

TOWN COUNCIL MEETING NO. 796, JULY 14, 2010

ROLL CALL

Mayor Toben called the meeting to order at 7:32 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Ms. McDougall called the roll.

Present: Councilmembers Maryann Derwin, John Richards and Ann Wengert, Vice Mayor Ted Driscoll and Mayor Steve Toben

Absent: None

Others: Janet McDougall, Assistant Town Manager
Sandy Sloan, Town Attorney
George Mader, Town Planning Consultant
Sharon Hanlon, Town Clerk
Andy Coe, Chief Government and Community Relations Officer, Stanford Medical Center
Sherri Sager, Chief Government Relations Officer, Lucile Packard Children's Hospital
Curtis Williams, Director, City of Palo Alto Planning & Community Environment Dept.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

None

CONSENT AGENDA [7:14 p.m.]

By motion of Vice Mayor Driscoll, seconded by Councilmember Derwin, Items 3, 4 and 5 were approved with the following roll call vote:

Aye: Councilmembers Maryann Derwin, John Richards and Ann Wengert, Vice Mayor Ted Driscoll and Mayor Steve Toben

No: None

- (3) Warrant List of July 14, 2010 in the amount of \$520,290.47
- (4) Recommendation by Assistant Town Manager – Consultant Services Agreement Between the Town of Portola Valley and Townsend Management, Inc. for Inspection Services
- (5) Recommendation by Administrative Services Officer – Adoption of the 2010-2011 Appropriations Limit
 - (a) Adoption of a Resolution of the Town Council of the Town of Portola Valley Determining and Establishing the Appropriations Limit for 2010-2011 (Resolution No. 2499-2010)

REGULAR AGENDA [7:36 p.m.]

- (1) Minutes of Regular Town Council Meeting of June 23, 2010 [*Removed from Consent Agenda*]

By motion of Councilmember Derwin, seconded by Vice Mayor Driscoll, the minutes were approved 3-0-2 (Councilmember Wengert and Mayor Toben abstained)

- (2) Minutes of Special Joint Town Council / EPC Meeting of June 30, 2010 [*Removed from Consent Agenda*]

By motion of Councilmember Derwin, seconded by Vice Mayor Driscoll, the minutes were approved 4-0-1 (Mayor Toben abstained)

- (6) Public Hearing – Report from Town Planner on Recommendation from Planning Commission on proposed Amendment to the Safety Element of the Town's General Plan [7:41 p.m.]
 - (a) Adoption of a Resolution of the Town Council of the Town of Portola Valley Adopting a Revised Safety Element as an Amendment to the General Plan and Adopting a Negative Declaration for the Amendment (Resolution No.)

Mayor Toben recused himself and said that he would speak from the audience on this topic as a private citizen. Vice Mayor Driscoll took the gavel.

Mr. Mader referenced his memorandum to the Town Council of June 28, 2010, noting that the Planning Commission has been dealing with the Safety Element for a long time. Major changes include new Geology Map and Land Movement Potential Map, Fire Hazard Map, Flood Maps, additional attention in the text to emergency preparedness, and information from the William Lettis & Associates study of faulting at the Town Center. At the Town Council's previous direction, the Fire Hazard Map is now available to the public on the Town website. Mr. Mader said that he believes the Safety Element and maps reflect recommendations made by all involved in preparation of the Safety Element –Public Works Director, Building Inspector, Fire Marshal, Emergency Preparedness Committee and Geologic Safety Committee.

Vice Mayor Driscoll opened the public hearing.

Mr. Toben, who lives at 12 Santa Maria Avenue in the Woodside Heights neighborhood, addressed two provisions of the proposed Safety Element that particularly affect neighborhoods identified on the Moritz Fire Hazard Maps as being the highest fire hazard areas. More than a year ago, he said that the Town Council opted against adopting the Cal Fire maps denoting high fire hazard areas because questions were raised about the nature of those comments and because his neighborhood was engaged in aggressive fire mitigation activities and felt it was unnecessary to designate the area in that way. There also were concerns about homeowners' insurance and real estate disclosure requirements with that type of designation, according to Mr. Toben.

