



PLANNING & TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION MINUTES

=====MEETINGS ARE CABLECAST LIVE ON GOVERNMENT ACCESS CHANNEL 26=====

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

Wednesday, June 28, 2006
Regular Meeting at 7:00 PM
Council Chambers
Civic Center, 1st Floor
250 Hamilton Avenue
Palo Alto, California 94301

ROLL CALL: 7:05 pm

Commissioners:

Patrick Burt – Chair - absent
Karen Holman – V-Chair - recused
Lee I. Lippert
Paula Sandas
Phyllis Cassel
Annette Bialson - absent
Daniel Garber

Staff:

Steve Emslie, Planning Director
Curtis Williams, Chief Planning/Transportation Official
Donald Larkin, Senior Deputy City Attorney
Amy French, Current Planning Manager
Steven Turner, Senior Planner
Dave Dockter, Planning Arborist
Zariah Betten, Executive Secretary

AGENDIZED ITEMS:

- 1a. 901 San Antonio Road [06PLN-00031, 06PLN-00050]
- 1b. 901 San Antonio Road [05PLN-00295, 06PLN-00114]

Commissioner Cassel: Those of you who wish to speak this evening, I am Phyllis Cassel, and I am going to chair the meeting this evening. I ask you to fill out a card with Zariah, print your name carefully so I can read it. It is not a signature but rather helpful to us to know who is speaking. Put your address on it and leave it with Zariah. Thank you very much.

Will the secretary please call the roll? Thank you.

I am going to call the meeting to order for June 28, 2006 at seven o'clock or slightly thereafter. The next part of the agenda is Oral Communications for anyone who wishes to speak on an item that is not on the agenda.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS. Members of the public may speak to any item not on the agenda with a limitation of three (3) minutes per speaker. Those who desire to speak must complete a speaker request card available from the secretary of the Commission. The Planning and Transportation Commission reserves the right to limit the oral communications period to 15 minutes.

1
2 Commissioner Cassel: I don't have any cards for that so I will close that item and we will
3 proceed.

4
5 **AGENDA CHANGES, ADDITIONS AND DELETIONS.** The agenda may have additional
6 items added to it up until 72 hours prior to meeting time.

7
8 Commissioner Cassel: I have no agenda Changes, Additions or Deletions.
9

10 The business this evening is two items listed as 1a and 1b, 901 San Antonio Road. A request by
11 Steinberg Architects on behalf of Bridge Urban Infill Land Development (BUILD) for Planning
12 and Transportation Commission review for rezoning to a Planned Community district and of a
13 proposed Planned Community district development plan, which includes the development of
14 103 units of for-sale town home style residences and 56 senior affordable residences, a
15 parking garage and landscaping improvements.

16
17 The other one is listed as 901 San Antonio Road a request by Steinberg Architects on behalf of
18 the Taube-Koret Campus of Jewish Life for Planning and Transportation Commission review for
19 rezoning to a Planned Community zone for the purpose of a Planned Community district
20 development plan, which will allow 134,000 square foot community center, including a cultural
21 hall and other spaces, 193 senior residential units and it goes on.

22
23 The plan this evening is that we will hear both of these items together. We are going to have a
24 Staff Report, which will cover both items. We are going to have presentation by the developer,
25 which will last 30 minutes rather than 15 because there are two projects here and this is an
26 extensive development and we wanted to give an opportunity to hear the total program from
27 what they have to say.

28
29 We will ask questions to clarify of the Staff and of the developer before we go to the public
30 hearing. I ask that we keep those mostly to questions that will help the audience and ourselves
31 understand what has been presented. We will go to the public hearing. You will get five
32 minutes to speak on both items. In other words, combined, whatever you have to say please
33 combine it for both projects and you will have five minutes to do that. We will then follow that
34 up with questions and comments. A decision will not be made this evening on the project. It
35 will be continued so that we can continue our discussion on July 26, 2006 but the public hearing
36 will be closed this evening. Don Larkin, you wish to have a word?

37
38 Mr. Don Larkin, Senior Deputy City Attorney: I was just going to mention that I think we can
39 all see that we are very close to our quorum. If for some reason, a phone call or a restroom
40 break, any Commissioner needs to leave the dais we would stop the hearing at that point for that
41 period of time. So just raise your hand and we can do that if it becomes necessary.

42
43 Commissioner Cassel: We may have more breaks than normal. We are ready for a Staff Report.
44

45 **NEW BUSINESS**

46 **Public Hearings:**

1
2 **1a. 901 San Antonio Road [06PLN-00031, 06PLN-00050]:** Request by Steinberg
3 Architects on behalf of Bridge Urban Infill Land Development (BUILD) for Planning and
4 Transportation Commission Review for rezoning to a Planned Community (PC) district
5 and of a proposed Planned Community (PC) district development plan, which includes
6 the development of 103 units of for-sale town home style residences and
7 56 senior affordable residences, a parking garage and landscaping improvements. The
8 project request includes a Comprehensive Plan amendment from Light Industrial to
9 Mixed Use, and a Tentative Map to subdivide the parcel and create condominium units
10 and certification of the Final Environmental Impact Report. Environmental Assessment:
11 A Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the BUILD and Taube-Koret Campus
12 for Jewish Life (TKCJL) has been prepared. Zone District: GM.
13

14 **1b. 901 San Antonio Road [05PLN-00295, 06PLN-00114]:** Request by Steinberg
15 Architects on behalf of the Taube-Koret Campus of Jewish Life (TKCJL) for Planning
16 and Transportation Commission review for rezoning to a Planned Community (PC)
17 District and of a proposed Planned Community district development plan, which includes
18 the development of an 134,000 square foot community center, including a cultural hall,
19 community meeting rooms, adult activity space, preschool, after school care facilities,
20 fitness center, administration and support areas and 193 senior residential living units.
21 The project request includes a Comprehensive Plan amendment from Light Industrial to
22 Mixed Use, a Tentative Map to subdivide the parcel and create senior housing
23 condominium units, and a Variance to exceed the 50-foot height limit, and a
24 Design Enhancement Exception (DEE) to allow a sculptural tower element to extend to
25 approximately 96 feet above grade and certification of the Final Environmental Impact
26 Report. Environmental Assessment: A Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for
27 the Bridge Urban Infill Land Development and TKCJL projects has been prepared. Zone
28 District: GM.
29

30 Mr. Steven Turner, Senior Planner: Thank you Chair Cassel. There are a couple of
31 housekeeping items before we start. Number one, I just wanted to give the speaking schedule in
32 terms of the Staff Report this evening. My name is Steven Turner, I am a Senior Planner and I
33 will be giving the oral presentation tonight regarding the Planned Community application and the
34 various application components that go along with both applications. I will then pass the mike
35 over to Curtis Williams, our new Chief Planning and Transportation Official who has worked
36 extensively on the environmental portion of this project and allow him to discuss the
37 environmental aspects of the project. Supporting Curtis we have our transportation consultant,
38 Dennis Struecker and our consultant on the preparation of the Environmental Impact Report,
39 Nora Monette available to answer any questions as well. I believe after Curtis speaks we have
40 Judith Wasserman here from the Architectural Review Board and she can answer any questions
41 and can also provide a brief overview of the ARB's review of the project. At that point we
42 would then turn it over to the applicant for their presentation.
43

44 The second housekeeping item refers to the BUILD Staff Report. You may have noticed as you
45 started to read through the Staff Report that about halfway through it appears that the pages were
46 flipped. So starting at Exhibit A of Attachment C you will notice that the pages were stapled in

1 backwards. So you should just simply flip them if possible so that you have the correct order of
2 the attachments. We apologize for that.

3
4 Okay, on to the Staff Report. Staff is recommending that the Planning and Transportation
5 Commission review the project, ask questions of Staff and the applicant, conduct the public
6 hearing, close the public hearing, provide comments and continue the project to the July 26, 2006
7 Commission hearing. This is the second formal hearing for both of these projects. Before I go
8 into the specifics of the projects I just want to provide a brief background and history of the
9 reviews.

10
11 The first take a look at where we have been in terms of this Planned Community application. As
12 you know, Planned Community applications get at the minimum four public hearings. There is
13 the initial review by the Planning and Transportation Commission, the project then if they are
14 recommended to a forward go on to the Architectural Review Board and it is at that Board where
15 the bulk of the design and architectural work is studied. The ARB would make a
16 recommendation back to the Planning and Transportation Commission and City Council. The
17 third meeting, the meeting, which we are at now, is that Planning and Transportation
18 Commission and a fourth meeting would be the City Council meeting. That City Council
19 meeting has not yet been agendized but we expect that that would take place sometime in
20 September.

21
22 Although we are recommending continuance the Staff Report does go into a recommendation for
23 the July 26 meeting. At that meeting Staff would be recommending the following items and
24 those items are listed in the Staff Report. So Staff at that meeting would be recommending that
25 the Commission find that the Final EIR adequately addresses the environmental impacts of the
26 proposed development plan for the requirements of CEQA and certify the Final EIR. The CEQA
27 resolution is provided in Attachment B of the documents.

28
29 We would also recommend that the Commission and City Council grant a zone change from the
30 existing General Manufacturing District to a Planned Community District and grant a
31 Comprehensive Plan Land Use Amendment from Light Industrial to Mixed Use. We would also
32 recommend to approve the Architectural Review Resolution including the Conditions of
33 Approval that are provide for you in Attachment D of the Staff Reports. We are recommending
34 approval of the Below Market Rate plan. We are recommending approval of the proposed
35 Tentative Map for the BUILD project that would subdivide the site into two sites, one a half-acre
36 site that would contain 56 senior apartment units and the larger part of the site that would contain
37 103 town home units.

38
39 On the TKCJL side we are recommending a Tentative Map for 193-condominium unit project.
40 The site would remain essentially the same but it would be prepared for condominium units for
41 the residential units on the site. For the Campus for Jewish Life we would also recommend a
42 variance to exceed the height limit as described in the Staff Report as well as a Design
43 Enhancement Exception for a sculptural tower that would exceed the 50 foot height limit as well.
44 Those would be the recommendations that Staff would bring forward to you on July 26, 2006.
45

1 So getting back to the review history of the project. The first review in front of the Planning and
2 Transportation Commission took place for BUILD on December 1, 2004 and for the Campus for
3 Jewish Life on September 14, 2005. The ARB review, the second review, took place on March
4 16 and April 20 and the Board recommended approval of the BUILD project on April 20 and the
5 Campus for Jewish Life project was reviewed on April 20 and May 18 and the Board
6 recommended approval of the project on May 18.

7
8 Also with the last 12 months Staff has been working very hard on the preparation of a Draft
9 Environmental Impact Report with a mitigation monitoring reporting program and a Final EIR.
10 The Draft Environmental Impact Report was released for a 45-day public review period in mid-
11 February of this year and we had received public comments from agencies, Commission
12 Members and members of the public. Staff held a Draft Environmental Impact Report meeting
13 with the Commission on March 29 and based upon that meeting and all the comments that we
14 received we prepared a Final Environmental Impact Report that included the responses to all the
15 comments that we had received. The Commission has copies of the Draft EIR and the Final EIR.
16

17 The other part of the project that came in your packet was a project background and description
18 document. This was the comb bound document that contained a detailed description of the
19 project and its elements as well as minutes from all of those meetings I have previously
20 mentioned. So you can refer to those to see your previous comments and those of other Boards
21 and Commissions as well.

22
23 So on to a summary of each project and I am going to start with the BUILD project and move
24 then to the Campus for Jewish Life project. The BUILD Bridge component is essentially a 100
25 percent residential project that is comprised of 56 senior housing units comprised in a rental
26 apartment building and a for sale town home project of 103 units. The total floor area of all the
27 units combined would be a little over 216,000 square feet, which would be an FAR of about
28 1.24. The parking garage, which is constructed at grade, would contain 303 spaces. The town
29 home units would be constructed on top of that garage podium and a portion of the units would
30 be constructed along the shared driveway with the Campus for Jewish Life. The senior town
31 home building would be located closest to Fabian right out in front.

32
33 For the Campus for Jewish Life this is a senior housing project and a community center project.
34 The senior housing project would contain 193 units of congregate care and assisted living units
35 and the community center would contain uses such as a cultural hall and a preschool and fitness
36 centers. That would approximately be 134,000 square feet. When you add all of the floor area
37 together on the Campus for Jewish Life project it is at about 432,000 square feet which is about a
38 1.17 FAR. The garage, which would also be constructed at grade, would contain 610 spaces and
39 predominantly all of the uses for the community center and the residential uses would be located
40 on top of the podium.

41
42 The building heights on the Campus for Jewish Life would range from 50 to 60 feet above grade
43 and have mechanical units that would extend from 70 to 75 feet. The applicant has requested a
44 variance from the 50-foot height limit for the project.
45

1 Another highlight of the design is the shared driveway in between the two projects. This is off of
2 Fabian Way and this is really the front entrance to both projects. This driveway would serve
3 both garages and really be the main entrance to both projects there.
4

5 There are a number of project components that are similar for both the Campus for Jewish Life
6 and the BUILD project and I will briefly go through those items. As I mentioned before the
7 Environmental Impact Report has been prepared by Staff and David Powers and Associates and
8 it encompasses both the BUILD and Campus for Jewish Life projects. The Draft EIR and Final
9 EIR were prepared in accordance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality
10 Act and the CEQA Guidelines. The Draft EIR includes a mitigation monitoring and reporting
11 program that would be required to be implemented to reduce any impacts to a less than
12 significant level. Again, Curtis Williams will talk a little bit more about the environmental
13 issues associated with the project.
14

15 Both projects also as previously mentioned include a Planned Community zone change. This
16 includes development program statements, development schedules, a development plan and
17 proposed findings for the establishment of the Planned Community District. These PC districts
18 are intended to accommodate developments for residential, commercial, professional or other
19 activities that would require flexibility under controlled conditions not otherwise attainable under
20 other districts. The PC district is particularly intended for unified comprehensively planned
21 developments that are of substantial public benefit and that conform and enhance the policies and
22 programs of the Palo Alto Comprehensive Plan.
23

24 In order to approve PC districts the City Council must make findings with regard to the site and
25 proposed uses that the project would not be possible under the existing zone district of the site,
26 that the development would bring public benefits not otherwise attainable within existing zoning
27 and that the project would be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and would be compatible
28 with adjacent uses. The proposed PC findings are contained in Attachment C of each Staff
29 Report in Section 4.
30

31 Both projects also involve a Comprehensive Plan Amendment and Comprehensive Plan
32 Amendments have been requested to change the existing land use of Light Industrial to Mixed
33 Use. According to the City's Comp Plan the Mixed Use designation would allow a mix of uses
34 including live/work, retail/office, residential/retail and residential/office development which
35 would be appropriate for these sites.
36

37 Then we get into the specifics of each application. I will start off with the BUILD site. With
38 regards to a Below Market Rate Housing plan the BUILD project would have 103 market rate
39 town home style uses and this PC would allow BUILD to designate a one-half acre parcel for the
40 development of 56 senior apartments that would be affordable to low and very low income
41 levels. These 56 units would satisfy the BMR requirement for the 103-unit town home project.
42 The applicant has indicated that the senior housing project would require federal, state and local
43 subsidies to develop the project and in the event that Bridge is unsuccessful in securing all of the
44 necessary funding commitments the BMR proposal also includes two alternative plans that
45 would allow the City to receive the BMR contribution required for the town home project.
46 Alternative number one would be approximately a 32 unit mixed income for sale residential

1 project that would include 16 BMR units to satisfy the 103 unit town home project and additional
2 BMR units to satisfy the additional requirements for the for sale town home units that would be
3 built as part of the 32 unit alternative project. Alternative number two would be a fee payment in
4 lieu of providing any BMR units. This fee would be at least \$4.5 million but no more than \$7.5
5 million and the final fee would be based upon certain costs, credits and proceeds on the half-acre
6 parcel that would have contained the original 56 units. The Planning Division Staff has reviewed
7 the proposed BMR Agreement and finds it to be acceptable to meet the policies and programs of
8 the BMR program. The BMR contribution is further described in the letter from Bridge
9 Housing, which is contained in Attachment E.

10
11 The final part of the application is a Tentative Map. The applicant has submitted a request for a
12 Tentative Map that would subdivide the existing four-acre site and create one multi-family
13 residential lot of approximately one-half of an acre containing 56 multi-family residential
14 apartment units and one multi-family residential lot containing 103 condominium town home
15 style units. The Draft Record of Land Use Action for the project is contained in Attachment F.

