

Special Meeting
November 26, 2007

1. Review of Climate Protection Plan..... 2
2. Adoption of a Resolution Expressing Appreciation to Debra Remley Upon Her Retirement 3
3. Adoption of a Resolution Expressing Appreciation to Jay Remley Upon His Retirement..... 4
4. Ordinance 4975 entitled "Ordinance of the Council of the City of Palo Alto Repealing and Reenacting Title 15 of the Palo Alto Municipal Code to Adopt the California Fire Code, 2007 Edition, and Local Amendments thereto, and Chapters 3, 4, 5, and 25 and Chapter One Appendix of the International Fire Code" 4
5. Ordinance 4976 entitled "Ordinance of the Council of the City of Palo Alto Repealing Chapter 16.04 of the Palo Alto Municipal Code and Amending Title 16 to Adopt a New Chapter 16.04, California Building Code, California Historical Building Code, and California Existing Building Code, 2007 Editions, and Local Amendments"; (2) Ordinance 4977 entitled "Ordinance of the Council of the City of Palo Alto Amending Title 16 of the Palo Alto Municipal Code to Adopt a New Chapter 16.05, California Mechanical Code and Appendix Chapters A and D, 2007 Edition"; (3) Ordinance 4978 entitled "Ordinance of the Council of the City of Palo Alto Repealing Chapter 16.08 of the Palo Alto Municipal Code and Amending Title 16 to Adopt a New Chapter 16.08, California Plumbing Code, 2007 Edition, and Local Amendments"; (4) Ordinance 4979 entitled "Ordinance of the Council of the City of Palo Alto Repealing Chapter 16.16 of the Palo Alto Municipal Code and Amending Title 16 to Adopt a New Chapter 16.16, California Electrical Code, 2007 Edition, and Local Amendments"; and (5) Ordinance 4980 entitled "Ordinance of the Council of the City of Palo Alto Amending Title 16 of the Palo Alto Municipal Code to Adopt a New Chapter 16.17, California Energy Code, 2005 Edition" 5
6. Resolution 8770 entitled "Resolution of the Council of the City of Palo Alto Approving a Class Cost Recovery Policy Applicable to Community Services Department Classes and Camps" 5

7. Stanford University Medical Center and Shopping Center Expansion Projects..... 6
8. Project Review of Stanford Shopping Center: Identification of Issues for EIR and Development Agreement Negotiations; Project Update and Review of Community Input Related to Land Use, Housing, Transportation, Sustainability and Open Space Issues for the Stanford Shopping Center Expansion Projects; Request for City Council Initiation of Title 18 (Zoning) Amendments: City Council Initiation of Changes to Title 18 (Zoning) to Revise the Existing Development Cap of the Shopping Center so that Proposed Zoning Changes Can be Studied as Part of EIR and Status of environmental and entitlement reviews 6

COUNCIL COMMENTS, ANNOUNCEMENTS, AND REPORTS FROM CONFERENCES..... 17

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 11:37 p.m..... 17

The City Council of the City of Palo Alto met on this date in the Council Chambers at 6:03 p.m.

Present: Barton, Beecham, Cordell, Drekmeier, Kishimoto, Klein, Kleinberg, Mossar

Absent: Morton

STUDY SESSION

1. Review of Climate Protection Plan

Municipal (City Government generated) emissions were estimated at 65,329 metric tons CO₂e. Primary sources included: City operations and facilities, Energy use, Fuel use, RWQCP use, Fugitive emissions from natural gas pipeline, and purchase of materials and supplies

The CPP also looked at Community emissions. The approach taken was the emissions were included if they were "owned" as result of actions or behaviors. This approach was more exhaustive than many other cities have done and have included sources not often included in inventories such as upstream emissions from discarded recyclables and a comprehensive cost/benefit analysis.

There are three main sources of community emissions. These were:

- Transportation (333,400 metric tons CO₂) which consisted of commute to Palo Alto, commute from Palo Alto, non commute auto travel, and air travel.

- Energy Use (295,016 metric tons CO₂) which consisted of gas and electricity use, each of which comprise about 50% of total.
- Solid Waste (100,304 metric tons CO₂e) which consisted of fugitive emissions from landfill in Palo Alto and other landfills. This estimate includes upstream emissions from items which could be recycled or composted but instead are deposited into waste stream, but does not include emissions from PASCO trucks but will be included in future inventories.