The draft Safety Element again identifies particular neighborhoods, including his, with the highest fire hazard rating. He said that no one questions the integrity of the Moritz maps, but he argued that it is not necessary and indeed is gratuitous to cite Moritz map language in the Safety Element's objectives. He asked that the Town Council consider eliminating specific references to certain neighborhoods; i.e., Woodside Highlands, Hayfields and the Alpine Hills area. In fact, he said, inclusion of these specifics may undermine the Council's actions last year that gave the neighborhood the benefit of the doubt and encouraged ongoing mitigation activities. He referred specifically to Section 4138 in the Safety Element, citing as worrisome and unnecessary some of the language in the last two paragraphs. Further, he suggested removing reference to the rejected Cal Fire maps in Section 4140a. While he recommended retaining language about adopting Chapter 7A of the Uniform Building Code, he suggested moving it to either the Policies or Objectives sections.

Vice Mayor Driscoll closed the public hearing and invited Councilmember discussion.

Councilmember Richards said that he understands Mr. Toben's points, but where do you stop redacting?

Councilmember Derwin asked the Town Attorney's opinion. Ms. Sloan said that it is a policy question as to how specific the Town Council wants to be with the language in the General Plan. She said that the General Plan sometimes references specific situations, but she would not be concerned legally if the Council decided to remove the language that Mr. Toben requested. Mr. Mader said that the areas of greatest concern were the ones listed. Although others are also of concern, he said that some of them are

very difficult to describe, such as canyons between lots. He said that he thinks it would do no harm to simply indicate the categories in the text and refer people to the maps. He agreed that the references to Cal Fire were gratuitous in this situation.

Councilmember Richards said that Section 4141, which references areas quite specifically but does not name neighborhoods, caught his attention. Councilmember Wengert said that she has no objections to removing the neighborhood-specific language, but said she shares Councilmember Richards' concern about where the editing ends. She also expressed concern about eliminating references to Cal Fire. The language makes it clear that the Town did not adopt the Cal Fire maps, but those maps exist and some people may rely on them.

Vice Mayor Driscoll added that he also is somewhat concerned about where to draw the line on editing out area names, because other specific areas in Town are singled out for other hazards, such as flooding, erosion and sedimentation. It is almost as if certain areas would get special treatment. Councilmember Wengert, too, noted how much some areas have been singled out relative to geologic and seismic risks.

In terms of 4141, Mr. Mader described it as more sweeping and embracing larger areas than the section on highest fire hazards, addressing the types of problematic situations. Any discussion of the San Andreas Fault, he pointed out, singles out a particular part of town. In 4133, he agreed that "west of Mapache Drive" could be eliminated without affecting the information presented in the context of sedimentation.

Vice Mayor Driscoll said that 4127 calls out Willowbrook Drive in relation to the floodplain, and 4129 discusses erosion potential in Westridge and Alpine Hills. He said he wanted to better understand the burdens on property owners in mentioning specific areas.

Vice Mayor Driscoll reopened the public hearing so that Mr. Toben could elaborate.

Mr. Toben recalled the Town Council discussions about the Cal Fire maps. Although there was debate as to whether insurers pay attention to Cal Fire maps, he said that according to Nate McKitterick, who works in the insurance industry, they do. Mr. Toben said that one does not know which documents the insurance industry uses as reference materials. Further, he said that the Council's action on the Cal Fire maps distinguishes the fire hazard issue from the other issues in the Safety Element.

In response to Vice Mayor Driscoll's question about legally mandated disclosure, Ms. Sloan said that she does not believe a homeowner would be required to reference the General Plan. However, due to the big brouhaha in Portola Valley and Woodside last year, most homeowners are now aware of the Cal Fire maps. She also noted that planners are trying to make such tools more available to help the public learn about hazards and take corrective steps. To the extent homeowners know about specific information that applies to their properties, legally they should disclose it.

Vice Mayor Driscoll said that since the Council decided against adopting Cal Fire maps, the Safety Element should not incorporate reference to them. He said that it is unnecessary to reference every possible map that covers the area. Councilmember Wengert said that while she understands the potential issues regarding homeowners' insurance and disclosure and is not uncomfortable about removing references to specific neighborhoods, she also raised the matter of consistency throughout the Safety Element.