16
17 Moving on to the Campus for Jewish Life project we will speak for the Below Market Rate
18 Housing program, the Tentative Map and a number of exceptions that they are seeking. For the
19 Below Market Rate Housing proposal they have proposed a plan that includes the provision of
20 12 congregate care and 12 assisted living units and subsidies of monthly costs for services
21 offered by the Jewish senior residents. These 24 units would be made available at entry fee
22 levels that comply with the income and affordability standards prescribed by the BMR program
23 for 59 years. The Planning Division Staff has reviewed the BMR proposal and finds it be
24 acceptable to meet the policies of the BMR program. The BMR contribution is further described
25 in the letter from the applicant in Attachment F of the Staff Report.

26
27 The applicant has submitted a request for a Tentative Map for the subdivision of one parcel and
28 the creation of one mixed use lot that would contain 193 multi-family congregate care and
29 assisted living condominium units and a community center. The Draft Record of Land Use
30 Action for those projects is contained in Attachment E.

31
32 The applicant, as previously mentioned, has requested a height variance. This is a variance to
33 exceed the 50-foot maximum height established by the PC District. The roof of the residential
34 buildings would extend from 55 to 60 feet above grade with mechanical equipment extending 65
35 to 70 feet above grade. The argument in favor of the variance is the location of the site within a
36 flood zone and the presence of groundwater contaminants as well as the previous aerospace uses
37 on the site. Federal and local regulations require that all occupied development within the flood
38 zone must be constructed at least eight feet above the sea level. The existing site is as low as
39 three feet above sea level and the site is subject to also a Regional Water Quality Control Board
40 cleanup order due to the presence of groundwater contaminants as a result of the previous
41 aerospace use on the site.

42
43 By constructing the community center and housing on a podium above the at grade parking
44 garage the project would meet the requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board for
45 the location of sensitive uses within these cleanup areas. The podium development plan would
46 result in the unique condition where the tallest buildings would exceed the 50-foot maximum

1 height. In order to develop the site in the manner requested by the applicant this variance would
2 be required. In order to approve the variance the Council must make findings that special
3 circumstances or conditions are present on the site that generally would not be present on other
4 properties within the district, that no special privileges would be granted that would be
5 inconsistent with the limitations on other properties in the district, that the project would be
6 consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and zoning, that the variance would not be detrimental
7 to other property owners in the area and the findings for the variance are contained in
8 Attachment C, Section 2.

9
10 The project includes a design for a proposed sculptural tower element that would be
11 approximately 12 feet by 12 feet and rise to a maximum height of 96 feet above grade. Staff has
12 determined that a Design Enhancement Exception would be the appropriate mechanism for this
13 feature. The tower would contain elevator equipment that would serve the parking garage, the
14 podium level and two floors of the adjacent Building C. The tower would have a solid portion
15 that would extend no higher than 65 feet above grade and a skeletal transparent type section that
16 would extend no more than 96 feet above grade. A DEE would be required for this feature to
17 exceed the 50-foot height limit in this PC district. The purpose of the DEE is to enhance the
18 design of a proposed project without altering the function or use of the site or its impact on the
19 surrounding properties. The tower with a footprint of about 144 square feet is a minor
20 architectural feature of the project and although the proposed height of the tower exceeds the
21 height limit the impact this tower would have on adjacent commercial and residential uses is not
22 significant. In order to approve the DEE the City Council must make findings that special
23 circumstances or conditions are present and the site generally would not be present on other
24 properties within the district, that the granting of the exception would enhance the appearance of
25 or improve the neighborhood character and that the exception would not be detrimental to other
26 property owners in the area. The findings for the DEE are contained in Attachment D in
27 Section 3.

28
29 The ARB has reviewed the request for the DEE and recommended approval of the project with a
30 condition that the design of the tower return to the ARB for formal public meeting.

31
32 Both projects include public benefits. As part of the PC request the applicant is required to
33 provide public benefits that would not otherwise be attainable utilizing the existing zoning.
34 There are a couple of common public benefits that would apply to both projects. One would be
35 the development of this shared plaza at the Fabian Way driveway. This 5,000 square foot plaza
36 would demarcate the main pedestrian entrances to the two developments and really be a focal
37 point for the projects. Another public benefit would be conversion of commercially planned and
38 zoned land for housing. The projects would result in redevelopment of sites listed on the
39 Housing Sites Inventory, listed in the Comprehensive Plan's Housing Element to residential and
40 a community center project. The site has been largely unoccupied in a deteriorated state for
41 many years. While this has generated little parking demand or traffic it has been an obstacle to
42 creating an environment that would be beneficial to a variety of uses. The site is presently zoned
43 to permit industrial/commercial development including office uses, which would exacerbate the
44 City's shortage of housing relative to jobs. The project would replace a deteriorated, largely
45 vacant office building with well-designed structures built to contemporary building and safety
46 standards using materials of high quality.

1
2 The individual public benefits provided by each project are as follows. For the BUILD project
3 BUILD is proposing a second mortgage program for local employees. This would be mortgages
4 from between \$25,000 to \$100,000 low interest second mortgages that would be offered to local
5 employees within the area. It would be for targeted households ranging from 100 to 200 percent
6 of the median area income. The intent of the second mortgage program would be to have
7 employees live near the workplace as a way to alleviate the jobs/housing imbalance and impact
8 on traffic. The fund would initially be established at \$500,000. The applicant has also indicated
9 that they would pay approximately \$480,000 towards the costs of implementing the
10 Charleston/Arastradero transportation plan. Moving on to the Campus for Jewish Life public
11 benefits, they are proposing the community center uses that would be shared with the City of
12 Palo Alto and the BUILD/Bridge project. The Campus for Jewish Life would enter into an
13 agreement with the City of Palo Alto Department of Community Services for shared use of
14 Jewish Community Center facilities. These facilities include the gymnasium, dance-aerobic
15 rooms, storage, classrooms, playing fields, large meeting rooms, cultural hall and performance
16 center, and a teen center. In conjunction with the City the JCC and the City would develop a
17 schedule of jointly sponsored programs as well as programs and portions of the facility to be
18 made available for programs sponsored only by the City. The specific provisions of the
19 agreement including hours of operation and payment of fees would be initially reviewed and
20 approved by the Director of Community Services with follow up reviews on an annual basis.
21 The Campus for Jewish Life would also provide reduced cost memberships for the JCC for
22 residents of the adjacent BUILD/Bridge project. Other benefits that would be offered by CJL
23 that would directly affect the BUILD senior housing project would be discounted memberships.
24 The JCC would provide discounted memberships to the low-income residents of the BUILD
25 senior housing projects, which includes the 56 units, which would house approximately 70
26 residents. This discount offered would be an 80 percent reduction of the applicable JCC standard
27 membership fee. Initially this reduced membership is projected to be \$20 or less per month.
28

29 Transportation assistance. The Jewish residents would provide transportation assistance to the
30 low-income residents of the BUILD senior housing project. The JSR shuttle services would be
31 made available to BUILD residents on a space available basis. The JSR anticipates that space
32 available will accommodate the needs of the BUILD residents because of the number and
33 frequency of shuttle trips will most likely be offered to the JSR residents. The cost to provide
34 the shuttle is about \$200,000 per year and in the unlikely circumstance that JSR discontinues
35 shuttle services for residents then this benefit would not be offered to the BUILD residents.
36

37 Following up on the Architectural Review Board reviews of the project, in addition to numerous
38 preliminary reviews over the course of about two years the ARB has conducted two formal
39 reviews of each project and has recommended approval of each project to the Commission and
40 City Council. Minutes of the review are contained in the supplemental book that came with your
41 Staff Report.
42

43 During the March 29 review of the Draft Environmental Impact Report the Commission made
44 comments and had questions that related to architecture and design. The ARB responded to
45 those comments and a summary of those review meetings are contained within each Staff
46 Report. The Architectural Review Resolution in Attachment D of each report summarizes the

1 Architectural Review findings that would be required for the approval of the development plan.
2 Again, Judith Wasserman is here from the ARB to answer any questions for you.

3
4 Finally the Conditions of Approval would also apply to the project. Both projects would have
5 standard condition of approval that would apply during the final map and building permit
6 processes. These conditions are contained in the Architectural Review Resolution in
7 Attachment D. Staff recognizes that each of these projects is large and complex and would
8 represent a significant change to the neighborhood. In response to comments from members of
9 the public and adjacent property owners Staff has recommended specific conditions of approval
10 that would address concerns that have been communicated to Staff.

11
12 So within the Conditions of Approval condition number six in the Campus for Jewish Life Staff
13 Report and condition number eight in the BUILD Staff Report would require a construction
14 impact minimization plan on neighboring businesses developed with cooperation from the
15 neighboring business owners. The plan would identify potential impacts for construction and the
16 time when those impacts would be expected to occur and how those impacts would be
17 minimized.

18
19 Specifically for the Campus for Jewish Life there are a number of conditions that Staff is
20 recommending based upon the size and complexity of the project and the uses that are being
21 proposed. Condition number eight contains a condition about the cultural hall and it is a cultural
22 hall use schedule requirement. It states that the JCC shall provide to the Planning Division a
23 monthly calendar that includes all of the proposed events within the cultural hall theater space.
24 Each event shall include a description of the event, hours, expected attendance and a description
25 of any other significant events that are taking place at the JCC during the time of the event.

26
27 Staff has recently requested that the applicant provide a noise study to address the effects of
28 amplified music on nearby residences. Copies of that noise report were put at your places and
29 are available at the table to the rear. The noise study concluded that effect of the amplified
30 music on nearby residential areas would be within the limits of the Noise Ordinance until 10:30
31 each evening. So based upon that noise report Staff is recommending a condition that deals with
32 amplified sound limitations. We have recommended, condition number nine, that all outdoor
33 events with amplified sound shall cease operations no later than 10:00 PM seven days per week.
34 Noise levels shall not exceed those limits proscribed by the City of Palo Alto's Noise Ordinance
35 and if Staff receives substantial complaints about amplified sound these hours may be further
36 restricted by the Director of Planning and Community Environment or referred to the Planning
37 and Transportation Commission and City Council for review.

38
39 Condition number 10 speaks to the Jewish Community Center and neighborhood association
40 meetings. JCC management staff and Board Members of the Palo Verde Neighborhood
41 Association shall meet periodically as agreed upon by the participants to discuss issues related to
42 the operation and use of the JCC facility. JCC management and staff and Palo Verde
43 Neighborhood Association Board Members shall make contact information including telephone
44 numbers and email addresses available to each organization.

1 In order to improve pedestrian movements into and out of the Fabian Way driveway Staff is
2 recommending that the Campus for Jewish Life and BUILD projects shall relocate and upgrade
3 the existing pedestrian crosswalk across Fabian currently located near the northern property line
4 of the BUILD parcel. This crosswalk shall be located to align with the Fabian Way driveway
5 into the Campus for Jewish Life.
6

7 Finally, condition number 21 of the Campus for Jewish Life conditions indicates a requirement
8 for shared parking agreements to accommodate overflow parking onto adjacent facilities for
9 special events when required by the Conditions of Approval or the EIR mitigation measures.
10 This shared parking agreement must be submitted at least two weeks in advance of any event.
11

12 So that concludes the Staff Report and description of the projects. There are a couple of minor
13 corrections that we would like to let the Commission know about and they are mainly in the
14 BUILD Staff Report within the Planned Community District Ordinance. This would be
15 Attachment C in Section 4, Roman Numeral V.
16

17 Commissioner Cassel: Do you have a page number?
18

19 Mr. Turner: Yes, it is on page 3. This speaks to the second mortgage program for as it states
20 here for public employees. It should state second mortgage program for local employees. It
21 essentially would be offered to local employees instead of the public employees as listed there
22 with a priority on City of Palo Alto and Palo Alto Unified School District employees.
23

24 The second correction would be to Roman Number VI this is payment of the additional
25 Charleston/Arastradero fees. It should state that payment of \$480,000 of the cost of
26 implementing the Charleston/Arastradero Plan would be part of the public benefit package.
27

28 In Section 7 of that same Attachment under Site Development Regulations it speaks to the
29 development schedule. The development schedule includes the project phasing of the plan. So
30 about halfway down in that paragraph on page 9 of that attachment the sentence starts off, "That
31 the applicant anticipates that the completion of Phase 1," this is what the correction should be,
32 "the completion of Phase 1 is likely to occur no sooner than 2009 with the senior phase to be
33 completed by the end of 2012." That would be a correction that would be brought back. Each of
34 these corrections would be brought back to the Commission on the July 26 meeting.
35

36 So that concludes my portion of the Staff Report and I will hand it over to Curtis Williams to
37 speak to the environmental aspects of the project.
38

39 Mr. C. Williams, Chief Planning and Transportation Official: Thanks Steven, take a breath.
40 That is a lot of work Steven put into this effort.
41

42 I just want to try to encapsulate for you some of the changes that were made in the Final
43 Environmental Impact Report. For the project you reviewed the Draft Environmental Impact
44 Report, held a public hearing on it, accepted comments and the Staff and the consultant have
45 addressed all of those comments, indexed them and responded to all of those. That Final

1 Environmental Impact Report in conjunction with the Draft represents the final environmental
2 document for the project.

3
4 You are required as the lead agency and the Council ultimately to certify that this Environmental
5 Impact Report is completed in accordance with CEQA, that you have reviewed and considered
6 the impacts and information contained in the Final EIR and that it reflects the independent
7 judgment and analysis of the City. The CEQA findings are included as Steven mentioned in
8 Attachment B of to the Staff Report and that also is appended then by the mitigation monitoring
9 program for each of the projects. The mitigation monitoring program essentially sets out all the
10 mitigation measures, who is responsible for implementing them and when that is to be done. It
11 serves as kind of a checklist to go through before a building permit or before occupancy these
12 things are all taken care of.

13
14 The responses to comments were primarily directed at three or four key areas. Transportation
15 was one. There was some supplemental information included outlining improvements in the
16 Charleston/Arastradero Corridor particularly pedestrian and bicycle improvements that would
17 help mitigate impacts on pedestrian and bicycle use. A TDM, Transportation Demand
18 Management, plan is an additional mitigation measure and has been submitted by the applicant
19 as an attachment to your Staff Report. The intent of that is to achieve a 15 percent reduction in
20 total trips generated from the site and it requires an annual monitoring program be submitted.

21
22 The mitigation for parking for special events Steven mentioned has not changed. Previously the
23 situation has been made better by the reduction in the number of units on the BUILD portion of
24 the property from the original proposal. So there is no longer a need for the two projects to share
25 parking but we do still request that on weeknights when there is some possibility of some overlap
26 of the uses that we have the special event parking plan and if necessary off-site agreement from
27 the applicant, CJL.

28
29 There is a revised mitigation measure for the left turn movements from Charleston that now
30 rather than prohibiting all left turn movements prohibit the left turn in but do allow for left turns
31 out of the site because of the minimal number of turns and the time for getting out into traffic
32 appears to be adequate based on the transportation analysis. Similarly the loading space along
33 San Antonio Road, which was originally suggested, should not be there the applicant has
34 proposed a series of conditions and a design that we feel works adequately. It limits trucks
35 leaving that space to turn right only onto Charleston and use truck routes out of town and also
36 requires that the loading space be entirely on CJL's property and not in the right-of-way.

37
38 There was further analysis of impacts on local roads, neighborhood cut-through traffic, and the
39 traffic consultant determined that there would not be a significant impact in terms of the number
40 of potential additional trips particularly on Louis and Ross Road.

41
42 Hazards and hazardous materials. The CJL risk management plan has now been approved.
43 There is an indication that it was close to approval in the Staff Report and it now has been
44 approved by the Regional Water Quality Control Board and all of those various conditions in
45 there are made conditions of this permit and are required to be implemented along with some
46 Fire Department requests for shelter in place and emergency preparedness plans.

1
2 Visually resources and aesthetic impacts. As Steven mentioned the ARB has looked at the plans
3 and is supportive of both projects. They have provided responses to some of the issues that the
4 Commission brought up and did consider that in their deliberations. Approvals are subject to
5 some items returning either on subcommittee level to the Board with the exception of the tower,
6 which has to come back wholly as a new public hearing before the Board, and noticed to all the
7 neighbors to look at that design when it is prepared.

