

Special Meeting  
June 14, 2010

The City Council of the City of Palo Alto met on this date in the Council Chambers at 7:38 p.m.

Present: Burt, Espinosa, Holman, Klein, Price, Scharff, Schmid, Shepherd,  
Yeh arrived @ 7:49 p.m.

Absent:

SPECIAL ORDERS OF THE DAY

1. Resolution 9060 entitled "Resolution of the Council of the City of Palo Alto Expressing Appreciation to Mark S. Herrera Upon His Retirement."

Council Member Scharff read the Proclamation expressing appreciation to Mark S. Herrera for outstanding public service.

**MOTION:** Council Member Scharff moved, seconded by Vice Mayor Espinosa to adopt the resolution expressing appreciation to Mark S. Herrera upon his retirement.

**MOTION PASSED:** 8-0 Yeh absent

2. Resolution 9061 entitled "Resolution of the Council of the City of Palo Alto Expressing Appreciation to Gary R. Brooks Upon His Retirement."

Council Member Klein read the Proclamation expressing appreciation to Gary R. Brooks for outstanding public service.

**MOTION:** Council Member Klein moved, seconded by Council Member Schmid to adopt the resolution expressing appreciation to Gary R. Brooks upon his retirement.

Officer Brooks spoke on his gratitude serving the Police Department.

**MOTION PASSED:** 8-0 Yeh absent

3. Resolution 9062 entitled "Resolution of the Council of the City of Palo Alto Expressing Appreciation to Steve Baca Upon His Retirement."

Vice Mayor Espinosa read the Proclamation expressing appreciation to Steve Baca for outstanding public service.

**MOTION:** Vice Mayor Espinosa moved, seconded by Council Member Holman to adopt the resolution expressing appreciation to Steve Baca upon his retirement.

Mr. Baca spoke on his gratitude serving the Police Department.

**MOTION PASSED:** 8-0 Yeh absent

4. Resolution 9063 entitled "Resolution of the Council of the City of Palo Alto Expressing Appreciation to Audrey Bates Upon Her Retirement."

Council Member Shepherd read the Proclamation expressing appreciation to Audrey Bates for outstanding public service.

**MOTION:** Council Member Shepherd moved, seconded by Council Member Scharff to adopt the resolution expressing appreciation to Audrey Bates upon her retirement.

**MOTION PASSED:** 9-0

5. Resolution 9064 entitled "Resolution of the Council of the City of Palo Alto Expressing Appreciation to Police Canine Lukas Z Kyjoskeho Udoli Upon His Retirement."

Council Member Schmid read the Resolution into the record.

**MOTION:** Council Member Schmid moved, seconded by Council Member Yeh to adopt the resolution expressing appreciation to Police Canine Lukas Z Kyjoskeho Udoli upon his retirement.

**MOTION PASSED:** 9-0

Police Chief, Dennis Burns spoke on his appreciation for the years of service rendered by the retired Police Department Staff.

## STUDY SESSION

### 6. San Francisquito Creek Joint Powers Authority's (SFCJPA) Capital Flood Protection Project Studies and Design Work.

San Francisquito Creek Joint Powers Authority (JPA) Executive Director, Len Materman made a presentation that provided updated information on the JPA's Capital Flood Protection Project studies and design work. He described the existing flood risk in the San Francisquito Creek Watershed (Watershed). He spoke on the ongoing joint Army Corps of Engineers/JPA Feasibility Study of long-term Comprehensive Flood Control Project alternatives. The JPA pursued the implementation of individual capital projects that would improve flood protection to the communities in the Watershed. The capital projects targeted the following San Francisquito Creek stream segments: 1) Highway 101 to San Francisco Bay; 2) San Francisquito Creek culvert beneath Highway 101; and 3) upstream of Highway 101. He described the scope of the proposed project between Highway 101 and San Francisco Bay. This project would include a combination of concrete floodwalls and setback levees to increase the channel capacity and enhance the habitat value of the creek. The preliminary project design was currently being reviewed and the scoping meeting for the project Environmental Impact Report would be held later this summer, with a proposed construction start date in summer 2011. The project was designed to convey 100-year fluvial flows, concurrent with a 100-year high tide event, with accommodation for future sea-level rise. JPA staff was coordinating with Caltrans on a project to expand the capacity of the San Francisquito Creek culvert beneath Highway 101, and the two adjacent frontage roads. Construction was expected to begin in summer 2012. He described the preliminary findings of an Alternatives Analysis performed by the Santa Clara Valley Water District to identify potential flood protection measures upstream of Highway 101. He outlined four alternatives, including a base option to replace existing bridges and stream capacity bottlenecks, and three supplemental options, including floodwalls, a bypass culvert, and upstream detention. He described the various benefits, constraints, impacts, and relative costs of each of the alternatives. He indicated there would be future policy choices made regarding the level of flood protection to be achieved, which specific design alternative to pursue, and a method of generating the funds to pay for flood protection improvements upstream of Highway 101. He spoke on project funding, coordination with the Corps' feasibility study, project aesthetics, public safety concerns, and potential impacts to adjacent property owners. Members of the public thanked the JPA Staff for their outreach efforts, and to advocate for protection of fisheries, project coordination with Stanford's Habitat Conservation Plan, and continuation of the accelerated pace of progress towards project implementation.

Craig Allen, 315 Melville Avenue, speaking on behalf of the Palo Alto Golf Advisory Council, spoke on their support for the San Francisquito Creek project.

Mark Peterson-Perez, spoke on impacts on the natural habitat and eminent domain issues that may result from the San Francisquito Creek project.

Brian Schmidt, Committee for Green Foothills, spoke on potential habitat enhancements, benefits to endangered species, and offsite mitigation contained within the Stanford Draft Habitat Conservation Plan. It was his belief the Stanford Draft Habitat Conservation Plan and the San Francisquito Creek project would work together.

Art Kraemer, 1116 Forest Avenue, spoke on his concern for waiting on Federal funding for the Capital Flood Protection Project.

Mr. Materman spoke on the Capital Flood Protection Project's plan to remove a levy that would provide enhancements to the Baylands. The plan would enhance the habitat for steelhead trout because it would create a gradual journey from saltwater to freshwater while providing hiding areas. He indicated construction efforts upstream would be underway in approximately nine months. It was his belief funding was available for the construction downstream, dependent on the final design.

#### CITY MANAGER COMMENTS

City Manager, James Keene updated the City Council on the eucalyptus tree state of affairs at Eleanor Pardee Park. The Public Works Department would remove the remaining three diseased eucalyptus trees. He stated Staff would keep the community posted on the health of the remaining eucalyptus trees.

#### ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

John Abraham, 736 Ellsworth Place, spoke on his support to retain the audit on police demographics.

Mark Peterson-Perez, spoke on the First Amendment, Due Process Clause, and the use of email.

Mark Peterson-Perez Jr., spoke on an online social media site called Palo Alto Free Press.

Leeron Morad spoke on the labor of fruit vendors in Palo Alto.

Mike Francois, 224 Gardenia Way, East Palo Alto, spoke on the harmful effects of fluoridated water.

#### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

**MOTION:** Council Member Shepherd moved, seconded by Council Member Holman to approve the minutes of May 17, 2010 as amended.

**MOTION PASSED:** 9-0

#### CONSENT CALENDAR

**MOTION:** Vice Mayor Espinosa moved, seconded by Council Member Yeh to approve Agenda Item Nos. 7-10.

7. Approval of a Conditional Use Permit and a Record of Land Use Action to Allow a Pediatric Dental Office on the Second Floor of an Existing Office Building at 2345 Yale Street.
8. Finance Committee Recommendation to Accept the Auditor's Office Quarterly Report as of March 31, 2010.
9. Finance Committee Recommendation to Accept the Auditor's Office Audit of Fleet Utilization and Replacement.
10. Approval of a Wastewater Treatment Enterprise Fund Contract with Carollo Engineers, P.C. in an Amount of \$389,715 for Design of Facility Repair and Retrofit Projects at the Regional Water Quality Control Plant - Capital Improvement Program Project WQ-04011.

**MOTION PASSED:** 9-0

#### AGENDA CHANGES, ADDITIONS, AND DELETIONS

Mayor Burt stated Agenda Item No. 12 had been requested by the residents' association, in the affected Open Space Zone District, to have the item rescheduled to a date certain on October 4, 2010.

#### ACTION ITEMS

11. Public Hearing: Approval of a Levy of Assessment for California Avenue Area Parking Bonds - Plan G: Fiscal Year 2010-2011 and Adoption of Resolution 9065 entitled "Resolution of the Council of the City of Palo Alto Confirming Engineer's Report and Assessment Roll, California Avenue Parking Project No. 92-13 (For Fiscal Year 2010-2011)."

Mayor Burt stated the City Engineer had prepared and filed with the City Clerk a report providing for the levying of special assessments within the Parking Assessment Districts created and established for the projects and under the Resolution of Intent. The report sets forth the amounts of assessments proposed to be levied for the Fiscal Year 2010. The assessments will be used to pay principal and interest on the Bonds issued in the various projects. The report has been open for public inspection. The purpose of the Public Hearing was to allow the City Council to hear all persons having an interest in any real property within the Parking Assessment Districts, take and receive oral and documentary evidence pertaining to matters contained in the filed report, and to remedy, correct or amend the report. He inquired whether the City Clerk had received any written communications from such interested persons.

City Clerk, Donna Grider stated no written communications had been received.

Public hearing opened and closed without public comment at 9:22 p.m.

**MOTION:** Council Member Shepherd moved, seconded by Council Member Klein to adopt the Resolution confirming the Engineer's Report and Assessment Roll for California Avenue District, Project No. 92-13 and levying assessments for FY-2011.

