

Special Meeting  
July 19, 2010

The City Council of the City of Palo Alto met on this date in the Council Chambers at 6:05 p.m.

Present: Burt, Espinosa, Holman, Klein, Price, Scharff, Schmid, Shepherd, Yeh

Absent:

CLOSED SESSION

1. CONFERENCE WITH CITY ATTORNEY – ANTICIPATED LITIGATION

Significant Exposure to Litigation against the City of Palo Alto by  
Local 1319, International Association of Firefighters  
Authority: Government Code § 54956.9(b)(1) & (b)(3)(A)

The City Council went into the Closed Session at 6:05 p.m.

The City Council reconvened from the Closed Session at 6:35 p.m. and Mayor Burt advised no reportable action.

7:00 P.M. SPECIAL ORDERS OF THE DAY

2. Resolution 9076 entitled "Resolution of the Council of the City of Palo Alto Expressing Appreciation to Nick Marinaro Upon His Retirement".

Council Member Price read the Resolution into the record.

Jean McCown, Stanford University, said Nick Marinaro started his career as a firefighter with the Stanford Fire Department prior to its merging with the City of Palo Alto Fire Department. On behalf of Stanford University, she thanked and congratulated Nick Marinaro for his service to the City and community.

**MOTION:** Council Member Price moved, seconded by Vice Mayor Espinosa to adopt the Resolution expressing appreciation to Nick Marinaro upon his retirement.

**MOTION PASSED:** 9-0

Nick Marinaro expressed his appreciation for the Resolution and having the privilege of serving the City of Palo Alto and Stanford communities.

3. Appointments for the Utilities Advisory Commission for Two, Three Year Terms Ending on June 30, 2013.

First Round of voting for the Utilities Advisory Commission for two, three-year terms ending on June 30, 2013:

Voting For Lisa Altieri: Yeh

Voting For William Berry: Burt, Espinosa, Holman, Klein, Price, Scharff  
Schmid, Shepherd, Yeh

Voting For James Cook: Burt, Espinosa, Klein

Voting For Robert Entriiken:

Voting For Mark Harris: Price

Voting For Arthur Roberts:

Voting For Robert Stillerman: Holman, Scharff, Schmid, Shepherd,

City Clerk, Donna Grider announced that William Berry with 9 votes was appointed to the Utilities Advisory Commission for one, three-year term ending on June 30, 2013.

Second Round of voting for the Utilities Advisory Commission for one, three-year term ending on June 30, 2013:

Voting For James Cook: Burt, Espinosa, Klein, Yeh

Voting For Mark Harris: Price

Voting For Robert Stillerman: Holman, Scharff, Schmid, Shepherd,

City Clerk, Donna Grider announced that no candidate received the required five votes.

Third Round of voting for the Utilities Advisory Commission for one, three-year term ending on June 30, 2013:

Voting For James Cook: Burt, Espinosa, Klein, Price, Yeh

Voting For Robert Stillerman: Holman, Scharff, Schmid, Shepherd

City Clerk, Donna Grider announced that James Cook with 5 votes was appointed to the Utilities Advisory Commission for one, three-year term ending on June 30, 2013.

#### CITY MANAGER COMMENTS

City Manager, James Keene said on June 21, 2010, the Palo Alto Medical Clinic was listed in the California Register of Historical Resources as a National Historic Place. The Chief Information Officer (CIO) Magazine announced the City of Palo Alto as one of the 2010 CIO 100 Winners, "Driving Future Business Growth and Technology Innovation." He announced Jaime Rodriguez was the new Chief Transportation Officer for the City of Palo Alto.

Jaime Rodriguez, Chief Transportation Officer thanked the Staff and community leaders who participated in the selection process for the position and looked forward to serving the City.

#### AGENDA CHANGES, ADDITIONS, AND DELETIONS

City Clerk, Donna Grider announced the City Council meeting scheduled for July 26, 2010, would begin at 6 P.M. due to the size of the agenda. It would be the last meeting where Action items would go before the Consent Calendar due to discussion of a Stanford item. The Council would begin their annual break on August 3, 2010 and the agendas were full through August 2, 2010.

Mayor Burt said the Council had an extremely heavy workload between May through July 2010. He asked to continue Agenda Item Nos. 4A and 7 to the Council's first meeting in September.

**MOTION:** Vice Mayor Espinosa moved, seconded by Council Member Yeh to reschedule Agenda Item Nos. 4A and 7 to a date uncertain.

- 4A. High Speed Rail Presentation on Background and History by Californians Advocating Responsible Rail Design (CARRD).
- 7. Report From High Speed Rail Standing Committee on Recent Activity and Request for Authorization for the City Manager to Enter Into (1) a Contract with Capitol Advocates, Inc. in an Amount Not to Exceed \$30,000 for High Speed Rail Legislative Advocacy Services and (2) a Contract with Hatch Mott and McDonald in an Amount Not to Exceed \$50,000 for On-Call Engineering Services Related to High Speed Rail.

**SUBSTITUTE MOTION:** Council Member Shepherd moved, seconded by Council Member Scharff to reschedule Agenda Item Number 4A to the next Council meeting of July 26, 2010 and Agenda Item Number 7 to a date in September 2010.

Council Member Shepherd spoke of the Californians Advocating Responsible Rail Design's (CARRD) presentation that contained information on the initial inception of the High Speed Rail (Authority) over a decade ago to the present with up-to-date information and movement that could slow down the progress of the High Speed Rail (HSR).

Council Member Scharff echoed Council Member Shepherd's comments.

Mayor Burt said the presentation contained valuable information and was a good foundation for discussions in moving forward. He said the Authority would be presenting the Preliminary Alternatives Analysis (AA) at the end of August. He raised concerns of the availability in responding to the Preliminary AA prior to the Authority's presentation.

Deputy City Manager, Steve Emslie said there was very little feedback from the Authority and he did not know if there would be a period for another round of comments prior to the Preliminary AA presentation. The Preliminary AA was scheduled to be presented at the first HSR Board meeting in August. The City would not be able to report and present its preliminary findings to the HSR Standing Committee until after the first Thursday in August. Comments would be forwarded to the Council during the first meeting in September.

Council Member Price said it was an excellent presentation by CARRD and noted she would support the Substitute Motion.

**SUBSTITUTE MOTION FAILED:** 4-5 Holman, Price, Scharff, Shepherd yes

**MOTION PASSED:** 9-0

## ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

Marjorie Khosrovi, Palo Alto spoke regarding Stanford Hospital negotiations.

Faushaed Keyghobadi, San Francisco, spoke regarding Stanford Hospital.

Paul Cole, spoke regarding Stanford Hospital negotiations.

Bern Beecham, Palo Alto spoke regarding the Santa Clara Valley Water District.

Winter Dellenbach, Palo Alto, spoke regarding Planned Community Zoning.

Mark Nadim, Palo Alto spoke regarding Planned Communities.

Tom Jordan, Palo Alto spoke regarding Planned Community Zoning.

Robert Moss, spoke regarding Planned Community (PC) Zoning.

## ACTION ITEMS

Per Council's direction the Stanford Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) is typed in verbatim.

4. Public Hearing: Stanford University Medical Center Facilities Renewal and Replacement Project-Meeting to Accept Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the Stanford University Medical Center Facilities Renewal and Replacement Project, Including an Overview of the Noise, Geology, Soils & Seismicity, Hydrology, Hazardous Materials, and Utilities Chapters of the DEIR.

Council Member Klein advised he would not be participating in this item as his wife is on the Stanford Faculty.

Curtis Williams, Director of Planning and Community Environment: This is a further meeting to entertain comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Stanford University Medical Center Facilities Rehabilitation and Expansion Project. Tonight we are dealing with several of the technical chapters in the Draft EIR, including Noise, Geology, Soils and Seismicity, Hydrology, Hazardous Materials, and the Utilities Chapters.

The order of business tonight is after my presentation Rod Jeung from PBS&J will again give you an overview of the topics and the mitigation measures.

The project sponsor, Stanford University Medical Center, will make some comments. We have here tonight Eduardo Martinez from the Planning and Transportation Commission. I think he will be available for questions but does not have a presentation prepared for you, and you have the minutes in the packet as well.

The last of these series of meetings is scheduled for next week to talk about Alternatives and Mitigation Measures, and the close of the public comment period is scheduled for the day after that, July 27, 2010. Following that date we will be preparing the Final Environmental Impact Report to come back to you in late fall with the project entitlements.

I also want to point out to you that we distributed to you today hardcopies that should be at your places of the primary plan sets for the project. These include elevations, and site plans, and the main pages of the plan set. There are a lot of details also associated with the plans that were not included there but they are in a CD that is provided to you.

The Lucile Packard Children's Hospital and main hospital models that have been prepared by the Medical Center were in the lobby earlier this evening for viewing. It will be there again next week before the Council meeting beginning at four o'clock. We also have put all of the plans that are submitted that are provided to you and the CD tonight on the website as well. So the public can view those as well as yourselves. With that I will turn it over to Rod Jeung from PBS&J to provide an overview of these sections.

Rod Jeung, Project Director, PBS&J: Thank you again for allowing us to come tonight and give you a whirlwind tour of several other chapters of the Environmental Impact Report. I am still Rod Jeung. I am still the Project Director for the project. Pleased to be that. With me tonight are some members of the staff who were instrumental in developing the sections that we are going to hear about tonight. First and foremost would be Trixie Martelino who served as the Project Manager. Kristin Chapman is also with us. Geoff Hornek who prepared the Noise Analysis is here along with Leanne Albe who prepared the Wastewater related sections, and also prepared the Water Supply Assessment that was approved by the Council and informed the water related sections.