8
9 I do want to note because some of the letters and cards that came in mentioned lighting on the
10 top of the tower. At this point there is no lighting proposed for the tower. That would be
11 something that would be reviewed at a later date if that were even proposed. There is a condition
12 of approval that suggests that any lighting shall be very low level and just for highlight and
13 should be turned off at a reasonable hour. It didn't specify the hour but that would be
14 determined as part of that review.

15
16 Cumulative impact on public facilities was a common comment particularly schools, parks and
17 libraries. School impact fees are paid and that from a CEQA standpoint is specifically adequate
18 to address the school impact issues but there is some additional information in the document that
19 has been provided about some of the background on schools. We can go into it if you like. As
20 for the parks issue we think that this project is providing community facilities that are going to
21 be useful to all of the residents of Palo Alto. So it is not deficient as far as parks go. There will
22 also be some park fees paid by the market rate townhouse units on the BUILD property. Also
23 community facilities fees include library impact fees, which will go into helping support
24 additional library improvements.

25
26 One other comment is that what was Alternative D in the original Draft EIR has been deleted
27 from the Final EIR. That is what is called the BUILD Design Alternative. That is BUILD's
28 proposed project now. So the project definition has been refined to specifically represent that
29 reduced number of units that BUILD has proposed and the alternative is no longer necessary.
30 The analysis was adjusted to address the project as it now stands.

31
32 So the Commission as its first action on July 26 is to recommend and is necessary to address the
33 Environmental Impact Report part of this before making any actions or approvals on the rest of
34 the project. So you will need to again certify the EIR including adoption of the findings and the
35 mitigation monitoring program that are attached.

36
37 So that is a summary of the environmental and we will let Judith discuss a little bit the ARB
38 review of the projects.

39
40 Ms. Judith Wasserman, Architectural Review Board Member: Thank you. I am not going to say
41 very much because I would rather answer your questions. One of the things that we did discuss
42 about EIRs in general is that they never ask about the positive aspects of the project. They
43 always assume anything new is a bad idea and we have to figure out how to mitigate that.
44 Whereas we felt that this project was a benefit. It was a good thing and that we didn't have to
45 make excuses for it. The project was enthusiastically and unanimously supported by the Board

1 and we felt that it was both inspired and inspiring. There is a lot of poetry on a lot of different
2 levels in this project that made us feel like architecture had a good name after all.

3
4 We did see it a lot. It came to us in many preliminary hearings because it was just too big to get
5 our hands around in the two allowed formal meetings. So we saw it in many stages. We had
6 what we felt was an extremely cooperative applicant. When we asked for further delineations of
7 things, very long contextual elevations, color renderings of various things we always got what
8 we asked for. It always described how much better things were getting as things went along.

9
10 Technically there are two projects but they both had the same architect, which turned out to be
11 although unusual very beneficial. The projects are tied together very well, they use common
12 space very well, and the color palettes are compatible with each other. The whole thing seems to
13 hold together very nicely.

14
15 We understood from some of your questions that one of the difficult issues had to do with the
16 raised nature of the project that basically at grade all we had was parking and that the real stuff
17 was all at the podium level. One of our concerns was how that podium level related to the street
18 and how did you get from grade up to the podium level. We felt that was addressed successfully
19 both from Fabian and from Charleston that we didn't feel it was an appropriate consideration to
20 do that from San Antonio because there was hardly any pedestrian traffic on San Antonio. There
21 is a way up but it is not a major – I am sure Rob will go into all the site planning with you. So
22 we thought that that worked out very successfully. One of the questions had to do with the
23 relationship to the neighborhood and precedent setting. My immediate reaction to that was yes,
24 this is a precedent setting project and a damn good thing too because this is a neighborhood that
25 doesn't have very much to recommend it architecturally and this will be a very high bar to set for
26 the neighborhood and that it will be an improvement in both the real estate way and the literal
27 way that this is going to be a great asset not only to the neighborhood but to the City as a whole.

28
29 I think that the applicant is going to discuss all the details of the project but one of the things that
30 I thought was particularly well done was the way the site planning took advantage of the fact that
31 there are no cars on the podium. I think this is something that we will all envy as we go about
32 our daily lives dealing with cars in our pedestrian lives to have a space in the City that is free of
33 vehicles and you can just walk around and enjoy the varied differently designed spaces for
34 different purposes. I would be happy to answer anything that I might remember from what we
35 did.

36
37 Commissioner Cassel: Thank you very much. Do we have questions that we want to ask now of
38 Staff or can we go do the developer's report? Okay, then I will proceed. I will ask the developer
39 to come forward. By the way, if any of you wish to speak please fill out a card. Please print
40 your name, you are not signing anything, I need to be able to read it. The first person to speak
41 tonight is going to be Lydia Tan the developer is putting these two projects relatively together.
42 Someone will speak from each project and then the architect is going to present the whole
43 project. We are going to give them half an hour to do this since it is two projects. Just speak
44 right into these mikes. They are very sensitive to the angle that you are speaking into them.

1 Ms. Lydia Tan, Bridge Housing Corporation and Bridge Urban Infill Land Development,
2 Applicant: Thank you very much. I am Executive Vice President of both Bridge Housing
3 Corporation and Bridge Urban Infill Land Development. Very quickly on agenda as Chairperson
4 Cassel indicated I am going to speak a little bit about our proposal, the BUILD proposal. Shelly
5 Hebert, the Executive Director of Taube-Koret Campus for Jewish Life will do the same for her
6 proposal. We are going to give the bulk of our time to Rob Steinberg, our architect, to walk you
7 through our development proposal.

8
9 So very quickly about Bridge Housing Corporation for those of you who are unfamiliar with us
10 we are a non-profit housing developer. Our offices are in San Francisco we are based in San
11 Francisco. We also have a satellite office in San Diego and we work throughout California to
12 create as much very high quality affordable housing throughout the state as possible. That is our
13 main mission. Over the 23 years we have been in business we now have a portfolio of about
14 12,000 homes. We are home to about 25,000 residents all working and very active members of
15 their communities.

16
17 Very quickly BUILD, Bridge Urban Infill Land Development, is the applicant for us and BUILD
18 is a partnership between Bridge and the California Public Employees Retirement System. When
19 we started this process back in 2002 we were a \$100 million partnership between Cal-PERS and
20 Bridge. We got another allocation being able to invest Cal-PERS dollars into urban
21 environments throughout California trying to create great urban environments.

22
23 Very quickly on the development our first presentation to the City was in 2004. Steven Turner
24 talked about our first presentation to the community was the end of 2002. We have been having
25 a very extensive dialogue over the many, many years as the project has morphed and changed
26 over time. Frankly, from the time we started our first initial concept to where we are today we
27 really appreciated all of the input from the community, the input from all of the public bodies
28 who have helped us along over the past years. Just to highlight our original proposal was about
29 230 homes on the four-acre parcel and we are now down to 159 units as Mr. Turner had
30 indicated. The other main change since we originally made our application is that the senior
31 component has moved from San Antonio over to Fabian to try and give more of a pedestrian
32 orientation to the project but also to help with the seniors in terms of access to other parts of the
33 City. As we think about what we have done we have reduced the height, we have reduced bulk,
34 we have reduced impact on traffic and other things and we actually scratched our heads a couple
35 of weeks ago and said why are we doing a PC zone? We are actually under 40 units to the acre.
36 We really don't have the kind of impact that a normal PC zone would be having on the
37 environment but we are happy to be doing that. We are happy to be providing the public benefit
38 that we proposed.

39
40 Just very quickly on the public benefit the Charleston/Arastradero improvements are actually
41 quite near and dear to our hearts. Folks might recall that when the original study for
42 Charleston/Arastradero was in place both the Taube-Koret Campus for Jewish Life and BUILD
43 donated \$20,000 to start that study. So we are very much invested in making sure that those
44 improvements go into place and are successful.

1 On the mortgage assistance program we are really excited about the idea of trying to create more
2 affordable housing above and beyond what we would normally be required to do and provide it
3 at a level that isn't normally addressed with the normal public programs. So we are really happy
4 to be doing that.

5
6 Then very quickly on the BMR agreement there is the proposal, and there are two backup
7 alternatives. I just want to very strongly iterate that it is our strong preference that the proposal
8 that is in front of you is the preferred direction as far as Bridge and BUILD is concerned. We
9 fully intend to build the 56 units as affordable senior. There are a lot of funding sources we will
10 still have to pull together in order to make it happen so Staff has wisely asked us and pushed us
11 to come up with a couple of alternatives to make sure that in some way, shape or form the BMR
12 requirements would be dealt with. So we are happy to have come to agreement on that.

13
14 The last thing I want to say is I do want to very much thank Staff over the four years. As you
15 can imagine if I listed everybody I would list every single person that works for the City of Palo
16 Alto. So just very quickly I want to thank in particular Steven Turner, Curtis Williams and Amy
17 French and Steve Emslie for sticking with us and helping us to create a really great project. We
18 are really excited about this project. So I will now ask Shelley Hebert to come up and talk about
19 the Taube-Koret.

20
21 Ms. Shelley Hebert, Taube-Koret Campus for Jewish Life, Applicant: Good evening. I am the
22 Executive Director for the development of the Taube-Koret Campus for Jewish Life. On behalf
23 of the partners in the project, the Palo Alto Jewish Community Center and the Jewish Home of
24 San Francisco I want to say how excited we are to have reached this point. We have appeared
25 before you two previous times for a conceptual review and in relation to our Draft
26 Environmental Impact Report. All together there have been 15 public hearings on the project
27 over the past several years in addition to many meetings with neighborhood groups including the
28 Green Meadow Community Association, Palo Verde Neighborhood Association and Palo Alto
29 Neighborhoods among others.

30
31 I believe that working with Staff all issues and concerns have been addressed. We have made
32 some modifications as a result of neighborhood input. I would especially like to express our
33 appreciation to Staff for their hard work throughout this very complex process.

34
35 This evening we brought several key people from our project team to be able to respond to
36 questions. I would like to introduce Rob Steinberg and Randy Popp of Steinberg Architects,
37 from our project management team Todd Aris, John [Eicko] and Jerry Fang of the Regis Aris
38 Group, Jim Baer our City Approvals Consultant, Sandy Sloan our land use attorney and David
39 Cook, our environmental attorney. The unique combination of a privately funded community
40 center integrated with senior housing in a true inter-generational environment has inspired our
41 Board, our volunteers, donors and professional team to create a project that we are very proud to
42 present to you this evening. We believe it provides significant public benefit to the entire
43 community through open membership to the JCC and access to the senior living residences for
44 people of all backgrounds and faiths. In addition to the public benefits inherent to the project the
45 Campus will provide great public benefit through an arrangement described earlier this evening
46 with the City of Palo Alto Department of Community Services for shared use of JCC facilities

1 including a gymnasium, aerobic and dance rooms, meeting rooms, classrooms, teen center,
2 cultural hall among others.

3
4 We are very respectful of the extensive public input process over the past two years as well as
5 the time available this evening. Therefore we have not asked the hundreds of JCC supporters in
6 our community to be here tonight to express their concerns and support of the project. Now I
7 would like to ask Rob Steinberg to provide you with an overview of the project design.

8
9 Mr. Rob Steinberg, Steinberg Architects: Good evening. As we heard from Staff there are quite
10 a number of issues to discuss so what I would like to do is just give you a brief overview of our
11 proposal. Let me begin by saying that this is a redevelopment of an existing site. You can see a
12 fairly large existing building, almost 100 feet on the site. I will remind you that we are near
13 residential but we are not tangent to the residential and interestingly enough and positive we
14 have access to a number of different roadways in order to distribute traffic in a variety of
15 different directions.

16
17 The 12.5-acre site is broken up roughly sort of one-third/two-thirds. On the left or the north side
18 is the BUILD/Bridge component that Lydia just told you about. There are 3.5 acres for market
19 rate housing located here and about half an acre for senior housing, low and very low income on
20 that part of the site. The additional 8.5 acres to the right or to the south is the Campus for Jewish
21 Life site.

22
23 As you have heard we have been at this process for about two years going through the
24 entitlement process. Our anticipation is that hopefully in the next several months we will
25 conclude that. We have certainly done our very best to be inclusive and collaborative as we have
26 gone through this process and we look forward to a thoughtful exchange with you this evening.

27
28 The proposal that we have has two components and I would like to begin by talking about the
29 four acre component that is comprised of Bridge housing and BUILD. Our original design that
30 we brought to the City was significantly more aggressive than the proposal that we are sharing
31 with you this evening. It had about 230 units. It was a large interior hallway loaded building. It
32 had four large courtyards that really were defined by three, four and five story buildings. Our
33 current proposal that we have in front of you this evening as you heard has been reduced by
34 about 30 percent. Probably more significant than that is we have taken this one very large
35 building and we have broken it into 12 smaller buildings. We have organized these 12 smaller
36 buildings along pedestrian walk-streets on top of the parking. It is a very interesting prototype.
37 It is a building type that we don't really have here in Palo Alto currently. We have organized
38 this part of the site around a large open courtyard and then there is a muse or a pedestrian walk-
39 street that goes off to the east and connects through to the Campus for Jewish Life. There is also
40 an eastern muse that takes you and connects through a grand street stairway out to Fabian. We
41 have purposely located the senior component on the front of the site near our shared driveway in
42 effort to provide dignity for the seniors, to provide convenient access to transportation and a
43 connection to the City. What is interesting is that corner of that building is the shared entry drive
44 to the entire mixed use development and is shared with the Campus for Jewish Life. For that
45 reason we took the lobby, we took the internal stair and we raised that up as really an entry
46 gateway to the entire mixed use community.

1
2 The market rate housing is comprised of two and three story buildings. Instead of being large
3 elevator access buildings all of the units are accessed through private courtyards or stoops or
4 gardens that lead you directly from the outside into your unit much like a single-family house.
5 What is kind of interesting and one of the things that we tried very hard to do is to create a sense
6 of arrival to these homes that made that experience sort of an unfolding adventure. So for
7 example if you walked into the site you would come along a gateway and someone's private
8 patio, you would come to a very wide stairway instead of having it go up vertically it comes up a
9 few steps to a landing, up a few steps to a landing and then you come to a large portal and you
10 are able to look into the site. What you do is you look into a very large central square, our open
11 space. On this large open space we have actually developed what we refer to as sort of
12 community sized front porch swings adjacent to the lawns and the open area, some very large
13 swings that are a place to connect with your neighbors, to have activity and movement, some
14 kinetic energy in that space and to liven that space and to give our central square a sense of
15 identity. From that space you could move off into the muse and down to the individual
16 residences.

17
18 Similar to the BUILD and the Bridge activity the Campus for Jewish Life is all about
19 connections. This portion of the site also has two components. It has 193 units of continuing
20 care retirement community residence for seniors and support activities and has about 135,000
21 square feet of community center space to it. It is really a very unusual mix of uses. You might
22 say, Rob, with this kind of mix of uses how do you pull together a design that knits this together?
23 I will tell you it has been a very interesting experience. One of the mechanisms that we used is
24 with our group we developed nine guiding principles. We used these principles to help us sort of
25 gauge the success of ideas that we brought forward. It gave us a sense of focus and an ability to
26 direct our decision-making to see if we were really achieving our goals. So for example one of
27 the things that we decided is that the journey is as important as the destination, that the interstitial
28 spaces and the connections were very, very important and we should encourage informal kinds
29 of activities as much as program kinds of spaces. Another principle that we talked about was
30 trying to get the buildings to reflect their purpose and function. The reason that we did this is we
31 wanted to have variety, we wanted to have a unified campus but we wanted to do that without
32 having uniformity and repetition to the buildings. I will show you how we did that in just a
33 minute. The third and sort of the last principle, I am just giving you a little sampling here, is that
34 we wanted to reinforce the idea of looking upward for divine inspiration. So we tried to add
35 detail that visually drew your eye upwards on the buildings as part of our design vocabulary. So
36 maybe that sounds very simple but it actually was rather complicated. We spent several years
37 exploring different alternatives. You are looking at five of them and I am not going to go into all
38 of them but you can see for example the green is the senior housing, here it was in this location,
39 then it was in that location, then it moved in a different way, then it folded in different directions.
40 In each of these iterations we wrestled with issues like security, connection, access both
41 pedestrian and vehicular, and we focused not just internally but how we were also connecting to
42 the City fabric as well. So we wound up and we settled on a land use plan that we think is very
43 successful. We think it is open and welcoming and inclusive and we also think it gives a sense
44 of identity to each of our users. So for example, the blue is the community center and the blue
45 and the community center expresses itself on each of the three streets in different ways. The
46 green is the senior housing and that has its own presence on Charleston. You can see that we

1 moved it away from the busy intersection and sort of brought it into the middle of the block. The
2 tan or orange color is where we have community center on the ground or on the grade or the
3 podium and we have housing vertically integrated over the top of that. So we have a sense of
4 identity but we have also tried to knit the two into an integrated, inter-generational mixed use
5 neighborhood.

