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1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE DRAFT EIR AND FINAL EIR

The Final Environmental Impact Report (Final EIR) for the proposed Stanford in Redwood City Precise Plan has been prepared by the City of Redwood City (City), the Lead Agency, in keeping with State environmental documentation requirements set forth in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The City has prepared the Final EIR pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines, including sections 15086 (Consultation Concerning Draft EIR), 15088 (Evaluation of and Responses to Comments), and 15132 (Contents of Final Environmental Impact Report). In conformance with these guidelines, the Final EIR consists of the following two volumes:

(1) the Draft EIR, which was circulated for a 45-day State agency and public review and comment period on January 26, 2012; and

(2) this Final EIR document, which includes a list of all commenters on the Draft EIR during and immediately after the Draft EIR public review period; the approved minutes of the February 9, 2012 and April 12, 2012 Historic Resources Advisory Committee (HRAC) public meetings (including an associated email), which include HRAC comments on the Draft EIR; the approved minutes of the February 21, 2012 Planning Commission meeting and public hearing on the Draft EIR; verbatim versions of all written communications (letters and emails) received during and immediately after the Draft EIR review period; the responses of the EIR authors to all environmental points raised during the public meetings and hearing and in the written communications; and associated revisions to the Draft EIR. None of the revisions to the Draft EIR represents a substantial increase in the severity of an identified significant impact or the identification of a new significant impact, mitigation, or alternative considerably different from those already considered in preparing the Draft EIR.

Both volumes of the Final EIR are available for public review at the City of Redwood City Community Development Department, City Hall, 1017 Middlefield Road, first floor, Redwood City, CA (telephone 650-780-7236) and at City libraries. Both volumes are also posted on-line on the City’s official website (www.redwoodcity.org).

The responses to comments included in this document are correlated to the meeting/hearing minutes and letters/emails by code numbers, which are posted in the right hand margin of the minutes, letters, and emails.

Certification of this Final EIR by the City Council of Redwood City must occur prior to approval of the Stanford in Redwood City Precise Plan.

1.2 PROJECT DESCRIPTION SUMMARY

This project description summary should not be relied upon for a thorough understanding of the details of the project, its individual impacts, and related mitigation needs. Please refer to Draft
EIR chapter 3 for a complete description of the project, Draft EIR chapters 4 through 15 for a complete description of identified environmental impacts and associated mitigation measures, and Draft EIR chapter 18 for an evaluation of alternatives to the project.

The Stanford in Redwood City Precise Plan is comprised of goals, policies, development standards, and urban design guidelines intended to guide the transition of the currently low-rise, parking lot-oriented complex to a campus workplace that is denser, greener, and more attractive architecturally. As part of the Precise Plan, the applicant would fund a Neighborhood Streets Enhancement Program to address residents’ concerns that increased vehicle traffic could diminish residents' enjoyment of their streets, sidewalks, and neighborhoods. The Precise Plan's sustainability elements include a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Program and extension of recycled water infrastructure to serve the new development. Flexible building forms would allow for long-term tenancing and re-tenanting by office, research and development (R&D), medical clinic, and other potential uses.

The Precise Plan is a zoning document with goals, policies, development standards, and urban design guidelines rather than a development blueprint. For example, the conceptual site plan referred to throughout the Draft EIR (see especially chapter 3, Project Description) is but one possible example of a site plan that is consistent with the contents of the Precise Plan document; other site plans could be realized on the Precise Plan development site. The project analyzed in the Draft EIR, therefore, is the Stanford in Redwood City Precise Plan document and its potential implementation, not any particular site plan that may result.

The Precise Plan would establish the City's development goals and requirements with the understanding that the nature of workplace facilities can change over time. The Plan's policy envelope for development intensity, building heights and orientation, architectural design, circulation, parking, and other components is intended to be flexible enough to allow for changing conditions, but definitive enough to ensure that the City's vision for the Precise Plan area is achieved.

The project proposal includes demolition of approximately 537,000 square feet of existing office and research and development (R&D) space, and construction of approximately 1,518,000 square feet of new space (a 1.0 floor area ratio [FAR] averaged over the development site) in approximately 13 new office/R&D/medical clinic buildings, plus approximately four parking structures and on-site surface parking containing a total of approximately 4,500 parking spaces. The proposed Plan also includes infrastructure improvements, including an on-site storm water retention system, a recycled water pipeline extension, dual piping for use of recycled water, a pedestrian greenway that would run through the center of the campus, and a new publicly accessible open space adjacent to Spinas Park.

Stanford University has identified a number of uses that may be relocated to the development site, including:

- Stanford University School of Medicine uses, including research management, communications, and institutional planning;
- Stanford University Business Affairs Department administrative uses, including financial, technological, business, and human resource activities;
The Precise Plan allows the following mix of uses on the approximately 1,518,000-square-foot development site:

- Up to 1,518,000 square feet of office floor area (75 to 100 percent of total new development at full buildout);
- Up to 228,000 square feet of medical clinic floor area (zero to 15 percent of total new development at full buildout); and
- Up to 152,000 square feet of R&D floor area (zero to 10 percent of total new development at full buildout).

Any mix of uses within these percentages is addressed by this EIR. The Precise Plan retains the flexibility to allow some variation in these floor area percentages. If substantial differences in these percentages are proposed as the Plan is implemented, additional CEQA review may be required.

The specific City approvals required to implement the Stanford in Redwood City Precise Plan include:

1. adoption of the Precise Plan;
2. rezoning of the Precise Plan area from IR (Industrial-Restricted) to P (Planned Community District) to reflect and implement the land uses and development standards specified by the Precise Plan;
3. approval of one or more Planned Community (PC) permits, incorporating the final Precise Plan in accordance with the City's PC zone process;
4. approval of associated tentative and final subdivision maps (for new on-site street extensions); and
5. amendment of the City's Recycled Water Services Area map to reflect the project-proposed extension of the recycled water transmission infrastructure to the Precise Plan area.

The City and Stanford University may, but are not required to, enter into a development agreement in connection with the Precise Plan.
As the Lead Agency, the City also intends this EIR to serve as the CEQA-required environmental documentation for consideration of this project by other Responsible Agencies\(^1\) and Trustee Agencies\(^2\) (e.g., San Mateo County Office of Environmental Health, Regional Water Quality Control Board, Fair Oaks Sewer Maintenance District) which may have limited discretionary authority over future site-specific development proposals facilitated by this project.

1.3 ADEQUACY OF FINAL EIR

Under CEQA, the responses to comments on a Draft EIR must include good faith, well-reasoned responses to all comments received on the Draft EIR that raise significant environmental issues related to the project under review. If a comment does not relate to the Draft EIR or does not raise a significant environmental issue related to the project, there is no need for a response under CEQA.

In responding to comments, CEQA does not require the EIR authors to conduct every test or perform all research or study suggested by commenters. Rather, the EIR authors need only respond to significant environmental issues and need not provide all of the information requested by the reviewers, as long as a good faith effort at full disclosure is made in the EIR (CEQA Guidelines sections 15088, 15132, and 15204).

---

\(^1\)Under CEQA Guidelines, the term "Responsible Agency" includes all public agencies, other than the Lead Agency, which have discretionary approval power over the project for which the Lead Agency has prepared a CEQA document.

\(^2\)Under CEQA Guidelines, the term "Trustee Agency" means a state agency having jurisdiction by law over natural resources affected by the project which are held in trust by the people of California.
2. RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIR

After completion of the Draft EIR, the Lead Agency (the City) is required under CEQA Guidelines sections 15086 (Consultation Concerning Draft EIR) and 15088 (Evaluation of and Response to Comments) to consult with and obtain comments from other public agencies having jurisdiction by law with respect to the project, and to provide the general public with an opportunity to comment on the Draft EIR. Under CEQA Guidelines section 15088, the Lead Agency is also required to respond in writing to substantive environmental points raised in this Draft EIR review and consultation process.

Comments on the Draft EIR were submitted in the form of a motion passed at the February 9, 2012 HRAC meeting; public testimony and Planning Commission comment at the February 21, 2012 Planning Commission meeting and public hearing; and in letters and emails received by the City during and immediately after the Draft EIR public review period. Eighteen (18) letters and emails pertaining to the Draft EIR were received during the Draft EIR public review period.

CEQA Guidelines section 15132 (Contents of Final Environmental Impact Report), subsection (b), requires that the Final EIR include the full set of "comments and recommendations received on the Draft EIR either verbatim or in summary"; section 15132, subsection (c), requires that the Final EIR include "a list of persons, organizations, and public agencies commenting on the Draft EIR"; and section 15132, subsection (d), requires that the Final EIR include "the responses of the Lead Agency to significant environmental points raised in the review and consultation process." In keeping with these guidelines, this Responses to Comments chapter includes the following sections:

- **a list of Draft EIR commenters** (section 2.1) which lists each HRAC member, Planning Commissioner, and individual who testified during the HRAC and Planning Commission meetings and public hearing, and each individual and organization that submitted written comments (letters or emails) to the City during or immediately after the Draft EIR public review period;

- **a responses to February 9, 2012 HRAC meeting comments** section (section 2.2), which includes the minutes of the HRAC meeting (including an associated email), followed by a summary of, and the response of the EIR authors to, each comment pertaining to Draft EIR content or adequacy;

- **a responses to February 21, 2012 Planning Commission meeting and public hearing comments** section (section 2.3), which includes the minutes of the meeting and public hearing, followed by a summary of, and the response of the EIR authors to, each comment pertaining to Draft EIR content or adequacy;

- **a responses to written comments received during the Draft EIR public review period** section (section 2.4), which includes copies of all letters and emails received during the Draft EIR public review period, followed by a summary of, and the response of the EIR authors to, each comment pertaining to Draft EIR content or adequacy; and
a responses to written comments received after the Draft EIR public review period section (section 2.5), which includes copies of the one email and one letter received after the close of the Draft EIR public review period. As a courtesy to the commenters, and in the spirit of full disclosure, responses to comments pertaining to the content and adequacy of the Draft EIR are provided.

2.1 LIST OF DRAFT EIR COMMENTERS

The HRAC members, Planning Commissioners, agencies, organizations, and individuals who commented on the Draft EIR at the HRAC and Planning Commission meetings, and in letter or email form during and immediately after the Draft EIR public review period, are listed below alphabetically. Each meeting commenter and each letter or email received is also identified in parenthesis by a code number--e.g., Planning Commission meeting comments PC 1, PC 2; letters L 1, L 2, L 3, etc. The code numbers are chronological in the general order that the comments were received. If a commenter prepared more than one comment letter or email, those letters/emails are grouped together to help convey the full scope of that individual’s collective comments.

2.1.1 HRAC Members (February 9, 2012 meeting)

Kaia Eakin (HR 1)
James Gernand, Vice Chair (HR 1)
Ken Rolandelli, Chair (HR 2)

2.1.2 Planning Commission Members (February 21, 2012 meeting)

Kevin Bondonno (PC 20, PC 32)
Janet Borgens, Chair (PC 5, PC 6, PC 7, PC 35, PC 36, PC 37, PC 38, PC 39, PC 41)
Rachel Holt (PC 4, PC 21, PC 22, PC 23)
Nancy Radcliffe (PC 1, PC 2, PC 33)
Ernie Schmidt, Vice Chair (PC 3, PC 24, PC 25, PC 26, PC 27, PC 28, PC 29, PC 30, PC 31, PC 40, PC 42)
Randy Tabing (PC 34)

2.1.3 Responsible and Interested Agencies

Lisa Carboni for Gary Arnold, District Branch Chief, Local Development--Intergovernmental Review, California Department of Transportation (L 11)
Mark Chow, Principal Civil Engineer, County of San Mateo (L 15)
Besz De La Vega, Deputy Clerk on behalf of Mark Church, Chief Elections Officer & Assessor-County Clerk-Recorder, County of San Mateo (L 5)
Scott Morgan, Director, State Clearinghouse, Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (L 18)
James C. Porter, PE, Director of Public Works, County of San Mateo (L 2)
Jean Roggenkamp, Deputy Air Pollution Control Officer, Bay Area Air Quality Management District (section 2.5)
2.1.4 Individuals and Organizations

Ian Bulla (section 2.5)
Janet Davis (L 4)
Karen Davis, Redwood City resident (L 10)
Gita Dev, FAIA, Member, Sustainable Land Use Committee, Sierra Club Loma Prieta Chapter (L 17)
Roxanne Dragan (L 13, L 14)
Steve Elliott, Stanford University (PC 18)
Catherine Greer (L 8)
Joe Hanson, Redwood City resident (PC 19)
Lorianna Kastrop, Redwood Village resident (PC 11, PC 12)
Mike Kastrop, Redwood Village resident (PC 13, PC 14, PC 15, PC 16, PC 17)
John Langbein, Redwood City resident (L 12)
Adina Levin, Menlo Park resident (L 16)
Bonnie Miller, Co-Chair of the Friendly Acres Neighborhood Association (PC 8, PC 9)
Clem Molony, Environmental & Safety Manager, Lyngso Garden Materials, Inc. (L 1)
Michael Morris, Redwood City resident (L 9)
Lauren Perritt, Friendly Acres resident (L 7)
Lisa Riedle, Friendly Acres Neighborhood Association member (PC 10)
Mark Sanders (HR 2)
Steve Schmidt, Menlo Park resident (L 6)
Terry R. Thom, Redwood City resident (L 3)
2.2 RESPONSES TO FEBRUARY 9, 2012 HISTORIC RESOURCES ADVISORY COMMITTEE (HRAC) MEETING COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIR

The following section includes the minutes of the February 9, 2012 HRAC meeting pertaining to the adequacy of the Draft EIR, followed by a written response to each comment pertaining to the content or adequacy of the Draft EIR. The comments and responses are correlated by code numbers added to the right margin of the minutes. As an update to the HRAC’s February 9, 2012 comments, the minutes of the April 12, 2012 HRAC meeting also are included.
Historic Resources Advisory Committee
Redwood City Hall
1017 Middlefield Road
Redwood City

MINUTES
APPROVED

February 9, 2012
Redwood City Hall
City Council Chambers

7:00 PM

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: K. Eakin, Vice-Chairman Gernand, N. Jabba, and Chairman Rolandelli

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT: None (one vacant position)

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT: Staff Liaison, C. Jany, P. Thompson, City Attorney, Senior Planner Riordan

GUESTS PRESENT: George Lee (726 Brewster), John Donohoe (Stanford Real Estate), Julie Jones (Stanford Attorney), Julie Cain (J. Cain & L. Jones historic report).

A tape recording of the entire meeting is available for listening at Planning Services upon request (24 hour request notice is requested).

1. Roll call and approval of the minutes of the regular HRAC meetings of January 12, 2012, special on-site minutes January 12, 2012 and January 20, 2012

M/S (Jabba/Gernand) to approve the regular HRAC minutes of January 12, 2012 as corrected
Motion Passed 4-0

M/S (Jabba/Eakin) to approve the special on-site HRAC minutes of January 12, 2012 as corrected
Motion Passed 4-0

M/S (Eakin/Jabba) to approve the special on-site HRAC minutes of January 20, 2012 as corrected
Motion Passed 3-0 (Gernand Abstain)

2. Oral communications:
   • George Lee, 726 Brewster, gave an overview of what repairs and upgrades will be made to the property for compliance with the Mills Act Contract, Phase 1: Dry rot repair, electrical repair, painting, and porch.
Phase 2: A new roof will be put on home, plant shrubs around electrical meter, replace driveway.

3. Redwood City “Path of History” update (Dee Eva).
   No new information to report at this time on the project.

4. Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Stanford in Redwood City Precise Plan:
   Review of Draft EIR/Cultural Resources Section and Recommendation to the
   Planning Commission on the treatment of three separate resources related to the
   AMPEX campus identified as potentially eligible for local listing in the Draft EIR.
   Jabba recused herself from this item.

Ms. Riordan, project Planner, stated that the items to be reviewed are potential local historic resources: The AMPEX sign, Warnecke plaza and fountain, and 425 Broadway building have not been determined to be on the National or California Historic Register and are not on a local historic resource list. However, the EIR evaluated the structures and determined that they were potentially significant local historic resources. The Precise Plan will allow for the removal and demolition of these structures and so the EIR identifies them as a significant and unavoidable impact. The Committee observed that the Laura Jones and Julie Cain report entitled “Cultural Resources Survey and Evaluation for the “Stanford in Redwood City Project” dated 1/12/09 , as well as the “Primary Record” on the Ampex sign dated 2/23/09 as well as the “Continuation Sheet” dated 5/18/09 were excluded from the EIR and felt that an accurate undertaking of the context of the historic evaluation requires review of these reports.

M/S: (Gernand/Eakin) To recommend to the Planning Commission that the three separate resources related to the Ampex campus be identified as eligible for local listing specifically: 425 Broadway, Warnecke fountain and plaza, and AMPEX sign, based on both the special relationship and importance of the above resources to the community of Redwood City and the importance of AMPEX as a Redwood City employer that established an early Redwood City connection to Silicon Valley. The HRAC recommendation should include the fact that this was a master-planned campus prepared by nationally recognized Master Architect John Carl Warnecke. And, recommend that a meeting be held with Mr. Warnecke’s son, who is also a practicing architect, be scheduled with the HRAC in order to provide some additional information to standing of the recommendation of State or National level. The Committee members recommended that the Laura Jones and Julie Cain report entitled “Cultural Resources Survey and Evaluation for the Stanford in Redwood City Project” dated 1/12/09 , as well as the “Primary Record” on the Ampex sign dated 2/23/09 as well as the “Continuation Sheet” dated 5/18/09 be reviewed by the Planning Commission as part of the EIR for the “Stanford in Redwood City” project.

Motion Passed 3-0

5. National Historic Preservation Month
Chair Rolandelli stated that the Redwood City School District has been notified regarding the walking tours. So far, there are two schools attending as of this meeting, Roy Cloud and Hoover.

Mrs. Jabba stated that the grant for the Civic Cultural Commission (CCC) is due and needs to be submitted by February 16, 2012 to make the March CCC Meeting. The HRAC is requesting the small grant which is $1,000 or less. A member of the HRAC will need to attend the CCC Meeting on March 1st, 2012 (N. Jabba and K. Eakin to coordinate).

6. CPF conference in Oakland 5.12 /Forum participation and CLG funding availability & info on CPF Webinars
Two members of the HRAC will be attending, Workshop regarding The Secretary of Interior Standards Treatment of Historic Properties on March 7th from 9am-4:30pm at the Golden Gate Club in the Presidio in San Francisco.

7. Preparation of an information handout for the maintenance, repair and when necessary, the replacement of historic windows (James Gernand) – (deferred to January meeting)
Continued to next meeting.

8. Update on historic survey of the potential historic district area generally known as the “Mt. Carmel Neighborhood” leading to a consideration of a CLG Grant Application (2011) for the subject work. Report on 2.8.12 meeting with consultant.
Mr. Gernand stated that Ken, Charles and he met with Sheila McElroy from CIRCA Consultants regarding the eligibility of the district.

Chair Rolandelli stated that Sheila recommended applying for the CLG Grant application this year for the first of two phases: Phase 1 is the physical determination of the district eligibility and level of significance. Phase 2 (2nd year) is to prepare the document for listing of the district.

9. Oral communications:
   • Staff Liaison update
   • HRAC fifth member recruitment update
     No new information at this time.
   • CLG report

   Mills Act contract updates
   726/728 Brewster update (potential Mills Act contract) was provided by staff
   439 Stambaugh Street update (tree removal) was provided by staff

OTHER COMMUNICATIONS
   • Mr. Gernand stated that Mr. Boris Zats had spoke with him in regards to completing a substantial portion of his building core rehabilitation and expressed difficulty in finding an appropriate retail attendant. Mr. Zats is interested in having HRAC comment related to the HRAC role and process and importance of preserving the historic architectural character of this building.
• Chair Rolandelli asked that the Main Street Historic District be agendized on the next HRAC agenda to include a review of the district boundaries.

• Chair Rolandelli inquired about the Historic Landmark plaque for the Roy Cloud house.

• Chair Rolandelli stated that he received an e-mail from the State Historic Preservation Office regarding work being done on WPA projects in the community.

• Chair Rolandelli stated that he felt that it was important for all HRAC members to belong to the National Alliance of Preservation Commissions

• Chair Rolandelli read from an article written by Jennifer Kenny, staff for Olympia Washington Heritage Commission.

10. M/S (Jabba/Eakin) to adjourn the HRAC meeting.
Motion Passed 4-0

Historic Resources Advisory Committee agenda materials, released less than 72 hours prior to the meeting, (24 hours prior to the meeting for Special Meetings) are available to the public at the Planning Services Department, Redwood City Hall, 1017 Middlefield Road, Redwood City, CA 94063

Staff Liaison: Charles Jany (650) 780-7239    email: cjany@redwoodcity.org
Thank you so very much for this most valuable information, Mark. Yes, I believe it is important that we see an early photo of the sign. If you could possibly locate one, it would be very helpful. Otherwise, Charles, I wonder if there might be an early photo in the archives collection at the Main Public Library.

Best Regards, Ken

In a message dated 3/16/2009 6:36:34 PM Pacific Standard Time, msanders@westpointmarina.com writes:

Hello all,

here is more information I was able to gather:

This sign was put up when building 3 (the new Ampex HQ building) was built in 1962 (and opened in 1963). The sign would not be permitted today, and even in those days required permission from Redwood City and the State (close to the freeway but on private land). Redwood City got permission for the sign from the state because Ampex made the sign a condition if it was to build the new HQ, and Redwood City wanted to see the improvement.

There was no prior sign, and the sign is still in its original location and has never been modified. Prior to this time only the buildings had small Ampex signs on them, and the company president (Bill Roberts) had three designs to consider and chose this one. The site was a large open field, and the company kept planted trees around the sign for many years.

I confirmed some of this via Charles Steinberg who was an executive VP and later president. The general counsel for Ampex in those days was Don Flanagan and I also talked to him—he still lives in Portola Valley. Finally I talked to Hank West who was the facilities manager at the time, and was responsible for erecting building 3 and the sign.

I have boxes of old Ampex files and literature as I am a recording technology history buff—there may be an old photo in it somewhere if it's important.

mark

PLG-Charles Jany wrote:

Hi Mark:

Below is the reply from the Historic Resources Advisory Committee
Chairman Ken Rolandelli.

Please advise as how to best obtain responses to the four questions below.

I will be happy to talk with Mr. Hammer, whichever way you think is best.

Many thanks again.

Monday, March 16, 2009 America Online: Kenrolandelli
> Charles
> 
> *From:* Kenrolandelli@aol.com [mailto:Kenrolandelli@aol.com]
> *Sent:* Monday, March 16, 2009 3:00 PM
> *To:* PLG-Charles Jany; Michael Bursak
> *Cc:* PLG-Kristina Mateo
> *Subject:* Re: FW: ampex sign
> 
> Charles,
> 
> This is most interesting and enlightening. I am especially interested
> in the comment "and a condition of sale was the sign had to remain in
> perpetuity."
> 
> I ask that you please contact Peter Hammer who was the manager of the
> Ampex History Museum. Mr. Hammer indicates that the sign was put up
> when the new HQ at 401 Broadway was built which means 1963. The
> following information is required:
> 
> 1. Confirmation that the present sign, altered or not, is the original
> sign.
> 2. Whether or not the present sign is in the original location
> 3. An early photograph of the sign (1960s)
> 4. Extent of alterations in detail - what's original and what's not
> and when any alterations were made
> 
> Thank you, Ken
> 
> -----Original Message-----
> From: mark sanders [mailto:msanders@westpointmarina.com]
> Sent: Monday, March 16, 2009 9:47 AM
> To: PLG-Charles Jany
> Subject: Re: ampex sign
> 
> Hi Charles,
> 
> Yes, the Ampex sign was a big issue when the company was taken
> over in
> the eighties.
> 
> You know that Ampex, HP and Varian Associates were the three
> companies
that started "Silicon Valley", and more than eighty companies spun
out
of Ampex, including Oracle, Memorex, and many others. When Ed Bramson
began to "harvest" the company (sell off the assets using junk
bonds so
he could pull out cash) one of his moves was to sell the 46 acre
Ampex
campus in Redwood City and lease back some buildings--and a
condition of
the sale was the sign had to remain in perpetuity. At the time
Ampex and
Sony dominated the television equipment business and no one could
imagine the company could fail.

The block letters on the sign were the logo on all Ampex
equipment, and
around the world it is still recognized by broadcasters, but it
may have
been altered for better lighting. The sign was put up when the new
HQ at
401 Broadway was built.

Peter Hammer was the manager of the Ampex history museum, and he is
still around to talk to. Also, Art Hausman was President for many
years
and he too is still around (he lives in Atherton). Let me know if the
history committee would like to contact either (I did talk to
historic
committee members in the past).

Best
mark


Feeling the pinch at the grocery store? Make dinner for $10 or less
MINUTES
APPROVED

April 12, 2012
Redwood City Hall
City Council Chambers

6:00 PM

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: K. Eakin, Vice-Chairman Gernand, N. Jabba, and Chairman Rolandelli

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT: None (one vacant position)

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT: Staff Liaison C. Jany, City Attorney P. Thompson, Assistant City Attorney V. Ramirez, Assistant Planner C. Rogers

GUESTS PRESENT: Sarah Ellen Owsowitz esq., Best, Best & Kriger

A tape recording of the entire meeting is available for listening at Planning Services upon request (24 hour request notice is requested).

1. Roll call and approval of the minutes of the regular HRAC meeting of March 8, 2012

M/S (Eakin/Gernand) to approve the regular HRAC minutes of March 8, 2012 as corrected

Motion Passed 3-0 (Jabba Abstain)

2. Historic Resource Training (60-90 minutes)

City Attorney, Ms. Pamela Thompson introduced the item as training for the Committee on the process and procedures of reviewing potential historical properties.

Assistant City Attorney, Ms. Veronica Ramirez and Ms. Sarah Ellen Owsowitz esq. of Best, Best & Kriger gave a presentation on the item.

3. Discussion of membership eligibility criteria for HRAC

The Committee discussed with the City Attorney the number of members on the committee, and if the member had to be a Redwood City resident.

M/S: (Eakin/Jabba) That the Committee re-insert the line in the By-laws to say, “The Committee shall have no less than four (4) Committee members at appointment and duration of their terms, be residents of Redwood City.”
Motion Passed 4-0

4. HRAC update regarding contact with Ampex architect and clarification of HRAC recommendation to Planning Commission regarding Stanford DEIR
Jabba recused herself from this item.

Vice Chair Gernand stated that there has been no change at this time with contacting the Ampex architect’s family (J.C. Warnecke), and since reasonable time has passed, for the committee to proceed with their recommendation to the Planning Commission.

M/S: (Gernand/Eakin) HRAC recommends to the Planning Commission that the DPR rating for the three separate resources related to the Ampex campus be revised, so as to have an assignment of status code 5; being that the HRAC believes they are historic resources of aesthetic, educational, cultural, and architectural significance to the citizens of the City under Redwood City Municipal Code section 40.3, because of the reason cited in the minutes of the February 9, 2012 HRAC meeting.

Motion Passed 3-0

M/S: (Gernand/Eakin) As a resolution of the statement in the Feb 9, 2012, minutes in contacting Mr. Warnecke’s family; the committee has made attempts to contact the family and have not received any response, concluding the effort and resulting in no further action required

Motion Passed 3-0

M/S: (Eakin/Gernand) Move that the report of Laura Jones and Julie Cain titled “Cultural Resources Survey and Evaluation for the Stanford in RWC Project”; dated January 12, 2009, as well as the primary record on the Ampex sign report dated February 23, 2009, and the continuation sheet May 18, 2009 be included in the EIR and be considered by the Planning Commission.

Motion Passed 3-0

M/S: (Eakin/Gernand) To concur with the conclusion of the draft EIR Stanford in Redwood City precise plan regarding the three improvements: Ampex sign, Warnecke fountain and plaza, and the 425 Broadway building on the project site. Move to concur with conclusion in the EIR section 14.1.

Motion Passed 3-0

5. National Preservation Month 2012
Chair Rolandelli stated The Historic Downtown Walking Tour will be May 6, 2012, at 10:30AM, and the Historic Union Cemetery tour will be May 12, 2012. Chair Rolandelli stated that he needs HRAC members to assist in volunteering for the Historic Downtown school tours. Mr. Jany stated that he will do outreach to City staff for support after next week.
6. Oral communications:
   - Upcoming State Office of Historic Preservation sponsored CLG Forum (Pre-California Preservation Foundation Conference in Oakland). Mr. Jany stated that Vice-Chair Gernand and committee member Jabba are confirmed for the pre-conference forum in Oakland.
   - Ms. Jabba stated that she will not be attending the next HRAC meeting in May.
   - Mr. Gernand stated that he will not be attending the HRAC meeting in June.
   - Chair Rolandelli stated that the deadline for the Mayor’s “Pride and Beautification Committee” nominations are due May 25, 2012 and requested the item be placed on the next meeting agenda.
   - Mr. Gernand stated that he will present information on historic windows which includes information from an article in the Alliance Review at the next HRAC meeting

7. Adjournment: M/S: (Jabba/Eakin) to adjourn the HRAC meeting
   Motion Passed 4-0

Historic Resources Advisory Committee agenda materials, released less than 72 hours prior to the meeting, (24 hours prior to the meeting for Special Meetings) are available to the public at the Planning Services Department, Redwood City Hall, 1017 Middlefield Road, Redwood City, CA 94063
HR Approved Minutes, Historic Resources Advisory Committee (HRAC) Meeting (including associated email); February 9, 2012 (7 pages)

HR 1 Historic Resources--The HRAC recommended to the Planning Commission on a 3-0 vote that the three separate resources related to the former Ampex campus (425 Broadway, the Warnecke plaza and fountain, and the Ampex sign) be identified as eligible for local listing. The HRAC also recommended that certain previously prepared historical research referenced in the Draft EIR be included in the Final EIR.

Response: The Planning Commission and City Council will consider the HRAC recommendation in their decision-making regarding the proposed Precise Plan. The Planning Commission’s recommendation regarding the potential historic significance of the resources will be forwarded to the City Council, who has the final decision-making authority on this issue. Draft EIR Impact and Mitigation 14-1 (Project and Cumulative Impacts on Historic Resources) incorporates the HRAC’s advisory capacity on these historic resource issues. In addition, Draft EIR Alternative 18.3 (Reduced Development/425 Broadway Preservation Scenario) evaluates an alternative to the proposed Precise Plan that would preserve on site, at a minimum, 425 Broadway and the Warnecke plaza and fountains.

In response to the recommendations by the HRAC, the Laura Jones and Julie Cain report entitled Cultural Resources Survey and Evaluation for the Stanford in Redwood City Project dated January 12, 2009, as well as the Primary Record on the Ampex sign dated February 29, 2009, and the Continuation Sheet dated May 18, 2009, have been included in appendix C of this Final EIR (available on the City’s website at www.redwoodcity.org under “Hot Topics”).

HR 2 Historic Resources--HRAC Chair Rolandelli and Mark Sanders exchanged email with Charles Jany, Staff Liaison for the HRAC, which provides additional oral history regarding the former Ampex campus. The HRAC requested that this email (3/16/09 et al.) be included in the Final EIR as additional information for Planning Commission and City Council consideration.

Response: This additional information will be considered by the Planning Commission and City Council in its decision-making regarding the proposed Precise Plan. See response to comment HR 1. It is noted that part of the oral history concludes, “[The Ampex] sign is still in its original location and has never been modified.” This conclusion is not substantiated by the State of California Resources Agency, Department of Parks and Recreation DPR 523 forms, prepared by L. Jones and J. Cain, which conclude that the sign was altered after 1985 to: (1) replace the lettering and convert the lights from incandescent to fluorescent, and (2) repaint the post frame from white to black. Photographs attached to the DPR 523 Continuation Sheet show that the sign has been altered (see appendix C of this Final EIR, available on the City’s website at www.redwoodcity.org under “Hot Topics”).

Stanford has informed the City that it is unaware of any condition of sale requiring its predecessor to retain the Ampex sign. Any condition requiring subsequent purchasers, such as Stanford, to retain the sign in perpetuity would have to be found in a recorded document. The title report for the project site, which Stanford submitted as part of its application for the Stanford in Redwood City project, does not
identify any recorded document requiring retention of the Ampex sign. In addition, Stanford has informed the City that its current lease of building space to Ampex states: “Tenant shall have the right, at Tenant’s sole cost and expense, ... to retain its billboard sign located near the freeway, provided that Landlord shall have the right to terminate Tenant’s rights to the billboard sign located near the freeway upon sixty (60) days written notice to Tenant.” This indicates that Ampex understands and agreed that Stanford could remove the sign upon 60 days written notice.

As an update to the HRAC comments above, the HRAC unanimously passed four motions at its April 12, 2012 meeting, as follows:

- The HRAC recommended to the Planning Commission that the California Department of Parks and Recreation rating for the three separate resources related to the Ampex campus (425 Broadway, the Warnecke plaza and fountain, and the Ampex sign) be upgraded to Status Code 5, meaning that the HRAC believes they are historic resources of aesthetic, educational, cultural, and architectural significance to the citizens of Redwood City under Municipal Code section 40.3 (Definitions) of the City’s Historic Preservation Ordinance.

- The HRAC decided that, after not receiving any previous response, no further attempt to contact the architect’s family would be made.

- The HRAC recommended that previously prepared cultural and historic resources reports pertaining to the project site be included in the EIR and considered by the Planning Commission. [The reports are included in appendix C of this Final EIR, available on the City’s website at [www.redwoodcity.org](http://www.redwoodcity.org) under “Hot Topics”.

- The HRAC concurred with the Draft EIR conclusions in section 14.1 (Cultural and Historic Resources, Setting) regarding 425 Broadway, the Warnecke plaza and fountain, and the Ampex sign.
2.3 RESPONSES TO FEBRUARY 21, 2012 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING AND PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIR

The following section includes the minutes of the February 21, 2012 planning commission meeting and public hearing pertaining to the adequacy of the Draft EIR, followed by a written response to each comment pertaining to the content or adequacy of the Draft EIR or a substantive environmental point. Almost all of the comments were responded to at the meeting, and no additional response is necessary. In some cases, additional information has been provided to supplement the initial response.

The comments and responses are correlated by code numbers added to the right margin of the minutes.
MINUTES
PLANNING COMMISSION
February 21, 2012
7:00 p.m.

City Council Chambers*
1017 Middlefield Rd
Redwood City, CA
Ph: 650-780-7233
Accessible to Disabled

DRAFT

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Commissioner Bondonno, Commissioner Holt, Commissioner Radcliffe, Commissioner Tabing, Commissioner White, Vice-Chair Schmidt, and Chair Borgens

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Acting Planning Manager Lyon, Senior Planner Riordan, Assistant City Attorney Ramirez

CONSULTANTS: Terry Bottomley, Bottomley Associates
Ray Pendro, MIG

GUESTS: NONE

PROCEEDINGS RECORDED: For further information not contained in this draft of the written minutes, a DVD recording of the entire meeting is available for listening or purchase at the Planning office, located in City Hall, Redwood City.

AGENDA POSTED: Copies of the Agenda for this meeting are posted at City Hall on the Friday prior to the Planning Commission meeting.

Public Hearing 7:00 PM:

1. ROLL CALL

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: January 10, 2012 and January 31, 2012

   M/S (Radcliffe/Schmidt) to approve the minutes of January 10, 2012 as submitted.
   Motion Passed 7-0

   M/S (Radcliffe/Schmidt) to approve the minutes of January 31, 2012 as submitted.
   Motion Passed 7-0

3. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS: None

4. CONSENT CALENDAR: None
5. DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (EIR) AND PRECISE PLAN FOR THE STANFORD IN REDWOOD CITY PROJECT

Blake Lyon: We have a couple folks for you this evening. We'll start with Maureen Riordan. She's our Senior Project Planner and she'll give us an overview of the project. And we've got Terry Bottomley from Bottomley and Associates and Ray Pendro from MIG, so we'll start with Maureen.

Maureen Riordan: The purpose of tonight's hearing is to take in public testimony on the Stanford Draft Environmental Impact Report and Draft Precise Plan. For tonight's agenda I'll provide a general overview of the planning process and schedule, and Terry Bottomley, the City's urban design consultant, will provide an overview of the draft Precise Plan for the Stanford project. MIG, the City's environmental consultant, will then provide an overview of the draft EIR.

Just to orient folks, this is the site. I think everybody's familiar with it by now, but this is Highway 101. It's bounded by Douglas, Bay Street, Spinias Park, and the City's fire station, and the Broadway Tower Apartments.

The proposed project is a request for a Precise Plan and a Zoning Map Amendment which would allow development of the site with approximately 1.5 million square feet of office, R&D, and medical clinic space, in addition to approximately 4 parking structures that would contain roughly 4,500 parking stalls, as well as new street parking, an onsite water retention system, recycle water pipeline extension to the property, and dual plumbing to allow recycled water for landscaping as well as for the buildings. It will also include a central greenway and publicly accessible open space area, and street extensions, which would include Barren, Warrington, and Hurlingame. Our urban design consultant will be showing what this looks like in a graphic soon.

Generally what has occurred so far: back in July of 2008 the Planning Commission recommended initiation of a General Plan and Zoning Map Amendment to City Council, as well as preparation of a Precise Plan. In August of the same year the City Council approved those items. In October of 2008 there was a Scoping Session on the Environmental Impact Report where the public was invited to express concerns they wanted addressed in the EIR. We had three community workshops held in English and Spanish, and we notified about 3,000 folks. It was facilitated by the Peninsula Conflict and Resolution Center, and we received a lot of significant and important information which shaped the concept plan. We wound up with a revised concept plan based on that feedback and that was presented to the Planning Commission and Architecture Review Committee in July 2009. In September there was a City Council meeting to approve the Guiding Principles, which are going to be used to develop the Development Agreement that is anticipated for this project. In November of 2010 there was a Joint Study Session to provide a project update and at that time the City Council appointed an ad hoc subcommittee to help with the Development Agreement negotiations. From January through December of 2011 the consultants completed the draft EIR and Precise Plan.

Right now we're going through the 45-day public review period on these two documents. It began January 26 and will end on March 12. We anticipate that in April the final EIR and the final Precise Plan will be prepared and you'll be making a recommendation on those to the City Council and in May the City Council will be considering the approval of
those documents as well as the Development Agreement. With that, Terry Bottomley is here to present the Precise Plan.

Terry Bottomley: I’m going to take about ten minutes to give an overview of the contents of the Precise Plan. Just to review quickly, the Precise Plan was initiated by the City in response to a development application from Stanford University for the site of the former Midpoint Technology Park. The entire Precise Plan area is about 48 acres. It includes properties owned by Stanford University, the Stanford Outpatient Clinic, and Genentech. The Precise Plan implements the new General Plan’s policies for the area by replacing the existing zoning. Quickly in context here, the Precise Plan area is outlined by a white dash. It’s about a mile east from downtown Redwood City, it’s bordered by the Friendly Acres Neighborhood on the east, nearby is Redwood Village and Fair Oaks to the south, and just to the west there that orange line is Woodside Road, to the north is US 101. As Maureen said the site is bordered by US 101 on the north, Bay St. on the South, it abuts properties that abut 2nd Avenue on the east, and is bordered by Douglas on the west. The new General Plan, or recently adopted General Plan designates the area for professional office/tech land use with the medical outpatient clinic site designated for a hospital. The current existing zoning, is Restricted Light Industrial, which is not consistent with the General Plan. The Precise Plan will rectify that. Some of the general community concerns that arose during the process that Maureen said were building heights and setbacks, particularly as they relate to the adjacent Fair Oaks Neighborhood, publicly accessible open space, building massing and just general development intensity on Broadway, parking, particularly the potential or concern about parking overflow into adjacent residential areas, and beautification of local streets, Broadway and Bay Road as well as some new streets that we’ll look at in a second. The Development Concept Plan was prepared based on community and Staff meetings, and this plan sort of provides the basis for a lot of the Precise Plan recommendations as far as physical development. A couple of key things: building heights and intensities are greatest to the north along the freeway, lowest on the east near the Fair Oaks Neighborhood. Parking is concentrated on the perimeter along Bay Road and along U.S. 101.

Chair Borgens: Mr. Bottomley, just for one second, the neighborhood that you’re referring to is...?

Mr. Bottomley: I keep saying Fair Oaks but it’s Friendly Acres.

Chair Borgens: Thank you.

Mr. Bottomley: Sorry. And there’s a greenway open space that extends from east to west through the plan area as proposed. Key Precise Plan issues and goals include, neighborhood compatibility, the Broadway corridor as sort of a special street and place within the City of Redwood City, access circulation and parking, the orientation of buildings and pedestrian ways, architectural character, environmental sustainability, and the relationship to downtown and adjacent residential areas. Like the City’s other Precise Plans, this one contains development standards and urban design guidelines, and the major categories of development standards are land use and development, building heights and setbacks, site development and parking. The standards are based on a new block pattern for the area that would be created by extending the existing street grid north through the plan area, so the existing streets Hurlingame, Warrington, and Barren would be extended up to Broadway. This allows for a lot of the policies in
particular standards for development intensity and building height to be tailored to individual blocks. So for instance, Block E, which is this sort of orange block at the top, the north, has the highest potential building heights and highest development intensity. Overall the Precise Plan area has a maximum developable floor to area ratio or FAR of 1.0 but within the Precise Plan area some blocks can exceed that as long as other blocks are lower than that. Standards for building setbacks and frontage improvements are based on streets. They're tailored to each street so that each of the streets is shaped as a unique public space. So for example there are different standards and design recommendations for Broadway (in this image you can see a potential streetcar) than there are for Bay Road, and some of the other streets.

The plan's Urban Design Guidelines address phasing, building orientation and design, pedestrian ways, streets and streetscape, and hardscape and landscape improvements. The plan's Urban Design Concept establishes Broadway as a transit, pedestrian, and biking corridor. Thanks for pointing that out Maureen. And it illustrates the plan's focus of pedestrian-oriented buildings on Broadway, as well as the central greenway open space that links to Spinas Park on the east. The guidelines use text and photos to address architectural form, generally contemporary, building materials and detailing, generally a combination of glass and masonry, and landscape approaches focusing on streetscapes and a storm water management, in particular rain guards and other features to percolate rain water.