I am going to start off with Noise tonight. This chart that you see on the slide should look very familiar by this point. Aligned along the left column are the various impact categories that were described and evaluated in the environmental document. Right across the top are the column headings are the significance conclusions ranging from NI or No Impact through Less Than

Significant or LTS, impacts that were identified as significant but with mitigation measures could be reduced to less than significant. Finally, in the far right hand column those impacts that are considered to be significant and unavoidable even with the implementation of various mitigation measures that have been recommended.

The impacts related to Noise are really either less than significant or mitigable, and they include the construction vibration and noise from hospital operations. Things like the emergency generators and heating ventilation and air conditioning units on nearby residential units. The impacts for which mitigation measures have been identified but would still remain significant include noise during construction, traffic noise associated with some of the hospital operations, and cumulative impacts.

In particular, let me zero in on those impacts that are identified as significant and unavoidable. For construction, which would last approximately 12 years, these activities would involve a range of different heavy construction equipment as well as truck activities coming in along Palo Alto streets. The noise from the construction activities would significantly impact sensitive receptors within the project sites including the patients of the existing medical facility. Also, if construction occurred on the larger Stanford campus at the same time as construction occurred at the Stanford University Medical Center Project then we would have cumulative construction noise impacts and those would be considered to be significant for residences at 1100 Welch Road.

I want to point out that the analysis of the Stanford University Medical Center Project did not address noise and vibration effect of pile driving. That is something that is still being discussed with the state. However, those particular effects are considered as part of the Tree Preservation Alternative, which is currently the preferred site plan. If pile driving is considered then both construction noise and vibration impacts would be significant and unavoidable as well. So regardless of which alternative ultimately got selected if the state did not allow certain ways of mitigating the noise from pile driving that would be a significant unavoidable impact.

Finally, I mentioned earlier that traffic associated with the hospital operations would trigger noise impacts. Interestingly enough it is not really the additional vehicular trips from employees and patients, it is really the new ambulance route that would expose residents to noise from sirens. So to help illustrate, what you see on the left hand side is the existing route that ambulances use to reach the emergency department. With the relocation of the emergency department closer to Sand Hill Road there would be a new access route that would pretty much run along Sand Hill Road

between El Camino Real and the proposed Durand Way extension. En route ambulances would pass the Stanford West Apartments, senior living residences, and the Ronald McDonald House. These sensitive receptors are not currently adversely affected by the sirens along the existing route. The new route would then expose these residences to the sirens, and that would be considered a significant and unavoidable impact.

As far as the mitigation measures that have been identified to deal with some of the impacts that have been previously described, there are a range of conventional best management practices to deal with construction related noise such as noise shielding, using quieter equipment, provisions for a Noise Disturbance Coordinator to receive complaints and things like that. However, even with these measures the noise levels have been identified to be significant and unavoidable for onsite uses. Also, during the operational period when there is the potential to hear noise from the emergency generators and the heating ventilation and air condition equipment there are mitigation measures such as shielding that would reduce those impacts to less than significant.

Moving onto Geology, Soils, and Seismicity. I did want to note that one of the foremost reasons that the project is being proposed is to comply with state law for seismic safety. The Alquist Hospital Facility Seismic Safety Act and Senate Bill 1953 require that acute care hospitals throughout the state meet heightened seismic safety standards by certain deadlines so that they remain standing and operable after a major earthquake. The Stanford University Medical Center Project would upgrade seismic safety design at the Medical Center. It would reduce the geologic hazards to staff, patients, and visitors by complying with the design standards that have been established by the Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development, or OSHPD, throughout the various hospital facilities. In addition there are state building codes and safety codes that have also been adopted by the City that would reduce those same effects for the non-hospital facilities.

As a result, as indicated on the chart above the impacts related to seismic and other geotechnical hazards would be reduced to less than significant, and other impacts related to erosion would also be regarded as less than significant.

The next major physical environmental topic is Hydrology. When we talk about hydrology we are concerned about flood hazards, erosion, and sedimentation, the groundwater, drainage, and water quality. As shown in this slide and the next one all the impacts that have been identified for the Hydrology topic are reduced to generally less than significant. The only exception to that are those impacts that are related to degrading the



groundwater quality. There are mitigation measures that have been identified to deal with the groundwater quality issue, and specifically the reason this has become a concern and is really kind of a segue into the next topic, has to do with some of the existing contamination that is found at the Hoover Pavilion and at 701 and 703 Welch Road where there is known contamination. So the potential for groundwater contamination results from the exposure of those contaminated soils and then the fact that the pollutants could infiltrate into the groundwater during rainfall. As such the EIR has really identified these impacts on groundwater quality very conservatively as potentially significant.

This is kind of a nice segue into the Hazardous Materials. In general, there are three major concerns when we talk about hazardous materials. The first is exposure to hazardous materials during construction and operations. The second is the accidental release of hazardous materials that would be used during the construction or subsequent operations. Finally, there are other safety related issues such as impeding emergency response, construction in a high fire hazard area, or operations near an airport. All of these impacts and all of these different impact categories are shown on this chart to be either no impacts or less than significant.

Only three items are of particular concern that I want to highlight. Again, this comes back to the known soil contamination that is found at 701 and 703 Welch and at the Hoover Pavilion site. The state maintains something called the Cortese List. This is a list that identifies sites with known hazardous materials, releases, or spills. The Hoover Pavilion site is on the Cortese List. As a result there are a number of mitigation measures that have been recommended as part of the Environmental Impact Report. First and foremost is acknowledgement and recognition that there are a number of regulations that deal with the handling, the use, the storage, and the disposal of hazardous materials. For the most part those existing regulations adequately deal with the substantial or potential risk associated with exposure to the hazardous materials. Those mitigation measures that have been recommended in the Environmental Impact Report are beyond or support or implement some of those regulations.

So identified on this chart are mitigation measures intended to deal with the demolition and construction of related hazardous materials. So for some of the existing buildings, which may have used asbestos for example or lead which was common in previous construction practices there is the potential to encounter those during the demolition. So there are certain standard practices that have to be followed in order to really alleviate the potential risk for construction workers and members of the public and communities surrounding the buildings.

During the construction period there is also the potential to be exposed to contaminated soil or groundwater at the sites that I previously mentioned. There are a number of measures that talk about the varied stage process of dealing with that potential risk.

Then finally there is concern about the emergency access for vehicles during the construction. There are a number of mitigation measures that have been identified primarily in the Transportation section that we discussed last week that would also help to ensure that emergency access is provided. There are also some operational mitigation measures that would also provide for that same protection.

The final topic that I am going to be mentioning tonight has to do with Utilities. For each of the utilities that are considered in the Environmental Impact Report and those include water, wastewater, drainage, solid waste, and energy. The impacts would be considered to be less than significant. While the impacts are not significant the project does include a number of design measures to enhance its sustainability. These measures include water conservation features, energy conservation practices, and recycling, reuse, and composting programs that further the goals of the City's Zero Waste Strategic Plan. This is something I think Council Member Yeh brought up last week. So that concludes my remarks for tonight and would be happy to answer any clarifying questions or anything else that we can.

Council Member Scharff: Thank you for that presentation. I was looking at the ambulance trips. I notice that basically we increased the treatment spaces from 38 to 51, and we went up on ambulance trips an extra 16. I was trying to figure out why we end up with – I guess my understanding of the emergency room is that it is overcrowded and they need more space. I am wondering what is driving this. Are there more injuries? Why would there be more injuries? So I assume injuries remain constant. So I am wondering why there are more people going to the emergency room and where they are coming from.

Mark Tortorich, Vice President, Design and Construction, Stanford University Medical Center and Lucile Packard Children's Hospital: Good evening. I think we had a similar question at the Planning and Transportation Commission hearing. There will be a certain amount of additional emergency department traffic due to growth in the community. Our emergency department because it is so undersized is frequently on diversion. So ambulance traffic gets diverted to other hospitals. We can no longer continue that practice. So as we rebuild the emergency department

we won't be on diversion anymore because we will have adequate capacity for much of the traffic that already exists.

Council Member Scharff: So you know the number of trips that are being diverted, and that is how you come up with the extra trips here.

Mr. Tortorich: There is a component of that, yes. I don't recall the number of trips offhand but it is a fairly significant number every year.

Council Member Holman: I have a couple questions having to do with landfill and what was counted and not, and demolition. Under Demolition and Recycling, recycling takes energy. A considerable number of buildings are going to be taken down, and a lot of square footage of buildings is being taken down. The recycling of all that material takes energy and the hauling of it takes energy. It creates greenhouse gases and also takes energy. So I am just wondering if that fully covered in impacts and considerations for mitigation.

Trixie Martelino, Project Manager, PBS&J: The recycling of demolition debris I believe was addressed in the Climate Change analysis as part of the emissions reduction program.

Council Member Holman: Not just the recycling but the energy that it takes to recycle.

Ms. Martelino: I don't believe the analysis went that far. It did not.

Council Member Holman: I would believe that it should. Especially with this amount of square footage, a building being demolished, it should be considered. Transport of those materials as well. In addition to that transport of new materials to be used in the new buildings also should be a consideration. It is a premise for LEED using locally manufactured materials.

Council Member Price: I have a general question. Thank you for your presentation. Considering that this proposed project and construction continues over a period of 12 years at a point when we are looking at the mitigation monitoring plan, which I understand the mitigations will be in more detail next week, how will the applicant address changes in technology, improved building performance options, and changes in the regulatory environment over or even post construction? We are identifying things right now. This is a document that has impacts over a long period of time. What should our expectations be regarding addressing that? Clearly, regulatory will require certain responses, but a lot of the things that we are identifying here may become passé or out of date in 15 or 20 years.