Based on this inventory, Staff proposed three goals. These were:

- Short Term Goal (July 2009) = 5% reduction in City generated emissions = 3,266 metric tons
- Medium Term Goal (July 2012) = 5% reduction in City and Community generated emissions = 39,702 metric tons
- Long Term Goal (July 2019) = 15% reduction in City and Community generated emissions = 119,070 metric tons to bring us in line with State goals

The short term goals can be achieved through increasing current programs at minimal cost to the City. Some of the medium term goals can be achieved through ongoing programs with additional resources, but additional cost benefit analysis needs to be completed first. Meeting medium term goals also requires public education and engagement as the City can not achieve goals on its own. Long term goals require significant additional investments, especially in achieving goals of Zero Waste Plan. These goals also necessitate public involvement.

The Sustainability team asked that the Council consider the following actions at the subsequent Council meeting:

- Acceptance of inventory estimates
- Conceptual acceptance of goals laid out in CPP
- Integration of emissions reductions into Comprehensive Plan
- Begin implementing short term cost-effective measures
- Allocate funding to conduct more detailed cost benefit studies for achieving medium and long term goals and initiate efforts to involve the community in achieving the reduction goals

No action required.

SPECIAL ORDERS OF THE DAY

2. Adoption of a Resolution Expressing Appreciation to Debra Remley Upon Her Retirement

MOTION: Council Member Beecham moved, seconded by Barton, to approve the resolution.

MOTION PASSED: 8-0, Morton absent.

3. Adoption of a Resolution Expressing Appreciation to Jay Remley Upon His Retirement

MOTION: Council Member Beecham moved, seconded by Barton, to approve the resolution.

MOTION PASSED: 8-0, Morton absent.

Jay Remley thanked the City, the residents, the Council Members and fellow employees who helped make his employment at the City a great career.

Debra Remley thanked Carl Yeats for his patience, understanding and leadership over the past nine years.

Director of Administrative Services Department Carl Yeats expressed his appreciation for Debra's services at the City of Palo Alto.

Director of Public Works Glenn Roberts expressed his appreciation for Jay and stated that he not only recognized problems but he proposed solutions and he would be missed.

Mayor Kishimoto stated that the City and the residents have really benefited from their contributions.

CONSENT CALENDAR

Council Member Kleinberg stated she would not participate in Items 4 and 5 due to a conflict as she had been employed by Joint Ventures Silicon Valley Network for two years to create a coalition of cities, including Palo Alto, to dissuade cities from adopting amendments to codes.

MOTION: Council Member Mossar moved, seconded by Beecham, to approve Consent Calendar Items 4-6.

4. Ordinance 4975 entitled "Ordinance of the Council of the City of Palo Alto Repealing and Reenacting Title 15 of the Palo Alto Municipal Code to Adopt the California Fire Code, 2007 Edition, and Local Amendments thereto, and Chapters 3, 4, 5, and 25 and Chapter One Appendix of the International Fire Code"

5. Ordinance 4976 entitled "Ordinance of the Council of the City of Palo Alto Repealing Chapter 16.04 of the Palo Alto Municipal Code and Amending Title 16 to Adopt a New Chapter 16.04, California Building Code, California Historical Building Code, and California Existing Building Code, 2007 Editions, and Local Amendments"; (2) Ordinance 4977 entitled "Ordinance of the Council of the City of Palo Alto Amending Title 16 of the Palo Alto Municipal Code to Adopt a New Chapter 16.05, California Mechanical Code and Appendix Chapters A and D, 2007 Edition"; (3) Ordinance 4978 entitled "Ordinance of the Council of the City of Palo Alto Repealing Chapter 16.08 of the Palo Alto Municipal Code and Amending Title 16 to Adopt a New Chapter 16.08, California Plumbing Code, 2007 Edition, and Local Amendments"; (4) Ordinance 4979 entitled "Ordinance of the Council of the City of Palo Alto Repealing Chapter 16.16 of the Palo Alto Municipal Code and Amending Title 16 to Adopt a New Chapter 16.16, California Electrical Code, 2007 Edition, and Local Amendments"; and (5) Ordinance 4980 entitled "Ordinance of the Council of the City of Palo Alto Amending Title 16 of the Palo Alto Municipal Code to Adopt a New Chapter 16.17, California Energy Code, 2005 Edition"
6. Resolution 8770 entitled "Resolution of the Council of the City of Palo Alto Approving a Class Cost Recovery Policy Applicable to Community Services Department Classes and Camps"

MOTION PASSED for Item 4 and 5: 7-0, Kleinberg not participating, Morton absent.

