts on 3-45.

Commissioner Garber: It appears that 3-48 is a summary of above.

Mr. Struecker: No, it is just the end of the Table. So if you wanted to find those intersections you would have to go ….

Commissioner Garber: I got you. That is just end of the long Table.

Mr. Struecker: All the Y’s are impacts.

Commissioner Garber: I follow you. Okay, thank you.

Vice-Chair Lippert: Just to clarify he was clarifying your question from earlier on, Commissioner Garber. So right now it is 20 of ten o’clock. What I propose is we go with another round of consultant questions. I would ask that all the Commissioners be concise in terms of your questions. It would be helpful if you could direct your question to the specific consultants and allow the consultant to answer the question rather than just one broad question. So what I am going to do is reduce the time. We are going to go to three minutes apiece. We will begin with Commissioner Fineberg.

Commissioner Fineberg: My first question regards housing impacts. In our Staff Report on page 13 it talks about population and housing. In PH-1 it says that the project would increase onsite employments and visitors and thus indirectly inducing housing demand, however the percentage of regional housing demand resulting from the project would be relatively small in comparison with the projected housing growth in the region, and would comprise a less than significant environment impact. Does CEQA require us to determine the housing impact within our scope of influence, within Palo Alto, or within the region? So how does the fact that it has no regional impact mean that there is less than significant impact?

Mr. Jeung: Let me go ahead and start that. It is an interesting question because the actual significance criterion that we have in CEQA simply asks are you going to be inducing substantial growth. It doesn’t necessarily relate it to a geographic area so it doesn’t specifically say the city, the region, etc. When we tried to take a look at how it is going to affect a local jurisdiction for any other sort of large-scale regional project what we will do is take a look at what the growth implications are associated with that project. In this case it is predominantly the addition of employment. So then you get into a secondary tier of analysis and what does it mean in terms of having that many employees located at a certain, given location. So it draws in additional housing. When the additional housing gets drawn in and pulled into the analysis then you need to think about where is that housing going to be located. This is where we get into sort of the residential location pattern, and recognizing that the employees, which are the direct effect are going to have an indirect effect in terms of the housing demand. The housing demand is really based on a larger market than just the local jurisdiction. So there is an attempt to understand the employment location patterns of the employees and to extrapolate that into the future so that some assumptions can be made about how many housing units are going to be required locally,
in the nearby housing market whether it is Palo Alto, Menlo Park, etc, and how much might be in
the East Bay, North Bay or South Bay. So when we talk about the growth and that induced
demand of housing relative to some geographic area it is relative to the overall housing market. I
don’t know if that helps, but it basically explains that the universe that we are looking at that
impact then does become the larger region, because that is the area that is going to accommodate
the housing demand.

Commissioner Fineberg: Question for our Planning Director. Has there ever been another
project reviewed within the last five years in Palo Alto where we look at housing impact, carbon
impact, school impact as a regional issue therefore Palo Alto is off the hook, we have no impact?

Mr. Williams: Under CEQA we have not had one where we found there is a significant impact
as far as the housing in terms of the regional, or in terms of that it is significant under CEQA
criteria. We have had housing projects and they have all been done with Negative Declarations.
Since the last EIR on a housing one, well we did the EIR on the affordable housing project, 801
Alma, and that was not an issue, 50 units. We did an EIR on the 901 San Antonio project and
that was a lot more units, but we didn’t have the greenhouse gas criteria there and we did have
housing criteria, and it wasn’t considered a significant impact to be mitigated in terms of the
housing itself. As far as nonresidential projects that have this inducement of housing issue I
don’t think we have had any that have come through in that time period.

Vice-Chair Lippert: We will go onto Commissioner Keller followed by Commissioner Martinez.

Commissioner Keller: It seems to me that a lot of the traffic impacts and housing impacts and
things like that are kind of like Chinese water torture. Every individual drop has very little
effect, but cumulatively they can make a Grand Canyon. So it seems to me that I am going to
focus with Mr. Struecker on transportation.

Let me first ask with respect to the Table on 3-45 through 3-48 is that before or after the various
mitigations?

Mr. Struecker: That is before.

Commissioner Keller: That is before, and where is the corresponding Table to this that has the
data to the detail of 3-45 to 3-48? Is there a Table like that after the mitigations?

Mr. Struecker: We had the graphics that showed with the diamonds.

Commissioner Keller: I see the diamonds in the Table ending on 3-170. Am I correct that you
have not given the detailed data equivalent to the details in 3.4-17, that Table, there is not an
equivalent one?

Mr. Struecker: There is. Appendix T has the tables in it that have diamonds and circles in them.
Revised Table 3-5 is on page 11 of Appendix T.
Commissioner Keller: Okay, thank you. So in the interest of time I will look at that further. I am wondering if Staff can think about this question and get back to us towards the end since we are running out of time in asking these questions. I am wondering if we could ask selected questions by email and have the consultants get back to us by email at their convenience rather than immediately.

Mr. Williams: I think that would be fine.

Commissioner Keller: Great. Let me ask about Caltrain. You have an assumption we talked about or I alluded to earlier about uniformity, and that is you are assuming that during the peak period of Caltrain all the trains are equally loaded. You are also assuming that the increased ridership is going to be an equal load on all the trains. How realistic is that assumption, and is it more reasonable to assume that the five o’clock train will be most heavily loaded, and that the additional load will be on the five o’clock train and that may exceed capacity?

Mr. Struecker: Yes, that is a good point. We kind of did acknowledge that in Staff-Initiated Change 1 where we said that the actual load factors would vary and there could be more passengers than seats on some trains. So we do agree with that. We have that in the response.

Commissioner Keller: So I am wondering if it might be possible on that in terms of getting actual per train ridership data from Caltrain if they have it available. If they are doing the counts on that day in February they probably have more detailed data that might be accessible even if it is not on the website, A. And B, if we can correlate that with the actual schedule of the employees at the Stanford Hospital to try to figure out how that might mesh up that might give us a more detailed study.

Finally, just quickly, is there any consideration of how many hospital employees use bicycles to tool around campus and use those bicycles on Caltrain, and the sufficiency of bicycle capacity on Caltrain for those commute partially by bicycle employees?

Mr. Struecker: We could see what is available on that.

Commissioner Keller: Thank you.

Vice-Chair Lippert: Commissioner Martinez.

Commissioner Martinez: I don’t have any further questions.

Vice-Chair Lippert: Okay, Commissioner Garber followed by Tanaka.

Commissioner Garber: Last summer when the presentation on the Climate Change chapter was presented there was conversation regarding the observation that most of the mitigations had to do with the operation of either the construction site or the project itself, and how energy was going to be used more efficiently or avoided, etc. The observation was made that the study did not really address, with one possible exception but I am not recalling it exactly, but of the tens of items that were mentioned did not address embodied energy at all. That is the embodied energy,
embodied carbon, embodied greenhouse gases that go into all the materials prior to any of it being used. There may be something in here if there is forgive me I have not found it. I am just curious as to how that was addressed or is it? What was the resolution on that topic?

Ms. Dubois: Typically with embodied energy you have to know the details as to the specific material, where it is coming from, how many miles it is going to take, and all of that is speculative. It is not something that can be easily assumed either. We don’t know whether it is going to come from next-door or going to come from China. Also, it is something that is beyond the project control. It is beyond the control of the hospital as to where the materials come from, and therefore it is outside of the scope of the CEQA analysis.