**MOTION PASSED:** 9-0

12. Public Hearing: Adoption of an Ordinance of the Council of the City of Palo Alto Amending Section 18.28.050 (Site Development Standards) to Chapter 18.28 Special Purpose Districts (PF, OS, AC) of Title 18 (Zoning) of the Palo Alto Municipal Code to add a Maximum House Size Limit to the Open Space Zone District. *(Staff requests item to be continued by Council Motion to 10/04/10).*

**MOTION:** Council Member Yeh moved, seconded by Council Member Scharff to continue Agenda Item No. 12 to October 4, 2010.

**MOTION PASSED:** 9-0

13. Public Hearing: To Consider Approval of a Vesting Tentative Map and a Record of Land Use Action to Subdivide the Existing Parcel into Five Separate Condominium Parcels for Four Residential Units and One Commercial Unit at 420 Cambridge Avenue.

Program Assistant II, Amy Johnson stated the proposed Vesting Tentative Map was to subdivide one existing 6,000 square foot parcel to establish five condominium units with an approved mixed-use development. The project's design, in the California Avenue Shopping District, was approved via the

Architectural Review Board process after the City Council approved the rezoning of the Pedestrian Transit Oriented Development. Staff determined that the Vesting Tentative Map application was in compliance with zoning, subdivision, and other codes and Ordinances, and pursuant to the State Subdivision Map Act. The Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions (CC&R's) for this development outlined the responsible parties for maintenance and general upkeep. To ensure ongoing maintenance provisions within the CC&R's, Staff suggested the City Council add a third Condition of Approval to Section 6, of the Record of Land Use Action, stating the maintenance of common areas shall be addressed to the satisfaction of the City Attorney. The final CC&R's would be submitted in conjunction with the Final Map.

Council Member Schmid inquired whether the condominiums were advantageous from a budgetary perspective.

Ms. Johnson stated title transfers would yield income to the City.

Public hearing opened and closed without public comment at 9:27 p.m.

**MOTION:** Council Member Holman moved, seconded by Council Member Scharff to: 1) approve the Vesting Tentative Map. 2) adopt the findings and conditions contained within the Record of Land Use Action, and 3) add a third condition to Section 5 of the Conditions of Approval of the Record of Land Use Action that maintenance of common areas shall be addressed to the satisfaction of the City Attorney in the Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions, for the subdivision.

Council Member Holman stated her support for the additional condition within the CC&R's.

**MOTION PASSED: 9-0**

14. Public Hearing: Stanford University Medical Center Facilities Renewal and Replacement Project Meeting to Receive Comments on the Stanford University Medical Center Facilities Renewal and Replacement Project Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR), Including Comments Focused on: A) the Project Description, Land Use, Population & Housing, and Public Services Chapters of the Draft EIR (*continued from June 7, 2010*); and B) Visual Quality, Biological Resources and Cultural Resources Chapters of the Draft EIR.

Council Member Klein advised he would not be participating in this Agenda Item as his wife was on faculty at Stanford University. He left the meeting at 9:29 p.m.

Curtis Williams, Director of Planning and Community Environment: Yes, thank you Mayor Burt and Council Members. I am Curtis Williams, Director of Planning and Community Environment. As the Mayor mentioned this is both a holdover from last week's meeting and also discussion of three additional chapter of the Draft EIR.

At last week's meeting the Council did go through a series and answers and was in the midst of making its comments, and did not have time to get through that. So we are looking forward to any additional comments tonight that you have on the Project Description, Land Use, Population and Housing, and Public Services. Those were last week's items. This week we are specifically looking that the Visual Quality, Biological Resources, and Cultural Resources Chapters of the DEIR. Rod Jeung of PBS&J has a brief presentation on those. Then Stanford Medical Center has a presentation on the visual portion including a flythrough of the site that they would like to make before you proceed. Mayor, is it okay to go through those presentations before you go back to last weeks items? The alternative is to have you discuss last week's items and then come to the presentation.

Mayor Burt: Let me get a sense of Council. So our options are to pick up right where we left off last week on the first item, or to have the Staff presentation on the second item, and then pick up where we left off. Then thirdly we could have the Staff presentation, go through these aspects, and then at the end return to where we left off last week. Three options, don't want to give you too many choices or spend too much time on this. Council Member Schmid.

Council Member Schmid: Why don't we finish where we were last week and then have a fresh view on these?

Mayor Burt: How does that sound to the rest? Is that how folks want to do it? Council Member Holman.

Council Member Holman: I would like to suggest, if I could, that it is 9:30 already and perhaps there are people here who want to speak on this item tonight. Perhaps before we continue our comments we allow the public to speak. Last week we lost some speakers.

Mayor Burt: I am seeing some nodding. Does that seem like the preferred way to go? Okay. Alright, so what we will do is have Staff presentation on the Biological Resources, and depending on whether we have significant questions on that we will make a determination whether to immediately hear from the public or allow questions from the Council before hearing from the public. What we want to do is make sure that the public has a chance to speak before it gets too late tonight.



Mr. Williams: I would like to introduce Rod Jeung from PBS&J. It looks like we may or may not have this presentation ready.

Rod Jeung, Project Director, PBS&J: Good evening Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, and members of the public. Tonight we are presenting the next set of environmental topics. As Curtis Williams mentioned we will be covering Visual Quality, Biological Resources, and Cultural Resources from the Draft Environmental Impact Report. How are we doing with the slides?

Well, considering the hour and the desire to receive comments and to hear from the public our remarks tonight will be even briefer than usual. Speaking about Visual Quality, you have before you, I hope, the same table, the same format that we have used in the past. The table in this case identifies and summarizes the Visual Quality impacts. As explained previously at the other hearings the column on the left identifies the criteria for evaluating the impacts and the significance are rated across the top in the column headings ranging from No Impact or NI to Significant Unavoidable, SU. The table shows that with implementation of the recommended implementation measures the potentially significant impacts of visual character, changes to public views, and new light and glare would be reduced to less than significant.

These visual impacts would occur both during the construction and the post-construction periods. There are two mitigation measures that have been identified to address the impacts in both phases. So during the first impact, during the construction period, the visual character on the site would be significantly impacted by the construction staging and activities. The Draft EIR calls for a Visual Improvements Plan during construction to conceal the staging areas, to remove construction debris on a regular basis, and to landscape disturbed areas as soon as possible.

During the operation period, or post-construction, the Draft EIR recommends that the City's architectural review process be conducted. That the recommendations from that process be followed to ensure that the appropriate design of the proposed structures, and this would include consideration of their effects on the visual character, public views, and light and glare are all taken into account. The intent of this mitigation measure is that adherence to the architectural review process and requiring the implementation of those recommendations as forwarded to the Planning and Transportation Commission and the Council would reduce the visual impacts to less than significant.

With respect to Biology, again as shown in the table, the SUMC project would have significant impacts on special status species and wildlife movement. Specifically the construction could disturb special status bats that may roost in trees, and structures onsite, and the Cooper's hawk, which

may rest in onsite oak trees. The project could also disturb wildlife movement by disturbing birds that use onsite and nearby trees for nesting. The disturbance of these nesting birds constitutes a violation of the California Department of Fish and Game Code and is a significant impact.

Finally, in terms of the Biological impacts the project would have a significant impact on protected trees, as defined by the City's Municipal Code. Of the 176 trees onsite 76 would be removed due to the project. Mitigation measures cannot guarantee that impacts to these protected trees would be reduced to less than significant. Thus the Draft EIR reports that this impact would remain significant and unavoidable for both the project and cumulative impacts.

So summarize the mitigation measures, the mitigation measures for special status bats and birds are essentially the same and include three basic steps. The first is to conduct surveys before construction occurs to determine if the species are present. Second, it is taking steps to avoid those particular species if they are present. Then third it is working with a qualified biologist to protect the species if they are detected.

In order to mitigate for the loss of the 71 protected trees the Draft EIR identifies six mitigation measures starting with a Tree Preservation Report all the way through identifying and planning for the relocation of the targeted trees that are going to be preserved, to making deposits to the City to ensure the successful relocation of those trees. However, it is recognized that even with these measures the loss of protected trees would remain a significant and unavoidable impact.

In terms of the last topic for tonight Cultural Resources, Cultural Resources includes the historic architecture and archeological resources that may occur on the site. As shown in the table, the same format as we have seen previously, the project would have significant impacts on Cultural Resources. Some of which can be mitigated to less than significant and some that cannot be avoided. Specifically the project could disturb previously undiscovered archeological resources, paleontological resources, and human remains. Although with mitigation these impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels.

However, the project would demolish the Edward Durell Stone Building complex, also known as the 1959 hospital building, which the City has determined to be eligible for the California Register of Historic Resources. While mitigation has been identified to reduce the impacts to this resource the building would still be removed so the impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. In addition, the Hoover Pavilion is considered an important example of pre-World War II hospital design and is also thus eligible for the California Register. While demolition of smaller surrounding

buildings and construction of the clinic and garage as part of the proposed project could damage the Hoover Pavilion with mitigation the impact would be reduced to less than significant.

This slide shows the range of mitigation measures that are proposed in the Draft Environmental Impact Report. They essentially cover five different mitigation measures to reduce the potential impacts to Hoover Pavilion. These measures call for a protective buffer around the building during construction, prohibition on the use of vibration causing equipment, and implementation of specific protective measures that are contained in a separately prepared Pavilion Protection document. The measures for the Stone Building complex would include documentation, although as I mentioned earlier, these measures would not avoid the loss of this historic resource.

Finally, there are measures that are recommended in the event that there are archeological, paleontological, or human resources discovered. These measures, which are pretty standard, would effectively reduce the potential effects to less than significant. That concludes tonight's presentation.

Mayor Burt: Thank you. Next I should say we have Commissioner Martinez here. Did you have anything that you wished to add? Has the Planning Commission already gone through a preliminary review of this segment? Yes. Is there anything that you wish to add beyond the minute copies that we received today?