There's a chapter on Circulation and Capital Improvements which includes many of the elements of the EIR, they've been incorporated into the Precise Plan. I'll just sort of read the categories. Vehicular pedestrian and bicycle improvements, transportation demand (TDM) program, street and intersection improvements, and water, wastewater, and storm drainage facilities. The Plan depicts key circulation improvements throughout the area including new streets and new pedestrian crossings proposed for those streets, some mid-block crossings, and priority bicycle improvements that extend out into the area, that new Precise Plan development will assist with developing and establishing in the future. Plan implementation involves an anticipated Development Agreement, sustainability and resource efficiency measures and policies, a TDM program, a neighborhood streets enhancement program, and development monitoring and phasing. The plan outlines the phasing coordination and funding responsibility for 24 discreet improvements, and/or programs related to circulation, transportation, utilities, and other infrastructure, and these range from street plan lines, which is sort of a paper exercise, to funding and construction of transit facilities, sewage system upgrades, and similar utility oriented improvements, and that's where I'd planned to stop the overview.

Ray Pendro: Good evening, I'm Ray Pendro from MIG. We helped prepare the EIR with City Staff and in coordination with Terri Bottomley's work. I'm not going to read all the text from these but I will have some highlights. The EIR is being prepared because there's a state law called CEQA that requires it. There's a legal guidebook that's used to decide what goes into an EIR and what's evaluated, and the point I want to make about the third bullet is the EIR is intended to inform people. The EIR is used to help decision makers decide on whether or not to approve a project. It's one of many items the decision makers need to evaluate, but the EIR itself does not approve the project. The Planning Commission would recommend certifying the EIR to say the information inside the document is accurate and describes the project and its impacts, which means the EIR is certified before the City decides whether or not to actually approve the project. So the EIR has topics and chapters. The project description basically reiterates what
Terri described from his Precise Plan, that's Chapter 3 of the EIR, and for each impact area which we'll show on later slides, there's an evaluation of impacts which are the effects of the project on the environment, and mitigations, which are solutions to try to minimize those effects or impacts. CEQA also requires that we examine alternatives to the project that Stanford has proposed. The intent of the alternatives is to reduce or avoid significant impacts.

These are the environmental topics addressed; there's a chapter in the EIR for each of these in this order. And each chapter identifies significant impacts. These are CEQA terms but in general they're what you think they might be. Significant impacts would be potential problems that the project might result in, then there are mitigations to reduce those impacts to less than significant levels, and some impacts cannot be mitigated to less than significant levels by using the CEQA guidelines, what we call "significance thresholds." These are called "significant unavoidable impacts." I will give you one just general example: if a project simply is so large that its air pollution does not fall under the thresholds that would be a significant unavoidable impact, even after you applied all the BAAQMD, or Air Quality Management measures that are recommended, you might still get air pollution emissions that are above their thresholds.

So we're going to focus on the impact areas that do have significant unavoidable impacts. Transportation, compared to existing conditions, meaning the traffic on the ground today, the project would cause significant delays at the following intersections. These are examined basically by how many seconds would a car have to wait at the stop sign or the red light, and these intersections. You will note that some of these intersections already have terrible traffic and therefore the project would add to that, but some of the intersections are already operating at low levels. This next comparison is required under CEQA. It's adding all the projects that might be completed by the year 2030, adding those projects into the traffic and then layering the Stanford project on top, and that examines what contribution will the Stanford project make to overall future traffic after the Stanford project is built out. Those impacts would be at these intersections. They're not always the same intersections as the project traffic itself like the previous slide. Finally for traffic impacts, the EIR examines segments of US 101 that are near the project site on the north, and project traffic would result in a significant impact on US 101. That's related to Caltrans criteria and the Congestion Management Plan criteria for the County. I also wanted to point out the addition of new pedestrians in the project area would require new high visibility crosswalks at these locations. This term significant unavoidable impacts would occur at these five intersections and on the US 101. The reason why these are considered significant and unavoidable is because Caltrans has jurisdictions over these locations, which means the City of Redwood City does not have complete authority on implementing the improvements that would reduce the impacts. All of these impacts have what I would call engineering solutions but the City would need to get Caltrans approval to implement them. So under CEQA we have to call that a significant unavoidable impact until Caltrans approves the mitigations. All other traffic impacts would be mitigated with commonly known solutions such as restriping, changes to the signals, or the applicant's payment of the City's Traffic Impact Fee.

Next topic: Air Quality. These are the significant impacts identified, construction related air emissions, that's basically dust from construction equipment. The second one is operational air emissions due mainly to vehicle trips. This is while the project is built out and in operation. Simply the size of it would contribute air pollution from the vehicle
trips, despite the TDM program and other solutions to minimize traffic, it's just that number of trips triggers the significance threshold. The third item is particulates, and that PM2.5 stands for what's called inhalable particulates that can get into your lungs, resulting from the freeway traffic and from Tyco Thermal Controls, which is an operation nearby in Redwood City. This would have impacts on a proposed onsite childcare center. The mitigations for these impacts are: construction emissions could be mitigated but there would be one that could not be mitigated using the AQMD or Air Quality Management District recommendations, and that's NOX, we call it NOX. It's from construction equipment. For project operation the emissions from vehicles, those would be significant and unavoidable, and those are mostly from car exhaust. In the EIR and in the Plan there is a condition that if impacts on the childcare center cannot be mitigated at the time the center itself was proposed, the childcare center would not be built. One of the requirements for example for the childcare center is it would need to be built at least 700 feet away from the freeway.

Noise, significant impacts related to the childcare center again. Project construction noise, and potential noise from the ventilation system at one of the parking structures near Bay and Barren. The findings are that the childcare center noise can be mitigated. A construction plan would be required but in this EIR Staff and consultants decided this should be called a significant unavoidable impact simply because the size of this project would require it to be constructed over a number of years. Just the amount of time that would be required for construction, we're calling that a significant unavoidable impact. And parking structure noise, this is mostly from fans that would ventilate the one parking structure. That could be mitigated with insulation and items called silencers and baffles.

Cultural and Historic Resources. Significant impacts, there is some discussion of whether or not three of the structures on site are historic structures. 425 Broadway, the Plaza with the fountains, and the Ampex sign out near the highway. And as always in a CEQA document we have to notify the readers that archeological or paleontological resources might be discovered while grading is being done. The mitigation findings: as we had mentioned the project includes demolition of all buildings on the site, so if any of these buildings are determined historic, this demolition would be considered a significant unavoidable impact. That determination hasn't been made yet because the City's Historic Resources Advisory Committee is considering its comments during this draft EIR period and will provide you with that information to help you with your decisions. But inside the EIR draft alternative 18.3 does evaluate an alternative that would save these three structures. And the archeological resources would be protected if any are found through the City's Cultural Resources Management Plan and similar measures.

These are the Alternatives I mentioned are required under CEQA. These were carefully selected with Staff and with Terri Bottomley to evaluate a range of feasible alternatives. That's what CEQA calls it. The City may or may not choose one of these alternatives over the proposed project. The City may even choose a combination of these alternatives, similar to what was done for your Downtown Precise Plan. One alternative is full occupancy of existing buildings. The buildings are about 1/3 occupied; they have about 600 employees now but could accommodate about 1,800 employees so we just fill in the buildings, and evaluate those impacts. No project has existing zoning. Existing zoning still has opportunity for the applicant to build some new square footage on the site up to about I believe 1 million square feet, and right now there are 537,000 square feet on the site so either 1 or 2 could be built without any additional entitlements or approvals. Number 3 is an alternative that would save 425 Broadway and the fountains.
and Ampex sign. Alternative 4 would include a hotel and a restaurant in place of some of the office and research and development space. And Alternative 5 would put approximately 228 housing units on the east near the same Friendly Acres on the east.

These are the next steps, which Maureen discussed. Tonight’s comments from the public and the Planning Commission are being transcribed and will become part of the Final EIR, meaning if there are questions that I can’t answer tonight off the top of my head or from what I know from the document, all the comments will be answered in the Final EIR in writing. Then the Planning Commission will recommend whether or not to certify the Final EIR in the spring. Your project contacts are Maureen here, and the document is on the City’s website at those locations. And I’m here to try to answer any questions you might have. Thank you.

Chair Borgens: Thank you for you presentation. Do we have any clarifying questions from Commissioners? Commissioner Radcliffe.

Commissioner Radcliffe: Don’t go away, Ray. When we’re talking about traffic impacts and air quality impacts, that’s considering that we are going forward with business as usual and not taking into account the trend to be more bike friendly, mass transit friendly, shuttle friendly?

Mr. Pendro: There are some credits identified in Chapter 7, the traffic chapter, there are some credits applied to this project because Stanford has agreed to meet these performance standards. For example, TDM, Traffic Demand Management, Stanford has agreed and the City would monitor their TDM program to make sure that it reduced traffic as usual by 18% during basically rush hours. So that is built into the project as a requirement. There’s a shuttle service embedded in the project that Stanford would run, so there are credits given and demanded as part of the project.

Commissioner Radcliffe: If we go forward with for instance our streetcar alternative that a lot appear are very passionate about, is that influence in there at all?

Mr. Pendro: The EIR recognized the streetcar plan but I do not believe it gives credit for streetcar riding by employees. It gives credit for TDM and shuttle service and van pulls and things like that.

Commissioner Radcliffe: Because that could be another factor to greatly reducing traffic impact.

Mr. Pendro The general idea is that in the EIR, and I am in no way making a comment on the streetcar idea, but we need to verify that such things would actually happens and we don’t want to overstate the benefit of the streetcar if in fact it lags a little behind some of the development on the Stanford side or whatever, then the EIR would be out of sync with those credits.

Commissioner Radcliffe: Great, thank you.

Chair Borgens: Vice Chair Schmidt.
Vice Chair Schmidt: Thank you. Just to piggyback on what Commissioner Radcliffe said, the 18% that you’re referring to in the credits that you’re talking about, are we talking about credits towards the impacts of the EIR? How are the credits working?

Mr. Pendro: For example, the traffic at the intersections are calculated during their busiest AM and PM rush hour. They’re called peak hour. Credits are given for the TDM program that Stanford would implement that add up to 18% of those trips off their site or to their site during the AM or PM rush hour. So when you look at the tables in Chapter 7 those number of trips are subtracted from the traffic as usual calculations that are taken out of the engineering manuals.

Vice Chair Schmidt: But from the traffic calculations that you have listed on your Environmental Impact Report?

Mr. Pendro: Right. If you look in Chapter 7 there will be a row, and trip generation table, that subtracts the TDM credits. And there’s a system written into the Precise Plan of how the effectiveness of that TDM program would be monitored before additional development is allowed on the site.

Chair Borgens: Commissioner Holt.

Commissioner Holt: While we’re on the subject of traffic, I have a question you might not be able to answer. In regards to the intersections under control of Caltrans, you said that there’s an engineering solution as far as the level of service but we can’t study it because we don’t have control over implementing it?

Mr. Pendro: The EIR does provide the levels of service and defines the mitigation, but the City doesn’t have the authority to sign off on that mitigation without Caltrans.

Commissioner Holt: So we can’t say it would be mitigated to less than significant because we don’t have control over how we would mitigate it. So my question is, and this is what I don’t know if, you can answer, why wouldn’t Caltrans approve mitigation in regards to the level of service?

Mr. Pendro: Caltrans, I don’t want to speak for them, but they have a long list of projects already in the pipeline, and attempting to coordinate the effect of all of those is up to them and not up to the City.

Commissioner Holt: Got it, thank you

Mr. Pendro: Meaning the mitigations aren’t infeasible, they just need an approval from Caltrans. Caltrans would not be funding them, Stanford would.

Commissioner Holt: Right, got it, understood, thank you.

Chair Borgens: So I’d like to follow up on that question, how difficult is it to bring them to the table and have they been included in this discussion to this point?

Mr. Pendro: Caltrans is included in these discussions ongoing with the City. In fact one of the pieces of work that the City’s trying to figure out with Caltrans is down at
Woodside near the freeway, and the City and Caltrans are negotiating on what that solution would be.

Chair Borgens: So then I had another question regarding, can you explain how it works, how does applying a payment or a fee work as a mitigation? If you can't do something you can pay a fee?

Mr. Pendro: It's not actually if you can't do something you pay a fee. That example might work in your city for a parks fee, not with traffic. The payment of a fee is actually a legal issue under CEQA, meaning this: there are these terms in CEQA called nexus, or connection, and rough proportionality, which means you cannot under CEQA, it's not saying what you might negotiate with a developer, but under CEQA you cannot ask an applicant to pay for more of a mitigation than their project is causing. So, the traffic impacts where future traffic going through those intersections, we can't make the applicant pay 100% because they're not contributing 100% of the traffic, and the City engineer will have a formula that we generally describe in the EIR as 12% of the traffic coming through there will come from Stanford, they'll get charged 12% of the price for improving that intersection, just as a logical comparison.

Chair Borgens: Then I had a question for Mr. Bottomley. Could the street parking created in the parking be assigned?

Mr. Bottomley: The on street parking?

Chair Borgens: The on-street parking, sorry. Is that assigned to Stanford or is that public parking?

Mr. Bottomley: Currently there aren't any policies in the Precise Plan to limit that to Stanford, so it will be public parking.

Chair Borgens: To limit it to Stanford, okay, thank you. Any other questions This is a public hearing so at this point we will open the public hearing and I have currently two speaker cards. If anyone wants to speak on this please bring your cards up. You have three minutes to talk. There are three lights there, you'll see it go green, yellow, red, when the red light goes off I ask you to wrap up your questions. Our first speaker will be Bonnie Miller followed by Lisa Riedle.

PUBLIC HEARING

Bonnie Miller: co-chair of the Friendly Acres Neighborhood Association, Madam Chairman, Vice Chairman, members of the Planning Commission, thank you for allowing us to speak to this matter. Stanford has come to our Neighborhood Association meetings for years, at least two or three years, they're present at every meeting. We have had several issues with the property and they've addressed every single one, and we appreciate that. We do know the traffic is going to be horrendous and we're studying the plans very carefully. I had two small items come to my attention today that I think I need to bring up, and I talked to Lucy Wicks earlier, they believe they've addressed and I will research also, but I've had somebody contact me whose brother-in-law worked at Ampex. They said there was a clause in the sale and they thought the sign was supposed to be in perpetuity, or that there was a number of years, so I will do some research and I'll go to the County and look at the sale papers. I still know people from
the Martin Group I can contact also to see the sale. So that was one item. The other item and this is just an FYI that there is a time capsule in the building of Ampex behind the fountain. They couldn’t remember if it was right or left side so if they watch for that, if they start tearing down that building, because there is an Ampex time capsule they’d like to be watched for. It’s just been really nice because Stanford has been listening to us, has been caring, has been working with us all the way through. They were there at the meeting last week and I expect them to continue to do so and I believe they’ll do that. We didn’t vote to support Stanford but it’s been very positive having them at the meetings and we know they’ll continue to be there. Thank you very much.

Chair Borgens: Thank you. Lisa Riedle followed by Lorianna Kastrop.

Lisa Riedle: Good evening, my name’s Lisa Riedle and I’m a member of the Friendly Acres Neighborhood Association, and I’m here tonight in support of Stanford University Precise Plan. They have been wonderful neighbors the last few years; they have all the property there and the Stanford clinics. I think the Precise Plan is very thoughtful and the architecture is beautiful. The landscaping is just going to be beautiful. I think they’ve been very thoughtful in mitigating traffic and circulation patterns, they’re staggering work hours and work shift hours, their plans for the shuttle to Caltrain and also to connect to Redwood City downtown, the Marguerite bus system and also the on site free parking structures to accommodate their employees their clients and their customers, and this is to help that their parking won’t spill to our neighborhoods. They’ve been very thoughtful about all these things. I appreciate that their buildings will be energy efficient. I applaud that they’re going to help bring the purple pipe systems down. Also the neighborhood street enhancement program I think that will benefit these neighborhoods quite a lot. I do have one concern that was brought up with the significantly unavoidable impact to some of our intersections. I find it hard to believe that they can’t be significantly avoidable, and I urge this panel to work with Menlo Park and also Caltrans to help with these engineering solutions. In specific I’m speaking of the intersection at Rolison Road and Marsh, as the traffic exits our neighborhood going east on Marsh. We’ve had a lot of potholes historically and it was brought to my attention that that was worsened with the heavy winters. Of course we haven’t had a heavy winter this year. I believe it’s an impact with the heavy traffic flow in and out of the neighborhood. I think that the potholes have been filled multiple times during each season and this specific intersection probably needs a base road enhancement so I urge this panel to work together with these other departments and jurisdictions. I find it hard to believe this is not avoidable and thank you again.

Chair Borgens: Thank you for your comments, Ms. Riedle. Lorianna Kastrop followed by Mike Kastrop.

Lorianna Kastrop: Good evening madam Chair, Commissioners, thank you. My name is Lorianna Kastrop, I’m a resident of the Redwood Village neighborhood. I’m overall in favor of the project, I think Stanford will be a good neighbor. I wanted to point out to the Planning Commission some items that may or may not be a part of the impacts that are evaluated here. So I’ll just point them out. It was perhaps an inadvertent experiment but for a short time this year or late last year Broadway was narrowed down to one lane for a short period of time and the impact on traffic as it stands now was really horrendous. I was coming off the freeway one morning a little after 10 AM, so after rush hour, and could not complete my left hand turn onto Broadway from Woodside Road, because traffic had stopped. That road cannot be narrowed to one lane safely, so there are
impacts to some of the planned bike lanes and adjustments to Broadway and Bay, and I think that those need to be studied further. Another comment I would make is that typically people who are turning that direction, as in going on Woodside Road heading into Redwood City and then turning left to go towards the project typically turn on Broadway because it's the quickest. You avoid lights that way. If you go all the way to Bay you have to sit through the lengthy light at Broadway and then turn left onto Bay. The way Caltrans has the light sequencing right now, the light at Bay to turn left onto is ages, it's not a demand light and you never know when you're going to be able to turn left on Bay. The way they propose in the project here, in the EIR, is that the employee entrance is considered to be Bay Road but I would propose to you that nobody will take Bay Road and it will be a mess on Broadway. I don't know how you can force people to turn onto Bay and even if they did, that light is terrible. Broadway is also impacted by Summit Charter School during rush hour, so kids crossing the street slows down traffic. Lastly I would just say that it's not part of the EIR project but I'd like the Planning Commission to consider if there are too many onsite food services in this project; it will not encourage employees to patronize the downtown and the neighboring businesses so I'd ask that that be considered part of the project as well to try to minimize onsite food service. Thank you.

Chair Borgens: Thank you, Ms. Kastrop. Mike Kastrop followed by Steve Elliott.

Mike Kastrop: Good evening, madam Chair and Commissioners; my name is Mike Kastrop and I also live in Redwood Village. We work right next to Redwood Village over on Spring Street and we've seen a lot of impact from traffic with the changes at Costco. There were a lot of mitigations that happened but there are still times when you sit through three or four lights just to get across Woodside Road at this time, and of course we're adding more people. I've look through the documents and the proposal is to add 1.5 million square feet but I didn't find where it says how many people are we really adding in the neighborhood that will be working there. I think that's a number that that's important so we can anticipate what we're dealing with. Woodside Road's already been talked about, and I see that's going to be a huge problem to solve. That will be a great challenge and I'm an architect so I understand challenges. First I do want to say I'm very much in favor of this project, I welcome Stanford to the neighborhood and I think they're going to be a great neighbor, there's just a few concerns. The parking seems light, it looks like it's 3 per 1000 square feet and it seems like office space is typically 6 per 1000 square feet so is there some type of mechanism in place where 50% of the people will be taking alternative transportation? That's what Facebook has committed to doing and it's a good model to aspire to. Lorianna talked about the massing on Bay when you turn on Bay Street off of Woodside, a whole lot of thought needs to go into that to mitigate and not back up traffic onto the freeway. The other thing that I was looking at was in the plan it shows parking garages and one thing that's a little misleading is that all their sections show 5 story garage and it calls for a 6 story garage in the plan. It's a big structure right on top of Bay Road so I'd like to see a little extra effort to make it look nice. A couple other items I'd like to be addressed, one is drainage. It's a disaster out there and it really needs to be improved by the project, not creating a worse situation. And then something that rarely gets looked at is wind, and the effect of wind on the neighborhood, because you're creating quite a large mass sitting out here and it's going to change wind patterns. It's going to create swirling winds on some of the neighbors and a huge amount of wind on the freeway as well. Thank you very much.
Chair Borgens: Thank you for your comments, Mr. Kastrop. Steve Elliott followed by Joe Hanson.

Steven Elliott: Good evening, Commissioners; I'm Steve Elliott of Stanford. I just want to say we're very happy to be here tonight to hear the comments from you and the public on the EIR and the Stanford and Redwood City Precise Plan. I'd like to thank Redwood City Staff, and you, and Redwood City's consultants for helping move this project forward. Though our team, City, and the consultants have spent a considerable amount of time and resources on this project, we think our process has insured a visionary Precise Plan and thorough EIR. The Stanford and Redwood City Precise Plan provides the framework to achieve a bright, long term future for this property. The Precise Plan outlines in great detail the strict rules and guidelines that will insure that this property will be an attractive, coherent development that the City and Stanford will be proud of. As part of the Precise Plan, we will be extending recycled water to this part of the City. Also Stanford will be providing a robust shuttle and TDM program that will be a strong link just to downtown and encourage transit ridership. The dramatically increased landscaping and open space areas together with the green building and other sustainable commitments in the Precise Plan are elements that Stanford is very experienced with on our main campus. Together these elements help to make Stanford and Redwood City the kind of infill redevelopment that achieves the state's greenhouse gas emissions goals and is encouraged by proponents of smart growth. Infrastructure improvements such as extending the street grid through the property will help to weave the site into the fabric of the local community. The neighborhood streets enhancement programs and contributions towards solving the area's local flooding problems will be significant benefits the project brings to the nearby neighborhoods. Finally we are working with City Staff on bringing world class Stanford business and education programs to Redwood City that will expand the growing relationship between Stanford and Redwood City. We look forward to hearing your comments and working together with you towards the realization of Stanford and Redwood City. We're happy to answer any questions you may have. Thank you.

Chair Borgens: Thank you, Mr. Elliott. My last speaker is Joe Hanson. Is there anybody else wanting to speak? Okay, Mr. Hanson.

Joe Hanson: Good evening; I'm Joe Hanson. I'm a Redwood City resident. I am in favor of this project. The workers in San Mateo County are looking forward to building this project and I'd like to speak for them. I just had a problem with the extension of the streets. It seems to me that for a long time this area's had the Ampex facility on it and Broadway and Bay Road have been relatively clear of traffic for several blocks. Adding these extensions is going to make for horrendous traffic problems. I understand putting them in to control the building heights, that makes sense, but maybe they could be built with pedestrian walkways rather than vehicle traffic going through there because it's really bad for traffic problems right now and I can only see it getting worse with the addition of extensions. Thank you very much.

Chair Borgens: Thank you for your comments. That concludes my speaker cards. Can I get a motion to close the public hearing?

MOTION TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING
M/S: (Radcliffe/Holt)
Motion Passed: All yes.
Chair Borgens: So we’ll have questions from the Commissioners. Commissioner Bondonno.

Commissioner Bondonno: Thank you, madam Chair. A couple of things, and I’ll start with the actual Precise Plan, if I might. And by reference I’ll start on Page 23. Page 23, and whatever section it is, Item D and E there, this whole section talks about development phasing in a number of areas here. They also had leading up to this some definitions, a glossary, if you will, of the difference between new development and net new development. And in just a couple places I'd like to be really explicit to make sure that we actually have the right use of each time. So on Page 23, Item D, talks about bringing in the private open space adjacent to Spinas Park and it states that this will be done when net new development exceeds 150,000 square feet. Just the next section in E talks about the greenway phasing and it just talks about the trigger for the greenway phasing on new development. And as we go through this I want to make sure that it is in fact new development and not net new develop. That’s kind of picky on semantics but –

Ms. Riordan: On Page 17 of the Precise Plan those definitions are provided. There’s initial development, initial phase, net new development, replacement space, and new development. We will look at those to make sure they're what we meant to have happen.

Commissioner Bondonno: The others are fairly self explanatory I just wouldn't want to miss, because new and net new are obviously two different things and wouldn't want to miss something triggering something like open space later rather than earlier or vice versa, whatever we’d intended to do. So if we could make that consistent throughout the Precise Plan and the EIR, it carries over to the EIR as well. Then specifically to the publicly accessible private open space next to Spinas Park. If I can get to the right page in the Precise Plan. I’ve marked it on Page 29. Talks about the conceptual illustrations and so forth and basically development of Block A would trigger this phasing. I think it’s the second paragraph on Page 29, it could be located at either the north end or the south end, either adjacent to Broadway or Bay. That will be decided. So my question is, who will make that decision and how will we make the decision on where that will be located? To the north or to the south?

Ms. Riordan: Some of it is dependent on the leasing space right now. Right now there’s someone leasing that space, they want to keep the building there for some time, so it might wind up shifting down a little bit, and if that person relocates to another building or somewhere else on the campus it will stay where it’s show on the concept plan.

Commissioner Bondonno: I guess what I’m getting on is ultimately that will be coordination between the developer and the City and maybe a couple other people?

Ms. Riordan: Yes.

Commissioner Bondonno: Maybe we should describe that a little bit here in the Precise Plan, to state that it’s not 100% decided by the developer. The City’s involved, the City will have criteria, the City’s involved as a stakeholder, and the neighborhood for that matter, quite frankly. The City, by extension the neighborhood, and input from the community on where best to place that open space.
Ms. Riordan: Every application that comes before you will be a Planned Community Permit so you will have a chance to look at anything that’s proposed for development in each phase.

Commissioner Bondonno: So that will specifically come back to us then?

Ms. Riordan: Yes.

Commissioner Bondonno: Okay. I’ll let another Commissioner go for a while.

Chair Borgens: Commissioner Holt.

Commissioner Holt: Just because I had some questions about that same topic, so I want to piggyback because I don’t quite understand. In regards to the location of the open space. I understand there’s somebody in that building right now so it may depend, but did you just say, Maureen, that it will come back to us?

Ms. Riordan: Right now the Precise Plan is just the global guideline for the development of the campus, and each phase will come before you when we have actual buildings with actual designs and the open space would come before you to be reviewed as well, so each phase will come back to you in a development proposal.

Mr. Lyon: If I could offer an example of a project that has recently gone through this process. We had the Peninsula Park Precise Plan, which you created and adopted the zoning, in effect the Precise Plan, and you recall that project changed a little bit. It was brought back in front of you was the 1 Marina Project in which the Commission approved the Planned Community Permit, that was actually the entitlement for them to go forward with their construction drawings and things like that. A similar dynamic would occur in this instance. What you’re being asked to consider tonight is the Precise Plan which is to activate the zoning document for this particular area, and it sets the framework on the range of approvable development within that. Any subsequent project specific detail would come back and need to show consistency with this document, and you need to be able to verify those details.

Commissioner Holt: All right, thank you. So my only comment at this point in regards to, when I read that it caught my attention as well, in regards to what we are going to decide where that park would go. I don’t live in this neighborhood but if I did it seems to me the open space is better placed on Bay where it’s backing up Spinas Park. If I were going to this park and I were taking my kids to this park I’d want the open space near the park. So I appreciate that it will come back to us but my comment right now anyways is that’s the better location for it. Since I still have my light on, I have some comments as well in regards to the work that’s being done by the Historic Resource Advisory Committee. So I do appreciate that the DPR on the sign and some other documents were sent to us as well as the report that was done by Laura Jones, I believe, and I didn’t have a chance to read all of it at this point since we just got it but just for my clarification I understand that we will be getting all of the comments made by the Historic Resource Advisory Committee and the responses by staff as part of our final document that we will get prior to our next meeting. Is that correct?

Ms. Riordan: Yes, as part of the Final EIR.
Commissioner Hcil: Okay.

Ms. Ramirez: Exactly, so what will happen is the HRAC will provide their formal recommendation to the Planning Commission, the Planning Commission will then do a review and provide your recommendation to the City Council on historic resources.

Commissioner Holt: And then, I'm sorry, I forgot the name of the woman who commented about the time capsule that may be on the Ampex property. Ms. Miller, thank you. That's really neat and I hope that it's true and I would just hope that Stanford heard that as well. Depending on where we end up going with those potentially historic places on this campus that we pay special care that if there is a time capsule there that we find it and that we perhaps put it in the history room at the library or do something significant with it.

Chair Borgens: Vice chair Schmidt then Commissioner Bondonno.

Vice Chair Schmidt: Thank you madam Chair. Several questions. Let me first start by getting some definitions I did talk about but want to make sure I had it on record. Can we, can I have, we talked about this a little before but I really need that Near Term [traffic] to be defined to the public as well.

Mr. Lyon: Happy to give it a shot, and Ray if you have any further clarification on this because you were actually the author of this document, please feel free to jump in as well. There's some references in the document that talk about Near Term with Projects. One of the things we look at when we talk about Near Term is what we know that's in existence today, on the ground, part of our built environment, and projects that have been submitted to the City and are under review and entitlement process. So some of those potential [traffic] volumes we're talking about, traffic, are considered in the context of this environmental document along with the project. So it typically looks at things within a fairly near-term, to use the language that's in here. I don't know if there's a specific timeline, it varies depending on that, so I'll defer to Ray to talk about the specifics.

Mr. Pendro: The Near Term Projects are listed in a table in the Land Use Chapter 4. This was the list that the City had on file for approved projects and pending projects that had not been constructed yet. So when the notice was released that this EIR was being prepared, the City gave us that table of approved and pending projects and traffic generation from those projects was added to the existing traffic counts. The intention of this is that that list of projects would be expected to be constructed and in operation by the time a Stanford project would be completed. The other situation that we needed to examine which you'll see in the traffic chapter is called Existing Plus Projects. This is a legal requirement, regardless of whether or not it sounds logical, of adding the entire Stanford development traffic onto the existing traffic from today with no growth over the next 20 years while the Stanford project is being built. That's a legal requirement for attempting to show the distinct contribution of the Stanford project to your streets. So the list in Chapter 4, it's also in the Appendix from the City Planning Department, those are expected to be completed before the Stanford project is. The Cumulative Traffic Scenario is growth until the year 2030, it includes your General Plan, growth over those years, traffic model growth from the freeway and the County traffic model and all those things are put together for the 2030 cumulative traffic. So we try to look at what part the Stanford project will add to traffic over different segments of time.
Vice Chair Schmidt: Great, thank you, Ray. The second def there is Protected Phasing. Can you give me a def on that?

Mr. Lyon: Certainly. Protected Phasing often refers to the turning movements within an intersection. For example, if you pull up to an intersection and there’s a dedicated left turn arrow where there is a phase of the green light that gives you the opportunity to make a movement that’s free of a potential conflict as opposed to a left turn yield on green where there may be conflicting movement coming from the opposite direction. When you have a Protected Phase, your movement is free of potential conflict.

Vice Chair Schmidt: And that actually improves the anticipated delay of traffic?

Mr. Lyon: There’s opportunity to evaluate different operational demands on an intersection. Especially, for example, if you had a single lane of traffic that was unprotected and that car was basically sitting in the intersection waiting to make a left turn while the opposing traffic was coming and everyone behind it was waiting for that left turn to occur, when you have a Protected Phase often times you can clear that out. It depends on the specific geometries of those intersections and stuff. I think Ray has something.

Mr. Pendro: Just to piggyback on Blake’s comment, that’s correct. A Protected Phase means, let’s say we’re at Veterans up by the freeway there, and Whipple. There’ll be an opportunity for left turn only and it will just be the left turn green signal. That could be let’s say 15 seconds long and let through 8 cars. That’s not my engineering math, I saw Commissioner Tabing.

Chair Borgens: You have obviously not gone through that intersection.

Mr. Pendro: What I’m saying is the left turn signal would be on long enough to let through a certain amount of cars without any other cars coming that way. If it were not protected, as you’ll see what happens when you drive, meaning the opposite lane is allowed to go straight while you’re trying to turn left, you sit there. When the light turns yellow or red a handful of cars tries to scream through the intersection to get through that left turn because they didn’t have their own light to cross the intersection. So it’s intended to let more cars turn left.

Vice Chair Schmidt: I counted eight times that we were talking about Caltrans coming to the table, or preventing some stuff, or possibly preventing some items. My question to that is if, and I’m going to say six because two of them were on 101 and I’ve given up on 101, is on the level of service F, if nothing does happen, even after construction, does it remain a Level of Service (LOS) F?

Mr. Pendro: If nothing happens it would remain LOS F, that’s as low as it can go, so the variable that comes after that is how many seconds longer would you be waiting at the light. It’s called delay. So you might have LOS F with 30 seconds waiting at the light. You could then with cumulative traffic and growth over the years, it would then be LOS F but you’ll see on some tables in Traffic Chapter 7 you might be waiting, the delay might be LOS F with 90 seconds. It helps identify. It doesn’t go any lower than F, the wait gets longer.
Vice Chair Schmidt: Then in regards to one that had to do with Menlo Park, how would the talk with Menlo Park when we’re talking, yes --

Chair Borgens: Scott and Marsh [intersection].

Mr. Pendro: That negotiation would be easier. In fact, I think, I’m trying to recall this so please excuse me, I believe that same intersection came up in North Fair Oaks Plan. During the final plan discussions, I know Commissioner Schmidt you were at some of those hearings; Menlo Park has already decided to mitigate that intersection because they’re getting funds from a project near by. That came up in the hearings just last month for the North Fair Oaks Community Plan. So that’s not even a negotiation anymore. Menlo Park’s agreed to make the improvement.

Vice Chair Schmidt: On Page 2-31, when we’re talking about the emissions, and I’m just going back to a previous development we were just talking about. “Acceptable options for reducing emissions include the use of late-model engines,” I was wondering if it would be wise to define the model year of the vehicle, or if what we included in the text is ample enough to define that.

Mr. Pendro: I would say that these mitigations came from the Air Quality Management District but that doesn’t mean we can’t put more detail in them. As an example I believe we actually list model numbers and so on for the generators that will go on site. That type of detail can be added.

Vice Chair Schmidt: On page 235, when we’re talking about the childcare center, on number 3. When we’re saying consider tiered planting of trees between the childcare center and the freeway, can we require that, out of curiosity, instead of considering it?

Ms. Riordan: Trees are actually part of the Precise Plan along the freeway.

Mr. Pendro: I agree and I believe that the term consider is just in case a combination of the other items may mitigate the impact. It’s just leaving open the option of some combination of those items meeting the threshold.

Vice Chair Schmidt: Okay, and I heard from someone, we were talking about the insulation of the childcare center, noise insulation. I’m wondering if it would benefit considering getting a little creative and maybe even using sound studio type of insulation for that building instead of — I’m not too familiar with the type of insulation to help reduce noise, but the first thing that came to my mind when we were talking about the noise was sound studio insulation to really keep it out.

Mr. Pendro: What’s typically done here since the buildings have not yet been designed is to require a performance standard, meaning the measurement inside a childcare center must be below a certain decibel level. So without the architectural designs yet, basically we’re leaving that up to the engineers. They must meet the requirement. They may come up with some inventive way of doing it or they may not need some extraordinary way to solve that problem, but they do need to meet the measurement, the decibel level within the building.

Vice Chair Schmidt: My last question, Mr. Kastrop brought up a good point. That is, how many people are coming in?
Mr. Pendro: 5,200. It's listed in the Alternatives Chapter. The easiest way to compare is the table in the Alternatives Chapter, which describes numbers for the project at the top of the table and for all the alternatives. The farthest right column, I'm just picturing it, it's called service population. That means number of employees plus, in the case of the residential alternative, adding the residents onto that number. Service population is employees plus residents, and that's listed in that table. It's 5,200 for the propose project. Six hundred people on the site now, and existing building can employ approximately 1,800.

Vice Chair Schmidt: That's all I have.

Chair Borgens: Commissioner Bondonno then Commissioner Radcliffe.

Commissioner Bondonno: Thank you madam Chair. Question back in the EIR, page 5-9. The item there marked as Item 10, the Maximum Building Dimension. Talks about dimensions no greater than 250 feet along Broadway and Bay frontages and on greater than 300 feet along the side streets, so that would imply to me or infer to me that we could have a rectangular building. The rectangular nature of that would be somewhat parallel to the side streets. Yet below that, half the page down, under Item 12, the last bullet of orientation, it says the rectangular building shall be oriented parallel to Broadway and US 101. They seem to be in conflict so can someone clarify that for me?

Mr. Pendro: These are taken from the Precise Plan they match what's in the Precise Plan. The difference is the orientation bullet applies only to the feature building along the freeway.

Commissioner Bondonno: Oh just that one building?

Mr. Pendro: That bullet is underneath the number 12 which is for the feature buildings which can go higher than 75 feet, so it typically would be like the visual simulation along the freeway that shows the tallest building parallel to the freeway and not jutting in towards Broadway.

Commissioner Bondonno: Thank you for clarification.

Chair Borgens: Commissioner Radcliffe then Commissioner Tabing.

Commissioner Radcliffe: Back to our discussion on how many people will be on the site. The 5,200 is maximum because some of this, we're not sure what our total build out will be, some will be R&D which will take less people per square foot. Is that correct?

Mr. Pendro: That's correct. It used the employee generation of the highest use.

Commissioner Radcliffe: So it very well could be much less in the end.

Mr. Pendro: Yes. We always do with EIRs is we create the largest reasonable umbrella so that whichever project, if you choose an alternative or approve some project, that it still fits under this evaluation.

Commissioner Radcliffe: Thank you.
Chair Borgens: Commissioner Tabing.

Commissioner Tabing: So first off, I would like to thank the Stanford representatives here tonight for working very closely and well with our city staff and the City, but even especially so with our residents here because I think the results so far speak for themselves in terms of the support that the community has thus far provided. I was very heartened to hear that from the community. I was actually just cringing, waiting for a barrage of comments, so we're past at least that point. But again thank you representatives, and hopefully this will continue in a very open and productive manner. Did have a follow up. I know we talked about, well, we're here to look at obviously the land use issues, but as a follow up to the Caltrans issue. I don't know if this is you, Maureen, or Blake, but how does the City, and it may not be a Planning Commission topic, but is this more of a City Council with Assembly Representatives, State Senator reps type of discussion, because this is obviously a huge project with significant impacts and yet the Woodside Road corridor, we're saying which I understand for EIR purposes there's not much that we can do, but outside of the Planning Commission venue, what are the plans that the City has put in place working with the developer to help those decisions along the way, even though I know we're not going to be making those decisions here?

Mr. Lyon: We have effectively kind of a two pronged approach, and it varies a little bit, but the first of which is we're working with our local transit authority specifically on the 101/84 interchange, and we've been in meetings and consultations with them, looking at it from a San Mateo County perspective and trying to come up with some effective alternatives to the existing condition, and then working through the Transit Authority into Caltrans and get some momentum that direction. In addition to that we have our engineering staff which is part of cCmunity Development which works very directly with District 4 Office of Caltrans to help coordinate and facilitate some of these outreach efforts. We often employ traffic consultants that have a very good relationship there as well to help facilitate that process. We try to take advantage of every opportunity to increase that dialogue and continue with that effort, but as was described earlier tonight by Ray pretty effectively is they have a pretty long list of projects and various designs standards and exception processes and various things we'd have to go through to try to make some of those designs a reality. So we continue in that endeavor but it is a big process.

Chair Borgens: Any other Commissioner questions? I have a couple. To Mr. Kastrop referred to wind, creating a wind tunnel. Can you briefly touch on how we avoid that?

Mr. Pendro: I can briefly touch on that. I'm not a scientist in this field but I've read about it and we've used some explanations in other documents. Two things will help: it's the massing and the setback requirements under the Precise Plan. Specifically reduced wind tunnel effects by requiring setbacks that you'll see every certain number of stories or after certain number of feet. Terry can explain setbacks but just the concept of it, setbacks can help #1 prevent wind tunnels and #2 to let sun into the interior spaces. The second thing is, and I learned this a bit from a San Francisco job we worked on, there's a certain height relationship and 75 feet compared to the width of the streets, I just can't tell you whether or not that will create a terrific wind impact, but a 75 foot building generally would not be the trigger for wind impacts. I think San Francisco studies these when the building hits 200 feet or so. But once again I'm not a scientist on
that. I would say the setback and building placement and open space and actually the streets cutting through break up these masses intentionally to avoid shadow and wind.

Chair Borgens: And Maureen could you explain a little bit on the statement regarding the water on page 86 of the Precise Plan. It’s, “In addition it’s anticipated that the Development Agreement between the City…”

Ms. Riordan: That particular quote at the bottom of Page 86 is in conflict with what’s stated on page 66 regarding potable water, so we need to continue to work with Stanford on that particular item to work the issues out for that. So it may change when we come back next time the language in the final EIR.

Chair Borgens: I had another suggestion and keep in mind I’m not an engineer or developer. In the Precise Plan we see a lot of pictures and we see, if I can find the page, it actually shows the here and then, what is now and what potentially could be. One of the things I’d like to see is a little more clarification on being precise. It showed a little dotted outline of what the building will look like.

Mr. Lyon: Chair Borgens, I think you’re referencing the visual simulations in the EIR, which are referenced in Section 5. It’s effectively figures 5.2, 5.3.

Chair Borgens: Yes, I am, thank you. It is this one.

Mr. Pendro: We did this intentionally.

Chair Borgens: Let me just finish. My comment is, if you’re going to include those pictures then I’d like to see the road diets with that or what your lane configuration changes will be. I’m not sure it shows that here.

Mr. Pendro: No, it doesn’t.

Chair Borgens: Yeah, so if you’re going to show one, I’d like to see it complete, what you think it’s going to look like. If you’re going to implement a road diet or road change.

Mr. Pendro: I would only –

Chair Borgens: Can you just draw it out, show a slide or something?

Mr. Pendro: No.

Chair Borgens: So explain why we can’t. If we’re going to say we’re going to do it –

Mr. Pendro: It can be done.

Chair Borgens: It cannot be done?

Mr. Pendro: It can be done, at a price and an amount of time. This is a computer generated simulation based on GPS and topography, 3D models and so on. But I do understand. You’re right the road diets are not shown, but just the buildings are shown. I could say this, I don’t know if it would convince you at all – because we’re trying to show changes in buildings, we don’t want to insert other variables that would change
from the existing photo to distract from the variable you’re looking at, building massing and height.

Chair Borgens: Okay, so the purpose of this picture is just to show building massing and height?

Mr. Pendro: Right, it’s not to show the lanes for the road diet or the streetcar on Broadway, if that’s of any help to you.