That also goes to point again with bringing the vehicle ridership or the patient and visitor trips. I am going to circle back because that also is beyond the control of the hospital, which is part of why it was not included in the analysis. We can’t, the hospital can’t say well, no you can’t come here. It is not in their control to reduce emissions or reduce vehicle miles traveled from the patients or vehicles. That is the same as the embodied energy it is not within their control to say where it comes from or how this manufacturer produces what they produce. So they can’t, because it is a global, and that is where we are having a lot of the issues because it is a global energy. If the manufacturer is over here if there is a better way, a more efficient way, for this manufacturer to produce something that would reduce the embedded emissions. Stanford can’t say, we can’t say well you have to do it another way. It is beyond our control.

Commissioner Garber: I understand I think both of the arguments. However, and I do agree that there are not recognized standard ways of calculating embedded energy or embodied energy. However the hospital is making a point that part of the value that it brings to the project is that it has a variety of efficient measures, and is using for instance LEED as one of those criteria. Part of that evaluation is based on the reduction of materials, reduction of the embodied energy, etc. It would seem to me that it would make sense that in order for that to have value you would want to measure that against something and that could in fact find its way into an Environmental Impact Report so that you can understand what then the value of applying this particular environmental criteria to the project would be. Just a thought.

Vice-Chair Lippert: Thank you. Commissioner Tanaka.

Commissioner Tanaka: My question has to do with one of the public comments or questions that were made in regard to hospitals are likely to bring a lot of other people, or a family, to the city who may be want to keep their family patient company during their trying times. I think at one point during the shopping center expansion plan there was a hotel contemplated in that area, maybe for that very reason. I was wondering about the practicality of, without having to do a restart of the EIR process, the possibility to give Stanford the tool as a possible mitigation in the future should they see that a lot of people are going outside the city having to drive in, the city is not getting the occupancy tax, is that something that can be given as a bonus perhaps as a tool for possible mitigation?

Mr. Williams: We would probably need the City Attorney to weigh in on this. We really can’t be speculative as far as the mitigation in the future goes. We kind of need to say what we
anticipate mitigation to be. Now, it might be appropriate to suggest that the option be included
in the zoning for the shopping center or something outside the scope of this project, that we look
at that and far as the zoning and Comprehensive Plan go for that to amend that to allow that to
happen., or to allow hotels in the hospital zone that you will see as part of this project. So those
are tools that would then be available. They would not necessarily relate specifically to the EIR
and be a suggested mitigation measure, but it would be at least taking a step forward towards
providing that additional benefit.

Commissioner Tanaka: I see, thank you.

Vice-Chair Lippert: Okay, I think we are going to try to wrap things up here. It is eight minutes
of ten and we want to be out of here by ten. First of all, I would like to thank the consultants for
coming here this evening. We are mindful that members of the public did have questions here
and I was notified by Staff that they will have the consultants and themselves answer your
questions in writing, and that they will be made part of the deliberations this evening.

I think Commissioner Keller’s idea of those Commissioners having additional questions, putting
those in writing and sending them to Staff and having the consultants answer them, and then we
can get those responses back to the Commission as part of our further deliberations and analysis
will be just great.

I would like to call on Cara Silver who is going to make some final statements with regard to the
analysis.

Ms. Silver: Yes, thank you. I think that the EIR process has been very thorough here. What it
has done is shown that there are many different approaches to these very complex issues.
Certainly there are lots of different methodologies, there are different assumptions, there are
differing opinions, and different ways to approach the analysis. What we are looking at in terms
of the adequacy of an EIR is we are looking at whether the approach that was taken by the EIR
consultants and analyzed in the EIR is a fair approach and whether there is a justification for that
approach, whether the approach is fully explained and analyzed well. It is important to
recognize that there may be other approaches but the City as the lead agency has a lot of
discretion in deciding what approach to select, and what assumptions to feed into the analysis.
So that is really what you are looking at when you are looking at the adequacy of the EIRs,
whether the approach is disclosed, and whether it is a reasonable approach, and whether it has
been analyzed well, and whether all of the impacts have been disclosed. So I think this
conversation has been very helpful in bringing out some of those issues.

Again, if at the next meeting will focus more on the findings and there will be a more complete
Resolution that will incorporate some of the comments that we have heard tonight, and it will
also include the additional findings necessary to make the Statement of Overriding
Considerations. We will be able to take additional comment on the complete Resolution at that
time.

Mr. Jeung: If I could add one additional piece of information. I do want to come back to
Commissioner Martinez’s point earlier. I think it was very, very well articulated that the weight
on your shoulders and that of the City Council is extremely, extremely heavy. You have a large, large project here. I am sorry, it can be very burdensome. You have a large project in front of you and a good way to look at it is from the perspective of the ledger and understanding that that ledger contains a number of different line items. When you look at the Environmental Impact Report just by the very nature of how it is structured, and how it is organized, and the various topics that were required in support of the lead agency, the City, to identify, describe, and disclose the impacts they are all very, very specific topics. So by the nature of the Environmental Impact Report we are driven and forced to take a look very, very specifically and narrowly at those impacts. Some of the things that you have brought up are very important policy-related issues and larger issues where you have to take a look at the whole of the ledger. That whole of the ledger is exactly what you and the City Council need to consider as you begin your deliberations on the merits of the projects, and that overall weighing of the pluses and the minuses. So what we are providing to the City as part of the environmental document is certain line items, very specific perspective on just the environmental impacts. When you take that into a broader context and you look at it from the community benefits, or the fiscal benefits, or some of the social economic things that CEQA doesn’t really allow you to delve into those are the considerations that really have to come into play, and that is on the merits of the project. So I don’t know if it is just by the nature of CEQA that you only can look at a small sliver but that is kind of why we only give you that perspective.

**Vice-Chair Lippert:** Thank you very much. Just in wrapping up tonight I would like to take the temperature of the Commission here to find out how the Commissioners feel about this. We probably will not take action on this. In fact, we won’t take action on this in terms of our recommendation and Certification until after the Entitlements have been prepared. So we are looking at that happening on April 20 or right around there, it might happen the week after, but right around the middle of April. Do the Commissioners feel it is necessary to get into the analysis say either after next week’s New Business or the following week’s New Business? We have a pretty full agenda next week in terms of two major projects. I believe it is Shell Station on Alma and then what else is there?

**Mr. Williams:** That is next week and then the week after is the 525 San Antonio project, which will have a fairly lengthy hearing.

**Vice-Chair Lippert:** Correct. Commissioner Fineberg.

**Commissioner Fineberg:** Are you asking us if we are going to want to get into analysis of the findings, the more complete Resolution, or the Statement of Overriding Considerations, or more of what tonight’s topic has been?

**Vice-Chair Lippert:** Tonight what we have done is gone through and asked questions of consultants. Now we can go back and we can begin, in terms of our analysis, begin to comment on the actual Final EIR. So any comments that you might have we would begin to make, but we wouldn’t take any action as of yet.

**Ms. Silver:** Chair Lippert, if I could. Staff would recommend that you make comments on the CEQA findings, which are contained in the Resolution at that next meeting.
Vice-Chair Lippert: So the question is do we want to do this next week after we have completed with our New Business? In other words, I am asking if somebody wants to make a motion to continue this.

Commissioner Garber: Do we need a motion? Your recommendation is, and I take it we would have to do this in two week’s time in order to be able to agendize it appropriately?

Vice-Chair Lippert: No, we don’t need to agendize it appropriately. We can just say we are going to continue this item to a date certain and give what that date is, or we can just basically say we continue the item to a date uncertain and let Staff handle that.

Ms. Silver: Right. It might help in calendaring we won’t have the complete Resolution until probably that mid April time period. So if you want to look at the complete package or the complete Resolution with all of the Statement of Overriding Considerations that won’t be available until mid April.