6
7 To me what really makes this plan extraordinary is not just the mix of users but the mix of uses
8 and how this can contribute to our community. We have fitness, indoor and outdoor pools,
9 administrative areas, after school programs, preschool programs, restaurants, retail, adult
10 activities, senior residential, senior dining and support facilities, cultural facilities all integrated
11 horizontally and vertically on the same site. From the very beginning our vision included the
12 idea that we wanted this not just to be a collection of buildings but we wanted to create outdoor
13 rooms that were framed between the buildings. What is so exciting to me is that we have a
14 whole series of different shaped outdoor rooms and they vary between places that are hardscape
15 and areas that are more richly landscaped so that they can accommodate a whole variety of sizes
16 and different kinds of functions. I just wanted to wrap up by showing you a few images of this.
17 This is a view of the cultural hall looking from Charleston. There is a two-story glass lobby into
18 the theater that suggests a sense of openness, a transparency. If you look carefully you can see
19 that we are detailing the roof so that there are elements on the top of it that draw you eye
20 upwards as I explained to you. When you enter from Fabian you see outdoor pools and indoor
21 pools. There is the outdoor pool on the terrace, indoor pools with glass connection to the
22 outdoor pool and the gymnasium. What we are trying to do is to suggest a sense of structure like
23 your bones, like the skeleton of a body with skin that is stretching between them. So it has a
24 little different character than cultural building. The senior building on Charleston is proud, it is
25 welcoming, it is part of our front door. It combines a whole series of outdoor and indoor spaces
26 that are tailored to the special needs of mobility and visibility of seniors. As I mentioned to you
27 as important as our rooms in our building are these interstitial spaces that we have, spaces that
28 are for arrival, more intimate kind of spaces, our town square that will accommodate all sorts of
29 large activities and abilities to have cultural activities indoors and outdoors where the campus
30 and the community could come together as one.

31
32 I would like to just tell you as a long term resident of Palo Alto, as a Fellow in the American
33 Institute of Architects that it is really a privilege to be with you tonight and share our vision for
34 BUILD and for Bridge and for the Campus for Jewish Life with you. I want to tell you on a
35 personal note that I am very confident that this proposal that we have in front of you tonight
36 combines the best practices of Planning, of Design, of Smart Growth with the values of our
37 community and the expectations for the quality of life and activity that our residents deserve and
38 expect. So we are very appreciative to share our thoughts with you tonight. Thank you.

39
40 Commissioner Cassel: Thank you. Do you have questions of the developer? Do you want to go
41 right to the public hearing? All right then we will move directly to the public hearing. We may
42 have questions of you later.

43
44 Those of you who wish to speak you will have five minutes to speak. You may speak on both
45 projects at the same time so that we will not have two separate hearings on each project. You
46 can integrate your comments then for both and any comments you wish to make on the Final

1 Environmental Impact Report. We will give you five minutes to speak. If you don't need the
2 five minutes you don't have to use it. We have 27 speakers so that is over two hours if you all
3 use five minutes. I am sure you will not all do that but on the other hand I want to give you an
4 opportunity to say what is important to you. The first person to speak tonight is Bob Evans to be
5 followed by Betsy Allyn. When you come up will you please say your name and the town in
6 which you live? Thank you.
7

8 Mr. Bob Evans, Palo Alto: Hi. I live right on Gailen on the other side of Fabian. I think the
9 project looks beautiful. When I first started to see it on the website I think it was quite clear
10 what it would look like and everything. I like the idea of taking down the Sun building and
11 hopefully getting something that I didn't see from my front, back and side yards anymore, which
12 would be the Sun building. However, I notice that these buildings which are 56 feet are now
13 moved closer to Fabian than the Sun building is so the one think I would like to criticize
14 although the website and the architecture stuff is beautiful is it didn't give me any kind of a
15 aspect ratio as to what I'll be looking at from the neighborhood. What is the perspective from
16 the surrounding streets as to how high this thing really is versus the fact that the Sun building
17 was set so far back from the residential area there, which is the Meadow Park area. So that is
18 number one.
19

20 That aside I would like to make sure since these are 56 feet tall and they actually have very large
21 wide roofs that we don't have any plans or future plans on having any parties or any kind of
22 stand up and look around at Palo Alto on these rooftops, any kind of an area other than air
23 conditioning and general maintenance. I am hoping that is the case but I haven't seen that
24 spelled out.
25

26 Perhaps my biggest concern is the fact that the City of Palo Alto has already voted on and passed
27 something to fix all the storm water runoff. In our neighborhood we flood. That is just right on
28 the other side of Fabian. You don't have to be a rocket scientist although perhaps we should
29 have hired one for this report because I think this person that did the storm drain water report
30 probably didn't make it through high school science. The reason I state that is because this water
31 report and the storm stuff seems to be totally focused on the pollution aspect and impact of what
32 we are going to do to the creek. This project doesn't state nor does this report state that this
33 water runoff will go into that creek. Now, I think that the fact that this is a report about the water
34 runoff kind of alludes to the fact that the City or somebody has hired a consultant to explain that
35 it is really not a problem they are going to take care of the pollution. Well, that is really
36 deflection from the fact of flooding because it doesn't really talk about flooding at all or our
37 streets or our problems in the neighborhood which is the water runoff from our streets during a
38 storm opens up into a gate that like less than halfway in height from the full height of Adobe
39 Creek. Every time that water level rises with the tide that gate closes and the water begins to rise
40 all the way up my driveway and my neighbor's. So much so that in our neighborhood we went
41 out and all chipped in and bought a pump because the City doesn't pump the water out. So we
42 have our own pumping station in our neighborhood for the flooding issue. This doesn't talk
43 about that. They didn't talk to anybody in our neighborhood because there are so many people
44 that know about it and yet it is not mentioned. That is a 10,000 gallon an hour pump we got
45 from Granger that kind of keeps up with the rain. So the City passed something where we were
46 supposed to get \$600,000 for this pump station to be put in but the San Francisquito Creek is

1 really getting all the focus of making that area stop flooding and there is nothing in our area. I
2 would like to know if the builders of this project, which all stand to make a lot of money, the
3 architects, the builders, the community itself and the retail and so on have even heard of this
4 before? You said I am asking questions, right?

5
6 Commissioner Cassel: No, you are not asking questions. You will just give us the information
7 and then we will check on that later.

8
9 Mr. Evans: I see. Okay. I misunderstood you then in the beginning of this.

10
11 Commissioner Cassel: The Commissioners will be asking questions.

12
13 Mr. Evans: Okay. So my primary concern then to sum it up is how come we can't hire real
14 contractors to go investigate and explore this? Thank you.

15
16 Commissioner Cassel: Thank you. Betsy Allyn to be followed by Judith Fields.

17
18 Ms. Betsy Allyn, Palo Alto: Good evening. I live on Willmar Drive on the corner across from
19 Terman School. I would like to just make a few comments tonight. I would like to thank Mr.
20 Steinberg for his drawings they show a great deal of imagination. I want to speak sort of from a
21 South Palo Alto neighborhood standpoint and that is that this is really a city in city. This is the
22 first time Palo Alto has ever done anything like this. This is precedent setting and what you do
23 will be with us for a long time, the bad and the good. It is a regional facility. People will be
24 coming from all over the Bay Area so there is much traffic and much safety and much impact to
25 be thought about. I think that there is no possible way that the full future impacts on South Palo
26 Alto and the neighborhood of this massive project can be measured or for that matter mitigated.

27
28 I am extremely concerned about the safety in this area and up on the corridor. As it has been
29 said many times it is a School Safety Corridor, it is a school commute corridor, thousands of
30 children use it and I don't think there has been an adequate analysis of the safety features of this
31 road at certain times of the year and at certain times. I would like to see lighted crosswalks for
32 the children and pedestrians. I would like to see lighted bike crossways for the bicyclists and
33 maybe even possibly lighted bike paths on the streets through there.

34
35 Another important point I think is the total actually approved multi-family housing units in South
36 Palo Alto so far is now 3,550 units planned and going to be built. There are 2,454 units noted by
37 the City but it is 3,550. There is a study that has been done showing the housing units sold in
38 South Palo Alto, 43 percent of those that have been sold were sold to families with what else?
39 Children, and those children will be going to school. Adding a 134,000 square foot recreation
40 center and a 380 seat theater for special events and the usage on a 24/7 basis is going to be a real
41 problem for this intersection and this area particularly for the neighborhoods because they will
42 get the traffic. I am wondering if both those buildings could not be scaled back just a little bit
43 and make very sure that the parking is on site. Having lived across from Terman for several
44 years we did experience the parking on our neighborhood streets. I think also that the applicant
45 should be required to provide shuttle services for all of its occupants for local shopping and
46 medical trips to decrease the traffic. I think the City should require that the construction

1 company use certain traffic routes and parking areas for trucks and workers and have enforceable
2 measures of responsibility so that the construction company is responsible for those rules being
3 followed and not the City. I think that the 50-foot height limit must be respected with a six to 12
4 foot above grade allowed where possible. The 50-foot height limit in Palo Alto has been rather
5 sanctified and respected. Also, there should be absolutely no 60 to 95 foot tower. This would be
6 setting a huge precedent and is way beyond being acceptable. It is not one of Palo Alto's values
7 and it should not be. It would be detrimental to the surrounding neighborhoods. I want to say it
8 would be almost an insult but I am not going to say that. Palo Alto has never managed a project
9 of this complexity and size. It is certainly precedent setting and therefore must be held to
10 acceptable standards and accountable standards for the City and the residents. Thank you.

11
12 Commissioner Cassel: Thank you. We are going to hear two more speakers and then we will
13 take a break. The next person to speak is Judith Fields to be followed by Alan Bennett.

14
15 Ms. Judith Fields, Palo Alto: Good evening. I am going to speak in favor of this project. Many
16 other people will laud the design or tell you about various components. I am going to speak to
17 why I think philosophically it needs to be approved. One of the things Palo Alto prides itself on
18 is maintaining diversity. This is one way to do that to have homes for our seniors. The price of
19 this project is likely to be more affordable or more accessible to a greater number of people than
20 some of the other projects in Palo Alto. Our seniors should not be punished because they grow
21 old. They should be able to live in Palo Alto.

22
23 We know the Bay Area is going to grow, different communities by different amounts. This is
24 one way to manage our growth. Change is difficult whether change is personal or in our
25 community and we need to accept that change is difficult and go from there. Every change has a
26 reaction. We need to think of the common good. For instance Palo Alto has taxed itself to
27 provide more money for the schools. We all agree the children deserve the best possible
28 education and it doesn't matter whether we have children in school or have never had children in
29 school. In the same way we need to look at the common good and have housing for our seniors
30 because we will all be old someday and this is the kind of resource we need. Thank you.

31
32 Commissioner Cassel: Thank you. Alan Bennett and when we finish the break Louise Lyman
33 will be speaking first.

34
35 Mr. Alan Bennett, Palo Alto: Good evening. I wanted to say a few words perhaps somewhat
36 selfishly about what the project means to me and my wife and why I see it to be important. First
37 the senior housing would be a potentially attractive option if we should age further. Despite
38 what I deny whenever I look in the mirror I have a number of friends and contemporaries who
39 are busily considering the senior housing options and I suspect that we will eventually be doing
40 just that. The mix of independent and assisted living, the religiously diverse population and the
41 chance to be next to a community center with an age diverse population all make the housing
42 component of the project very attractive to us. I guess it is sort of obvious that at least the senior
43 housing component of the projected plan really wouldn't make any additional demands on the
44 schools.

1 Secondly, the senior programming will be potentially important to us no matter where we live in
2 the area. Things like bridge, which frankly I leave to my wife but language clubs and lectures
3 and social events and movies can all make a difference to the quality of our lives during the
4 coming years. The bottom line is as a Palo Alto resident I am certainly concerned that traffic and
5 environmental effects be minimized and I suspect City Staff and the Commission will work to
6 make that the case. I strongly support getting the campus up and running as quickly as is
7 sensible. Thank you.

8
9 Commissioner Cassel: Thank you. We are going to take a break of seven minutes. We will
10 come back and we have another 20 people to speak.

11
12 I'd like to call this meeting back to order. Would everyone please take a seat. We have a very
13 good Vice Chair, he gave me a 20 second warning. Lee is acting as Vice-Chair this evening and
14 we even have our next speaker, ready to go. That's how we get this moving this evening.

15 Louise Lyman.

16 Ms. Louise Lyman, Palo Alto: Hi, good evening. My name is Louise Lyman and I live right on
17 the corner of Louis and Charleston and I can tell you that's a busy corner already. I want people
18 to realize that this is the biggest development that has ever been done in Palo Alto and do we
19 realize how many homes are in the process of being approved of being built. I think somebody
20 had already mentioned it, 3500 .feet. The biggest concern that I have is the traffic. Right now,
21 this is on Charleston, the Charleston Corridor study, and the plan is to make Charleston go one
22 lane each way. As it is now, cars are backed up the block with two lanes in each way and we
23 know that there's going to be hundreds of cars going into this development. Its going to be a
24 gridlock, I can assure you. Now, as far as the plan for the Jewish Community Center they have
25 got beautiful ideas, nice ideas, but to be able to put all of that in eight acres, they need 20 acres.
26 It is going to so dense and so tall. We have a 50-foot building height limit in Palo Alto but it
27 almost seems like that has not been obeyed at all with a 95 foot tower that is going to be 12 by
28 12. I noticed I didn't see any of that on any of those buildings or in the display. Now I am kind
29 of wondering just exactly is that that little thing in the middle? That isn't 95 feet comparatively.
30 So many of the neighbors in the neighborhood are very concerned about a 95 foot tower
31 especially if it is going to be lighted and what is going to happen.

32
33 Another thing we are very concerned about is traffic, the U-turns and the left hand turns. As I
34 say it is just going to be gridlock.

35
36 The noise. This business of amplified music in the courtyard. Now no other place in Palo Alto
37 lets you have outside noise until ten o'clock at night. When you have twilight orchestras or
38 when you have any of the other outside events they stop at eight o'clock or 8:30. When I heard
39 ten o'clock or 10:30 I'll tell you that will never fly with us because I am like three doors away
40 from it and I am already going to get earplugs.

41
42 The density and the height I already mentioned. The parking is going to be I think a problem. I
43 think that the auditorium holds 400 people and if there is another event that is also at the same
44 time they are probably going to need some overflow parking. I know we would like to have it be
45 that they call it an event so that they tell the City how many people are going to be there and how
46 much parking is going to be needed. I did take a bit of offence at the woman who said, well this

1 is going to be an improvement that is not a very nice neighborhood anyway. There isn't really
2 anything to be proud of. I thought, okay, I didn't feel very good about that because we have
3 some very nice homes and to have this dense and this high buildings right next to us is not going
4 to be an improvement in livability. So as I say there are some very nice features in the whole
5 center but you need 20 acres not eight to put them in. Thank you.

6
7 Commissioner Cassel: Thank you. Doris Petersen to be followed by Richard Madigan.

8
9 Ms. Doris Petersen, Palo Alto: I am President of the League of Women Voters. Well
10 Commissioners, the League of Women Voters supports with enthusiasm the two proposals for
11 developments at 901 San Antonio Road which are before you tonight. We urge you to
12 recommend the Planned Community District that is requested. These developments have been in
13 discussion with the City for at the last two years. An extensive Environmental Impact Report
14 has been completed. Changes to the plans have improved them. The proposals adhere to dozens
15 of Comprehensive Plan policies, help the City meet its Housing Element agreement with the
16 state, further availability of diverse housing types for different income levels in the City, improve
17 a deteriorating section of the City and provide other benefits to families already residing there.

18
19 The League is pleased that the 103 unit for sale townhouse development will provide some
20 entry-level housing and units at prices not often seen in Palo Alto. One bedroom to four
21 bedroom units are priced at today's market from the range of \$400,000 to \$800,000. BUILD's
22 inclusive housing requirement of 16 units will be met by fund to Bridge for 19 rental units of the
23 56 affordable senior rental units planned on the Fabian side of the property. This entire rental
24 housing project will serve low income and very low-income seniors with at least 30 units
25 reserved for extremely low-income persons, a group often ignored. This housing responds to
26 many of the League's housing positions as well as to our City Housing Element contract with the
27 state.