MOTION PASSED for Item 6: 8-0, Morton absent.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Council Member Cordell stated she would not participate in Item 7a and 7b due to a conflict of interest because she was employed by Stanford University.

Vice Mayor Klein stated he would not participate in Item 7a and 7b due to a conflict of interest because his wife was employed by Stanford University.

Council Member Mossar stated she would not participate in Item 7a and 7b due to a conflict of interest because her husband was employed by Stanford University.

7. Stanford University Medical Center and Shopping Center Expansion Projects

- a. Project Review of Stanford Medical Center: Identification of Issues for EIR and Development Agreement Negotiations; Project Update and Review of Community Input Related to Land Use, Housing, Transportation, Sustainability and Open Space Issues for the Stanford University Medical Center Modernization and Expansion Projects, Request for City Council Initiation of Title 18 (Zoning) Amendments and City Council Initiation of Changes to Title 18 (Zoning) for Hospital and Related Uses, so that Proposed Zoning Changes Can be Studied as Part of EIR and Status of environmental and entitlement reviews
- b. Project Review of Stanford Shopping Center: Identification of Issues for EIR and Development Agreement Negotiations; Project Update and Review of Community Input Related to Land Use, Housing, Transportation, Sustainability and Open Space Issues for the Stanford Shopping Center Expansion Projects; Request for City Council Initiation of Title 18 (Zoning) Amendments: City Council Initiation of Changes to Title 18 (Zoning) to Revise the Existing Development Cap of the Shopping Center so that Proposed Zoning Changes Can be Studied as Part of EIR and Status of environmental and entitlement reviews

City Manager Frank Benest stated that specific negotiations would start after the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) studies had been conducted and there were specific data regarding the impacts of the two projects. He stated the goal was to arrive at a package of mitigations and benefits that would have great benefit for the community and the region. Phase one was the development of the area hospital plan and a preliminary identification of issues. Phase Two would be the EIR and the entitlement phase.

Marlene Berkoff, Peer Review Consultant stated there had been major questions that had been addressed: 1) why were the essential replacement of the adult Stanford University Hospital and the expansion of the Lucile Packard Children's Hospital projects happening in the first place; 2) why they were proposed at being so big; 3) Code compliance issues with seismic codes and space issues. There was a population study done in the Bay Area and there would be a 35 percent increase in bed demand in Santa Clara and San Mateo Counties. There were issues with patient rooms: 1) changing rooms from double to single rooms; and 2) the sizes of the rooms have changed but are consistent with the size of rooms across the nation. There were two things that were driving the building configurations that were being proposed by Stanford: 1) the limited site area; 2) to keep all of the existing operations going during the transition.

Director of Planning Steve Emslie stated some of the documents the Planning and Transportation Commission (P&TC) and the Council would be reviewing were the Development Agreement and an EIR. Staff was asking for further direction from the Council and from the public on the framework for the negotiations. The Stanford University Medical Center was asking for an establishment of a new zoning district, which would accompany development standards and would address future minor amendments. The zoning changes for the shopping center were different as they were at their full build out and there was no potential future expansion.

Art Spellmeyer, Senior Vice President Simon Property Group stated that the significant impacts would be identified in the EIR process.

Martha Marsh, Chief Executive Officer of Stanford Hospital and Clinics stated that the peer review validated that the proposal was consistent with standards that were moving forward in the healthcare industry. There had been delays in surgery because of not having enough patient beds, emergency rooms were overcrowded, and the ambulances were on diversion.

Christopher Dawes, Chief Executive Officer of the Lucile Packard Children's Hospital stated that both of the hospitals had been through an extensive process to determine how many beds would be needed. He stated that both hospitals were running at 80 percent of occupancy with periods of 100 percent where the normal would be at about 75 percent.