Vice-Chair Lippert: So would we then have just the April 20 or 27 meeting date only that one item?

Mr. Williams: You will have the Entitlements on that meeting as well.

Vice-Chair Lippert: I am sorry, Stanford University Medical Center, the Final EIR.

Mr. Williams: Yes, yes, there will not be any other projects on that schedule.

Commissioner Garber: Do I understand, Staff’s recommendation is that we have another meeting between now and April to address specifically Attachment B.

Mr. Williams: No. Attachment B we are going to revise somewhat and we are going to have a more complete Resolution in any event, which won’t be to you until after we have some other meetings.

Commissioner Garber: So the only other reason that we would then want to continue this is if there are additional questions that Commissioners would like to have answered that have not been asked tonight.

Mr. Williams: Correct.

Vice-Chair Lippert: Those questions would be made to Staff only.

Mr. Williams: Right.

Vice-Chair Lippert: Commissioner Keller.
Commissioner Keller: I believe that there are actually two potential reasons for a meeting. One of those reasons for a meeting is to ask questions, which are going to be done in writing because we are not going to have consultants next time, and we can do that over the next week or so I presume, gather that together and send it to you. Another reason for us to have a meeting is for us to make comments and observations about this lengthy tome and the adequacy of that. Those comments may be useful in terms of the process that goes into creating the documents that come back to us in mid April. Therefore continuing this item into the 16th or the 23rd would allow us to make comments and have that feed into the process rather than waiting until it gets back to us at that time, and then having to do it all at once, which seems to be an overwhelming thing to do at once without much opportunity to give input.

Vice-Chair Lippert: Any other Commissioners? Commissioner Garber, do you have anything?

Commissioner Garber: I was looking at Susan because I had heard her. Did you have anything else you wanted to add to that or other ideas of approaching this?

Commissioner Fineberg: I guess I am thinking that if we have the ability to submit further questions to consultants in writing, I don’t think I have more questions for Staff. Forgive me, but I can always put them in writing and Staff can choose whether they want to answer them or not. So I don’t know what we would do with sort of this extra meeting except for comments on the adequacy, which may be a huge topic. I am not sure how I would know about the adequacy until I see the findings, the Resolution more fully fleshed out, a complete Resolution, and the Statement of Overriding Considerations. If it turns out that there are no Statements of Overriding Considerations then the mitigations are going to be different than if everything is a Statement of Overriding Consideration. So I don’t see how we can determine adequacy until we have a final Resolution.

Commissioner Garber: I am not advocating here, but in my mind it is two steps. The first step is to determine whether this document is adequate, whether it has imagined all the various impacts that can be imagined. Then there is a recommendation that would then go to Council for Certification, and correct me if I am wrong, but it is imaginable that we could Certify it with conditions. We could say we really thought X, Y, and Z should occur and we would like the Council to consider those things to be added to this document. Is that a possibility?

Mr. Williams: Yes, well your recommendation would be a recommendation. We wouldn’t make any changes to the document at this point. If you recommended something to the Council that should additionally be looked at or something that should be corrected then the Council would make that determination when they saw that. Usually when things happen like this and there are changes, and correct me if I am misremembering here, but it is usually in the form of an Addendum or Errata or something like that that goes with it. We don’t go back in and change the Final EIR itself.

Commissioner Garber: So in my mind that is step one. The second step is then there is the actual project recommendation, which takes the form of us reviewing the Entitlements, and the Statement of Overriding Considerations, and the Development Agreement as well. All of that sort of wraps the actual project, and that is a sort of separate set of recommendations that this
body would make that presumably could also be conditioned and then would go the City. So in
my mind, I can understand why we would have a second meeting for us to talk about the
comments and then potentially conditions even if we don’t take action on it. It could certainly
help Staff be informed about where the Commission is going with those particular topics. It does
seem to me that then when you do have the Entitlements in place, you do have a draft of the
Development Agreement, you do have the Statement of Overriding Considerations those things
are really in response to the learnings that we have made on the EIR here. Does this make no
sense or does this make sense?

Vice-Chair Lippert: Commissioner Keller.

MOTION

Commissioner Keller: Based on what Commissioner Garber has ably described it seems to me
that we might want to follow a process like this. If people are interested in this then I can make a
motion to that effect. That is that we gather our comments over the next week, and that we give
our questions to Staff to go to EIR consultants by a week from today, being March 16. Then the
consultants give us back the comments a week later, and that we continue this item to two weeks
from now. To the extent that we have things based on our learnings of that, to the extent that we
have any comments we can then cover them after the 525 San Antonio topic. To the extent that
there is nothing for us to do there then the topic will be short. This gives us the flexibility. So if
people are interested in that I am going to suggest that we continue this to a date certain of
March 23.

Vice-Chair Lippert: Thank you. Is there a second?

SECOND

Commissioner Garber: I will second.

MOTION PASSED (6-0-1-0, Commissioner Tuma conflicted)

Vice-Chair Lippert: Okay, any discussion? All those in favor? (ayes) Opposed? That passes
unanimously. Thank you.
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EXCERPT

Stanford University Medical Center: Recommendation to City Council to certify the Final Environmental Impact Report (Final EIR) for the Stanford University Medical Center Facilities Renewal and Replacement Project, including a statement of Findings that the Final EIR complies with the California Environmental Quality Act. (contd. from March 9 meeting)

Vice-Chair Lippert: Okay, we are going to get started here. This item is a continuation of the Stanford University Medical Center Renewal and Replacement Project, Responses to Comments document, and Final EIR. With that what I am going to do is I am going to turn the microphone over to Staff. Staff is going to make a presentation. Then I am going to immediately open the public hearing. Members of the public that wish to speak to this item will have five minutes. Then we will close the public hearing and return to the dais for comments by Commissioners. Then we will continue the item, but that is not an action that we are taking here. It is simply going to be continued and we will be taking our action on the FEIR along with the Entitlements and the Development Agreement, as well as the rezoning. Staff.

Mr. Steven Turner, Advance Planning Manager: Good evening Commissioners. I am Project Manager for the Stanford University Medical Center projects. Staff’s recommendation tonight is as Vice-Chair Lippert to essentially review the responses to the unresolved questions received at the March 9 Commission Meeting and the responses to Commissioners questions that were received via email since the March 9 meeting, and then finally to provide comment to Staff on the adequacy of the Final EIR for the SUMC project.

Commissioners, at the last meeting on March 9 Staff presented the Final Environmental Impact Report for the Stanford University projects. As part of Staff’s presentation you heard an overall project timeline, and evolution of the project, and the Environmental Impact Report. Staff provided an overview of the EIR document. Cara Silver from our Attorney’s Office provided information regarding the CEQA findings that were contained in your Staff Report. We talked about Next Steps and the reviews that would happen after the Commission finished their review. At that point the Commission provided comments to Staff.

In the Staff Report for this evening there are questions and responses that Staff has provided with regard to a number of issues that came up at the meeting that Staff was unable to fully answer at that meeting. Much of the questions were provided responses via Staff and our consultants at that meeting but there were a few that remained unresolved. Those relate to the Business as Usual scenario, the regional versus local housing impacts, and the Ardenwood Park and Ride site and its ability to serve East Bay transit users. Those responses are provided in writing in your Staff Report and Commissioners should be able to review those.

In addition to those questions, and since the March 9 meeting, two Commissioners submitted comments via email. We received comments from Commissioner Keller and Commissioner...
Fineberg. Over the past couple of days Staff has provided prepared responses to those questions. Those responses are at your places tonight and they are also available for the public at the back of the room. Commissioners may want to review those as well this evening.