Eduardo Martinez, Planning and Transportation Commissioner: Thank you. The Commission spent about almost three hours on Visual Quality, Cultural Resources, and not much on Biological Resources. I think our discussion felt that there were great impacts visually on the Hoover Pavilion that the placement of the new building just seemed contrary. We felt that the radical change of the hospital campus really had both a cultural impact on our Cultural Resources, and a visual impact. Culturally there was a loss of continuity we felt. Not just in the demolition of the hospital, but just in the sense of the fact that this was a campus that has been in operation for 50 years or more. Visually we felt that there was a visual impact to the towers, a suggestion that maybe the height of the towers could be reduced. There was a suggestion that the medical office buildings could potentially be housed in the old hospital building, the Stone Building, as a way of preserving it. Then on Quarry Road there has been some discussion I think with the Council and the Planning Commission that there should be a plan for that as a significant entrance, gateway, to Stanford. We felt that should be considered in the mitigations for the Visual Quality aspect of the DEIR.

There were other suggestions moving the medical office building closer to the other office buildings on Welch Road so it would be more a part of a

cluster of buildings and similar uses, and continuing the visual impact down Pasteur Drive through the gardens that are being preserved all the way to where the entrance to the hospital was as a way of mitigating the visual impact of the project. Thank you.

Mayor Burt: Thank you. Do colleagues have questions of either Staff or Commissioner Martinez before hearing from the applicant and then members of the public? Vice Mayor Espinosa.

Vice Mayor Espinosa: Just quickly for Commissioner Martinez. One of the things that was interesting to me was trying to find any sort of consensus on this resolution in the historic nature of the Hoover building and what is proposed around it beyond sort of moving some of the structures or decreasing height, etc. I just couldn't find that there was a consensus around that but sometimes it is hard to get that from just the minutes. So I was wondering if you thought that there was a clear direction that the Commission wanted to see the project go in order to resolve that.

Commissioner Martinez: I agree with you there was not a unanimous consensus but there was a majority opinion that the historic value of the Hoover Pavilion would be better served if there were a different location for the new building, and that we would really do more to restore some of the original qualities of the Palo Alto hospital, and that had to do with the landscaping of the entrance and really trying to restore it as it looked in 1939. There were a lot of ideas about moving buildings, not having the building there, and one felt that it was okay like it was. I think there was a strong consensus that really the Cultural Resource of the Pavilion was being compromised in the new plan.

Mayor Burt: Thank you. I don't see any other questions at this time. So would the applicant like to up to ten minutes to speak? Welcome.

Mark Tortorich, Vice President of Facilities Planning, Design and Construction for Stanford University Medical Center and Lucile Packard Children's Hospital: Thank you. Good evening Mayor Burt, Members of the Council. We have a presentation that we structured for about 15 minutes so hopefully that will be acceptable to you. We have a photorealistic visual flythrough and then a few slides that we showed to the Planning Commission.

Mayor Burt: By our rules you are allowed ten minutes at the beginning and five at the end. If you wish to take all 15 at this time that would be fine as well.

Mr. Tortorich: Well, we will talk as fast as we can.

Mayor Burt: Okay.

Mr. Tortorich: What we wanted to show you, if Zach can get video fired up, is a photorealistic simulation of moving through the project starting at the Quarry and El Camino intersection and then moving through the various projects on Welch Road up to Pasteur Mall. Zach, we can skip that and go right to the slides if that would be okay.

So I think one point I did want to address is that at the Hoover site there was an awful lot of dialogue and discussion about the Pavilion building which we are renovating to house some of our community physicians, about a 20,000 square foot requirement, as well as the proposed medical office building that is about 60,000 square feet on the site. Again, we proposed that building to give long-term security to community physicians who want to stay in the immediate vicinity of the Medical Center, as well as a parking structure on the Hoover site. We don't currently have occupants of that building right now. I think we have added a few additional slides to give what we would consider to be the existing context of the Hoover site.

There had been a suggestion at Planning Commission of using the old 1959 hospital for community physicians. The 1959 hospital and School of Medicine building is about 850,000 square feet. We don't currently have a requirement that is unmet in our plan for community physicians. So that didn't seem like a practical fit for us. There isn't 850,000 square feet of need for community physicians. There is about 20,000 square feet and we are housing them in the existing Pavilion that will be renovated as part of this project.

So here is the photorealistic video. It comes with music but I can narrate. This is at the transit center and then crossing El Camino coming up Quarry Road. PF Chang's is there on the right. Then on the left is the existing Hoover Pavilion that will be renovated. You will see medical office building here on Quarry Road. Then you will see the utility substation that is here at the corner, and the parking structure in the background. There will be an ensemble of buildings between the parking structure, new medical office building, and Pavilion.

This is moving up Quarry Road toward the Lucile Packard Children's Hospital expansion, which you can see in the background behind the Stanford Barn. This depiction will turn you right onto Welch Road and you will see a grove of trees here at the corner of Quarry and Welch. We had changed the design for the Children's Hospital to preserve that grove of trees at the corner. We have created really a very large open space at the corner. These are the patient rooms with landscaping right outside of the patient rooms as you can see.

You are moving past the entrance to the existing Children's Hospital on Welch Road. You will see the new median strip and landscaping that is also proposed as part of the Welch Road improvements. We are ready to turn into the Pasteur Mall, which is the traditional entrance to the Stanford Medical Center. School of Medicine research buildings, specifically the Foundation in Medicine 1, 2, and 3 can be seen there on the right. On the left in the immediate foreground is the Parking Structure 4 that won an award from Palo Alto, as well as the hospital and clinic buildings in the foreground. This is the FIM building and one of the trees that we have preserved by redesigning that FIM 1. These are our future clinic buildings adjacent to the Thomas Church Fountains that exist at the entrance to the current hospital. This is the new five-pavilion 1.1 million square foot Stanford Hospital, with the entrance here to the immediate right. You can see the glass towers above the diagnostic and treatment platform looking back towards the clinics building and courtyard that is created there at the entry. Then you will see the parking structure in the foreground to the lower left. So that is the photorealistic simulation.

Now we will move onto the slide show and I will speak very fast. So I want to mention to you the four different aspects of the project Hoover Pavilion, Lucile Packard Children's Hospital, Stanford Hospital and Clinics, and the School of Medicine.

Next. The slide to the left is our existing conditions slide. The slide to the right is our proposal studied under the EIR, our base proposal.

Next. As part of our design process, we have developed a set of design guidelines that represent the things in between the buildings that connect developments, landscaping, paving, and such.

Next. Now we will talk about the Hoover Pavilion.

Next. You can see the upper left is the historic viewshed. That is the characteristic we consider to be the most significant about the view to the Hoover Pavilion at Palo Road and Quarry Road with the medical office building and parking structure adjacent.

Next. We really studied the language of the existing Hoover Pavilion, tried to match heights, tried to match base conditions, and then the vertical nature of the architectural expression. So that as our architect, WR&S characterizes it this is really an ensemble of buildings on that campus.

Next. This is a view from the shopping center parking structure looking across Quarry Road at Hoover Pavilion. The Pavilion really is behind all those trees.

Next. Again a view from Quarry looking past the power station at the Hoover Pavilion. So Hoover Pavilion is not well seen except from the corner of Palo Road and Quarry Road by our analysis.

Next. These are some still of the photorealistic simulation that you saw.

Next. Then a point that we just wanted to make that the Environmental Impact Report does not suggest that there is any degradation of the visual quality of the Hoover Pavilion structure.

Next. Lucile Packard Children's Hospital. We have combined both inpatient facilities and clinics into one structure.

Next. We have made a very significant effort to connect with nature. As I mentioned in the photorealistic simulation, we actually changed the design of the building to accommodate the grove of trees at the corner.

Next. Through our site planning we are creating gardens. The garden that you see to the upper right is on grade. The garden that you see to the lower left is on top of our surgery platform. By doing this we have really created about three and a half acres of open space and green space that didn't exist on this site before. It is predominantly buildings and asphalt paved parking lots.

Next. This shows you what is underneath that discovery garden, and that is going to be our operating perioperative service area, and prep and recovery, and then our lobby, which has a nice glass wall that opens up to the gardens at the corner of Quarry and Welch.

Next. Our patient spaces up in the upper floors, which will have overlooks to the gardens, as well as landscaping right outside of the patient windows.

Next. Again, some still photographs from the photorealistic simulation.

Next. Stanford Hospital and Clinics, this is the 1.1 million square foot replacement hospital for our seismically deficient facilities. Then clinic buildings for about 429,000 square feet, these are for predominantly Stanford practices.

Next. This is a render site plan, which was our original proposal. You can see outlined the sixth pavilion that sat on the Pasteur Mall. We have actually removed that pavilion to preserve a grove of trees on what is called the Kaplan Lawn. We have also redesigned our parking structure from being a below grade structure to a structure that is partially below grade and above grade to accommodate trees in that location.

Next. This is a diagram that will show you overlaid with our original proposal the trees that we now have preserved by redesigning the building.

Next. Here you can see some views and the updated site plan, which is part of the Tree Preservation Alternative, which is our preferred Alternative for the project.

Next. This gives you a view of the site plan with the drop-off, with the new hospital connecting to the existing facility.

Next. Our architect, Rafael Vinoly, and Lee, Burkhardt, Liu really have discussed this building as a garden interface between humanity and technology. The humanity being the patient bedrooms, and the technology being our emergency department and our interventional platform on the second floor.

Next. The ground floor plane shows the big volumes of space we are working with, our emergency department, which is nearly 40,000 square feet, as well as our imaging space. Those two spaces need to be immediately adjacent to each other. That really drives a lot of our planning of the building.

Next. Again, our patient floors with access from each of the single rooms out to natural daylight and good orientation to our internal atrium.