Dr. Phillip Pizzo, Dean for the Stanford Medical School stated there had been a lot of evolutions and revolutions founded at Stanford.

Mr. Benest stated that staff was underway in preparing technical studies as well as a Draft EIR. There would be a preliminary architectural review, negotiations regarding the Development Agreement and project updates from the P&TC and the Council.

Planning & Transportation Commission Vice-Chair Daniel Garber clarified that the City Manager's Report (CMR) had two recommendations for each CMR. The first portion of the CMR asked for identification of issues, the second part dealt with various zoning actions that the P&TC had not yet addressed. He stated that both Stanford and the City had chances to mitigate the impacts it would have on the community. Both the public and Planning and Transportation Commissioners have spoken regarding the Development Agreement going on parallel with the EIR Study.

Public Hearing was opened at 8:34 p.m.

Lee Wieder, 637 Middlefield Road stated the Chamber of Commerce Board of Directors supported in concept, the proposed renewal and replacement program. This hospital was the only level one-trauma center between San Francisco and San Jose. This meant major participation in emergency preparedness and disaster planning for Palo Alto and the Silicon Valley.

Tina Peak, 160 Palo Alto Avenue stated Stanford wanted to increase the amount of beds by 35 percent because of increased population but from 1980 to 2000, there had only been a population increase in Palo Alto of six percent. She asked that if Stanford wanted to be a large regional hospital it should be built in San Jose. Palo Alto was not an appropriate venue for a large regional hospital and she opposed these projects.

Edward R. Holland, 1111 Parkinson Avenue encouraged people to help maintain the state of the art facility that resides in Palo Alto.

Chuck Fonseca, 43555 Grimmer Boulevard stated he worked at Stanford Hospital and expressed his concerns that the building projects had direct impacts on many of the members of his Union, SEIU. The hospitals had refused to deal with their union and he asked the community members to hear their concerns. He asked to see addressed in the agreements: 1) the availability of affordable housing; 2) the impact of developments on transportation; 3) environmental consequences; 4) protection of parks and open spaces; 5) local hiring and job training; 6) promoting family, supporting wages and benefits, job security and the right to organize.

Arden Anderson, 807 Oregon Avenue stated his family stayed in Palo Alto because of the many assets this community had including Stanford Medical Center and he supported the projects.

C. J. Wilson stated we should be looking at how these projects were going to impact people as employees, transportation, housing, job quality and the environment. There would be an increased quality of care but would that affect the cost of the care.

Thomas Taylor, 2140 High Street asked the Council to optimize the hospitals potentials and the benefits their services would enrich.

Michael Anderson, 1300 Trinity, Menlo Park stated he agreed with the comments made by the Mayor in the Daily Newspaper regarding traffic and housing.

John Stern, 1303 Cowper Street asked the Council to place as few limitations and guidelines on the design as possible so that planners could construct a world class Medical Center.

Tommy Fehrenbach, Middlefield Road stated he was confident that the City and Stanford could come to a solution that best fits our dynamic community.

Sandra Lonnquist stated Stanford was one of the key employers in our community and she supported the project.

Mark Sabin, 533 Alberta Avenue stated this project would be a tremendous public benefit to the community and he supported this project.

Kathleen Much, 128 Hillside Avenue, Menlo Park stated Stanford provided incredibly good health care and she supported the project.

Stanley Peters, 128 Hillside Avenue, Menlo Park stated the goals of Stanford were exactly in line with the goals of our community.

Brian Schmidt, Committee for Green Foothills, 3921 East Bayshore Road stated they supported the Mayor's opinion in the Weekly.

Robert Moss, 4010 Orme Street stated these were regional facilities and it was inappropriate for the citizens of Palo Alto to bare the burden of the environmental impacts that would be imposed by this development. Stanford and the Children's Hospital should pay the impacts that were imposed.

Bruce Feldstein, 2891 Greer Road stated there had been many children from all over the country that come to these hospitals and Palo Alto becomes there home away from home while being treated.

Crystal Gamage, 1568 Channing Avenue stated that any proposed mitigation for environmental impacts should not delay redesign or stop the completion of the hospital plan.