For this evening kind of moving on from here we have PBS&J, our Environmental Impact Report consultants, specifically Rod Jeung is here to provide a general overview of the themes and questions that came up at the last meeting. Then we will have Cara Silver provide some comments regarding the City’s approach to the analysis in the EIR. With that I think I will hand it over to Rod.

Mr. Rod Jeung, PBS&J Consulting: Thank you, Steven. I served as the project director. With me tonight is Kirsten who has been here constantly throughout all these meetings and was instrumental in helping to prepare the document.

As Steven mentioned there were a number of comments that were received subsequent to the March 9 meeting. I first want to acknowledge and commend the Commissioners for their efforts and their diligence at trying to better understand the stacks of papers that have been produced, and to really engage and understand the nature of the mitigation, the nature of the analysis, and how best to ensure that Palo Alto is going to be protected and will not experience some of the impacts that would occur if the mitigation measures were not to come to fruition.

Steven and Curtis asked me to think about the questions that had been received and try to frame some of the emerging themes that were coming out of those questions. Two things really jumped to mind as I was reading through the additional comments that were received. One is there is a tremendous, tremendous reliance on the GO Local Pass. There is a tremendous reliance on other mitigation measures to somehow offset the additional traffic, and vehicular trips that are going to be generated by the project. There is a very legitimate set of questions about what happens if Caltrain is not there to provide the mitigations that we are assuming can be accomplished through the mitigation programs. What happens with some of the other mitigation measures that were identified? So in response we have prepared a written document and I want to just highlight some of the responses that are provided in there that help address that question.

The second question that Steven brought up is the Business as Usual concept, something that emerged primarily out of AB 32 related to greenhouse gas emissions and global warming, and its appropriateness as a baseline for evaluating impacts and the effects of the Stanford project on climate change here in Palo Alto and globally. So those are the two questions and themes that emerged for me.

In regard to the first point the ability of Caltrain to truly accommodate the project demand was evaluated in a number of different fashions. Primarily what we are keying in on is that the EIR has assumed that Caltrain will be able to accommodate 15.8 percent of the future vehicular traffic. Questions have obviously come up with the recent news and dire information from the JPB about the long-term viability of Caltrain. When we looked at the ability of Caltrain to meet that 15.8 percent demand, we did take a look at the three different periods. It wasn’t just done on a daily basis. We looked at the AM Peak, we looked at the PM Peak, and we looked at the
average daily. Then at each peak it was compared with the ridership levels that were found to be on the Caltrain vehicles at that time. So there was a clear apples-to-apples comparison of what the demand would be from the Stanford project assuming the 15.8 percent diversion, and what the ridership was on those trains. In each of those different peak periods it was determined that there would be sufficient capacity on the Caltrain trains to support that additional demand coming from the Stanford project.

There were some questions about the use of the data and whether the information was current enough or was reflecting long-term trends because there had been some trends in Caltrain ridership. When you go back historically and take a look at Caltrain ridership the highest peak ridership occurred in February 2009. The ridership levels that are used in this analysis for comparison purposes of the supply and demand of Caltrain were based on February 2010 ridership levels. So we went back and took a look at how the February 2010 ridership levels compared to the peak levels in February 2009. It turns out that the next two highest years of ridership on Caltrain was in 2008 and in 2010. So we are feeling fairly comfortable that we are looking at a scenario where the Caltrain trains are used pretty heavily, and that the additional increment from the Stanford project would be sort of a worst-case scenario because the trains are heavily used. So that was sort of the picture on how Caltrain would be able to support and meet the demands that are anticipated from Caltrain.

I think the bigger question that was coming out of that particular line of questioning was what happens if in the future we really don’t have Caltrain to rely on, or some of the other mitigation measures? I think it is important here to understand that the mitigation measures have a very rigorous TDM program, a monitoring program, and certain milestones by which Stanford and the City need to get together and make sure things are happening. So during the ramp up period as Stanford is starting to grow and different phases are coming online there is a monitoring program and there are monetary penalties that will be imposed if Stanford is not meeting its targets. If by 2025 it hasn’t met it overall TDM goal then there is another monetary payment penalty that is imposed. I believe it was $4.0 million at 2025. Not necessarily knowing what happens beyond 2025 because this is a long-term project there is going to be ongoing discussions. If after 2025 Stanford is not achieving its TDM targets then there is the opportunity for the City to meet with Stanford and request what additional programs, what additional financial contributions, what other things can be done to ensure that we can achieve that TDM target. Probably as a last case resort the City has the opportunity to rescind the Conditional Use Permit or to modify those conditions. So there are a lot of checkpoints along the way as the project is ramping up and at certain milestones.

Regarding Business and Usual it is a term that has come specifically out of AB 32 in the Scoping Report. You have done a lot of research on this. AB 32 says that we have a set of conditions that are currently unmitigated, a current set of practices, a certain way of living that results in a certain amount of greenhouse gas emissions that are going to occur. If we don’t make any changes to those ways of doing things, building things, operating things we are not going to be able to reduce greenhouse gas emissions to achieve the targets that are specified in that legislation. So the Business as Usual serves as kind of a baseline against which we can measure in the state our progress towards accomplishing the targets that are established by AB 32.
Now clearly if you use that as your baseline where you are assuming nothing is being done it can be interpreted as a fairly low bar. When you think about all the things that Palo Alto is doing like its Climate Protection Plan, like the new standards for Green Building Ordinances and construction. All of those things are going to improve upon that Business as Usual. But the Business as Usual has been defined in AB 32, and it is the way of measuring how successful we are in reaching the targets. Whether that is an appropriate metric to be using or baseline to be using under an EIR document is sort of another question. Here we can go and take a look at what the City has adopted in its Climate Protection Plan. The Climate Protection Plan has basically evolved from the AB 32 targets. So the methodology for deriving that and sort of the definition of a Business as Usual is fairly similar. There is nothing in CEQA that precludes us from being able to adopt a standard of significance that would be comparable to what is called for in AB 32. The fact that the City has the Climate Protection Plan and calls for something comparable allows us to say that Business as Usual serves as a useful baseline from which to measure our improvements.

So when we take a look at Business as Usual we recognize and realize that there is no way we are going to be able to achieve the AB 32 targets, and as a result the EIR would declare that impact to be cumulatively considerable and it would be a significant impact. So when you begin to layer on top of that Business as Usual the new standards that have come in, the City’s Climate Protection Plan, some of the new standards that have been established at the state and take a look at the vehicle miles traveled as a result of the project that is where we got below the 30 percent reduction target that has been established under AB 32. That is how we came to making a declaration that the impact was less than cumulatively considerable.

March 9, at our last meeting we had a lot of discussion about how the project really affects VMT and are we really going to be reducing the vehicle miles traveled, what about if we take into account other considerations of people who are flying in from outside and taking advantage of some of the services and programs that are offered by Stanford. When you get into that level of questioning we are really beginning to delve into speculation about how much travel could occur with or without the project. So the City has worked closely with ourselves and the climate change consultants to establish what we believe to be a fairly conservative and appropriate approach to evaluate the impacts. That in a nutshell is kind of the basis for how we came up with the Business as Usual, how we strove to address the vehicle miles traveled associated with the project, and how we took into account some of the additional energy efficiency measures, the Transportation Demand Management programs, and some of the new standards that are being required by the state. Thank you.