Chair Borgens: I don’t like it but I understand it. I like it more complete. If you’re going to show a picture of what it can potentially be, I’d like to see what it could potentially be. I understand what you’re saying, I can do an overlay in my mind.

Mr. Pendro: We do show the trees so we did go part of the way.

Chair Borgens: Yeah, I got the trees.

Ms. Riordan: Also, you probably have seen it in the Precise Plan that shows the streets options.

Chair Borgens: You talked about the noise from the air conditioning units, and there’s a way of mitigating that, and from the garage. So that will be implemented, correct?

Mr. Pendro: Yes.

Chair Borgens: Because that garage is close to 2nd Avenue, and what was causing a buffer was part of that green space.

Mr. Pendro: Typically noise is cut in half over a certain amount of distance, so we only measured at the nearest parking structure. Meaning that –

Chair Borgens: Nearest to a neighborhood?

Mr. Pendro: Yes, the parking structure nearest to the residential area. The plan we have at this point does show that open space directly to the east, so there aren’t as many buildings blocking the noise, because that open space is show there. But there is a simple solution to this but we had to identify it because you project the noise, because the ventilation system is, I think, on the roof of the parking structure.

Chair Borgens: And then with cars going around in the garage.

Mr. Pendro: That’s right, but it would actually be the ventilation system that is a constant whir and noise, and once again the entire site is still subject to the City’s Noise Ordinance, and we just identified that parking garage as something to call attention to now because we think the level would be beyond the Noise Ordinance, unless it were baffled.

Chair Borgens: You could put a big wall up there – I’m just kidding.

Mr. Pendro: Well there are more aesthetic ways to do that.
Chair Borgens: A brick wall like the freeway, it bounces over. The question with the vibration, I brought it up earlier today, when you’re pile driving? Can you explain a little about vibration noises and damages?

Mr. Pendro: I’ll do it this way. I’ve never had an EIR where pile driving was able to create structural damage to a nearby building. The building has to be practically dilapidated for it to be damaged by pile driving. It’s during construction. If pile driving is needed here the basic way you do it is generally you drill a hole in the ground before you start pounding in it, and there area, again, blankets and buffers for that work. It’s even more, obviously, more temporary than construction, it’s only done for a few days until you plant this piles that hold up buildings.

Chair Borgens: Commissioner Schmidt.

Vice Chair Schmidt: Yeah, something just came to my mind and I’m going to ask. In regards to the parking structure, is there going to be any infrastructure for electric vehicles, out of curiosity?

Mr. Pendro: I will tell you that the EIR does not call that out but I’m speculating, there is a list of sustainability measures in the EIR, in Chapter 3 that Stanford is guaranteeing as part of the project, and I would check if electrical cars, plug-ins are there. Would Steve know? Steven Elliott? I’ll check my table in Chapter 3 and see if it’s listed.

Mr. Elliott: I don’t think that particular item was listed per se but it’s certainly becoming more and more popular and would certainly be something to look at.

Vice Chair Schmidt: And I think of that because Tesla Motors is on your site out there.

Mr. Elliott: A lot of new construction has plug-ins for electric vehicles so it’s becoming more and more common.

Vice Chair Schmidt: And I’m going to piggyback on Commissioner Tabing’s statement. I really, really appreciate the level of partnership that you guys have, Stanford, has been doing since this project began. From a couple of the comments that I heard that I didn’t hear partners, I heard good neighbors. I really, really appreciated that, and look forward to that relationship developing even further. So thank you for that.

Mr. Pendro: I wanted to clarify one item about the on site population. We used the 5,200 as a worst-case scenario for greenhouse gas, air pollution emissions, and traffic. The way Stanford has structured, you can see in the EIR there are different combos of land uses that are permitted and that range will go from 4,500 to 6,000. There’s a range but for the calculations we took the middle point for greenhouse gasses and air pollution if that clarifies anything. You’ll see in other places there’s a range from 4,500 to 6,000.

Chair Borgens: So why would you not have just gone to the max, I’m just curious.

Mr. Pendro: Because, you need to be feasible and reasonable, two words used in CEQA. So we used the middle point. I can’t tell you exactly, like some calculation reason for it. Just that we used the number that’s larger than the minimum and smaller than the maximum. For example, it’s possible that the project would have entirely office
space, but the other alternatives include partial office space, partial medical clinic, partial R&D and that was the direction the project is taking based on Zoning and General Plan.

Mr. Lyon: Chair Borgens, if I might, one thing we can do, and this was mentioned earlier, if there are specifics that need to be followed up in the EIR we can respond to that as well, so if we need to reevaluate that we can do that as well.

Vice Chair Schmidt: So I'm going to echo a statement that Commissioner Raddiffe had made at one of the last, when we had this last meeting on Stanford, when I hear those numbers, and I also heard one of the public say it as well, I understand that you're going to need to have your own cafeterias and stuff to manage, so people can quickly get their lunch. When I hear those numbers I'm thinking, I hope we definitely have something that enables those employees to come to downtown and frequent our establishments for dining or shopping as well, if that's the case but especially for the lunches.

Chair Borgens: Any other questions? Okay, that concludes our discussion regarding this: we look forward as it moves through its process. We have a tabled timeline set out for us. I see nothing else on our agenda.

6. MATTERS OF COMMISSION INTEREST:

Mr. Lyon: I have two items for your reference, or point of interest. I try to give you a heads up of what to expect in the next month. I believe it's March 6th we have tentatively scheduled a plan development permit for 1410 Vallota, it's a single-family home on a fairly large site that is being subdivided into five single family homes, so we'll bring that forward for your consideration. Later in the month you all remember that we have the training we'll be attending March 20th, 21st, 22nd and I believe it's the 20th we also have an item for you which is the CWG annual reporting program, so we have that for you as well. And I have to confirm those dates but if my memory serves me correctly.

Chair Borgens: Do we have an agenda at all for that training? Do we have anywhere we can go and look?

Mr. Lyon: We will be providing you and having our administrative staff get everybody signed up for that and give you the specifics as to the location and what training options are available for you to attend to go through that. We'll be doing that probably in the next week to two weeks. That's it.

7. MOTION TO ADJOURN:
M/S (Schmidt/Holt) to adjourn the meeting at 8:42PM
Motion passed: All yes.
PC 1  Traffic and Air Quality--Commissioner Radcliffe--Do the traffic and air quality impacts identified in the EIR take into account the trend to be more bike friendly, mass transit friendly, and shuttle friendly?

Response: Please see the response in the accompanying Planning Commission meeting transcript.

PC 2  Traffic--Commissioner Radcliffe--Is the influence of the potential streetcar accounted for in the EIR?

Response: Please see the response in the accompanying Planning Commission meeting transcript.

PC 3  Traffic--Vice Chair Schmidt--How do the traffic credits work in the EIR analysis?

Response: Please see the response in the accompanying Planning Commission meeting transcript. The table referred to in the response is Draft EIR Table 7.10 (Project Trip Generation).

PC 4  Traffic--Commissioner Holt--For those intersections studied in the EIR that are under Caltrans control, why wouldn't Caltrans approve mitigation?

Response: Please see the response in the accompanying Planning Commission meeting transcript. Portions of the transcript response are clarified as follows. The Draft EIR intersection mitigations that require Caltrans approval are Mitigations 7-1, 7-2, 7-5 (same as 7-1), 7-6 (same as 7-2), 7-12, 7-13, and 7-14. The applicant is required to fully fund Mitigations 7-1, 7-2, 7-5, and 7-6. Mitigations 7-12, 7-13, and 7-14 are either currently on, or are planned for addition to, the City's Traffic Impact Fee (TIF) Projects List. Accordingly, the applicant's payment of the updated TIF (or fair share if not on the TIF) would satisfy its mitigation obligations for these three intersections. These mitigations are detailed in Draft EIR chapter 7 (Transportation, Circulation, and Parking) and on revised page 7-57 in section 3 (Draft EIR Revisions) of this Final EIR.

PC 5  Traffic--Chair Borgens--Has Caltrans been included in the intersection mitigation discussion?

Response: Please see the response in the accompanying Planning Commission meeting transcript.

PC 6  Traffic--Chair Borgens--How does applying a payment or a fee work as a mitigation?

Response: Please see the response in the accompanying Planning Commission meeting transcript. The payment of fees constitutes adequate mitigation under CEQA if the agency collecting the fees (here, the City) has a reasonable plan to use the fees to accomplish the mitigation. Redwood City has a Traffic Impact Fee (TIF) program in which the City collects fees from developers and uses the resulting fund
to implement transportation improvements the City has specified. In the case of the Stanford in Redwood City project, the Draft EIR shows that the following traffic mitigation measures would be implemented either through the established TIF program or through the collection of fair share payments from developers:

- Veterans/Woodside (Mitigation 7-12),
- Woodside/Bay (Mitigation 7-13),
- Woodside/Middlefield (Mitigation 7-14),
- Douglas/Bay (Mitigation 7-15),
- Douglas/Middlefield (Mitigation 7-16),
- 2nd Avenue/Broadway (Mitigation 7-17), and
- Marsh/Scott (Mitigation 7-18).

The applicant would fully fund and construct the other intersection improvements identified in the EIR, as follows:

- Woodside/Broadway (Mitigations 7-1 and 7-5),
- Woodside/Bay (Mitigations 7-2 and 7-6),
- Charter/Broadway (Mitigations 7-3 and 7-7),
- Douglas/Broadway (Mitigations 7-4 and 7-9),
- Charter/Bay (Mitigation 7-8 [a or b]), and
- 5th Avenue/Bay (Mitigation 7-10 [a or b]).

PC 7 Parking--Chair Borgens--Is the project’s on-street parking assigned to Stanford or is that public parking?

Response: Please see the response in the accompanying Planning Commission meeting transcript.

PC 8 Historic Resources--Bonnie Miller, Co-Chair of the Friendly Acres Neighborhood Association--Ms. Miller has heard that the Ampex sign was required to remain in perpetuity as a condition of sale of the property and will research that issue.

Response: Please see the response to comment HR 2 above.

PC 9 Historic Resources--Bonnie Miller, Co-Chair of the Friendly Acres Neighborhood Association--There is an Ampex time capsule behind the fountain.

Response: Neither City staff nor the EIR consultants are aware of documented evidence of the existence or location of a time capsule. Stanford has confirmed that a marker for an underground time capsule exists on the project site and identifies the location of the Ampex time capsule. Stanford has offered to Ampex that it can retrieve the time capsule, and Ampex has indicated that it plans to do so prior to construction activities that might disturb the time capsule.

PC 10 Traffic--Lisa Riedle, Friendly Acres Neighborhood Association Member--Ms. Riedle expressed concern regarding the significant unavoidable intersection impacts identified in the EIR. She also noted the intersection of Rolison and Marsh, including potholes resulting from heavy traffic.
Response: Technically, there is no intersection at Rolison and Marsh; the commenter may be referring to the "elbow" where Rolison meets Marsh, or to where the frontage road meets Marsh. Traffic to and from the project on Rolison was assigned to the signalized intersection of Marsh Road/Scott Drive. This is intersection #22 in Draft EIR chapter 7 (Transportation, Circulation, and Parking). A significant project impact with mitigation is identified in Draft EIR chapter 7 for the Marsh Road/Scott Drive intersection (Impact/Mitigation 7-18).

The comment regarding potholes pertains to a perceived existing maintenance issue, not to the content or adequacy of the Draft EIR.

PC 11 Traffic--Lorianna Kastrop, Redwood Village resident--Ms. Kastrop described her negative driving experiences in the project vicinity and suggested that Broadway not be narrowed to one lane in each direction.

Response: By approving the Precise Plan, the City is not approving a roadway configuration for Broadway. Any changes in the roadway configuration for Broadway would be considered as a separate action, independent from approval of the Precise Plan. In instances where the Precise Plan outlines alternatives that may be implemented by the City, such as implementation of a road diet for Broadway or other Precise Plan area street, the City retains discretion to select the alternative that best achieves the goals and objectives of the Precise Plan. To the extent that the selection of the alternative is subject to additional environmental review pursuant to the EIR or Precise Plan, the applicant shall be obligated to fund the costs of such additional environmental review.

PC 12 Project Description--Lorianna Kastrop, Redwood Village resident--The Planning Commission should consider if there are too many on-site food services in the project, which would discourage employees from patronizing local restaurants.

Response: The comment pertains to the Precise Plan, not to the content or adequacy of the Draft EIR. Consistent with the Precise Plan’s level of detail and intentional flexibility, the Plan does not specify the amount or type of any on-site food services. This level of detail would be considered as individual applications are submitted under the Precise Plan and the long-range mix of land uses is continually evaluated and monitored.

PC 13 Traffic--Mike Kastrop, Redwood Village resident--Mr. Kastrop described his negative driving experiences near the Costco store. How many people will the project add to the neighborhood?

Response: In several chapters, the Draft EIR states a range of approximately 4,500 to 6,000 total employees on the development site at Precise Plan buildout, for a net increase of approximately 3,900 to 5,400 employees over existing conditions (e.g., see chapter 6--Population, Housing, and Employment). It is noted that trip generation estimates and traffic analyses are not directly related to the number of employees on a site. Such data is most closely related to the types and amounts of land uses on a site. As one example, retail stores generate more trips due to customers than employees, and medical clinics generate more trips due to patients.
than employees. See the traffic analysis methodology described in Draft EIR section 7.1 (Transportation, Circulation, and Parking--Methodology).

PC 14 Parking--Mike Kastrop, Redwood Village resident--The project does not seem to provide enough parking.

Response: Draft EIR subsection 7.4.7(e) (Transportation, Circulation, and Parking--Other Transportation Issues--Parking) provides a comprehensive, quantitative analysis of projected parking conditions in the Precise Plan area. The analysis concludes that the project on-site parking supply would be adequate.

PC 15 Parking--Mike Kastrop, Redwood Village resident--The parking garage section illustrations show 5-story structures, but the Precise Plan calls for 6-story garages.

Response: The comment pertains to the content of the Precise Plan, not the content or adequacy of the Draft EIR. The heights of the parking structures in the Precise Plan section illustrations (pages 54 through 59) are correct, but the sections inadvertently do not show vehicles parked on the top-most level. The illustrations in the Precise Plan document will be revised; the revision does not affect any other Precise Plan content.

PC 16 Drainage--Mike Kastrop, Redwood Village resident--Existing drainage conditions need to be improved by the project.

Response: The proposed Precise Plan would not degrade drainage conditions in the Plan area or in the vicinity. Please see Draft EIR section 10.3 (Storm Drainage and Water Quality), especially Impact/Mitigation 10-3, which mandates no increase in off-site flooding compared to existing conditions. In reference to existing drainage conditions in the project vicinity, under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), it is illegal for EIR mitigation to require a project to mitigate impacts that are not caused by the project. Please see comment and response PC 6 in the Planning Commission transcript for an explanation of this “nexus/rough proportionality” CEQA requirement, which is codified in CEQA Guidelines section 15126.4(a)(4).

PC 17 Wind--Mike Kastrop, Redwood Village resident--The project will create swirling wind on some of the neighbors and a huge amount of wind on the freeway as well.

Response: Please see the response in the accompanying Planning Commission meeting transcript. The transcript information is supplemented with the following response.

The EIR consultant researched the City and County of San Francisco environmental policies on wind. As one example, the Candlestick Point-Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II Development Plan EIR (November 2009, Planning Department Case No. 2007.0946E) includes a section on wind. The Candlestick Point EIR notes, “The impact of wind funnelling can often be reduced by the presence of tall, bushy trees along streets susceptible to wind to force the wind to stay above street level.” (page III.G-3) In addition, the EIR notes, “Buildings that have an unusual shape, rounded faces, or utilize setbacks have a less noticeable wind effect. A general rule is that the more complex the building is geometrically, the less noticeable the probable wind
impact at ground level.” (page III.G-5) As well, “It is generally understood...from many prior wind-tunnel tests on a variety of projects in San Francisco that most, if not all, buildings under 100 feet do not result in adverse wind effects at street level, barring unusual circumstances.” (page III.G-6) Therefore, the Candlestick Point EIR requires any building over 100 feet in height to undergo wind testing to check if the building would cause a 26 mile-per-hour-equivalent wind speed for a single hour of the year (San Francisco’s wind impact threshold). (page III.G-7)

Potential mitigations identified in the Candlestick Park EIR for buildings over 100 feet in height—if wind testing results in exceedance of the City’s adopted wind threshold—include a minimum 15-foot setback from street edges, placement of awnings on building frontages, street and frontage plantings, articulation of building facades, or the use of a variety of architectural materials. (page III.G-8) Even if the City of Redwood City had adopted wind policies similar to San Francisco’s, the Stanford in Redwood City Precise Plan already incorporates the components described above, even for buildings of less than 100 feet in height.

PC 18 General--Steve Elliott, Stanford University--Mr. Elliott described components of the Precise Plan.

Response: The comments are consistent with information in the Draft EIR. No additional response is necessary.

PC 19 Traffic--Joe Hanson, Redwood City resident--The project-proposed street extensions will create horrendous traffic problems.

Response: Draft EIR chapter 7 (Transportation, Circulation, and Parking) provides a comprehensive transportation analysis of the Precise Plan, including the proposed extensions of Barron, Warrington, and Hurlingame Avenues through the Precise Plan area. Hurlingame would be designed as either a roadway extension or a pedestrian paseo. Precise Plan implementation would result in traffic impacts as described in Draft EIR chapter 7. With or without the proposed roadway extensions, the proposed project would add traffic volumes to streets in the project vicinity, and mitigations would be required to reduce significant traffic impacts.

As noted in Draft EIR subsection 7.4.4 (Neighborhood Traffic), “All of the residential streets in the vicinity are operating, and would continue to operate, within their physical capacities with buildout under the Precise Plan.” Although no significant impact on residential streets has been identified, “Stanford University has proposed a Neighborhood Streets Enhancement Program (NSEP), described in subsection 3.4.7 of [the] EIR, to help address the livability of residential streets in the Friendly Acres, Redwood Village, and North Fair Oaks neighborhoods.”

The street extensions are consistent with City General Plan policies requiring small block patterns, public streets, extensions of the urban fabric, and other related urban design and planning components. See Draft EIR chapter 16 (Project Consistency With Local and Regional Plans).

PC 20 Project Description--Commissioner Bondonno--The commissioner expressed concerns regarding the meaning of specific terms used in the Precise Plan (e.g.,
“new development,” “net new development”). He also requested additional information regarding the potential location of the proposed publicly accessible open space.

**Response:** Please see the response in the accompanying Planning Commission transcript. The transcript information is supplemented with the following response. The Draft EIR distinguishes between “total square footage,” which is additive, and “net new square footage,” which first subtracts the existing approximately 537,000 square feet of building space currently on the project development site. In the Draft EIR, this distinction is necessary because under CEQA the baseline for evaluating environmental impacts must be the existing environment (“what is on the ground now”), and the project development site currently includes approximately 537,000 square feet of building space as a baseline. The terms are used consistently throughout the Draft EIR.

**PC 21**  
Open Space--Commissioner Holt--Will the Planning Commission be involved in deciding where the publicly accessible open space will be located?

**Response:** Please see the response in the accompanying Planning Commission transcript. The Draft EIR is consistent with the response from City staff. As one example, the Draft EIR Introduction (section 1.1) explains, “The Precise Plan is a zoning document with goals, policies, development standards, and urban design guidelines rather than a development blueprint. For example, the conceptual site plan referred to throughout the EIR...is but one possible example of a site plan that is consistent with the contents of the Precise Plan document; other site plans could be realized on the Precise Plan development site. The project being analyzed in this EIR, therefore, is the Stanford in Redwood City Precise Plan document and its potential implementation, not any particular site plan that may result.”

**PC 22**  
Historic Resources--Commissioner Holt--Will the Planning Commission receive the HRAC’s comments on the Draft EIR and the staff’s responses to those comments?

**Response:** Please see comments and responses HR 1 and HR 2 of this Final EIR. The HRAC did not have any comments specific to the content or adequacy of the Draft EIR, but it did recommend that the three separate resources related to the former Ampex campus (425 Broadway, the Warnecke plaza and fountain, and the Ampex sign) be identified as eligible for local listing as historic resources. In response to the recommendation by the HRAC, the Laura Jones and Julie Cain report entitled Cultural Resources Survey and Evaluation for the Stanford in Redwood City Project dated January 12, 2009, as well as the Primary Record on the Ampex sign dated February 29, 2009, and the Continuation Sheet dated May 18, 2009, have been included in appendix C of this Final EIR (available on the City’s website at www.redwoodcity.org under “Hot Topics”).

**PC 23**  
Historic Resources--Commissioner Holt--Referring to an earlier comment, the Commissioner noted that, if one exists, the on-site time capsule should be located and displayed.

**Response:** Please see the response to comment PC 9 above.
PC 24  Traffic--Vice Chair Schmidt--Please define the term “Near Term” traffic as used in the EIR.

Response: Please see the response in the accompanying Planning Commission meeting transcript. Draft EIR chapter 7 (Transportation, Circulation, and Parking), especially beginning at subsection 7.1.3 (Roadway System Analysis Scenarios), provides a comprehensive explanation.

PC 25  Traffic--Vice Chair Schmidt--Please define the term “protected phasing” as used in the EIR.

Response: Please see the response in the accompanying Planning Commission meeting transcript. The term “protected phasing” is used in Draft EIR chapter 7 (Transportation, Circulation, and Parking), almost exclusively in the mitigations (i.e., the numbered mitigation boxes).

PC 26  Traffic--Vice Chair Schmidt--The commissioner requested clarification on the meaning of “LOS F” (traffic Level of Service F).

Response: Please see the response in the accompanying Planning Commission meeting transcript. Also see Tables 7.1 (Signalized Intersection Level of Service [LOS] Definitions) and 7.2 (Unsignalized Intersection Level of Service Definitions) on Draft EIR page 7-6.

PC 27  Traffic--Vice Chair Schmidt--The mitigation required for the intersection of Scott and Marsh would require approval from the City of Menlo Park. How would that be accomplished?

Response: In the response at the Planning Commission meeting, the EIR consultant inadvertently misidentified the intersection referred to in the North Fair Oaks Community Plan EIR. The Menlo Park intersection discussed in that EIR is Marsh and Florence. The Menlo Park intersection alluded to in the comment, and discussed in the Stanford in Redwood City Precise Plan Draft EIR, is Marsh and Scott. Please see Draft EIR Impact and Mitigation 7-18 (Cumulative With Project Impact on Marsh Road/Scott Drive Intersection). The recommended mitigation is a restriping of existing pavement, not the construction of new roadway.

The mitigation process would be a collaborative effort between Menlo Park staff and Redwood City staff. If and when the City of Menlo Park restripes the intersection, the Precise Plan developer would contribute approximately 16 percent of the funds to implement that improvement. Based on the Draft EIR sensitivity analysis (see subsection 7.4.6), this mitigation would need to be completed before Precise Plan total development exceeds 893,810 square feet in order for the restriping to mitigate the project’s contribution to the cumulative impact at the Marsh Road/Scott Drive intersection.

PC 28  Air Quality--Vice Chair Schmidt--Can the model year of “late-model engines” for construction equipment be specified (see EIR Mitigation 8-1)?
Response: Please see the response in the accompanying Planning Commission meeting transcript. The transcript information is supplemented with the following response. Draft EIR Mitigation 8-1--items 6, 7, 17, 18, and 20 through 23--describe the specifications and performance standards that construction engines must meet. Prior to construction periods, the project developer would provide documentation to the City showing that engines used in construction equipment meet the specifications and performance standards described in the Draft EIR. The applicant would also provide such information to BAAQMD and consult with BAAQMD staff if requested.

PC 29  Air Quality--Vice Chair Schmidt--Can “tiered planting of trees between the child care center and the freeway” be required instead of considered (see EIR Mitigation 8-3)?

Response: Please see the response in the accompanying Planning Commission meeting transcript.

PC 30  Noise--Vice Chair Schmidt--Can sound studio insulation be used for the child care center?

Response: Please see the response in the accompanying Planning Commission meeting transcript. The noise reduction performance standards are identified throughout Draft EIR chapter 13 (Noise).

PC 31  Employment--Vice Chair Schmidt--How many people will the Precise Plan bring into the area?

Response: Please see the response in the accompanying Planning Commission meeting transcript. The transcript information is clarified with the following response. In several chapters, the Draft EIR states a range of approximately 4,500 to 6,000 total employees on the development site at Precise Plan buildout, for a net increase of approximately 3,900 to 5,400 employees over existing conditions (e.g., see chapter 6--Population, Housing, and Employment). The approximate employee number of 5,000 identified at the Planning Commission meeting was taken from Draft EIR Table 18.1 (the actual number listed is 5,250) and is the midpoint between the range of 4,500 to 6,000.

PC 32  Project Description--Commissioner Bondonno--The commissioner requested a clarification regarding “Maximum Building Dimension” and building orientation.

Response: Please see the response in the accompanying Planning Commission meeting transcript. The transcript information is supplemented by the following response. As defined in the Precise Plan (page 5-9, chapter 5--Aesthetics), a feature building is any building over 75 feet in height in the Precise Plan area. The Precise Plan allows one building in each of Blocks B, C, and E to be over 75 feet in height, for a potential total of three feature buildings in the Precise Plan area. Any rectangular feature building must be oriented parallel to Broadway and US 101; a rectangular feature building would not be permitted to be oriented toward the proposed campus greenway (down a side street) or to be oriented at an oblique angle to Broadway or US 101. Draft EIR Figure 5.2 (visual simulation) illustrates an example of this Precise Plan standard.
PC 33  Employment--Commissioner Radcliffe--The commissioner requested clarification on how the number of project employees was forecast.

Response: Please see the response in the accompanying Planning Commission meeting transcript. Also, see the response to comment PC 31 above and the more detailed explanation of potential employment under the Precise Plan in response to Chair Borgen's comment in PC 41 below.

PC 34  Traffic--Commissioner Tabing--What plans has the City put in place to mitigate impacts that require Caltrans approval?

Response: Please see the response in the accompanying Planning Commission meeting transcript.

PC 35  Wind--Chair Borgens--Referring to an earlier comment, the commissioner requested information regarding wind tunnel effects.

Response: Please see the response in the accompanying Planning Commission meeting transcript. The transcript information is clarified by the response to comment PC 17 above.

PC 36  Water--Chair Borgens--The commissioner requested a clarification regarding water availability as described in the Precise Plan.

Response: Please see the response in the accompanying Planning Commission meeting transcript. The comment pertains to Precise Plan content. The information in Draft EIR section 10.1 (Water) remains accurate.

PC 37  Visual Simulations--Chair Borgens--Can the visual simulations depict the road diet along Broadway?

Response: Please see the response in the accompanying Planning Commission meeting transcript. The transcript information is supplemented by the following response. The Draft EIR visual simulations depict conceptual design components proposed by Stanford University, including new buildings and landscaping. In order to focus on potential building height and massing (including the visual effect of landscaping on those variables), potential street configurations under the Precise Plan are not simulated. Precise Plan chapter II (Development Standards & Urban Design Guidelines) contains illustrations of potential street configurations. Please also see the response to comment P 11 above.

PC 38  Noise--Chair Borgens--The commissioner requested clarification regarding noise mitigation for the parking garage nearest the Friendly Acres residential neighborhood.

Response: Please see the response in the accompanying Planning Commission meeting transcript. The issue of potential noise from the parking structure ventilation system is discussed in Draft EIR chapter 13 (Noise), Impact/Mitigation 13-4. In addition, the Precise Plan area and its activities will continue to be subject to Chapter 24 (Noise Regulations) of the Redwood City Municipal Code and the Noise chapter.
of the Redwood City General Plan (see Draft EIR section 13.2, Regulatory Setting) as these codes/policies are amended from time to time. The impact of noise from the parking structure would be less-than-significant with mitigation. Also see the upcoming response to comment L 3.06.

PC 39  Vibration--Chair Borgens--The commissioner requested clarification regarding construction vibration.

Response: Please see the response in the accompanying Planning Commission meeting transcript. The issue of construction vibration is discussed in Draft EIR chapter 13 (Noise), Impact/Mitigation 13-3. The impact of construction vibration levels would be less-than-significant with mitigation.

PC 40  Electric Vehicles--Commissioner Schmidt--Will there be infrastructure in the parking garages for electric vehicles?

Response: The comment pertains to the Precise Plan, not to the content or adequacy of the Draft EIR. The City can consider a requirement for electric vehicle parking as a condition of project approval.

The technology used for electric vehicle charging has changed over time, and likely will continue to change. These changes affect both the type and the quantity of charging stations needed to accommodate electric vehicle use. Stanford reports that it has more than 20,000 parking spaces on the Stanford University campus, and has installed six new J1722 electric vehicle charging units (240 volts) at three locations (replacing the older electric vehicle charging units) to accommodate the new generation of electric vehicles. Stanford also plans to install a limited number of additional units as part of a pilot effort to provide additional electric vehicle charging options. However, Stanford does not anticipate installing electric charging stations for every worker who commutes using an electric vehicle. With the average commuter living 17 miles from campus, it is feasible to make a round trip without charging on campus.

Stanford also is investigating the future possibility of providing Level 3 charging (480 volts), which could charge vehicles in 25 to 30 minutes. These units are not readily available yet, nor are most electric vehicles equipped to handle this fast-charging approach. However, once these units become common, they may provide capacity to charge a greater number of vehicles with a single charging station than can be accomplished today.

Stanford intends to continue to assess the needs of workers at the Redwood City campus, evaluate the results of its pilot program, and respond to technological developments, as it implements the Stanford in Redwood City project.

PC 41  Employment--Chair Borgens--The commissioner requested clarification on the forecasted number of project employees.

Response: Please see the response in the accompanying Planning Commission meeting transcript. The transcript information is clarified by the following response. The 5,250 total employee number was used in the Draft EIR only for the greenhouse
gas (GHG) emissions per capita/service population ratio (emissions per employee) (see Draft EIR chapter 9, Climate Change). It is noted that trip generation estimates (which account for the vast majority of GHG emissions) are not directly related to the number of employees on a site. Such data is most closely related to the types and amounts of land uses on a site. As one example, retail stores generate more trips due to customers than employees, and medical clinics generate more trips due to patients than employees. See the traffic analysis methodology described in Draft EIR section 7.1 (Transportation, Circulation, and Parking--Methodology). Likewise, GHG emissions calculations for electricity, natural gas, and water usage, and wastewater generation, are based on similar criteria, not on the number of employees (see Draft EIR Table 9.2, Greenhouse Gas Emissions Scenarios, 2020 and 2030). Therefore, GHG emissions are calculated using the same worst-case project scenario identified throughout the Draft EIR.

The midpoint for the total number of projected employees was considered the most reasonable number for the GHG ratio (emissions per service population). In its recommended methodology for assessing GHG emissions, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) instructs that the project-related GHG emissions should be divided by the number of employees at the project site. As explained in the prior paragraph, the project-related GHG emissions for this project were calculated using building square footage and uses, rather than based on employee counts. The metrics used for such analyses tend to be conservative, and are unlikely to represent the low end of the employment range identified in the EIR. This means that if one were to divide a conservative emissions calculation (based upon relatively high employee trip counts, water use, and energy demand) by the low end of the potential range of employees on the site, the resulting ratio could substantially overstate greenhouse gases per employee. If one were to divide the emissions calculation by the high end of the potential range of employees on site, the resulting ratio could understate greenhouse gases per employee. The EIR authors and City staff decided that the best approach would be to divide the emissions calculation by the midpoint of the potential range of employees on site. Using this approach, based upon the range of employment identified in the EIR, the resulting ratio is more likely to overstate than understate the ratio of greenhouse gases per employee. Therefore, it is a reasonable but still conservative methodology.

PC 42 Project Description--Vice Chair Schmidt--Referring to an earlier comment, the commissioner noted that hopefully the project employees would be able to patronize Downtown restaurants and shops.

Response: The comment pertains to a potential outcome of the Precise Plan. Related to facilitating employee visits to Downtown Redwood City, Precise Plan implementation would include shuttle service from the Precise Plan area to Downtown Redwood City, as well as new bike amenities (bike storage, showers) and improvements to on-street bicycle facilities. Also, the City’s adopted Downtown Precise Plan will provide housing within walking distance of the Precise Plan area.
2.4 RESPONSES TO WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE DRAFT EIR PUBLIC REVIEW PERIOD

The following section includes copies of all letters and emails received during the Draft EIR public review period, each followed by a written response to each comment on the content or adequacy of the Draft EIR or on a substantive environmental point. The comments and responses are correlated by code numbers added to the right margin of each letter and email.
Maureen Riordan
Senior Planner
Planning & Housing Services
City of Redwood City
1017 Middlefield Rd.
Redwood City, CA

Draft EIR for Stanford Development

As an environmental manager in business during the past twenty years, I have reviewed numerous EIR’s. For the Stanford development proposal, I have reviewed the Draft EIR and attended numerous public meetings.

My review of this proposal and of the Draft EIR leads me to the conclusion that when the EIR and mitigations are completed, this development will fit into the neighborhood, and the local community will accept it.

To me the key issue is traffic. I reviewed the significant impacts and proposed mitigations related to the Woodside Road intersections, the local intersections, and the Highway 101 intersection. I was pleased to see that the proposed mitigations will be able to address the impacts.

Stanford will need to work hard with the state agencies who need to approve changes affecting roads within their jurisdiction. But, overall, I believe that the project can successfully be built while keeping that neighborhood and city streets whole.

I was also pleased to see that the project’s Precise Plan is consistent with both the city’s General Plan and zoning ordinance.

I recommend that the Planning Commission approve the EIR.

Thank you.

Clem Molony
Environment & Safety Manager
Lyngso Garden Materials, Inc.
L 1 Clem Molony, Environmental & Safety Manager, Lyngso Garden Materials, Inc.; February 15, 2012 (1 page)

L 1.01 General Support for Draft EIR--The commenter concludes that traffic is the key environmental issue and recognizes that traffic mitigations are available if approved by State agencies. The commenter recommends approval of the Draft EIR.

Response: The comment is acknowledged; no additional response is necessary.
Ms. Maureen Riordan  
Senior Planner  
City of Redwood City  
Planning Services  
P.O. Box 391  
Redwood City, CA 94064-0391  

Re: Stanford in Redwood City Precise Plan, Chapter 7 Transportation Only-Review Comments  

Dear Ms. Riordan:  

Thank you for the opportunity to review chapter 7 of the EIR for Stanford in Redwood City Precise Plan. The following summarizes the San Mateo County Department of Public Works' concerns relating to the proposal:  

1- **Parking**: The EIR proposes that parking be removed from all 4 legs of Charter Street and Broadway and also Charter Street and Bay Road (50 spaces each leg) to mitigate congestion at these intersections. Has there been any analysis performed on how removal of parking will impact businesses along this area? If so, what mitigation plans are proposed to relieve any parking issues businesses may experience in this area?  

2- **Under Cumulative Conditions**: There are some intersections that will need to be signalized in the future to allow for acceptable levels of service. The EIR has determined percent fair shares that are to be contributed by the developer to the City to address the issue at the time of permit issuance. What is the City's timeline for installing these signals? What strategies does the City plan to implement for the time period of unacceptable levels of service after the development prior to installation of signals?  

These intersections and developments % contribution to signal are as follows:  

- Douglas Avenue and Bay Road at 87%  
- Douglas Avenue and Middlefield Road at 23%  

3- **Under Cumulative Conditions**: The intersection of Hurlingame Avenue and Middlefield Road is predicted to function at a level of service of F with 101 seconds of delay. However, since it does not meet signal warrants, the EIR assumes the project to have no significant impact at this intersection. Under existing conditions this intersection functions at LOS C, and by definition, this qualifies as significant impact. Even if the intersection does not meet traffic signal warrants, it is unacceptable to
allow the level of service to deteriorate to LOS F from a C. Please indicate your solution for maintaining an acceptable level of service.

4- **Under Near Term Conditions:** Similar to item #2 above, the intersection of Charter Street and Bay Road will meet signal warrants during the near term conditions and the EIR assigns 41% of the cost to this development. What entity will fund the remaining 59% and what is the timeline for the installation of the signal? What are the mitigation plans for the time period of unacceptable levels of service after the development prior to installation of signals?

5- **Roundabouts:** As part of mitigation for the intersections that will meet traffic signal warrants, the EIR suggests that the feasibility of roundabouts will be evaluated. Have the City performed a capacity analysis for these roundabouts to ensure that an acceptable LOS will be achieved? If so, the County would appreciate the opportunity to review and comment on the results prior to City approval.

6- **Construction Traffic:** The County would like to review the construction traffic plan once available. Construction traffic and parking can have adverse impact on our roadway system and we would like the opportunity to address these impacts before they become major issues.

We look forward to your response to our questions. If you need clarification regarding any of the issues being brought to your attention please contact Hanieh Houshmandi, Associate Civil Engineer, at 650-599-1481. Thank you for providing us the opportunity to comment. We look forward to working together towards the completion of a regionally successful project.

Very truly yours,

James C. Porter, PE
Director of Public Works

JCP:JAL:DYS:HH:sdd
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cc: Joseph A. Lo Coco, Deputy Director, Road Services
Diana Shu, Road Operation Manager
Hanieh Houshmandi, Associate Civil Engineer
L 2.01 Parking--Has there been an analysis performed on how removal of parking near Charter and Broadway will impact businesses in this area, and what related mitigations are proposed?

Response: At the intersection of Charter Street and Broadway, the Draft EIR states that mitigation (Mitigation 7-3) of project impacts would require the addition of a traffic signal and the addition of left-turn pockets to all legs of the intersection. It is also possible to mitigate the project impact by simply installing a signal and leaving the striping the same as existing, i.e., no left-turn pockets. Left turns would be made on a green signal from the through lanes. There is insufficient street width to add the turn pockets without removing on-street parking. The Draft EIR states that about 50 total on-street parking spaces would need to be removed. Although a quantitative parking survey was not completed, observations verify that some of the curb parking spaces are used. Most of the surrounding businesses have off-street parking, but some do not. At the time of implementation of the traffic signal, the detailed intersection design would be determined.

At the intersection of Charter Street and Bay Road, the Draft EIR states that the mitigation (Mitigation 7-8) is the addition of a traffic signal and the addition of left-turn pockets on Bay Road. The left-turn pockets would be added by reducing the number of through lanes on Bay Road from two lanes in each direction to one lane in each direction. Removal of on-street parking would not be required.

L 2.02 Traffic--What is the City’s timeline and strategy for installing traffic signals identified to mitigate cumulative traffic impacts at the Douglas/Bay and Douglas/Middlefield intersections?

Response: The City plans to add the Douglas/Bay (Mitigation 7-15) and Douglas/Middlefield (Mitigation 7-16) intersections to its list of Traffic Impact Fee (TIF) program improvements so that the improvements will be completed under the TIF program when they are needed. If for any reason the City does not add one or both of these intersections to its TIF program, the City will collect fair share payments from the applicant and other developers to fund the needed improvements. Under either the TIF or the fair share approach, the intersection improvements would be scheduled so as to avoid unacceptable traffic operations at the intersection.

L 2.03 Traffic--Please indicate the solution for maintaining an acceptable Level of Service (LOS) under cumulative conditions for the Hurlingame/Middlefield intersection.

Response: The LOS F designation at the intersection of Hurlingame Avenue and Middlefield Road refers to traffic on Hurlingame Avenue turning either right or left on Middlefield Road. Traffic on Middlefield Road does not have a Stop sign and faces no delay. During the AM peak hour, there are roughly 100 vehicles using Hurlingame Avenue to access Middlefield Road. During the PM peak hour, the count is about 60. The project would add no vehicles during the AM peak hour and potentially about 60 vehicles during the PM peak hour. These vehicles would potentially face long delays (LOS F) in trying to access Middlefield Road. However,
these vehicles, both existing traffic and project traffic, have options to avoid the delay. They could use Douglas Avenue, which has a traffic signal, instead of Hurlingame Avenue to access Middlefield Road. Also, the traffic signal warrant would not be met at the Hurlingame Avenue/Middlefield Road intersection. Traffic signals should not be installed at unwarranted locations because they would unnecessarily delay traffic on the main street. Because the vehicles have options, because the number of vehicles experiencing LOS F would be relatively small, and because a traffic signal warrant would not be met, the project impact to the Hurlingame Avenue/Middlefield Road intersection is considered less-than-significant.

L 2.04 Traffic--What is the City’s timeline and strategy for installing traffic signals identified to mitigate traffic impacts under Near Term Plus Project conditions at the Charter/Bay intersection?

Response: The City plans to add the Charter/Bay (Mitigation 7-8) intersection to its list of Traffic Impact Fee (TIF) program improvements so that the improvements will be completed under the TIF program when they are needed. If for any reason the City does not add this intersection to its TIF program, the City will collect fair share payments from the applicant and other developers to fund the needed improvements. Under either the TIF or the fair share approach, the intersection improvements would be scheduled so as to avoid unacceptable traffic operations at the intersection.

L 2.05 Traffic--Has the City performed a capacity analysis for identified potential roundabouts to ensure that an acceptable LOS will be achieved?

Response: For two of the study intersections that would meet signal warrants and that would have project impacts, the Draft EIR suggests consideration of roundabouts in lieu of traffic signals. The two intersections in question are Charter Street/Bay Road and 5th Avenue/Bay Road. Under cumulative conditions with the project, both intersections with a roundabout would operate at LOS A or B during the morning and evening peak hours. Calculation sheets are included in appendix A of this Final EIR. At the time of implementation of the intersection improvements, either signals or roundabouts, Redwood City would work with County staff on the design details.

L 2.06 Traffic--The County would like to review the construction traffic plan once available.

Response: The Draft EIR (subsection 7.4.7[f]) states that the applicant should submit a construction traffic control plan prior to start of construction to identify truck routes and to specify how street closures or partial closures will be handled. Redwood City will share the construction traffic control plan with County staff for its review prior to the start of construction.
Dear Ms. Riordan and Members of the Planning Commission,

I am writing to you concerning the “Stanford in Redwood City” Project. I have lived at 910 Second Ave. since March 1, 1997 and have seen a great deal of changes in our neighborhood since then.

A few months after we moved in, Excite and a couple of other “start-ups” were planning a remodel of existing buildings and new construction. As a new homeowner, I was a little naïve and distracted about how it would affect us. Fifteen years later and a little wiser, the size of the Stanford project has me very concerned. 1.5 million square feet is similar to the size of Pacific Shores Center at the end of Seaport Blvd. Instead of being at the end of an industrial area, Stanford’s project is within a neighborhood.