Cara Silver, Senior Assistant City Attorney: Council Member Price that is an excellent question. That frequently happens with these projects that are built out over a long period of time. What we try to do is structure a mitigation program that has some flexibility so if new technologies do come online the applicant primarily can request to substitute out different technologies. There is a procedure for doing that. Sometimes it requires a hearing, sometimes it can be done at an administrative level. We detail that out in the Conditions of Approval.

With respect to regulatory changes, those need to be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. For the most part the applicant does receive vested rights to develop the project in compliance with the regulations in effect at the time the project is approved, but there are certain exceptions to that. They need to be evaluated on an individual basis.

Ms. Martelino: If I may add that as well, to a certain extent the analysis does consider future requirements regarding technology. For example, in the Air Quality section there is an acknowledgement that through the subsequent years and construction, construction equipment will necessarily have cleaner emissions. That is factored in future years of construction.

Public Hearing opened at 8:20 p.m.

Mr. Tortorich: Thank you Mayor Burt, Members of the Council. My name is Mark Tortorich, Vice President of Design and Construction, Stanford University Medical Center and Lucile Packard Children's Hospital.

We had some comments and an overview we wanted to talk to you about related to seismic safety. Then also Kristen Hanson, from our General Services Department will be talking to you a little bit about sustainable operations. I think that story really does help round out some of the sections that you are reviewing tonight, and will demonstrate to you how we at the hospital currently and in the future through operations will help reduce the impacts to the environment with our hospital projects.

So SB 1953 the seismic regulations that govern all hospitals and that certainly have particular impact on Stanford Hospital and Clinics and our need to rebuild. Our facilities currently fall into four out of the five possible categories, the SPC1, 2, 3, and 4. SPC1 buildings are considered in the words of OSHPD and this law 'collapse hazards,' so they do definitely need to be replaced or taken out of service by 2013. SPC2 facilities are facilities that have to be replaced by 2030. In the particular case of Stanford Hospital, our building constructed in 1959, has no eligibility for retrofit beyond 2030. We

have other facilities on the campus that meet the rating of SPC3 and 4. Those ratings tell you that your structure is suitable to OSHPD's standards for continued use beyond 2030 but in some cases the facilities will suffer major structural damage in a major seismic event. So obviously we need to retrofit those structures as well.

Next slide. So the overview here shows you really the disposition of the Medical Center within those five different categories. So SPC1 and 2 comprises our 1959 hospital. Our 1973 hospital building that we are also asking to have replaced fits into that SPC3 category, and would probably suffer significant structural damage in the event of an earthquake. Our SPC4 category buildings we feel very comfortable with that is our 1989 hospital facility and the Children's Hospital. Then of course all new hospital buildings would have to be designed to an SPC5 standard. That is an extraordinarily difficult standard to achieve.

Next. This site plan of the Medical Center sort of gives you a diagram of how the facility lays out. So for purposes of clarity this 1959 structure is here. The yellow structure is the 1973 core expansion. This is the 1989 hospital modernization project here and then Lucile Packard Children's Hospital. So you can see the rating categories from 1, to 2, to 3, to 4, and then our new facilities would be SPC5. You can also see that there is a nonstructural category of compliance with OSHPD and none of our facilities fully meet OSHPD's requirements for 2013.

Next slide. So obviously Palo Alto is unfortunately right in between two major faults in the San Francisco Bay Area, both with significant capacity to create ground motions that would be upsetting to buildings. They are the San Andreas Fault and the Hayward Fault. Due to our proximity to this San Andreas Fault, quite honestly, the State of California and OSHPD are very concerned about the seismic criteria for our buildings. So that is why you see that in our Tree Preservation Alternative we have asked for the alternative of driving piles for the foundation. We were hoping to be able to design this building with a mat foundation so that we do not have to use piles. OSHPD disagreed with us. They felt that the capacity of an earthquake generated by the San Andreas Fault was so significant that we would have to go to a pile foundation. Driving piles is very noisy and disruptive to the Medical Center, we don't want to do that. But, this is the conundrum, the State of California rarely approves an alternative method such as auger cast piles. We are still working with the state to try to use that method because we believe it would be less disruptive to our patients in the hospital.

Next slide. I also mentioned the nonstructural damage this is one of the lessons that came out of the Northridge Earthquake in Los Angeles. As you can see by the eight hospitals studied by the *New England Journal of Medicine* many of the evacuations of hospital beds were a result of nonstructural damage. Not the structural frame collapsing or suffering irreparable damage, but fire sprinklers breaking and causing the hospital facility to be unusable. Clearly we have patients who are incapacitated, which is why there are such heavy regulations on us. So these hospital buildings had to be evacuated and as you can see in many cases over 200 or 300 beds in the hospital facility that would have to be evacuated. We would obviously have no place to evacuate these patients to. There are no hospitals in the surrounding community that could take the 400 to 500 patients that we would have to evacuate at any one time from our facilities. So our facilities do have to be earthquake safe for both structural and nonstructural damage.

Next slide. Obviously there are other elements of construction that relate to seismic safety. OSHPD has now required that all major manufacturers of medical equipment certify to the state that the internal components of the major medical equipment can survive the shaking that is predicted to come from a major earthquake in California. So for example, a manufacturer of MRI machine has to perform tests on a shake table to demonstrate that their heavy magnet, the internal workings, can actually withstand the forces of a major earthquake coming our way.

Next. One of the methods that we are taking to reinforce ourselves from earthquake damage is to design our new Stanford Hospital with a seismic isolation system. It is a base isolation system similar to the one being used at Mills Peninsula Hospital and also at San Francisco International Airport. So these base isolators, and there will be over 250 of them at the Stanford Hospital Project, actually separate the foundation of the building from the structural frame so that the structural frame can be lighter, it can be less costly to build, and the contents of the facility will withstand ground motions in a more significant manner, and so we will be able to continuously operate after a major event affecting this community.

Next slide. At this point I would like to ask Kristen Hanson to talk to you a little bit about sustainable operations and what we are already doing at Stanford Medical Center.

Ms. Kristen Hanson, General Services Department, Stanford: Thank you Mark. Good evening Mayor Burt, City Council Members. It is an honor to come and talk to you a little bit as we in the organization and you are here

learning about the new facility to let you know what we do currently in our facility and our operations, touching on sustainability.

The first slides talk a little bit about waste diversion. We have over a 30-year history of recycling what I have referred to as the big three; cardboard, mixed paper, and mixed beverage containers. Annually we average approximately 700 tons of recycled material. We have a very longstanding tradition of donating our unused medical supplies, medical equipment, and medical furniture. On average it is around 15 tons per year. We have approximately ten years of history of a universal waste recycling program, which includes our electronic waste, our batteries, and our fluorescent light bulbs. On average it is approximately 28 tons a year. Some other unique recycling efforts that we have include recovery and recycling of cooking oil, managing our rag-out linens, shrink-wrap, and recyclable medical device programs. These together total average about 18 tons per year.

Touching on a few of our environmentally preferable purchasing strategies, in 2004 we implemented a reusable sharps container, as we were one of the first US customers for Daniels Sharpsmart. It is an Australian based company. Today reusable sharp containers by two companies are really considered best in class for hospitals initiating sustainable efforts, and we were one of the first ones back in 2004. The same year we implemented microfiber mop cleaning systems to improve infection control. It has an added benefit though of significantly reducing the water that is consumed. To date almost 66,000 gallons have been reduced or eliminated and avoided chemical dilution totaling approximately 3,300 gallons. In 2007 the same Environmental Services group or housekeeping staff completely implemented green seal certified cleaning chemicals across the organization, all three entities. We also have a very unique medical supply delivery system in partnership with Owens and Minor where over 600 reusable totes are exchanged daily with unit of measure stock that is taken directly up to the patient care unit.

Touching a little bit on our healthy food initiatives, of course we use locally grown and produced fresh fruits, vegetables, meats, poultry, dairy, and offer fair trade coffee. In 2007 we introduced 100 percent post consumer recycled napkins and bulk condiment dispensing systems. In 2008 we were able to implement food service area recycling containers in the back or the production side, which is a very big step for us with space constraints in the old building. In 2008 we also introduced healthier snacks in our vending and retail settings. You may have heard about this in some of our local sharing of this great event, in 2009 we partnered with Jesse Cool to introduce Farm Fresh. It is a program for our patients that include organic meal offerings for the patient to select from. In 2009 we selected and began offering our

biodegradable containers specifically for our to-go efforts. In 2010 we will be implementing composting segregation out in the two cafeterias.

Recognition for these current sustainable efforts that are underway, we are honored to receive the 2010 Partner for Change Environmental Excellence Award from Practice Green Health. They really are the nation's leading membership organization for healthcare facilities that are really committed to environmental responsible operations and wanting to report those efforts on an annual basis. The award recognizes facilities that are continuously working to improve mercury elimination, working on waste reduction and introducing various pollution prevention programs. So thank you for allowing us to share what we currently do.

Mayor Burt: Thank you. I take it that completes the applicant's presentation tonight, is that correct? Alright, thank you very much. We have two members of the public who have submitted cards. If anyone else wishes to speak, please bring your card forward. First is David Haray followed Beth Bunnenberg.

David Haray, Palo Alto: Mayor and fellow Council Members, I work for the Medical Center but I do not speak for the Medical Center. I am here as a Palo Alto resident. I believe I have the best of both worlds namely to work at a place that inspires and to retire every evening to a community by which I am able to renew myself for the next days challenges.

I know this evening focuses on DEIR chapters including Noise, Geology, Soils and Seismicity, and other environmental impacts. As you stated Mayor Burt in your State of the City Address, Stanford and the City share in a vision of sustainability and we have more in common than that which separates. I am confident that together the Medical Center and the City will find acceptable solutions to manage their way through. I have been encouraged by the collaboration that is in evidence and the positive comments made by the City Manager and the Planning Staff. I am encouraged by the number of positive comments I hear from Members of the City Council. I am here to ask for your full support of the Stanford Renewal Project.