Next. Then stills from the photorealistic rendering.

Next. So I would ask David Lennox, our Campus Architect to talk about the School of Medicine.

Dave Lennox, Stanford Campus Architect: So the three School of Medicine buildings FIM 1, FIM 2, and FIM 3 will replace square foot for square foot the square footage in the Stone complex that they are currently occupying.

Next. The three buildings will actually provide a face for the School of Medicine to the Medical Center whereas the new buildings that have just recently been completed are the face to the main campus.

Next. We will be using the kit of parts, and the massing, and the scale, the limestone, the red lids, the rhythm of windows will all be incorporated in the new FIM designs.

Next. These are the views from Pasteur and Welch. You can see it will maintain the scale of the existing School of Medicine.



Next. One of the challenges of trying to do cutting-edge research space in the Stone complex is a floor-to-floor as it shows on the left. Currently how we are trying to make those work but it is really a challenge. We can't do a hospital in the Stone complex but we certainly have as much challenge doing cutting-edge research space. They are about three to four feet difference in floor-to-floor depth.

Next. So what we end up doing to meet the energy codes, to meet the HVAC requirements we end up needing to put equipment on the outside of the building, and run it up the outside walls and up in the roof.

Next. Thank you.

Mr. Tortorich: So we went quickly through that presentation. I know that some members of the Council maybe have seen the architectural expression of this project develop over the years, and some may be new to the project. So we would certainly offer to provide any further updates individually if you need them at your convenience. We certainly would be happy to do that. I think I have made it within our time limit. Thank you.

Mayor Burt: Thank you.

Public hearing opened at 9:56 p.m.

Stanley Mayerson, Palo Alto: I have gone through this. I just want to say one thing and that is all. A statement of – look you ally yourself with Stanford. It is genius to put stuff together. You not only get medical, you get all the other stuff along with it from anthropology. You are allying yourself with a world-class university. The chance is an incredible opportunity at this point. It depends on, well Palo Alto is I could say small but as a scientific community, medical, or whatever it provides an alliance. The sky is the limit. That's all.

Mayor Burt: Thank you. That was Dr. Stanley Mayerson. So we have cards from two members of the public at this time. Brian Schmidt followed by Bob Moss. Welcome.

Brian Schmidt, Committee for Green Foothills: Thank you. Good evening. We will be submitting most of our in writing. We barely, to be honest, had a chance to look at some of these things. I have just a couple brief comments. On some of the landscaping issues there might be some opportunities to work cooperatively. There are some interesting things there being done elsewhere. For example, in Morgan Hill they are doing tree plantings in the medians with oaks. They have done some interesting methods of reducing water demand and providing some habitat possibilities. I was interested to hear about the whole idea of connection to nature and

some open space. I think those should be examined closely when you have some trees in parks with mowed grass beneath. That is not exactly what I would call nature. Maybe there is some opportunity to do that with that open space they have discussed up above the buildings. Usually private open space where the public doesn't get at access to doesn't compensate for the losses that the public has elsewhere.

We did have some concerns about visual impacts, especially considering the height and the density that might occur from this. So we are not sure that could be reduce to less than significant impact, and there might be some possibility for mitigation through open space protection elsewhere. We will submit other comments later. Thank you.

Mayor Burt: Thank you. Our next speaker is Bob Moss. Welcome.

Bob Moss, Palo Alto: Thank you Mayor Burt and Council Members. I found the review of the Visuals completely inadequate. The impact is significant. If you look at the video I notice that one of the things there was an area of the Hoover Tower you can't see because of all the trees. I can't tell you how many projects I have seen proposed where they very carefully have selected a location to look at that says, oh, this is not going to have an impact, and they picked the only place on the planet where it wouldn't have an impact. If you move ten feet to the right or the left you see it. Two examples, Campus for Jewish Life where when they showed how it was going to look they were standing behind the trees on San Antonio, but if you moved ten feet to the right you would see this massive building. A lot of people have complained about it. More recently the VA hospital where the only places they looked at the new building where in an area where there were a lot of trees. If you moved 50 feet to the left you could see the building. This one is the same thing.

It is not necessary to have a hospital 130 feet tall. We have two hospitals that have been built in Santa Clara County within the last two years that are between 60 and 70 feet tall, Kaiser in Santa Clara and El Camino Hospital in Mountain View. If they can do it Stanford can do it. The bulk and the scale are excessive.

Another thing that is fundamentally wrong is asking the ARB to have oversight on the project and the design. The ARB doesn't do issues relating to compliance with the zoning, land use, and other significant issues like biology for example. They look at things like the color and the types of window frames that you have. That is inadequate. The ARB should not be the arbiter of whether or not the buildings are correct. It should go back to the Planning Commission and if necessary to the Council. So the mitigations are inadequate and it will create significant problems if the actions, which

are proposed, are what are adopted. We have to do some corrections and make things work properly.

Trees for example, I saw very little about transplanting some of those significant trees and preserving them. A lot of those could be but they are just saying we are going to look at it, we are going to try. There should be a requirement that they do it. So I think the mitigations that are proposed are inadequate. They need to be looked at again and corrected.

Mayor Burt: Thank you. Stephanie Munoz followed by A. Gladys Stavn.

Stephanie Munoz, Palo Alto: Good evening Mayor Burt and Council Members. Stanford is the largest college campus in the country. I suppose that makes it the largest college campus in the world. You cannot permit them to develop the entire 8,000 acres as commercial. They have to have some residential. You have to insist that Stanford provide housing for the workers with which it earns its millions.

The state is telling Palo Alto it must provide low-income housing for those workers and there is no place in Palo Alto to put them except on Stanford land. No place. You have to pass the buck back to Stanford.

Palo Alto was for many years a bedroom community. People took the train to San Francisco. I took the train to high school in San Francisco. The Stanford Industrial Park changed that and the Serrano Decision forced the state to equalize school funding. The demand that every town supply low-income housing is the direct result of the Stanford Industrial Park.

San Jose, unaware of Proposition 13 to come, annexed open land like crazy and developers built little three bedroom houses, selling for an average of \$15,000. The impact on Palo Alto's neighbors of the commuter traffic was intolerable. Barron Park, which had resisted annexation to Palo Alto for years, was dragooned into the City by jury-rigging a district to include the cemetery so that Arastradero Road, to the consternation of the residents, could be widened by cutting their front yards in half.

Los Altosans living on Cuesta and Covington, the only two through streets in town simply couldn't get out of their driveways. Stanford's solution was to join with the Southern Pacific Railroad to get Santa Clara County to build Foothill Expressway. The County put a \$6.0 million bond issue on the ballot to approve the transportation. After the measure passed they revealed the routes. Does that sound familiar? Telling us that by voting for the bond measure we voted for the routes too, surprise. They bought the section of the Southern Pacific branch line, which the railroad was delighted to get rid of, which served Los Altos, Saratoga, Campbell, Los Gatos, and West San Jose. Bob Debsinflint berated Palo Alto until they were blue in the face but

to no avail. This time there isn't any railroad to destroy. Palo Altoans are in exactly the same position Los Altoans were in some years ago. They are not going to like it, and they are going to remember you did it, if you let Stanford get away without the low-income housing. It has to go someplace. You cannot have robots doing this work in the hospital. You have to have people that make ten dollars an hour, and they have to live someplace. Please, we lost a railroad. Thank you.

Mayor Burt: Thank you. Our final speaker is A. Gladys Stavn hopefully I am pronouncing that correctly.

A. Gladys Stavn, Palo Alto: Good evening Council Members. Yes, you are pronouncing that correctly. I am referring to the Stanford University Medical Center Visual Quality and Architectural Design pamphlet, which was also presented on the video. I have a quick question in this direction, mostly to the people who spoke who showed the video.

Mayor Burt: Our A/V person will get angry at us if we – it is fragile. That should work fine. Perfect, thank you.

Ms. Stavn: It is on page 11, there is a little red pathway and a little bridge. It is very appealing to me and I am wondering where this will be located especially since it leads into some trees. Could the members of the Stanford community answer that question for me?

Mayor Burt: They can't directly from your question but we may be able to have them answer that subsequently.

Ms. Stavn: Okay, thank you.

Public hearing closed at 10:07 p.m.

Mayor Burt: Thank you. So would the applicant like to use their remaining minutes to either respond to members of the public or add additional information that you didn't have an opportunity to do at the outset?

Mr. Tortorich: I would be happy to answer the question. I am not sure I understand it. The bridge here that is shown is an illustration of the attempt to connect with nature. This bridge doesn't exist on the Children's Hospital site.

The photograph to the right is a photograph of another place. The drawing on the left is the connection of our open spaces at the Children's Hospital. There are three significant open space and we hope to visually connect them. The right is somewhat of a metaphorical photograph.

As to the rest of the time I am happy to answer any questions you all may have about the rather rapid presentation if points are not clear, or if there are areas that you would like me to emphasize.

Mayor Burt: We weren't sure if we should give you a speeding ticket as you were racing through those streets. Colleagues, any questions for the applicant? Council Member Price.

Council Member Price: Yes, thank you. I appreciated the presentation even if it went by very quickly. Just a couple of things. In terms of the design of the significant main buildings, the hospital buildings, can you just give a couple of clarifying points why the decisions were made to make it reach a height of 130 feet? It is not clear to me, because there is a huge volume of material, how much of the building is below grade, and what are the functions of the activities below grade? If you could just clarify for me from your perspective the need to reach a height of 130 feet per proposed here.

Mr. Tortorich: I will happy to. Zach, can you go first to the diagrammatic section? So this idea of the garden as the interface between technology and humanity, the first two floors are really the highly technological spaces, our emergency department, and our imaging department. The floor-to-floor height there is about 18 to 20 feet. The floor above that is the surgical platform, which again is about a 20-foot, in fact it is even taller floor-to-floor height. The reason is because of not only the functions that occur with in the spaces but all of the mechanical distribution ductwork and bracing of medical equipment that has to occur in the ceilings.