28
29 Many components of the Campus for Jewish Life development like the 193 senior residential
30 units it is building, the Fabian entry plaza shared by both BUILD and TKCJL, the shuttle service
31 that will provide senior from both developments and CJL recreation facilities that will be open to
32 the community will improve the livability of the area.

33
34 We are pleased with additional public benefits from BUILD. One, an impact fee to the
35 Charleston/Arastradero road improvement program of five times the required amount and two, a
36 new second mortgage program for local workers with preference for Palo Alto City and school
37 district employees with terms such as three percent simple interest, interest only payments for ten
38 years of the loan, targeted to households earning from 100 to 150 percent of area median income
39 and available for properties throughout the City. This will encourage homeownership for
40 families now priced out of the market. We urge approval of the Planned Community District for
41 both BUILD and TKCJL. Thank you very much.

42
43 Commissioner Cassel: Thank you. Richard Madigan to be followed by Karen Stiller.

44
45 Mr. Richard Madigan, Menlo Park: Good evening. I am Director and Senior Property Manager
46 for California Pacific Commercial Corporation with an office in Menlo Park. We have been a

1 property owner in Palo Alto since 1956. We presently own ten parcels totaling nearly 18 acres in
2 the immediate are of the proposed development including three properties right across the street
3 on Fabian Way.

4
5 Of primary concern to us as a neighbor is a requested Design Enhancement Exception for a
6 sculptural tower element of approximately 96 feet in height. We strongly believe this artistic
7 element, which rises some 30 feet higher than the already imposing 65 foot structural tower is
8 both inappropriate and totally unwarranted. Having recently met with the project manager and
9 the architect it is now evident that this highly visible illuminated spire is not a key element to the
10 project nor does it serve any useful purpose. It is simply a self-promotional architectural
11 adornment the details of which still remain unknown. Given the massive size and scope of this
12 development one would hope the applicant would endeavor when possible to mitigate the
13 project's impacts on the community. Instead, this non-functional, needless, aesthetic element
14 would attract still further attention to this site compounding such important concerns as traffic
15 and parking.

16
17 Finally, given the low profile nature of our neighborhood where safety and security have long
18 been valued how is such a visible potential target of any benefit to the neighborhood? Put
19 simply, our view is that the most excessive feature of this project is also the least essential and
20 that only negatives will potentially result from approval of this ill-advised, non-integral, aesthetic
21 element. In offering these few remarks her tonight Cal Pacific would also be pleased to discuss
22 the matter in greater detail with the Commissioners. Thank you.

23
24 Commissioner Cassel: Thank you. Karen Stiller to be followed by Natalie Krauss Bivas. I hope
25 I am pronouncing your names close to right.

26
27 Ms. Karen Stiller, Jewish Community Relations Council: Thank you. I am the Peninsula
28 Director the Jewish Community Relations Council. I am here to speak this evening in strong
29 support of this project. I have been really impressed with the planning process that the Campus
30 has gone through with the diligence they have engaged the community with and the degree to
31 which this will be a project and a place for the entire community. I would like to focus on a few
32 areas behind why I am so supportive of this project. First of all, this will be a tremendous bridge
33 building for our community. It will be open to people from all walks of life and all backgrounds.
34 It will be a place of gathering for people who might not otherwise cross paths. Other Bay Area
35 JCCs bear out this and the Terman site also showed this to be true.

36
37 Second, we are all concerned about the welfare of the youth in our community. As a former
38 social worker I can attest to the benefits of having a healthy and positive place for teens to go in
39 the times that they are out of school or not sleeping. The teen center in the new JCC will really
40 be a big benefit to the teens in the community. It will be an excellent resource and a positive
41 place that they can go and find programming that is needed. Additionally due to the unique
42 nature of the project there would be opportunities for intergenerational exchange, which is
43 something that will be of benefit both for seniors as well as benefits to teens.

44
45 Third, a mom of a nearly one-year old daughter I am looking forward to the preschool programs
46 and after school programs the JCC will provide. As many people here I am sure know there is a

1 limited amount of resources for this in our community, limited amount of resources of high
2 quality preschool programs. Wasn't there just a ballot initiative about this particular issue?
3 Anyway, I am really looking forward to the expanded services that the JCC will be able to
4 provide. So in sum I just want to again state my strong support for this project and I thank you
5 for your time.

6
7 Commissioner Cassel: Thank you. Natalie Krauss Bivas to be followed by Jeff Rensch.

8
9 Ms. Natalie Krauss Bivas, Palo Alto: Thank you and I must say you are one of the few people
10 who has ever pronounced my name absolutely correctly. I am a Palo Alto resident. I am also a
11 Palo Alto Unified School District teacher. I am a reading specialist and English as a Second
12 Language Specialist at Palo Verde School. I am here to speak in support of this project. I can
13 tell you as a teacher that parents are really burdened in trying to find daycare, preschool and after
14 school programs for children in Palo Alto. The benefit of this project is that this project can
15 service children from Hoover School, Fair Meadow School and Palo Verde it is a very short
16 commute from all of those three schools.

17
18 As a teacher of English as a Second Language I try to find programs for my children who have
19 come from China, Korea, Japan, Israel who don't speak English such as after school programs,
20 summer camp programs where they can improve their English in a way that is better than being
21 in a classroom where the rule is quiet. They can have an exchange with children before they
22 have really made friends. I really look forward to the new JCC providing that service for
23 children.

24
25 As I listened to Mr. Steinberg and Ms. Tan I realize another benefit of this program as a teacher
26 in Palo Alto. Two of our most beloved teachers at Palo Verde this year are leaving because they
27 cannot afford to live here. They happen to be married to two other Palo Alto teachers. So just in
28 my small orbit that is four teachers leaving because they can't live in Palo Alto. This project
29 could potentially provide housing for the many, many teachers who leave, the young teachers
30 who cannot afford to live in Palo Alto.

31
32 I also realized as I was sitting here that I am about to reach the 24th anniversary of my move to
33 Palo Alto. I came here 24 years ago pregnant with my first child. The very first people that we
34 met were moving from New Jersey, they knew our sisters and they were bringing my sister's crib
35 with them. The husband was the director of the JCC and he was to oversee the move to Terman,
36 which was a temporary location. Twenty-four years have passed, this man has been retired for
37 years, the baby that I was pregnant with is now a graduate student and there is still not a
38 permanent home for the JCC. I really hope that beside the service that first used at the JCC, the
39 nursery school, but the next service that I use isn't the senior housing because it hasn't seen its
40 fruition yet. Thank you.

41
42 Commissioner Cassel: Thank you. Jeff Rensch to be followed by Sandra Grimsrud.

43
44 Mr. Jeff Rensch, Palo Alto: Honorable Commissioners I live in South Palo Alto and am a
45 member of All Saints Church. I work with the housing team of the League of Women Voters. I
46 am not speaking for the League for sure but I strongly agree with everything that Doris Petersen

1 said about the project. I am strongly in favor of the project, every detail of it really and I don't
2 have anything original to say except that this stuff does bear repeating and that there are quite a
3 lot of us in strong favor and just to remind you that we are here, that there are so many of us.
4 The thing that really drew me out of my comfortable chair in my house to come in is the 56 units
5 of low income and very low income housing for seniors. I really agree with Lydia Tan's
6 comment earlier that we really must put in those actual physical units and not money for
7 speculative units in the future. Actually putting that in is a very important thing. I love the
8 recreation facilities. I will probably want to use them and our kids really need them. I love the
9 more meeting space and the cultural facilities. I love the fees for the parks and schools. I love
10 the extremely generous contribution for our Charleston Corridor transportation plan because that
11 needed funding to achieve its goals and the \$500,000 worth of help for the low interest
12 mortgages.

13
14 It seems to me that the traffic and parking and noise complaints I just feel they are not of a
15 monumental scale and they can be resolved by negotiation and trust. Any small nuisance residue
16 beyond that will be acceptable as the price of converting a kind of a dead site into a really vibrant
17 community space. It is an outstanding project. It is really an abundant project and I am willing
18 to bet that a very strong majority of residents support it as much as I do. Thank you.

19
20 Commissioner Cassel: Thank you. Sandra Grimsrud to be followed by Paul Grimsrud.

21
22 Ms. Sandra Grimsrud, Palo Alto: Hi, I would like to start out by saying that I feel that this
23 project is a plus for the neighborhood and the area. It fulfills a lot of needs. I will also say that
24 this project is the biggest undertaking of its kind in the history of the City of Palo Alto. Any
25 project this large can have a significant impact either good or bad on the community at large.
26 This impact will be felt most strongly by the surrounding neighborhoods. In order to be good
27 neighbors we must be considerate of basic needs before our ideal wants. In order to maintain the
28 tranquility and traffic safety and quality of life we must be able to address issues before they
29 become a problem.

30
31 Traffic. With no left turn from Charleston or even with the increased traffic some people may
32 turn that way, with no left turn on Charleston back onto 101 many vehicles could decide to take
33 the most convenient turnaround by turning right onto Louis and taking a right onto Bibbits and
34 Gailen and loop around back to take a left on Charleston and return to 101. This would be
35 extremely dangerous and intrusive to what is essentially an open-ended cul-de-sac where
36 children play.

37
38 As far as the amplified sound I feel that the study that was taken was an independent study first
39 of all about the sound. They deemed that it was an acceptable amount of sound for our
40 neighborhoods. I suggest that it be an independent study and that the neighborhood be let in on
41 it. I know amplified sound systems. An example is Gamble Gardens is not allowed to have any
42 amplified sound even for weddings so as not to disturb the neighborhood. Another example is
43 our twilight concerts in the park the amplified sound is not allowed after I believe eight at night
44 for the park programs of this kind. They are only by permit. Even the sound of a leaf blower is
45 not welcome in Palo Alto. We only ask that our neighborhood be given the same opportunity to
46 be free of unwanted amplified sound and these small studies that have been done for our – first

1 of all these postcards that we sent you with our concerns for the neighborhood I feel independent
2 studies were done as to diffuse the things that we had to say. I don't appreciate that.

3
4 Construction noise and pollution and the hours. We understand that construction is expected to
5 last at least two years and with what was said tonight it sounds like six years from the beginning
6 the final phase will be finished. So that is six years of listening to construction and demolition
7 and we would ask as a good neighbor that you put reasonable time limits on the times that these
8 noises will be listened to by us.

9
10 As far as the amplified sound 10:00 to 10:30 at night is just ridiculous when you look at the rest
11 of Palo Alto.

12
13 The building design, I think most people have already talked about the tower being an
14 unnecessary aspect. Again, as a good neighbor why would you do this if you want the
15 neighborhood to welcome you?

16
17 I know this project is your jewel and I can appreciate that but don't be blinded by your
18 enthusiasm. I challenge you to be a good neighbor. Thank you.

19
20 Commissioner Cassel: Thank you. The next person to speak is Paul Grimsrud. If anyone else
21 would like to speak would you complete a card now? I would like to call an end to cards coming
22 in. It will be nine o'clock in five minutes. Paul.

23
24 Mr. Paul Grimsrud, Palo Alto: Sandy and I have lived in our house for about 33 years. We are
25 probably within about 100 yards of the project and that is why we are quite concerned about the
26 possible impacts of the large development.

27
28 I agree with my wife and with others that have presented the project it can be a very good asset
29 for the neighborhood and for Palo Alto but there are some concerns that have been voiced and I
30 would like to add a little bit to that. I work in the power plant industry and my clients build and
31 operate power plants. The tower as I look at it reminds me of the stacks that two of my clients,
32 Morrow Bay and Carlsbad, California, the power plants there. Those stacks have really defaced
33 those communities. This is a much smaller scale to that but I don't think that this 96-foot tower
34 is also going to be visible from our second story bedroom. It may be a divine inspiration for
35 some but I don't think it would be to me.

36
37 The traffic I think my wife didn't hear that the left turn on Charleston now looks like it would be
38 allowed. That is going to be a very difficult thing to get onto Charleston on a left turn. If that
39 becomes difficult it may turn out to be a right turn. We already get a lot of U-turns around the
40 Bibbits Drive and Louis area and I suspect that that will continue to increase with this project. If
41 there were commercial vehicles that are doing that it would be very detrimental.

42
43 I don't know if there is anything on asbestos in the buildings that exist but I presume that if
44 asbestos is in the existing building that the demolition process will mitigate any fibers coming
45 into our neighborhood.

1 Parking is already an issue in our neighborhood from the people that live on Charleston when
2 they have parties there is a lot of parking in our neighborhood. This could be a problem from
3 this project, I don't know, but I hope that you take that into account in your plans.
4

5 I won't talk any more about the sound. We do get sound from Shoreline occasionally, which is
6 several miles away. I would think the sound from 100 yards away could be more significant if
7 there is much amplification. So certainly a decibel rating or decibel limit on the sound should be
8 applied for this project. Thank you.
9

10 Commissioner Cassel: Thank you. Jone Manoogian to be followed by Ann McColloch.

11
12 Audience Member: Jone Manoogian has left.
13

14 Commissioner Cassel: Thank you. Then Ann McColloch to be followed by Smita Joshi.
15

16 Ms. Ann McColloch, Palo Alto: Thank you. Everything that I would have brought up has been
17 brought up. I just want to second the motion or not the motion but please, someone, look at the
18 flooding concerns. They are real. The information that was given by Bob Evans is not
19 fabricated. I live directly across the street from him right behind Fabian Way. Thank you.
20

21 Commissioner Cassel: Thank you. We will make note of that. Smita Joshi to be followed by
22 Jean Wilcox.
23

24 Ms. Smita Joshi, Palo Alto: Commissioners, I am the President of the Palo Verde Residents
25 Association.
26

27 Commissioner Cassel: Pardon me. Can you give us your name? Thank you.
28

29 Ms. Joshi: Sure, I am Smita Joshi. I am the President of the Palo Verde Residents Association.
30 We had the opportunity of meeting with the developers of this project a couple of times. Once
31 many Board Members met with them and then they came over and gave a presentation at a
32 neighborhood-wide meeting and we appreciate that.
33

34 This is going to be a very exciting project for us. We are very close to this project. The cultural
35 and social opportunities that this project provides us we welcome very heartily and gratefully. I
36 do believe that the architectural element of this project will bring a lot of excitement to our part
37 of town, which lacks much.
38

39 I wish I could just stop right there but I can't. We do have three main areas of concern from this
40 project because we are so close to it. One of them is parking, the second is traffic and the third is
41 noise. When we met with the developer we were told that at least for event parking there would
42 be offsite campuses either purchased or at least for long term, five to ten years, and there will be
43 shuttle services provided to and from the campus from those offsite services. At least the FEIR
44 does not include any such agreements to date and when we inquired of the Staff and the
45 developer they have not been made. Time and again reference has been made in various
46 documents and at various meetings to parking possibilities at Kehillah Jewish High School that is

1 across the street but when one of our Board Members, Pam Raden, contacted the admissions
2 officer at the school she was told that they plan to rent out their facilities to renters at night and
3 on weekends, at least a couple of nights a week and on weekends, so on those days the parking
4 spaces will not be available. Also, currently Kehillah High School is about 90 students. In a
5 couple of years they are hoping to go up to 250 so the daytime parking will get significant even
6 before the building TKCJL is built. Some other projections that were made for daytime parking
7 we found a little disturbing the number of parking spaces that are being allotted to senior housing
8 within the TKCJL is rather low especially because they are high end units and many of them are
9 two and three bedroom units. There are not even as many parking spaces as the number of
10 housing units and many of them as I said are more than one bedroom and you expect at least a
11 couple to live in them. There are going to be a large number of employees, large number of
12 contractors, large number of nurses, physical therapists of various kinds and there are so many
13 different uses of these buildings go on that there is going to be a lot of parking crunch even
14 during daytime. We are afraid that without an ongoing offsite parking space that overflow is
15 going to fall into our neighborhood and all the other surrounding neighborhoods. So as far as
16 traffic concern, I am sorry I still have to speak about the event parking. We really would like a
17 long-term lease agreement to be part of the conditions of approval of this project. We don't want
18 offsite parking to be done an event-by-event basis. We would really like to support this project
19 as an enthusiastic neighbor being assured that all of our worries are taken care of and then we
20 will be able to support this project wholeheartedly. That really is our wish that long-term leases
21 be done once and for all for all event parking is our request.