I agree with Council Member Holman on needing to have the necessary meetings so as to make informed discussions. As you may have seen in a recent Palo Alto Weekly story back in 1956 architect, Durell Stone even grew frustrated in the protracted negotiations. As you again stated Mayor Burt in your City Address, "I am determined that we will move this project forward expeditiously this year through review by our relevant Boards and Commissions, and finally the City Council. I ask all of you not to waiver, conduct the necessary meetings, do what is necessary to be informed, but to



bring this to a vote by year end so we can begin to at last build our shared vision together." Thank you.

Beth Bunnenberg, Palo Alto: Tonight I am speaking as an individual. This is in response to the Stanford Draft EIR. My comments are about two historic structures that are in this plan. The plans for the 1930's Hoover Pavilion appear appropriate while perhaps a little more attention could be given to the entry façade where the stairs are being replaced. But the original ziggurat art-deco style is well maintained in the submitted plans.

The second is the Edward Durell Stone, 1959 hospital building. I strongly disagree with Stanford's report indicating that the hospital was not one of Stone's major achievements. The hospital has some characteristics that are much like his very famous embassy in Delhi, India. I very much agree with the ARG, Architectural Resources Group, peer review report that says that the Stone Building appears eligible for listing on the California Register, and should be considered under CEQA. Demolition of the Stone Building would be a significant adverse impact and could not be mitigated.

The Architectural Resources Board had an interesting suggestion on a historic preservation alternative to save the Stone Building. The suggestion was to use the Stone Building but not as a hospital but retrofit it for one of the buildings for medical offices, which Stanford says it needs. Additionally, please consider the cumulative adverse affects of Palo Alto's losing buildings one of two buildings of Stone's that are still intact here. His work is internationally known. Also, to follow up on Council Member Holman's comment, think of the mass, the huge mass, of debris of the Stone Building. How many dump trucks would it take? How much landfill? Why not save the Stone Building and avoid all those dump loads of materials that could be retained in place. Thank you.

Public Hearing closed at 8:38 p.m.

Council Member Schmid: Let's see, it is more of a question than a comment. On the Utility side there is a water issue, and I know we have had a discussion of water use in Palo Alto. We are confronting a future with probably less water coming to us. We have a long-term goal as a city to cut our water usage. Then of course there are the dry years that come on which require a reduction of 10 to 20 percent as time goes on. I note that the Medical Center calls for allocation of between four and five percent of the Palo Alto water supply. So I am wondering if this involves the City making planning decisions, which would cut into its ability to foster or sponsor new growth over time.

Steve Emslie, Deputy City Manager: I will just go back to the water supply finding that the Council had made prior to the release of the Draft EIR to make the finding that adequate water supplies do exist. Just to give you a summary we found that there is ample supply in the normal years. In the second and third years of a drought condition conservation measures would have to be employed in order to meet the city's and the hospitals overall water consumption needs. The water conservation measures that were anticipated in the project either in the design or the landscaping or the mitigation measures in the Draft EIR were found to be adequate to achieve the level of water conservation necessary in order to meet our water requirements for all existing uses with a buffer to allow for some increase use of water as well.

Ms. Martelino: If I may add to that as well just to echo what Mr. Emslie said, the conclusions with the conservation measures and additional measures going forward there would be adequate water during drought years. Those conclusions incorporate future growth projections that are in the Urban Water Management Plan. So that accounts for some future growth to the 2025 horizon already.

Council Member Schmid: It implies future growth in the City of Palo Alto. Is that what you are saying?

Ms. Martelino: Yes.

Council Member Schmid: Okay, I guess my concern is just to have a clear statement from I guess the City that while we are undergoing an expected reduced water supply and we are planning for dry years that any future growth planned for in our long-term planning takes into account the fact that we do have a declining water supply. This project, which accounts for between four and five percent of our water use, is actually increasing its usage over that time period.

Council Member Holman: Just quickly to follow up on Council Member Schmid's comments. One thing that I did not find was adequate permeability comparisons of present to proposed.

Mayor Burt: Yes, as long as it pertains to the agendized elements of the EIR.

Council Member Holman: I thought we could comment at any time, or is it just the public can comment at any time on what we have been given? Let me frame it this way. The City Attorney will stop me if I am not supposed to say this. What I have been hoping to get, and been asking to get are plans

that would indicate circulation, some aspects of context that address the various aspects of our review under the DEIR. While we just got this this evening at places what I am not finding here is what I was hoping to find.

Mayor Burt: Let me break this into two aspects. I would say that if there is a request then maybe Staff could confirm whether this is the protocol that we are intending to follow. Our next meeting is our wrap up on this subject. If there are requests for information to be provided in advance of that meeting then I think tonight would be an appropriate time to make that request. If it is to comment on items that are not tonight's focus then I would suggest we await next week's meeting which is an opportunity to look at all of the DEIR aspects comprehensively.

Council Member Holman: Thank you for the clarification. So it is the latter. I have been requesting almost since we began to get some better visuals that would give us better indication of circulation, linkages, pedestrian/bicycle paths, context for new buildings in relation to existing buildings, certainly in relation to Hoover Pavilion because there is an interest there. Perhaps it is on the disk. I don't know and won't know until I have a chance to look at those. What I am finding as I just quickly go through since we got this at places, as I go through what is in front of us this evening what I find are, and I am exceedingly frustrated so you will hear that. I am exceedingly frustrated because what I am finding primarily here is a parking garage with no context, elevations, and wall sections, various floor plans that have nothing to do with relevance to a DEIR. So I am more than frustrated.

Mayor Burt: Let's let Staff see if they have responses to the concerns that you stated on looking at circulation and connectivity issues.

Council Member Holman: And context. I know the Planning Commission also had considerable questions about trees. What are these trees? Where are these trees? What are the ones we are taking down? We still have no information that I have found on those topics.

Mr. Williams: Thank you Mayor and Council Member Holman. Some of those I think are deficiencies in here about where are the number of trees or details of trees. If it is not in there we need to respond to as part of the Final EIR. As far as the circulation overall context we will go back and see if there is something we missed. I believe that a lot of that is in the EIR itself. There are site plans that show the whole project. There are circulation plans that show pedestrian and bicycle pathways connecting through to all of the elements of the project. So I am not sure how much more we have available to provide at this point.

Council Member Holman: Maybe my expectation has not been clear, but what I have been expecting is when we started this process two and a half years ago or so there were diagrams presented to us that were far more descriptive than what is in the DEIR. They were more readable because they were of a size, and had more information on them so you could interpret what was being presented. What are primarily in the DEIR are reduced drawings to such an extent that there is really not a way for me to grasp them, and I have a background of 30 years in graphics. I can't grasp with what is in there, what is connected to what. You get to a certain size and you can't read streets, or there aren't streets on them. So my expectation has been that we would have at least the level of information that we had prior to starting the EIR process, and we have not seen it. So you are hearing my frustration. Sorry about that.

Mayor Burt: Let me ask for clarification. Aside from the particular issue of to what degree the graphics in the DEIR are readable can you also put into context how much of that issue is appropriate for the DEIR and how much for the project consideration as we go forward with the Development Agreement?

Mr. Williams: Well, it is both to some extent. I think we have addressed in the DEIR what needs to be addressed in terms of making the determinations of significance as far as impairment of views, and those kinds of things, and as far as adequacy of bicycle and pedestrian facilities and to that extent. It doesn't mean we can't have clearer exhibits that show some of those things, and that show the context if that is not here right now. So I think there may be something that we can do just in terms of creating larger exhibits of what we have and trying to address some of that concern. I think it is probably more relevant to the project design specifics than to the EIR, but I understand and apologize we have not gotten that through at this point to create the documents.

Mayor Burt: So is that something that would be readily available prior to next week or is that something difficult to provide?

Mr. Williams: I don't know. Steven or Zach could you maybe come up and indicate what is available?

Steven Turner, Advance Planning Manager: Good evening. A lot of the information that perhaps Council Member Holman is referring to can be found in the project application materials. The initial application was submitted in 2007 and amended over time as the project was analyzed and developed. All of those project information materials are up on the website

so they are available. They have not been packaged in a manner that is perhaps more usable as a tool for the Council. Certainly as Staff we have been hearing that it would be helpful to you to have those tools in order to move forward with the review of the project. Certainly at this point we are reviewing the Draft EIR and the impacts and the mitigations. Certainly as we go forward past this point into the review of the actual project, complete the review with Architectural Review Board, Staff would begin to develop those tools that are essentially the final set of materials that the Council can then begin to review and ask questions, make comments, and then finally review with Staff and the public.

Mr. Williams: So it sounds like we should be able to pull some of those application materials and make, as you said at the beginning you saw something, and we can update those.

Council Member Holman: Please, yes. I know there is sort of a gray line between the DEIR and the project review. My concern is that I don't want to look back and say, oh gee, I wish I had known then. There are aspects of this kind of review that inform mitigations. If mitigations appear to be adequate or is there something we could do to reduce an impact if we had only had the information to see it. So I just don't want to be looking back and say oh it is too late that was a DEIR topic. Can Staff indicate when we might be able to get some of these visuals to Council?

Mr. Williams: I would expect within the next couple of days.

Vice Mayor Espinosa: Two areas, two questions on Noise and two on Hydrology. I am hoping to just understand the comment about cumulative construction projects at Stanford and what we understand and what we don't, and if there are additional information that would be helpful to gather as we move past the Draft.