Councilmember Wengert said that she is uneasy about removing any reference to the Cal Fire maps. She said that it is clear that Portola Valley has not adopted Cal Fire maps in favor of maps that are more robust and much more pertinent for our community. Councilmember Wengert suggested that rather than removing reference to Cal Fire maps, the same sections could be revised to include references to adoption of the more robust and relevant Moritz map. That would clarify what the Town has done and why.

Vice Mayor Driscoll said that we don't want the Town's General Plan to stigmatize properties in any way. With that principle as guidance, he asked Mr. Mader to make appropriate revisions to the proposed Safety Element. Councilmembers agreed to having the Safety Element on the agenda of the July 28, 2010 Town Council meeting.

(7) Recommendation by Town Manager – Approval of the 2010-2011 Planning Program [8:03 p.m.]

Mayor Toben returned to the dais. With no questions or comments, Vice Mayor Driscoll moved to adopt the 2010-2011 Planning Program. Councilmember Richards seconded and the motion carried 5-0.

COUNCIL, STAFF, COMMITTEE REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

(8) Recommendation by George Mader and the Conservation Committee – Proposed letter to Stanford University requesting Town's involvement in the Stanford University Habitat Conservation Plan [8:05 p.m.]

Vice Mayor Driscoll recused himself from agenda items #8 and #9 because his wife works at Stanford.

Mr. Mader said that he and Paul Heiple, Conservation Committee Vice Chair, discussed the plan and worked together on a letter. It primarily reflects Mr. Heiple's observations with regard to habitats, rare and endangered species, invasive species and plantings, maintenance of flow rates in San Francisquito and Los Trancos Creeks and the fact that unforeseen situations may arise during the 50-year span the Habitat Conservation Plan covers. The letter acknowledges that some aspects of the HCP benefit Portola Valley, particularly preservation of creek corridors. Although it has not yet appeared in the Federal Register, he said, Stanford has indicated that the response period has been extended to August 30.

Mr. Mader and Mr. Heiple also looked at the Conservation Program and Associated Guidelines for Special Conservation Areas at Stanford University, which Stanford was required to submit to Santa Clara County but that the County has not yet acted upon. This document is broader than the HCP in that it includes the basic species.

Councilmember Wengert suggested a less directive and more cooperative tone, particularly in the language about maintaining minimum flow rates. In terms of prohibitions against planting invasive species, she said that it would be important to ensure that the list is updated regularly to remain effective over the longer term. Mr. Mader pointed out that Mr. Heiple cited a number of sources of such information that could be included.

In terms of tone, remembering that a polite letter to Stanford about the Rosewood property got nowhere, Mayor Toben said that a small entity dealing with an institution of Stanford's heft must make its voice loud and clear. In addition, he suggested other points to include, such as controlling invasive species and perhaps obtaining mitigation credits for aggressive programs of invasive control. Given the threat posed by invasive plants, Mayor Toben also suggested that it might be useful to identify specifically some local endangered or rare plants that merit consideration, instead of simply making abstract references. He said that he liked what Mr. Mader wrote about consideration of communities of species, not isolated species. Again recalling the futile Rosewood experience, Mayor Toben said that it might be useful also to ask Stanford when hearings will be held.

In response to a question from Councilmember Richards about the conservation easement along San Francisquito Creek and the Council's prior discussions about the potential for crossing that easement for development, Mr. Mader said that although he expected development there to be precluded because the easement should be clear about it, he said it is worth calling it out in the letter.

Councilmembers agreed that Mayor Toben could sign the draft letter as amended.

(9) Report from George Mader – Draft EIR for the Stanford University Medical Center Renewal Project [8:17 p.m.]

Mr. Mader put the immensity of the Stanford University Medical Center (SUMC) Project into a different perspective by converting the floor area being added—into 30 acres, albeit vertically. He said that Mr. Coe has pointed out that the efficiency in current hospital design is to go vertically. The project also would increase full-time equivalent employees by a significant 23% and add 2,053 new parking spaces (two-thirds underground) by 2025. Earlier plans for modification to the Stanford Shopping Center are not a part of this.