Dr. Bruce N. Baker, 3195 Kipling Street asked the Council to share in the many successes of Stanford by supporting Stanford.

Barbara Newton, 2332 Branner Drive, Menlo Park stated this project would have impact on Palo Alto but would also service surrounding communities.

Jose Arzate, 3122 David Avenue stated we should keep the only level one trauma center between San Francisco and San Jose.

Tracy Fallecker stated patient care was the most important issue and design had a large impact on how care was delivered on the bedside. She asked the Council to focus on patient care and making it a top priority.

Susie Thom, 753 Maplewood Place stated this was an opportunity to balance the community's desires with the hospital project goals. She asked everyone to commit to working together on how to mitigate any impacts outlined in

the EIR so an expanded and up-to-date medical facility would be available when needed.

Craig Barney, 3218 Maddux Drive stated there were additional facilities needed in our area and he applauded the Council for conducting an outside peer review.

Ellen Wyman, 546 Washington Avenue stated that the public was not well informed on this item and asked that the recommendation of the rezoning return at another time.

Gordon Newell stated the City was very fortunate to have this facility and staff available to us and he supported the expansion.

Sally Probst, Coastland Drive stated there was cutting edge help and training for physicians available at Stanford Hospital and Lucile Packard Hospital and she supported the expansions.

Joe Hopkins, MD, 3264 Murray Way stated there were many reasons why the expansion should happen from safety to patient privacy and he supported the expansion.

Jeanne Kennedy, 680 Lowell Avenue stated that medical care was very important to everyone and she supported the expansion.

John King, 724 Barron Avenue stated the hospital expansion would provide a state of the art facility for the staff to work in as well as a safe facility and he supported the expansion.

Stephen Player, 1874 Guinda Street stated that we should be working together as a partnership for a reasonable solution and he supported the expansion.

Daniel Bernstein MD, 414 Bellview Drive stated there were babies and children that were unable to get into surgery due to lack of beds and he supported the expansion of the hospitals.

Sunny Dykwel, 480 Gary Court stated the expansion plans for the Shopping Center would provide needed revenue for the City. She asked the Council to negotiate a larger hotel and a convention center, which would increase Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) for the City.

Twila Harrison, 3549 Middlefield Road stated she supported the expansion plan.

Reverend John Harrison, 3549 Middlefield stated that Stanford was a place of healing and hope and he supported the expansion.

Hal Mickelson, Box 20062 Stanford, stated there was a need to expand and maintain a world-class facility and he supported the expansion.

Joel Spolin, 357 Whitclem Place stated facilities were needed for his family, community and for his business and he supported the expansion plan.

Jon Stoumel, 1630 Castilleja Avenue stated the housing needs would be met by the marketplace and should not be a hospital problem to solve. He stated that he supported the expansion.

Dr. Robert Norris, 701 Welch Rd, Suite C stated that Stanford was a vital resource to the community being the only level one trauma center between San Francisco and San Jose, a designated stroke center, critical cardiovascular intervention center, and a pediatric critical care center. He added that ten percent of patients were being seen in the hallways because of lack of bed capacity and he supported the expansion.

Emily Renzel, 1056 Forest Avenue asked that the rezoning return to the P&TC and she asked where this Stanford project would ever end.

Tom Jordan, 474 Churchill Avenue stated the impacts and costs of this project were not available yet and there needed to be more data available for any decision were made.

Nancy Alexander, 435 Santa Rita stated that entering into a Development Agreement would be premature because the environmental and fiscal impacts were not yet available. The impacts of the hospital, shopping center and the proposed housing would need to be identified before a Development Agreement was written and committed upon.

Michael Griffin, 344 Poe Street stated this was one of the most complex development proposals ever to come before the City and he asked that the negotiations be put on hold until there was more information on the project.

Jennifer Varno, Lytton Gardens Senior Communities stated the environmental impacts were important and complex and now was the time to put the right technologies and medical facilities into place. She supported the expansion.

Andy Doty, 4072 Scripps Avenue stated that Stanford was an incredible asset to the community and to the entire region and he supported the expansion.

Public Hearing closed at 10:38 p.m.