Since Stanford in Redwood City began in 2008, I have attended most of the community meetings about the project. In the beginning, the community was told that the buildings would be for departments of non-academic staff and possibly some R&D. It is now stated in the Precise Plan, that there will be some R&D, laboratory facilities, medical offices, and possibly some classroom facilities. As time has gone on and new pieces of this development have been exposed, I have doubts to the honesty of the developers of the project. Will they only begin with permitted use buildings and then work in the “accessory or conditional use” buildings? I hope there is a statement within this agreement to the contrary.

**Traffic, traffic & more traffic!** The number of Stanford employees that will be coming & leaving this area will be in the thousands! Let’s face the facts, 1)a majority of people will **not** get out of their cars, and 2)our neighborhood streets cannot accommodate that much traffic. Do they really believe that installing some traffic lights will help? That will mean a back up of vehicles at red lights. How will neighbors get out of their driveways? How will fire leave their driveway in an emergency onto a thin, crowded street?

Does Stanford really expect to shuttle 5,000 – 6,000 employees? That is a lot of employees to shuttle--- if they **do** get out of their cars and use other means of transportation. How many shuttles will it take to bring the employees to and from work? How many shuttles will
have only a few people or be empty but still on the road? If there is a shuttle, we must also make sure that it does not use Second Ave. as part of its route.

Has anyone traveled around Woodside Road and Broadway / Bay Rd between 7:00am – 10am and 4pm -- 7pm? The exit for Woodside Road on Highway 101 is already backed up. The exit for Marsh Rd. is also, already backed up. There are so many specific questions to answer before any of this project begins.

As you may recall, the Costco expansion was a source of concern for the residences and businesses around them. I do not believe that the traffic lights that were installed to mitigate the increased amount of traffic are doing much good. I work near the intersection of Middlefield Rd. and Willow St. and see the traffic congestion and the frustrations of the drivers. Has there been any post-assessment of the huge traffic back-ups that occur daily? The lights are not in sync and no one can predict which yellow light drivers will choose to ignore or at which intersection they will block. Many times during the week I see Police, Fire & Ambulances sitting in traffic with the lights & sirens on, unable to move. This is NOT safe. I do not want a similar intersection/street diet to happen in our area, especially if there is a cali for service in our neighborhood.

The Parking Garages. I understand that parking is going to be an issue with a project this large thus the need for parking garages. I believe that the garage listed as “P1” be built as far away from 2nd Ave. as possible. We all know that car alarms will be going off and the noise from the ventilation system is something that will be loud, especially during the evening hours.

As it stands now, every Sunday evening around 10:00 p.m. a parking lot vacuum truck drives around the current campus lots and cleans the parking lots with a loud, continuous whirring-sounding vacuum. This goes on for 60-90 minutes. (Last Sunday, it started at 11:30 p.m.) Will we have to endure this with each parking structure and lots?
**Generator Servicing.** Since the Outpatient Clinic has opened, the neighborhood and especially the tenants at Broadway Towers, has had to endure the sounds of the generators at the Stanford Clinic being serviced. Although it only happens 3-4 times per year, is it something that we will have to endure with the new buildings? I forgot to mention that this takes place at about 7:30 – 8:00am on a Saturday and continues for about ½ a day.

**Spinias Park.** What will be the impact on the health of children and the residents who live along the route that leads to the Stanford project? We must remember that with more traffic there will also be an impact to the air quality. This is something that must also be looked at very closely. Spinias Park is one of the most heavily used parks in Redwood City.

**Property Tax.** Since Stanford is considered non-profit, they are exempt from paying property tax. In lieu of this, Stanford has offered to establish a fund to help the neighborhood, because they realize what the traffic increase will do to this side of town. Since we all know property taxes (and their increases) are forever, how long is the fund going to be around? We need to look far into the future, not just what may happen in a couple of years.

Prior to buying our home, we were told that we should “live” in that city for a few days to see what the traffic, neighborhood, and commute would be like. I invite you and the members of the Planning Commission and the City Council to “live” in our neighborhood for a few days to see what we deal with. In the Precise Plan, Stanford mentions that this project will help to increase the values of the surrounding properties. I am not a real estate expert, but I do know that an increase in traffic usually has a negative impact on home values.
I hope the officials of Redwood City have the foresight to look into the future and see what problems may arise from allowing Stanford to build a project of this magnitude within a busy community. We have invested in this neighborhood. We spent our savings to buy this house where we could come home to relax and, hopefully, to live happily ever after, without having to fight for peace and quiet. Believe me, there will be issues from this project.

Sincerely,
Terry R, Thom
L 3.01 Land Use--The commenter expresses concerns regarding the various uses proposed for the Precise Plan buildings (e.g., non-academic, R&D, laboratory facilities, medical offices) and how these proposed uses appear to have changed over time.

Response: The comment pertains to the commenter’s experience at community meetings, not to the content or adequacy of the Draft EIR or the Precise Plan. The description of proposed Precise Plan land uses is consistent between the Draft EIR and the Precise Plan document. For example, please see Draft EIR section 2.1 (Proposed Project) and Precise Plan chapter IV (Implementation), “Development Impacts, Monitoring & Phasing.”

L 3.02 Traffic and Public Services--The commenter has concerns about traffic generated by the project and the ability of Fire Department vehicles to leave the fire station driveway [presumably Fire Station #11 at Broadway and 2nd Avenue).

Response: Draft EIR chapter 7 (Transportation, Circulation, and Parking) includes a comprehensive and detailed analysis of existing and projected traffic conditions in the Precise Plan vicinity, prepared by professional transportation engineers and approved by Redwood City staff. Draft EIR chapter 11 (Public Services), subsections 11.1.4 (under “Police Emergency Response and Evacuation Impacts”) and 11.2.4 (under “Fire and EMS Emergency Access and Response Impact”), concludes, based on information provided by the Redwood City Police Department and Redwood City Fire Department, that Precise Plan implementation would not result in a significant impact on emergency response or emergency evacuation.

L 3.03 Traffic--Does Stanford really expect to shuttle 5,000 to 6,000 employees? Other shuttle concerns are also expressed, including not using 2nd Avenue as a shuttle route.

Response: Neither the Precise Plan nor the Draft EIR reports that Stanford University expects to shuttle 5,000 to 6,000 employees. The overall Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program included as an integral part of the Precise Plan identifies shuttle service as one component of over 20 that comprise the program. With the TDM program, project vehicle trips would be expected to be reduced by approximately 18 percent during peak travel hours (AM and PM rush hours). See Draft EIR chapter 7 (Transportation, Circulation, and Parking), especially Table 7.9 (TDM Program Summary).

The actual shuttle routes have not been decided. The commenter states that 2nd Avenue should not be used as part of the route but does not explain why.

L 3.04 Traffic--The commenter expresses concerns regarding existing traffic conditions in the project vicinity.

Response: Draft EIR chapter 7 (Transportation, Circulation, and Parking) includes a comprehensive and detailed analysis of existing and projected traffic conditions in the Precise Plan vicinity, prepared by professional transportation engineers and approved by Redwood City staff.
L 3.05 Traffic and Public Services--The commenter expresses concerns about the Costco expansion and the ability of fire and police vehicles to access his neighborhood.

*Response:* Please see the response to comment L 3.02 above.

L 3.06 Noise--The commenter has concerns about potential parking garage noise and the noise currently produced by “vacuum trucks” that clean the site’s existing parking lots.

*Response:* The issue of potential noise from the parking structure ventilation system is discussed in Draft EIR chapter 13 (Noise), Impact/Mitigation 13-4. In addition, the Precise Plan area and its activities will continue to be subject to Chapter 24 (Noise Regulations) of the Redwood City Municipal Code and the Noise chapter of the Redwood City General Plan (see Draft EIR section 13.2, Regulatory Setting) as these codes/policies are amended from time to time. The noise impact resulting from project *construction* would be significant and unavoidable, based on the potential long-term construction schedule (see Impact/Mitigation 13-2). Noise and vibration impacts resulting from project *operation* would be less-than-significant with mitigation (see Impacts/Mitigations 13-1, 13-3, and 13-4). Also see the response to comment PC 38 above.

CEQA does not require the City to restrict the location of the parking garages because the parking garages would not result in a significant and unavoidable impact. The only permanent noise source associated with parking garages would be the ventilation systems, which would not operate continuously. Rather, Stanford would install carbon monoxide detectors in the parking garages to enable ventilation systems to be triggered when needed. In addition, the ventilation systems would be subject to Mitigation 13-4, which would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level. The proposed office, research and development, and medical offices would not be expected to generate substantial nighttime vehicular activity, including noise from vehicle movement and car alarms. Given existing levels of street noise on 2nd Avenue near Bay Road (ranging from 59 to 66 dBA $L_{eq}$ during the day), daytime vehicular activity would not result in a substantial increase in noise levels at sensitive receptors. Noise associated with trucks sweeping the lots would not be greater than existing noise levels associated with the surface parking lot cleaning activities that the commenter refers to in the comment letter.

Further, even though trucks used to sweep parking lots are an existing condition, it appears that Stanford has been responsive to neighborhood complaints regarding the time of day that such activities occur. Stanford reports that in its effort to keep the existing Midpoint campus clean and free of litter, it retains a parking lot sweeping service to clean the parking areas every week. The cleaning was scheduled for Sunday evenings because the fewest cars are parked on the campus at those times. However, Stanford received a call stating that the sweeping was taking place very late Sunday night and into Monday morning, and was disturbing neighbors along 2nd Avenue. Once alerted, Stanford worked with the sweeping service to adjust its schedule so that parking lot cleaning occurs early in the day rather than at night. (Personal communication, L. Wicks, Stanford Office of Government & Community Relations, April 2012) Stanford will continue working with neighborhood residents and businesses to minimize noise impacts.
L 3.07 Noise--The commenter expresses concerns regarding noise from generator testing.

Response: The noise resulting from generator testing is intermittent and temporary. Existing and future generators in the Precise Plan area are subject to the testing and operating permit requirements of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD). The existing generators at the Stanford Medicine Outpatient Center are subject to California Health and Safety Code standards under which a health facility is to test each of its diesel backup generators 12 times per year, with testing intervals of not less than 20 days and not more than 40 days. The tests are to be conducted for at least 30 continuous minutes, except for one test per year that is 2 hours in duration. The generators on the Stanford in Redwood City campus are not anticipated to be tested more frequently, or for a longer duration than the existing generators at the Stanford Medicine Outpatient Center. Stanford will continue working with neighborhood residents and businesses to minimize noise impacts.

L 3.08 Air Quality--What will be the impact on the health of children and the residents who live along the route that leads to the project?

Response: Please see Draft EIR chapter 8 (Air Quality) for a detailed and comprehensive analysis, prepared by professional air quality scientists, of potential project air emissions and health effects. The analysis shows that project implementation would not result in significant carbon monoxide emissions impacts (see Draft EIR pages 8-20 and 8-21). With respect to cancer risks, chronic and acute noncancer hazard indices, and concentrations of particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in aerodynamic diameter (PM$_{2.5}$) from project-related traffic, the analysis shows no significant health risk to off-site populations (see Draft EIR page 8-24).

The Draft EIR’s analysis of these risks is based on the ENVIRON Human Health Risk Assessment (HHRA), which was prepared by experts and then peer reviewed by the City’s experts. This assessment analyzed the additional traffic the project would bring to Highway 101, Bay Road, and Broadway, the most heavily traveled roadways in the project vicinity. It combined the emissions from this traffic with emissions from the project’s on-site emissions sources. The result was that the estimated excess lifetime cancer risks, noncancer health indices, and PM$_{2.5}$ exposure concentrations for off-development populations resulting from operation of the project were below all BAAQMD-recommended significance thresholds. See Human Health Risk Assessment, January 2011, page 21 (appendix D of this Final EIR, available on the City’s website at www.redwoodcity.org under “Hot Topics”; please note that the cover is inadvertently dated January 2010, when it should be January 2011).

The health risk assessment (HHRA) evaluated the impacts on nearby residents of increases in roadway traffic due to operation of the project. These results are summarized in HHRA Tables 3.2 through 3.4. Table 3.2 in the HHRA shows the estimated PM$_{2.5}$ concentrations due to project-related operational traffic increases on major roadways. Table 3.3 in the HHRA presents the estimated excess lifetime cancer risk, noncancer chronic hazard index, and acute hazard index for a residential land use scenario estimated at 100 feet from the roadways. Table 3.4 in the HHRA shows the project lifetime cancer risk for the project contribution to traffic on
Broadway and Bay Road at increasing distances from the roadway, between 10 and 1,000 feet. As summarized in these tables, all levels are below significance thresholds.

L 3.09 Property Tax--How long will the “neighborhood fund” [presumably the project-proposed Precise Plan Neighborhood Streets Enhancement Program--NSEP] be funded?

Response: The comment pertains to a Precise Plan component summarized in Draft EIR chapter 3 (Project Description), subsection 3.4.7 (Precise Plan Neighborhood Streets Enhancement Program [NSEP]). Precise Plan chapter IV (Implementation, “Neighborhood Streets Enhancement Program [NSEP]”) describes the funding of this program. The NSEP is not a payment in lieu of property taxes. Rather, the NSEP creates a funding mechanism to deliver improvements to the surrounding neighborhoods that will offset certain impacts of the project on such neighborhoods. These project-related neighborhood impacts are less-than-significant for purposes of CEQA, but for the NSEP program, such impacts would have quality of life implications for such neighborhoods.
From: Janet Davis [mailto:jadjadjd@sbcglobal.net]

Sent: Monday, February 27, 2012 2:30 PM
To: PLG-Maureen Riordan
Subject: Re: Stanford RWC Campus EIR

How about a bridge/connection to E. Bayshore. That would help the congestion on Woodside road

From: PLG-Maureen Riordan <Mriordan@redwoodcity.org>
To: Janet Davis <jadjadjd@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Mon, February 27, 2012 11:45:42 AM
Subject: RE: Stanford RWC Campus EIR

Ms. Davis,

Thank you for your email. I will forward it to our environmental consultant for a response in the Final EIR.

We did explore the concept of a new exit onto the freeway early on but Caltrans would not consider it as they have spacing requirements between freeway exits.

Thanks.

Maureen Riordan
Senior Planner
Planning Services

Voice: (650) 780-7236
Email: mriordan@redwoodcity.org

Think Green before printing this e-mail

From: Janet Davis [mailto:jadjadjd@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Monday, February 27, 2012 10:16 AM
To: PLG-Maureen Riordan
Cc: Lennie Roberts; diane Shu
Subject: Stanford RWC Campus EIR

I went through the EIR briefly and have a comment. The proposal contemplates an enormous amount of excavation and removal of existing structures. This will involve many truckloads of material being shipped from the site. I saw nothing to indicate how this is to be accomplished. I live near the main Stanford Campus and their continual construction involves convoys of double tractor/trailer rigs that are directed along narrow Alpine Road to I-280 through a residential area. One time I counted 45 such gigantic rigs within approx. one hour. This has had, and continues to have, a very deleterious effect on the neighborhood and safety of commuters, pedestrians and bicyclists.
The RWC site is in an industrial area but there still may be some very negative impacts on people, especially around the Woodside Road intersections. Has any thought been given to a West Bayshore feeder street or some kind of exit onto the freeway itself?
L 4.01 Traffic--Would a bridge/connection to East Bayshore Road relieve congestion on Woodside Road?

*Response:* Early in the Precise Plan process, the City did explore concepts and conceptual designs for new roadway and freeway connections. However, based on safety concerns and engineering limitations, primarily related to the configuration of US 101 and the distance between the Woodside Road and Marsh Road freeway interchanges, no feasible solution could be designed. For the example mentioned by the commenter, an overpass to East Bayshore Road would require an incline too steep to meet safety and engineering requirements.

L 4.02 Traffic--The commenter expresses concerns about construction traffic.

*Response:* Construction traffic considerations are described in Draft EIR chapter 7 (Transportation, Circulation, and Parking), subsection 7.4.7(f) (Construction Traffic). Further details would be included in the construction traffic control plan coordinated with City staff prior to the start of construction phases, once specific site planning, building designs, and phasing are formulated.

L 4.03 Traffic--Has any thought been given to a West Bayshore feeder street or some kind of exit onto the freeway itself?

*Response:* Please see the response to comment L 4.01 above.
March 1, 2012

City of Redwood City - Planning & Housing Services
1017 Middlefield Road
Redwood City, CA 94063

Subject: Return of Notice of Environmental Impact Report Posted for 30 days

(Public Resources Code Section 21092.3)

The attached notice was received by the County Clerk on January 26, 2012
and posted for thirty (30) days.

By: Besz De La Vega
Deputy Clerk on behalf of Mark Church
NOTICE OF PLANNING COMMISSION PUBLIC HEARING
NOTICE OF COMPLETION AND AVAILABILITY OF THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT AND DRAFT PRECISE PLAN FOR THE STANFORD IN REDWOOD CITY PROJECT

Notice is hereby given that the City of Redwood City (Lead Agency), State of California, is making available for public review a Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR) and Draft Precise Plan for the Stanford in Redwood City Project. The Planning Commission will hold a public hearing to accept comments on these documents on February 21, 2012 (details below).

Project Location and Description: Stanford University proposes to redevelop a 35-acre portion of a larger 48-acre campus that is bisected by Broadway and generally bounded by Douglas and Second Avenues, Highway 101 and Bay Road. The remaining 13 acres of the 48-acre campus that are not proposed for development, but that are included in the Precise Plan, include: 420-450 Broadway (Stanford Medical Clinics) and 550 Broadway.

The Stanford in Redwood City Precise Plan calls for the demolition of eight office and research and development (R&D) buildings totaling approximately 537,000 square feet and their replacement with approximately 1,518,000 square feet of building space for office, and potentially R&D and medical clinic, uses, in approximately 13 buildings supported by approximately four parking structures, on-site surface parking and new street parking. Common support uses will include a cafeteria, a childcare center and other employee amenities. The project also proposes an onsite storm water retention system, publicly accessible open space and landscape amenities. A conceptual site plan, providing one example of how the Draft Precise Plan standards and guidelines could be applied to formulate a development site plan, is attached.

Draft EIR: The Draft EIR has been prepared by the City of Redwood City pursuant to all relevant sections of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The Draft EIR is intended to inform City of Redwood City decision makers, other responsible agencies and the general public of the potential environmental consequences associated with the Stanford in Redwood City Precise Plan (Project) and to identify possible mitigation measures that would reduce or eliminate those impacts. Significant environmental effects are anticipated in the following resource areas, as described in the corresponding chapters of the Draft EIR: Transportation, Circulation, and Parking; Air Quality; Climate Change; Utilities; Hazards and Hazardous Materials; Noise; Cultural and Historic Resources; and Geology and Soils.

Copies of the Draft EIR and Draft Precise Plan are Available at:
Posted on Redwood City’s website: www.redwoodcity.org. Click on “Hot Topics”, then “More”, then “Stanford in Redwood City”

Redwood City Main Library and North Fair Oaks Library


*To view full filing, plus go to Building 335, 1st Floor, Special Services

(Over)
Public Hearing: The Planning Commission will hold a public hearing on **February 21, 2012** at **7:00pm** at the **City Hall Council Chamber**, 1017 Middlefield Road, Redwood City to take comments on the Draft EIR and Draft Precise Plan. No decisions will be made at the hearing. The public may use either this forum to provide oral comments or may send written comments to Planning staff anytime during the public review period.

Questions or written comments about this project and/or the public hearing should be directed to:
Maureen Riordan, Senior Planner
City of Redwood City
Planning and Housing Services
1017 Middlefield Road / P.O. Box 391
Redwood City, CA 94064-0391

Phone: (650) 780-7236
Fax: (650) 780-0128
email: mriordan@redwoodcity.org
L 5.01 General--Confirmation that the Draft EIR Notice of Completion and Availability was posted for 30 days pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21092.3.

Response: The confirmation is acknowledged; no additional response is necessary.
From: steve schmidt [mailto:menloparksteve@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, March 02, 2012 11:14 AM
To: Chip Taylor; Kirsten Keith; Diana Shu
Cc: Mike Harding; Margaret Pye; Tom Madalena; PLG-Maureen Riordan; Richard Napier
Subject: Stanford's RWC Campus

At last night's SVBC Peninsula Committee meeting, we were given a presentation by Redwood City Planner Maureen Riordan of the Stanford Medical Center Expansion in RWC.

One feature of the mitigation/development agreement plan is to improve bike access to the campus by improving facilities on Bay Road, Middlefield, Broadway, 2nd Ave., 5th Ave. and Douglas Ave. in an effort to help achieve an 18% share of walking, cycling and transit access to the campus.

A glaring omission is the opportunity is the once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to correct the Bay/Marsh/Florence/Bay complex intersection for cyclists:

A bicycle undercrossing of the Samtrans/Dumbarton tracks that would allow a simple connection at the Marsh Manor Shopping Center between the Menlo Park Bay Road and the County/RWC Bay Road. This will make the bicycle commute between MP and RWC far safer and more appealing to those who are daunted by all the merging, the turn restrictions and the bumpy at-grade railroad crossing at the existing pair of intersections.

The value of Stanford's expansion of medical facilities into RWC would be further enhanced by making this improvement part of a development agreement between Stanford and RWC.

I suggest that the City of Menlo Park, San Mateo County and Redwood City join forces and ask that this needed improvement be added to the requirements for approval of the Stanford project.

Steve Schmidt

Menlo Park
L 6.01 Bike Access--The commenter provides suggestions for improving bike access at the Bay/Florence/Marsh intersection.

Response: The comment pertains to a suggested improvement to an existing condition, not to the content or adequacy of the Draft EIR. Draft EIR subsection 7.4.7(c) (Transportation, Circulation, and Parking--Bicycle Facilities) discusses existing and proposed bicycle facilities in the Precise Plan vicinity. Draft EIR Table 7.9 (TDM Program Summary) lists the bicycle-related elements of the Stanford University Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program included as an integral part of the Precise Plan. More specific details of the proposed bicycle-related elements are included in Precise Plan chapter IV (Implementation--Bicycle-Related Elements). The Precise Plan proposed bicycle linkages are consistent with the San Mateo County and Redwood City bicycle plans.

The Precise Plan notes, “The specific bicycle linkages will be selected by the City in consultation with the applicant”. The City may consider the commenter’s suggested bike access improvements as part of Precise Plan implementation. The commenter’s suggestion does not change the impact or mitigation findings of the Draft EIR.
From: Lauren Perritt [mailto:lau66rep@pschell.net]
Sent: Monday, March 05, 2012 11:48 AM
To: PLG-Maureen Riordan
Subject: Stanford Campus

Maureen: although Stanford has done an admirable job in trying to be a good tenant in the Friendly Acres Neighborhood, it cannot be denied that traffic has increased substantially since their occupying a portion of the former Ampex campus.

I live three blocks from Marsh Road, and there are times when it takes me 2-3 minutes just to leave Hoover Street to gain access due to increased traffic along Rolison Road trying to turn on to Marsh and then go either East or West. And this is just with the Medical Facility moving in. Imagine when the entire campus is occupied -- even if it is years out.

And since there are so many agencies that have to be dealt with for Marsh Road; e.g. CalTrain, Atherton, Menlo Park, etc., it doesn't seem that it will ever be an easy fix with that much more traffic expected. It takes an "Act of God" just to get the potholes fixed at the signal -- and then they return in three months. Imagine getting a concerted effort by all the agencies to solve the problem! If there is one.

I'm just sorry that Stanford purchased the acreage which borders on a neighborhood. It's too bad they couldn't have purchased something East of the Bayshore Freeway which is an industrial/commercial area. I can't be enthused about their upcoming construction (whenever it begins) as the years of interruption it will cause in the neighborhood and city streets.

I am also not pleased with the concept of greater than two-story buildings on the campus. The apartment building on 2nd Avenue is enough of an eyesore in an otherwise lovely, tree-shrouded neighborhood.

Lauren Perritt
Friendy Acres resident for 39 years
L 7.01 Traffic, Construction, and Building Heights--The commenter expresses concerns regarding existing and future traffic conditions in the project vicinity, as well as potential construction impacts and proposed building heights.

Response: The Precise Plan’s range of potential land uses is consistent with the Redwood City General Plan land use designations for the Precise Plan area (see Draft EIR chapter 4, Land Use and Planning). Draft EIR chapter 7 (Transportation, Circulation, and Parking) includes a comprehensive and detailed analysis of existing and projected traffic conditions in the Precise Plan vicinity, prepared by professional transportation engineers and approved by Redwood City staff. Also, potential construction impacts are described in Draft EIR chapter 7 (see subsection 7.4.7[f]--Construction Traffic), chapter 8 (Air Quality, especially Impact/Mitigation 8-1), and chapter 13 (Noise, especially Impact/Mitigation 13-2). Potential visual impacts of the proposed building heights are evaluated in Draft EIR chapter 5 (Aesthetics).
Dear Maureen Riordan,

Thank you for your assistance this morning regarding the draft EIR for the Stanford in Redwood City project. Attached is a copy of my e-mail sent to Michelle Littlefield last Friday. Page 8-26 of the draft EIR mentions additional evaluations and screenings assessments completed by ENVIRON that are not included in the draft EIR document or in the appendices, list of figures, or list of tables.

Page 8-26 states, “ENVIRON performed a screening assessment of the impacts of traffic emissions upon the project development site with respect to evaluating exposures of children they could attend an on-site childcare center.” I would appreciate it if you could provide this assessment for me to review, as soon as possible, so that I may make public comment.

Page 8-26 states, “ENVIRON also evaluated stationary sources of TAC or PM2.5 emissions near the project development site. Screening modeling of the nearby Tyco thermal controls facility indicates significant single-source PM2.5 concentrations across much of the precise plan area. ENVIRON reports that annual concentrations ranged from 2.7 ug/m3 to 0.31 ug/m3, at or above the PM2.5 threshold across the project development site.” Please also provide this evaluation, and all data used to create this evaluation.

The two ENVIRON documents that you gave to me this morning do not appear to be the documents requested above. I am uncertain as to the exact name of the two documents listed above, so I have provided the specific references and page number stated in the draft EIR.

One of the documents given to me this morning entitled, “Human Health Risk Assessment Construction, Operational and Traffic Emissions Stanford in Redwood City”, dated October 2010, in numerous locations states, “Note to City: additional information regarding off-site sources of PM2.5 will be provided within the next few weeks”. Please provide for me a copy of the additional information they are noting, and confirm whether the additional information and data was considered in the draft EIR dated January 12, 2012.

Lastly, ENVIRON mentions the Tyco thermal controls facility’s annual concentration range and the number 2.7ug/m3. Please confirm where this number came from, and based on this number, are all neighboring sites to the Tyco thermal controls facility also
exposed to the same level of pollutant? It is my understanding that .30 ug/m3 is the level of significance for a single source, meaning higher cancer risk, above acceptable levels. If my assumptions are correct, please confirm whether the students at Summit Preparatory Charter High School are being exposed to an unacceptable health hazard.

Thank you,

Catherine Greer

From: Catherine Greer [mailto:catherine@greergardens.net]
Sent: Friday, March 02, 2012 2:45 PM
To: 'mlittlefield@redwoodcity.org'
Subject: concerns with Stanford in Redwood City project

Dear Michelle,

After reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Stanford in Redwood City Precise Plan I have the following questions and concerns:

Although the plan generally seems to be a good fit for Redwood City and the surrounding community directly impacted by this project, it does not identify Summit Preparatory Charter School on its maps, in its description or the substantial impacts that may result to the students at Summit Preparatory Charter High School, many of whom are “sensitive receptors”.

Voted by Newsweek to be one of the Top 10 Most Transformative High Schools in the Nation, Summit Preparatory Charter High School is less than 1000 feet from the edge of the Stanford project site. The front door of the school is less than 10 feet from Broadway and the emissions from construction, operational diesel emissions, truck diesel emissions, and the emissions from the additional volume of approximately 4500 vehicles.

Summits’ basketball hoop is located approximately 250 feet from the closest edge of highway 101 and the students who play there are already deeply impacted by the extraordinarily high exposure to air pollution at this site. The tiny outdoor space West Summits’ building is where many of the students gather before school, at lunch and after school. Page 8.26 of the draft EIR notes substantial concerns and makes me question whether the current air-quality at Summit Preparatory Charter High School is currently a hazard to the students. Adding additional pollution from the Stanford project would seem to increase the students likelihood of short-term and long-term health effects.
I am concerned that the current project radius of 1000 feet is too small because the majority of the traffic impacts will be concentrated along the entire distance of Broadway through the highway interchanges of Woodside Road and Marsh Road. The impact of this concentrated traffic and air pollution does not stop when the vehicles hit the 1000 foot distance.

The intersection of Woodside Road and Broadway and the entrance to Highway 101 is currently an untenable traffic nightmare, that puts motorists, pedestrians and bicyclists at risk. I have been told that the light at this intersection is timed to do a complete cycle every 4 minutes, however, in my experience I have waited in my car for even longer periods of time trying to get through this intersection. It is my understanding that the current air-quality models average the air impacts over a 24-hour period, 365 day year and include weekends. This averaging may substantially underestimate the “actual” traffic conditions on Broadway and Woodside Rd. and underestimate the “actual impacts” to Summit students during the periods when they are at school. Heavy diesel trucks at this location generally travel from 8-5, M-F, not on weekends or nights. As a result of the extraordinarily heavy traffic conditions at rush hour, vehicles (and diesel trucks) idle on the on-ramps and congested intersection, resulting in far greater particulate matter than likely predicted by a model that averages these conditions across all of Redwood City.

I also want to verify whether the vehicle AADT total and truck AADT total is based on estimated truck percentage, or actual truck percentage from a verified traffic count. Again, this extraordinarily congested intersection is atypical compared to any other location in Redwood City and perhaps the County because of its unique access to the Port of Redwood City, Granite Rock, Lyngso Garden Materials, Peninsula Building Supply and other heavy industry located nearby. Any “averaged” traffic count model, or “estimated” model would likely underestimate the “actual impacts” at this location.

The data from the current air monitoring station, located at 897 Barron Ave. may not accurately reflect the conditions at the Stanford project (or surrounding intersections), because most of the particulate matter, PM, generated from vehicles on Highway 101, Woodside road, Broadway, and Marsh Road drop out of the air column before it reaches 897 Barron Ave. Numerous studies indicate that 2/3 of the cancer risk from toxic air contaminants comes from diesel particulate matter. Studies also show that PM is deposited in the first 500 feet from its source. In spite of the enormous work put in to the draft EIR, I am unclear as to whether the data from this air monitoring station was used, or whether actual sampling was conducted at the Stanford site and at these intersections.

Lastly, it was unclear as to whether the emissions from Granite rock and the Port of Redwood City were considered in this draft EIR in the calculations of current conditions and whether the potential contamination emanating from 1013 and 1061 Douglas Ave., 2201 Bay Rd., 2480 Middlefield Rd., 1831 East Bayshore Rd., Southern Pacific Railway spurs between Marsh and Woodside roads and 800 Chestnut, as well as other contaminated industrial sites in Redwood City were included to accurately estimate the potential health risks.
For decades, the City of Redwood City has sought to improve our community, and has developed great projects downtown and in surrounding neighborhoods that has transformed our city. As Redwood City focuses on the area south of Woodside Rd., I could not think of a better neighbor than Stanford University. In fact, it would be an honor to welcome Stanford to Redwood City. The intent of this project is well matched for the needs of Redwood City but the traffic and potential health effects must be accurately measured and mitigated, where needed.

Sincerely,

Catherine Greer
L 8.01 Air Quality--Some reports noted on Draft EIR page 8-26 are not included in the Draft EIR.

Response: The requested information was provided to the commenter. The information is contained in the report entitled Human Health Risk Assessment, Construction, Operational and Traffic Emissions, Stanford in Redwood City, Redwood City, California (ENVIRON International Corporation, January 2011, Project Number 03-25047A) (HHRA). Section 1.3 (Adequacy of Final EIR) of this Final EIR discusses requests for additional information. The ENVIRON research and report were peer reviewed by Illingworth & Rodkin, EIR air quality, climate change, and acoustical consultants. The ENVIRON report is appendix D of this Final EIR, available on the City's website at website at www.redwoodcity.org under “Hot Topics”; please note that the cover is inadvertently dated January 2010, when it should be January 2011.

L 8.02 Air Quality--The commenter requests the “screening assessment” for traffic-related air quality impacts on the proposed child care center, which is noted on Draft EIR page 8-26.

Response: The supplied ENVIRON report includes the requested information in section 3.1 (Screening Assessments--Freeway/Major Roadway) and Table 6.3 (On-Site Operational/Traffic Emissions: Estimated Excess Lifetime Cancer Risks, Noncancer Hazards Indices, and PM$_{2.5}$).

L 8.03 Air Quality--The commenter requests the “screening modeling” evaluation of the existing Tyco Thermal Controls facility for PM$_{2.5}$ emissions.

Response: The supplied ENVIRON report includes the requested information in section 3.2 (Screening Assessments--Existing Off-Site Stationary Sources) and Table 6.3 (On-Site Operational/Traffic Emissions: Estimated Excess Lifetime Cancer Risks, Noncancer Hazards Indices, and PM$_{2.5}$).

The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) (Andrea Gordon, agordon@baaqmd.gov, 415-749-4940) verified the screening modeling used for the Draft EIR. BAAQMD also provided the associated, supplemental information in appendix B of this Final EIR (available on the City's website at www.redwoodcity.org under “Hot Topics”).

L 8.04 Air Quality--The two ENVIRON documents sent do not appear to be the documents requested above.

Response: Initially, the commenter was inadvertently provided with an earlier draft of the ENVIRON report. The most current version of the report (referenced above) was then promptly sent. See the responses to comments L 8.01, L 8.02, and L 8.03 above.

L 8.05 Air Quality--The commenter requests “additional information” noted in the Human Health Risk Assessment report initially provided.
Response: Please see the response to comment L 8.04. In the earlier draft of the ENVIRON report that the commenter received, the “additional information...within the next few weeks” was a placeholder as BAAQMD researched the Tyco Thermal Controls data calculated by ENVIRON, to verify its accuracy. As noted in the response to comment L 8.04, BAAQMD verified the data, which is included in the final, January 2011 ENVIRON report.

L 8.06 Air Quality--Please confirm the source of the Tyco Thermal Controls facility annual concentration range identified in the Draft EIR.

Response: Please see the response to comment L 8.03. The comment asks about risks to Summit Preparatory Charter High School from the existing Tyco facility, rather than from the proposed project. Therefore, the comment is outside the scope of this EIR. It may be noted, however, that the HHRA (appendix D of this Final EIR, pages 8 and 9, available on the City’s website at www.redwoodcity.org under “Hot Topics”) describes the Tyco data as follows: “The data required to conduct refined modeling of the PM_{2.5} concentrations from the Tyco facility was not available. Consequently, ENVIRON conducted a conservative screening analysis of the Tyco facility emissions....Note that this analysis likely overestimates PM_{2.5} concentrations....[D]ue to lack of adequate data, the true risk due to PM_{2.5} from the Tyco facility is unknown and could be considerably lower than estimated.”

L 8.07 Air Quality--The Draft EIR does not identify any substantial impacts that may result on the students of Summit Preparatory Charter High School, which is located less than 1,000 feet from the Precise Plan area.

Response: The health risk assessment prepared by ENVIRON assessed impacts from project construction and operation on nearby sensitive receptors. That assessment identified the greatest impact that would occur as a result of construction and operation of the proposed project. Tables 6.1, 6.2, and 6.3 of the ENVIRON report present the highest predicted impacts from the proposed project in terms of construction, traffic, and stationary sources. These impacts were predicted for the maximum-exposed child, adult, and worker. Draft EIR section 8.3 (Air Quality/Impacts and Mitigation Measures) describes the impact findings from construction and operation of the proposed project with respect to nearby sensitive receptors. Those impacts, both from single sources and cumulative sources, were found to be less-than-significant. Summit Preparatory Charter High School is discussed in the ENVIRON report and is located approximately 900 feet east of the project boundary. As noted on page 5 of the ENVIRON report, off-development workers and residents in close proximity to the project are expected to incur a higher exposure to the emission sources considered in the assessment relative to potential students at the school. Therefore, excess lifetime cancer risks and noncancer hazards estimated for the off-development residents and workers were considered protective of the sensitive populations located farther away, including students at Summit Preparatory Charter High School.

L 8.08 Air Quality--Adding pollution from the proposed project would seem to increase the students’ likelihood of short-term and long-term health effects.
Response: Please see the response to comment 8.07 above. The Draft EIR evaluated cumulative impacts in terms of Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) Community Risk Impact thresholds in accordance with BAAQMD CEQA Air Quality Guideline recommendations. The impact from the proposed project with respect to single-source and cumulative source impacts from emissions of PM$_{2.5}$ and toxic air contaminants were found to be less-than-significant.

L 8.09 Air Quality—Regarding project impacts on sensitive receptors, concentrated traffic and air pollution does not stop when motor vehicles reach 1,000 feet from the project site.

Response: The cumulative air quality analysis prepared for the proposed project followed the BAAQMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, which include an evaluation of all cumulative sources of traffic and stationary sources within 1,000 feet of the project site. The project itself would not create a significant community risk or health hazard (see Draft EIR section 8.3). The impact analysis also evaluates the cumulative effect of existing and projected conditions on the Precise Plan area. To extend this analysis to all uses along the length of Broadway is beyond the scope of this EIR and inconsistent with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

L 8.10 Air Quality—It is the commenter’s understanding that air quality modeling is “averaged” over a 365-day year, which may substantially underestimate “actual impacts” on Summit students resulting from traffic on Broadway and Woodside Road.

Response: The assessment conducted by ENVIRON evaluated traffic impacts using BAAQMD screening tables for San Mateo County and project predicted traffic levels. Specifically, ENVIRON based Broadway and Bay Road PM$_{2.5}$ cancer risk and noncancer Hazard Indexes on the BAAQMD surface street lifetime cancer risk and noncancer Hazard Index screening tables published by BAAQMD. The Draft EIR’s traffic analysis provided the Near Term No Project Conditions and Near Term Project Conditions traffic volumes for segments of the major roads that are expected to be impacted by the project. ENVIRON evaluated two segments of each road: the segment passing through the residential neighborhood adjacent to the project, and the non-residential segment with the greatest project-related average daily traffic. ENVIRON linearly interpolated the values between the two closest BAAQMD table traffic volumes to calculate each scenario’s concentration or risk. ENVIRON then calculated the project impacts by subtracting the Near Term No Project Conditions from the Near Term Project Conditions.

It should be noted that the BAAQMD Roadway Screening Analysis Tables provide conservative estimates of PM$_{2.5}$, cancer risk, and noncancer Hazard Indexes. In other words, the tables over-estimate the impact to ensure that project impacts are not underestimated. If a project would result in a significant impact when using these

---


2 ENVIRON identified roadways within 1,000 feet of the project site and having sufficient traffic volumes to cause an impact. These roads included US 101 and two surface streets: Broadway and Bay Road.
data, the BAAQMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines recommend that refined modeling be conducted. Since the proposed project was not causing a significant impact due to its emissions when using these data, a refined analysis was not necessary.

L 8.11 Air Quality and Traffic--Please verify if the vehicle total and truck total is based on estimated truck percentage or actual truck percentage from a verified traffic count.

*Response:* Please see the response to comment 8.10 above. The traffic counts were based on predicted traffic volumes in the Draft EIR and screening volumes used by BAAQMD to develop their Roadway Screening Analysis Tables for San Mateo County.

L 8.12 Air Quality--The data from the current air monitoring station at 897 Barron Avenue may not accurately reflect existing conditions in the project vicinity.

*Response:* The BAAQMD Roadway Screening Analysis Tables used in the ENVIRON study, which is the basis of the Draft EIR health risk findings, were based on the District's conservative modeling of the traffic emissions for specified distances and do not include data measured at the BAAQMD air monitoring station.

L 8.13 Air Quality--The commenter is uncertain if air emissions calculations for existing conditions considered “potential contamination” from a variety of locations listed by the commenter.

*Response:* The ENVIRON analysis, which is the basis of the Draft EIR health risk findings, included all roadway and stationary sources within 1,000 feet of the Precise Plan area.

L 8.14 Air Quality and Traffic--“The intent of this project is well matched for the needs of Redwood City but the traffic and potential health effects must be accurately measured and mitigated, where needed.”

*Response:* Comment noted; no additional response is necessary.
March 7, 2012

To
City of Redwood City
Community Development Department

Planning
re: Stanford University Project, Redwood City, California

There should be no project because it will have a negative impact on the residents of the surrounding area.

Stanford has disregard for the health and safety of the residents in the area, which is comprised of a large population of families with children. The area has many schools, churches and community centers. The surrounding area has one of the highest number of children per square mile in San Mateo County. It has a very large Hispanic population and many non-English speaking residents. A better location for this project would be on the unused vacant land owned by Stanford near the University and Medical Center at Stanford, Ca.

The increased traffic will adversely affect the nearby community at all hours of the day. This will result in an increase in motor vehicle, pedestrian and bicycle accidents. This project will cause an increase in injury and death to the residents of the area.

The project will increase noise pollution. The area already has poor air quality since it is surrounded by US 101, Marsh Road, Woodside Road, Bay Road, Broadway Street and Middlefield Road. This project will result in more asthma and other respiratory diseases. The exhaust and venting from the project and construction will further pollute the air.

This project is too big for the area. The surface streets, freeway and off-ramps are already filled to capacity. There is no room for new lanes. Re-stripping streets and traffic signals will not lower the volume of traffic noise and pollution.

There are only two US 101 routes to this area, Marsh Rd and Woodside Rd., 84. Both North and South freeway ramps to these overpasses are backed up onto the freeway. The City of Menlo Park has approved a hotel business park East of US 101 and South of Marsh Rd. This project will further the pollution and traffic. The City of Menlo Park also restructured Fair Oaks Ave. running North and South and this caused most of the traffic going North and South to go on Bay Rd. The intersections of Woodside Rd., 84, Broadway and Bay Rd. and Marsh Rd. and Florence are already over-used.

For these reasons, there should be no project.

Michael Morris
Redwood City, CA 94063- (650) 714-6201/ cc: file

Michael Morris
MMORRE@yahoo.com
L 9. Michael Morris, Redwood City resident; March 7, 2012 (1 page)

L 9.01 General--The commenter describes various concerns with the project (e.g., traffic, noise, air quality) and concludes that the project should be located on vacant land owned by Stanford University near its main campus.