From his evaluation of the project's DEIR, Mr. Mader anticipates additional notable impacts on housing and climate, but the two major concerns are about traffic and the visual aspects of the corridor that Portola Valley residents travel. Four intersections are of particular concern:

- Junipero Serra Boulevard/Alpine Road/Santa Cruz Avenue, where no mitigation improvements are proposed and which will result in peak hour scores of D+ LOS in the morning and D- in the afternoon. (D equals a long traffic delay of 25 to 35 seconds.)
- Santa Cruz Avenue/Sand Hill Road, which will be rated LOS D in the morning and E in the afternoon. (E is very long traffic delays of 35-50 seconds.)
- I-280 northbound off-ramp from at Alpine Road; Stanford proposes a signal there, but Mr. Mader said the proposal cannot be evaluated because there is no plan for what signalization would include.
- I-280 southbound off-ramp, with a morning peak hour score of F and afternoon peak hour of D.

Mr. Mader noted that both Palo Alto and Menlo Park accept levels of service that Portola Valley is not accustomed to. Even without the hospital project, traffic studies indicate considerably more traffic by 2025. Incremental additions from the hospital, while not horrendous, are part of that. Stanford's proposal has created considerable buzz on the PV Forum, Mr. Mader said, with mixed opinions. Some say signals are needed and others say they aren't; some are concerned about signals interfering with the traffic flow in off-peak hours. One post suggested a traffic cop in the morning and another more patrols for ticketing. Virginia Bacon pointed out the need for another connection between I-280 and the Stanford campus. Another post said this may be the first step toward a four-lane Alpine Road.

Mr. Mader found the DEIR inadequate in that it did not evaluate the traffic capacity of Alpine Road between Junipero Serra and I-280, where traffic already backs up all the way to Junipero Serra/Santa Cruz. Similarly, the DEIR gave inadequate consideration to the need for a right-turn lane from Santa Cruz onto Sand Hill. The DEIR said this is needed but not feasible; Mr. Mader said that it is feasible but expensive. Further information would provide a basis for better evaluation of the conclusions drawn in the DEIR, he said, but at the same time he acknowledged that it is a very difficult problem, given the I-280 traffic, particularly vehicles headed to the Stanford campus.

In terms of visual impacts, Mr. Mader said that going down Sand Hill Road will be a very different experience from what it is now. Noting for context that the apartment building at 101 Alma Street is about 110 feet tall, the hospital buildings will be 130 feet, in dramatic contrast to the Stanford Village across the road. It also appears that the buildings will be illuminated. One of the things that Mr. Mader said bothered him about the DEIR is the conclusion that there is no significant visual impact because Palo Alto's Architectural Review Board (ARB) and City Council will review the final design. How do you evaluate a design you don't have? As he understands it from the DEIR, the proposal provides leeway for changing the way buildings are arranged and modifying their appearance. He also is concerned that leaving the decisions to the ARB and City Council for design review leaves the public out as a party to the process. Mr. Mader said that he discussed these concerns with Steven Turner, the planner in charge of this project.

The DEIR states that the percentage of regional housing demand resulting in this project would be relatively small in comparison with projected housing growth in the region. Mr. Mader said that statement does not address the issue sufficiently because it discounts the local impact. In terms of climate change, he indicated the DEIR concludes that even with the measures discussed, the project would contravene the goals of the city's Climate Protection Plan and have a cumulative considerable contribution to global climate change.

Mayor Toben invited Councilmembers questions for Mr. Mader.

In response to Councilmember Derwin's inquiry about the process and timeline, Mr. Mader said that comments on the DEIR are due by July 26 or July 27. He was uncertain whether and when action on the DEIR would be taken. After the consultant incorporates comments and changes and completes the Final EIR, it will go back to the Palo Alto Planning Commission and then City Council and zoning. Meanwhile the ARB will look at the hospital design in more detail. Mr. Mader also explained that traffic adaptive signals, designed to ease congestion, use technology that automatically changes the timing of red lights and green lights to adjust to the traffic flow.

Councilmember Wengert said that the Page Mill Road intersection is a big piece of the puzzle missing in the discussion. Page Mill has consistently been the bigger problem, creating huge traffic problems in peak times. Portola Valley gets the overflow, particularly once you get to Alpine Road. Attention to this problem is needed in order to understand the full picture of traffic and all the mitigation aspects. In terms of traffic solutions, the possibility of extending Marguerite shuttle service to Portola Valley might have the opposite effect of the one intended, she said. With the large increase in employment linked to the project, many of those employees might come to Portola Valley to park and catch the shuttle. As Councilmember Wengert put it, this solution might create a magnet that draws people to Portola Valley to park.