The third floor houses large mechanical units to provide the air exchanges necessary on those first two floors. Those first two floors have nearly three acres of space on each floor. So we have cleverly disguised those mechanical spaces with a garden. That will be a very public space. The floors above that are patient bedrooms, our single occupant patient rooms. There are four floors of those spaces.

The reason for 130 feet is just the mathematical addition of the floors below for technology, the large floor-to-floor height necessary for the mechanical equipment, which is about 24 feet in that third floor, as well as the 16 feet in floor-to-floor height for each of the patient bedrooms. The reason we like to organize a hospital vertically is because of patient care. So somebody coming into the emergency department in trauma, who needs to have surgery and is in a condition where we are right at the edge of saving their life, can be transported vertically to an operating room and cared for immediately in trauma surgery. Once recovered and stable enough to move into a patient bedroom we will move them vertically up into a patient room.

Zach, if you can go to the first-floor floor plan, what you will see here is we have the emergency department in this location, our ambulance bay, and our drop-off, and our imaging department here. So many cases that come into the emergency department there is a complaint of pain, something has happened. To properly diagnose the patient there needs to be an MRI, a CT scan or some other interventional study of what is going on inside. So that requires this immediate adjacency. Once stabilized in the emergency department there are elevators that can bring you immediately upstairs to surgery and moving on with the procedure.

You will see that there are banks of elevators within each of these patient units. So there is one set here. There is one set here, here, and here. That is what we call our offstage vertical circulation so patients don't have to move through public corridors as they have to do in the existing hospital between the operating room, recovery spaces, and patient rooms. Then we have the public elevators here and here that take you all the way vertically from the basement all the way through to the seventh floor.

As to your question of what is in the below grade structure there is one floor below grade. Zach, if you could go to the entry level plan. So we are entering the building from the drop-off into our internal atrium here, those public elevators. The perimeter of the building underground takes up this space. So in this region is our kitchen. The kitchen is regulated by the State of California. It has to be in an OSHPD inpatient building because we have to be able to serve meals to patients in the event of a major earthquake that incapacitates other services. We will have mechanical equipment, electrical service, and other such appurtenances below the emergency department. We will have our central sterile supply, so the sterilization of all the instruments necessary for the operating room located in this region. Then we will have other material management and lab services located in this department below. So these spaces at the ground floor are the heavy support that don't need to be visible to the public for the operations of the hospital vertically.

So the 130 feet again is really to allow us to organize patient movement privately and safely in the most efficient way possible, and that is through vertical transportation. Not what we have today taking a patient hundreds of feet down public corridors from one space to another.

Council Member Price: Thank you. I am assuming that another reason that there was not more activity below grade is the costs. Is that correct or are there geological issues, etc. that would preclude?

Mr. Tortorich: Geologic issues. We are having a really, really difficult time with the State of California and the quality of the soil that is here on the site to accommodate a hospital building. In fact, there was a debate that

occurred last week about whether the maximum credible quake we have to design to is 7.8, which was the 1906 earthquake for San Francisco, or whether that actually goes up higher than 8.0. The criteria is the building has to withstand that kind of a shake and immediately maintain operations. So that is a level of design that no other structure in California has to go through, say for nuclear power plant. So one level below is all we could do.

We have also designed the building to accommodate base isolation. So these are about 250 shock absorbers that will separate the foundation from the structure of the building. So the ground may move like this, and the building won't feel that same level of force. It allows us to design with a lighter weight of steel and also provides a greater insurance of operations after a major seismic event.

Council Member Price: Thank you. So the issues of seismic safety and all of the regulations around that really have a major impact on some of your design decisions related to the creation of these structures. Is that correct?

Mr. Tortorich: Absolutely. They affect all of our design decisions.

Council Member Price: Okay. I very much appreciate the attention to various designs and some modifications that have taken place. I think the sensitivity to the landscaping, the connectivity, all of the linking of the different parts of the campus I think makes a lot of sense.

The issue of the substations, my question is if there is sufficient buffering of those. It is sort of hard to tell we moved through this very quickly. Those are by nature quite ugly. Has there been enough attention regarding mitigation or buffering of the substations?

Mr. Tortorich: There are a couple of issues there. One is the substation, which is Palo Alto Utility Substation is here. There are power lines that move overhead in this direction. We will have to move those power lines and actually underground them in this location. We have not addressed the power station. I think it is really a Palo Alto utility station. There are existing trees around the station, which we will preserve obviously, but it is an element of the site.

Council Member Price: The Tree Preservation Alternative, I appreciate the discussion of that here during the presentation. I think it has some real merit. Could you very, very quickly talk about what you perceive to be gateway features? There were some comments made by the Planning and Transportation Commission in terms of unifying elements and gateway features that bring you into the site. Is there something specific or are you still evolving some of those thoughts?

Mr. Tortorich: I am not exactly sure of the reference to the gateway features, but if we go to the site plan what we do see is that the parking structure here to the shopping center is really immediately adjacent to the street and the sidewalk. The location of the medical office building really provides an open gesture we believe to the corner. There will also be transit stops right here to allow you to make access to the site. There will also sort of be a plaza that connects the entry to the medical office building with the Pavilion and the parking structure. So that is one element.

As you approach the Medical Center campus, and sort of moving through the retail, we did think very hard about how the Children's Hospital is one entry to the Medical Center campus. So we worked quite significantly on the design to create that tower element that you saw, what we call the Lucie Wall because of the graphic that represents the Children's Hospital. Then also the movement of the towers to preserve that grove of trees at the corner of Welch and Quarry.

The real gateway to the Medical Center has traditionally been Pasteur Mall. I think we had a good dialogue with the Planning Commission about the fact that when this building was built in 1959 it was the termination of that Pasteur Mall. It was the main feature. No longer do we want the Clinic's building to be the main feature of the termination of that Pasteur Mall. It really will be in this location as the entry to the new hospital building, and the entry to the remaining 1989 patient pavilions. We also wanted to reinforce, and we have done a great amount of study, to reinforce this outdoor promenade, which we believe connects the School of Medicine research and faculty position with the Stanford adult hospital and the Lucile Packard Children's Hospital. It is a wonderful outdoor lane. Right now it is a fire lane that is used by pedestrians and bicyclists but it is used that way by accident. We hope to make it more of a designed event.

So Zach, could you go to the ground floor of the adult hospital? This is a good shot of it. So this building won't exist any more, right? So we don't want that to be the termination of this event, because this really is the entrance to the hospital, and this will be a real center of energy.

So Zach if you can go to the next diagram. This really will be the center of activity. So that promenade will be enlivened by a café at the ground floor, not a traditional part of a hospital program at the ground floor, but we thought a very important element to make this a vital place. We have also allocated a component of space from our imaging department, which doesn't make our Chief of Radiology happy, for retail space, again, to create a designed event along that promenade. We want to encourage the movement of medial students and faculty through that open space, and frankly encourage the movement of the citizens of Palo Alto through that



open space to go from our Children's Hospital, the adult hospital, and the School of Medicine.

Mayor Burt: Any other questions or comments? What I would like to suggest is we will go through on the Visual Quality, Biological Resources, and Cultural Resources and let everybody go with their comments or questions at this time. Then we will return to the other half of the item. Council Member Holman.

Council Member Holman: I found as I went through the Biological Resources that I was continually confused as to what the mitigations were and how many trees were being protected. Thank you for the response to the questions that I did submit. One of the questions that I had still, I don't see which question it was, but I had asked about the mitigation measure for the publicly owned trees, the City owned trees. The response was that there were mitigation measure and these applied to both the City own and the private trees, but I just didn't find that when I was reading the mitigations. So why the focus on the City owned trees and why not equal focus on all of the trees? I am not being facetious about that, of course we want the City owned trees to be focal points, but I just didn't find the same mitigations for the others. For the trees that are being removed what is the mitigation? The language seemed to be kind of loose in terms of like feasible and those sorts of things.

While you are thinking about that there also seemed to me when I was reading through it to be some conflicting numbers. Like one of the mitigations talked about 48 trees I think or 58 trees being removed, but really there are more than that being removed. That was where it was referencing the hospital zone. So I want to make sure I am clearly understanding this. The Tree Preservation Alternative retains 13 of the 71 protected trees. Is that correct?

Mr. Williams: Council Member Holman, thank you. My understanding is that it retains 13 more of the protected trees. There are actually 176 protected trees on the site. So under the proposed project initially there were 71 of those that were being removed. Under the Tree Preservation Alternative there are 58 to be removed, and that is still considered significant, but it does preserve some of the nicer remaining trees that are on the site. So it is not 71 total protected trees it is 176 or something like that protected trees overall. There is just that difference.

I understand what you are saying as far as the public versus private and it sounds like we have some work to do to try to clean that up and break it up. I don't know, and if Rod knows now fine, but I don't know that there were different mitigation measures for public versus private trees.

Mr. Jeung: I can at least give it a shot to provide Council Member Holman with an initial idea. I apologize for it being confusing. We had a very, very specific mitigation measure that we had worked out with the City Arborist to specifically deal with the replacement of any public street trees that might be affected. So the mitigation measure associated with that was specifically captured within Mitigation Measure BR-4.5, which is on page 3.9-28.

All the other protected trees are those that are governed by the City Municipal Code that are found on the Stanford property. That is where I will make sure that we make sure that the numbers are consistently presented. There were 71 trees that were identified as protected trees. Then I think what you were referring to is that the hospital district that the Stanford University Medical Center team is proposing has a hospital district that would preserve 13 of those trees. So there were recommended mitigation measures and a Tree Preservation Alternative that would come up with different numbers, but we will clarify all that.