Mr. Jeung: Let me just go ahead and generally address that comment to the best that I can, and then if anything else more specific comes up I will ask Staff to support me. Recognizing that the hospital project is expected to occur over a 12-year period, it is a period when there are other projects that could be entertained by Stanford University either as part of its GUP or other improvements. To the extent that we don't know right now what those projects might be we are acknowledging in the Draft Environmental Impact Report, which again needs to disclose potential impacts, we are acknowledging that there is the potential for those construction projects to coincide with one another. To the extent that they occur at the same time the noise and vibration, and construction related affects associated with the

Stanford University Medical Center Project could also compound with those related to other Stanford projects.

Vice Mayor Espinosa: I get the impact. What I am saying is Stanford has a pretty good sense of what is coming online. You look out a decade or a little bit longer than that they have a good sense of that. I wonder how that conversation goes in terms of getting specifics about those projects and where they are and really understanding that timeline.

Mr. Jeung: Thank you. I appreciate that clarification. The other thing that is going to be happening as part of the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, and that is part of the Construction Traffic Management Plan, is a return by Stanford at various phases as they begin to move forward into the construction aspects of the different components of the project. So at the time that those specific phases occur we can have a better appreciation of some of the other activities that are being entertained by Stanford and be able to do a better job in terms of the cumulative impacts.

Vice Mayor Espinosa: Do you think you have a good sense of that now? Could you map out over a 12-year period what you foresee Stanford building?

Mr. Jeung: We have a sense from what is currently provided and permitted by the GUP. We have other information from the Stanford community plans and things like that. So there is the potential to go ahead and map something out to see on a schedule basis what might overlap.

Ms. Martelino: I would like to add to that as well. I refer you to pages 3.1-4 and 3.1-5 of the Draft EIR. It goes into the contemplated future development under the GUP. On page 3.1-4 there is a general description of what would occur overall under the GUP, but there is also a paragraph that lists specific buildings that are expected to be constructed and their timelines. It is a fairly brief list of buildings but it is the best information we have at this point.

Vice Mayor Espinosa: Let me just be frank. That is what struck me. Here we are we are referencing information that we get from the GUP. In your presentation even talking about how we don't have a full sense of this necessarily, and here we are with the applicant. They know what they are building. I just wonder about how that dialogue goes to really come to understand projects that are coming online within the next decade. Do we have a good understanding about that? Is it worth going back to the table and having a conversation face-to-face as opposed to the materials that you are getting from the GUP to really come to understand that?

Mr. Williams: I think that is something we should do. We should just put together a timeline and try to match it up with the stages of this project and see what is happening at the same time, and try to address it.

Vice Mayor Espinosa: Thank you. Very quickly, there was mention at the Planning and Transportation Commission meeting about routes for construction traffic, and particular mention of Sand Hill Road and Willow and their proximity to the project. I wonder how we go about, and I just don't know and am hoping for my own edification how we go about those conversations with adjoining cities or municipalities to talk about what are going to be the preferred traffic routes for construction traffic, and how much oversight or leeway we have in mandating where those are when they are not within our jurisdiction.

Mr. Emslie: As we have indicated in prior meetings we are in regular conversations with our neighboring cities of East Palo Alto, Menlo Park primarily, and we are in conversations regarding the environmental impacts of this. In fact, we are receiving comments tomorrow evening as we are attending the Menlo Park City Council Meeting where they will be reviewing their comments. We are also talking with the Staff regarding preferred mitigations for issues that arise outside of our jurisdiction. So I think the lines of communication are open to have that dialogue.

Vice Mayor Espinosa: Great. Then two quick questions on Hydrology, one is for Stanford. I notice in the PTC minutes as well a very quick dismissal referencing OSHPD about gray water. I was just hoping to understand that better. It seems like the way we should be going. I know it is not where you are just repeating back the response but I am hoping to come to a better understanding of why that is.

Mr. Tortorich: So we are taking a few measures within the design of the project to try to capture rainwater and condensate water so it would help reduce our irrigation load. In terms of gray water systems it just runs up against the infection control measures at the state. I can't disagree with them quite honestly, nor can the professionals working on our project disagree with them. There is just too much risk of trying to have a gray water system at a hospital building. Somewhere, ten years down the road, a plumber accidentally connects one pipe to the other pipe. It is not a simple system to do.

The other thing is that given the nonstructural requirements that come with everything that we have to do the cost of a gray water system would be extraordinary. You would have to double pipe almost all of your fixtures. So

it really is not a system that is economical to install, and second, one that would be permitted by the regulatory authority.

Vice Mayor Espinosa: Is that both inside and outside all structures? There is no way to segment out water systems? It is such a significant and large project one would think that there are either parts of the buildings within or really outside measures that could be taken.

Mr. Tortorich: No, unfortunately OSHPD has jurisdiction over the entire hospital building. In fact, they have jurisdiction over the School of Medicine buildings right now because the hospital is not appropriately separated by the School of Medicine buildings. So it is a pretty strict standard.

Vice Mayor Espinosa: Thank you. Then finally, I was just noticing the significant thresholds around substantially impeding the water flows especially related to flood areas into the creeks. I just wonder if I could get a better understanding and if we feel we have adequately covered, I know in our previous Council this was much more of a discussion point, but retention basin and how that has played into the conversations and if we feel that has been fully addressed.

Mr. Jeung: I will say that the state has very, very rigorous standards now regarding stormwater retention during both the construction and post-construction. So the requirements to date are such that there is virtually no net new increase during the peak period. Whatever means Stanford has to take in order to accommodate and fulfill those standards that are under the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System are going to have to satisfy the state. So the additional sort of net new increase into San Francisquito Creek should be commensurate with what is permitted under the regulations.

Vice Mayor Espinosa: That said this is for City Staff. We have competing interests here or compounded interests in really addressing creek issues, and addressing impacts of this project. I just want to make sure that we have had those conversations both internally and with the applicant to come to fully understand whether or not there isn't some joint agreement that could be made that could help address mutual concerns.

Ms. Silver: We certainly have had those discussions with the applicant, Vice Mayor Espinosa. I think the EIR at this point does not identify an impact such that a detention basin would be a feasible mitigation measure. But it would be appropriate discussion for a Development Agreement item.



Council Member Yeh: Thank you. Thank you to Staff and the PTC for their comments. I just had a series of questions for the Utilities and Utilities area. I know PTC had discussed the idea of anaerobic digestion as it related to the COGEN plant. It was just a quick discussion. I know in the Staff presentation and also in Stanford's presentation there was discussion about segregation of compostable materials in the waste diversion. I am just curious, I mentioned in the past about redundancy for electricity for the hospital. It is more a philosophical question for Stanford, which is through this EIR process the analysis criteria has primarily been about sufficiency of electric resources. Whereas, the issue and really what I understand the primary driver for this project overall is addressing seismic needs of the hospitals. So my question to Stanford is how do you see redundancy as it relates to electric supply? Not necessarily sufficiency of electric supplies but the redundancy aspect.

Mr. Tortorich: Council Member Yeh, in terms of the backup power supply for the two hospital buildings the State of California and the Joint Commission requirements that regulate hospital accreditation throughout the country demand that we have been 92 and 96 hours of emergency generator capacity for all life safety systems, and predominantly for most systems within the hospital. So the emergency generators are our primary backup.

As to redundancy of primary power supply, we currently use Palo Alto power and plan on doing so in the future. We are investigating whether there are other options to have backup power either from Cardinal COGEN or from some other source. It is not a simple thing to do. There are all sorts of issues with the electrical engineer. They can explain to me and I forget immediately after they tell me. The emergency generators are our primary redundant power supply for the two hospital buildings.

Council Member Yeh: One quick follow up question on that then. I know in terms of that redundancy, and my understanding too is that there might be a kind of parallel and a separate path going on than just the discussions between the City and Stanford. Just for COGEN specifically whether or not Stanford does see this waste diversion as opportunities for that COGEN plant specifically and if Stanford is contemplating anaerobic digestion as one of the options.

Mr. Tortorich: I don't know that for a fact. The University is studying what to do for the next generation of COGEN. I am not sure whether they are planning on buying power off the grid or generating their own power by other means. So that is certainly something I can bring back to the University and get their opinion on.

Council Member Scharff: Thank you. Most of my questions were actually answered. I do have one technical issue. On 3.15-11 it says, Palo Alto's refuse disposal landfill is expected to reach its total permitted capacity of 7.76 million in late 2010. I am just assuming we are going to need to change that. I guess that is sort of one of my question. Is someone going to go through this and fix all of that for the EIR? Okay, thanks.

**MOTION:** Council Member Shepherd, moved, seconded by Council Member Holman to move Agenda Item Number 6 forward to be heard before Agenda Item Number 5.

**MOTION PASSED:** 9-0

6. Referral to Policy and Services Committee For its Review And Recommendations of Project Safety Net Community Task Force Report On Palo Alto Youth And Teen Suicide Prevention and Strategies for Addressing Their Social and Emotional Health.

Cubberley Center and Human Services Division Manager, Rob De Geus provided an update on the Project Safety Net (PSN) Report. He said the PSN Report was developed by a community task force in response to the tragic teen suicides in Palo Alto between May 2009 and January 2010. The presentation contained information as outlined in Staff Report CMR:312:10. Staff recommended the Council to refer the PSN Report to the Policy and Services Committee (P&S) for further review and recommendations.

Linda Lenoir, Palo Alto Unified School District (PAUSD) spoke regarding Parent & Community Education. She said several panels and presentations had been devoted to educating parents, community, and Staff which focused on depression, suicide prevention, social and emotional health. She said under the framework of the Developmental Assets Program the Parent-Teachers Association (PTA), the City, and youth community agencies would continue PAUSD's educational efforts. The Palo Alto Medical Foundation (PAMF) contributed by educating physicians on reduction on means.