Councilmember Wengert also said that it would be helpful to understand whether the procedure Stanford's going through with the Palo Alto's ARB and City Council differs from what was done in the past with other large-scale development projects. Ms. Sager noted that most of the time the University has gone through a county rather than city process, but she believes the process they are going through with Palo Alto is Palo Alto's normal city process.

Ms. Sloan worked for Palo Alto when the Stanford hospital was developed before, and in subsequent iterations involving expansion and the development of the Lucile Packard Children's Hospital, it was more a design review because the zoning was already in place. What seems different here is the 130-foot height, because Palo Alto has a 50-foot height limit, which is requiring creation of a new zoning district.

Mr. Coe explained that the rationale for the SUMC Project is threefold: to meet seismic regulations and standards, to meet current and anticipated capacity needs and to modernize facilities, which by hospital standards have become antiquated. The technology and medical equipment in use today and standards for patient care and patient rooms have changed dramatically since when the hospital was built (in 1959) and expanded (in 1973). To shed additional light in terms of Mr. Mader's review and subsequent discussion, he pointed out a number of facts. In the 1950s and 1960s there was a plan to run a connecting road from Alpine to Page Mill through the Stanford foothills. During the Sand Hill Road projects, some residents talked about an Alpine "swoop," a road from Junipero Serra/Alpine at I-280 directed to the campus. It was generally dismissed for financial and environmental reasons. It is important for hospitals to go vertical for efficient delivery of services as well as for patient safety and privacy reasons. Other comparably tall buildings in the area include 101 Alma, which is actually 140 feet, Palo Alto City Hall at 127 feet and Palo Alto Square at 132 feet. Working with the SUMC, the City of Palo Alto is creating a special Hospital District that would be limited to this particular area and allow a variance to Palo Alto's 50-foot maximum height.

Mr. Coe said that Stanford Medical Center is preparing its own comment letter on the DEIR with objections to its climate change analysis. He did not identify detail about errors noted, but said that once the deficiencies in the DEIR are addressed, the project will meet climate change goals.

In terms of the process and timeline, the City of Palo Alto has released the DEIR. In a 69-day public process, by July 26 there will have been 14 public hearings—at the Planning Commission, ARB and City of Palo Alto levels, as well as council meetings in Menlo Park, East Palo Alto and Portola Valley. The DEIR comments will go back to the City of Palo Alto for review, and late in 2010 or early in 2011, they will have the Final EIR for review as well as a development agreement between SUMC and the City of Palo Alto. Those documents and the final entitlements will go to the Palo Alto City Council for a decision, probably during the first quarter of 2011.

Mr. Mader asked about the design stage when the Final DEIR, development agreement and final entitlements go to the Palo Alto City Council. Mr. Coe said it would be very far along by then, because they will have gone through the further ARB review. There will be tweaks to the design and further public review, but the basic details of size, style and impacts will not change. Mr. Coe said that the project team would be glad to come back to Portola Valley to show the Town Council the design and a visual fly-through. Ms. Sager, adding that the Lucile Packard Children's Hospital design is very close to final, wanted to emphasize that the building sustainable facilities is among the design principles applicable to both facilities.

Councilmember Wengert asked whether a height limitation is anticipated in the Hospital District that Mr. Coe described. Ms. Sager said she believed it would be 130 feet. Mr. Coe reiterated that the new zoning district would be specific to the SUMC facilities and could not be replicated citywide.

Mayor Toben invited members of the audience to speak.