Council Member Holman: That would be great. Then going to Cultural Resources if I might. By the way I think it is important to maybe remind us all, and the City Attorney will weigh in here if I misspeak, what we are doing now is just evaluating impacts, or potential impacts, or no impacts. So that we know what we are looking at when we are looking at approving and what do approve. So this isn't approval or disapproval of anything. It is just actually knowing what we are looking at in terms of a project.

In looking through the Planning Commission minutes, on page 35 of 70, starting on line 13 it is talking about while Hoover Pavilion is a visually distinctive structure in the project vicinity, and we have heard about it tonight, it is not a visually protected resource under the Comprehensive Plan. The obstruction of this building would not comprise a significant visual impact, but it is something that is discussed in the Cultural Resources section. So again, we are looking to the Comprehensive Plan, we are looking to local sensibilities in order to identify what the scenic resources that need to be protected are and whose views are important.

That was confusing to me. A DEIR a CEQA document so I don't know what Comprehensive Plan has to do with how we evaluate viewsheds. I don't know if you want to answer this now or if I just bring up the issues now, but that was confusing to me and I think may have given some misinformation to some folks, unless I am misinterpreting that.

Mr. Williams: Thank you. I will just say that it is confusing. I think the Hoover Pavilion is addressed or it is an issue in both in Visual and in Cultural. So our thought is that these issues that the Commission brought up will be address one way or the other. I think they brought up some very good points about the visual aspect of it, which I think we need to

reevaluate based on some of those comments they made. The Comprehensive Plan sometimes is used as our threshold for significance. That is where it sometimes enters in. Clearly the Hoover Pavilion is identified as a culturally significant/historically significant building in the Cultural Resources section, and we need to consider it and look at it that way and then be consistent in the Visual section.

Council Member Holman: If I might too, there was also I think some confusion or lack of understanding. I see the Preservation Planner is here so if I misspeak I would invite him to correct me. There was some question about somewhat the importance of Hoover Pavilion and the Stone Building and that they were not on the Inventory. If I am remembering correctly the Hoover Pavilion is not on the Inventory because when we were doing the Inventory back in the 1970s they didn't go to the other side of El Camino. That I think is the only reason why and that was not made clear at the Planning Commission meeting.

The Stone Building, when that inventory was done hadn't reached the threshold of 50 years. So those are the reasons why. It isn't because they are less significant. As a matter of fact, I think the Hoover Pavilion as part of the Dames & Moore survey that was done more recently I think determined it was eligible for the National Register. So just so it is on the record so we know what we are dealing with and why some things are and some things are not.

Having to do with Cultural Resources as well, I agree with many of the comments the Planning Commission made. There is one other aspect of the Secretary's Standards actually which is a requirement of CEQA when it refers to cultural resources and that is that the historic resource, any built additions or context that those structures are subordinate to the historic resource. I think that is kind of what the Planning Commission was getting at when they were talking about the impacts of these other buildings on that same site. For those of you who have not been looking at this project so long, these comments that the Planning Commission made with several new Planning Commissioners, these are all suggestions that are years old. They are very consistent with comments that have been made for two and half or three years, something like that.

I can either pass or if somebody else has a light on?

Mayor Burt: Well before you do, Rod I think your associate had something she wanted to add at a certain point in Council Member Holman's questions or comments.

Trixie Martelino, Project Manager, PBS&J: I would like to clarify for the visual analysis there was a comment on the Hoover Pavilion not being

treated as a visual resource. One of the considerations we took in identifying which resources were considered visual resources were policies from the Comprehensive Plan. There are specific policies in the Comprehensive Plan that protect say views of the hillsides to the west, or views of the bay to the east. Also, there are specific policies that protect views from scenic roads such as Sand Hill Road. There was no particular policy that protected the visual integrity or the appearance of the Hoover Pavilion. That is where the statement in the Visual Quality section came from.

Also, to address your comment on treating the Hoover Pavilion as a cultural resource, the Hoover Pavilion despite it not being listed in the City's Inventory is treated as a historically significant resource, and there are mitigation measures in the Cultural Resources section that protect the Hoover Pavilion from damage during construction.

Council Member Holman: Thank you.

Mr. Williams: Excuse me if I could just introduce Trixie Martelino, the Project Manager from PBS&J.

Mayor Burt: I will let Council Member Scharff and then we can go around if need be.

Council Member Scharff: Thank you. I just had a few questions about the Stone Building. I gather that originally Stanford's consultant found the complex not to be one of Stone's major achievements and probably not eligible for listing on the CRHR. Then we did a peer review of that. One of the things we looked at was the Stone Building design was designed during a pivotal and innovate phase of his career, and it has remained in its original location. I guess my question was is the Stone Building considered innovative or was it just designed during an innovative phase of his career? In other words, does the Stone Building reflect that innovation that we are talking about?

Charles Chase, Director of Planning for Architectural Resources Group, Inc.: Members of Council, my name is Charles Chase. I was responsible with Jodi Stock, who is with me here tonight, for that peer review. The Stone Building designed by Edward Durell Stone would be and does embody the innovative process of that period of his work.

Council Member Scharff: Could you elaborate, and tell me what exactly that means?

Mr. Chase: Well the body of Stone's work, without going into a history lesson, he moved into a phase of his work that architectural features on this

building represent. The screen work, a series of columns around the base of the building is a very formalistic style that is embodied or is present in the building that stands today.

Council Member Scharff: Okay, and I guess while you are up here, my belief is that this building, the City Hall is a Stone building.

Mr. Chase: That is correct.

Council Member Scharff: I notice that somewhere in here it says only one other Stone building in Palo Alto, the Palo Alto Main Library, retains sufficient integrity. What have we done to this building? It looks fairly similar.

Mr. Chase: At some point in the past the Paris style that wrapped the perimeter of this building was removed.

Council Member Scharff: So that is why it no longer retains the integrity.

Mr. Chase: That is correct.

Council Member Scharff: Got it. I guess the other question I had was the first heart transplant took place in the Stone Building.

Mr. Chase: In the United States.

Council Member Scharff: In the United States, yes. So I guess my question with that is on the interior spaces they have been all remodeled, is that correct?

Mr. Chase: Yes, we commented in our report that because of the changes over time, which is natural for any facility, but probably more importantly for a hospital building where technologies change constantly and functions change and actual use of interior spaces may change on a fairly regular basis that you would not find the original or what would have been present at the time when that heart transplant took place is present.

Council Member Scharff: What I gathered from the applicant, if the applicant could confirm, is that building is not really appropriate to do research or cutting-edge anything anymore given it is basically functionally obsolescent in the interior, given the heights of the ceilings. Did I pick that out correctly out of the presentation, or was I incorrect?

Mr. Tortorich: So the Stone building has a few deficiencies. One is that by law it cannot be used as a hospital beyond 2030 and possibly beyond 2013. Two, even is the State of California OSHPD was not involved, even by the Palo Alto City code it is significantly deficient in many areas seismically, and

would have to undergo a very significant seismic retrofit which would most likely alter significantly the architectural character of the building.

Separately the intense mechanical systems that are required to do medical research, do clinics work, or to be a hospital building, which it can't be, would require extensive renovation of the building. It was designed to be more naturally ventilated than it was mechanically ventilated, but the codes now in healthcare and in research require that you mechanically ventilate the spaces significantly. So to install that mechanical work both the equipment and to distribute the air would dramatically alter the character of that building beyond recognition.

Council Member Scharff: We are obviously planning on having a plaque somewhere that commemorates the heart transplant?

Mr. Tortorich: Absolutely for the heart transplant, and probably do something else to commemorate the work that had gone on in that building over time and the architecture that was done.

Council Member Scharff: Now, what is exactly going on that site? What kind of new activities would be done on that space?

Mr. Tortorich: Outpatient clinics and medical offices. Outpatient clinics don't have to be permitted by the State of California but they have specific requirements administered by the State of California. They are very similar to hospitals in all features except for the structural aspects. The structural aspects are more in keeping with the City of Palo Alto's codes.

Council Member Scharff: After the building is torn down and the new space is there you said the activities that will be there are still outpatient clinics?

Mr. Tortorich: Yes, outpatient clinics, and faculty offices.

Council Member Scharff: Alright. Thank you very much.

Mayor Burt: Other questions or comments? Then I will take a moment. I want to return to an issue that Council Member Price brought up but I want to ask for a clarification from Staff. The substation is on City property but the treatment of Quarry and having that Village Concept and the pedestrian elements, those are part of mitigations under the Transportation, is that correct? How does that tie-in?

Mr. Williams: Well, there are a couple of ways. One is they are part of the Village Concept so that Alternative does embody the interconnectivity from the transit station down to the hospital.

Mayor Burt: The Village Concept is tied in with both the Land Use and the Transportation mitigations?

Mr. Williams: Yes, those components are part of both. I don't know that all of the Village connectors are considered mitigations under Transportation. We might ask Cara to respond.

Cara Silver, Senior Assistant City Attorney: There are aspects of the Quarry connection that are mitigations. There are aspects that are project components suggested by applicant, and there are aspects that are portions of the Village Concept.

Mayor Burt: Okay, so that helps me. The reason I bring it up is I wanted to make sure that we are on sound footing of looking toward the entire treatment of Quarry as part of the mitigation. Even though I think it is a very small economic impact to do something more along the lines of what Council Member Price was suggesting, I do think that when I saw that video that substation stood out like a sore thumb. If we are looking at the entire treatment of Quarry as how it really makes this a Village Concept and one that will be much more pedestrian used I think that even though that is a City owned substation, doing more treatment to that could help that whole thoroughfare there that is an important part of our Transportation mitigation.