Response: The Precise Plan’s range of potential land uses is consistent with the Redwood City General Plan land use designations for the Precise Plan area (see Draft EIR chapter 4, Land Use and Planning). Draft EIR chapter 7 (Transportation, Circulation, and Parking) includes a comprehensive and detailed analysis of existing and projected traffic conditions in the Precise Plan vicinity, prepared by professional transportation engineers and approved by Redwood City staff. Likewise, Draft EIR chapters 8 (Air Quality) and 13 (Noise) contain professionally prepared, quantitative, and comprehensive air quality and noise analyses. Draft EIR section 18.6 (Alternative 18.6: Alternative Project Location) in chapter 18 (Alternatives to the Proposed Project) evaluates the possibility of locating the proposed project elsewhere.

For various reasons (e.g., lack of other available sites of adequate size and character, similar or greater environmental effects at other locations), the possibility of locating the proposed project on an alternative site that would avoid or substantially lessen potentially significant environmental impacts identified in the EIR, while attaining most of the project objectives, is considered remote (see Draft EIR section 18.6).

With regard to the specific location suggested by the commenter, vacant areas adjacent to the Stanford campus and hospitals include undeveloped land in the Santa Clara County foothills, recreation fields along Sand Hill Road, and the Stanford Arboretum. Unlike the project development site, those locations do not have general plan designations allowing the types or intensity of uses that have been proposed, nor are such land use changes likely to be approved. Stanford lands in the Santa Clara County foothills are outside of the “Academic Growth Boundary” adopted by Santa Clara County and are designated by the Stanford Community Plan as “Open Space and Field Research” and “Special Conservation Areas.” Very limited development is allowed in these areas, and the uses contemplated in the Stanford in Redwood City Precise Plan are not allowed. The recreation fields located along Sand Hill Road are subject to restrictions in a Development Agreement between the City of Palo Alto and Stanford University, which do not allow commercial facilities to be constructed in this location. Finally, the Stanford Arboretum is designated by the Stanford Community Plan as “Campus Open Space,” which does not allow construction of the types of facilities contemplated in the Stanford in Redwood City Precise Plan. Further, constructing the project on undeveloped land could result in greater impacts to biological resources, creek habitat and water quality, potential archaeological resources, and aesthetic resources than the proposed project. For these reasons, the alternative location suggested by the commenter is not considered to be a potentially feasible alternative capable of substantially reducing the impacts of the proposed project.
From: Karen Davis [mailto:karen.k.davis@stanfordalumni.org]

Sent: Thursday, March 08, 2012 2:40 PM
To: PLG-Maureen Riordan
Cc: Karen Davis

Subject: My Comments Regarding the Draft Environmental Impact Report / Precise Plan for the Proposed Expansion of Stanford in Redwood City

My Comments Regarding the Draft Environmental Impact Report / Precise Plan for the Proposed Expansion of Stanford in Redwood City

March 8, 2012

(1) bicycling infrastructure:

I commuted by bicycle to Stanford for 15 years when I was employed there; I drove to work only one day a year. Bicycling from my home in southern Redwood City to Stanford was very pleasant. However, it would not be pleasant to commute by bicycle from my Redwood City home to the Stanford location in Redwood City. I suspect that there may be a number of bicycle-commuting Stanford employees that are going to be very disappointed about the move of their Stanford offices to Redwood City, unless significant changes are made to bicycling infrastructure near the Stanford site in Redwood City.

Thus, I concur with the comments dated March 10, 2012 by John Langbein about the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the proposed the Stanford expansion in Redwood City and its effects on bicycling.

(2) zoning and development of baylands:

I would like to be assured that the proposed change in zoning to allow the Stanford expansion would not later lead to a zoning change
in Redwood City's baylands. While there may not appear to be a connection between the Stanford expansion and the baylands, here is my concern: During the recent preparation for the 2010 General Plan for Redwood City, one of the proposed alternatives (I think it was Alternative 7) for the baylands was to re-zone some of the baylands for light industry. The rationale was that more area for light industry was needed to compensate for the reduction in light-industry-zoned areas because of re-zoning of a light-industry area for Stanford (even though Redwood City residents had been assured that the zoning of the baylands would remain as it was in the 1990 General Plan). So, please, in the future, don't be tempted to use the proposed Stanford expansion as an excuse to develop the baylands.

(3) flooding and development of baylands:

The area of the Stanford expansion is prone to flooding. Why Stanford wants to expand in that area I don't know, especially since news reports about a year or so ago said that Stanford had to cancel some surgeries due to a flooded parking lot. My fear is that Stanford's expansion into a flood-prone area could lead the city to approve the proposed Saltworks development as a way of supposedly solving flooding. So again, please don't use the proposed Stanford expansion as a justification in the future to develop the baylands.

Karen Davis

152 Oakfield Avenue

Redwood City, CA 94061

(650) 365-9462
L 10 Karen Davis, Redwood City resident; March 8, 2012 (2 pages)

L 10.01 Bike Access--The commenter concurs with the bike-related comments dated March 12, 2012 by John Langbein on the Draft EIR.

Response: See the response to comment L 6.01 above. (Although the commenter refers to Mr. Langbein’s March 12, 2012 letter, the commenter’s own email was received by the City earlier, on March 8.)

L 10.02 Land Use--The commenter wants to be assured that the proposed zoning to allow the Precise Plan would not later lead to a zoning change in Redwood City’s “baylands” [location not specified].

Response: The project development site’s proposed uses are already consistent with the Redwood City General Plan land use designations of Commercial--Office Professional/Technology and Hospital. By State law, General Plan designations take precedence over zoning designations. The rezoning would align the proposed zoning designation (P Planned Community District) with the existing General Plan designations. Any proposed, future rezoning of “baylands” sites would require a Rezoning process separate from the Stanford in Redwood City Precise Plan process.

L 10.03 Flooding--The commenter fears that the project’s expansion into a flood-prone area could lead the City to approve the proposed Saltworks development as a way of supposedly solving flooding.

Response: The proposed Stanford in Redwood City project is responsible for mitigating any potential flooding impacts caused by its development. Please see Draft EIR chapter 10 (Utilities), section 10.3 (Storm Drainage and Water Quality), especially subsection 10.3.4 (Impacts and Mitigation Measures).
March 8, 2012

Ms. Maureen Riordan
Planning Services
Community Development Services
City of Redwood City
1017 Middlefield Road
P.O. Box 391
Redwood City, CA 94064

Dear Ms. Riordan:

STANFORD IN REDWOOD CITY PRECISE PLAN – DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

Thank you for continuing to include the California Department of Transportation (Department) in the environmental review process for Stanford in Redwood City Precise Plan. The following comments are based on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR). Additional comments may be sent pending review of the requested information.

Forecasting
On page 7-32, Table 7.10 Project Trip Generation, assumes an 18 percent trip reductions rate to the AM and PM peak hour generated trips due to the implementation of various travel demand management (TDM) measures. Please provide a discussion on how this reduction rate was derived. The Department believes the reduction rate is overestimated since the project site is not located in a major transit corridor, near a transit center or light rail station. Further, since the TDM measures are solely implemented by the employers and most employees would be relatively high income and own vehicles, the TDM participation rate is likely to be low. To determine a more accurate TDM participation rate, the Department recommends conducting travel surveys on previous and current employees under comparable conditions near or at the project site.

Roadway System Transportation Analysis
1. Please include the following as study intersections in the analysis:
   a. US-101/Marsh Road, northbound (NB) Marsh Road to southbound (SB) US-101 on-ramp,
   b. El Camino Real/Jefferson Avenue,
   c. Veterans Boulevard at Brewster Avenue/Main Street/Maple Street, and
   d. Broadway at Winslow Street/Main Street/Maple Street

"Caltrans improves mobility across California"
2. Please provide a discussion, geometric plan, and level of service (LOS) analysis for the project’s Alternative Hurlingame Avenue extension to Bay Road.

3. Intersection #4: To get a proper LOS analysis, we recommend separating the US-101 SB off-ramp and Woodside Road SB movements rather than combining them.

4. We also recommend alternative phasing of Phases 3, 4, 7, and 8 on US-101 to Broadway eastbound and westbound which currently exclusively uses Phase 7.

5. Please provide a discussion in the Transportation Demand Management program about including a shuttle bus component from the project site to the main campus at Stanford Hospital in Palo Alto.

Please feel free to call or email Sandra Finegan at (510) 622-1644 or sandra_finegan@dot.ca.gov with any questions regarding this letter.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

for
GARY ARNOLD
District Branch Chief
Local Development – Intergovernmental Review

c: State Clearinghouse
Subject: Comments on Stanford in Redwood City DEIR
From: Gary Black <gblack@hextrans.com>
Date: 3/19/2012 10:25 AM
To: "sandra_finegan@dot.ca.gov" <sandra_finegan@dot.ca.gov>
CC: Ray Pendro <rayp@migcom.com>, PLG-Maureen Riordan
     <MRIordan@redwoodcity.org>

Hello Sandra,

This e-mail is a follow-up to the phone conversation we had last week. Hexagon prepared the
transportation analysis in the Stanford DEIR, and we are preparing the responses to comments. Our
phone call served to clarify a couple of the Caltrans comments in Gary Arnold's letter dated March 8,
2012.

The Caltrans letter requests additional intersection analysis for the northbound Marsh Road to
southbound US101 on-ramp. However, there is no intersection at that junction. You clarified that you
would like to see a general discussion of traffic operations at that part of the interchange.

The Caltrans letter requests a discussion and analysis of the project alternative that extends Hurlingame
Avenue to “Bay Road.” We discussed that Hurlingame already intersects Bay Road, and the project
alternative would extend Hurlingame Avenue to Broadway. We agreed that in the Caltrans comment letter
“Bay Road” is a typo and should read “Broadway.”

We will proceed to respond to the comment letter with these clarifications. Please contact us if the above
does not reflect your understanding of our phone conversation.

Thank you,

Gary Black, AICP
President
Hexagon Transportation Consultants, Inc.
San Jose | Gilroy | Phoenix | Pleasanton

111 W. St. John St, Suite 850 | San Jose, California 95113 | 408.971.6100 | 7 408.971.6102

www.hextrans.com
P  Please consider the environment before printing this material.
L 11 Lisa Carboni for Gary Arnold, District Branch Chief, Local Development--
Intergovernmental Review, California Department of Transportation; March 8, 2012
(accompanied by a March 19 email between Gary Black, AICP, Principal, Hexagon
Transportation Consultants, Inc. and Sandra Finegan, the contact identified in the March 8
letter) (3 pages)

L 11.01 Traffic Forecasting--Please provide a discussion of how the 18 percent peak hour trip
reduction rate was derived for project-generated traffic.

Response: Stanford University submitted a Transportation Demand Management
(TDM) program that describes the measures that the University proposes to
implement. The TDM program is listed in Table 7.9 in the Draft EIR. Hexagon (EIR
transportation consultant) conducted a review of the program to determine the likely
trip reduction that would occur. Using the URBEMIS software, which accounts for
trip reductions due to the project location and TDM program, Hexagon calculated a
22.5 percent trip reduction. The Hexagon evaluation is included in appendix A of this
Final EIR, which is available on the City’s website at www.redwoodcity.org under
“Hot Topics”. In consultation with City staff and Stanford representatives, it was
decided that using an 18 percent reduction would represent a more accurate and
conservative approach. Stanford implements a TDM program at its existing campus
in Palo Alto, and the existing program achieves better than an 18 percent peak-hour
trip reduction, which provides additional support for the conclusion that the level
assumed in the EIR can be achieved in Redwood City.

L 11.02 Roadway System--Please include the US 101/Marsh Road intersection, northbound
Marsh Road to southbound US 101 on-ramp, in the transportation analysis.

Response: According to Figure 7.8 in the Draft EIR, there is a demand volume of
almost 4,000 vehicles approaching the US 101/Marsh interchange on northbound
Marsh Road during the PM peak hour under cumulative conditions with the project.
The closest intersection along Marsh Road that feeds northbound traffic into the
interchange is the Marsh Road/Scott Drive/Rolison Road intersection. About 3,050
vehicles would be approaching the interchange from Marsh Road, with 900 turning
from Scott Drive and Rolison Road. The PM peak-hour Level of Service (LOS) at the
Marsh Road/Scott Drive intersection calculates to LOS F. A significant project
impact and mitigation are identified in the Draft EIR for the Marsh Road/Scott Drive
intersection (Impact/Mitigation 7-18).

According to Table 7.18 in the Draft EIR, there will be 1,454 PM peak-hour vehicles
using the southbound US 101 on-ramp from northbound Marsh Road under
cumulative conditions with the project. There is one lane from Marsh Road that
feeds into the southbound on-ramp, and two lanes on Marsh Road that continue
northbound. Thus, of the 4,000 vehicles on Marsh Road, about 1,450 would use the
on-ramp and 2,550 would continue straight in two lanes (1,275 per lane). This
represents adequate lane balance on Marsh Road. The number of vehicles
projected to use the US 101 southbound on-ramp is within the capacity of the ramp.
The number of vehicles continuing straight on northbound Marsh Road during the
PM peak hour (2,550 vehicles) would result in LOS F at the intersection of the
southbound US 101 ramp to Marsh Road, as shown in Table 7.16 in the Draft EIR.
However, the project traffic contribution to the cumulative impact at this intersection
(2.2 seconds of delay) would be less-than-significant, so no project mitigation is required.

L 11.03 Roadway System--Please include the El Camino Real/Jefferson Avenue intersection in the transportation analysis.

Response: A project trip assignment was run, and the project would add 28 peak-hour trips to the El Camino Real/Jefferson Avenue intersection. This is an insufficient number of trips to potentially cause an impact, so no further analysis was conducted.

L 11.04 Roadway System--Please include the Veterans Boulevard at Brewster Avenue/Main Street/Maple Street intersections in the transportation analysis.

Response: A project trip assignment was run, and the project would add over 100 peak-hour trips to each of these intersections. Therefore, an analysis of these intersections was completed for each study scenario. Appendix A (Table 1) of this Final EIR (available on the City’s website at www.redwoodcity.org under “Hot Topics”) shows that each intersection would operate at Level of Service D or better for each study scenario. Therefore, the project impact would be less-than-significant, and no mitigation is required.

L 11.05 Roadway System--Please include the Broadway at Winslow Street/Main Street/Maple Street intersections in the transportation analysis.

Response: These intersections are located in Downtown Redwood City. The project trip assignment shows that the project would add about 145 total peak-hour trips within Downtown Redwood City. However, these trips would be split among several different intersections. The impact on any one of the intersections Downtown would be less-than-significant, and no mitigation is required.

L 11.06 Level of Service (LOS)--Please provide a discussion, geometric plan, and LOS analysis for the project's Hurlingame Avenue extension to Bay Road.

Response: One of the site plan options for the project would extend Hurlingame Avenue through the project development site to intersect with Broadway. The Broadway/Hurlingame Avenue intersection would be about 500 feet east of the Broadway/Douglas Avenue intersection. Without the Hurlingame Avenue extension, the project could access Broadway at four locations; with the extension there would be five access points. The total project traffic that would exit the site to make a turn onto Broadway is estimated to be about 500 vehicles during the PM peak hour. With five exit points, that is an average of 100 vehicles at each intersection. With four exit points, the volume is about 125 per intersection. The Hurlingame Avenue extension would carry about 100 vehicles during the PM peak hour, which would help to spread the traffic out that is accessing Broadway from the project site. Very little non-project traffic is forecast to use Hurlingame Avenue between Bay Road and Broadway, if it were extended to Broadway.
L 11.07  Level of Service (LOS)--For the LOS analysis, the commenter recommends separating the US 101 southbound off-ramp and Woodside Road southbound movements.

_Response:_ The software used to calculate intersection levels of service (LOS) cannot accommodate 5-legged intersections, which is the case for the southbound US 101/Broadway/Woodside Road intersection. The traffic analysis therefore combines the southbound 101 off-ramp traffic with the southbound Woodside Road traffic. In reality these movements operate on separate phases. However, by combining the movements, the traffic analysis still results in an accurate depiction of the LOS at the intersection.

L 11.08  Traffic Signal Phasing--The commenter recommends that Broadway be converted from split-phase signal operation to protected left-turn phasing at the Broadway/southbound US 101/Woodside Road intersection.

_Response:_ Draft EIR Mitigation 7-1 (Woodside/Broadway) calls for restriping the eastbound and westbound legs on Broadway at this intersection and the conversion of the signal from split-phase to protected left-turn phasing. This mitigation would satisfy the Caltrans request in the comment.

L 11.09  Transportation Demand Management (TDM)--In the project TDM program, please include a shuttle bus from the main Stanford University campus to the Precise Plan area.

_Response:_ The employees who may be relocated from the Stanford Palo Alto campus and medical center to the Stanford in Redwood City campus are anticipated to be those who do not require a location on the main academic campus because they will most likely not frequently visit other main campus offices or buildings. Accordingly, it is unlikely that the project will generate sufficient traffic between the main campus and Redwood City such that a fixed-schedule shuttle bus would be used with enough frequency to be effective. To encourage employees to ride such a shuttle, Stanford would have to run it on frequent headways, which would result in numerous empty shuttle trips between the campus and Redwood City. This would not reduce traffic or air pollutants. Instead, Stanford intends to utilize a carsharing program or an alternative on-demand service at the Redwood City campus that can be used by employees as needed when traveling to the main campus. This would enable the employees to take transit or ride bicycles to work, and it would reduce vehicle trips to the minimum needed to travel between campuses during the middle of the day. In addition, employees at the Stanford in Redwood City campus would be able to take shuttles to the downtown Redwood City Caltrain station and then ride Caltrain to Palo Alto, where Marguerite shuttles are available to transport them to campus buildings. To the extent assumptions about travel between the Palo Alto campus and the Stanford in Redwood City campus prove to be incorrect, adjustments to the TDM program, such as a shuttle component between the two campuses, would be made to increase use of transit alternatives, thereby reducing vehicle trips.
John Langbein
152 Oakfield Ave.
Redwood City, CA
March 10, 2012
John.Langbein@yahoo.com

Redwood City Planning Commission and Planning Dept.
City of Redwood City
1017 Middlefield Rd
Redwood City, CA

Subject: Stanford in Redwood City/Precise Plan and DEIR

I have read parts of both the Precise Plan and its accompanying DEIR and I wish to comment on some of the transportation aspects (Chapter 7 of the DEIR).

I would have like to have seen a more aggressive policy in the Precise Plan to build more bike lanes (Class II) within the 3 mile radius of this project. Instead, the PP relies upon both the C/CAG bike plan, which is regional in scope, and the Redwood City General Plan (Circulation Element). This project is located at the edge of the City's boundary and any bicycle related planning needs to involve not only Redwood City, but the adjoining County, Atherton, San Carlos, and Menlo Park. There many Stanford employees who will be working at the Stanford's Redwood City Office, who live within 3 miles of this project, and who could easily ride their bike to work if they had bike facilities that would give them a sense of safety. Instead, although cycling to the Broadway destination is currently doable by an experienced bike commuter, the additional traffic generated by this project will make bike commuting daunting for all but the most dedicated bike commuter (of which there are few). Without substantial improvements, bike commuting will not be an option for most. For instance, east-west travel is very limited to discrete corridors as there is extremely limited set of roads that cross both El Camino and the Caltrain tracks. At a minimum, these need substantial improvements.

In addition, the PP needs to be more aggressive about encouraging commuters not to drive to work as a single occupant. Perhaps the best way to accomplish this would be to do what Stanford already does on their main Campus; charge for parking. Instead, the PP and DEIR is pushing to have more than enough parking such that there is between a 5 and 15% vacancy rate. Of course, if on-campus parking is limited, there needs to be mechanisms to prevent employees from parking in the nearby residential neighborhood.

Sincerely,

John Langbein
L 12. John Langbein, Redwood City resident; March 10, 2012 (1 page)

L 12.01 Bike Access--The commenter would like to see a “more aggressive” policy in the Precise Plan to build more bike lanes within the 3-mile radius of the Plan area, including the involvement of the County, Atherton, San Carlos, and Menlo Park.

Response: Please see the response to comment L 6.01 above.

L 12.02 Parking--The Precise Plan needs to be “more aggressive” about encouraging less single-occupancy-vehicle commuting.

Response: The Draft EIR parking analysis, including methodology and rationale, is included in chapter 7 (Transportation, Circulation, and Parking), subsection 7.4.7(e) (Parking). Of note is that the project’s parking adequacy is based on surveys of nearby large-scale developments. Also, the 10 percent parking vacancy cushion considered appropriate for the Precise Plan area accounts for the project’s mix of new and regular users. The parking vacancy cushion is considered necessary to accommodate clinic patients, visitors, and the public (e.g., users of the new publicly accessible open space)--not only the regular employees in the Precise Plan area.

The Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program included as an integral part of the Precise Plan is described in Draft EIR subsection 7.4.2(a) (Trip Generation), especially in Table 7.9 (TDM Program Summary).

The Precise Plan establishes goals for trip reduction, and requires ongoing monitoring and reporting. This will enable the applicant to adjust the program as needed to best reduce use of single-occupant vehicles. It will be important to allow ongoing flexibility to manage the TDM program.
March 11, 2012

Dear Planning Commission and Ms. Riordan,

According to newspaper articles about Menlo Park and the expansion of Facebook, I’d like to ask if Redwood City also has a “vehicular trip cap limit”? And what is the limit? It would behoove the city to have one if there is none at this time. Our city is wooing or allowing too many new businesses into its limits without any forethought as to the future consequences it brings to each neighborhood.

The Facebook issues in Menlo Park still are not comparable to Redwood City’s Stanford issues. The biggest being that Stanford, when occupying their buildings will NOT bring in any revenue for the city. Plain and simple: why allow such a massive project with a non-profit?

The city has reacted to the increase in city traffic by making street “diets”, which make the streets narrower so the line of cars is longer. If you’ve ever tried to drive though downtown to get to a meeting or appointment, cars are clogged up on Jefferson, Broadway, Marshall, and Middlefield, and then Woodside Rd. due to the crazy lane diets on the other end of Broadway. Our stop lights are not synchronized, so cars crawl through the city from about 4:00 pm to 7:00 pm. Intersections are blocked and it becomes very unsafe and frustrating to calmly arrive to a destination and arrive on time, unless you have left your home 40 minutes earlier.

The Costco traffic is a great example of my point. Planning Commission or the City Council has approved a crazy design with stop lights that clog up Middlefield onto Woodside Rd. or further back south onto Middlefield. It peaks at commute hours and weekends, but, again, no forethought was put into this design to
make entering and exiting safe and easy. The design just does not flow.

Another probable issue to this project are the needs of modern buildings and the impact that has to the surrounding neighborhood. The Genentec building (550 Broadway) and the newer Stanford Outpatient Clinics have some huge generators attached to their buildings. (The other leased buildings at MidPoint Technology Park also have gated generators.) During maintenance and service and power outages they are so loud, the sound is comparable to standing on the tarmac near a jet engine at take off. This noise does not happen every day, but with the all the other (electrical) attachments to parking garages and buildings, I sense that it will not be a quiet industrial & residential area surrounding a city park.

The thought of this magnitude of construction a block away from my home—or in some cases 100 yards from my home, makes me very sad to live in a city that seems not to care about the quality of life of its residences.

Thank you,
Roxanne Dragan
910 Second Ave.
L 13.01 Traffic--Does Redwood City have a “vehicular trip cap limit”? Other comments pertain to the commenter’s experiences in traffic.

Response: The comments related to perceived existing traffic conditions in Redwood City, including at Costco, do not pertain to the content or adequacy of the Draft EIR, whose comprehensive transportation, circulation, and parking analysis is included in chapter 7. The Stanford in Redwood City Precise Plan does not include a vehicular trip cap, for the reasons discussed in the response to comment 16.01 below. With regard to “street diets,” please see the response to comment PC 11 above.

L 13.02 Noise--The commenter is concerned about generator and construction noise.

Response: Please see the responses to comments L 3.06 and L 3.07 above.
February 19, 2012
Dear Planning Commission and Maureen Riordan,

I would like to comment regarding the Stanford in Redwood City plan. I live at 910 Second Avenue directly across from Spinas Park and the project.

I am concerned with traffic, noise, air quality, and public safety.

I understand this will be a phased build, but at no time has Stanford stated which buildings are in which phase. Therefore, we do not know which area will be built first. I assume it will be block A closest to Second Avenue based on building usage and land use.

1. I would like to see **P1 and Building 5 switched** for the following reasons:
   **NOISE** – As stated in the EIR 13-18, parking structures use “ventilation system(s) and other mechanical equipment” which “possibly represent a potentially significant impact” to the neighbors. It does not mention the car driving/turning sounds of tires nor car alarms setting on and off or horns. This structure is closest to my street and home. I forsee, without any building or foliage sound break, we will be impacted with more car noise day and night—depending upon building usage hours.

   **PUBLIC SAFETY** – In this day and age, a parking structure within 500 yards of a park and open space where children will be playing (many times unattended) is creepy. It can be an invitation for danger. The further away this structure is from any potential dangerous opportunities, the better for our city.

   **AIR QUALITY** – It is a scientific studied fact that people who live closer to freeways and traffic have increased health issues such as heart disease and asthma. Locating the P1 closer to our park, street, or neighborhood adds to our potential health issues.

2. The neighborhood NOISE issue is addressed during construction (13-2) with a “Noise Disturbance Coordinator”. I would like that
position to extend past the build-out of all phases and continue to meet with the Friendly Acres/ East Bayshore Neighborhood Association for at least two years post build, to mitigate any other types of noise issues related to occupancy, traffic, etc.

3. **TRAFFIC** – As you know, since the Stanford Outpatient Center has opened, traffic has increased on our neighborhood streets. It is mostly significant during morning and evening commute hours, although patients to the clinic frequently use our street. We have had to call the community liaison for the clinic, Lourie Campos, to report many speeding vehicles---employees and patients.

Stanford maintains that they will run a free shuttle to and from downtown for employees and community. Add the number of these shuttles to the Redwood City shuttle schedule. This increases vehicular traffic on our streets, also. Remember, in 2009, when the outpatient center opened, they contracted with AC Transit to run a shuttle bus for employees which began in Hayward, ended in Fremont, and made 35 round trips down Second Ave. Monday through Friday---all that without talking to the neighborhood first, or doing a walk-though of the route. Common sense needs to prevail—where should traffic be contained so that children of our city are safe playing at a city park? Make sure they use unoccupied streets such as Douglas Ave., between Bay and Broadway. So, in thinking about the shuttles that will or might happen, discussion and input with the community it directly affects need to come first.

They also claim they will run a lunchtime shuttle for employees to take advantage of our downtown restaurants (tax revenue). If any of you have ever driven or tried to drive through Redwood City during lunch hour, you know how congested traffic is. If you have only 60 minutes for lunch, how do you expect someone to have enough time to hop the shuttle, get a seat in a restaurant, eat, and return in the allotted timeframe?

PLEASE use your common sense when listening to Stanford’s rational (on all issues).
I am also concerned that the intersection mitigations Stanford proposes will congest traffic even more. I am asking each commissioner to drive through the EIR mentioned intersections at 4:30 – 5:00 on a weekday. I want them also to drive towards downtown on Broadway with the new traffic lane “diet”. What this diet has done is further congest traffic on Broadway at peak times by going from two lanes into one each way. I further contest that if the blocks of Broadway within the Stanford project go on a diet, traffic will be backed up from light to light in both directions. Travel time from Friendly Acres to downtown will go from 7-10 minutes to 15-20 minutes, theoretically.

Please also take into consideration removal of the left turns onto Broadway from the Post Office and/or Smart and Final lots. These turn choices that drivers make also significantly impede traffic and have nearly caused many accidents throughout the years.

4. **Greenway Buffer/Spinas Park extension** – This proposed extension will be quite attractive. I am concerned, though, that if this parcel is changed to a baseball or soccer field, that we will have more traffic and noise issues. Stanford has stated that it will be a privately owned parcel and maintained by Stanford. That’s what we know at this time. I also understand the need for more playing fields in our city, but I do not want a change of this magnitude to come forth without specific direction and agreement from the neighborhood, as this would impact them even more.

5. **Jobs** -- During construction and post build-out I would like Stanford to include in their employee count 10-15% Redwood City residents, if not more. If the % cannot be met, I would like to see an employee training program or similar to what Ikea did when it moved into E. Palo Alto.

6. **Local Historic Value** – As stated in the letter to you from CIRCA: Historic Property Development, the architect of the AMPEX campus was Mr. John Warnecke, a famous and important architect in the 1950’s and 60’s in the Bay Area and nation. Ampex was the inception of (recording) technology before this was known as Silicon Valley.
They moved to Charter Street in 1952 and the campus grew from there. Whatever can be done to preserve the “Warnecke” fountains as a pleasing view for new company’s employees would greatly enhance the Stanford campus in Redwood City. This would show they are interested in its “special meaning to the community of Redwood City”.

7. R & D – Please get specifics of the type of research and development that may take place in any of their buildings. We all know that Stanford does animal research. The area/building on the Palo Alto campus is secretive. I would prefer no animal research to be done on the Redwood City campus. Not only for personal reasons, but it could be a public safety issue if the site is discovered, vandalized, or picketed, etc.

8. “CREATING A FUND to offset the presence of more cars in the area”. How much will be in this fund and how long will it last? It’s admirable that Stanford will/must mitigate traffic issues it will cause by opening a fund to help the neighborhood. I think this should be an on-going fund/trust that will help in any emergency for the Friendly Acres/East Bayshore Neighborhoods.

My reasoning is that whenever a new company wants to come into our neighborhood—which is mixed industry and homes—they will always promise us things or donate a bit, but once in, we never hear from them again. I site Excite@Home, Stanford Outpatient Center, Cargill. This is the “good neighbor” syndrome. If Stanford is here to stay, they should be that good neighbor and actually give us more than a cute sign for the entrance of our neighborhood or traffic mitigation. Remember, Stanford is exempt from property taxes.

Our neighborhood needs:
• full-time nurses at each school—Fair Oaks, Hoover, Taft
• free or discounted access to their gym
• discounted access to their daycare/preschool
• resident employees at the daycare
• jobs for 10-15% or more residents of Redwood City
• discount or free continuing education classes for RC residents
9. Truck Routes – Please rethink the truck routes that the construction trucks will use. My block is a designated truck route, as is Bay Rd., Douglas Ave. The EIR states that “construction traffic to and from the construction sites via designated truck routes where possible”. This is the same route that the AC Transit bus used—past a city park, past 8+ homes on a narrower street than Douglas Ave. Please consider removing the truck route from the block of Second Ave. between Broadway and Bay Roads. Our street will be safer when all trucks, semitrailers, and buses are removed from utilizing it.

Remember, Stanford is a huge entity that will make a larger footprint in our neighborhood and city. We want their assistance to make our city more attractive and they need our assistance for their planned campus. This must be a win-win situation.

Thank you,
Roxanne Dragan
L 14 Roxanne Dragan; February 19, 2012 (5 pages)

L 14.01 Project Description--At no time has Stanford stated which buildings are in which phase.

Response: Precise Plan chapter II, section III (Development Phasing) describes potential phasing of project development. The Draft EIR does not analyze the overall project in phases because: (1) the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires evaluation of a project as a whole (not in piecemeal fashion) in order to not underestimate potential environmental impacts (CEQA Guidelines section 15378); and (2) a definitive project phasing schedule has not been formulated.

L 14.02 Noise--The commenter would like to see the locations of project parking structure 1 and building 5 switched due to potential noise impacts from the parking structure near residences.

Response: As discussed in many places in both the Precise Plan and the Draft EIR (e.g., EIR chapter 3--Project Description), the project site plan at this time is conceptual and is but one example of how the Precise Plan standards and guidelines could be applied to formulate a development site plan. The Draft EIR concludes that the noise impacts resulting from the location of a parking structure at Bay and Barron would be less-than-significant. Please also see the response to comment L 3.06 above.

L 14.03 Public Safety--Regarding parking structure 1 and building 5, a parking structure within 500 yards of a park and open space where children will be playing can be an invitation to danger.

Response: The comment is conclusory without supporting evidence. After reviewing the proposed project, the Redwood City Police Department concluded that: (1) the proposed project would result in a less-than-significant impact on police services, and (2) applicant-proposed, on-site, proactive internal security measures (e.g., alarm systems, security cameras) and trained personnel (e.g., private security) would help address potential security concerns. Please see Draft EIR section 11.1 (Police Service).

L 14.04 Air Quality--Locating parking structure 1 closer to Spinas Park and residential neighborhoods adds to potential health issues.

Response: Please see Draft EIR chapter 8 (Air Quality) for a comprehensive and quantitative analysis of potential air emissions effects of the proposed project. The potential location of a parking structure at Bay and Barron would not cause a significant air quality impact. Emissions associated with the parking structure include construction emissions and emissions from vehicle traffic along the streets approaching the parking structure. The impacts from these sources along with other project-related traffic and operational emissions were evaluated in the health risk assessment (appendix D of this Final EIR, available on the City’s website at www.redwoodcity.org under “Hot Topics”). The estimated excess lifetime cancer risks, noncancer hazards, and PM_{2.5} concentrations for on-site operational and traffic emissions would all be below significance thresholds. In addition, the evaluation of
resident and worker risks in the health risk assessment is considered protective of park users due to the longer duration of exposure of the nearby residents and on-site workers.

L 14.05 Noise--The commenter would like the “Noise Disturbance Coordinator” [identified in Draft EIR Mitigation 13-2] position to be extended for at least two years after construction is completed.

Response: The mitigation is recommended as an extra level of protection from noise specifically during project-related demolition and construction activity. During project operation, the City will maintain its existing procedures for implementing Chapter 24 (Noise Regulation) of the Redwood City Municipal Code, as amended from time to time. See Draft EIR subsection 13.2.1(b)--Redwood City Municipal Code.

L 14.06 Traffic--The commenter describes past and present experiences with traffic. Also, the commenter notes that the proposed project shuttle service should require input from the community during the planning stage, and doubts if project employees will take a shuttle to Downtown for lunch.

Response: The operation of a shuttle would reduce, not increase, the overall number of vehicles on the roadway network generally because a shuttle can accommodate more passengers than a standard passenger car. The details of the shuttle service (including creation of a new service or participation in an existing service) have not yet been decided. However, future specific developments proposed under the Precise Plan would be subject to the City decision-making process, including public hearings.

L 14.07 Traffic--The commenter is concerned that the recommended intersection mitigations will make traffic worse, as will the recommended road diet on Broadway.

Response: The Precise Plan identifies Broadway as a Pedestrian and Transit Corridor. The location of proposed parking structures along Bay Road is coordinated with this designation for Broadway. The intent is to have drivers use other, nonresidential streets that have more capacity to accommodate vehicles. The Draft EIR transportation, circulation, and parking analysis (chapter 7) is consistent with these City intentions. With respect to a Broadway “road diet,” please see the response to comment PC 11 above.

The commenter’s other observations (e.g., left turns from the post office) concern existing traffic conditions and do not affect the Draft EIR findings.

L 14.08 Traffic and Noise--The commenter is concerned that, if the proposed publicly accessible open space includes baseball or soccer fields in the future, more traffic and noise will result.

Response: As noted in Draft EIR chapter 11 (Public Services), section 11.3 (Parks and Recreation), the EIR assumes that the new publicly accessible open area would be passive open space. Any additional proposals for the space would be subject to the City decision-making process and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review process, including public hearings.
L 14.09 Employment--The commenter wants to see at least 10 to 15 percent of project jobs go to Redwood City residents.

Response: Although the City can consider the comment in its decision-making on whether to approve the Precise Plan, this is not an environmental issue subject to CEQA.

L 14.10 Historic Resources--The commenter would like to see the “Warnecke” fountains preserved.

Response: Please see Draft EIR chapter 14 (Cultural and Historic Resources) for a discussion of the Warnecke fountains. Draft EIR chapter 18, section 18.3 (Alternative 18.3: Reduced Development/425 Broadway Preservation Scenario) evaluates preservation of the fountains. Also see the response to comment HR 1 above.

L 14.11 Project Description--The commenter is concerned that animal research will occur as part of the project’s “R&D” uses.

Response: The City’s General Plan and zoning regulations do not currently govern the type of research that can be conducted in buildings in which research and development is a permitted use. While the comment expresses a generalized concern about vandalism or picketing, there is no evidence that such events would occur at the Stanford in Redwood City campus. Stanford has maintained a safe, clean environment on its main campus in Palo Alto.

Article 2 of the City’s Zoning Ordinance includes the following definitions for research and development uses:

Research and Development. A use primarily engaged in the study, testing, engineering, design, analysis, or experimental development of products, processes, or services related to current or new technologies. Research and development may include manufacturing, fabricating, processing, assembling or storage of products or materials, or similar related activities, where such activities are accessory to research, development or evaluation. Related administrative uses such as finance, marketing, sales, accounting, purchasing, or corporate offices; provisions of services to others on- or off-site; and related educational uses may also be included provided they remain accessory to the primary uses of "research and development," and are consistent with any limitations on accessory uses for the applicable zone district. Typical "research and development" uses may include, but are not limited to, computer software and hardware firms, electronic research firms, biotechnical firms, and pharmaceutical research laboratories.

Research and Development, Laboratory Type. A research and development use for which the research and development components require substantial laboratory space and/or other equipment for testing or development, which may also include associated adjacent or nearby workstations for recording or preparing written documentation of research. Typical laboratory research and
development uses may include, but are not limited to, biotechnical firms and pharmaceutical research laboratories.

Research and Development, Office Type. A research and development use for which the research and development components primarily occur in an office setting, with minimal laboratory area or research equipment, other than computers and other related electronic equipment. Typical office type research and development uses may include, but are not limited to, computer software and computer simulation firms.

L 14.12 Project Description--The commenter has questions presumably about the Precise Plan Neighborhood Streets Enhancement Program (NSEP).

Response: Many of the opinions expressed by the commenter are related to perceived existing conditions in Redwood City that do not pertain to the content of either the Precise Plan or the Draft EIR. The referenced Neighborhood Streets Enhancement Program (NSEP), however, is part of the Precise Plan and Draft EIR (e.g., see EIR subsection 3.4.7 in chapter 3--Project Description). The NSEP would not be a measure required to mitigate an identified environmental impact under CEQA, but rather a program volunteered by Stanford University. Draft EIR page 3-18 notes, “The City would be responsible for determining the appropriate use of the NSEP funds, in consultation with the residential neighborhoods of Friendly Acres and Redwood Village, and in consultation with San Mateo County with respect to the North Fair Oaks neighborhood.”

L 14.13 Traffic--The commenter is concerned about construction truck routes.

Response: The comment refers to roads currently designated as truck routes by the City, which is an issue beyond the scope of the EIR.
-----Original Message-----
From: MarkChow [mailto:mchow@smcgov.org]
Sent: Monday, March 12, 2012 1:00 PM
To: PLG-Maureen Riordan
Cc: astillman@smcgov.org; mchow@smcgov.org
Subject: Stanford in Redwood City DEIR

Maureen,

The Fair Oaks Sewer Maintenance District has reviewed the Draft EIR for the subject project. Below are our comments:

1. We believe our comments in my e-mail to you dated Dec. 20, 2010 @ 2:10 PM have not been fully addressed in the document, specifically regarding the wastewater generation rates and the capacity impact to the District's 33" diameter trunk lines downstream of the project site.

2. The 2010 e-mail also requested that flow monitoring should be performed during wet weather conditions prior to the final design of the construction documents.

3. It is anticipated that dewatering of groundwater will be required during construction. Depending on the quantity encountered, the District may not be able to accommodate large amounts of discharge into the sewer system on a temporary basis. The contractor shall have alternate means of disposing the groundwater.

Please let us know if you have any questions. Thank you for the opportunity to review the DEIR.

Mark Chow
Principal Civil Engineer
County of San Mateo

[Message delivered by NotifyLink]
L 15 Mark Chow, Principal Civil Engineer, County of San Mateo; March 12, 2012 (1 page)

L 15.01 Wastewater--The Fair Oaks Sewer Maintenance District (FOSMD) uses wastewater generation rates different from those used by the Redwood City Community Development Department, Engineering Division. The resultant different calculations could change the identified impact on FOSMD’s 33-inch-diameter trunk lines downstream from the Precise Plan area.

Response: San Mateo County Ordinance Code Section 4.32.010(g) includes the County’s formula for calculating wastewater generation, based on a Residential Equivalent Unit (REU) of 220 gallons per day of domestic water usage. Draft EIR Mitigation 10-2 (Increased Wastewater Flows in the Local FOSMD Collection System) requires updated calculations “at the time that construction of net new square footage of project development is proposed,” at which time the County would apply its wastewater generation factors for the calculations. The use of the County’s generation factors does not change the findings or mitigation requirements of the Draft EIR.

L 15.02 Wastewater--Flow monitoring should be performed during wet weather conditions prior to the design of the construction documents.

Response: Agreed. Flow monitoring shall be performed during wet weather conditions prior to the design of the construction documents. This requirement is subsumed under Mitigation 10-2.

L 15.03 Wastewater--FOSMD may not be able to accommodate construction dewatering discharge into the sewer system.

Response: Comment acknowledged. Although not anticipated by the City Engineer of Redwood City, if dewatering becomes necessary as part of project construction, permission from the County of San Mateo Engineering Department would be required. Depending on the quantity of groundwater encountered, the contractor might need to dispose of the water in the storm drain system after first treating it to meet National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) requirements. Draft EIR section 10.3 (Storm Drainage and Water Quality) describes the NPDES requirements.
-----Original Message-----
From: aldeivnian@gmail.com [mailto:aldeivnian@gmail.com] On Behalf Of Adina Levin
Sent: Monday, March 12, 2012 3:49 PM
To: PLG-Maureen Riordan
Subject: Stanford in Redwood City Precise Plan EIR

Attention Maureen Riordan, Redwood City Planning

Thank you very much for providing a presentation on Stanford in Redwood City Precise Plan to the Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition.

I am a resident of a neighboring community, and support investments in biking, walking and transit to improve the environment and quality of life. Following the Redwood City General Plan Complete Streets strategy, the Precise Plan has good recommendations for improving pedestrian safety and bicycle access. The proposed streetcar line to downtown Redwood City would provide additional facilities to reach the Precise Plan area without the need for driving.

Another positive attribute about the plan is that it calls for Transportation Demand Management to help reduce drive alone mode share.

However, it may be possible to achieve greater results from TDM, based on the example of Stanford's excellent TDM achievements in its main Santa Clara County Campus.