Ms. Cara Silver, Senior Assistant City Attorney: Thank you Rod. To frame the remainder of the hearing tonight I wanted to just go over the purview of the Commission. Again, what we are going to do at this point is solicit the final comments that you have on the Final EIR. A final recommendation regarding the adequacy of the EIR and whether the City Council should certify the EIR will be postponed until you also have the full Resolution on the findings, and it will be heard in conjunction with the Entitlement permits.

At this stage we want to have you make any additional comments that you have. You have provided lots of questions throughout this process. You have also provided additional written
questions following the hearing, and many issues as Rod has mentioned have come up, and these are all very good questions. What CEQA requires in terms of a legally adequate document is really the courts look at whether this is adequate as an informational document. Whether there is substantial evidence in the record to justify the conclusions that the City has made. It is important, this is not something that requires that every single methodology be examined, that every single scenario be run, and it really doesn’t require absolute perfection. It is just really an informational document. So I think that will help frame the issue here in that what we are really looking at are the major significant impacts disclosed, the mitigations measures identified, and are other alternatives adequately addressed. So with that we welcome any final comments on the Environmental Impact Report.

Vice-Chair Lippert: Before we go to the public there were two additional items that we had requested of Staff. One was to report on questions by the public that were asked at the last hearing, and to simply respond to those. We have members of the public here tonight and also watching on public access. So would either the Director or Steven Turner care to respond?

Mr. Turner: The Staff Report goes into detail on those questions that Staff feels were not fully provided at the last meeting. So we took the opportunity over the last two weeks to provide responses to those questions that we felt were left unresolved. So the Staff Report does go into detail regarding those.

The second item that I think Chair Lippert was referring to with regard to an update was our meeting with Menlo Park and the work that we are doing with them to review the traffic analysis and how that would affect the City of Menlo Park.

We had a meeting this afternoon, a Technical Team meeting, with the Staff from the City and staff from Menlo Park. It was a very good working meeting. Menlo Park presented us with a list of about 12 questions that they had with regard to the analysis. We were able to answer many of those. There are a few that we need to follow up with. We have scheduled a second meeting for Tuesday of next week to review those follow up issues with Menlo Park. Menlo Park is preparing for a City Council meeting on April 5 whereby the Council will provide their formal comments to the City of Palo Alto with regard to the adequacy of the Final Environmental Impact Report and its effect on Menlo Park. So overall the meeting with Menlo Park was good and the spirit of working together to resolve the issues was appreciated.

Vice-Chair Lippert: So that will be coming back to us before we take our action on the Certification of the EIR, correct?

Mr. Turner: We can certainly provide you with the outcomes of the Technical Meetings and Menlo Park City Council Meeting when we provide the Commission with information on the other Entitlements.

Vice-Chair Lippert: Great, thank you very much. With that what I will do is open the public hearing. I have one speaker card from Robert Moss. You will have five minutes, Mr. Moss. If there are any other speakers please get in a speaker card. If Stanford wishes to also speak this is the time for them to make their comments. Thank you.
Mr. Robert Moss, Palo Alto: Thank you, Vice-Chair Lippert and Commissioners. This is quite a bit of mitigations. I went through the report and I think the Staff has made an effort to really cover everything, but there are a few items that I think are still open.

One of them was touched on. If a mitigation like the GO Pass is not practical for reasons that have nothing to do with the City or Stanford, Caltrain goes under, asking for a $4.0 million payment is nice, but that is not going to happen for 14 years. I would suggest that that $4.0 million be adjusted for inflation. If we have significant inflation over the next ten years that $4.0 million will buy about $1.0 million worth of real mitigations in 2026. So I suggest that as a way of keeping that the kind of money we are taking about in the mitigation.

Second, this is a huge project and it is going to be going on for 15 or maybe 20 years before it is complete. It is quite possible that some of the mitigations that look perfectly reasonable today don’t work. What do you do? I think it would be useful to have a clause in the approval, because we are talking about giving Stanford a right to build, and if something falls through the cracks, instead of just saying oh my God, what are we going to do now? Have a clause that allows the project to be reopened and then we can take mitigating measures, which we don’t have on the table right now. I will give you just two examples. We could require that housing be built close to the site on Stanford land to house a certain number of the workers in order to reduce traffic, because that is the only way you can get it done. You could require that until traffic is reduced to a specific level the number of patient rooms that can be occupied is reduced by some amount. You reduce the number of patients then you reduce the number of guests that reduce the number of staff. Those are just two examples. Just leave that as a potential corrective action.

Talking about some of the specifics, on Visual Impacts, VQ-2.1, you are going to have the ARB look at what is being proposed and you are saying the ARB can do whatever they want to to make it look better. As you may recall last year I commented on some new procedures that hospitals have undertaken to reduce the need for large buildings. This has actually been implemented in a number of hospitals in the east and Midwest. A hospital the size Stanford is proposing could actually be reduced by as much as 20 percent, and the building height could be reduced by as much as two stories. The cost would be reduced by tens of millions of dollars, and the efficiency of the operation of the building and the hospital is significantly increased. If you have forgotten the reference I gave I can dig it out and give it back to you again, but that should be something that is considered when they look at the visual impact.

Another area that is in the report is on page 65 and 66, exposure to contaminated groundwater and soil, the mitigation HM-3.1 requires that additionally the site remediation assessment shall be subject to review and approval by the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board. I would suggest that that be stricken, and the remediation be overseen by EPA. The Water Board has demonstrated repeatedly that they are incapable of adequate remediation of contaminated sites in Palo Alto. I am in the process of having them removed from oversight. So make it EPA not the Water Board.
Finally, housing. The Staff Report says that CEQA does not require housing mitigations but this project is going to require, according to ABAG, some kind of housing mitigations because there are going to be thousands of jobs created. So there ought to be some provision that if ABAG imposes a housing requirement, and they could impose a requirement for as many as 400 or 500 additional housing units, that Stanford will then be required to contribute to the cost of the additional housing, provide land, provide funds, whatever, but that they are participants. They don’t just stand aside and say we are not involved. So I would like to see that put in as one of the requirements in the EIR. Thank you.

Vice-Chair Lippert: Thank you, Mr. Moss. If there are any other speakers now is the time.

Okay, with that I will close the public hearing and return to the Commission. You have all had your opportunity to get your questions in, they have been distributed to the consultants, they have been answered, and now it is our time to make comments on the FEIR.

As I said, we will not be taking action regarding the adequacy of the EIR, but as Cara Silver explained our charge here this evening is to express our comments regarding the FEIR. We have approximately 50 minutes. That is just enough time I think to get in probably two five-minute rounds of comments, and then we will simply adjourn for the evening by around ten o’clock. So with that Commissioner Keller you have five-minutes to make your first round of comments.

Commissioner Keller: Thank you. I actually have some follow up questions. The first thing is with respect to the City of Palo Alto’s Climate Protection Plan. Could you tell me what the baseline is for the City of Palo Alto’s Climate Protection Plan and how that relates to the notion of Business as Usual? In some sense the Climate Protection Plan has a number of greenhouse gases as the baseline that I understand, and it seems to me that Business as Usual seems to add onto that baseline. So how do increases in population and increases of uses like this Business as Usual affect the City of Palo Alto’s Climate Protection Plan baseline calculations?

Mr. Jeung: I don’t have the information with me, Commissioner Keller. I can’t respond directly to you right now.

Commissioner Keller: Okay, well this is sort of the follow up to that kind of thing. So maybe you can respond later. The second thing is thank you very much for the AECOM document, which is the AM baseline Caltrain analysis. Unless I am looking in the wrong place I don’t see a PM calculation analysis. Am I looking in the wrong place or is it not there?

Mr. Jeung: I believe there was an attachment that accompanied the set of responses that had the lengthier documentation provided by AECOM.