I also wanted to speak briefly on the height issues and the impacts because this is a comment period from us on the environmental impacts. We have elsewhere in the City our height limitations but I think there are really two aspects to it. One is what is spoken of in the report and whether it impacts the viewscape. The other is really an urban design element. Within the urban design element that has to do, in my recollection of the pretty detailed discussions around the Comprehensive Plan adoption and subsequent to that, is that it really has to do with the urban feel in our downtown areas more than it has to do with an area that is more isolated like this. I just am less sensitive to the height impact in this area than I would be in our core urban development areas near our downtowns, and those aspects. We still have to look at those impacts on the viewscape and that is a legitimate concern.

On the historic part, we may not have had the first human heart transplant here, but I believe we did have the first dog heart transplant there. I remember that dog very well. I got a tour in high school and he still barked.

On a very quick side note, we have to make sure that we have our other historic elements. There is a well forgotten that I insist is true that Charles de Gaulle did come to see the Stone Building in I believe early 1960. Ty Cobb did escape from the ground floor of the Stone Building to never be

allowed inside again. So those little sidebars I just couldn't pass up, I am sorry.

Council Member Holman: Yes, thank you. I will leave the viewscape for the Hoover Pavilion alone other than to say I think there is still an impact there.

The role of the HRB, in reading the Planning Commission minutes, and seeing the description from the Director there of their role, I guess it is not clear to me how the ARB, Planning Commission, and Council is going to get clear comments from them if they are not giving direction and they are just commenting. So the question that just came up earlier this evening of Planning Commission is like was there a consensus? So if we don't have consensus comments from the HRB how are we going to know what their direction is? That is the body in the City that knows the Secretary's Standards. So I am not quite sure how it works that when we are doing CEQA review that we are binding ourselves to the Ordinance. Maybe City Attorney could answer that for me. How is that we are binding ourselves to our City Ordinance when we are doing CEQA review and we are trying to utilize the body that has the expertise, but we are tying their hands because these buildings are not on the Inventory? It seems like a rat in a maze kind of situation.

Ms. Silver: We have had several conversations about the role of HRB internally. There is a possibility that the Council can make a referral to the HRB for further review as opposed to just reviewing the CEQA documentation. So you may want to make a very limited referral and then the HRB will make a recommendation to either Planning Commission or directly to the City Council. We are still exploring that piece of it.

We have determined that the HRB, because the property currently, both Stone and Hoover, are not on the Inventory the HRB does not need to review this application formally. So those are our preliminary thoughts. Perhaps Dennis Backlund would like to offer further comments on this.

Council Member Holman: Yes, if the Preservation Planner would come to the podium.

Dennis Backlund, City Planner: Regarding the HRB, one factor about the Board that is unusual in Palo Alto and not common to all cities in California is that it is a certified local government. This means that there is a special contract between the Board the State Preservation Office that monitors the Board, checks their resumes, requires special training, and therefore the HRB is the City's only State Certified Board focusing on a particular specialty that is pertinent to this environmental review. Therefore it can be regarded as a valuable resource.



The buildings are not on the Inventory, which means that there is not a formal requirement through the Municipal Code for them to do a review where they would take a formal motion. So of course we leave this to the Council and the City Attorney to work out how they should review this, but their special expertise is not in question.

Council Member Holman: Thank you very much. So is Staff going to get back to us about what our options are about that, or when we should make such a direction? What is your advice?

Mr. Williams: I think we will get to you. I think we need to find a way to incorporate the HRB's comments to you. I think the dilemma was more one of as you started out with whether they are voting on a consensus or majority recommendation to you or whether they are making a group of comments to you. Certainly on the EIR that is all they are doing is the comments. We take all the comments and respond to them. On the project itself we will come back to you and try to let you know where we think the best way to inject that is and look for ways to get a consensus recommendation or a majority recommendation to you.

Council Member Holman: Thank you. I appreciate in the long run it is going to save time and provide clarity. So I appreciate that.

A couple of comments about Visual Quality. Building height, if the video flythrough could be put back up I think it would be helpful. I would concur somewhat with the comments of the Mayor that height in itself isn't so much a concern. I was struck by something though in seeing the video. In comment there were examples given of heights of other buildings in Palo Alto and on the Stanford campus that are of significant height. I think a comparison of footprints is important. That is one place here. One of the things I was struck by is because of the height and the mass combined there is a barrenness aspect to the background there. I think there were a couple of other places where that was obvious too, where I was just struck about there is no greenery, there is no foliage, and it is just building. So I think there is a relationship between height and open space that needs to be considered in terms of mitigating the visual impacts. I think that is my only other comment for this section.

Mayor Burt: Okay. I don't see any other lights on this section. So in that case we can return to Item 14 A, which is the Project Description, Land Use, Population and Housing, and Public Service Chapters and pick up where we left off a week ago. Is there anyone who would like to either ask questions or provide comments? Council Member Yeh.

Council Member Yeh: Thank you. I did want to just have a chance to ask about the methodology used for the housing, and just understand the

preparation for the EIR. I know that the basis for what appears in the EIR is the current percentage of employees that work for the hospitals and live in Palo Alto. If someone could walk me through that methodology it would be helpful. Was that the only one looked at or were alternatives looked at?

David Doezeema, Kaiser Marsden Associates: Just to summarize we prepared the Housing Needs Analysis, which is Appendix K to the DEIR. To get to your question, we in looking at the different types of adjustments that could be made to reflect commute and where the workers at this hospital could live we looked at also the Census 2000. It also provides a ratio of workers who both work and live in Palo Alto. That is a 14.3 approximately that both live and work in Palo Alto according to the 2000 Census, whereas the Stanford data, which was applied in the DEIR, indicates about eight percent.

Council Member Yeh: How does that compare with for example a calculation of the housing impact fee? If this were a for profit developer for example, using the City's methodology for calculating, what would be the equivalent versus just looking at the existing percentage of residents.

Mr. Doezeema: I think the impact fee wasn't set directly based on that Census relationship. I am not sure of the exact methodology that was used to set the existing impact fee. I don't believe it was a specific commute relationship that was used like this.

Council Member Yeh: I can turn to Staff to see if they know.

Mr. Williams: I am not aware of what the specific percentage was. I know the resultant fees that I think we reported before cover approximately 16 or 17 percent of what the estimated cost would be to create those units. I would have to go back and see what the basis was.

I think the dilemma here was being in an Environmental Impact Report situation and we need to have something factual to kind of base what that estimate comes from, and the eight percent equates to what the current percentage is. It could be more than that but we don't necessarily have a basis.

Now from a policy standpoint the Council can certainly look at, as you get to review the project, where you would like to set a policy target for percentage of housing. That is not what the EIR necessarily has to look at, but as a policy matter if the Council wanted to have a higher percentage then eight percent accounted for in some ways then that can be done through Conditions of Approval, Development Agreement, or the various methods that have been outlined in the document as possible approaches to the housing.

That is what makes this housing no nebulous in this is, we had that discussion, we have that menu that I think Council Member Schmid referred to a couple meetings ago of there are several ways to try to address this. In terms of trying to address it in the DEIR based on some factual number that we can hang our hat on, the eight percent is the most obvious one.

Council Member Yeh: So I guess it gets to because there is on the Land Use side a request for new zone then I think Council Member Scharff had discussed what appears in the EIR I think then directly relates to mitigations. Then we have the Development Agreement, which is separate. I know that is a different discussion. I think for me just understanding, I don't know how frequently this kind of request has come before the City in terms of land use to create the zone. So given that there is not much historical context for then kind of seeing this analysis, knowing what is going to be really relevant to the mitigation side, and what is going to fall outside of mitigation that is relevant to environment impacts I think it is just so important to have that clarity. Once it is pulled out of mitigation context and then it becomes more subject to I think negotiations, having that clear factual basis, knowing the methodology, getting agreements on that methodology I think is really what will drive that particular issue for me forward with all the parties involved.

Mr. Williams: We will go back and look at our housing nexus study too and see if that gives us any guidance for this.

Council Member Yeh: Otherwise I know since the last session was focused on this new proposed zone it is just something that I as an individual Council Member I did want to express my openness to. I did think that there are a lot of important services provided by the hospital that I think Stanford has always been seen as a leader within the health field. That even within the context of other hospitals going through their rebuilding the position of Stanford as one of the preeminent academic hospitals I think is something that factors into my decision process and seeing this request for a new zone. So I just wanted to go on the record with that. Thank you.

Mayor Burt: Other Council Members? I will just add one item. There was concern at the Planning Commission over the sequencing of this process given that we are looking at significant changes to our Comprehensive Plan kind of in response to a project proposal rather than deliberately setting up this hospital zone in advance. I would just say that while I agree with them in the abstract, we have had this project in the works for four years or so, and I think that we have had ample opportunity to look at those impacts. It might be ideal to have gone in the sequence that they were advocating. I think from a practical standpoint that we have an obligation to take it in the sequence that we are, and that we have had ample opportunity to really look at it in the context of the Comprehensive Plan, even though our Update will

formally follow approval of this project in all likelihood. I don't see that as a barrier to proceeding with the hospital zones for instance. Council Member Schmid.

Council Member Schmid: I guess I just have a question on procedure for Staff. We have been engaged in this process for awhile and we are now in a formal process of reviewing. I guess from my perspective the parts that are going to have the biggest and longest lasting impacts on Palo Alto are housing and traffic. In both of those the mitigations or the nexus we keep talking about are based upon models that seem to me to be biased or flawed. I raised this issue a year ago on the traffic model. I raised it the other night on the housing model, which is based on the same thing. I did read in the interim the new traffic model, which is the same as it used to be. So I guess I am just wondering what our role is. We can raise these issues and say we are representing the public in some way. I would think one of the responses would be here is a simply couple page statement that addresses the issues you raised, and it doesn't seem to happen. We end up in the same place, and now we are getting close to decision points and we are still there. So what is the process we are going through and what emerges from this process? I would think one of the outcomes should be a simple and straightforward answer to fundamental issues on housing and traffic. What can we look forward to?