Martin Litton, 180 Bear Gulch Drive (Alpine Hills) said that he believes he detects a tone of cynicism, possibly anger, not yet outrage. He said that when he grew up in Los Angeles, it was much nicer than it is now, and by law a building could not exceed 150 feet—on Broadway, on Hill Street, Spring Street—and it looked as if the tops of all the buildings had been cut off with a saw. At one time, California wanted to make Alpine Road a freeway. Since Stanford and Palo Alto Medical Foundation have scattered premises in Los Altos and elsewhere, he asked, "Why does all of this have to go here?" It seems to ignore the will of the residents for miles and miles around. The residents did not ask for the shopping center to be put into an area that had been beautiful, nor did they ask for the Ohlone Field to be destroyed to put up a housing development. Alpine Road is no longer a country lane; it is bedeviled with traffic. You walk in a din when you hike on trails there, with noise coming even from the people riding bikes. Things are not getting better, and very often what Stanford wants to do only makes them worse. When does it end? It has to stop some time, and it should have stopped sometime ago. He said that we have gone as far as we need to go. Mr. Litton credits the Stanford Medical Center with saving his life a couple of times, but he said that he is deeply concerned about the SUMC Project, a 130-foot building to replace what had been a 13-story building. One of the outcomes of this proposal would be to press for more and more growth in Portola Valley, and to fill available space with housing. He said that he trusts the Portola Valley Town Council will resist. Anger is one thing; outrage is a better thing, he said, and added that we aren't getting the full picture; things always turn out worse than expected.

Mr. Williams apologized for arriving late and offered to answer any questions about the project or process. Councilmember Wengert reiterated her question about whether the process is the same for the SUMC Project as it has been with other projects in the past. Mr. Williams said it's very similar to the shopping center expansion, the Mayfield Agreement for the soccer fields and associated housing, but one thing that differs from prior projects is the Hospital District rezoning. The development agreement on the SUMC Project will provide for some tradeoffs to help offset increases in density and intensity of the project, probably including additional health services for underserved populations in the community, he added.

Councilmember Wengert asked whether the zoning change proposal is occurring in parallel with the EIR. Mr. Williams said that the zoning change will go to the Palo Alto Planning Commission and City Council this fall. Then the plan is for everything to come together at the same time, probably late this year.

Councilmember Richards asked whether there is a link between the EIR and ARB processes. Mr. Williams said that the ARB has been reviewing the project for the past two years. A number of design changes over that time have been based on the ARB's input. Later this year, design specifics will go to the Palo Alto Planning Commission and City Council for their reviews. All of the basics of massing and footprint – pretty much everything except architectural feature detail – will be decided by the City Council after a recommendation from the Planning Commission as a part of this process. Further architectural details will then go to the ARB.

Mr. Mader, explaining that he had discussed this with Mr. Turner, inquired about the ARB review reducing visual impacts to a less than significant level by addressing massing, layout, landscaping and architectural design impacts. The DEIR says, "Architectural review shall assess the appropriateness of proposed demolitions, proposed building heights and massing, siting of buildings and structures, architecture, the sod treatments, landscaping, circulation plans and parking." Mr. Mader said that although the DEIR lists these things, it does not evaluate them because the details won't be known until the ARB and the City Council take action. That bothers him, because the visual aspects should be analyzed within the context of the EIR.

Mr. Williams said a fair amount of the DEIR addresses massing, footprint, landscape treatment and open space, but there is more to come. The DEIR is poorly worded in this respect, he said, and it is a point that the Palo Alto City Council also has raised, because when the DEIR talks about the Architectural Review Board it is often meaning instead the architectural review process. That process is moving forward simultaneously with the EIR and the project, and the Planning Commission and City Council both will look at the design in addition to the ARB before it is adopted. The ARB has received more detail since the DEIR was released, so more detailed plans will be put on the website, as well as the fly-through. Stanford Medical Center has created some 3D models that will be available at City Council meetings.

Mr. Mader said that it would have been better had the DEIR indicated basic parameters such as maximum heights and floor area, circulation patterns and so on, with an indication that minor modifications might be made. That way, people could know what the outer limits are; that is not evident in the DEIR. He said he understands that refinements are anticipated, but even these basics have not been evaluated in the DEIR. Mr. Williams reiterated that there is room to clarify it with much better wording.

With no further comments from the audience or Palo Alto and Stanford representatives, Mayor Toben outlined areas that would be addressed in submitting Portola Valley's comments on the DEIR as those covered in Mr. Mader's July 8, 2010, memorandum to the Town Council, including comments on traffic, visual impacts, housing and climate change. In that context, he brought the matter back to the Council for reactions and any further recommendations.