The Stanford in Redwood City plan calls for reducing trips by 18% compared to typical trip generation rates for analogous land uses. This may be less ambitious than the level Stanford is able to achieve.

In its main Campus area in Santa Clara County, Stanford University was able to reduce the level of driving alone to work from 72% to 52% from 2002 to 2007 as a result of a comprehensive TDM program that includes free transit passes for employees, expanded transit service, car sharing and hourly car rentals, expanded bike parking, bike storage, and bike rentals, parking cashout, and parking pricing.

There should be an "apples to apples" comparison done between the demonstrated achievements of Stanford in Santa Clara County and the potential achievements in Redwood City. Redwood City should hold Stanford to the same standard that it is able to meet a few miles away.

Also, Redwood City's TDM mandate is not as strong as the requirement imposed by Santa Clara County on Stanford University in the Stanford Community Plan, or the requirement being imposed by Menlo Park for the Facebook Campus.

Both of these plans require a "trip cap". In the case of the Stanford Community Plan, the standard is "no net new trips." In the case of the Facebook Campus, the EIR called for a trip cap penalty providing a disincentive to exceed the maximum number of trips. The penalty level is currently being negotiated as part of the development agreement with Menlo Park.

I would recommend strengthening the TDM provision to include a trip cap and penalties for exceeding the agreed level, holding this Precise Plan to the standard that Stanford is held to in Santa Clara County, and the standard that Facebook is being held to a few miles away.
Also, the TDM provision calls for mode share in the Specific Plan area to be measured. If the TDM program reaches its goals over a five year period, the measurement is halted. Given the ongoing development expected in the area, and potential changes in transit facilities beyond the five year period, it is risky and unwise to stop measuring transportation mode share once the TDM program reaches its goals.

Measurement and monitoring should be ongoing to verify that the city and Stanford achieve the transportation goals on an ongoing basis.

The results of this measurement and monitoring should be made available to City Council and the public in order to facilitate policy guidance regarding ongoing investments in transportation.

By strengthening the TDM provision in these ways, the plan would be better able to achieve the results of reducing traffic impact and pollution.

Thank you for your consideration,

Adina Levin
Menlo Park

References:

Stanford Community Plan, Santa Clara County

Facebook Campus Project, Menlo Park
http://www.menlopark.org/projects/comdev_fb.htm
L 16.01 Traffic--The commenter recommends strengthening the Precise Plan Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program to include a trip cap with penalties for exceeding the agreed-upon level. Also, measurement and monitoring of the TDM goals should be ongoing.

Response: Because several comments in this Final EIR refer specifically to the nearby Facebook project in Menlo Park as an example of a project with a trip cap limit, the *Menlo Park Facebook Campus Project Draft EIR* (Atkins, December 2011, State Clearinghouse No. 2011042073), including appendix E (Trip Cap Memo, Fehr & Peers, March 28, 2011), was consulted for this response.

The Facebook Draft EIR identifies significant unavoidable impacts on transportation infrastructure and identifies physical traffic improvements to help reduce those impacts. The proposed vehicular trip cap is not the sole mitigation identified for traffic impacts, “no net trips” is not the goal of the Facebook Draft EIR traffic analysis, and traffic impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

A primary reason for the Facebook trip cap is explained on page 4 of the “Draft Memorandum, Facebook Menlo Park Campus, Documentation of Transportation Assumptions,” March 28, 2011 by Fehr & Peers (Facebook Draft EIR appendix E): “On a per square foot basis, the number of vehicle trips generated by Facebook is substantially higher that the ITE [Institute of Traffic Engineers] rates, as the employee density is higher than a typical office use. On a daily basis, Facebook generates approximately 42 percent more trips per square foot; on a peak hour basis, Facebook’s trip generation is 32 percent higher per square foot.” These conclusions are based on current operations at the existing Facebook campus. For example, travel surveys at Facebook show that the average vehicle trip rate is 13.60 daily trips per 1,000 square feet of office space.

The above situation is not the case for the *Stanford in Redwood City Precise Plan*, where the ITE average vehicle trip rate for office space of 7.62 daily trips per 1,000 square feet is applicable (see Draft EIR Table 7.10, Project Trip Generation).

The Precise Plan, with its proposed mix of land uses, is not analogous to the Facebook development, which is a single-user private corporate campus. The Precise Plan’s integration of floor area ratio (FAR) limits (see Draft EIR chapter 3), Transportation Demand Management program and monitoring (see chapter 7), traffic mitigation sensitivity analysis (also chapter 7), fair share contribution toward traffic improvement costs (chapter 7), and Neighborhood Streets Enhancement Program (chapter 3) was designed intentionally to provide proactive and effective mitigation and monitoring of potential project-related transportation, circulation, and parking impacts. This proactive process provides a tangible financial incentive for the property owner to maximize trip reduction, not merely meet a cap to avoid being penalized.

The Stanford main campus does not have a trip cap. Instead of attempting to impose a trip cap, Stanford’s General Use Permit (GUP) requires that Stanford either attain a standard of no new net commute trips during peak commute times or provide
proportional funding of mitigation measures for specified impacted intersections (GUP Conditions G.3 and G.4).

Similarly here, the Draft Precise Plan requires accelerated funding of identified intersection mitigations, as well as funding of additional intersection mitigations, if target goals for TDM trip reductions are not met. The Draft EIR includes the results of a sensitivity analysis by Hexagon Transportation Consultants of the trigger points during project buildout for all of the intersection mitigation measures identified in the Draft EIR (pages 7-65 and 7-66). Under the Draft Precise Plan, the project’s failure to meet trip reduction targets for two consecutive years would accelerate the applicant’s obligation to construct or pay its contribution to these intersection improvements.

Regarding measurement and monitoring of the TDM goals, the Precise Plan (chapter IV, under “Development Impacts, Monitoring & Phasing”) describes the detailed and comprehensive process that the City has designed to ensure that TDM goals are met, including annual reports to the City continuing after buildout. The Precise Plan would allow suspension of some, but not all, regularly scheduled TDM reports and studies if TDM target goals are met for five consecutive years and no additional development has occurred. This provision reflects the City’s judgment that if the TDM program has functioned as intended for five years and no additional development has occurred on the project development site, the owner should be required only to provide annual reports documenting that the TDM program continues to be implemented, rather than to prepare and submit redundant studies. If new development has occurred, however, the full set of reports and studies described in the Precise Plan is required. In addition, the Community Development Director or his/her designee may require such reports and studies in his/her discretion if there are changes in building tenancy or after full buildout of the campus. See Precise Plan chapter IV under Development Impacts, Monitoring & Phasing.
Comments on Stanford Campus in Redwood City
Draft Environmental Impact Report
Submitted by: Sierra Club Loma Prieta Chapter
Sustainable Land Use Committee

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Report for Stanford in Redwood City.
Sierra Club Loma Prieta Chapter is very pleased to see Stanford taking advantage of locating within the urban footprint of Redwood City with a sustainably designed campus. We support the Precise Plan for this area and Stanford’s contribution to energizing this segment of Redwood City. Since this will be a blueprint for the next 10-20 years, we are raising a few critical concerns.

1. Introduction

Para1.4 Consistent with common professional practice, the City of Redwood City has defined "probable future projects" as those which had an application submitted at the time the Notice of Preparation (NOP) was released for review. Accordingly, Table 4.1 in chapter 4 (Land Use and Planning) of this EIR summarizes under construction, recently approved, and pending development projects in Redwood City as of the NOP release date for this EIR (October 2008); the fully detailed cumulative project lists maintained by the City are included in EIR appendix 21.2.

It is not “Common professional practice” to use data that is so out of date when up-to-date data is available within the agency preparing the EIR. In this case, several significant changes have occurred and these need to be acknowledged and possible cumulative impact addressed: The Cargill Saltworks proposal was presented in 2009, was reasonably foreseeable and should be included in the list. See Attachment B.

4. Land Use and Planning

Table 4.1 is confusing and inaccurate. It is neither the status in 2008 nor the status in 2011– it is a mixture of 2008 data and 2011 data.

7. Transportation, Circulation and Parking

The cumulative effect on traffic, with the inclusion of the Cargill development adjoining this development across the freeway, is so significant that it has to be acknowledged that the two projects, together, present a significantly different set of scenarios and that the mitigations proposed will not be acceptable in that case. See Attachment B following.

Trip Cap: A trip cap should be included as a mitigation measure and compliance should be measured with a penalty for non-compliance as is the case with Facebook in Menlo Park and Stanford Main Campus.

Mode Share: Measurement should not be discontinued after five years as development is projected to continue for at least 10 years. It should continue till build-out.
Residential Parking Permit Program: A Residential Parking Permit program definitely has to be studied and on-going funding for administration funded as a Community Benefit, by Stanford, to address the very real impacts on the nearby residential neighborhoods that are going to be affected by Stanford’s parking. Palo Alto neighborhoods are experiencing all-day parking problems, in front of homes, as a result of Stanford main campus parking policies by workers looking for free parking. North Fair Oaks, Friendly Acres and other neighboring areas can be expected to experience both drive-thru dangers and all day parking as a result of the campus development, unless they are protected during business hours.

9. Climate Change
As discussed in subsection 9.1.3(f) of this EIR chapter, the Precise Plan area is expected to be vulnerable to both an approximately 16-inch sea level rise in San Francisco Bay by midcentury and an approximately 55-inch sea level rise in the Bay by end-of-century.
Subsection 9.1.3 is missing from the EIR.

10. Utilities 10.3 Storm water mitigation: Porous asphalt and pervious concrete should be used for all new roadways and open parking and paving. Porous asphalt is being used for highways to improve highway safety by removing water from the surface. Pervious concrete paving is now a standard requirement in many jurisdictions to meet clean water goals, improve water quality, reduce pollution of water bodies such as the bay, reduce storm water runoff, and decrease burden on waste-water treatment facilities. It is also recognized as being important for re-charging ground water, though that might not be a consideration at this location.

The storm water detention potential of the 2.4 acre open space and the Greenway should be given priority. In addition, the storage capacity of the roadways within the project should also be considered for detention as it is not a residential development.

Detention capacity in the form of below grade reservoir systems could be considered for feasibility of joint flood water detention and harvesting of rain water to be used for irrigation.

13. Noise
Openings for the ventilation of garages should not face towards the residences.
Garages should not be exposed at all in the proximity of residential areas. Housing should wrap the parking garages. See Attachment A.

18 Alternative Scenarios
Alternative 18.5: Housing on Sites A and B considers housing on two of the sites.
Since adding 3,000 to 5,000 new employees (not including indirect hiring) is a large infusion and the traffic impacts are one of the most significant impacts, employee rental housing on-site would be very desirable. It is also noted to be the best environmental solution.
precise plan should be modified to encourage the addition of housing.

As mitigation for the use of multi-level parking garages near a low-scale residential area, housing should be used to wrap and entirely conceal the parking garages from the neighborhood – not just at the ground floor level. This will serve as a transitional element, softening the impact of massive structures with a multi-unit housing, more compatible with nearby single family residential zoning. Cities are recognizing the deadly effect of multi-story parking garages and the area should be treated with the consideration of a neighborhood that deserves the most sensitive treatment possible, as it is going to shoulder and suffer the greatest impacts. See Attachment A following.

Other considerations:

- **Biological Resources**

  **Bird friendly design:** The project site is in close proximity to San Francisco Bay and the Don Edwards Wild Life Refuge which are both habitat for resident wild birds, migratory flocks of birds as well as feeding areas for local birds residing in the hills and open spaces on the Peninsula. In addition, some of the adjacent retired salt ponds are currently being used by some wild bird colonies. The buildings could present potential problems for birds. Large buildings clad with glass are known to present a hazard to flying birds. Building lighting can also present hazards.

  While bird collision risks vary depending upon building architecture and site-specific aspects, some general solutions exist that can help mitigate the problem, and some treatments are available to help make structures and windows more visible to birds. Also, night lighting can be adjusted for both bird safety and energy savings. The City of San Francisco has already adopted “Standards for Bird-Safe Buildings” in July 2011 and a comprehensive and informative report was produced by the American Bird Conservancy. The standards that San Francisco adopted are voluntary in some areas of the city, and mandatory in hazard areas. These standards aim to reduce the number of birds killed by collision with buildings and/or by entrapment in plumes of light at night.

  Please see: http://sfplanning.org/index.aspx?page=2506

  We ask that the EIR include biological resources as a section because of adjacency to the Bay and bodies of water used by wild birds and include mitigation for hazards to wild life using bird-friendly design.

Respectfully submitted: Gita Dev, FAIA

Member, Sustainable Land Use Committee, Loma Prieta Sierra Club.
A STANFORD CAMPUS IN A SUSTAINABLE REDWOOD CITY

ATTACHMENT A:

Redwood City is one of the most progressive sustainable communities on the Peninsula. Stanford is one of the pre-eminent universities in the country. It is an opportunity to create a synergy that results in something more than a conventionally nice looking campus.

Sierra Club Loma Prieta suggests that the City raise the bar for sustainable design in the Precise plan to propose more forward thinking architectural and urban design solutions that move beyond form-based zoning prescriptions. The campus should be a demonstration of what it could mean to be truly green and be much more sensitive to the context - insertion next to a finely grained residential community.

PARKING STRUCTURES MITIGATION: Stanford is proposing to introduce several of the dreaded massive multi-story parking garages near the fine residential grain of North Fair Oaks – a community of many small single family homes and even smaller duplexes. This is a failure of good urban planning practice and the City should require a higher standard of quality neighborhood design to revitalize the area.

The following is a brief excerpt from a collection of images from Sierra Club Loma Prieta’s presentation of City Parking garages and Green Roofs.

Typically, cities are now requiring the parking in downtown areas be wrapped in either housing or mixed use space. All multi-story parking structures on Stanford Campus should be COMPLETELY wrapped from views from the neighborhood – not just the ground floor. Fair Oaks residents should not be subjected to views of commercial multi-story parking garages, however well decorated.

This project in Houston, Texas, typical of this solution, is new 393-unit luxury urban apartment community in The Waterway Square District of The Woodlands Town Center. The apartments are wrapped around a parking structure, providing 613 parking spaces.
WRAPPED PARKING GARAGE:

WRAPPED PARKING GARAGES ARE NOW TYPICAL IN MANY CITY NEIGHBORHOODS: Housing wrapped around parking. University of Texas, Arlington

INNOVATIVE SOLUTIONS: “Mountain Dwellings” by BIG Architects- Housing over parking, south facing units have green patios for a slightly suburban solution.

GREEN PARKING STRUCTURES:

A multi-level bike storage garage - located on a busy street behind the Ritz Carlton Hotel, Osaka, Japan. The facility acts as a place for people commuting to the city to store their bikes.

Neat rows of bikes line each floor, which can be accessed via a central staircase or a bumpy sloped corridor which is a ramp for people to walk their bikes down.
ALTERNATIVE ENERGY GENERATION: The Greenway Self Park in Chicago works to harness the city’s legendary wind to help power its utilities. Greenway Self Park features pairs of corkscrew wind turbines, along the corners, that extend from its base to its roof, collecting wind gusts as they push their way through the streets. If you’ve ever walked around a downtown corner during a Chicago winter, you know just how powerful that force can be. Beyond the turbines, this garage also features natural rainwater collection systems and electric car charging stations for next generation drivers.

GREEN BUILDINGS UTILIZING GREEN ROOFS AND GREEN WALL DESIGNS:

The Nanyang Technological University of Singapore recently erected a green roof building to house their School of Art, Design and Media. The five story structure features two curved sections with stretches of green roof fully accessible to students. In the Nanyang School of Art, the line between landscape and building are blurred. Beyond the aesthetic value of this green roof design, this living skin saves heating and cooling costs and collects rainwater for landscape irrigation.

The benefits of green roof design and other green technologies are not always apparent. To help communicate their values to the public, the Green Technology Showroom by Vector Architects is an example in eco success. The Green Technology Showroom in Beijing, China is blanketed in thick, climate-controlling grasses attached to an inner steel skeleton.
ROOFTOP URBAN AGRICULTURE: Community garden on Parking garage rooftop. Cafeteria could grow its own herbs and vegetables.

HABITAT FOR WILDLIFE: Stanford is close to the bay and the wild life refuge which is part of the Pacific Flyway. The California Academy of Sciences is a stunning achievement in green roof design. The building features a 2.5 acre green roof that is blanketed by local plants, acting as a habitat for bay area wildlife including birds and a variety of insect life.

HABITAT FOR WILDLIFE: Vancouver Convention Center. Wild grasses and plants on the 6 acre rooftop provide habitat for many birds and a diverse insect population including honey bees whose honey is harvested. Song birds, establishing residence here, have made their way back into the downtown.
OPEN SPACE DESIGN: Possible community center integrated under park to maximize use of the 2.4 acres open space. Historial de la Vendée has created a geometric, softly-pitched structure lined with a lush green roof. From a distance, this green roof looks nearly indistinguishable from the land around it, just a collection of hills.

Central Library, Delft University of Technology, The Netherlands, Mecanoo transitions from sidewalk to planted roof

1997

ICON FROM THE FREeway:
Create an icon that represents the forward thinking culture of Redwood City and Stanford combined.

Old style icon – Hoover tower in Stanford and UC Berkeley campanile.

New style icon - Provide a new style icon to put Redwood City on the map: For example, feature sustainability with an active readout, viewable from the freeway, of alternative energy generated on-site by the new campus.

END OF SECTION
The Stanford in Redwood City DEIR uses a combination of two methods to analyze the Project’s cumulative impacts. It uses a “summary of projections method” and the “list of projects method.” See DEIR, p. 17-4. With regard to the latter, the document identifies individual land use projects that are either under construction, recently approved or pending in Redwood City (“Table 4.1 Projects”). See DEIR pgs. 4-6 and 7, Table 4.1, and Appendix 21.2. The DEIR states that the Cargill/DMB Saltworks Project was not included in Table 4.1 because it was not “reasonably foreseeable” when the City released the Stanford EIR’s Notice of Preparation (NOP) in October 2008. Id., p. 4-7. The DEIR also states that the City has a policy of using the NOP date as the cutoff for its list of cumulative projects so that environmental analysis could proceed without constant revision. Id. at 4-6.

There are several reasons why the City errs if it fails to include Saltworks in the Stanford in Redwood City DEIR’s cumulative impact analysis.

First, by not including Saltworks, the DEIR substantially understates the Stanford Project’s cumulative environmental impacts. Omitting any one of the development projects identified in Table 4.1 may not result in a serious underestimation of the Stanford Project’s cumulative environmental impacts, but the failure to include the single largest project ever to be considered by Redwood City appears to avoid confronting environmental effects, many of which will likely be extensive. An EIR is “an environmental ‘alarm bell’ whose purpose it is to alert the public and its officials to environmental changes before they have reached ecological points of no return.” Village Laguna of Laguna Beach, Inc. v. Board of Supervisors (1982) 134 Cal. App. 3d 1022, 1027 (emphasis added). By omitting Saltworks from the cumulative impact analysis, the Stanford DEIR’s approach strips the document of its ability to provide forewarning.

Second, given the protracted Stanford DEIR process (it’s taken four years to prepare the DEIR), the City had ample time to consider the Saltworks’ environmental impacts in the Stanford DEIR’s cumulative impact analysis. DMB submitted the Saltworks development application in May 2009, shortly after the Stanford NOP was published. See Saltworks NOP, p. 1.) Consequently, the Stanford DEIR consultants had almost three years to analyze the effect that the Saltworks Project, together with the Stanford Project, would have on the environment. Conducting such an analysis was certainly possible especially since CEQA does not require the discussion of cumulative impacts to be as detailed as is provided for the effects attributable to the (Stanford) project alone. CEQA Guidelines section 15130 (b).

Third, the City cannot simply evade its obligation to analyze the impacts of Saltworks because the task may difficult. Rather, the City must “use its best effort to find out and disclose all that it reasonably can”. Citizens to Preserve the Ojai v. Ventura, 176 Cal.App.3d 421, 431 (1986); see also Laurel Heights Improvement Assn. v. Regents of the University of California, 47 Cal.3d 376,
399 (1988) *(Laurel Heights I)* (“We find no authority that exempts an agency from complying with the law, environmental or otherwise, merely because the agency’s task may be difficult.”).

Fourth, unlike the other projects included in Table 4.1, Saltworks has never had the benefit of environmental review. The Stanford DEIR suggests that each of the Table 4.1 Projects was included in the Redwood City General Plan and consequently, the policies in the General Plan and mitigation measures in the General Plan EIR reduce these projects’ impacts to a less than significant level. *(See e.g., DEIR’s discussion of cumulative population, housing, and employment impacts, p. 17-5).* Although the Saltworks application preceded the City’s General Plan update, the City did not include Saltworks in the General Plan. Consequently, although Saltworks is a pending future project, its environmental impacts have never been examined and, therefore, have not been mitigated. Thus, the City is leaving the public and decision-makers with a profoundly distorted view of how the City would look twenty years from now.

Fifth, the size of the Saltworks project and its proximity to the Stanford project will result in significant cumulative environmental impacts. The Stanford DEIR asserts that none of the Table 4.1 projects is near enough to the Stanford project study area to result in local cumulative environmental effects. *(Id. at 17-4).* The Stanford project is enormous; it would result in 1,518,000 square feet of office space in 13 new buildings, supported by four parking structures, on-site surface parking and new street parking. *(See DEIR p. 3-10.)* The Saltworks project, located on the Cargill salt ponds approximately 1/3 of a mile from the Stanford Project, is also enormous. It would add up to 12,000 additional housing units, 140,000 square feet of retail/commercial and 1,140,000 square feet of office and R&D in Redwood City. *(Saltworks NOP pgs. 11-15.)* The Saltworks project and the Stanford project, have the potential to result in extremely significant cumulative environmental impacts, including but not limited to:

- Severe traffic impacts to city streets and regional roadways – most especially US 101, Marsh Road and Woodside Road *(Saltworks NOP pgs. 72-73),*
- Significant impacts to local air quality, potentially violating air quality standards *(Saltworks NOP p. 45),*
- Significantly increased greenhouse gas emissions, potentially impacting local and state policies to reduce emissions *(Saltworks NOP p. 55)*
- Significant impact to the city’s water supply, potentially resulting in the construction of new water facilities, such as a desalination plant, the construction and operation of which could cause significant environmental effects *(Saltworks NOP pgs. 74-75),*
- Significant impact to neighborhood and regional parks, including the “acceleration” of “physical deterioration” from increased usage *(Saltworks NOP p. 71),*
- Substantially degraded visual character of the surrounding area *(Saltworks NOP p. 36),*
- Significantly increased population of, and induce substantial population growth within Redwood City *(Saltworks NOP p. 67),*
- Substantially increase the need for additional police, fire and other emergency personnel and facilities *(Saltworks NOP p. 69),*
• Significant impact to the access of emergency vehicles, due to cumulative traffic impacts (Saltworks NOP p. 72), significant impact from cumulative projects associated with the need for additional public infrastructure projects, such as but not limited to a new wastewater treatment plant and storm water drainage facilities (Saltworks NOP p. 75).

END OF SECTION
L 17 Gita Dev, FAIA, member, Sustainable Land Use Committee, Sierra Club Loma Prieta Chapter; March 12, 2012 (11 pages)

L 17.01 Introduction—Regarding the Draft EIR cumulative projects list (Table 4.1 and appendix 21.2), the Cargill Saltworks proposal was presented in 2009, was reasonably foreseeable, and should be included in the list.

Response: Sierra Club comment #1 disagrees with the Draft EIR’s list of “probable future projects” and states that the Draft EIR should have included the “Cargill Saltworks proposal” in its list of cumulative projects.

Under CEQA, the lead agency has discretion to set a reasonable cutoff date for determining what other projects are pending and should be included in the cumulative impacts analysis. This cutoff date can be as early as the date of the project application, which in the case of the Stanford in Redwood City project was May 2008. Here, the City used October 2008, the date of the Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the Stanford in Redwood City EIR, as its cutoff date for the Draft EIR’s cumulative projects list. The first Saltworks proposal was submitted in May 2009, and the NOP for that original proposal was issued in October 2010, well after both the application date and the NOP date for the Stanford in Redwood City project.

In the case of the Saltworks project, not only was the original project application later than the Stanford in Redwood City application and NOP, DMB, the Saltworks applicant, requested the City hold off processing the application to allow DMB additional time to review and respond to community input. On November 4, 2011, the City issued the following Project Update regarding the Saltworks project:

“Redwood City was informed on November 4 that DMB Associates intends to engage in a continuing internal review and evaluation of their submitted proposal, in light of the volume of comments and feedback received during the initial scoping process. As more information and any revisions to the proposal are made available by the applicant, the City will carry on its analysis of the application. Following the applicant’s continuing review and evaluation, the City anticipates a second scoping period, including a revised Notice of Preparation and related project description.”

DMB ultimately withdrew its 2009 application on May 3, 2012. The City anticipates that when DMB does resubmit a development application, the revised Saltworks proposal will differ substantially from the original proposal.

The City does not know, and cannot make assumptions regarding, the level of development that will be included in the revised Saltworks proposal. When the revised Saltworks proposal is submitted, a revised NOP is issued for that proposal, and the City’s environmental analysis of the revised Saltworks proposal begins, that analysis will include the Stanford in Redwood City project as a cumulative project.

L 17.02 Land Use and Planning—Draft EIR Table 4.1 is confusing and inaccurate; it is a mixture of 2008 data and 2011 data.
Response: The commenter is incorrect. The information in Table 4.1 (Recently Built, Under Construction, Recently Approved, and Pending Development Projects in Redwood City as of November 2008) was compiled entirely in November 2008 by the City of Redwood Community Development Department, as noted in the “Source” line of the table. For verification, Draft EIR appendix 21.2 (Cumulative Projects List) includes the actual Community Development Department project lists dated November 3, 2008 and printed at the time.

L 17.03 Transportation, Circulation, and Parking--The Cargill Saltworks project should be included in the Draft EIR cumulative traffic analysis.

Response: See the response to comment L 17.01 above.

L 17.04 Transportation, Circulation, and Parking--A trip cap should be included as a mitigation measure, with a penalty for non-compliance.

Response: See the response to comment L 16.01 above.

L 17.05 Transportation, Circulation, and Parking--“Mode share” measurement should not be discontinued after five years but should continue to project buildout.

Response: Regarding measurement and monitoring of the TDM goals (including mode share), the Precise Plan (chapter IV, under “Development Impacts, Monitoring & Phasing”) describes the detailed and comprehensive process that the City has designed to ensure that TDM goals are met, including annual reports to the City continuing after buildout.

L 17.06 Transportation, Circulation, and Parking--A residential parking permit program has to be studied to address the very real impacts on the nearby residential neighborhoods that are going to be affected by Stanford’s parking.

Response: Although “parking” is not an environmental impact category identified by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the City recognizes the importance of this issue to the nearby residential communities. The Draft EIR does include a parking analysis (chapter 7, subsection 7.4.7[e]--Parking). The analysis concluded that the proposed project would have an adequate on-site parking supply.

L 17.07 Climate Change--Referenced subsection 9.1.3 is missing from the Draft EIR.

Response: The subsection was misidentified. The reference should be to 9.1.1(c). Draft EIR page 9-28 has been corrected (see section 3 of this Final EIR).

L 17.08 Storm Water Mitigation--Porous asphalt and pervious concrete should be used for all new roadways and open parking and paving.

Response: The comment pertains to suggested design solutions, not to the content or adequacy of the Draft EIR. The City may consider the commenter’s suggestion as part of Stanford in Redwood City Precise Plan implementation. The commenter’s suggestion does not change the impact or mitigation findings of the Draft EIR. Please see Draft EIR section 10.3 (Storm Drainage and Water Quality), especially
Mitigation 10-3 and “Long-Term Water Quality Effects,” which identify storm water performance standards without restricting design options, consistent with the flexibility envisioned for the Precise Plan.

L 17.09 Noise--Garages should not be exposed near residential areas. Housing should wrap around the parking garages.

Response: The comment pertains to a suggested design solution, not to the content or adequacy of the Draft EIR. Mitigation 13-4 (Potential Noise from Parking Structure Ventilation System) identifies performance standards to mitigate the impact without restricting design options, consistent with the flexibility envisioned in the Precise Plan. Also, the project does not propose housing, but Draft EIR Alternative 18.5 (With Housing Alternative) evaluates the possibility.

L 17.10 Alternatives to the Proposed Project--The Precise Plan should be modified to encourage the addition of housing, which should be wrapped around the parking garages.

Response: Draft EIR Alternative 18.5 (With Housing Alternative) addresses the comment. Consistent with CEQA and with the flexibility envisioned in the Precise Plan, the discussion under Alternative 18.5 does not include a physical design that mandates wrapping residences around parking garages. The proposed parking garages would not result in significant adverse effects on aesthetic resources, so further restrictions on design are not required by CEQA.

L 17.11 Biological Resources--The EIR should include a biological resource section that evaluates the project’s risk of causing bird collisions. The commenter refers to the San Francisco Standards for Bird-Safe Buildings.

Response: Neither the Redwood City General Plan nor its EIR identifies bird collisions as a potential impact resulting from new development in the City. The San Francisco Planning Department Standards for Bird-Safe Buildings (July 14, 2011) includes “Requirements for Location-Related Hazards” that apply to “buildings located within a clear flight path of less than 300 feet from an Urban Bird Refuge.” The Precise Plan area is located more than 300 feet inland from San Francisco Bay, the Don Edwards San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge, and other bayside areas. Nevertheless, consistent with the commenter’s suggestions and the Standards for Bird-Safe Buildings, the Precise Plan (chapter II, under “Urban Design Guidelines”) does include several components consistent with the Standards, for example: (1) “[C]ontinuous undifferentiated glass and/or other similar wall designs are not recommended”; (2) “All glass buildings are not recommended”; and (3) reflective glass is not recommended.
March 12, 2012

Maureen Riordan
City of Redwood City
1017 Middlefield Road
Redwood City, CA 94063

Subject: Stanford in Redwood City Precise Plan
SCH#: 2008102023

Dear Maureen Riordan:

The State Clearinghouse submitted the above named Draft EIR to selected state agencies for review. On the enclosed Document Details Report please note that the Clearinghouse has listed the state agencies that reviewed your document. The review period closed on March 9, 2012, and the comments from the responding agency (ies) is (are) enclosed. If this comment package is not in order, please notify the State Clearinghouse immediately. Please refer to the project's ten-digit State Clearinghouse number in future correspondence so that we may respond promptly.

Please note that Section 21104(c) of the California Public Resources Code states that:

"A responsible or other public agency shall only make substantive comments regarding those activities involved in a project which are within an area of expertise of the agency or which are required to be carried out or approved by the agency. Those comments shall be supported by specific documentation."

These comments are forwarded for use in preparing your final environmental document. Should you need more information or clarification of the enclosed comments, we recommend that you contact the commenting agency directly.

This letter acknowledges that you have complied with the State Clearinghouse review requirements for draft environmental documents, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act. Please contact the State Clearinghouse at (916) 445-0613 if you have any questions regarding the environmental review process.

Sincerely,

Scott Morgan
Director, State Clearinghouse

Enclosures
cc: Resources Agency
Document Details Report  
State Clearinghouse Data Base

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCH#</th>
<th>2008102023</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td>Stanford in Redwood City Precise Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Agency</td>
<td>Redwood City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>EIR Draft EIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Stanford University is proposing to develop a satellite administrative office, research and development (R&amp;D) and medical clinic campus totaling approximately 1.5 million s.f. of floor area in approximately 13 new office/R&amp;D/clinic buildings (plus approximately 4,500 parking spaces in four parking structures) on a 35-acre development site. The proposal includes demolition of approximately 537,000 s.f. of existing office/R&amp;D space; construction will be phased. The proposed plan also includes construction of an onsite storm water retention system and a pedestrian greenway that would run through the center of the campus.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lead Agency Contact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Maureen Riordan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>City of Redwood City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>(650) 780-7236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>email</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mriordan@redwoodcity.org">mriordan@redwoodcity.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>1017 Middlefield Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Redwood City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zip</td>
<td>94063</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>San Mateo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Redwood City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lat/Long</td>
<td>37°29'9.43&quot;N/122°12'17.8&quot;W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Streets</td>
<td>Douglas &amp; Second Avenues, Highway 101, and Bay Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel No.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proximity to:

| Highways       | US 101, SR 84, SR 82 |
| Airports       | Caltrain/Dumbarton RR |
| Railways       | Redwood Creek, Atherton Channel, Bayfront Canal |
| Waterways      | Redwood City/Sequoia |
| Schools        | GP designation: Commercial-Office Professional/Technology and Commercial-Regional; zoning: IR-Industrial Restricted |
| Land Use       | Aesthetic/Visual; Air Quality; Archaeologic-Historic; Drainage/Absorption; Economics/Jobs; Flood Plain/Flooding; Geologic/Seismic; Noise, Population/Housing Balance; Public Services; Recreation/Parks; Schools/Universities; Sewer Capacity; Soil Erosion/Compaction/Grading; Solid Waste; Toxic/Hazardous; Traffic/Circulation; Water Quality; Water Supply; Landuse; Cumulative Effects; Other Issues |

Project Issues

| Reviewing Agencies | Resources Agency; Department of Fish and Game, Region 3; Office of Historic Preservation; Department of Parks and Recreation; Department of Water Resources; California Highway Patrol; Caltrans, District 4; Regional Water Quality Control Board, Region 2; Department of Toxic Substances Control; Native American Heritage Commission; Public Utilities Commission; Statewide Health Planning |

Date Received | 01/25/2012 |
| Start of Review | 01/25/2012 |
| End of Review | 03/09/2012 |

Note: Blanks in data fields result from insufficient information provided by lead agency.
March 8, 2012

Ms. Maureen Riordan
Planning Services
Community Development Services
City of Redwood City
1017 Middlefield Road
P.O. Box 391
Redwood City, CA 94064

Dear Ms. Riordan:

STANFORD IN REDWOOD CITY PRECISE PLAN – DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

Thank you for continuing to include the California Department of Transportation (Department) in the environmental review process for Stanford in Redwood City Precise Plan. The following comments are based on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR). Additional comments may be sent pending review of the requested information.

Forecasting
On page 7-32, Table 7.10 Project Trip Generation assumes an 18 percent trip reductions rate to the AM and PM peak hour generated trips due to the implementation of various travel demand management (TDM) measures. Please provide a discussion on how this reduction rate was derived. The Department believes the reduction rate is overestimated since the project site is not located in a major transit corridor, near a transit center or light rail station. Further, since the TDM measures are solely implemented by the employers and most employees would be relatively high income and own vehicles, the TDM participation rate is likely to be low. To determine a more accurate TDM participation rate, the Department recommends conducting travel surveys on previous and current employees under comparable conditions near or at the project site.

Roadway System Transportation Analysis
1. Please include the following as study intersections in the analysis:
   a. US-101/Marsh Road, northbound (NB) Marsh Road to southbound (SB) US-101 on-ramp
   b. El Camino Real/Jefferson Avenue
   c. Veterans Boulevard at Brewster Avenue/Main Street/Maple Street, and
   d. Broadway at Wiuslow Street/Main Street/Maple Street
2. Please provide a discussion, geometric plan, and level of service (LOS) analysis for the project's Alternative Hurlingame Avenue extension to Bay Road.

3. Intersection #4: To get a proper LOS analysis, we recommend separating the US-101 SB off-ramp and Woodside Road SB movements rather than combining them.

4. We also recommend alternative phasing of Phases 3, 4, 7, and 8 on US-101 to Broadway eastbound and westbound which currently exclusively uses Phase 7.

5. Please provide a discussion in the Transportation Demand Management program about including a shuttle bus component from the project site to the main campus at Stanford Hospital in Palo Alto.

Please feel free to call or email Sandra Finegan at (510) 622-1644 or sandra_finegan@dot.ca.gov with any questions regarding this letter.

Sincerely,

GARY ARNOLD
District Branch Chief
Local Development – Intergovernmental Review

c: State Clearinghouse
L 18 Scott Morgan, Director, State Clearinghouse, Governor's Office of Planning and Research; March 12, 2012 (4 pages)

L 18.01 Draft EIR Review Period—“This letter acknowledges that [the City] has complied with the State Clearinghouse review requirements for draft environmental documents, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act.” The State Clearinghouse letter also attached the Caltrans letter (March 8, 2012), which Caltrans sent to both the State Clearinghouse and the City of Redwood City. That letter is included as Letter L 11 in this Final EIR.

Response: Comment acknowledged; no additional response is necessary. The State Clearinghouse letter also attached the Caltrans letter (March 8, 2012), which Caltrans sent to both the State Clearinghouse and the City of Redwood City. That letter is included as Letter L 11 in this Final EIR.
2.5 RESPONSES TO WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED AFTER THE DRAFT EIR PUBLIC REVIEW PERIOD

The following section includes copies of the one email and one letter received after close of the Draft EIR public review period, each followed by a written response to each comment on the content or adequacy of the Draft EIR or on a substantive environmental point.
Dear Maureen,

I recently became aware of Stanford’s Medical Center’s plans for the current Midpoint Technology Park and am writing to voice my concerns over the project. I have lived and worked in Redwood City for the past 6 years, and I have lived on Broadway for the last 4 years. This project will directly impact my health, safety, and quality of life. As such I would like to make sure that the Stanford Project meets high standards for livability. Although at this point I am generally supportive of the project, several concerns that need to be addressed to ensure a healthy, livable environment for the current neighborhood residents.

In Redwood City’s most recent General Plan, the city outlines many commendable goals which would enhance the livability and quality of life in Redwood City. Many of the Goals and Policies in the plan seek to encourage alternative methods of transportation, reduce vehicle trips and vehicle miles traveled (VMT), complete a comprehensive bicycle network, increase bike and pedestrian safety, and create “complete streets” in the city. These are all laudable goals that would increase livability in the city. After reading the EIR, it appears there are many areas where Stanford’s plans are incompatible with these long term goals. In order to ensure the best possible project, the city should remedy the existing problems with the precise plan.

A paramount concern for local residents is the amount of additional traffic and the impacts it will have on the health, safety, and livability of the surrounding neighborhoods. In section 7 of the draft EIR, the applicant specifies their plans for mitigating the anticipated increase in traffic. Many of their mitigation measures include re-striping roadways to include additional turn lanes, and adding additional traffic lanes to Broadway, Bay, and Middlefield. Studies have shown that adding additional traffic lanes actually increases traffic through “induced demand”. Since the goals for Redwood City (BE-25.1, BE 31.3) involve reducing vehicle trips and vehicle miles traveled, these mitigation measures are inappropriate as they would serve to increase traffic and increase VMT.

In addition to the traffic these mitigation measures would generate, they conflict with the General Plan in other areas as well. Section BE-25.4 of the General Plan states that projects consider the impacts on various travel modes when evaluating transportation impacts. Section BE-25.5 calls for reducing travel lanes and roadway width, while adding sidewalks and bike lanes. Although the EIR calls for expanding many intersections, no mention is made of any specific bike or pedestrian improvements to be made to increase safety or usability of these intersections. The improvements called for would undoubtedly make many intersections less safe for bicyclists and pedestrians. I travel by bicycle on a daily basis through Broadway and Woodside. This intersection is easily the worst that I pass through on my commute to work. Woodside is already a traffic sewer with large volumes of high speed traffic coming to or from the freeway. Motorists routinely encroach upon existing bike lanes. The north side of the intersection lacks any pedestrian crossing. As the intersection currently exists, it already needs improvements for bikes and pedestrians which make it safer and easier to cross. Adding additional turn lanes for freeway traffic would only make the existing problems worse.

Many of the measures which seek to add traffic lanes do so in order to maintain Automobile Level of Service (LOS). Often the expected delay spelled out in the EIR is measured in seconds. For the Woodside and Broadway intersection, for example, there is an estimated additional delay of 22 seconds. Given that section BE-55 calls for evaluating elimination of LOS as a standard in the proposed streetcar corridor, the weight given to LOS and automobile delay in the EIR is inappropriate. As a resident of the area, I am entirely unconcerned with 22 seconds of additional delay for Stanford’s automobile.
commuters. I am far more concerned with having a safe, livable street which serves the surrounding community and emphasizes bike and pedestrian safety. However, the applicant provides no mitigation measures which would improve the intersections in this way.

Parking is another area where the Precise Plan is grossly inconsistent with the Redwood City General Plan. Much like additional lanes on the road, additional car parking also serves to induce demand for automobile travel. The General Plan recognizes this, and multiple sections in the General Plan (BE-52, BE-31.7, BE-31.1) call for limiting car parking. Given these concerns, it’s important to evaluate the number of proposed parking spaces and consider whether or not they are excessive.

Based on the estimates provided by the applicant, the proposed amount of parking is clearly in excess of what is necessary. In section 7.4.7e of the Precise Plan, the applicant provides details of surveys of parking at Oracle and Electronic Arts. These were selected as benchmarks as they are large, single entity office complexes located within Redwood City. The survey resulted in parking usage rates of 1.87 and 2.68 occupied spaces per 1,000 square feet, with an average of 2.28. If the given average rate of 2.28 is used to calculate parking requirements for this project, this would result in a total of 3,420 parking spaces. However, the applicant concluded that they require over 4,500 spaces - over 1,000 more than the estimated average! Given the General Plan and the above stated concerns about excessive parking, it is appropriate to make a significant reduction in the number of parking spaces provided in the project.

Please make sure to address the above concerns and ensure that the residents of Redwood City and North Fair Oaks are able to enjoy living in a community with safe streets.

Respectfully,

Ian Bulla
Redwood City
Bulla Comment #1: “Many of [the EIR’s] mitigation measures include restriping roadways to include additional turn lanes, and adding additional traffic lanes to Broadway, Bay, and Middlefield. Studies have shown that adding additional traffic lanes actually increases traffic through ‘induced demand’. Since the [General Plan] goals for Redwood City (BE-25.1, BE 31.3) involve reducing vehicle trips and vehicle miles traveled, these mitigation measures are inappropriate as they would serve to increase traffic and increase vehicle miles traveled (VMT).”

Response #1: The EIR is required to identify the necessary mitigation measures for all study intersections with a project impact. The potential measures to restripe roadways or add additional traffic lanes at the intersection approaches to Broadway, Bay, and Middlefield were described to mitigate the project impacts on the corresponding study intersections. In Draft EIR chapter 7 (Transportation, Circulation, and Parking; page 7-37), the text states, “At the future time when development of the Stanford in Redwood City project reaches levels warranting implementation of the mitigations described below, the City may decide to identify alternative mitigation strategies.”