Council Member Drekmeier stated that there were structural performance categories per building which required meeting standards by a certain time. He asked whether these numbers were confirmed.

Ms. Berkoff stated there were two structural analyses done by two structural engineers.

Council Member Drekmeier asked whether they could get a map showing the different structures in the highest needs for upgrades.

Ms. Berkoff stated that Stanford did have plans that showed the buildings.

Council Member Drekmeier asked whether they could expand by 400 thousand square feet to meet the current needs and not expand the operation.

Assistant Director of Planning Curtis Williams stated there was a reduced size alternative for the facility but that would not add beds.

Council Member Drekmeier stated that Area B was to remain open space for 25 years and the area was outside of Palo Alto. He asked whether an annexation of the area was considered and how much the School District would be able to add to the concerns of population growth.

Mr. Benest stated that the Development Agreement indicated Area B would be open space and there was an exception that would allow for housing within those 25 years. The issue of annexing could be discussed at a different time. The City would share the demographic and employment data with the School District.

MOTION: Council Member Beecham moved, seconded by Barton, to approve staff recommendation to 1) review and provide input regarding key issues related to the Stanford University Medical Center (SUMC) Facilities Replacement and Renewal Project to inform the EIR process and form the basis of negotiations for the development agreement and 2) initiate changes to Title 18 (Zoning) to accommodate hospital and related uses (including housing and open space) so that the proposed changes can be studied as part of the EIR.

AMENDMENT: Mayor Kishimoto moved, seconded by Drekmeier not to initiate the zoning amendment at this time, but to direct staff to work with the Planning and Transportation Commission to draft a hospital amendment and then to initiate the zoning at a later date.

AMENDMENT FAILED: 2-3, Drekmeier, Kishimoto yes.

Council Member Beecham stated this was a long process, which would take several years, and these were necessary steps. The item for consideration recommends a broad spectrum of thoughts about what should be considered in review and evaluation of the projects and do not represent a final comprehensive list of the issues.

Mayor Kishimoto asked whether the list in attachment A was expected to be accepted into the Motion.

Mr. Benest stated that the list was the framework for the project but if the list was unchanged that would be the framework to move forward with.

Mayor Kishimoto stated that acceptance of the issues were part of the Motion.

Council Member Barton stated he did support the Motion relative to the issues list and he did not want to spend a lot of time changing and prioritizing because that would be considered negotiations in public which would be very unwise.

Council Member Drekmeier asked to add a discussion regarding storm water retention basins on Stanford land, which was one community benefit that only Stanford could provide.

Council Member Beecham asked the staff how they would like to add comments to the list.

Mr. Benest stated that issues regarding storm water retention would be under item 42.

Council Member Drekmeier asked what the role of the P&TC was in the process.

Mr. Emslie stated that it was either the Council or the P&TC who could initiate the zone change and the applicant could request an initiation of the P&TC.

Council Member Drekmeier asked whether the order to hear this project would be: Certification of the EIR, Development Agreement and then the Zoning Change.

Mr. Emslie stated the EIR would have to be certified before the Zoning Amendments could be considered.

Mayor Kishimoto asked whether the preliminary negotiations for the Development Agreement would end in May, 2008.

Mr. Benest stated there were preliminary discussions to talk about issues, to help negotiations, which would be informed by the EIR data. The draft EIR would be available in the summer of 2008 and would then move into negotiations of the Development Agreement.

Mayor Kishimoto asked what the staff was doing to eliminate a complicated negotiation of the Development Agreement.

Mr. Benest stated there were project updates along the way.

Mayor Kishimoto asked whether that would include the draft of the Development Agreement.

Mr. Benest stated when the Draft was available, there would be hearings with the P&TC, Architectural Review Board (ARB) and the Council to provide comments on the EIR impacts, adequacy of the Draft EIR, and implications for staff.

Mayor Kishimoto asked whether there would be choices available for negotiations of the Development Agreement.

Mr. Benest stated that not every provision of a Development Agreement could be discussed in public.

Mayor Kishimoto stated there was a difference between negotiating every decision in public and providing a detailed Development Agreement for review only.

Senior Assistant City Attorney Cara Silver stated that there was a resolution regarding the process of adopting Development Agreements and it requires a public hearing in front of the P&TC as well as the Council.