Commissioner Keller: I have that and it looks like it is only the AM and doesn’t say anything about PM as far as I can tell, but maybe I am looking in the wrong place.

Mr. Jeung: Keep on going and I will look for that.

Commissioner Keller: Great. With respect to Caltrain use since we have the calculations by zip code I am wondering if rather than taking the residences by zip code and lumping them together
and saying if you live in San Jose for example, or you live anywhere in Sunnyvale that you are
going to take Caltrain. Doesn’t it make more sense instead to say take the zip codes, and if the
zip codes are within half a mile or a mile or whatever the distance we think is fair to commute to
Caltrain that that should be computed? But on the other hand if your distance to the nearest
Caltrain station is five miles then people are probably not going to commute that way. So I am
wondering whether if you actually have zip codes if that makes more sense than actually
aggregating to cities.

Mr. Jeung: It actually did start with the zip code level. The level of refinement that you are
asking for, that you are seeking, in order to consider who would actually take Caltrain or other
transit services within a half mile of the station obviously makes a lot more sense, but our ability
to use that information or to actually have access to that information was not available. The
information that we got on the residential pattern of the Stanford employees is based on their zip
code, and we didn’t get any more refined than that.

Commissioner Keller: I appreciate that, but there are some zip codes in Sunnyvale for example
that are all the way by 101 or all the way by 280, and people are less likely in those zip codes to
take Caltrain. So if we could take the zip codes that are located within or some portion of the zip
code is located within a mile of a station, and if there is no portion of a zip code that is located
within a mile of a station maybe they are not going to take Caltrain. Maybe a calculation like
that might make sense with the exception of San Francisco where there is enough transit feeding
into the Caltrain station that people within many parts of San Francisco will take it, but that is
probably not the case for much of the peninsula.

The last question I have in this round is with respect to Transportation Demand Management. Is
there a specific performance requirement for the TDM diversion for single occupancy vehicles?
I guess it is 30-some odd percent is supposed to apply or not come by single occupancy vehicles.
If Stanford fails to meet that are they supposed to whatever they can or else what? What is the or
else, and are they required to do whatever it takes to meet that?

Mr. Jeung: At 2025 if they have not met the overall goal there is a meeting between City Staff
and Stanford, and at that point there is an opportunity to explore the different options that would
be available. It could be looking at additional funding. It could be looking at expanding existing
services. It can be taking advantage of other types of transit subsidies that are available at that
time. So it is sort of wide open at that point in order to try to achieve that target.

Commissioner Keller: Well, it seems to me that the target for the General Use Permit is actually
more often than just once in the lifetime of a full build out. The GUP process does have annual
or more periodic. It seems to me that Palo Alto should insist on more periodic measures of
where this is done, and not merely the $4.0 million penalty but something that is done on a
periodic basis and requires specific performance in periodic measures, and in addition, beyond
2025 as well.

Ms. Silver: Commissioner Keller, I believe that was one of the questions that you had submitted
in writing and there was a response to that provided to you today. So just to repeat, there is
annual monitoring, and after 2025 Stanford still must obtain the 35.1 trip diversion. There will continue to be annual reporting and monitoring to verify that.

Commissioner Keller: Thank you. I think it is also realistic to wonder how likely it is that we will actually rescind Stanford Hospital’s CUP. I think that that has as much chance as my getting elected president.

Vice-Chair Lippert: Well, President Keller, we are going to move onto Commissioner Tanaka.

Commissioner Tanaka: I would like to thank the public speaker for coming out and making a few comments. I did have a few questions about some of his comment for Staff. When I read the documents it appeared that almost everything I saw was already adjusted for inflation. Is that not true, or are there some things like the $4.0 million payment, which are flat fees that no matter how high inflation goes will never be adjusted? Can Staff or someone from PBS&J comment on that comment?

Ms. Silver: The $1.8 million figure that represents the current cost of the GO Pass will be adjusted for inflation in the event that Caltrain no longer offers the program. The mitigation measure is written such that the applicant would have to put the $1.8 million as adjusted by inflation into an alternative TDM program.

The $4.0 million figure is really a penalty. It does not have an inflationary factor attached to it. It is one-time penalty.

Commissioner Tanaka: Okay. I didn’t realize that. Wouldn’t it make sense for everything to be adjusted by inflation? Because there is inflation and over 50 years inflation will get pretty high. Would it not make sense to have that kind of provision in there so that everything is inflation adjusted?

Ms. Silver: Are you talking about the $4.0 million penalty?

Commissioner Tanaka: I am talking about all the dollar figures. Shouldn’t it all be uniformly indexed to inflation? Especially over a really long-term project.

Ms. Silver: Right. I think there are two dollar figures that are relevant here. One is the GO Pass figure of $1.8 million that is adjusted by inflation. Then there are the penalties and the penalties are not adjusted by inflation.

Commissioner Tanaka: I see. Is it possible to get them adjusted to inflation, to index to inflation? Is that part of the Development Agreement, or what is the mechanism? It seems logical to me.

Ms. Silver: Penalties typically are not adjusted by inflation. Again, it was a figure that was arrived at in view of the fact that it would be paid on a one-time basis in 2025. To that extent it included inflationary factors, but that is certainly a comment that you can suggest to the Council if you think it is appropriate.
Commissioner Tanaka: Yes, I definitely suggest that, or perhaps deflation should that ever occur. It could work the other way. It seems to have it in constant dollars makes a lot of sense.

Then the other comment Mr. Moss made was about guarantees. Can you also comment on the practicality of that? It seems to be a very tough thing to do. We already have this 2025 check so I don’t if there is – in some way that is our guarantee. I think his comment was to allow the project to be reopened after we had already granted the use.

Ms. Silver: I think Mr. Moss was talking about the Development Agreement, and that is really beyond the purview of this particular hearing talking about the mitigation measures.

Commissioner Tanaka: Okay. What about the EPA versus the Water Board? Does PBS&J have a comment on that?

Mr. Jeung: In the State of California when we have any issues related to hazardous materials contamination or hazardous waste contamination there are two regulatory oversight agencies at the state level of course. DTSC, the Department of Toxic Substance Control is responsible for any of the soil contamination. They are responsible for ensuring that the appropriate level of cleanup is performed, and that the appropriate mitigation measures, and remediation plans are implemented. Their counterpart when anything involves the groundwater is the Regional Water Quality Control Board. So by default any of the references to regulatory agencies within California typically refer to those two. The ability for EPA to step in and take over or maybe co-lead a remediation effort I am not aware of that. I don’t know how that would work.

Commissioner Tanaka: Okay, thank you.

Vice-Chair Lippert: Thank you. We will go onto Commissioner Fineberg. If there are any other Commissioners that have comments please turn on your lights.

Commissioner Fineberg: I would like to thank Staff for the considerable time and our consultants for the considerable time they put into answering our questions. I want to take the first moment just to make sure that the applicant, public, and everyone knows that I am restricting my comments strictly to what is on the agenda tonight, which is reviewing the adequacy of the environmental review. I am not going to talk about the wonderful qualities of the hospital and the reasons it is a benefit to the city, and the need for quality care in the community. We all know that but sometimes that gets forgotten. So enough said on that.