Management Specialist, Greg Hermann said the PSN Task Force consisted of members from the Lucile Packard Children's Hospital (LPCH), the PAMF, Caltrain, the community, and the City formed a subcommittee and considered media education as one of seven strategies. The members focused on dealing with issues and hosted a media workshop with executives from Bay Area media agencies facilitated by the American Association of Suicideology. The group continued to function as a resource in answering inquiries from organizations that were part of PSN and the Task Force.

Wesley Cedros, Palo Alto Unified School District, said the purpose for "Gatekeeper" training was to help identify signs of anxiety and depression in youth and teens and provide guidance through appropriate care in the community. He spoke of the Question, Persuade, Refer (QPR) Program chosen by PSN community to insure youth safety and to provide a common language for care providers, schools and City Staff.

Ms. Lenoir spoke regarding Youth Outreach that focused on engaging with youths in identifying and finding solutions together. The youth forum was a venue that fit into the Council's strategic goals of Civic Engagement and Community Collaboration for Youth Well-being. She said youth and adults needed to move forward in the commitment and be accountable for its efforts. A list of the ideas from the youth forum could be found on the [www.cityofpaloalto.org/teen](http://www.cityofpaloalto.org/teen).

Mr. Cedros said PSN focused in developing bereavement support groups and resources for youth and adult survivors of suicide. Kara Grief Counseling and Education, Adolescent Counseling Services (ACS), PAMF, LPCH and California Healthy Kids (CHKS) provided onsite services for after trauma incidents. The focus was to continue monitoring the need for services and to streamline future response to traumatic events. The goal was to provide comprehensive and relevant mental health support for youths and teens in the community. She said with the help of Health Alliance for Response to Adolescent Depression (HEARD), PAUSD's availability of the three session referral program increased to six and nine sessions. The LPCH, PAMF, and ACS had expanded their services and broaden the PSN's process for exchange of information between primary care, social behavior health, and schools. She said the Reduction of Lethal Means to Self Harm strategy dealt with site safety at the area in question. Increased lighting, removal of vegetation, and partnership with Caltrain installed fencing in the area which increased the safety at the location. "Track Watch", a volunteer group, provided physical and visual deterrent for individuals. The effort was funded through community donations and continued with the City's Police Department in transitioning the monitoring responsibilities to the group. The 41 Developmental Assets Program provided a common language and metrics to determine a healthy environment for youths and teens. The City lead community members, school officials, youth serving non-profits, and Project Cornerstone in integrating the framework into the community.

Ms. Lenoir said PAUSD adopted the Developmental Assets and would move forward with a student survey beginning Fall through December 2010. Schools would work with the PTA to implement the survey starting in October 2010 with 4th through 7th graders and students from Palo Alto and Gunn High Schools. Schools would review the survey results and work on

specific assets relevant to site results. Project Cornerstone would work with schools to provide education and program options for teachers, parents and students.

Mr. Cedros said through the efforts of the PSN Committee members, the PAUSD Board approved the comprehensive board policy that addressed suicide prevention and intervention in the schools.

Mr. De Geus said PSN would continue to implement its practices as defined in the report through the Summer and into the new school year. The report defined 22 specific strategies, actions, and recommended next steps that related to the City, PAUSD, youth-serving agencies, and the community.

Council Member Shepherd asked what “common language” meant in the PSN Report, page 64.

Mr. Hermann said it referred to the Developmental Assets, a nationally recognized framework that was developed and implemented with metrics to support its advocacy in communities.

Council Member Shepherd said the report did not address a more natural language to be used between groups. She asked what approach should be taken to inform parents of risky activities.

Mayor Burt encouraged colleagues to direct specific issues to P&S where the PSN Report would be worked on in depth.

Council Member Shepherd asked whether P&S would be looking into having PAUSD as part of the meetings to help differentiate between City and school district’s responsibilities.

Mr. De Geus said as a community effort and in moving forward, school districts should be part of the conversation.

Council Member Shepherd raised concerns about funding for the project.

Mr. De Geus said funding was yet to be determined. The Community Services Department had faced budget reductions and was looking into grant opportunities to support the projects sustainability. He said there was one potential grant in the works with the PAUSD for \$250,000.

Cyndy Ainsworth, Kara Grief Counseling and Education, Palo Alto, said Kara has provided grief support to the community for the past 35 years. Kara was composed of staff and volunteers and would continue to work with the

schools and the community to provide support and training as needed. There was an increase in demand for counseling services not only with affected families but throughout the community.

Dr. Amy Heneghan, Palo Alto Medical Foundation, said the HEARD Alliance had been working on a component since September 2009. A toolkit had been developed for providers to use in identifying mental health problems and provide mental health care for youths. Its resources would educate, screen and collaborate with mental health providers, schools, share information in a common language and empower physicians caring for adolescents in their practices.

Becky Beacom, Palo Alto, spoke regarding distinct strategies, organizations and roles and through the efforts of the PSN program in reaching a common goal for the health and well-being of youths. She asked for the Council's support in continuing the work.

Dr. Shashank V. Joshi, Palo Alto, spoke of HEARD Alliance composed of volunteer organizations. Its mission was to collaborate among mental health and educational professionals to enhance the community's ability in responding to adolescent depression. He said depression was one of the risk factors for the tragic events that had taken place in the community. Its primary focus was to determine discreet and attainable goals in working to address interventions in the year after a suicide or suicide cluster had occurred and know as "postvention", a link in prevention, education, and intervention aspects of working together. He said Psychological Autopsy was launched by the Stanford Labs, a project to better understand youths' suicide and to present the information to the affected families and the community through PSN website postings. The information would first be approved for disclosure by the deceased victim's parents in hopes to shed light on the risk factors for teen suicide and help develop suicide prevention and wellness approach.

Chris Miller, Los Gatos, said he had seen the transformation of the Developmental Assets in the community of Los Gatos and urged the Council and the Palo Alto community to support its framework.

Anat Adamati, Stanford, asked the Council's support in getting curriculums established in the district to help support the programs and efforts in promoting happier and healthier youths.

Terry Godfrey, Palo Alto, urged the Council to support the framework of PSN.

Sunny Dykwel, Palo Alto, said the PTA Council's goal was to advocate, promote and support students' social, emotional, and physical health. The PTA Council offered several parent-education programs at school levels and opened to the community. She recommended the PTA Board adopt the 41 Developmental Assets and urged the Council to accept Staff's recommendations.

Pat Markevitch, Palo Alto, said she supported the PSN Project and it was comforting to know the availability of suicide prevention resources in the community.

Marielena Goona-Mendoza, Palo Alto, said she was part of the Track Watch group and encouraged installation of telephones where youths could connect to a suicide hotline for help. She suggested lights and removal of vegetation along the tracks to discourage hiding sites for those attempting suicide.

Leif Erickson, Youth Community Service (YCS), said developmental research was identified as a service and a key pathway for young people to achieve balance and connections. He said YCS remembers each young person the community had lost and rededicate the work in their memory.

**MOTION:** Council Member Price moved, seconded by Council Member Holman to: 1) refer the Project Safety Net (PSN) report to Policy & Services Committee in September for further review and recommendation, and 2) Staff is to return to Council with specific policy recommendations from the Committee that support teen suicide prevention and strategies for the social and emotional health of youth and teens in Palo Alto.

Vice Mayor Espinosa asked P&S to focus on creating a check and balance system in sustaining the program and to engage businesses, community leaders and community members in committing to the process. He asked P&S to review the comments from the joint meeting between Youth Council and the Council regarding their reactions, what the school district had proposed, and recommendations from the community.

Council Member Shepherd spoke regarding the link between the Youth Council and business community. She encouraged the P&S to get a commitment during the Thanksgiving break so that youths who had been working on ideas could return and feel there was traction on their efforts. She suggested having a joint meeting between P&S and Human Resource Commission (HRC) or with the Parks and Recreation Commission (PARC) to solidify synergy and capture more of the Council committees in moving forward with these issues.

Mayor Burt appointed Council Member Price as Council Liaison to the 41 Developmental Asset subcommittee of Project Safety Net Project Safety Net.

**MOTION PASSED: 9-0**

5. Approval of Three Year Software Consulting Services Contract With Sierra Infosys Inc. in the Amount of \$750,000 for the Support and Maintenance of SAP Industry-Specific Solution for Utilities, SAP Financials, Customer Relationship Management System, Business Intelligence System and Utilities Customer Electronic Services (*Item continued from July 12, 2010*).

Administrative Services Director, Lalo Perez gave an overview and a PowerPoint presentation as outlined in Staff Report CMR:291:10.

Assistant Administrative Services Director, David Ramberg spoke of the added cost for upgrades, enhancements, and functionality for SAP modules. He said one major project not included in the current Capital Improvement Project (CIP) was 2016-17 upgrades for SAP. He said the SAP maintenance support contract for SAP's environment comprised of 20 integrated modules and 14 external interfaces with banking institutions, Pay Pal, and other external entities. The two levels of support were Level 1, which involved 85-90 percent of support needed to resolve in-house issues by SAP support team. Level 2, was for 10-15 percent of higher-level consultant support for the new SAP modules. The key objective was to provide support to critical systems that required 24/7 operations such as online customer billing, payments, night bill generation and processing, support key business areas with Citywide impacts in Payroll and Utility billing, and supplementing in-house resources in Level 2 support. The key objective was transfer of knowledge to in-house resources to improve efficiencies, provide technical expertise and assist Staff in resolving urgent customer problems. The contract term was a "pay as we use" up to 3 years, renewed annually with a cost of \$250,000 per year or \$750,000 over a three-year period.

Council Member Klein asked how the expenditures compared to industry standards and what the cost was for night-time customer service.

Mr. Perez said an assessment study still needed to be completed by an independent reviewer using their expertise, reviews, and metrics to determine whether the investment was worth the money.

Council Member Klein asked when the study would be completed and could the City get out of a 3-year contract if the study showed expenditures were too high.