22
23 So as a topic of concern our neighborhood is very close to this project and we have two of the
24 main feeder streets to this project East Meadow Drive and Louis. Both of these are school
25 corridors as is Loma Verde Street. Our entire neighborhood was not studied by their traffic
26 study except for the one little intersection between Middlefield and East Meadow. Especially
27 with the narrowing of the Charleston corridor we are concerned that there will be extra traffic on
28 East Meadow Drive. Some of the projections that have been mentioned in the FEIR are that no
29 more than ten extra cars will be expected run our streets because of this project. Thank you.

30
31 Commissioner Cassel: Thank you. Jean Wilcox to be followed by Penny Ellson.

32
33 Ms. Jean Wilcox, Palo Alto: Good evening Members of the Planning and Transportation
34 Commission. I would like to welcome both Taube-Koret Campus for Jewish Life and BUILD
35 development to my neighborhood. They will be a great addition to South Palo Alto. There are,
36 however, some problems with the projects, which will impact my neighborhood Charleston
37 Gardens. Charleston Gardens is located directly across the street, directly across Charleston, and
38 we are not a deteriorating neighborhood.

39
40 During an earlier session Council advised the Campus for Jewish Life that they could exceed
41 Palo Alto's 50-foot height limit by about four feet because of groundwater problems. Now they
42 want to go up above the height limit by ten feet so they can build to 60 feet or more. Ten feet is
43 one whole floor, why can't they take one floor off and comply with Palo Alto's 50-foot height
44 limit? In fact, they have doubled their floor area ratio since they presented their plans initially.
45 A 96-foot tower and a 75-foot variance for an equipment building are unacceptable. These tall
46 structures will be directly in our line of sight.

1
2 Every story they go up generates more traffic on our nearby residential streets. Over 800 vehicle
3 trips per day are expected to go to and from the site. Many of these vehicles will use Montrose
4 and Sutherland to avoid traffic signals on San Antonio at Leghorn and San Antonio at Charleston
5 and the lights at Middlefield and Charleston. The Final EIR did not analyze the increased traffic
6 on the residential streets of Montrose and Sutherland, which are very close nearby. This needs to
7 be done.

8
9 Parking is another huge problem .07 spaces per unit is not enough. Parking will need to be found
10 not only for residents, but for some of the 280 employees and the many daily visitors to the
11 Campus for Jewish Life. Evening events at the cultural hall will be a particular problem. The
12 theater will hold over 300 people and the suggested shared parking with residents who leave for
13 work in the morning will not be available. Additional land needs to be purchased for parking.
14 Vans or mini buses must be provided to bring event patrons to the cultural hall.

15
16 Also, the Campus for Jewish Life should be required to get an event-by-event permit approval
17 from the City for all special events. Outside music in the courtyard has been proposed. I would
18 like to ask you to ban amplified music outside and to set a time limit of 8:00 or 9:00 PM not
19 10:00 PM for all musical events.

20
21 Groundwater contamination is another problem. In the event of an accidental hazardous release
22 either during construction or afterwards plans should be put in place to warn neighbors to shelter
23 in place.

24
25 If these concerns can be addressed and satisfactorily dealt with we welcome both projects to our
26 neighborhood. Thank you very much.

27
28 Commissioner Cassel: Thank you. Penny Ellson to be followed by Susan Fineberg.

29
30 Ms. Penny Ellson, Palo Alto: I live in Palo Alto and I am the Chair of the Civic Affairs
31 Committee for Green Meadow Community Association. The Taube-Koret Campus for Jewish
32 Life and BUILD outreach to our community continues to be appreciated by Green Meadow
33 residents. Both applicants very early in the process invited us to share our concerns about their
34 projects and to collaborate to find solutions to many of the problems this project might have
35 created in the community. They were early supporters of the Charleston/Arastradero plan and
36 participated in its development. We want to thank Staff for their leadership in helping that
37 happen and the developers for their outreach.

38
39 At Green Meadow's quarterly meeting in April with 58 residents present the Campus for Jewish
40 Life presented their architectural plans. Overall the response to the design was very positive.
41 Well, there had been some concerns about that very long wall on San Antonio we have referred
42 to in the DEIR comments. CJL assured the community that it would be well screened with
43 landscaping and that the San Antonio approach to Palo Alto would be inviting and attractive.
44 Green Meadow is still in the process of reviewing the FEIR. It is summer and I am moving
45 slow. Our comments will be presented to the PTC in writing before the July 26 extended hearing
46 date.

1
2 Now I am going to take off my Green Meadow hat and be traffic lady. I want to comment I was
3 very glad to see the inclusion of a TDM program. I had one question though, I was wondering
4 why if the regional report, the rides report, reports the alternative mode rate at 26 percent was the
5 alternative mode used for the project set at 15 percent? How about a compromise of 20 percent,
6 maybe? It is food for thought. The shared shuttle for BUILD residents is a great way to build on
7 the natural synergies for this site as well as the discounted CJL memberships for the BUILD
8 residents. It is a great idea, yahoo you!

9
10 Let's see I had one question that – two questions actually. One was Green Meadow had
11 commented that it wasn't clear to them from the drawings what accommodations would be in
12 place to help bicyclists merge safely with vehicular traffic to get to the bike racks in the garage
13 and the FEIR response said that this question would go to ARB, etc., etc. It seems like a more
14 perfect question for you guys so I am asking you tonight. I just want to sort of bring that up
15 again and have you consider it and maybe talk about it a little.

16
17 I would like to clarify, a request was made to include the Charleston/Arastradero plan pedestrian
18 and bicycle safety improvements as mitigations for the project and the response says they will be
19 included in the text of the EIR. I still wonder if they can include it as a mitigation. That was not
20 clear so I would sort of like that question answered as we are reviewing the FEIR.

21
22 Finally, a comment that I hope will get forwarded to Council, which is this. I spent last night at
23 the 100 Mayfield meeting. A comment that I made was between these two projects we are
24 getting nearly 1,000 new units of housing on San Antonio Road to say nothing of new Jewish
25 day school and all the other development coming along. Both of these projects are according to
26 CEQA going to generate zero or maybe 15 additional peak hour trips. I talked about the Louis
27 Carroll world of EIR analysis in my DEIR response but when it comes right down to it this is
28 just not what we are going to live with and somehow the City needs to look at this. If it is not
29 going to be done in the EIR we have to take a look at arterial functionality. It is going to be very
30 important for the future success of the Charleston/Arastradero plan and for the future success of
31 our community in South Palo Alto. Thank you very much and thank you again to our new
32 neighbors.

33
34 Commissioner Cassel: Thank you. Susan Fineberg to be followed by Sally Probst.

35
36 Ms. Susan Fineberg, Palo Alto: Commissioners, good evening. When you consider these two
37 projects I would like to ask you to decide if the Palo Alto Comprehensive Plan matters. Let me
38 explain why I am asking that question.

39
40 The Environmental Impact Report for the Comprehensive Plan adopted in 1998 considered the
41 environmental impacts of 2,454 additional residential units within the sphere of influence. The
42 residential units on Stanford were included there was an allocation for 280 graduate student beds.
43 The EIR found that with this number of additional residential units there would be significant
44 and unavoidable impacts on transportation, circulation and parking as well as on other public
45 services such as schools. However, in the Statement of Overriding Considerations when Council
46 approved the Comprehensive Plan they approved this level of development because the public

1 benefits would outweigh these significant negative impacts. To date there are more residential
2 units built than were analyzed even in the high development alternative analyzed in the
3 Comprehensive Plan EIR. Start with the 1,196 units that City Staff cites then add the 1,033 units
4 built on Stanford Campus, add the single family homes built on empty lots that Staff does count
5 and the 96 approved for Classic Communities not counting another 600 units that are projected
6 before 2010. When the Comprehensive Plan was adopted the City rejected the high development
7 alternative as environmentally inferior, therefore, although a project may have impacts that are
8 individually limited it will based on the higher development alternative discussed in the EIR for
9 the Comprehensive Plan have cumulatively considerable and potentially significant
10 environmental impacts. These impacts include all the things people have talked about tonight
11 increased traffic, noise, decreased air quality, overcrowding of our public facilities like schools,
12 parks and libraries. There is a fair argument that because the number of residential units added
13 through any additional development is higher than the development caps that were considered in
14 the Comprehensive Plan's EIR that there will be significant negative impacts of these past,
15 present and reasonably foreseeable future projects.

16
17 The EIR for these two projects does consider the cumulative impacts it is on page 23 but it finds
18 either no impact or less than significant impacts for everything but a few key intersections.
19 These conclusions that there are simply no impacts stand in stark contrast to those of the
20 Comprehensive Plan adopted by the City of Palo Alto in 1998. One of these two documents,
21 either the Comprehensive Plan or the Environmental Impact Reports for these projects, must be
22 wrong. Do we get to decide that the Comprehensive Plan and the underlying environmental
23 analysis is wrong? Can we ignore the analysis from the Comprehensive Plan EIR and build
24 4,000 units when the Comprehensive Plan approved a project with 2,454 units? This is why I
25 ask you if the Comprehensive Plan matters. Thank you.

26
27 Commissioner Cassel: Thank you. Sally Probst to be followed by Irene Sampson.

28
29 Ms. Sally Probst, Palo Alto: Good evening. For ten years my husband and I had a company
30 office in the commercial land just across San Antonio from this area. So I have observed it day
31 after day and I think these projects are a tremendous improvement. Also I had my antique
32 furniture refinished in a little shop that was in some of the land that CJL has already bought. I
33 think it is a great improvement not only to the area but to the City. These projects have required
34 collaboration between four entities CJL, BUILD, Bridge and the City. I compliment all of them
35 for working together collaboratively. I think that there are many, many, dozens really of policies
36 in the Comprehensive Plan will be fulfilled by these developments. I am particularly happy that
37 there will be a diversity of housing types available for the City and I like that second mortgage
38 plan. It will not only add to these projects but also be available for people who meet the criteria
39 for other areas of the City. So I hope that you will consider this positively and thank you.

40
41 Commissioner Cassel: Thank you. Irene Sampson to be followed by Bill Chapman.

42
43 Ms. Irene Sampson, Palo Alto: I live about three blocks away from where this project will be. I
44 have lived there for 49 years so I probably have a record. I have been following the proposals
45 for both the BUILD housing and the Campus for Jewish Life for some time now and I have
46 watched the many changes that have been made to meet neighborhood concerns and desires. I

1 am pleased with what they are offering for our corner of town -- needed housing and a range of
2 affordability and services that can enrich the entire community. I am aware that many of my
3 neighbors have concerns about what they feel are changes too big for the area to absorb but I
4 personally believe that the benefits far outweigh the negatives. I look forward to seeing these
5 attractive facilities replacing the rather dismal properties that are currently there and the sooner
6 the better. Thank you.

7
8 Commissioner Cassel: Thank you. Bill Chapman to be followed by Janet Owens.

9
10 Mr. Bill Chapman, Palo Alto: Hello folks. I think we have heard many compliments for this
11 project tonight and many, many well-reasoned concerns. I want to tabulate some of them very
12 quickly. One, traffic. Two, parking. Three, noise in the evening. Four, height. Five, setbacks.
13 Six, schools. Seven, sufficient land. The flooding problem. The precedent setting problem.
14 And one that hasn't been mentioned which I would like you to consider is that here we are
15 shortly after Katrina with a lot of publicity about global warming and the rising sea level and we
16 are constructing this development right at the edge of the Bay. If we go 30 years, 40 years into
17 the future will they be suing us because Palo Alto failed to either get an agreement they would
18 never sue us or that we failed to warn them that they were doing something very dangerous with
19 their \$250 million development at this time in history. Is this a logical place to put so massive a
20 structure?

21
22 Now, Mrs. Wasserman said, this is precedent setting and damn good, or something like that.
23 Well, it could have been precedent setting and much better if it had been more modest. This is
24 not a modest development. This is so immodest a development that they come here and build it
25 right out to the edge with hardly any setback. They want to build a 95-foot immodest tower and
26 they want Palo Alto to give them the right to build immodestly high. If this is as Wasserman
27 says, precedent setting, what will the next developments around East Meadow do? Why would it
28 not be logical for them to say to you folks we want 65 feet? What is an extra five feet? They got
29 60. Nine days ago I was at a meeting where Classic Communities was already saying we want
30 something extra because compared to Trumark, which was approved only half a year ago we are
31 better in some regards. They are already comparing each other's special specifications and gifts
32 from the City. So I think there are tremendously intelligent people from Palo Alto who have
33 spoken wisely about the beauties of this but the need for more modesty. Lower it. Take off the
34 top ceiling. Tell them to get more land. Tell them to do away with things. Tell them to get rid
35 of the nighttime amplifiers. That is awful. Why don't we do this? In recognition of the size, the
36 mass, of this project and the political significance of it and the religious significance of it why
37 don't we accord it the extra respect it would get if your Commission held special meetings
38 primarily for the citizens who are concerned, something you wouldn't do for little projects like
39 Trumark. Does not this big project warrant special attention to community concerns, which are
40 massive in this case? Thank you very much.

41
42 Commissioner Cassel: Thank you. Janet Owens to be followed by Robert Moss.

43
44 Ms. Janet Owens, Palo Alto: I live in the Downtown area. I have been in Palo Alto since 1963
45 and most of that time I have been actively involved in the development of housing especially for
46 low income people not only in Palo Alto but throughout the Bay Area.

1
2 We continue to need more housing than we have built. It is a critical need and it puts burdens on
3 people to solve those problems individually. So I am delighted to see this project going forward.
4 I have not always been in favor of it but they have assured now that the low-income housing will
5 remain low income in the future and in the future we are going to need it now as much as we
6 needed it in the future when I first started worrying about this sort of thing. The need has grown
7 faster than any response to it.

8
9 As always individual variations cause concern, and worry, and reaction. As a resident myself I
10 have felt this sometimes. I have found that in the Palo Alto area these things are usually worked
11 out in actuality much better than in discussions before public bodies. I wish this project the best
12 of luck as it goes forward for everyone those who live in it, those who enjoy the facilities and
13 those from the inside and those who enjoy them from the outside. Thank you.

14
15 Commissioner Cassel: Thank you. Robert Moss to be followed by Ellen Fletcher.

16
17 Mr. Robert Moss, Palo Alto: Thank you. I live in Barron Park. I will begin by complimenting
18 Rob Steinberg on the design and the architecture as we have gone through this process for the
19 last several years every iteration has been even better and he has done a good job. However, I do
20 have a few issues with both the Bridge project and the Campus for Jewish Life. Let me go
21 through them. I think these are things you haven't heard before tonight.

22
23 First you have heard a lot about housing and how the building over 3,500 units already exceeded
24 our bogie for ten years by 50 percent in only six years. You have heard arguments on both sides
25 on traffic impacts and so on but there is an impact that hasn't been mentioned and that is money.
26 Because of Prop 13 and Prop 218 and other things that have been imposed on local governments
27 housing costs money. Every housing unit requires services from the City approximately \$1,000
28 to \$1,200 a year more than is recovered in taxes. So the housing units, which have been
29 improved already, are going to have a net cost to the City of over \$3.0 million a year. Bear that
30 in mind.

31
32 One of the things you have heard about especially is event parking. In Appendix A, mitigation
33 measure B-5.1 says, special event parking for special events on weekday evenings or events.
34 There is nothing to limit the impacts from special events to weekday evenings. Strike 'weekday
35 evenings' any special event any time, weekday mornings, weekends that is going to have a
36 parking impact. When the JCC was at Terman under the Terman Specific Plan there was a limit
37 to the number of special events that could be held every year. I think as a first cut we should
38 have a limit to the number of special events. I am not prepared to say what a fair number is six,
39 eight, ten, but we should put a number in and anything beyond that requires a special permit.

40
41 Also, in that same mitigation it says if parking is provided on a nearby site attendees can reach
42 the Campus for Jewish Life on foot. However, who determines what is nearby? I can see a
43 couple of years from now the Campus for Jewish Life saying somebody could park over on East
44 Bayshore and that is within walking distance so we won't have to provide transportation. So I
45 would like to have a figure put in for what is nearby. Put a number down 200 yards, 500 yards
46 so there is no argument in the future and we don't play games.