My round of comments is about a determination and the results of whether we measure air quality impacts based on what I will characterize as the way we did it in the DEIR, and I am trying to say this as simply as I can, which I believe was based on using a baseline methodology. Please, Staff, correct me if I am wrong on this. When we switch from the DEIR methodology, which said they were significant and I believe they were unmitigatable, we went to the Final EIR switching to a method using Business as Usual and then they became cumulatively insignificant, and we didn’t count the patient and visitor trips. Beyond that it gets my head starting to spin.
I did some research. I found two papers that I thought helped me to understand it. One was a white paper from the League of California Cities. A second was a statement from the Attorney General’s Office. Staff and consultants have been kind enough to analyze those. The conclusion I draw from it is that we need a decision, I don’t know whether it should come from Council or whether we need to somehow analyze it and recommend to Council, but which method are we measuring our air quality impacts? Are we using the way we did it in the DEIR or are we using the way it now is in our Final draft before us?

To simplify the issue, I see that the League of California Cities says that we are not to confuse the Business as Usual model that comes from the Air Resource Board’s methodology used in scoping plans that we then brought into our Climate Protection Plan with the CEQA required analysis of project effects and comparison to environmental baselines. It doesn’t preclude the use of a significance threshold derived from Business as Usual but the Attorney General says local agencies making decisions need to move away from the Business as Usual. California League of Cities, who I assume is a relatively trusted entity and legitimate source of good information, says that it is not recommended.

The substantive final sentence of Staff’s answer says that “When an agency or entity states that it will reduce emissions by a specific percentage there is always a question as to what the point of comparison is for that reduction.” So I think we need to decide which way we are going to analyze those air quality impacts. I am not sure I know what is right, but going from cumulatively considerable and unmitigatable to cumulatively insignificant. It is a huge difference.

Next topic. I am happy to hear that Menlo Park is working with our Staff. Thank you. I can’t comment right now on the adequacy. I don’t know what their issues are, and will look forward to getting that feedback. That will go to inform us as to what their issues are and what the adequacy of those issues are.

My last area is historic mitigations. We received a letter.

Vice-Chair Lippert: Can you wrap it up?

Commissioner Fineberg: Sure. We received a letter from the Palo Alto Stanford Heritage, which passed forward a document from the National Trust for Historic Preservation recommending the establishment of a community preservation fund. I have not heard discussion of that and I believe that that is something that we need to decide whether it should be included as a mitigation. Maybe we can come back to that or other Commissioners can comment on it on their rounds. Right now we are leaving the demolition of the Stone Building unmitigated.

Vice-Chair Lippert: Actually, I believe that that is something that Staff will need to respond to in terms of their Final report in terms of Entitlements, etc. That is not really relevant to the FEIR.

Ms. Silver: Chair Lippert, to address Commissioner Fineberg’s earlier comment I did want to make a clarification regarding Business as Usual. It is a very complicated topic. I believe this is
the first EIR that the City has prepared that has analyzed greenhouse gas impacts to this extent. It certainly is an evolving field and it is very complex. On top of all of that complexity the CEQA thresholds changed somewhat throughout the process that the EIR was being prepared. So that adds a new level of complexity as well.

A couple of clarifications with regard to that. The papers that you were citing actually relate to greenhouse gas climate change impacts as opposed to air quality. The air quality is analyzed separately. I thought you knew the distinction but I just wanted to clarify for the record. So we are referring to greenhouse gas impacts, and that is really the area that CEQA law is still evolving in and trying to wrestle with how do you deal with a global impact when CEQA is really designed to analyze and mitigate local impacts. That is why this is a tough issue.

I also wanted to clarify that in this area the difference between the DEIR analysis and the Final EIR analysis was not on the methodology. Both documents employed the Business as Usual methodology. The difference was that in the DEIR it looked at the patient and visitor trips in terms of the vehicle miles traveled. The Final EIR though we took those out because there was a determination made that it was really too speculative to figure out where, or which continent, or which state even that patients would be coming from. So that was removed. Then the construction worker VMT trips were actually added in. In both documents the Business as Usual methodology was employed.

Vice-Chair Lippert: Thank you. Commissioner Garber.

Commissioner Garber: I actually have no more comments or questions so I will pass. We can go to the next person.

Vice-Chair Lippert: Commissioner Martinez.

Commissioner Martinez: On page 39 of the Staff Report we talk about the demise of the Stone Building. I am certainly no expert to say this was his best work or how we measure its loss, or on the other hand how Stanford University measures the utility of an antiquated building. I do know that just requiring the photographs with a certain level of mega pixels and that seems kind of inadequate. Not so much for preservation versus not preservation, but really for the memories of the people who this hospital impacted their life in one way or another. It just seems to be there needs to be a greater acknowledgement of the passing of the Stone Building than what is represented here. Maybe it is represented somewhere else, I don’t know. Whether it is placing a memorial garden or some structure to memorialize the lives saved and lost during over 50 years I think would be more important to many of us than the debate over how to preserve whatever is left after the new hospital is built. Thank you.

Mr. Turner: Commissioner Martinez, just to let you know, Mitigation Measure CR-1.4 that is listed on page 41 does have a mitigation for a permanent interpretive display, signage, or plaques. It doesn’t go into detail about what those are or should be, but we do have a mitigation in there that I think…
Commissioner Martinez: I saw that but it doesn’t really say where those go. They could be on the side of the new building or something. So I just thought really replacing something in place where the hospital once stood and letting people know about it with the plaques and such there might be a stronger message than what we are reading here. Thanks, Steven.

Vice-Chair Lippert: Commissioner Garber, you had a follow up.

Commissioner Garber: Just a thought, Commissioner. In Chicago the Sullivan Stock Exchange which was demolished under significantly different circumstances, the arch was preserved and actually made part of the landscaping of the Art Institute there. There may be some architecturally significant portion of the hospital, the screen, the concrete screening, etc. that could be used in some way as a possible way of memorializing the previous structure.

Vice-Chair Lippert: Yes, I too am sensitive to the historic nature of the building, but also wanted to remind Commissioners Martinez and Garber that it is not just the notable architect but it is also the notable physicians that were there. Doctor Norman Shumway had performed groundbreaking if not revolutionary heart surgery and techniques there that should be appropriately acknowledged.

My comments are very basic. First of all, I want to thank all the consultants that worked on this. This is a remarkable piece. I don’t believe that there is any stone that remained unturned. I also want to thank the public. I think they did an outstanding job both with the Draft EIR as well as with the Final EIR in terms of bringing their comments back to us. I want to thank the patients of Stanford University, particularly the Medical Center Staff, and the Land Use Planning Staff for enduring this process. I want to thank my fellow Commissioners for the thoroughness of going through this document and raising your questions, doing it in a timely fashion, and now in the process that will ensue making your comments, and hopefully we will be able to certify the adequacy of this document.

In the remaining time I just want to make a personal comment that this document has been a moving target. Greenhouse gas emissions I don’t think were on the radar when we actually began this. As it came into focus I think it was seamlessly incorporated into this process in a way that is meaningful. By that I mean you can look at greenhouse gas emissions and you can go down to the products that will be transported to this building, or in my personal case the patients that will come from far corners of the world.

With that I want to lay on something a little personal here. My mother has advanced Parkinson’s disease. She didn’t receive treatment at Stanford Medical Center so it is not a conflict of interest. This is going on 20 years ago. She had received experimental surgery. It was done at Good Samaritan in Los Angeles and she came from southeast Florida to receive this treatment. So there were greenhouse gas emissions associated with her coming out to California. She lived in Los Angeles for a couple of months while she underwent this procedure, returned home, and then most recently as six years ago she had another procedure done to again arrest her Parkinson’s. This was done in Oxnard at St. John’s, again experimental, groundbreaking Parkinson’s surgery. Well, my mother would not be around today if it were not for this experimental surgery.
I use this as purely anecdotal that Stanford is a world-class facility. Just as my mother went to these facilities for groundbreaking surgery people from around the world will be coming to Stanford for these groundbreaking experimental procedures. I don’t know if it is the basis for which we can make a Statement of Overriding Considerations or recommend that, but certainly the standard by which Stanford should be weighed is the same standards that we apply to other facilities such as Hewlett Packard in the Research Park or Google or Facebook, or any other entity. That would be the level that I would look to see that this Final EIR met in terms of the creative innovation that would be applied from this facility. It is not just a medical facility. This is integral to the health and economic well-being of this community as well as people from around the world.