Mr. Perez said the system required maintenance support and would work with the City Manager to expedite completion of the study.

Mr. Keene said he felt the maintenance contract was essential and would prove to be non-negotiable. SAP was a complex system and provided what the City required in terms of transparency, complexity of fund accounting, good customer service and responsiveness. He said the Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) systems available from private sector providers were similar in overall cost, and complexity. He did not feel the Council should postpone authorization of maintaining the system. He felt Staff would return with benchmark data from the outside that would put the City in context of what it already had and what was being accomplished. The Administrative Services Department (ASD) had encountered a volume of issues causing setbacks in moving forward with the study.

Council Member Schmid asked which department was responsible in the decision-making of the system.

Mr. Perez said decisions were vetted through a group of members from the Utilities, ASD, and Public Works Department and a project management office where work orders and recommendations were put through. Unresolved issues would be forwarded to department heads or taken to the City Manager.

Council Member Price asked if the \$250,000 per year was a minimum maintenance fee and could it possibly increase.

Mr. Perez clarified it was an on-going expense that would grow with time and inflation because predominate support was from consultants. The current annual expense was capped at \$250,000 for a 3-year contract unless Staff found it necessary to request more funds.

Council Member Price asked if there was the possibility of building additional in-house expertise rather than having to rely on outside support.

Mr. Perez said transfer of knowledge was a component in the plan and a future goal to be more self-supporting.

Council Member Price asked if there were other cities with city-owned utilities that use the SAP system.



Mr. Perez said the Cities of Spokane, Dallas, San Diego, and the Oracle Corporation used the system. It was a system that did not require heavy customization and eliminated large expenditures on updates.

Council Member Scharff said the contract had a “pay as we use” term and asked what would happen to the \$250,000 if it were not used, what were the downsides of the contract, and could the City terminate the contract.

Mr. Keene said there were no downsides to the contract unless the Council determined a concern about Staff’s judgment in using the money.

Council Member Scharff needed clarification on the approving process of CIP projects.

Mr. Keene said CIP projects were 5-year plans. He said the 2011 funds were approved by the Council and any funds remaining in subsequent years were considered in the plan but not being approved at the current time. Contracts attached to CIP projects need to come back to the Council for specific discussions. He said an intermediate step could take place between the approved CIP and bringing the contract forward for further discussion.

Council Member Scharff said he would like the contract to come forward. There were several things the Council would like to do in terms of the billing process. He did not think SAP lead to cost-savings, if anything, it required an increase in the Utilities staffing and the changes were expensive. He hoped the benchmarking study would include looking into an official way of having input on how things were changed in the billing process, what was required, and at the same time be mindful of the cost.

**MOTION:** Council Member Scharff moved, seconded by Council Member Schmid to: 1) approve and authorize the City Manager or his designee to execute the usage-based professional services agreement with Sierra Infosys. Inc. in the amount not to exceed \$250,000 per year for the support and maintenance of various SAP modules, the contract will be for fiscal years 2011, 2012, and 2013, the total not to exceed value of this agreement is \$750,000, and 2) authorize the City Manager or his designee to execute the renewal agreement at the rate of \$250,000 per year for years two and three for software consulting services, and 3) refer FY 2011 Information Technology (IT) CIP’s to Finance Committee for further discussion and then to Council as an Action item.

**INCORPORATED INTO MOTION WITH THE CONSENT OF THE MAKER AND SECONDER** that when it returns to the Finance Committee to include

benchmarking information, cost benefit, and a continuum report related to Information Technology (IT) CIP's.

Council Member Holman asked if the SAP contracts were CIP projects in the IT fund.

Mr. Perez said yes, it was all in the Information Technology fund.

Council Member Klein said the SAP system was being referred to as a \$200 million system and was it correct to assume that was the amount processed per year and not the City's cost.

Mr. Perez said that was correct.

**MOTION PASSED: 9-0**

8. Review and Comment on the 2009-2010 Santa Clara County Civil Grand Jury Report "Cities Must Rein In Unsustainable Employee Costs".

City Manager, James Keene gave a presentation as outlined in Staff Report CMR:315:10. He said a correction needed to be made in the Addendum to Item No.8. The word "Charter" needed to be changed to "Non-Charter." Non-charter cities were known as general law cities in the State and precluded from binding interest arbitration. He said the City was required to respond to each of the Grand Jury Report's recommendations and filed by August 30, 2010. The report consisted of 13 findings with recommendations. Each city needed to state whether they agreed or disagreed with the recommendations and if they were implemented or not. An explanation was required if a recommendation was not applicable.

Mayor Burt needed clarification on what the Council was asked to do.

Mr. Keene said the report was being presented to get a sense of the Council's comments or concerns. Staff would come back at a later date with recommendations and comments in a Staff Report.

Mayor Burt said the process would be to discuss each finding in order.

Council Member Klein suggested listening to public comments prior to moving forward with the discussion.

Bob Moss, Palo Alto, said employee's salaries and benefits should not be compared to other cities and jurisdictions but to private industry since they

were more of a determinant. He said it was self-defeating for the City to allow high benefits, pay and security all at the same time. The City could not afford it. He encouraged having employees increase their medical and pension contributions. It was important that employees, the community, and the unions work together since the ability to raise taxes and revenues was limited.

Herb Borock, Palo Alto, said the Report, Table 3, page 6, was missing the average healthcare data for individual and family. He spoke of arbitration and consolidation of fire services. He said binding arbitration gave fire personnel more standing in negotiations. He urged the Council not to place a measure on the ballot. A 1996 report revealed consolidation of fire service in three cities, Palo Alto, Mountain View, and Los Altos saved 5.5 administrative positions out of 254.5 positions and if the cost were allocated to cities based on calls-for-service, Palo Alto's cost would increase.

Mr. Keene said as a follow-up to Mr. Borock's comment, Staff needed to make corrections and clarifications in certain charts of the Report regarding missing data, healthcare contributions, retirement formula, and days off. Corrections would be included in the response to the Grand Jury.

Mayor Burt asked if any of the information could be provided at this evening's meeting.

Mr. Perez said the healthcare information that was provided to the Grand Jury was the annual and not individual costs. An e-mail link was provided that reflected 2010-2011 healthcare premiums. Blue Shield's 2010 highest rate for basic premium for employee only was \$577.33 per month, for employee plus one was \$1154.66, and \$1501.06 for a family. The 2011 premiums increased by 7.265%.

Mayor Burt asked about floater holidays and total days off for employees.

Mr. Perez said it varied by labor groups and one group had 61 days. Staff would review each labor group and provide the exact data. He said the family medical leave time in the Report was more of an exception than the norm.

Mr. Keene said the Report indicated zero floating or personal days off, which was incorrect, and varied by bargaining group. The City's retirement formula for pension was based on the highest year and not the last year.

Council Member Schmid said the most important item was total compensation and was critical in looking at future commitments.

Council Member Scharff asked if the City calculated salary step increases and cost-of-living adjustments (COLA) as outlined in the Report.

Mr. Perez said yes, and it depended on the labor group. The majority was in non-management staff in step progression of 1 through 5, and depended on the step the employee was hired at which could include both.

Council Member Scharff said he was in favor of the Grand Jury findings and recommendations.

Mayor Burt asked whether the COLA was given without little bearing on the market in Finding #2.

Mr. Perez said the cost of inflation was part of negotiations and Council's directions. The City was subject to market benchmarking and certain positions could get a higher increase due to the market.

Vice Mayor Espinosa said one of the areas that should be looked at was Finding #3 regarding employees added value to the City. He said there was a need in finding ways to better tie rewards to performance and contributions to the City.

Council Member Klein said he agreed with most of the Grand Jury Report, but believed they were trying to do one size fits all using San Jose City as the model. He had a problem with Finding #3 and had difficulty in knowing where to go with the step progressions. He said the City's system worked well.

Council Member Yeh said it was important to review the data. Reality was that the public sector was not the go to sector for young people because they tend to job hop. That was not a sustainable system. Employees were retiring after decades of working for the City and that also was not sustainable.

Council Member Holman said there was an obligation to the community to spend their funds correctly and to insure that the best service was provided. The humanity aspect should not be forgotten when addressing the Grand Jury's Report.

Council Member Shepherd asked if the COLA was based on Consumer Price Index (CPI) in San Francisco.

Mr. Perez said it was based on San Francisco and San Jose CPI.

Council Member Shepherd raised concerns regarding healthcare based on the CPI. She supported the final recommendation regarding COLA increases.

Mayor Burt said he was interested to know whether healthcare was included in the COLA. The City covered healthcare, and if healthcare was included in the COLA, the City was paying double the COLA that pertained to healthcare. He questioned the baseline salary of being adequate for living in the local area versus the COLA. He said the higher cost of benefits were unsustainable and could mean service cuts to the community.

Council Member Price asked what the trade-offs were in providing resources to an employee in order for them to live in the region, what the pay structure was for Federal employees, and how did the City compare to the Federal Government's process. She was concerned of how people managed who were compensated at 60 percent or less.

Council Member Klein said the City did not have a COLA in the contract, historically it did, but not for sometime.

Mr. Keene said the City had a combination of market adjustments using CPI in addition to the step increases.

Council Member Klein said the Grand Jury's discussion of COLA's did not apply to the City. He said the housing cost made it difficult for many employees to live and work in Palo Alto since the 1970's

Mayor Burt said the Council would now move on to Sections No. 4, Medical Insurance; No. 5, Pension; and No. 6, Days Off.

Council Member Schmid said the Report identified benefits as the biggest systemic problem. Cities found when large sums of benefits were granted, benefits accumulated over time. A 10-year forecast showed benefits grew quicker than revenues. He felt Recommendations 4 and 5 pertaining to employee participation were important.