1
2 One of the things about the Bridge housing proposal that concerns me greatly, there are actually
3 two things, one of them is that all of the BMR units are for seniors. One of the reasons that we
4 have had BMR requirements initially is to have people who worked here be able to live here.
5 Earlier you had a teacher talk about how teachers can't afford to live here. Some of the BMR
6 units should be in those townhouses. At least ten percent of those townhouses should be BMR.
7 If that means that some of the senior housing is market rate so be it. Secondly, the density of the
8 senior housing is projected at over 110 units an acre, which is grossly excessive. That is more
9 than three times the normal development density and far higher density than any other
10 development in Palo Alto in the last 40 years. Now there are a couple of ways you can reduce
11 that. One of them is to reduce the gross number of units and the other is to increase the area
12 instead of a half acre make it perhaps three-quarters or one acre.

13
14 I am also very concerned about having the money, the \$5.0 million or \$7.0 million, to build that
15 in escrow basically for six years. At the rate housing costs are increasing if they don't build that
16 in six years you are not going to get the full number of units with that amount of money. So
17 shorten the time period or have an escalation clause so that you take into account the reduction in
18 value, currently it is between eight and ten percent a year for construction.

19
20 In the case of the Campus for Jewish Life I would like to see on Appendix D there is a section
21 50, which talks about giving the amount impervious area and then making some adjustments.
22 Reduce the amount of impervious area by requiring wherever possible that that be permeable and
23 the water will drain. Finally, get rid of that 95-foot tower. We don't need it.

24
25 Commissioner Cassel: Thank you. The next person to speak is Ellen Fletcher to be followed by
26 Pat Saffir.

27
28 Ms. Ellen Fletcher, Palo Alto: I live on San Antonio Road just two blocks from this project and I
29 must say that I am really excited and looking forward to completion of this project because it is
30 going to be such a big asset to all of us in Palo Alto especially those of who can just walk over. I
31 wanted to mention that on our block where we are so close we are not organized into any
32 neighborhood organization but neighbors that I have spoken to are all very, very positive about
33 this project. I haven't heard any complaints about it. One final comment that people are talking
34 about all the impacts including traffic increase. Of course there is going to be traffic increase.
35 There is going to be traffic increase if you don't change the zoning. If the zoning is fully built
36 out as commercial you are going to have impacts too. So no matter what you build there you are
37 going to have traffic impacts. Thank you.

38
39 Commissioner Cassel: Thank you. Pat Saffir to be followed by John Fredrich.

40
41 Ms. Patricia Saffir, Palo Alto: I live on Bryant Street in South Palo Alto. I am just here to urge
42 the Planning Commission to recommend approval of the Planned Community development
43 zones requested by both Bridge and the Campus for Jewish Life. Both BUILD and the Jewish
44 Community group have listened carefully to the commentaries and concerns, to the communities
45 concerned and their projects have been altered considerably to make them fit in better.

46

1 Low and very low income housing for seniors is a continuing real need in Palo Alto. Both these
2 projects speak generously to helping fill that need. The family townhouse units will also help fill
3 our previously approved housing commitments.
4

5 I am not going to make a speech tonight I am just going to say that I believe that the facts that
6 were presented by the Planning Staff in their reports more than justify the approval of these
7 projects. I urge you to do so. A further comment, not everybody in Palo Alto is afraid of a little
8 immodesty.
9

10 Commissioner Cassel: Thank you. John Fredrich to be followed by Scott Petersen.
11

12 Mr. John Fredrich, Palo Alto: I live in Barron Park and I am an employee of the school district
13 and a long time resident. In fact I have lived on the south side of town now most of the last 20
14 years. I wanted to add my perspective as somebody that lived in the Terman apartments across
15 from the JCC for eight years starting in 1985 and used the facilities and was a member of that
16 community. So I wanted to both commend the people that have brought this proposal forward
17 and you Commissioners and people in the community that have worked so hard to bring it along
18 these many years. It is an asset and a set of amenities that are much in need since we lost the
19 JCC at the Terman site. When it was there many of the concerns about noise, traffic and other
20 things were dealt with in creative and imaginative ways. As problems came up restrictions were
21 developed and there is the statutory and procedural methods for dealing with a project even of a
22 greater scope as this one is. So I wanted to make that clear that it wasn't always smooth sailing
23 but the community development group and the many things that were talked about as the JCC
24 operated at Terman worked out very positively. When it went away many of us went to the Y
25 and unfortunately at the same time the Elks wellness center was taken out of commission. So
26 there are many people in the community that look forward to the physical culture possibilities
27 that this new site will deliver in addition to many of the housing components that other people
28 have talked to. I guess in the end though I wanted to encourage us to focus on imagination on
29 the long term and think about of course many of the traffic and environmental problems may be
30 solved by the catastrophic success of our current environmental and foreign policy as we work at
31 a national level. I think it is wiser to think of how forward looking people throughout Palo
32 Alto's history going back to the Stanford's and the Hewlett's and the Packard's and the Schultz's
33 that got the Terman center there going envision where we could go in the future and deal with
34 these many community needs. In that regard see this set of possibilities as something that can be
35 worked with and be a real augmentation to the quality of life. Yes, it does seem to many people
36 a very urban type of development and it is but it is a very well conceived development that is
37 going to fulfill many community uses. So I encourage you to move it forward at this time.
38 Thank you.
39

40 Commissioner Cassel: Thank you. Scott Petersen to be followed by Pete Squire and that will be
41 our last speaker.
42

43 Mr. Scott Petersen, Palo Alto: Good evening. I live at the intersection of Fabian and Charleston
44 diagonally across from the proposed site. I believe that the proposed building is going to be a
45 great asset to the community. I think it is going to greatly improve our area and the architectural
46 diagrams and drawings I think really exemplify the thought and interest and use of the site and

1 has been very well done. I am concerned on two different levels. One is an operational level
2 and the other is at a constructional level. I will start with the constructional level.

3
4 My understanding is that given the shear magnitude of this project and the costs of the project
5 that it is going to be done in multiple phases potentially spanning ten or more years. I am very
6 concerned that we are going to be dealing with the ongoing noise, dust, heavy traffic, vibrations,
7 etc. associated with building a project of this size for potentially up to a decade thus lowering the
8 value of our properties and lowering our quality of life. I hope that anything that can be done to
9 increase the speed of the project is taken to minimize that effect as well as the hours of
10 construction.

11
12 The other area that I have a concern on duplicates many of the things that were said earlier. This
13 is at an operational level. The items of traffic, the items of parking, the items of noise and in
14 particular any amplified noise are of real concern to us. I would hate to see these operational
15 items that I believe can be easily addressed get in the way of this project. Thank you.

16
17 Commissioner Cassel: Thank you. Peter Squire. That is our last speaker tonight.

18
19 Mr. Pete Squire, Palo Alto: I think this project is going to be good. That land is very valuable
20 and it is good we can get something like this there but I have a few concerns of course. The
21 amplified sound is one. I wonder if it is possible to aim the sound toward the highway. I notice
22 in the architectural there are big plates that funnel sound and things in various areas. Can we
23 take that and funnel the noise toward the highway? I don't think anybody on the highway is
24 going to care about the noise but us in the neighborhood do.

25
26 We live near Cubberly and they get loud noise at Cubberly all the time and Mitchell Park and
27 Shoreline and here is another one that is just going to be adding to it. I would like to see some
28 real enforcement too. They always start out good and underestimate it. I know Foothill College
29 when they moved to Cubberly they said everybody would park right there at Cubberly. Well,
30 they are on all the side streets everywhere and there seems to be no way to control it. So they
31 grossly underestimated Foothill and it looks like the same thing here. So I would like to have
32 some kind of way to curtail the events or something if they can't contain the parking.

33
34 Then the cut-through traffic – same thing. If they underestimate the cut-through traffic what is
35 the enforcement? Will they cut down the size of the events or the number of events going on at
36 one time? I think it is still there, there is going to be no entrance from San Antonio coming from
37 the highway. I think if that can be opened up there can be a lot of traffic there. I know there are
38 some concerns but that would be a great way if you could have 1,000 or so more cars going in
39 and out of there that still should be used if possible. Thank you.

40
41 Commissioner Cassel: Thank you. I am going to raise my hand and call a five-minute break.
42 We will come back and the next step will be for the developer to get five minutes. Why don't
43 we do that first? Does the developer want to make comments for five minutes or a summary
44 statement?

1 Ms. Sandy Sloan, Taube-Koret Campus for Jewish Life: I would like to point out a big picture
2 perspective of some of the things that have been mentioned. First with regard to traffic there is
3 no doubt that a community center will generate traffic but the traffic during peak period hours
4 actually decreases with this project compared to the situation if the Sun building was reoccupied
5 or as Ellen Fletcher said if another commercial use like Sun moved into this area. At page 235 of
6 the Final EIR the traffic study points out that there might be 15 more trips in the AM Peak Period
7 but 76 fewer trips in the PM Peak. In other words, if you look just at the peak hours there are 61
8 fewer trips than if the Sun building was reoccupied.

9
10 With regard to parking CJL is providing 610 parking spaces. This is actually 23 more spaces
11 than is required by the City's Zoning Ordinance for the community center including the
12 preschool. Even though the JCC is 50 percent larger in square footage than the Terman JCC the
13 parking provided is 250 percent what was provided at Terman.

14
15 The last thing an applicant or the City wants to do is to have excessive parking on a site because
16 that entices people to drive alone and is absolutely counter then to any TDM program. Our
17 parking analysis as the Staff pointed out is ample for weekend nights when a special event is
18 taking place because at that time there will be no preschool and very few people use the fitness
19 center on a weekend night. The traffic report has asked that for special events on the weekday
20 nights that there be offsite parking available and CJL will obtain that offsite parking well in
21 advance and will notify the City of where it is as required by the conditions of approval.

22
23 With regard to noise as Steven Turner pointed out there was a noise study conducted by Charles
24 Salter and he points out two things in the study about amplification. The first one is the obvious.
25 If there ever was a self-policing neighborhood for amplification or any noise this is it. The
26 seniors will be living right above the JCC spaces and right above the courtyards. Second, when
27 he did the noise study he determined that amplified noise would comply with the Palo Alto Noise
28 Ordinance as long as the amplification ceased at 10:30 PM. The Staff is recommending that any
29 amplification cease at ten o'clock but the CJL is requesting that on Saturday nights you consider
30 allowing it to go to 10:30 PM.

31
32 Finally, our architect, Rob Steinberg, would like to say a few words about the tower. He does
33 have a few slides to show you.

34
35 Mr. Steinberg: Because the tower has been talked about I just wanted to address that very
36 briefly. If you look at first the model you can see that the solid component of the tower is ever
37 so slightly taller than the rest of the buildings. Beyond that what is being recommended by the
38 ARB is an open see-through element on top of that. What we have done is taken a few
39 photographs and superimposed the new buildings on that. This is a view across Fabian from the
40 office buildings. In fact these may be the office buildings that the gentleman spoke of earlier. In
41 fact, from that view or from the residents that would be on the west side you cannot see the tower
42 from this view. If you go over to the corner of Fabian and Charleston again you cannot see the
43 tower at all from offsite where any of the residential is. If you look from the corner of San
44 Antonio and Charleston the solid part of the tower ends right there just slightly above the
45 residential part. This very faint element is the part that would be the open see-through part of the

1 tower. The visual impact from offsite is very, very minimal. I just wanted to share those few
2 images with you. Thank you.

3
4 Commissioner Cassel: Thank you very much. We appreciate that. Okay, I am going to call a
5 five-minute break as Don said we can't have one of us walk out. We will be back with any
6 comments that Staff wants to make at this time and then we will be making some comments.
7 Thank you.

8
9 Let's call this meeting back to order. I want to thank everyone. I hope those of you who wanted
10 to see the model and the tower had a chance to do that. It will be here I think a little bit after the
11 close of our meeting. Staff, did you want to make any comments at this time? What we are
12 going to do is raise questions that we have that we think are significant or important that will
13 then be answered at the next meeting. We have about a half an hour. I don't think it does us
14 much good too much beyond 10:30 because there just isn't enough time to get into anything
15 really substantive at this time. So do you want to make any comments before we start?

16
17 Mr. C. Williams: Just a few. There were a couple of comments that I would like to respond to
18 and then I would like to ask Dennis Struecker, the traffic consultant, to come up and respond to a
19 couple of issues as well.

20
21 First of all as far as the flooding and the storm water runoff goes the EIR did review that and
22 determine that the impervious surface for the proposed project would be slightly more than the
23 existing. As you know the site is almost all paved already. It will be slightly more than that.
24 There is a mitigation measure and condition that the applicants provide onsite detention that
25 would reduce the level of runoff to less than the predevelopment runoff levels. So in other words
26 there will be less runoff from this site than there is now under the existing conditions. That is a
27 condition of approval that they must provide the design for that before getting building permits.

28
29 Commissioner Cassel: Does that water go into the creek or does it go into the storm water
30 system?

31
32 Mr. C. Williams: It goes to the drainage ditch along San Antonio Road I believe.

33
34 Commissioner Cassel: You can get that information later to clear that up.

35
36 Mr. C. Williams: Yes, we can get the specifics of that.

37
38 Secondly, there was a comment about asbestos and the demolition of the existing building.
39 There is a process for demolition that you must get a permit from the Air Quality Management
40 District for properly addressing that before the demolition permit can be issued. So that will be
41 required.

42
43 There were a few comments about the construction period, truck routing, hours of operation and
44 that kind of thing. We have a logistics plan that is required to be developed and is presented to
45 the plan review committee for their review so that the Staff all looks at those very issues as to not
46 only what are the routes that trucks and employees are taking but also where are you parking,

1 where are you storing materials, etc., etc. so they won't impact neighboring properties.
2 Construction hours are limited by the Municipal Code and that would be strictly adhered to.

3
4 Then the couple of traffic issues that I would like to ask Dennis Struecker to talk about the cut-
5 through traffic potential and the parking spaces per unit that were used for the senior residences.

6
7 Mr. Dennis Struecker, Traffic Consultant: Good evening. I am from Korve Engineering. I
8 worked on the EIR traffic analysis and recently I am also a contract employee to the City on
9 general traffic issues.

10
11 On the cut-through traffic it has been pointed out tonight and correctly so that this is a regional
12 facility and a lot of the traffic is going to be on 101 and it is going to access the site as
13 conveniently as possible. We did some look through on the roadways that go to the north
14 towards Oregon Expressway and clearly the highest speed of any roadway there is West
15 Bayshore, which is how we assign most of the traffic that would go back to Oregon Expressway
16 to and from the north on U.S. 101. The next highest street in terms of travel speed would be
17 Middlefield which we also assigned traffic to. We didn't analyze any intersections on Louis or
18 Ross, which traffic analyses of these types generally concentrate on the signalized intersections
19 but both of those streets are much slower and people tend to optimize their travel time. There are
20 speed humps on Ross. There are several stop signs on both streets. As Sandy Sloan pointed out
21 I guess we do these Louis Carroll traffic analysis but we do look at the net new traffic. So there
22 is very little net new traffic from this project. The reason that we do look at net new traffic is
23 because the future projections assume a reuse of this site as something like the Sun project. So
24 having said that the total traffic going to the north in the peak hour is about 70 to 80 trips. So we
25 have four streets, we have West Bayshore, we have Louis, we have Ross and we have
26 Middlefield. So if you divide them all equally that is ten but my professional opinion is that yes
27 some traffic could leak onto Louis and Ross but most people would optimize their travel and use
28 Middlefield and to a greater extent particularly if they are going north on 101 to use West
29 Bayshore.

30
31 Now to Montrose and Sutherland, Montrose has possibilities. In my opinion Sutherland is not an
32 efficient route at all for any cut-through traffic in the out of direction travel that it would have.
33 The only traffic that would want to use Montrose is the traffic that comes up from San Antonio
34 from the south or Middlefield from the southeast. While I was listening to the comments I
35 looked at the left turn delay at Middlefield. So if you are coming up on San Antonio and want to
36 turn left on Middlefield it is nearly identical to the left turn delay if you want to turn left at
37 Charleston. So there is no advantage really of turning left early in terms of minimizing your
38 delay. There is greater delay though from turning left from Charleston at Fabian. So if you
39 came up Montrose you would have to turn right onto Charleston, I am looking at a map here so I
40 am maybe at a greater advantage from people that don't live in the immediate area, that you have
41 to turn right on Charleston and then left onto Fabian. That left turn delay is greater than the right
42 turn delay from continuing to Charleston and then turning right on Fabian. If I have you totally
43 confused now it is late I can understand that.