Councilmember Richards said that he believes the proposed letter takes the right approach, although the project looks an "awful lot like a done deal." Councilmember Wengert referred back to her earlier comment, suggesting that something be added to address traffic issues on Page Mill Road. Ms. Sloan said that basically the traffic delays at I-280/Alpine and I-280/Sand Hill Road would increase by 4.4 and 3.1 seconds. Although Page Mill is quite congested currently, because the analysis shows the SUMC Project increasing the morning delay of 1 second, it is not considered significant by the EIR and it is also further away from the Town. Ms. Sloan suggested that the analysis probably factored in the idea that it would be more logical to take Alpine or Sand Hill to get to the hospital.

Understanding that traffic conditions will worsen by 2025 under any circumstances, Councilmember Wengert said that she set up a grid to see the magnitude of extra seconds' delays would be with and without the SUMC Project. The difference is actually minimal, she found, because even if you take the middle of the ranges, you come up with something like 7.5 seconds of additional delays in the worst-case scenario. She said the bigger question in her mind is how to deal with these problems, and agrees that more detail about signalization mitigations is needed. She said that the Page Mill intersection is already complicated, dangerous and problematic, and requires a fairly significant and more detailed review. She also said that given a major renovation at I-280/Junipero Serra, Santa Cruz and Alpine, she is not very

optimistic about any short-term solutions there. Mr. Mader replied that the DEIR's conclusion that a potential solution (the aforementioned right-turn lane) is simply infeasible is inadequate.

In terms of the visual aspects of the project, Councilmember Wengert said that she is unsure of what comments to the DEIR would be appropriate at this point. Commenting on the establishment of the special zoning district, she said it would be helpful to understand what Stanford foresees over the longer term, and what the 30-, 40- and 50-year development plans look like so that this project could be seen in that context. As she observed, long-term planning would be easier if the University's goals were known. While she is concerned about the impacts, she also said that on the positive side, this project will create a lot of jobs as well as a modern, world-class facility.

Councilmember Derwin said that she was horrified by reading this, including the fact that Alpine Road wasn't addressed. In addition, even though the DEIR acknowledges deteriorating conditions at some of the affected intersections, to say that improvements are not feasible or the cost would be prohibitive is tantamount to a blow-off. Using Rosewood as her reference point, she said it has really changed the experience in that area, and increased I-280 traffic tremendously. The SUMC Project will add even more to a plate that is already overflowing. The visual impact will take away from what we have and we share with communities up and down the Peninsula. In summary, she said she is unhappy with the DEIR and said that it does not feel respectful to our community.

Mayor Toben generally concurred with his colleagues' concerns; he said they quite ably identified some of the limitations in the DEIR. He said that he appreciated Mr. Mader's expert review as well. To put a fine point on a couple of comments, he noted that most of Mr. Mader's memo addresses the northbound I-280 ramp onto Alpine Road but did not really discuss the southbound ramp. Mr. Mader said that the DEIR did not really address the southbound off-ramp, but agreed with Mayor Toben that it should. Mayor Toben then asked Mr. Mader to take his outline, refine it with tonight's input and give it to the Mayor for his signature, because timing does not allow putting it on the agenda at the next Council meeting.

(10) Reports from Commission and Committee Liaisons [9:20 p.m.]

(a) Planning Commission

Councilmember Richards reported that after a public hearing on a proposed conditional use permit for a wireless antenna facility, the Planning Commission denied the application. After another public hearing, the Commission approved the CUP for the Thomas J. Fogarty winery.

(b) Council of Cities

Councilmember Derwin reported that the Council of Cities met in San Mateo on the evening of San Mateo's annual wine walk. ABAG President Mark Green announced that next year the organization, which was the first COG in the Council of Governments in California, will celebrate its 50th anniversary. They are trying to embark on a sustainable community strategy throughout the region. Los Angeles County actually has adopted and is copying its green business program. They are working on a sustainable community strategy throughout the region to make AB32 and SB375 work, and are looking for money to finish the Bay Trail, which is 60% complete. ABAG's Energy Watch brought in \$1.4 million. The full General Assembly will be in Santa Clara County on October 21.