Mr. Williams: Thank you, Council Member Schmid. I am not sure I am understanding exactly what you are getting at as far as what you are looking to. I will say that the models we have to use are somewhat ones that we need to be able to point to and say that there is some consistency or commonality to them with common practice out there used by other cities, etc., etc. The traffic model you mentioned is essentially the same. I think there have been very significant changes in the last year in the traffic model that we will talk about in a few weeks when we talk about Transportation. So we did do I think quite a bit of work to try to modify that to be more Palo Alto specific. The housing, you are right, we are basically using what we have. Although we used the ABAG year that we felt was sort of most closely related to the current circumstances.

Our hope is that ultimately we do get to a point where the housing determination is made, how much housing is necessary, what is the technique, probably through to some extent the mitigations, but also through the Development Agreement too. Incorporate that and then on the traffic side what are the key mitigation measures that we outline to try to address those traffic impacts. Yes, it is all based on some models that certainly could be challenged and have been challenged in the past. I think Rod would like to add to that.

Mr. Jeung: I do want to add to that because it is a very fundamental point. It is something that you raised at the last Council meeting that had to do with the voracity or the use of the ABAG forecasts. I think because it is a concern and probably to others in the City it is incumbent upon us in our Responses to Comments to go ahead and develop a response that will help the public and yourselves understand the use of those different models, including the derivation, the methodologies inherent in them, how they are used for traffic forecasting, how they are used for population and housing forecasts, so that everyone has a common understanding of how they are used. It, of course, may not satisfy you because I know you have some very legitimate concerns about how the ABAG forecasts are used. Again, the environmental document is a public information document and to the extent that we can provide a better explanation of how those models are used, and how those forecasts are developed it can be beneficial.

Council Member Schmid: Good thank you.

Mayor Burt: Council Member Holman.

Council Member Holman: Yes, just one. I guess you would say it is a procedural question. Having to do with Comprehensive Plan compliance or conformance, the approach that is being indicated in the DEIR is a change of the Comprehensive Plan, and that is indicated as a mitigation. I am not understanding how that could be a mitigation because we don't change the standards for other things to provide mitigations. It would seem to me that that would later be a policy decision to be made, which well may be made. I am not understanding how we can change the Comprehensive Plan and say that is a mitigation. We don't change out air quality standards, we don't change our traffic standards, and we don't change any of our other standards. So procedurally I am wondering how that is a mitigation as opposed to a policy decision to be made at a later date.

Mr. Jeung: I am going to start off the response, and I am more than willing to be corrected as I go along with the response. There is always a tricky issue that comes up when you have any sort of a large-scale project, or even a small-scale project that as part of that project involves a general plan amendment, or in this case a new zoning district. You heard some other speakers talk about the Menlo Gateway project in Menlo Park that proposed a general plan amendment and a new zoning. We have done other hospital projects where they similarly have come up with new hospital districts as part of the entitlement process.

So while the proposed project is coming forward with a specific development application and inherent in that talks about a development program, circulation improvements, etc. it also identifies the required entitlements in order to accommodate that project. So I am parsing hairs a little bit here in

the sense that I am describing or thinking of the hospital zone and the Comprehensive Plan Amendment as part of the entitlement process, almost part of the proposed project rather than a mitigation measure. What we need to do, and what the City needs to understand in the Environmental Impact Report is that we are looking at the impacts associated with making those changes. So when we look at the physical changes that occur with the hospital and its height, and its mass, and its scale, and the resultant traffic, etc. we are looking at the implications of going forward with those entitlement requests that have been made by the applicant. So in essence you are looking at both the development application, the zoning district, the Comprehensive Plan Amendment all as part of a package, and we are describing the impacts of all of those within the Environmental Impact Report.

Council Member Holman: Appreciate the description but I am still not seeing why. We are not going to argue the point. I don't want to argue the point, but I don't understand why we couldn't just say that there is an impact, so be it, we will make a policy decision later, and the project will conform to the new proposed hospital zone. So just a comment.

Mayor Burt: Council Member Price.

Council Member Price: The comment was made earlier as it relates to the number of people who live within the City of Palo Alto and the environs that would be part of the commuting, etc. I know that is a separate issue related to Transportation. My basic question is the Census data from 2010 you mentioned earlier that we are utilizing 2000 data. Are we going to miss a window here to use the more current Census data? When is the 2010 data available? Is it going to be available in time to be utilized in this process?

Mr. Doezeema: The 2010 Census actually is not going to include comparable data to the 2000 Census. That data set has been replaced by the American Communities Survey. Although I have not looked up to see what the number is, the 2008 American Community Survey would have comparable data, which is available now.

Mayor Burt: Any other questions or comments? Okay, I think that concludes item number 14 and we will just move onto Council Member Questions, Comments, and Announcements.

Council Member Price: Excuse me I did want to make a quick comment.

Mayor Burt: Okay, Council Member Price.

Council Member Price: This is sort of related to process in terms of ensuring that I recognize we have a lot of meetings coming up, Public Hearings,

related to the environmental work here in front of us. I just wanted to make sure and just make the observation that if there are citizens that want to speak and we get to this very, very late in the evening is there anyway to really look at is it possible to say for example put the Proclamations later in the evening and start our kind of specific Public Hearing items a little bit earlier, so that citizens that do want to comment on this document have a real opportunity to do that.

The other thing I would like to observe is I think the schedule we have before us is great. It is very ambitious and I am all for keeping that. If we find in July or prior to the first or second week of July that there appears to be a need to add an additional meeting, I am reluctant to say this, to ensure that the community members have an opportunity to speak. I don't know if my colleagues would consider such a thing. At this moment it may be premature, but if there are people who want to speak, and by the time we get to this item it is very late in the evening. What are other people's observations about that?

Mayor Burt: Council Member Schmid.

Council Member Schmid: I would just like to second that. I think it is an important element and we often find ourselves doing as the last item on the Agenda. So the opportunities to discuss come after waiting three hours at 10:30 or eleven o'clock at night. So it might be good to have some targeted dates where we say we will do this by eight o'clock or first thing on the Agenda, and announce it so that people know that. As Council Member Price, maybe putting in a special meeting where we announce it would just be for a two hour public comment on the whole thing, the wrap up, the mitigations, or some important element of it. So that makes a lot of sense.

Council Member Price: Could I ask what the Staff's reaction to that would be? I know we don't meet often enough.

Mayor Burt: Before we go into that we may be able to partially answer this by looking at our Tentative Agendas. I think what I am hearing is a concern to make sure that the wrap up session has an ample public comment opportunity at a good hour, after we have had the input and the analysis that has gone on in the Planning Commission meetings and here. That is scheduled for Monday, July 26. We have at this point in time a fairly light Agenda. The only other item on Action Item is the College Terrace Residential Parking Permit Program. I don't even know if that is time sensitive.

Mr. Williams: We may be able to move that or it may actually end up as a Consent Item instead of an Action Item.

Mayor Burt: Right. At this point in time we do not have a Study Session or a Closed Session scheduled for that meeting. So as far as our visibility allows at this point in time it looks like we have that blocked out real well. That has been part of the effort to try to at least at that end of the schedule to really devote ourselves to this topic as we wrap it up in that meeting.

Council Member Yeh. I am sorry, before we do that, did Staff have any other comments in response to Council Member Price's concerns?

Mr. Keene: Well, Mr. Mayor the only thought is if we are going to get to that point to get to it sooner, to identify that extra date sooner rather than later, as opposed to the last minute. Since we do get into the summer schedule and people are coming and going and that sort of thing.

The other thing I would say is I know that late afternoon or early evenings are difficult but occasionally for something special I would suggest that you might think about that. Sometimes if the accommodation of the public is such that we don't just always think about starting at six o'clock or seven o'clock and trying to figure out how to get all the business done. Not that it would be a regular practice, but you go to a County Board meeting and they are meeting all day at times too.

Mayor Burt: Council Member Yeh.

Council Member Yeh: I just wanted to express appreciation for that consideration of tweaking. I think every time we meet there are big topics for the DEIR. I just want to express my openness to it where if there is a set of issues that will be discussed, and we see that the public comment stack is bigger than others that there might be consideration for bumping that Stanford item up earlier in the Agenda if there just happens to be a large number of comment cards submitted. I think that would reflect just – and I think we have been pretty sensitive to that.

Mayor Burt: I will just add so everybody is bearing in mind I believe that the other two scheduled meetings at the Council are on July 12 for the Transportation, Air Quality, Climate Change, and Sustainability, which could be very substantial. This morning we looked at pushing out the 7:30 Study Session on Council Priorities Work Plan to July 19 because the Stanford component on that night is Noise, Geology, Soils, Seismicity, Hydrology, and Hazardous Materials a less substantive issue in all likelihood. So that change has just been made to try and balance out those two meetings. So I think the two big ones we have are on July 12 and we do have a Closed Session on labor at six o'clock scheduled. Then no Study Sessions after that and this is the only scheduled action item for that night.



Council Member Holman: Just to support and appreciate Council Member Price's raising this issue. Appreciate that it looks like there are some opportunities to forward. My anticipation is the further we get into this process and the longer the DEIR has been out there the more public comments that we are going to get. That kind of traditionally is what happens. So I appreciate we have some opportunities to hear from the public earlier and make more accommodation for that.

#### COUNCIL MEMBER QUESTIONS, COMMENTS, AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mayor Burt reported on a meeting held last week with the High Speed Rail (HSR) lobbyist who provided an update to the HSR Committee. On June 9, 2010, Chair of the High Speed Rail Authority, Curt Pringle met with the Mayors from Mountain View, Menlo Park, Atherton, and Palo Alto. He provided a tour of some of the right-of-ways and impacted areas of the future HSR. He reported that TheatreWorks received four Tony awards on June 13, 2010.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at 11:20 p.m.