44
45 So again it is not a very efficient route. It almost depends on where the signal cycle is at San
46 Antonio what somebody may do. But here again the inbound traffic is about 40 and I would

1 expect that no more than ten of those people would find Montrose to be an attractive inbound
2 route. Then outbound route you tend not to want to do a lot of left turns and the outbound route
3 using Montrose would involve a left turn from Charleston onto Montrose and then another left
4 turn onto Middlefield as opposed to a series of right turns going onto Charleston and San
5 Antonio. So before I go onto the next one I'll stop.

6
7 The parking for the BUILD project for the senior housing we used a number that BUILD
8 provided of .7 spaces per unit. Before we used that we checked Parking Generation, which is a
9 national publication by the Institute of Transportation Engineers. Their rate for senior housing is
10 .5 per unit. There were two studies there that they had data for and both of those studies had a
11 greater supply, as a matter of fact more than one space per dwelling unit, so it wasn't constrained
12 by a lack of supply. It was constrained by seniors not owning as many vehicles as the general
13 population. When we found that there was a .5 in a national publication we felt using .7 was
14 more than conservative enough.

15
16 Commissioner Cassel: My understanding was that you have .7 because that was what BUILD
17 has found on their sites locally which was fine as far as I was concerned but what I understand is
18 on the other site, on the Jewish Community Center site, I thought you used .41 for the congregate
19 housing and .50 for the assisted living. I presume the larger number was because in assisted
20 living you are counting staff in that process because they would have fewer drivers than the
21 congregate housing would have. I wondered why you used .7 for BUILD or at least not the .5
22 because of the reason that was mentioned in the audience that it is a higher income group moving
23 in.

24
25 Mr. Struecker: We used the .7. BUILD suggested the .7 as long as it was conservative enough
26 for us.

27
28 Commissioner Cassel: But the other one I thought used .41.

29
30 Mr. Struecker: Let me grab the report.

31
32 Commissioner Cassel: That can be answered later. You can check on that for the next meeting.

33
34 Mr. C. Williams: Yes, we will bring that back to you.

35
36 Commissioner Cassel: Go ahead.

37
38 Commissioner Garber: One other question to be followed up on that is if you can address one of
39 the concerns that was raised which is the impact of employees parking in the parking facility
40 relative to the other uses of that parking lot.

41
42 Commissioner Cassel: Staff, do you have anything else that you want to add before we make
43 any comments?

44
45 Mr. C. Williams: No, thanks.

1 Commissioner Cassel: What I thought we would do if it were agreeable to all of you is we
2 would each take a few minutes and try to summarize the most significant questions we have or
3 the most significant comments. I have five or six pages here so I figure all of you would ask half
4 of those questions. But as best you can in about five minutes. What to start?

5
6 Commissioner Sandas: I will take less than five. Since Curtis answered the question I had about
7 flooding or at least addressed that question. I appreciate that. Complimentary to that question
8 someone in the audience spoke to the issue of maybe if that contaminated groundwater were to
9 percolate up to the surface or something that there might be a dangerous situation created and
10 there may be the need for an evacuation or warning the neighborhood or something. So if you
11 can address that topic when we come back that would be great.

12
13 Then one other thing, I think Penny Ellson mentioned a compromise in the Traffic Demand
14 Management from 15 to 20 percent. I can't remember exactly what the issue was I wrote
15 sketchy notes and that doesn't do any good at this hour. But if you remember it a little better or
16 we could look back in the notes and see what that was about and you could address it that would
17 be great.

18
19 Commissioner Cassel: Thank you. Lee.

20
21 Commissioner Lippert: May I ask my questions of the architect?

22
23 Commissioner Cassel: You want answers tonight?

24
25 Commissioner Lippert: I have questions for the architect. Can we do that tonight or do you
26 want me to hold that until the next hearing?

27
28 Commissioner Cassel: Go ahead and ask them so he knows what they are. We don't have time
29 to get answers to all of them is the issue but ask them and get them out there.

30
31 Commissioner Lippert: Okay. With regard to mechanical equipment on the roof we have a 65
32 foot requested height for the buildings. Would we still permit a 15-foot roof screen for
33 mechanical on this kind of a project? Is it necessary? Can the mechanical units be located far
34 enough away from the edge of the building so that they are just not visible from the public right-
35 of-way therefore eliminating the need for significant mechanical screens?

36
37 With regard to the benefit program for the Campus for Jewish Life in there it indicated the use of
38 the facilities there. It said that ten City events could happen in the auditorium space but it wasn't
39 specified over what period that was whether that was a year or the lifetime of the facility.

40
41 With regard to the tower element that is being proposed here, is it being proposed as a lighted
42 structure? What is being lit? Is it going to wind up being like the Eiffel Tower with a bunch of
43 little lights that go up it and pop and flash? That was for your benefit Curtis. Or is it just when
44 you light air you don't see anything. Those are my questions.

45
46 Commissioner Cassel: Dan.

1
2 Commissioner Garber: The other Commissioners got most of mine, however, I would be curious
3 to learn from the applicant if any market study has been done to determine or what has
4 determined the size of the cultural hall, the size of 380 seats or almost 400 seats. I am curious to
5 learn if it will ever be filled or if it will always be filled depending on the types of events that are
6 there. Obviously without a fly space and side space the types of things that will be presented in
7 there become significantly limited. So that is one question.

8
9 The other question has to do with again the use and utilization of the project as it faces
10 Charleston in terms of the use of the stair, how frequently that is used, why it is used, the entry
11 into the cultural center there, the relationship between those two elements and the entry to the
12 senior housing. I am curious as to the use, the liveliness, and the occupancy of the street by the
13 project in that particular area.

14
15 That will be it for the moment. Let me come back to one other thing.

16
17 Commissioner Cassel: I can probably take up all the time the rest of you didn't take. I had a
18 variety of questions. I think before I lose it because I didn't have this on my original list is we
19 need to define what a special event is because we keep talking about special events. What does
20 that mean and when does an event actually overflow the parking that is there? I think that would
21 help us.

22
23 I was kind of curious about why the Charleston Road/Arastradero Corridor Study didn't include
24 the section on Charleston from San Antonio to Fabian. I still have some more reading and
25 studying to do on this I didn't happen to find out how the bicycles fit into this underground
26 parking, how people get upstairs to the first level, the flow when the traffic comes through. I
27 know the parking itself is done by the ARB but I am trying to understand what happens with this
28 traffic flow in terms of people getting in. How long does it take to fill this space? I guess my
29 comment here is that when we get overflow parking part of that is that you can't get into the site
30 not only do you have to have enough spaces but you have to be able to get into it adequately.
31 We are talking about one entry point to get into a 600 space parking garage. For a special event
32 or major events can't the parking garage be opened on San Antonio Road for those making right
33 hand turns so that it could fill easily from that side? That would help to fill the section near the
34 cultural center. So I had questions that related to better understanding of the traffic flow in and
35 how it is going to be occupied rapidly and not cause backups onto the street and not cause people
36 to want to park in other places even if there are enough parking spaces underground. How do
37 they find them? How do they get upstairs? I am sure they are on that picture I just haven't
38 looked carefully enough and I am not an architect as to how people are moving up onto the
39 podium level from inside the garage. There has to be more than one elevator.

40
41 I already asked the question about the difference in the parking spaces for senior housing.
42 Someone else asked some of the other questions I have here. There is a delivery drop off area
43 for deliveries other than this big garage area and part of that circulation question and
44 understanding the circulation I would like to know more about what size vehicles can pull into
45 that area and how that works. Just an explanation, I am looking at a map but I think it would be
46 helpful if that were explained.

1
2 Mr. C. Williams: You mean on Charleston?

3
4 Commissioner Cassel: You pull off Charleston into that area.

5
6 Mr. C. Williams: Okay.

7
8 Commissioner Cassel: And then there is a little driveway to the Fabian Way side of that and
9 down there in that section goes people who are doing deliveries to the site.

10
11 Mr. C. Williams: Right.

12
13 Commissioner Cassel: I think we talked about this once before. I am still interested to look a
14 little more at this external shape. I have already talked about basically issues with first level
15 traffic circulation. I am not so concerned about what is going on on the podium that is internal
16 and I am sure that will come out really nice but rather how does this traffic level flow on the first
17 level.

18
19 Questions came up about someone doing security. I don't understand what the security is. It has
20 come up in several different ways about people getting into the facility, it being screened. I
21 guess this is part of my concern about getting 600 cars into this place. What is this security
22 person going to be doing? They said something about cards to go into buildings, cards to go into
23 the café, and I am sure I got this all mixed up with a number of other things. So I would like to
24 know a lot more about what this security is. Is this an open facility that everyone is going to be
25 welcome into and are they really going to be welcome into it or is this really a very closed
26 facility because people are very concerned about security issues? How does this feel and can
27 you walk in?

28
29 The TDM, basically I see three parts to that the seniors become TDM because they are there and
30 they reuse the stuff that is on the site, they might consider working with a bank. I have a mother
31 in a similar type of facility and the bank is open a couple hours of the day and it is a very busy
32 space. It keeps people from going offsite and it helps people who no longer need their cars. A
33 small sundry store works very well on this site. Is it going to be available as a little retail store?
34 There was a gift store there, is that what they mean by what is going in there and will it be open
35 to people other than just the seniors? The café available for staff and guests will work very well
36 for keeping people on site and helping people out who are transitioning from truly independent
37 living into more need for assisted living. Then they can stop off there.

38
39 The TDM for the employees is probably okay at the numbers they gave us because it is going to
40 be very difficult for this staff to do two people driving at the same time because although the
41 staff numbers look large people are working rotating shifts and rotating days. So there is not that
42 many staff on at any one time but they are working all kinds of funny hours. I can promise you I
43 have worked in a medical facility and the hours are funny.

44
45 However, what there isn't in the TDM program is any kind of way to deal with or encourage less
46 traffic from the people who are using the facility in the format that we are doing with the

1 YMCA. They had real limits with their parking and people were concerned in the neighborhood
2 and they are doing some perhaps model things in terms of encouraging the people who are using
3 the facility, essentially the customers, to try to walk, bike and come together with their neighbors
4 when they are driving. I think we ought to look at that because that is where most of the traffic is
5 coming from. It is not the employees who are just a couple hundred people but the users, which
6 will be large numbers.

7
8 Commissioner Lippert: With regard to the TDM program, and I believe it is the benefit that was
9 talked about, about the Campus for Jewish Life having their own shuttle. In there it talked about
10 if the shuttle were discontinued it wouldn't be available for the residents of the adjacent Bridge
11 housing project. Would it be possible if that program were discontinued that in fact an in lieu fee
12 would be paid to the Palo Alto Shuttle and they would pick up service?

13
14 Commissioner Cassel: My follow up to that is to be of use to people at Bridge it has be as
15 dependable as it is to people at the JCC site. You can't expect people to use and depend upon a
16 shuttle if they are going to wait until maybe there is an extra space. So I can't plan on going to
17 the food store on Friday because I have to wait to see if there are enough people in another
18 building that want to go there first before I can find out if I can get there. There needs to be a
19 little more quality in that if that is going to be a public benefit.

20
21 Under noise I think we have to deal with that a little more. There isn't going to be noise from the
22 inside amphitheater. They have that double walled so they aren't going to hear anything from
23 the outside that isn't the issue. The issue is what kind of external events do they have and when
24 we talk about special events I can see us having problems when we are having an outdoor event
25 and an inside event. I mean a real festival then we are really going to have some issues there. I
26 don't know how many of those events happen but those kinds of things would be appropriate for
27 this site but then of course we really do have a problem.

28
29 Then the BMR issues. We have learned I think from work we have done in the past that we are
30 better off with more units than we are trying to have too many BMR units on high-income units.
31 I know in other situations we have said we can get 56 units, we are going to get two units
32 although they are small units and they are isolated in one building for special senior housing and
33 we are going to get one unit for every two units. The units are smaller, they are more specialized
34 but we actually get very usable units out of these. The money that is coming for the special
35 program to subsidize the other units, the people moving into the for sale family units is unique
36 and nice.

37
38 Go ahead, Dan. Let me run through this and see if I covered everything.

39
40 Commissioner Garber: I would like to echo Phyllis' comments with two emphases one of which
41 is there is a lot of depth to the BMR information that has been offered here and I will endeavor to
42 get through all of it that I haven't been able to get through in the last four days. I would be
43 interested in further discussion about some of the different alternatives that have been raised here
44 tonight as well as the recommendations that the Staff have made thus far.

1 The other thing is a general comment that the amount of attention and focus and solutioning that
2 has been done to create a viable environment on the project's ground floor plane is tremendous.
3 The ultimate success will include its active interaction with its surrounding neighbors which is
4 not just a traffic issue in terms of dropping off and being able to adequately house cars but how
5 the site actually interacts with the neighbors which hopefully is really a future issue in terms of
6 what the project can present as a way of precedent setting for that part of Palo Alto. I think it
7 could bear further conversation. I know it has been a theme in the conversations that we have
8 had in these Chambers in months past. How that actually happens and how the project actually
9 supports that interaction is critical.

10
11 Commissioner Cassel: I just have one last thing before I turn this over to Lee. I am really glad
12 to see that the senior housing on the BUILD project was moved forward. That was one of my
13 biggest concerns about this project when I first saw that this housing was going to be in the back
14 and it was going to be isolating. It really made me apprehensive to have it back there and I really
15 appreciate your moving that forward. Go ahead, Lee.

16
17 Commissioner Lippert: During the public testimony it was alluded to that the traffic element in
18 the EIR is out of sync with the traffic element of the General Comprehensive Plan and I know we
19 are going through a General Comprehensive Plan, I won't say amendment but update. It might
20 be worthwhile to take a look at that portion of it when we get to the General Comprehensive Plan
21 update.

22
23 Commissioner Cassel: Anyone else want to make a comment? Anything jog anyone's memory?
24 Anything else you would like from us? You got enough?

25
26 I want to thank everyone, the public hearing was helpful, and the contributions from the
27 developer are very nice. They have done a lot of hard work and we really appreciate that. The
28 Staff has worked very, very hard. Don.

29
30 Mr. Larkin: The Chair needs to close the public hearing and you will need a motion to continue
31 the item.

32
33 Commissioner Cassel: Yes. I am closing the public hearing and I need a motion to continue this
34 to the July 26 meeting.

35
36 MOTION

37
38 Commissioner Garber: So moved.

39
40 SECOND

41
42 Commissioner Sandas: Seconded.

43
44 MOTION PASSED (4-0-1-2, Commissioner Holman recused herself with Commissioners Burt
45 and Bialson absent).

1 Commissioner Cassel: Any discussion? All those in favor say aye. (ayes) That motion passes
2 four to nothing.

3
4 Is there anything else on our agenda tonight?

5
6 Mr. Larkin: Announcements From Officials

7
8 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**: None.

9
10 Commissioner Cassel: Announcements From Officials.

11
12 **REPORTS FROM OFFICIALS/COMMITTEES.**

13
14 Mr. Larkin: The only announcement I was going to make is for those of you that haven't heard
15 Wynne Furth is retiring from the City not from the practice of law. There will be a reception in
16 the City Attorney's Office tomorrow at 3:30 PM. I know it is short notice but you are all
17 welcome to attend.

18
19 Commissioner Garber: I believe there is a person with a new title at the desk.

20
21 Commissioner Cassel: Curtis has a new title is what he was saying.

22
23 Mr. Steve Emslie: Well welcome. I made the announcements last time at your meeting that
24 Curtis was made full time and I think you are all familiar with Curtis. We are very lucky and
25 glad to have him with us. So welcome to you r new Planning and Transportation Officer, Curtis
26 Williams.

27
28 Commissioner Cassel: Are there any other comments or announcements or anything?

29
30 **COMMISSION MEMBER QUESTIONS, COMMENTS, AND/OR ANNOUNCEMENTS.**

31
32 Commissioner Cassel: Our next meeting is going to be on July 12, 2006. There is a Stanford
33 item on that first I believe and then there is a study session for the Zoning Ordinance Update that
34 is going to be held second. You had a comment on that?

35
36 Commissioner Sandas: Not on the agenda item but that I will not be in attendance at the meeting
37 and this is my one and only notification. Zariah, I am not going to be at the meeting on the 12th.

38
39 Commissioner Cassel: Okay. Anyone else not going to be there? We all need to be here on the
40 26th please. Okay.

41
42 **NEXT MEETING**: Regular Meeting of July 12, 2006.

43
44 Commissioner Cassel: Thank you very much and I will adjourn the meeting.

45
46 **ADJOURNED: 10:31 PM**