Council Member Shepherd asked if Staff was going to look at employee days off.

Mr. Perez said yes, and would be specified by labor group.

Council Member Shepherd said the report showed the City had 75 potential days off which were over one-fourth of the workdays. It was out of sync with the private sector. She raised concerns on how the work got done and

projects completed and asked if it was necessary to get additional staffing to cover the days off.

Mr. Keene said there would always be an impact regardless of the number of days off. Staff would provide the Council with accurate numbers on August 2, 2010.

Council Member Shepherd had concerns regarding the City's benefits package and said it was out of sync with the private sector. It did not allow everyone to contribute to the efforts in keeping healthcare in control. She would like to find a healthcare package where employees contributed more.

Council Member Holman addressed the last part of Recommendation 4e regarding high deductible medical plan. She said the problem with union negotiations was not all members in the same union paid the same rate. High deductibles impacted those who were at the lower part of the spectrum. Regarding Recommendation 6a, she said the City should negotiate to reduce vacation and holidays off. She asked Staff to respond to the spectrum and not only to what was listed in 6a. Vacation was about keeping employees fresh and refreshed and should not be accumulated but used.

Mr. Perez said Staff would describe the caps and limited amounts that could be banked per labor groups.

Council Member Scharff said he supported Council Member Holman's suggestions except for Recommendation 4e. Recommendation 5a was an issue that would affect the City's budget and should be a priority. He asked Staff to return with an overview of Nos. 4, 5, and 6 and what worked or did not work for Palo Alto.

Council Member Yeh said he could relate to Recommendations 4 and 5 as they relate to the City's long-term costs. The City's pension costs showed a level of unsustainability and needed reform. It was important on how to move forward in implementing each recommendation and the affects it would have on employees. He asked Staff to come back with out-of-the-box ideas on how to reform the cost.

Council Member Price said she was unsure if Recommendations 4c and 4d were being done and how they were being done. She said the City had the least control on healthcare and could only control the plans being offered.

Mr. Keene said Staff could come back with recommendations that were contrary to what was being discussed because there was information that Staff was not aware of and needed to be built into the response.

Mayor Burt said he was surprised to find the number of days off there was for employees which included floating holidays. He felt days off contained in the table were not far off. He referred to Recommendation 5C3 and said it was an issue the City tried to negotiate with public safety in calculating pension in the last 3 years. The issue went into binding arbitration and the arbitrator ruled against the City. He said federal employees' pension was a defined contribution and not a defined benefit.

Mr. Keene said traditionally it was a defined benefit but was unsure what it was now.

Mayor Burt said that needed clarification and benchmarking should include federal benefits as well as private sector benefits. He said the Council would now move on and review Nos. 7, 8, and 9.

Vice Mayor Espinosa said he had a problem with reducing compensation for entry level positions when there were qualified applicants. He was surprised of the low salary for entry level positions. He raised concerns regarding outsourcing and believed it decreased service levels. In addressing No. 9, the issue the City faced in job classification and adjustment was the ability of doing it. The City Manager should have the ability to restructure the organization.

Council Member Shepherd said she agreed with Vice Mayor Espinosa on Nos. 8 and 9, but troubled with No. 7. The Bay Area was a complicated area to live in and needed capable hires which put friction in bringing people up to market with salary. It cost 15 percent more to live here than other places in California. She agreed with the report in looking at a mix of market-oriented compensation practices to adjust to competition labor changes.

Council Member Yeh said Recommendation 7 usually pulled up salaries of management which could be out-dated information. Midlevel as well as top level salaries should be looked at. It was high salaries that pulled up the average. He supported Recommendation 8, in looking at consolidating services across jurisdictions. Recommendation 9, operational efficiencies needed to be looked at.

Council Member Scharff said outsourcing was successful this year and believed the City should continue to look at that process with certain functions. It was a way to achieve cost-savings without cutting services.

Council Member Price said Recommendations 8 and 9 were critical discussions with labor groups. If the City did not collaborate with labor groups it could create more issues rather than reaching solutions that made sense to the City.

Mayor Burt said the Council would now move on to Sections No. 10, 11, and 12.

Assistant City Attorney, Don Larkin said the City could respond to No. 13 but was not specifically asked to respond to Nos. 10 and 13.

Vice Mayor Espinosa said Recommendation 10 and 13 were out of the City's purview. The City Manager and Mr. Perez should respond to Nos. 11, 12a, c, and d, since it concerned publicized meetings about the goals as well as making sure the Council Members and the public were well informed. The responses could be about what the City focused on during the past year.

Mayor Burt said the finding on No. 13 regarding Binding Arbitration was not limited to San Jose.

**MOTION:** Council Member Scharff moved, seconded by Council Member Holman to direct the City Attorney to draft a proposed Charter Amendment and ballot language for August 2, 2010 regarding binding arbitration whether to place this on the November 2010 Ballot.

Council Member Sharff clarified the vote was not to remove binding arbitration but to have a discussion on August 2, 2010, and the only way to do that was to request the City Attorney to draft a proposed Charter Amendment and the ballot language.

**INCORPORATED INTO THE MOTION WITH THE CONSENT OF THE MAKER AND SECONDER AMENDMENT** to have a policy discussion regarding the proposed Charter Amendment on July 26, 2010.

**INCORPORATED INTO THE MOTION WITH THE CONSENT OF THE MAKER AND SECONDER AMENDMENT** to begin the meeting of July 26, 2010 at 5:30 p.m.

**MOTION TO CALL THE QUESTION:** Council Member Klein moved, seconded by Council Member Schmid to Call the Question.

**MOTION TO CALL THE QUESTION:** 8-1 Yeh no



**MOTION AS AMENDED PASSED:** 8-1 Yeh no

Council Member Shepherd asked the City Attorney if the Council could put a tax initiative on the ballot to help fund the staffing for the firefighters.

Mr. Larkin said no, not in November 2010, because a general tax needed to be placed on the General Municipal Election which occurred in odd-number years.

**CONSENT CALENDAR**

**MOTION:** Vice Mayor Espinosa moved, seconded by Council Member Scharff to approve Agenda Item Nos. 9-14.

Council Member Holman said regarding Agenda Item No. 12, what did the City receive in return for exchanging 79,000 square feet for 45,000 square feet for the Public Access and Public Recreation Access Easements at the Hyatt property at Stanford.

Director of Administrative Services, Lalo Perez said it was part of multiple easements that were completed in 2002. A map was approved in 2002 which contained work done by a company who neglected to follow the map and placed the trails in the wrong locations. The Hyatt and Stanford group wanted to get the City's approval on the change to modify the map. It would change the existing public recreation access easement of 42,017 square feet to a new 45,529 square feet. The City gained 3,500 square feet as a result of this change.

Mr. Keene said his understanding of Council Member Holman's question dealt with an issue that was decided in 2002 and an exchange had taken place. The current issue was a housekeeping type correction of the map and as a result, the action on the map was an adjustment that gained seeded land for the City. He said he did not think the Council would be in a position to make changes to the land difference.

**INCORPORATED INTO THE MOTION WITH THE CONSENT OF THE MAKER AND SECONDER** to continue Agenda Item Number 14 to a date uncertain.

Council Member Klein advised he would not be participating in Agenda Item No. 12 as his wife is on faculty at Stanford.

9. Approval of a Contract with Valley Slurry Seal Co. in the Amount of \$977,577 for the 2010 Street Maintenance Program Slurry Seal and Microsurfacing Capital Improvement Program Project PE-86070.
10. Resolution 9077 entitled "Resolution of the Council of the City of Palo Alto Expressing Appreciation to Robert Ward Upon His Retirement."
11. Approval of a Contract with Granite Construction Company in the Amount of \$2,226,227 for the 2010 Street Maintenance Program Asphalt Overlay Capital Improvement Program Project PE-86070.
12. Resolution 9078 entitled "Resolution of the Council of the City of Palo Alto Summarily Vacating Public Access and Public Recreation Access Easements at 600 and 620 Sand Hill Road." (*Item continued from May 3, 2010*).
13. Approval of an Amendment to Ordinances Regarding Publications of Board & Commission Recruitments: Adoption of an Ordinance Amending Sections 2.18.030, 2.20.015, 2.21.020, 2.22.015, 2.23.020, 2.24.020, 2.25.020, and Section 16.49.030 of the Palo Alto Municipal Code to Delete the Publication Requirements for Board and Commission Recruitment Ads and Adding Section 2.16.060 to Establish the Publication of One Board and Commission Recruitment Advertisement in a Two-Week Period.
- ~~14. Adoption of an Ordinance Amending Section 2.04.010, Relating to Notice of Regular Meetings, and Section 2.04.070, Relating to Notice of Agendas, of Chapter 2.04 of Title 2 of the Palo Alto Municipal Code.~~

**MOTION PASSED for Agenda Item Nos. 9-11,13: 9-0**

**MOTION PASSED for Agenda Item No. 12: 8-0 Klein not participating**

COUNCIL MEMBER QUESTIONS, COMMENTS, AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

**MOTION:** Council Member Holman moved, seconded by Council Member Scharff to direct the City Attorney to return to Council on August 2, 2010 with a Charter Amendment to align our elections on even numbered years and ballot language to extend current Council member terms to five years and to not affect the Council members' abilities to serve two terms.

Council Member Scharff was in favor of discussing the item.

Council Member Holman said this was the time to have the discussion given the other things that could be on the ballot.

**MOTION PASSED:** 8-1 Schmid no

Council Member Yeh reported on attending the Low Carbon Cities Initiative in Beijing last week.

Mayor Burt adjourned the meeting in memory of Stephen Schneider (1945-2010) who was a renowned Stanford University Climatologist.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned in memory of Stephen Schneider at 1:10 a.m.