Mayor Kishimoto stated that she wanted choices for this project to go to both the Council and the community.

AMENDMENT: Mayor Kishimoto moved, seconded by Drekmeier not to initiate the zoning amendment at this time, but to direct staff to work with the Planning and Transportation Commission to draft a hospital amendment and then to initiate the zoning at a later date.

AMENDMENT FAILED: 2-3 Drekmeier, Kishimoto yes

Mayor Kishimoto stated this project could shape and affect our community between gas emissions and traffic. There was a need to protect our quality of life. She asked whether there was a reduced size alternative to the project.

Mr. Benest stated yes and expansion of the hospitals was to help deal with referrals and regular patients.

Mayor Kishimoto asked whether staff was considering this Hoover site as a hotel site.

Mr. Benest stated the property owner had no interest in using his property for a hotel.

Mayor Kishimoto asked whether there were anything proactive that could be done in terms of regional outreach.

Mr. Benest stated that the City of Menlo Park would be involved in all issues.

Mayor Kishimoto stated that traffic, housing, open space and urban design were her biggest priorities regarding issues.

Council Member Kleinberg asked whether we were asking that all of the mitigation to be made and paid by Stanford Medical Center or Stanford University.

Ms. Silver stated the application was submitted by both entities.

Council Member Kleinberg asked whether certain items on the mitigation list could be removed: Charleston/Arastradero Improvements; the Bol Park Right of Way; residential arterial neighborhood traffic improvements; no cost leases for substation sites; and the housing fees. She asked if the Council had previously voted on housing fees.

Mr. Benest stated the staff recommended that the current exemption be removed and the Council did not agree.

Council Member Kleinberg asked how it ended up on the list.

Mr. Benest stated that the staff recommended that the housing demand generated by the new employment of the hospitals be addressed.

Council Member Kleinberg stated the housing fee being apart of the list after the Council took a vote seemed inappropriate.

Ms. Silver clarified that the vote was connected to the project and they wanted to see the housing impact analyzed in the EIR before making a decision on whether to impose a fee or require onsite housing.

Council Member Kleinberg stated this was on the list as something that should be agreed upon or discussed.

Mr. Benest stated the intention was to identify the housing demand and to discuss how that would be mitigated.

Council Member Kleinberg stated at the moment there was an exemption and therefore it should not be listed. She also asked that potential impacts on downtown retail, be removed because that should be a benefit to our area. This list was supposed to be a list of benefits and mitigation and benefits were not included. She asked that we look at which impacts could be mitigated in a reasonable and effective way and which could be balanced out by the benefits of the hospital and shopping center expansion.

Mayor Kishimoto asked whether the "park and ride" concept could be included on the list.

Mr. Benest stated yes.

MOTION PASSED 7a: 5-0, Cordell, Klein, Mossar not participating, Morton absent.

MOTION: Council Member Beecham moved, seconded by Barton, to approve staff recommendation to 1) review and provide input regarding key issues related to the Stanford Shopping Center (SSC) Expansion Project to inform the EIR and form the basis of negotiations for the development agreement, and 2) initiate changes to Title 18 (Zoning) to increase the existing development cap for the shopping center so that the proposed zoning can be studied as part of the EIR.

Council Member Drekmeier stated he was hesitant to vote on whether more square footage was needed and he did not see the purpose for the zoning change at this point.

Mr. Benest stated they were studying the impact of the zoning and would need to be initiated through the EIR.

Council Member Drekmeier asked whether this would take five votes to move forward.

Ms. Silver stated the initiation did not but the adoption of the formal ordinance would require five votes.

Council Member Drekmeier clarified that the initiation would take three out of five.

MOTION PASSED 7b: 5-0, Cordell, Klein, Mossar not participating, Morton absent.

COUNCIL COMMENTS, ANNOUNCEMENTS, AND REPORTS FROM CONFERENCES

Council Member Drekmeier stated as the liaison to Neighbors Abroad, he had attended their meeting the previous week. Neighbors Abroad requested they be informed when Sister Cities visit. He noted that on Saturday, December 8, 2007, Neighbors Abroad was holding their annual party from 4-7p.m. at 69 Santiago in Atherton.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 11:37 p.m.