The EIR transportation consultant has checked the proposed improvements for Broadway specified in the Redwood City General Plan. Based on the description on page BE-31 in the General Plan, “Broadway southeast of Woodside Road will maintain its traditionally industrial function, providing locations for business that support commerce throughout the Peninsula and that offer jobs for skilled laborers.”

Section BE-57 of the General Plan states that pedestrian enhanced design, i.e., a reduction in travel lanes from 4 to 3, should be considered on Broadway between Maple Street and a quarter-mile east of Douglas Avenue (where Broadway already provides a three lane cross-section). In the Draft EIR Circulation chapter, the mitigation measures proposed for the Douglas Avenue and Broadway intersection do not include adding lanes to Broadway. Instead, the mitigation recommends installing a traffic signal and restripping Broadway from four lanes to three lanes at the intersection approach, consistent with the recommendation for pedestrian enhanced design in the General Plan. From Charter Street and through Woodside Road (not in the Precise Plan area), Broadway would need to retain the four-lane cross-section to accommodate the forecasted traffic volumes at Level of Service (LOS) D.

Along Bay Road, the mitigation measures in the Draft EIR would involve reducing the intersection approaches from four lanes to three lanes, along with the installation of traffic signals, at the intersections with Charter Street and Douglas Avenue.

Also see the response to comment PC 11.

Bulla Comment #2: “For the Woodside and Broadway intersection, for example, there is an estimated additional delay of 22 seconds. Given that [General Plan] section BE-55 calls for evaluating elimination of LOS as a standard in the proposed streetcar corridor, the weight given to LOS and automobile delay in the EIR is inappropriate. As a resident of the area, I am entirely unconcerned with 22 seconds of additional delay for Stanford’s automobile commuters. I am far more concerned with having a safe, livable street which serves the surrounding community and emphasizes bike and pedestrian safety. However, the applicant provides no mitigation measures which would improve the intersections in this way.”
Response #2: The Draft EIR Circulation chapter does include bike and pedestrian improvements as proposed mitigation measures at the Broadway and Woodside Road intersection. In Mitigation 7-2 (page 7-38) in the Draft EIR, it is specified, "Pursuant to Caltrans Deputy Directives 64 and 64-R1, requiring facilitation of multimodal travel, it is possible that the above improvements to the intersection of Woodside Road and Broadway would also be required to include such features as pedestrian count-down signals, an emergency vehicle preemption system, reconstruction of corner radii to reduce pedestrian crossing distances, pedestrian median refuges, bike lanes, and bike detectors." Also see response #3 below.

Bulla Comment #3: Although the EIR calls for expanding many intersections, no mention is made of any specific bike or pedestrian improvements to be made to increase safety or usability of these intersections.

Response #3: The Draft EIR Circulation chapter describes specific bike and pedestrian facility improvements in subsection 7.4.7--Other Transportation Issues, beginning on page 7-67. The recommended improvements include building crosswalks and pedestrian count-down signals at all intersection legs to provide adequate pedestrian access at the intersections of Charter Street/Broadway, Charter Street/Bay Road, Douglas Avenue/Broadway, Douglas Avenue/Bay Road, Hurlingame Avenue/Middlefield Road, 5th Avenue/Bay Road, Hurlingame Avenue/Bay Road, and Barren Avenue/Bay Road. The project would also include improvements to on-street bicycle facilities within 3 miles of the Precise Plan area (see item [c] in Draft EIR subsection 7.4.7).

Bulla Comment #4: “Based on the estimates provided by the applicant, the proposed amount of parking is clearly in excess of what is necessary.”

Response #4: The project would consist of approximately 1,138,500 square feet of office space, 227,710 square feet of medical clinic uses, and 151,806 square feet of research and development (R&D) space, for a total of 1,518,016 square feet. The City's parking code requires: one space for each 200 square feet of gross floor area for medical or dental offices and clinics; one space for each 300 square feet of gross floor area for financial services, professional, business or administration offices generating 100 or more PM peak period trips; and one space for every 250 square feet of gross floor area for research and development use. According to these parking requirements, the project should provide 5,540 off-street parking spaces. The project proposes to provide 4,386 off-street parking spaces, which is substantially less than the City's minimum requirements. The justification for the reduction is based on surveys of other office complexes in Redwood City (see item [e] in Draft EIR subsection 7.4.7).
March 22, 2012

Maureen Riordan, City Planner
City of Redwood City
1017 Middlefield Road
Redwood City, CA 94016-0391

Subject: Stanford in Redwood City Precise Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report

Dear Ms. Maureen Riordan:

Bay Area Air Quality Management District (District) staff reviewed your agency’s Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the Stanford in Redwood City Precise (Plan). District staff understands that the Plan would create a satellite campus setting that will include up to 1.5 million square feet of office and medical clinic development.

District staff commends the City’s commitment to implement sustainability measures as part of the Plan, including an ambitious transportation demand management (TDM) plan to reduce emissions from driving. Effective measures included in the TDM plan that will reduce vehicle miles traveled and air pollutant emissions include implementing a bike and car sharing program, subsidizing employee transit passes, and improving bus infrastructure. However, since the DEIR concludes that impacts to air quality remain significant after mitigation, District staff recommends that the TDM plan also include parking measures to mitigate the number of parking spaces and implement parking pricing consistent with the City’s progressive Parking Plan.

In addition, staff recommends that the Plan be required to upgrade the four existing diesel generators to meet ARB Tier 4 emission standards as a condition of project approval. District staff believes these measures are feasible for reducing the Plan’s significant impact for operational emissions.

Staff agrees with the City’s analysis of toxic air contaminants and the mitigation measures to protect the potential child care center from exposure to toxic air contaminants. Staff supports Mitigation 8-3 to conduct a site specific health risk assessment for the child care facility and to install an air filtration system and relocate child outdoor use areas as necessary to avoid adverse health impacts.

If you have any questions, please contact Sigalle Michael, Senior Environmental Planner, (415) 749-4683.

Sincerely,

Jean Roggenkamp
Deputy Air Pollution Control Officer

cc: BAAQMD Director Carole Groom
     BAAQMD Director Carol Klatt
Jean Roggenkamp, Deputy Air Pollution Control Officer, Bay Area Air Quality Management District; March 22, 2012 (1 page)

BAAQMD Comment #1: “District staff recommends that the TDM plan also include parking measures to minimize the number of parking spaces and implement parking pricing consistent with the City’s progressive Parking Plan.”

Response #1: Annual TDM program monitoring will be integrated with an annual Parking Use Study to ensure that TDM program goals are met. Please see Precise Plan chapter IV under Development Impacts, Monitoring & Phasing. The integrated monitoring of these two project components (TDM and parking supply) is essential to the overall TDM program’s success and will enable the applicant to adjust the program as needed to best reduce use of single-occupant vehicles. It will be important to allow ongoing flexibility to manage the TDM program.

BAAQMD Comment #2: BAAQMD “staff recommends that the [Precise] Plan be required to upgrade the four existing diesel generators to meet ARB [Air Resources Board] Tier 4 emissions standards as a condition of project approval.”

Response #2: As noted on EIR page 8-22 (included in Final EIR section 3--Revisions to the Draft EIR), the four existing generators “are operated less than 50 hours per generator per year for routine testing accordance with BAAQMD regulations. Therefore, as existing uses that have permits from BAAQMD, operation of these generators is not subject to, and does not require, additional mitigation,” such as upgrading or replacement. As described in Draft EIR Mitigation 8-2, all new generators on the development site will be required to reduce reactive organic gas (ROG) emissions, as calculated for the EIR, by 30 percent or greater on an annual basis.

BAAQMD Comment #3: BAAQMD “staff agrees with the City’s analysis of toxic air contaminants and the mitigation measures to protect the potential child care center from exposure to toxic air contaminants.”

Response #3: Comment noted. The information referred to by BAAQMD is included in EIR chapter 8 (Air Quality).
3. DRAFT EIR REVISIONS

The following section includes all revisions to the Draft EIR made in response to comments received during and immediately after the Draft EIR comment period. This section also includes revisions resulting from informational updates that do not affect the EIR conclusions (e.g., see chapter 7 pages related to traffic) and typographical errors discovered since Draft EIR publication (e.g., see page 3-12). All text revisions are indicated by strike-through and underlining plus a bracket in the left margin next to the revised line(s). All of the revised pages supersede the corresponding pages in the January 2012 Draft EIR. None of the criteria listed in CEQA Guidelines section 15088.5 (Recirculation of an EIR Prior to Certification) indicating the need for recirculation of the January 2012 Draft EIR has been met as a result of the revisions. In particular:

- no new significant environmental impact due to the project or due to a new mitigation measure has been identified;
- no substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact has been identified; and
- no additional feasible project alternative or mitigation measure considerably different from others previously analyzed in the Draft EIR has been identified that would clearly lessen the significant environmental impacts of the project.
(4) approval of associated tentative and final subdivision maps (for new on-site street extensions); and

(5) amendment of the City’s Recycled Water Services Area map to reflect the project-proposed extension of the recycled water transmission infrastructure to the Precise Plan area.

The City and Stanford University may, but are not required to, enter into a development agreement in connection with the Precise Plan.

This EIR has been prepared by the City to provide the CEQA-required environmental documentation for each of these Precise Plan-related approvals. The proposed rezoning would apply to the entire Precise Plan area. The rezoning would be consistent with the adopted Redwood City General Plan land use designations for the Precise Plan area (see Figures 4.3 and 4.4 of this EIR), the impacts of which were analyzed in the Redwood City General Plan EIR, certified on October 11, 2010. See subsection 3.4.1, “Proposed Project Characteristics/Overview,” of this Precise Plan EIR. Because no additional development is proposed for two properties included in the area: (1) the Stanford Medicine Outpatient Center located on approximately 11.3 acres at 450 Broadway near 2nd Avenue (identified as Block F in the Precise Plan and this EIR), and (2) 550 Broadway, an existing building located on approximately 2.3 acres on Broadway at Douglas Avenue (identified as Block G in the Precise Plan and this EIR), there are no specific project impacts to be evaluated as to these two properties. Any future development on either of these two properties would be subject to its own CEQA review, if and when such development is proposed. Any future development would be subject to the development standards and urban design guidelines of the Precise Plan.

This EIR has been prepared by the City to provide the CEQA-required environmental documentation for each of these Precise Plan-related approvals. As used in this EIR, the terms "Stanford in Redwood City Precise Plan," "Precise Plan," "draft Precise Plan," and "project" are intended to be synonymous and refer to all aspects of the current Precise Plan proposal, including all of the approval actions listed above. This EIR is intended to serve as a public information and disclosure document identifying those environmental impacts associated with the proposed project that are expected to be significant, and describing mitigation measures and alternatives that could minimize or eliminate significant adverse impacts and increase beneficial effects. Such impacts and needed mitigations are discussed in this EIR to the level of detail necessary to allow reasoned decisions about the project and conditions of project approval. As a result of the information in this EIR, the City Council of Redwood City may act to approve or deny these various project actions, and/or to establish any associated requirements or conditions of approval considered necessary to mitigate identified project impacts on the environment.

As the Lead Agency, the City also intends this EIR to serve as the CEQA-required environmental documentation for consideration of this project by other Responsible Agencies.

---

1CEQA Guidelines section 15149(b).

2Under CEQA Guidelines, the term "Responsible Agency" includes all public agencies, other than the Lead Agency, which have discretionary approval power over aspects of the project for which the Lead Agency has prepared an EIR.
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and Trustee Agencies¹ (e.g., San Mateo County Office of Environmental Health, Regional Water Quality Control Board, Fair Oaks Sewer Maintenance District) which may have limited discretionary authority over future site-specific development proposals facilitated by this project.

1.2 EIR APPROACH AND ASSUMPTIONS

1.2.1 Impact Assessment Assumptions

The purpose of this EIR is to evaluate the likely environmental consequences (impacts and benefits) with full realization of the buildout potential anticipated with adoption of the proposed Precise Plan, and to describe mitigation measures and alternatives that could minimize or eliminate potentially significant adverse environmental impacts and increase beneficial effects.² The Precise Plan buildout assumptions used as the basis for the impact analyses in this EIR are

¹Under CEQA Guidelines, the term "Trustee Agency" means a state agency having jurisdiction by law over natural resources affected by the project which are held in trust by the people of California.
²CEQA Guidelines section 15149(b).

T:\10672\FEIR1-r (10672).doc
(2) rezoning of the Precise Plan area from IR (Industrial-Restricted) to P (Planned Community District) to reflect and implement the land uses and development standards specified by the Precise Plan (as discussed more fully in section 1.1, the rezoning would be consistent with the adopted Redwood City General Plan land use designations for the Precise Plan area, the impacts of which were analyzed in the Redwood City General Plan EIR, certified on October 11, 2010);

(3) approval of one or more Planned Community (PC) permits, incorporating the final Precise Plan in accordance with the City’s PC zone process;

(4) approval of associated tentative and final subdivision maps (for new on-site street extensions); and

(5) amendment of the City’s Recycled Water Services Area map to reflect the project-proposed extension of the recycled water transmission infrastructure to the Precise Plan area.

The City and Stanford University may, but are not required to, enter into a development agreement in connection with the Precise Plan.

As the Lead Agency, the City also intends this EIR to serve as the CEQA-required environmental documentation for consideration of this project by other Responsible Agencies\(^1\) and Trustee Agencies\(^2\) (e.g., San Mateo County Office of Environmental Health, Regional Water Quality Control Board, Fair Oaks Sewer Maintenance District) which may have limited discretionary authority over future site-specific development proposals facilitated by this project.

### 2.3 ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

As required by the state CEQA Guidelines, the scope of this EIR includes all environmental issues to be resolved and any areas of environmental controversy known to the Lead Agency (the City), including those issues and concerns identified as possibly significant by other agencies, organizations, and individuals in response to the City’s Notice of Preparation\(^3\) (dated October 2, 2008). Areas of potential controversy raised by agencies or the public include:

- Traffic and parking
- Light and glare

\(^1\) Under CEQA Guidelines, the term “Responsible Agency” includes all public agencies, other than the Lead Agency, which have discretionary approval power over aspects of the project for which the Lead Agency has prepared an EIR.

\(^2\) Under CEQA Guidelines, the term “Trustee Agency” means a state agency having jurisdiction by law over natural resources affected by the project which are held in trust by the people of California.

\(^3\) The Notice of Preparation (NOP) is a CEQA-required brief notice sent by the Lead Agency to notify the Responsible Agencies, Trustee Agencies, and potentially involved federal agencies that the Lead Agency plans to prepare an EIR for the project, and solicits guidance regarding EIR scope and content. The City’s NOP for the proposed project and scoping comments received in response to the NOP are included in appendix 21.1 of this EIR.
- Air quality
- Noise
- Housing
- Water supply
signal warrant. According to City guidelines, these changes would constitute a **significant project impact**.

**Impact 7-8: Near Term Plus Project Impact on Charter Street/Bay Road Intersection.**

Under Near Term Plus Project conditions during the PM peak hour, project traffic would cause the intersection to degrade from LOS D (27.7 seconds delay) to LOS E (37.7 seconds delay). In addition, this intersection would have peak hour volume increases large enough under both peak hours to satisfy the peak hour signal warrant. According to City guidelines, these changes would constitute a **significant project impact**.

**Mitigation 7-8(a).** To mitigate the project’s impact (i.e., the project applicant would be responsible for fully funding/completing the mitigation) at the intersection of Charter Street and Bay Road, the intersection would need to be signalized with protected phasing on the eastbound and westbound approaches on Bay Road, and permitted phasing on the northbound and southbound approaches on Charter Street. In addition to signalization, the eastbound and westbound approaches would need to be restriped to include a total of one left-turn lane and one shared through/right-turn lane. With these improvements, the level of service (LOS) at this intersection would improve to an acceptable LOS C in the AM peak hour and LOS D in the PM peak hour.

Traffic from the proposed project would add 10.0 seconds to the PM peak hour delay at this intersection over Near Term No Project conditions (see EIR Table 7.11); other Near Term growth would add 14.5 seconds to the delay over Existing conditions. Therefore, it is assumed that the proposed project would contribute approximately 41 percent toward this impact. The proposed project would mitigate its contribution to this impact by contributing its fair share to a...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impacts</th>
<th>Potential Significance Without Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Potential Significance With Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Mitigation 7-8(b). Mitigation of the project's impact at the intersection of Charter Street and Bay Road would require the conversion of the all-way stop controlled unsignalized intersection to a single-lane roundabout. Standard roundabouts are at least 110 feet in diameter. Smaller roundabouts may operate efficiently down to 80 feet in diameter. The existing intersection at Charter Street and Bay Road would allow up to an 80-foot-diameter roundabout. If the design work shows that the 80-foot-diameter roundabout would not require the acquisition of additional right-of-way and would not create additional safety hazards for motorists, pedestrians, or bicyclists compared to Mitigation 7-8(a), and if substantial evidence at the time the roundabout is proposed shows that the roundabout would not divert traffic to other intersections, the roundabout shall be considered feasible and may be substituted for

mitigation fund established to pay for the cost of this improvement (estimated, based on this EIR, to be 41 percent) at the time of issuance of a building permit or, if the City adds the improvement to its Traffic Impact Fee Program (TIF) project list, the proposed project would mitigate its contribution to this impact by paying its Traffic Impact Fee in effect at time of payment and issuance of a building permit.

or

Applicant Fair share or payment of Traffic Impact Fee

LS
Mitigation 7-8(a). With this improvement, the level of service (LOS) at this intersection would improve to an acceptable LOS B during the AM peak hour and LOS C during the PM peak hour.

Traffic from the proposed project would add 10.0 seconds to the PM peak hour delay at this intersection over Near Term No Project conditions (see EIR Table 7.11); other Near Term growth would add 14.5 seconds to the delay over Existing conditions. Therefore, it is assumed that the proposed project would contribute approximately 41 percent toward this impact. The proposed project would mitigate its contribution to this impact by contributing its fair share to a mitigation fund established to pay for the cost of this improvement (estimated, based on this EIR, to be 41 percent) at the time of issuance of a building permit or, if the City adds the roundabout to its Traffic Impact Fee Program (TIF) project list, the proposed project would mitigate its contribution to this impact by paying its Traffic Impact Fee in effect at time of payment and issuance of a building permit.

Implementation of any one of these two mitigation options would reduce this project impact to a less-than-significant level.
**Impact 7-9: Near Term Plus Project Impact on Douglas Avenue/Broadway Intersection.**
Under Near Term Plus Project conditions during the AM peak hour, project traffic would cause the intersection to degrade from LOS C (21.9 seconds) to LOS F (179.1 seconds). During the PM peak hour, the intersection would continue to operate at LOS F, but project traffic would cause the critical delay at the intersection to increase from 54.5 seconds to 223.4 seconds (i.e., by 168.9 seconds). In addition, this intersection would have peak hour volume increases large enough under both peak hours to satisfy the peak hour signal warrant. According to City guidelines, these changes constitute a significant project impact.

**Mitigation 7-9.** Implement Mitigation 7-4 (the project applicant would be responsible for fully funding/completing the mitigation). With these improvements, the level of service (LOS) at this intersection would improve to an acceptable LOS C during both peak hours, and the impact would be less-than-significant.

**Impact 7-10: Near Term Plus Project Impact on 5th Avenue/Bay Road Intersection.**
Under Near Term Plus Project conditions during the PM peak hour, project traffic would cause the intersection to degrade from LOS C (21.8 seconds delay) to LOS E (38.4 seconds delay). In addition, this intersection would have peak hour volume increases large enough under both peak hours to satisfy the peak hour signal warrant. According to City guidelines, these changes would constitute a significant project impact.

**Mitigation 7-10(a).** The signalization of the 5th Avenue/Bay Road intersection is a transportation project included in the City's 2000 Traffic Impact Fee Program (TIF). Payment by the project applicant of its City Traffic Impact Fee in effect at time of payment and issuance of a building permit would mitigate this impact. To mitigate the project’s impact (i.e., the project applicant would be responsible for fully funding/completing the mitigation) at the intersection of 5th Avenue and Bay Road, the intersection would need to be signalized. (5th Avenue is considered north-south and Bay Road is considered east-west.) No further improvements would be required. With this improvement, the
Mitigation 7-10(b). Mitigation of the project’s impact at the intersection of 5th Avenue and Bay Road would require the conversion of the all-way stop controlled intersection to a single lane roundabout. The existing road widths at 5th Avenue and Bay Road would allow up to an 85-foot-diameter roundabout. If the design work shows that the 85-foot-diameter roundabout would not require the acquisition of additional right-of-way and would not create additional safety hazards for motorists, pedestrians, or bicyclists compared to Mitigation 7-10(a), and if substantial evidence at the time the roundabout is proposed shows that the roundabout would not divert traffic to other intersections, the roundabout shall be considered feasible and may be substituted for Mitigation 7-10(a).

Because Mitigation 7-10(a) is included in the City’s TIF project list, the proposed project would mitigate its contribution to this impact by paying its Traffic Impact Fee following the City’s substitution of Mitigation 7-10(b) for Mitigation 7-10(a) in the TIF project list. With this improvement, the level of service (LOS) at this intersection would improve to an acceptable LOS B during both peak hours.

or

Mitigation 7-10(b). Mitigation of the project’s impact at the intersection of 5th Avenue and Bay Road would require the conversion of the all-way stop controlled intersection to a single lane roundabout. The existing road widths at 5th Avenue and Bay Road would allow up to an 85-foot-diameter roundabout. If the design work shows that the 85-foot-diameter roundabout would not require the acquisition of additional right-of-way and would not create additional safety hazards for motorists, pedestrians, or bicyclists compared to Mitigation 7-10(a), and if substantial evidence at the time the roundabout is proposed shows that the roundabout would not divert traffic to other intersections, the roundabout shall be considered feasible and may be substituted for Mitigation 7-10(a).

Because Mitigation 7-10(a) is included in the City’s TIF project list, the proposed project would mitigate its contribution to this impact by paying its Traffic Impact Fee following the City’s substitution of Mitigation 7-10(b) for Mitigation 7-10(a) in the TIF project list. With this improvement, the level of service (LOS) at this intersection would improve to an acceptable LOS B during both peak hours.

or

Mitigation 7-10(b). Mitigation of the project’s impact at the intersection of 5th Avenue and Bay Road would require the conversion of the all-way stop controlled intersection to a single lane roundabout. The existing road widths at 5th Avenue and Bay Road would allow up to an 85-foot-diameter roundabout. If the design work shows that the 85-foot-diameter roundabout would not require the acquisition of additional right-of-way and would not create additional safety hazards for motorists, pedestrians, or bicyclists compared to Mitigation 7-10(a), and if substantial evidence at the time the roundabout is proposed shows that the roundabout would not divert traffic to other intersections, the roundabout shall be considered feasible and may be substituted for Mitigation 7-10(a).

Because Mitigation 7-10(a) is included in the City’s TIF project list, the proposed project would mitigate its contribution to this impact by paying its Traffic Impact Fee following the City’s substitution of Mitigation 7-10(b) for Mitigation 7-10(a) in the TIF project list. With this improvement, the level of service (LOS) at this intersection would improve to an acceptable LOS B during both peak hours.

or

Mitigation 7-10(b). Mitigation of the project’s impact at the intersection of 5th Avenue and Bay Road would require the conversion of the all-way stop controlled intersection to a single lane roundabout. The existing road widths at 5th Avenue and Bay Road would allow up to an 85-foot-diameter roundabout. If the design work shows that the 85-foot-diameter roundabout would not require the acquisition of additional right-of-way and would not create additional safety hazards for motorists, pedestrians, or bicyclists compared to Mitigation 7-10(a), and if substantial evidence at the time the roundabout is proposed shows that the roundabout would not divert traffic to other intersections, the roundabout shall be considered feasible and may be substituted for Mitigation 7-10(a).

Because Mitigation 7-10(a) is included in the City’s TIF project list, the proposed project would mitigate its contribution to this impact by paying its Traffic Impact Fee following the City’s substitution of Mitigation 7-10(b) for Mitigation 7-10(a) in the TIF project list. With this improvement, the level of service (LOS) at this intersection would improve to an acceptable LOS B during both peak hours.

or

Mitigation 7-10(b). Mitigation of the project’s impact at the intersection of 5th Avenue and Bay Road would require the conversion of the all-way stop controlled intersection to a single lane roundabout. The existing road widths at 5th Avenue and Bay Road would allow up to an 85-foot-diameter roundabout. If the design work shows that the 85-foot-diameter roundabout would not require the acquisition of additional right-of-way and would not create additional safety hazards for motorists, pedestrians, or bicyclists compared to Mitigation 7-10(a), and if substantial evidence at the time the roundabout is proposed shows that the roundabout would not divert traffic to other intersections, the roundabout shall be considered feasible and may be substituted for Mitigation 7-10(a).

Because Mitigation 7-10(a) is included in the City’s TIF project list, the proposed project would mitigate its contribution to this impact by paying its Traffic Impact Fee following the City’s substitution of Mitigation 7-10(b) for Mitigation 7-10(a) in the TIF project list. With this improvement, the level of service (LOS) at this intersection would improve to an acceptable LOS B during both peak hours.
implementation of the improvements, would mitigate the impact to a less-than-significant level. However, because these improvements would require Caltrans approval, the City of Redwood City cannot ensure the construction of these improvements. Also, the additional westbound through lane would require additional right-of-way. Without implementation of the proposed improvements, the impact would be significant and unavoidable.

Impact 7-14: Cumulative With Project Impact on Woodside Road/Middlefield Road Intersection. Under Cumulative With Project conditions during the PM peak hour, the intersection would remain at LOS F, and the proposed project could contribute up to 22.629.2 seconds of critical delay to the intersection. According to City of Redwood City guidelines, this constitutes a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact.

Mitigation 7-14. This mitigation is in addition to the Caltrans intersection improvement that will be implemented in 2013; a description of the 2013 improvement is included on page 7-21 of this EIR.

To mitigate the significant cumulative impact at the intersection of Woodside Road and Middlefield Road, an additional southbound through lane would need to be added to Woodside Road. (Woodside Road is considered north-south and Middlefield Road is considered east-west.) In addition, crosswalks and pedestrian signals should be added to achieve better pedestrian mobility as described in the City’s New General Plan. Because this intersection is subject to Caltrans jurisdiction, this roadway widening and any changes to the operation of this roadway widening and the signal would require Caltrans approval.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impacts</th>
<th>Potential Significance Without Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Potential Significance With Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pursuant to Caltrans Deputy Directives 64 and 64-R1, requiring facilitation of multimodal travel, it is possible that the above improvements would also be required to include such features as new crosswalk and pedestrian signals, curb ramps, pedestrian count-down signals, an emergency vehicle pre-emption system, reconstruction of

---

S = Significant  
LS = Less than significant  
SU = Significant unavoidable impact  
NA = Not applicable
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impacts</th>
<th>Potential Significance Without Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Potential Significance With Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>corner radii to reduce pedestrian crossing distances, bike lanes, and bike detectors. With these improvements, the level of service (LOS) at this intersection would remain at LOS F. Although LOS F still exceeds the City of Redwood City LOS standard, conditions with this mitigation would be better than under Cumulative No Project conditions, improve to LOS D during the PM peak hour, resulting in a less-than-significant cumulative impact. The widening of Woodside Road, inclusive of this intersection, is included in the City’s Traffic Impact Fee Program (TIF) project list. However, there is no current design option that is acceptable to both Caltrans and the City of Redwood City; therefore, this improvement may be infeasible. If a design for widening Woodside Road can be developed which is acceptable to both Caltrans and the City of Redwood City, payment of the Traffic Impact Fee by the applicant would mitigate the proposed project’s contribution to the significant cumulative impact to a less-than-significant level. If it is determined that the Woodside Road improvements remain infeasible because the improvements are not consistent with the New Redwood City General Plan and/or Caltrans policy, the cumulative impact would remain significant and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

S = Significant  
LS = Less than significant  
SU = Significant unavoidable impact  
NA = Not applicable
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impacts</th>
<th>Potential Significance Without Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Mitigation Responsibility With Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact 7-15: Cumulative With Project Impact on Douglas Avenue/Bay Road Intersection</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Mitigation 7-15. To mitigate the significant cumulative impact at the intersection of Douglas Avenue and Bay Road, the intersection would remain unavoidable, as would the proposed project’s contribution to that cumulative impact.</td>
<td>Applicant fair share or payment of Traffic Impact Fee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*S* = Significant  
*LS* = Less than significant  
*SU* = Significant unavoidable impact  
*NA* = Not applicable
Impact 8-2: Operational Emissions Increases. Project development would generate stationary, area, and traffic air pollutant emissions increases. These emissions would not subject sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, but emissions of ROG and PM\(_{10}\) would exceed BAAQMD significance thresholds. This project-related effect is considered a significant project and cumulative impact.

Mitigation 8-2. In addition to the project-proposed sustainability measures described in chapter 3 (Project Description) of this EIR, which include a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program, implement the following measure:

Minimize generator-testing of the new generators to reduce ROG emissions. New generators emissions, as computed on an annual basis, shall be reduced by 30 percent or greater. This could be achieved in a number of ways:

1. Install fewer than the assumed 13 new generators;
2. Install generators with lower emissions (in this case, smaller generators);
3. Test new generators at lower running loads (the analysis assumed 100-percent load, so 50-percent load would reduce emissions); and/or
4. Reduce the number of annual testing hours annually.

The applicant shall submit an analysis of the new generator emissions prior to installing more than five new generators at the project development site.
Impact 8-3: Community Risk and Hazard Impacts. Project development could expose attendees of the on-site child care center to significant levels of PM$_{2.5}$. Significant impacts from the Tyco Thermal Controls Facility to attendees of the proposed child care facility are anticipated to be significant regardless of where the child care facility is located within the Precise Plan area. This project-related effect is considered to represent a significant project and cumulative impact.

Mitigation 8-3. Buffer the child care center from existing and planned emission sources, and include project features to reduce TAC and PM$_{2.5}$ exposure from air pollutant sources--which include US 101 traffic, and the Tyco Thermal Controls facility, and existing and proposed generators--through the following measures:

1. When construction of a child care center is proposed, conduct site-specific detailed analysis to determine the child care center’s TAC and PM$_{2.5}$ exposures. The analysis should be utilized to guide final design and siting of the child care facility and determine the level of ventilation/filtration necessary to ensure that indoor concentrations will be less-than-significant.

Implementation of this measure to reduce generator emissions would reduce ROG emissions by 2.7 pounds per day, which would result in total ROG emissions of 53.1 pounds per day, which is below the BAAQMD significance threshold of 54 pounds per day. However, this mitigation measure would reduce PM$_{10}$ emissions by a minimal amount, leaving PM$_{10}$ emissions above the BAAQMD significance threshold. Therefore, as currently proposed, the project would result in a significant unavoidable project and cumulative operational air quality impact.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impacts</th>
<th>Potential Significance Without Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Potential Significance With Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Evaluate and appropriately buffer the child care center from existing diesel generators at the Stanford Medicine Outpatient Center and 550 Broadway, and any other sources near the Precise Plan area identified by BAAQMD at the time such analysis is undertaken.</td>
<td>23. Ensure that the ventilation/filtration systems in the child care center result in an indoor cancer risk of less than 10 in one million and annual PM$<em>{2.5}$ concentrations of less than 0.3 µg/m$^3$ from any single source or less than 100 in one million cancer risk and annual PM$</em>{2.5}$ concentrations of less than 0.8 µg/m$^3$ from cumulative resources.</td>
<td>34. Consider tiered plantings of trees between the child care center and air pollutant sources such as the freeway, existing and planned generators, and the Tyco Thermal Controls facility.</td>
<td>45. Avoid location of any truck loading zones near the child care facility.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

S = Significant  
LS = Less than significant  
SU = Significant unavoidable impact  
NA = Not applicable
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impacts</th>
<th>Potential Significance Without Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Potential Significance With Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

shall be mitigated by placing the child care center more than 700 feet from the freeway. Based on currently available information, the impact from Tyco Thermal Controls cannot be mitigated to a less-than-significant level because the elevated PM$_{2.5}$ levels from the facility extend across the entire project development site. If the Tyco Thermal Controls facility remains in operation at the time of construction of the child care center, and if the detailed analysis described above shows PM$_{2.5}$ levels exceeding the 0.3 µg/m$^3$ standard throughout the development site, construction and operation of a child care center on the development site shall be
operating hours. Although existing and future noise levels measured along roadways in the project vicinity exceed 55 dBA CNEL, noise levels in outdoor activity areas could be reduced from roadside levels by at least 20 dBA through site selection and site design, including buffer areas, siting the building as an effective noise barrier for adjacent traffic noise sources, and, or in combination with, other noise barriers. The approval of future commercial uses near the child care center may, at City discretion, require a noise study demonstrating how the proposed new commercial uses—including associated loading docks, refuse areas, and ventilation systems, and emergency generators—would meet these standards.

Implementation of these measures would reduce the potential impact on the proposed child care use to a less-than-significant level.

### Impact 13-2: Project-Facilitated Construction Noise

Construction activities facilitated by the project would include building demolition, site grading and preparation, construction of new buildings, and installation of utilities. Noise levels at 50 feet from the demolition or construction equipment source could reach approximately 105 dBA, resulting in intermittent interference with typical existing residential and business activities, as well as any on-site sensitive uses developed during

Mitigation 13-2. Reduce project demolition- and construction-period noise impacts on nearby residences (including the Broadway Towers apartments and the mobile home park near the proposed recycled water pipeline route) and sensitive uses developed on the development site during earlier phases (e.g., child care center) by incorporating conditions in project demolition and construction contract agreements that stipulate the following conventional construction-period noise abatement measures:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Potential Significance Without Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Mitigation Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13-2</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>Applicant SU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

S = Significant  
LS = Less than significant  
SU = Significant unavoidable impact  
NA = Not applicable
Existing land uses surrounding the Precise Plan area are illustrated on Figure 3.2 and include:

**To the North:** US 101 (Bayshore Freeway);

**To the East:** Broadway Towers Apartments (seven stories) and associated at-grade, covered parking area (at the northwest corner of Broadway and Second); Andrew Spinas Park (tot lot, play equipment, basketball court, tennis courts, barbecue area); Redwood City Fire Station #11; and the low-density residential Friendly Acres neighborhood, which continues east to Marsh Road at the Redwood City/Menlo Park border;

**To the South:** one- and two-story heavy commercial, manufacturing, and other light industrial, and office uses; and the Redwood Village and Fair Oaks residential neighborhoods (the latter in unincorporated San Mateo County); and

**To the West:** one- and two-story heavy commercial, manufacturing, and other light industrial, and office uses.

The 34.85-acre (approximately 1,518,000 square-foot) portion of the Precise Plan area proposed for development (“the development site”) comprises the area occupied by the following buildings and their associated landscaped areas and parking lots: 405, 425, 475, 500, 510, 555, and 575/585 Broadway, and 1228 Douglas Avenue, plus 415 Broadway (3.92 acres with no building). Adjacent properties that are not part of the Stanford in Redwood City project, but which are included in the Precise Plan area (and identified on Figure 3.2), comprise: (1) the Stanford Medicine Outpatient Center located on approximately 11.3 acres at 450 Broadway near Second Avenue, and (2) 550 Broadway (an existing building located on approximately 2.3 acres on Broadway at Douglas Avenue). Because no additional development is proposed for these two properties at this time, there are no specific project impacts to be evaluated as to these two properties. Any but any future development would be subject to the development standards and urban design guidelines and development standards of the proposed Precise Plan and would be subject to its own CEQA review, if and when such development is proposed.

### 3.1.3 Existing Development Site Characteristics

As depicted on Figure 3.2, there are eight one- and two-story, office and R&D buildings totaling approximately 537,000 square feet in floor area on the 34.85-acre development site, with associated landscaped areas and parking lots for approximately 3,275 cars. The existing buildings are separated from the public streets by the surface parking lots. A landscaped courtyard with reflecting pools/fountains is situated between the 425 and 475 Broadway buildings. As of the release of this EIR’s Notice of Preparation (NOP) (October 2008), the on-site buildings were approximately 50 percent occupied and tenants included Ampex, BigBand Networks, Claria Corp., Nextance, and Silver Spring Networks. At Broadway and Douglas Avenue (the western gateway to the site), a semicircular trellis sign identifies the area as "Midpoint Technology Park."

---

1The existing Stanford Medicine Outpatient Center was subject to individual, City-certified CEQA review.
Existing buildings and parcels on-site include the following (see Figure 3.2):

- 1228 Douglas Avenue (32,000 square feet on 1.85 acres);
- 405 Broadway (55,282 square feet on 3.14 acres);
- 415 Broadway (no building on 3.92 acres);
The gross maximum FAR for the Precise Plan Area is 1.0. However, street and open space dedication requirements reduce the amount of developable land, creating higher net FARs on individual blocks. The Precise Plan focuses higher FARs on the blocks to the west, away from the Friendly Acres neighborhood, and on the north, adjacent to US 101. This provides for variety and flexibility in development. However, given the Precise Plan’s gross maximum FAR and maximum build-out requirements, it is not possible for all blocks to be built to their respective maximum net FAR; i.e., developing some blocks to the maximum net FAR requires that other blocks be developed at less than the maximum net FAR.

Variations in height maximums reflect Precise Plan policies for lower levels of development on the east side of the Precise Plan Area, adjacent to the Friendly Acres neighborhood, and higher levels of development on the west and north adjacent to US 101. The height limits establish a maximum envelope for individual buildings. However, given the Precise Plan’s average building height, FAR, and maximum build-out policies, it is not possible for all buildings to be built to the maximum height; i.e., developing some buildings to the maximum height requires that other buildings be developed at less than the maximum height.
The Precise Plan would allow a maximum 1.2 floor area ratio (FAR) on Block F, and a maximum building height of 60 feet. This is less than the 75-foot building height currently allowed by the block’s “Industrial-Restricted” (IR) zoning. Further, the Precise Plan’s FAR and height limit are within the FAR and height limit authorized by the adopted 2010 Redwood City New General Plan, which have been evaluated at a conceptual level in the New General Plan EIR.

Block F is designated “Hospital” in the 2010 Redwood City New General Plan. The “Hospital” category encourages the concentration of established and proposed healthcare facilities and their related uses. Appropriate uses include hospitals, large-scale professional offices and clinics offering medical, dental, or related services, and ancillary buildings and facilities. The “Hospital” designation allows for a maximum 2.0 FAR, and a maximum building height of 5 stories.

No new development is proposed for Block F. Accordingly, Block F is not included in the development area evaluated in the Stanford in Redwood City Precise Plan EIR. Future development in Block F would necessitate project-specific CEQA review.

Block G is located on the northeast corner of Broadway and Douglas Avenue. Block G contains an electronic equipment facility operated by an entity that is not affiliated with Stanford University.

The Precise Plan would allow a maximum 1.0 FAR on Block G, and a maximum building height of 75 feet. The same FAR and building height are allowed under the block’s current “Industrial-Restricted” (IR) zoning. While the IR zoning generally allows up to a 0.7 FAR, an additional 0.3 FAR can be authorized for electronic equipment facilities. Further, the Precise Plan’s FAR and height limit are within the FAR and height limit authorized by the adopted 2010 Redwood City New General Plan, which have been evaluated at a conceptual level in the New General Plan EIR.

Block G is designated “Commercial--Office Professional/Technology” in the 2010 Redwood City New General Plan. The “Commercial--Office Professional/Technology” designation provides opportunities for small- and large-scale professional offices, office complexes and campuses, and related uses that support office uses. This designation also facilitates districts where emerging and evolving technologies and businesses can operate in flexible building spaces. Such businesses may involve combinations of traditional office activities and small-scale manufacturing or research and development uses. The “Commercial--Office Professional/Technology” designation allows for a maximum 1.0 FAR, and a maximum height of 5 stories.

No new development is proposed for Block G. Accordingly, Block G is not included in the development area evaluated in the Stanford in Redwood City Precise Plan EIR. Future development in Block G would necessitate project-specific CEQA review.

3.4.2 New Buildings

The approximately 13 new Stanford in Redwood City buildings (not including the four proposed parking structures—see 3.4.4 below) would range in height from three to eight stories, with a maximum height of 120 feet. Building heights would vary to create distinct massing elements. As described by the applicant (detailed architectural designs are not part of the Precise Plan project), building designs would visually relate in scale and massing to the existing, adjacent
The project will initiate a car sharing program, providing vehicle access to employees who use alternative commute methods and need a vehicle to attend to personal or business related activities.

The project will offer participation in the project's Transportation Demand Management programs to existing developments and employers in the Precise Plan area (i.e., Stanford Hospital and Clinics and 550 Broadway).

Once per year, a traffic consultant hired by the City, in consultation with and paid for by the owner(s) of Blocks A-E (the project development site), will collect and analyze peak period trip data and parking data to assess the effectiveness of the TDM program. The traffic consultant will prepare an analysis report, and the City will coordinate review of the report with C/CAG. The details of TDM monitoring are included in Precise Plan chapter IV (Implementation), under Development Impacts, Monitoring & Phasing.

(c) Water Conservation.

- Incorporate the necessary infrastructure for potential future water-saving measures into construction of new facilities (e.g., recycled water pipeline extension and dual plumbing for landscape and toilets to use non-potable water).
- Develop specific design guidelines for conserving and reusing water in new buildings and landscaping.
- Develop and implement sustainability goal of 25% reduction of water use below Title 24 building standards (as of May 2008).

(d) Energy Efficiency.

- Require all new building projects to achieve energy performance at least 30% better than required by California’s energy code (as of May 2008).
- Consider joining local utility renewable energy or offset purchasing programs.
- Explore opportunities for cost-effective renewable energy installations on the development site.

(e) Waste Minimization.

- Develop an educational campaign for the development site promoting the 5 “R”s (reduce, reuse, recycle, buy recycled, rot).
- Educate the campus about waste reduction techniques.
- Develop a recycling program to include:
  a. Solid waste
  b. Paper and cardboard
  c. Food waste collection program to collect organic waste
  d. Bottles and cans
  e. Collection of electronic waste.
- Support market development for recycling products by continuing to identify new waste materials within the development site and finding dependable recycling markets.
- Develop management processes to increase the reuse of capital assets (fixtures and furnishings), office supplies (staplers, file folders), and unwanted employee items.
(f) **Environmentally Preferable Purchasing.**

- Implement a comprehensive educational program to teach employees about:
  a. The benefits of full product use, reuse, and environmentally preferable purchasing, wherever possible;
  b. The availability of 30% post-consumer content paper for preferable/default purchases, and the availability of other office products made with recycled content;
  c. The advantages of Energy Star-qualified equipment when it is available; and
  d. The array of products now made with bio-degradable materials.
traffic volumes plus traffic generated by other approved developments in Redwood City (i.e., all under construction and recently approved projects listed in Table 4.1 of this EIR). This subsection describes the procedure used to determine Near Term No Project traffic volumes and the resulting traffic conditions.