Councilmember Derwin reported that Woodside Mayor Dave Burow gave a status report to the Council on the San Mateo County Charter Review Committee. This group met 13 times between January and June and made a number of recommendations, including: 1) Change the system of electing the Board of Supervisor members to a district system instead of the current at-large system (Councilmember Derwin said she is disappointed that the Board of Supervisors already has rejected this idea), 2) Change the method of filling vacancies on the Board of Supervisors, 3) Change the method of filling vacancies in other county elected offices, 4) Change the offices of the Treasure-Tax Collector and Auditor-Controller to appointed rather than elected and 5) Require Board of Supervisors' review of all the existing boards and

commissions every eight years or less to determine boards that should be continued and those that should be eliminated. Mayor Burow has the full report available.

(c) (C/CAG) City/County Association of Governments

Councilmember Derwin attended the C/CAG special meeting on July 8, 2010, where C/CAG considered whether to place on the November ballot a San Mateo County Vehicle Registration Fee (VRF) of \$10 with proceeds going to local traffic improvement. SB83 authorizes C/CAG as a countywide transportation planning agency to impose an annual fee of up to \$10 on all motor vehicles registered in the County. At this time, such a measure requires only a simple majority to pass. A poll indicated that 66% of likely voters would support the VRF measure; however, if another proposition on the November ballot passes, fees such as this one will require a two-thirds vote in the future.

The board approved a guaranteed \$75K per city for the Local Streets and Roads fund.

50% of the funds, estimated at \$3.18 million, can be used for local streets and roads; 50% can be used for countywide transportation programs. It could include programs to mitigate congestion, mitigate pollution, prevent water pollution, expand senior and disabled transit operations and support Safe Routes to School.

Councilmember Derwin reported that C/CAG also discussed the fact that if this measure passes, there will be an 18-month overlap with the current \$4 VRF fee. They decided to add a 25-year sunset provision to the proposed language and opted for a guaranteed minimum distribution for each community rather than allocations based on population and roads per city for the portion of the money that will go direct to cities. On a straight-allocation basis, Portola Valley would receive \$47,101. The guaranteed minimum approach was approved; if this measure is approved, Portola Valley will receive \$75,000. Councilmember Derwin said that she and a couple of others voted for a \$100,000 minimum but they were outvoted. C/CAG also voted to spend \$950,000 on the election. If the measure passes, this will be reimbursed out of the VRF proceeds.

Councilmember Derwin said she cannot attend the next meeting and hopes someone will go to represent Portola Valley.

(d) ASCC (Architectural and Site Control Commission)

According to Councilmember Derwin, ASCC dealt with three items. They approved parking modifications for 35 Antonio Court, subject to conditions and instructions for the owner to continue working with the neighbor on parking and landscaping.

Review on the new house at 300 Westridge continued. Some neighbors had listed concerns, all but one of which were addressed. The project was approved, subject to three conditions, and will move on to the Planning Commission for grading plan review.

ASCC approved a remodel for 219 Wyndham, a project that came in just before the Green Points Rating System went into effect. It needs 50 points and has 49. Issues included location of the carport and the effect of Chapter 7A on the use of some of the materials they want to use. The project was approved, subject to conditions and revision of the carport design, which will come back to the full Commission.

(e) Emergency Preparedness Committee

Vice Mayor Driscoll reported that the Emergency Preparedness Committee met to review the June 30, 2010 drill conducted with the Town Council.

WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS [9:32 p.m.]

- (11) Town Council 6/25/2010 Weekly Digest – None
- (12) Town Council 7/2/2010 Weekly Digest – None
- (13) Town Council 7/9/2010 Weekly Digest
 - (a) #1 – Memorandum to Mayor and Members of the Council from Brandi de Garneau regarding Proposed Location of LEED Plaques on Town Center Buildings – July 9, 2010

Councilmember Derwin commented that placement of plaques should be consistent. Council unanimously agreed to Library option #1. Councilmember Richards and Vice Mayor Driscoll will decide on appropriate margin placement.

- (b) #2 – Memorandum to Mayor and Members of the Council from the Town's Green Team regarding Environmentally Preferable Purchasing Policy Status Report – June 30, 2010

Mayor Toben expressed his admiration for the work that had been done by the Green Team and said that he is extremely impressed by the report. He particularly appreciates how well it reflects Town staff's commitment to the organizing principles of sustainability and advanced resource efficiency. He asked that attending staff relay his appreciation to the team.

ADJOURNMENT: 9:38 p.m.

Mayor

Town Clerk