So with that I have note here. I think Commissioner Tanaka wants to say something very briefly and then we will go through another round of comments. You will do it during your turn? Okay, fine, if that is the case we will go with Commissioner Keller followed by Tanaka.

Commissioner Keller: Thank you. I agree with Chair Lippert that no stone has been unturned but the Stone Building will be upturned. That being said, first I would like to thank the members of the public who participated in this, most of who have now left or are watching it on TV at some point, or maybe read it in the newspaper. Also thanks to the Staff for their work on this project, and especially thanking the EIR consultants for a detailed and careful analysis. In particular patience with our questions and as a generator of a lot of them I particularly take that to heart.

As mentioned by Commissioner Fineberg the Stanford Medical Center nobody questions is an important asset to the community, region, the state, and the world. That is one of the considerations of what Business as Usual means in terms of that is that it is an asset to not merely the community but people come from far and wide as was pointed out by Chair Lippert.

Having the Stanford Medical Center be earthquake safe as a hospital is particularly important considering the recent events in Japan and the likelihood of an earthquake on the Hayward Fault in the near future.

I think that there is a need to reconcile the City’s Climate Protection Plan and the approach with the Business as Usual. In particular, effectively with Business as Usual talking about an increase in the baseline to affect the Business as Usual and how does that increase the baseline for the Climate Protection Plan? I think that that question is unanswered and I am not sure how we will make up for the necessary decrease the Climate Protection Plan talks about.

I also point out that $4.0 million is about one-tenth of one percent of the cost of the project. So that is significant amount of money but in the large scheme of how much it costs it is a slap on the wrist in some sense. Whether that is good or bad or not is interesting.

With respect to the answer to the question Q5 of mine, it does indicate that the City of Menlo Park’s traffic impact significance thresholds are a lot more stringent than Palo Alto’s. The statement here that the City of Menlo Park’s criteria would likely increase the number of
intersections and roadways upon which significant impacts are expected to occur since they allow only small increments of additional delay. So that says something about what we are doing in Palo Alto. Now we live next to Menlo Park. Somehow there are more impacts in Menlo Park because they take a closer look at it, than there are impacts in Palo Alto, and yet much of the traffic to the hospital goes through Palo Alto. Something seems wrong about that and that is because Palo Alto is fairly lax compared to Menlo Park about traffic impacts. I think that is something we should consider in the future about changing those significance thresholds.

In terms of question 2 where I talk about the zip code and diversion, I think we have already talked about that briefly. Zip codes that have no part of them within a mile of Caltrain are unlikely to be using Caltrain particularly as you go closer to the Stanford Medical Center.

In particular, my question 9 talks about the consideration of the traffic analysis and the idea that the traffic analysis is uniform. That says that regardless of where people come from we are going to uniformly reduce traffic from all directions, doesn’t seem to make as much sense. If you are taking into account Caltrain ridership where it comes from then where that Caltrain ridership is going drives where people come from, and that should drive how they get here. So that should be taken into account.

The reduction in Caltrain is not going to reduce the amount of people coming from the East Bay. So people coming from the East Bay they are coming through Embarcadero Road, they are coming through various other routes from the East Bay. So the reductions from Caltrain from San Jose or San Francisco are incommensurate.

So with my remaining seconds left let me say that I appreciate the work of Stanford in working hard with this project. I am disappointed that the Stanford Shopping Center changes were withdrawn from this because I think it is very unlikely that there won’t be an expansion to the Stanford Shopping Center before 2025. That seems to have been a strategic change that delayed the completion of Draft Environmental Impact Report and the Final Environmental Impact Report. If the Stanford Shopping Center had been included we would be probably a year or so closer. We would have already approved this project. It would be underway and it would already be under construction. So thank you very much for all the work of everybody doing this. I look forward to our next meeting where we discuss recommendations to the Council. Thank you for giving me the follow up questions answered. Thank you.

Ms. Silver: Excuse me Chair Lippert, again if I could just chime in on the greenhouse gas impacts. As you were talking Commissioner Keller, I looked up the numbers in our Climate Protection Plan. It was discussed in the DEIR of course, but just to refresh the City’s Climate Protection Plan has a goal of achieving 15 percent below the 2005 emission levels by 2020. That metric is derived from AB 32 and in the impact analysis it was translated into the metric that was used that was a more uniform metric. So the Climate Protection Plan goals were analyzed in the EIR.

Commissioner Keller: If there is a certain number that is in the Climate Protection Plan and Business as Usual says that the baseline is actually increased in some sense, or if there is an increase in the population in Palo Alto or other development, does that correspondingly increase
our 2005 number that we are using as the baseline? Or are we still stuck with that baseline and
15 percent below that by 2020?

Ms. Silver: Are you talking about in our Climate Protection Plan?

Commissioner Keller: Yes. In our Climate Protection Plan there is a number in there.

Ms. Silver: Right.

Commissioner Keller: I am wondering if we have committed ourselves to 15 percent below that
number or if that number will be adjusted for increases in the population, and increases that are
indicated here for the Business as Usual for the Stanford Hospital?

Ms. Silver: There is a 2005 metric baseline that was used for calculating. When you incorporate
Business as Usual the reduction then has to be greater than what was projected for 2005. So
there was a calculation made to account for new development and that is the final metric that was
used in the EIR.

Commissioner Keller: I will follow up separately.

Vice-Chair Lippert: May I make a suggestion here? I think that we are beginning to get into the
discussion of mitigations and entitlements, etc. in interpreting this data. I think you laid it out
very well. The consultants laid it out very well that AB 32 is a relatively new thing as it unfolds
in this EIR. What I think is probably appropriate, and I am sure Commissioner Keller would
concur with me, is perhaps we should have the City’s Sustainability Coordinator come to the
next review of this document in terms of the mitigations and how this might be handled as we go
down the road. We are not taking action on it tonight and it really is going to have to be
managed by the City Manager’s Office and the Sustainability Coordinator. Commissioner
Tanaka.

Commissioner Tanaka: I am not sure I need to make this disclosure but I will just in case. Last
Thursday my daughter had surgery at Stanford Hospital.

Vice-Chair Lippert: Did you pay for it?

Commissioner Tanaka: I think my insurance company paid for it.

Vice-Chair Lippert: Then I think you are covered.

Commissioner Tanaka: I might have a co-pay, I am not sure actually. My kids were born there
as well, but other than that I have no other affiliation with Stanford Hospital. I do share the
Chair’s comments about thanking everyone involved in the process. It has been a very long
process but it is a very complete document. I want to thank everyone, Stanford, Staff, PBS&J,
the consultants, the public for coming out and really making this happen and pushing it forward.
I think clearly everyone on this Commission and in the community understands the importance
of having a cutting-edge research facility to have other new techniques developed like heart
transplants and the ability to handle disasters like earthquakes. So I just wanted to thank
everyone for their work.

Vice-Chair Lippert: Commissioner Fineberg? No. Commissioner Garber? No. Commissioner
Martinez? Then I think we have concluded our business here this evening. Thank you all. We
will adjourn and we will pick this up sometime in April. Thank you.