(a) Near Term No Project Conditions Roadway Improvements. It is assumed in this analysis that the transportation network under Near Term No Project conditions would be the same as the existing transportation network except for two improvements described below.

(1) Planned Auxiliary Lanes on US 101 between Marsh Road and Embarcadero Road (northbound and southbound). Construction was completed in December 2012 (after the EIR traffic analysis was completed and the Draft EIR publicly circulated). It is scheduled to begin in 2011, with anticipated completion in 2013. The new auxiliary lanes would be located within the County Line-to-Whipple Avenue study freeway segment along US 101. Since the new auxiliary lanes constitute a relatively small portion of the study freeway segment, they are not expected to perceptibly affect freeway segment levels of service. Thus, the new auxiliary lanes were not included in the freeway segment analysis.

(2) Proposed Improvements at Woodside Road/Middlefield Road Intersection. The following improvements are planned for construction in 2013:

- Southbound on Woodside Road: adding a right turn lane and converting the shared-right-through lane to a through lane;
- Westbound on Middlefield Road: converting the left-through lane to a second left turn lane;
- Eastbound on Middlefield Road: converting the left-through lane to a through lane;
- Changing the signal phasing on Middlefield Road from split-phase to protected left turns.

(b) Near Term No Project Conditions Traffic Volumes. Near Term No Project peak hour traffic volumes were estimated using the Redwood City Subarea traffic model and adding to existing traffic volumes the volumes from approved but not yet completed developments in Redwood City. A list of under construction and recently approved projects was provided by the City of Redwood City Community Development Department (see EIR Table 4.1) and added to the City traffic model. Near Term No Project peak hour traffic volumes are shown on Figure 7.6.

(c) Near Term No Project Conditions Intersection Operations. The results of the intersection LOS analysis under Near Term No Project conditions are summarized in Table 7.7. The results indicate that five intersections would exceed the City’s LOS standard during at least one peak hour:

- El Camino Real/Whipple Avenue (PM peak hour),
- Woodside Road/Broadway (PM peak hour),
- Charter Street/Broadway (PM peak hour),
- Flynn Avenue/Middlefield Road (AM peak hour), and
Douglas Avenue/Broadway (PM peak hour).

(d) Near Term No Project Conditions Signal Warrant Checks. The results of the peak hour traffic signal warrant checks under Near Term No Project conditions are summarized in Table 7.8. The results indicate that the following six study intersections would have peak hour traffic volumes large enough to satisfy the peak hour signal warrant during at least one peak hour:

- Charter Street/Broadway,
- Charter Street/Bay Road,
- Flynn Avenue/Middlefield Road,
### Table 7.7

**INTERSECTION LEVELS OF SERVICE—NEAR TERM NO PROJECT CONDITIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Existing Conditions</th>
<th>Near Term No Project Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AM Del/ Veh1</td>
<td>PM Del/ Veh2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Veterans Boulevard/Whipple Avenue</td>
<td>D 37.1</td>
<td>D 43.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>El Camino Real/Whipple Avenue</td>
<td>D 41.6</td>
<td>E 58.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Veterans Boulevard/Woodside Road</td>
<td>B 19.7</td>
<td>D 40.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Woodside Road/Broadway</td>
<td>D 37.2</td>
<td>E 59.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Woodside Road/Bay Road</td>
<td>C 24.0</td>
<td>D 35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Woodside Road/Middlefield Road</td>
<td>D 36.3</td>
<td>D 40.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Charter Street/Broadway</td>
<td>B 14.1</td>
<td>C 17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Charter Street/Bay Road</td>
<td>B 12.1</td>
<td>B 13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Charter Street/Middlefield Road</td>
<td>C 22.2</td>
<td>C 25.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Flynn Avenue/Middlefield Road</td>
<td>C 24.2</td>
<td>C 21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Douglas Avenue/Broadway</td>
<td>B 10.4</td>
<td>B 11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Douglas Avenue/Bay Road</td>
<td>B 10.5</td>
<td>B 10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Douglas Avenue/Middlefield Road</td>
<td>A 8.6</td>
<td>A 6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Hurlingame Avenue/Middlefield Road</td>
<td>C 18.3</td>
<td>C 20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2nd Avenue/Broadway</td>
<td>B 10.5</td>
<td>B 11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2nd Avenue/Bay Road</td>
<td>A 9.9</td>
<td>B 10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>5th Avenue/Broadway</td>
<td>B 11.5</td>
<td>B 10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>5th Avenue/Bay Road</td>
<td>C 17.8</td>
<td>C 17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>5th Avenue/Middlefield Road</td>
<td>C 27.1</td>
<td>C 31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>El Camino Real/5th Avenue</td>
<td>B 14.4</td>
<td>B 16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>US 101 SB Ramps/Marsh Road</td>
<td>C 22.9</td>
<td>C 22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Marsh Road/Scott Drive</td>
<td>B 14.7</td>
<td>C 21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Marsh Road/Florence Street</td>
<td>C 20.3</td>
<td>C 27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Marsh Road/Middlefield Road</td>
<td>C 31.2</td>
<td>C 34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Willow Street/Middlefield Road</td>
<td>A 5.3</td>
<td>A 4.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCE:** Hexagon Transportation Consultants

**Notes:**

1. LOS = Level of Service.
2. Del/Veh = Average delay per vehicle in seconds.

**Bold font** indicates unacceptable conditions.
Table 7.9
TDM PROGRAM SUMMARY

(1) Bicycle-related elements:

- The project will improve selected on-street bicycle facilities within 3 miles of the Precise Plan area (as more specifically described in the Precise Plan).
- The project will provide employees the use of secure bike storage on the development site.
- The project will provide employees showers and changing rooms for commuter bikers and pedestrians.
- The project will initiate a communal bicycle sharing program for employees to encourage alternative commute methods by providing alternative transportation options during work hours.

(2) Promoting alternative forms of transportation:

- The project will participate in or operate a shuttle service during commute peak periods to and from the Redwood City Caltrain station.
- The project will initiate a program that will offer subsidized transit passes to employees.
- The project will implement a vanpool program.
- The project will create preferred parking for vanpoolers.
- The project will implement a carpool program.
- The project will create preferred parking for carpoolers.
- The project will provide a commute assistance center offering “one stop” shopping for transit and commute alternatives information.
- The project will conduct periodic surveys of employees to examine the use of alternative transportation and best practices.
- The project will consult with SamTrans to improve existing bus service to the project.
- The project will make selected improvements to the existing bus infrastructure (e.g., stops, shelters, benches) within ½ mile of the project site. (These improvements will be within the existing public right-of-way. The specific location of these improvements will be determined by Redwood City in consultation with SamTrans and Stanford University.)
- The project will work with the Peninsula Traffic Congestion Relief Alliance (commonly referred to as the “Alliance”) to develop a Transportation Action Plan.

(3) Services for commuters:

- The project will initiate an “emergency ride home” program for commuters using alternative transportation modes (transit, carpool, vanpool).
- The project will initiate a program that will offer the installation of high bandwidth connections to the Internet in qualified employees’ homes to facilitate home-telecommuting.
- The project will install video conferencing centers within its conference rooms.
- The project will initiate a program that will offer compressed work week program to applicable staff.
- The project will initiate a program that will offer alternative hours work program to applicable staff.
- The project will provide on-site amenities, accommodations and programs (such as child care credits and facilities, automated teller machines, fitness center, sundries shop, etc.) that encourage employees and visitors to leave their cars at home.
- The project will initiate a car sharing program, providing vehicle access to employees who use alternative commute methods and need a vehicle to attend to personal or business related activities.
- The project will offer participation in the project’s Transportation Demand Management programs to existing developments and employers in the Precise Plan area (i.e., Stanford Hospital and Clinics and 550 Broadway).

Once per year, a traffic consultant hired by the City, in consultation with and paid for by the owner(s) of Blocks A-E (the project development site), will collect and analyze peak period trip data and parking data to assess the effectiveness of the TDM program. The traffic consultant will prepare an analysis report, and the City will coordinate review of the report with C/CAG. The details of TDM monitoring are included in Precise Plan chapter IV (Implementation), under Development Impacts, Monitoring & Phasing.

SOURCE: Stanford University
Table 7.11  
INTERSECTION LEVELS OF SERVICE--NEAR TERM CONDITIONS (NO PROJECT AND PROJECT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>AM Peak Hour</th>
<th>PM Peak Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Near Term</td>
<td>Near Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No Project</td>
<td>Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Del</td>
<td>Del</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Veterans Boulevard/Whipple Avenue</td>
<td>D 37.4</td>
<td>D 37.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+0.0</td>
<td>+0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>El Camino Real/Whipple Avenue</td>
<td>D 42.7</td>
<td>E 58.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+0.3</td>
<td>+0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Veterans Boulevard/Woodside Road</td>
<td>C 20.6</td>
<td>D 44.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+0.0</td>
<td>+0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Woodside Road/Broadway</td>
<td>D 42.1</td>
<td>F 83.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+9.8</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Woodside Road/Bay Road</td>
<td>C 39.9</td>
<td>D 43.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+10.3</td>
<td>+1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Charter Street/Broadway</td>
<td>C 24.7</td>
<td>F 153.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F 127.7</td>
<td>F 153.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+103.0</td>
<td>+69.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Charter Street/Bay Road</td>
<td>B 14.6</td>
<td>D 27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D 32.9</td>
<td>E 37.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+18.3</td>
<td>+10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Charter Street/Middlefield Road</td>
<td>C 23.0</td>
<td>C 26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+0.1</td>
<td>+0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Flynn Avenue/Middlefield Road</td>
<td>E 35.2</td>
<td>E 57.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C 24.2</td>
<td>E 56.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-11.0</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Douglas Avenue/Broadway</td>
<td>C 21.9</td>
<td>F 54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F 179.1</td>
<td>F 223.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+157.2</td>
<td>+168.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Douglas Avenue/Bay Road</td>
<td>B 10.7</td>
<td>B 11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B 14.0</td>
<td>D 30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+3.3</td>
<td>+19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Douglas Avenue/Middlefield Road</td>
<td>A 9.0</td>
<td>A 9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A 9.4</td>
<td>B 11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+0.4</td>
<td>+2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2nd Avenue/Bay Road</td>
<td>B 11.0</td>
<td>C 18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B 11.6</td>
<td>E 51.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+0.6</td>
<td>+32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>2nd Avenue/Bay Road</td>
<td>B 10.3</td>
<td>B 13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B 11.6</td>
<td>C 22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1.3</td>
<td>+9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>5th Avenue/Bay Road</td>
<td>B 11.6</td>
<td>B 10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B 11.8</td>
<td>B 11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+0.2</td>
<td>+0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>5th Avenue/Middlefield Road</td>
<td>C 18.0</td>
<td>E 38.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C 21.4</td>
<td>+16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>El Camino Real/5th Avenue</td>
<td>B 14.6</td>
<td>C 31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B 14.5</td>
<td>C 34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>+2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>US 101 SB Ramps/Marsh Road</td>
<td>C 23.2</td>
<td>C 22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C 23.9</td>
<td>C 22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+0.7</td>
<td>+0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Marsh Road/Scott Drive</td>
<td>B 14.8</td>
<td>C 21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B 14.9</td>
<td>C 22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+0.1</td>
<td>+0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Marsh Road/Florence Street</td>
<td>C 20.4</td>
<td>C 27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C 20.5</td>
<td>C 28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+0.1</td>
<td>+0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Marsh Road/Middlefield Road</td>
<td>C 31.4</td>
<td>C 34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C 31.1</td>
<td>C 34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Willow Street/Middlefield Road</td>
<td>A 8.6</td>
<td>A 5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A 8.7</td>
<td>A 5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+0.1</td>
<td>+0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCE:** Hexagon Transportation Consultants

**Notes:**
1 LOS = Level of Service.
2 Del (sec) = Average delay per vehicle in seconds.
3 Change in delay.
4 The unsignalized intersection does not meet signal warrants. Thus, the project does not result in a significant impact at this intersection.

**Bold font** indicates unacceptable conditions.
**BOX** indicates significant project impact.
Mitigation 7-7. Implement Mitigation 7-3 (the project applicant would be responsible for fully funding/completing the mitigation). With these improvements, the level of service (LOS) at this intersection would improve to an acceptable LOS B in the AM peak hour and an acceptable LOS C in the PM peak hour, and the impact would be less-than-significant.

Impact 7-8: Near Term Plus Project Impact on Charter Street/Bay Road Intersection. Under Near Term Plus Project conditions during the PM peak hour, project traffic would cause the intersection to degrade from LOS D (27.7 seconds delay) to LOS E (37.7 seconds delay). In addition, this intersection would have peak hour volume increases large enough under both peak hours to satisfy the peak hour signal warrant. According to City guidelines, these changes would constitute a significant project impact (see criteria for "Intersection Impacts" in subsection 7.4.1, "Significance Criteria," above).

Mitigation 7-8(a). To mitigate the project’s impact (i.e., the project applicant would be responsible for fully funding/completing the mitigation) at the intersection of Charter Street and Bay Road, the intersection would need to be signalized with protected phasing on the eastbound and westbound approaches on Bay Road, and permitted phasing on the northbound and southbound approaches on Charter Street. In addition to signalization, the eastbound and westbound approaches would need to be restriped to include a total of one left-turn lane and one shared through/right-turn lane. With these improvements, the level of service (LOS) at this intersection would improve to an acceptable LOS C in the AM peak hour and LOS D in the PM peak hour.

Traffic from the proposed project would add 10.0 seconds to the PM peak hour delay at this intersection over Near Term No Project conditions (see EIR Table 7.11); other Near Term growth would add 14.5 seconds to the delay over Existing conditions. Therefore, it is assumed that the proposed project would contribute approximately 41 percent toward this impact. The proposed project would mitigate its contribution to this impact by contributing its fair share to a mitigation fund established to pay for the cost of this improvement (estimated, based on this EIR, to be 41 percent) at the time of issuance of a building permit or, if the City adds the improvement to its Traffic Impact Fee Program (TIF) project list, the proposed project would mitigate its contribution to this impact by paying its Traffic Impact Fee in effect at time of payment and issuance of a building permit.

or

Mitigation 7-8(b). Mitigation of the project’s impact at the intersection of Charter Street and Bay Road would require the conversion of the all-way stop controlled

(continued)
**Mitigation 7-8(b) continued:**

unsignalized intersection to a single-lane roundabout. Standard roundabouts are at least 110 feet in diameter. Smaller roundabouts may operate efficiently down to 80 feet in diameter. The existing intersection at Charter Street and Bay Road would allow up to an 80-foot-diameter roundabout. If the design work shows that the 80-foot-diameter roundabout would not require the acquisition of additional right-of-way and would not create additional safety hazards for motorists, pedestrians, or bicyclists compared to Mitigation 7-8(a), and if substantial evidence at the time the roundabout is proposed shows that the roundabout would not divert traffic to other intersections, the roundabout shall be considered feasible and may be substituted for Mitigation 7-8(a). With this improvement, the level of service (LOS) at this intersection would improve to an acceptable LOS B during the AM peak hour and LOS C during the PM peak hour.

Traffic from the proposed project would add 10.0 seconds to the PM peak hour delay at this intersection over Near Term No Project conditions (see EIR Table 7.11); other Near Term growth would add 14.5 seconds to the delay over Existing conditions. Therefore, it is assumed that the proposed project would contribute approximately 41 percent toward this impact. The proposed project would mitigate its contribution to this impact by contributing its fair share to a mitigation fund established to pay for the cost of this improvement (estimated, based on this EIR, to be 41 percent) at the time of issuance of a building permit or, if the City adds the roundabout to its Traffic Impact Fee Program (TIF) project list, the proposed project would mitigate its contribution to this impact by paying its Traffic Impact Fee in effect at time of payment and issuance of a building permit.

Implementation of any one of these two mitigation options would reduce this project impact to a less-than-significant level.

---

**Impact 7-9: Near Term Plus Project Impact on Douglas Avenue/Broadway Intersection.** Under Near Term Plus Project conditions during the AM peak hour, project traffic would cause the intersection to degrade from LOS C (21.9 seconds) to LOS F (179.1 seconds). During the PM peak hour, the intersection would continue to operate at LOS F, but project traffic would cause the critical delay at the intersection to increase from 54.5 seconds to 223.4 seconds (i.e., by 168.9 seconds). In addition, this intersection would have peak hour volume increases large enough under both peak hours to satisfy the peak hour signal warrant. According to City guidelines, these changes constitute a significant project impact (see criteria for "Intersection Impacts" in subsection 7.4.1, "Significance Criteria," above).
Mitigation 7-9. Implement Mitigation 7-4 (the project applicant would be responsible for fully funding/completing the mitigation). With these improvements, the level of service (LOS) at this intersection would improve to an acceptable LOS C during both peak hours, and the impact would be less-than-significant.

Impact 7-10: Near Term Plus Project Impact on 5th Avenue/Bay Road Intersection. Under Near Term Plus Project conditions during the PM peak hour, project traffic would cause the intersection to degrade from LOS C (21.8 seconds delay) to LOS E (38.4 seconds delay). In addition, this intersection would have peak hour volume increases large enough under both peak hours to satisfy the peak hour signal warrant. According to City guidelines, these changes would constitute a significant project impact (see criteria for "Intersection Impacts" in subsection 7.4.1, "Significance Criteria," above).

Mitigation 7-10(a). The signalization of the 5th Avenue/Bay Road intersection is a transportation project included in the City’s 2000 Traffic Impact Fee Program (TIF). Payment by the project applicant of its City Traffic Impact Fee in effect at time of payment and issuance of a building permit would mitigate this impact. To mitigate the project’s impact (i.e., the project applicant would be responsible for fully funding/completing the mitigation) at the intersection of 5th Avenue and Bay Road, the intersection would need to be signalized. (5th Avenue is considered north-south and Bay Road is considered east-west.) No further improvements would be required. With this improvement, the level of service (LOS) at this intersection would improve to an acceptable LOS B during both peak hours.

or

Mitigation 7-10(b). Mitigation of the project’s impact at the intersection of 5th Avenue and Bay Road would require the conversion of the all-way stop controlled intersection to a single lane roundabout. The existing road widths at 5th Avenue and Bay Road would allow up to an 85-foot-diameter roundabout. If the design work shows that the 85-foot-diameter roundabout would not require the acquisition of additional right-of-way and would not create additional safety hazards for motorists, pedestrians, or bicyclists compared to Mitigation 7-10(a), and if substantial evidence at the time the roundabout is proposed shows that the roundabout would not divert traffic to other intersections, the roundabout shall be considered feasible and may be substituted for Mitigation 7-10(a). Because Mitigation 7-10(a) is included in the City’s TIF project list, the proposed project would mitigate its contribution to this impact by paying its Traffic Impact Fee following the City’s substitution of Mitigation

(continued)
(Mitigation 7-10(b) continued):

7-10(b) for Mitigation 7-10(a) in the TIF project list. With this improvement, the level of service (LOS) at this intersection would improve to an acceptable LOS A during both peak hours.

Implementation of either one of these two mitigation options would reduce this project impact to a less-than-significant level.

(e) Freeway Segment Operations. The traffic model forecasts depicted in Table 7.12 indicate that under both the Existing Plus Project condition and Near Term Plus Project condition, the project would add traffic equal to one percent or more of the freeway’s capacity to each of the study freeway segments during at least one peak hour, with the exception of US 101 between the Santa Clara County line and Whipple Avenue in the northbound direction. Related impact and mitigation findings are identified below.

Impact 7-11: Existing Plus Project Impacts on US 101 Freeway Segments. Traffic generated by the proposed project alone is expected to result in the following freeway segment operational effects:

- northbound US 101 (mixed flow) lanes between Whipple Avenue and SR 92 (PM)--an additional 4.6 percent of the freeway segment capacity;
- southbound US 101 (mixed flow) lanes between SR 92 and Whipple Avenue (AM)--an additional 3.0 percent of the freeway segment capacity; and
- southbound US 101 (mixed flow) lanes between Whipple Avenue and County line (PM)--an additional 1.6 percent of the freeway segment capacity.

These changes in freeway segment operations would represent a significant impact (see criteria for "Freeway Segment Impacts" in subsection 7.4.1, "Significance Criteria," above.)
## Table 7.16
### INTERSECTION LEVELS OF SERVICE--CUMULATIVE CONDITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>AM Peak Hour</th>
<th>PM Peak Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cumulative</td>
<td>Cumulative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Without</td>
<td>Without</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conditions</td>
<td>Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Del</td>
<td>Del</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Del</td>
<td>Del</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>(sec)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(sec)</td>
<td>Chng(^1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>(sec)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(sec)</td>
<td>Chng(^1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Veterans Boulevard/Whipple Avenue</td>
<td>D 49.1</td>
<td>F 124.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E 76.4</td>
<td>F 197.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>El Camino Real/Whipple Avenue</td>
<td>E 72.6</td>
<td>F 197.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C 26.2</td>
<td>F 81.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Veterans Boulevard/Woodside Road</td>
<td>C 26.2</td>
<td>F 81.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E 72.6</td>
<td>F 197.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Woodside Road/Broadway</td>
<td>D 54.0</td>
<td>F 221.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C 26.1</td>
<td>D 48.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Woodside Road/Bay Road</td>
<td>C 26.1</td>
<td>D 48.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E 72.6</td>
<td>F 197.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C 26.1</td>
<td>D 48.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Woodside Road/Middlefield Road</td>
<td>E 80.8</td>
<td>F 94.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C 26.1</td>
<td>D 48.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Charter Street/Broadway</td>
<td>F 172.2</td>
<td>F 268.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C 21.7</td>
<td>C 25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Charter Street/Bay Road</td>
<td>C 21.7</td>
<td>C 25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D 30.4</td>
<td>D 36.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Charter Street/Middlefield Road</td>
<td>C 21.7</td>
<td>C 25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D 30.4</td>
<td>D 36.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Flynn Avenue/Middlefield Road</td>
<td>F 92.1</td>
<td>F 94.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E 72.6</td>
<td>F 124.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Douglas Avenue/Broadway</td>
<td>F 182.4</td>
<td>F 132.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D 30.8</td>
<td>D 48.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Douglas Avenue/Bay Road</td>
<td>C 15.8</td>
<td>C 24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D 30.4</td>
<td>D 36.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Douglas Avenue/Middlefield Road</td>
<td>D 44.8</td>
<td>D 54.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C 21.7</td>
<td>C 25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Hurlingame Avenue/Middlefield Road</td>
<td>C 20.0</td>
<td>D 32.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E 58.3</td>
<td>E 58.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2nd Avenue/Broadway</td>
<td>F 100.8</td>
<td>F 94.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D 26.0</td>
<td>D 36.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2nd Avenue/Bay Road</td>
<td>D 26.0</td>
<td>D 36.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C 21.7</td>
<td>C 25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>5th Avenue/Broadway</td>
<td>C 21.7</td>
<td>C 25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D 30.4</td>
<td>D 36.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>5th Avenue/Bay Road</td>
<td>C 21.7</td>
<td>C 25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D 30.4</td>
<td>D 36.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>5th Avenue/Middlefield Road</td>
<td>C 23.7</td>
<td>E 58.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C 21.7</td>
<td>C 25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>El Camino Real/5th Avenue</td>
<td>B 16.3</td>
<td>B 16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B 16.0</td>
<td>B 16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>US 101 SB Ramps/Marsh Road</td>
<td>C 34.6</td>
<td>C 53.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D 53.2</td>
<td>D 53.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Marsh Road/Scott Drive</td>
<td>B 16.5</td>
<td>B 16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C 21.6</td>
<td>C 21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Marsh Road/Florence Street</td>
<td>C 22.0</td>
<td>C 21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A 6.3</td>
<td>A 6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Marsh Road/Middlefield Road</td>
<td>C 32.3</td>
<td>C 31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A 6.3</td>
<td>A 6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Willow Street/Middlefield Road</td>
<td>A 6.3</td>
<td>A 6.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCE:** Hexagon Transportation Consultants

**Notes:**

1. LOS = Level of Service.
2. Reported delay for signalized and all-way stop controlled intersections is the average delay in seconds. The reported delay for one- and two-way stop controlled intersections is the delay on the worst-case approach.
3. Change in delay.
4. The unsignalized intersection does not meet signal warrants. Thus, the project does not result in a significant impact at this intersection.

**Bold font** indicates unacceptable conditions.

**BOX** indicates significant project impact.
**Mitigation 7-13.** To mitigate the project’s contribution to the cumulative impact at the intersection of Woodside Road and Bay Road, an *additional westbound through lane* would need to be added and the shared through/right-turn lane converted to a right-turn lane. (Woodside Road is considered north-south and Bay Road is considered east-west.) Traffic from the proposed project could add up to 46.2 seconds to the PM peak hour delay at this intersection over Cumulative No Project conditions (see EIR Table 7.16); other Cumulative growth could add up to 3.4 seconds to the delay over Near Term No Project conditions. The proposed project would contribute its fair share to a mitigation fund established to pay for the cost of this improvement (estimated, based on this EIR, to be 93 percent) at the time of issuance of a building permit or, if the City adds the improvement to its Traffic Impact Fee Program (TIF) project list, the proposed project would pay its Traffic Impact Fee in effect at time of payment and issuance of a building permit.

The above improvements would be added to mitigation measures identified under Existing Plus Project conditions for the intersection of Woodside Road and Bay Road (Mitigation 7-2). The proposed project’s payment of its fair share towards these improvements, and the City’s implementation of the improvements, would mitigate the impact to a *less-than-significant level*. However, because these improvements would require Caltrans approval, the City of Redwood City cannot ensure the construction of these improvements. Also, the additional westbound through lane would require additional right-of-way. Without implementation of the proposed improvements, the impact would be *significant and unavoidable*.

---

**Impact 7-14: Cumulative With Project Impact on Woodside Road/Middlefield Road Intersection.** Under Cumulative With Project conditions during the PM peak hour, the intersection would remain at LOS F, and the proposed project could contribute up to 22.629.2 seconds of critical delay to the intersection. According to City of Redwood City guidelines, this constitutes a *cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact* (see criteria for “Intersection Impacts” in subsection 7.4.1, “Significance Criteria,” above.)
Mitigation 7-14. This mitigation is in addition to the Caltrans intersection improvement that will be implemented in 2013; a description of the 2013 improvement is included on page 7-21 of this EIR.

To mitigate the significant cumulative impact at the intersection of Woodside Road and Middlefield Road, an additional southbound through lane would need to be added to Woodside Road. (Woodside Road is considered north-south and Middlefield Road is considered east-west.) In addition, crosswalks and pedestrian signals should be added to achieve better pedestrian mobility as described in the City's New General Plan. Because this intersection is subject to Caltrans jurisdiction, this roadway widening and any changes to the operation of the signal would require Caltrans approval. Pursuant to Caltrans Deputy Directives 64 and 64-R1, requiring facilitation of multimodal travel, it is possible that the above improvements would also be required to include such features as new crosswalk and pedestrian signals, curb ramps, pedestrian count-down signals, an emergency vehicle pre-emption system, reconstruction of corner radii to reduce pedestrian crossing distances, bike lanes, and bike detectors. With these improvements, the level of service (LOS) at this intersection would remain at LOS F. Although LOS F still exceeds the City of Redwood City LOS standard, conditions with this mitigation would be better than under Cumulative No Project conditions, improve to LOS D during the PM peak hour, resulting in a less-than-significant cumulative impact.

The widening of Woodside Road, inclusive of this intersection, is included in the City’s Traffic Impact Fee Program (TIF) project list. However, there is no current design option that is acceptable to both Caltrans and the City of Redwood City; therefore, this improvement may be infeasible. If a design for widening Woodside Road can be developed which is acceptable to both Caltrans and the City of Redwood City, payment of the Traffic Impact Fee by the applicant would mitigate the proposed project’s contribution to the significant cumulative impact to a less-than-significant level. If it is determined that the Woodside Road improvements remain infeasible because the improvements are not consistent with the New Redwood City General Plan and/or Caltrans policy, the cumulative impact would remain significant and unavoidable, as would the proposed project’s contribution to that cumulative impact.

Impact 7-15: Cumulative With Project Impact on Douglas Avenue/Bay Road Intersection. Under Cumulative With Project conditions during the PM peak hour, the intersection would degrade from LOS C to LOS F, and the proposed project could contribute up to 78.2 seconds of critical delay to the intersection. According to City of Redwood City guidelines, this constitutes a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact (see criteria for “Intersection Impacts” in subsection 7.4.1, “Significance Criteria,” above.)
Currently, the project development site includes four generators powered by diesel fuel that are used to provide power when normal electricity is not available. Practically all of the annual operations of these generators are associated with routine testing. This is generally allowed by BAAQMD permit conditions to occur up to 50 hours per year. Emissions were computed for the existing generators based on their size and an assumed annual operation of 50 hours per year. The project development site includes one 350-kilowatt and three 1,250-kilowatt generators. Emission rates for diesel generators published by US EPA were applied to compute annual emissions and average daily emissions.\(^1\) Average daily emissions are reported in Table 8.5.

The proposed project may include replacement and additional emergency generators powered by diesel fuel, natural gas, or propane. These generators, especially diesel generators, would be a source of air pollutant emissions during routine testing. Emergency generators are typically tested for 15 minutes to one hour each month, resulting in emissions of air pollutants. The primary emissions are NO\(_x\) and diesel particulate matter. Since these new generators are likely to exceed 50 horsepower, they would be subject to BAAQMD permitting requirements. In addition, these generators are likely to emit more than 5 pounds per day of NO\(_x\) for each day that they are tested. This would increase the total emissions for the project, contributing to the significant regional air quality impact.

The generator engines would have to meet ARB emission standards, and the BAAQMD would be required to ensure that health risks associated with diesel particulate matter emissions would be acceptable (note that ENVIRON performed a preliminary health risk analysis that is described under Impact 8-3, Community Risk and Hazard Impacts).\(^2\) Sources of air pollutant emissions complying with all applicable BAAQMD regulations generally will not be considered to have an individual significant air quality impact. No other stationary air pollutant sources have been identified for the project.

In order to account for generator emissions with the proposed project, a scenario of one 750-horsepower generator per building was assumed. Testing of these generators would occur up to 50 hours per year. Air pollutant emissions were computed based on ARB Tier 4 emission standards, which would be required for new generators at the time the project would be built. Annual emissions were computed assuming testing of 13 generators up to 50 hours each. The average daily emissions associated with generator testing are also shown in Table 8.5.

---

\(^1\)US EPA. AP-42 Compilation of Emissions Factors, Volume 1 – Section 3.4 Large Stationary Diesel And All Stationary Dual-fuel Engines.

\(^2\)BAAQMD risk policy requires that these sources have a cancer risk of less than 10 in one million, which is the same as BAAQMD’s recommended CEQA threshold.
generators proposed to replace the existing generators on the project development site (Blocks A through E) as part of proposed Precise Plan development. These new generators could potentially be located within Blocks A through E, but they would not replace the existing generators on Blocks F and G. Although emergency generators would be in place in the Precise Plan area, the proposed project is not anticipated to result in any disruption of power supply during construction or operation. The generators are for emergency use only (e.g., to maintain power for vital medical equipment during power outages).

Potential project development is expected to generate increases over existing conditions in reactive organic gases (ROG) and particulate matter (PM$_{10}$) that would exceed the BAAQMD thresholds of significance. Under the current BAAQMD thresholds, the change in emissions would be significant for ROG and PM$_{10}$.
Operational emissions would have effects in terms of potential cancer and non-cancer risks as well as elevated PM$_{2.5}$ levels. The project would be a source of temporary TAC emissions during construction. As described under Impact 8-1, less-than-significant risk and hazard impacts associated with construction activity are predicted. Both operational sources (i.e., diesel generators) and project-generated traffic were evaluated for risk and hazard impacts. The sum of all the risk and hazard impacts from project operational emission sources were compared to the BAAQMD significance thresholds for cancer and non-cancer risk and PM$_{2.5}$ levels.

ENVIRON assessed the risk, hazards, and PM$_{2.5}$ levels from incremental traffic impacts along US 101, Bay Road, and Broadway. Emissions from the new project generators were also computed by ENVIRON, assuming annual operation of 13 550-kiloWatt generators operating for 50 hours each year. Dispersion modeling of DPM and VOCs indicated that computed on-site and off-site cancer and non-cancer risk would be below BAAQMD’s community risk significance thresholds. The combination of traffic and stationary sources were also found to be below the significance thresholds of 10 in one million cancer cases, a hazard index of one, and annual PM$_{2.5}$ of 0.3 µg/m$^3$.

**Mitigation 8-2.** In addition to the project-proposed sustainability measures described in chapter 3 (Project Description) of this EIR, which include a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program, implement the following measure:

Minimize generator testing of the new generators to reduce ROG emissions. New generator emissions, as computed on an annual basis, shall be reduced by 30 percent or greater. This could be achieved in a number of ways:

1. Install fewer than the assumed 13 new generators;
2. Install generators with lower emissions (in this case, smaller generators);
3. Test new generators at lower running loads (the analysis assumed 100-percent load, so 50-percent load would reduce emissions); and/or
4. Reduce the number of annual testing hours annually.

The applicant shall submit an analysis of the new generator emissions prior to installing more than five new generators at the project development site.

Implementation of this measure to reduce generator emissions would reduce ROG emissions by 2.7 pounds per day, which would result in total ROG emissions of 53.1 pounds per day, which is below the BAAQMD significance threshold of 54 pounds per day. However, this mitigation measure would reduce PM$_{10}$ emissions by a minimal amount, leaving PM$_{10}$ emissions above the BAAQMD significance threshold. Therefore, as currently proposed, the project would result in a significant unavoidable project and cumulative operational air quality impact.
Mitigation. No significant impact has been identified; no mitigation is required.

8.3.5 Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Substantial Air Pollutant Concentrations

Impact 8-3: Community Risk and Hazard Impacts. Project development could expose attendees of the on-site child care center to significant levels of PM$_{2.5}$. Significant impacts from the Tyco Thermal Controls Facility to attendees of the proposed child care facility are anticipated to be significant regardless of where the child care facility is located within the Precise Plan area. This project-related effect is considered to represent a significant project and cumulative impact (see criteria [d] in subsection 8.3.1, "Significance Criteria," above).

Since the proposed project could include a child care center, which is considered a sensitive receptor, community risk and hazards would need to be addressed from the nearby air pollution sources. ENVIRON evaluated community risk and hazard impacts of siting a child care center on the development site. This evaluation took into account nearby emissions from traffic and stationary sources. The analysis was conducted in conformance with BAAQMD CEQA Air Quality Guidelines recommendations. The CEQA Guidelines recommend evaluation of impacts to sensitive receptors of existing off-site stationary sources and mobile sources (major roadways and freeways) within a 1,000-foot zone.

US 101 is located adjacent to the Precise Plan area. ENVIRON performed a screening assessment of the impacts of traffic emissions upon the project development site with respect to evaluating exposures of children that could attend an on-site child care center. The ENVIRON analysis indicated that significant PM$_{2.5}$ levels would occur at a distance of up to 700 feet from US 101, and significant excess cancer risks would occur closer to the travel lanes. Significant non-cancer risks were not identified. Other roadways were not considered to significantly affect the project development site. The Precise Plan area is large enough that a child care center could be located more than 700 feet from US 101 so as to avoid a significant health risk.

ENVIRON also evaluated stationary sources of TAC or PM$_{2.5}$ emissions near the project development site. Screening modeling of the nearby Tyco Thermal Controls facility indicates significant single-source PM$_{2.5}$ concentrations across much of the Precise Plan area. ENVIRON reports that annual concentrations range from 2.7 µg/m³ to 0.31 µg/m³, at or above the PM$_{2.5}$ threshold across the project development site.

According to ENVIRON’s analysis, the combination of US 101, local arterial and collector roadways, on- and off-site standby diesel generators (including proposed generators on the development site and existing generators at the Stanford Medicine Outpatient Center and 550 Broadway), and the nearby Tyco Thermal Controls facility, would have PM$_{2.5}$ levels at the project development site that exceed BAAQMD’s CEQA thresholds for community risk and hazards from cumulative sources. The primary sources of PM$_{2.5}$ emissions affecting the project development site are the Tyco Thermal Controls facility and US 101 traffic. The cumulative cancer risk and chronic hazard index from these sources would be below the BAAQMD threshold for cumulative sources of TACs. Because of the PM$_{2.5}$ impact, however, emissions from US 101 and Tyco Thermal Controls Facility represent a significant impact to the siting of sensitive receptors on the project development site.
Mitigation 8-3. Buffer the child care center from existing and planned emission sources, and include project features to reduce TAC and PM$_{2.5}$ exposure from air pollutant sources—which include US 101 traffic, and the Tyco Thermal Controls facility, and existing and proposed generators—through the following measures:

1. When construction of a child care center is proposed, conduct site-specific detailed analysis to determine the child care center’s TAC and PM$_{2.5}$ exposures. The analysis should be utilized to guide final design and siting of the child care facility and determine the level of ventilation/filtration necessary to ensure that indoor concentrations will be less-than-significant.

2. Evaluate and appropriately buffer the child care center from existing diesel generators at the Stanford Medicine Outpatient Center and 550 Broadway, and any other sources near the Precise Plan area identified by BAAQMD at the time such analysis is undertaken.

3. Ensure that the ventilation/filtration systems in the child care center result in an indoor cancer risk of less than 10 in one million and annual PM$_{2.5}$ concentrations of less than 0.3 µg/m$^3$ from any single source or less than 100 in one million cancer risk and annual PM$_{2.5}$ concentrations of less than 0.8 µg/m$^3$ from cumulative resources;

4. Consider tiered plantings of trees between the child care center and air pollutant sources such as the freeway, existing and planned generators, and the Tyco Thermal Controls facility;

5. Avoid location of any truck loading zones near the child care facility;

6. With respect to outdoor use areas for the child care center, impacts from US 101 shall be mitigated by placing the child care center more than 700 feet from the freeway. Based on currently available information, the impact from Tyco Thermal Controls cannot be mitigated to a less-than-significant level because the elevated PM$_{2.5}$ levels from the facility extend across the entire project development site. If the Tyco Thermal Controls facility remains in operation at the time of construction of the child care center, and if the detailed analysis described above shows PM$_{2.5}$ levels exceeding the 0.3 µg/m$^3$ standard throughout the development site, construction and operation of a child care center on the development site shall be prohibited. If the detailed analysis shows that some or all of the development site would be exposed to PM$_{2.5}$ levels lower than 0.3 µg/m$^3$, the outdoor use area for the child care center shall be sited in one of those locations.

Implementation of these measures would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.
Impact 9-1: Sea Level Rise Impacts on Project Development. Based on the BCDC sea level rise maps, the project may be affected by anticipated sea level rise and associated changes in broader flood plain boundaries. Potential impacts associated with future development that may be subject to sea level rise include risk to public safety and property damage, representing a potentially significant impact (see criterion [d] in subsection 9.3.1, "Significance Criteria," above).

As discussed in subsection 9.1.31(fg) of this EIR chapter, the Precise Plan area is expected to be vulnerable to both an approximately 16-inch sea level rise in San Francisco Bay by mid-century and an approximately 55-inch sea level rise in the Bay by end-of-century.

Mitigation 9-1. For all new development on the project development site, the City shall ensure that the development complies with the most current Redwood City General Plan and Redwood City Municipal Code requirements for protection from flood hazards, consistent with Mitigation 10-3 in chapter 10 (Utilities), of this EIR. These provisions would require compliance with associated storm drainage storage, building elevation, and flood-proofing requirements. Implementation of these measures would be expected to reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.
Table 10.1
CURRENT AND PLANNED WATER SUPPLIES (AF/YR)¹ FOR REDWOOD CITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SFPUC² Potable Water PurchasesSupply</td>
<td>12,243</td>
<td>12,243</td>
<td>12,243</td>
<td>12,243</td>
<td>12,243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redwood City Groundwater³</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers/Exchanges In or Out</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desalination</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycled Water⁴</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>3,238</td>
<td>3,238</td>
<td>3,238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>14,243</td>
<td>14,243</td>
<td>15,481</td>
<td>15,481</td>
<td>15,481</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: Redwood City 2010 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP), Table 4-1.

¹ AF/YR = acre-feet per year
² SFPUC = San Francisco Public Utilities Commission. It is acknowledged that Redwood City’s supply assurance is currently 12,243 af/yr.
³ Defined as municipal potable source only; does not include existing or future private wells.
⁴ Redwood City recycled water is not a potable supply and is currently available for non-potable uses only.
⁵ FY = fiscal year

Existing Potable Water Delivery Infrastructure. The City’s Public Works Services Department is responsible for operating the existing local water distribution system. Water for Redwood City is supplied via several turnouts from the Hetch Hetchy water system; the nearest turnout is located approximately 0.5 miles south of the project development site. Water is conveyed to the project development site through a series of water mains varying in size from 8 to 16 inches in diameter. The project development site is served by a 10-inch diameter cast iron pipe (CIP) line in Broadway, an 8-inch polyvinyl chloride (PVC) line in Bay Road, and a 12-inch PVC line and 8-inch CIP line in Douglas Avenue. Water is then distributed from these street mains to the project development site through a network of on-site service laterals. All existing water lines on-site and in the project vicinity are either CIP or PVC.

Existing Potable Water Storage Facilities. Redwood City has 12 municipal potable water storage facilities that can store a total of 21.4 million gallons. There are no municipal water storage facilities on or in the vicinity of the project development site.

Existing Hydrant Flow. Existing flows from hydrants serving the project development site are regularly tested by the Redwood City Fire Department. The Fire Department reports that the 10-inch main located in front of 475 Broadway (an existing building on the development site) is capable of supplying approximately 1,800 gallons per minute (gpm) at 59 pounds per square inch (psi) Static and 53 psi Residual, and the 8-inch main located in front of 2886 Bay Road...
Outside of the laboratory, a three-dBA change is considered a just-perceivable difference.

A change in noise level of at least five dBA is required before any noticeable change in community response would be expected.

A 10-dBA increase is subjectively heard as approximately a doubling in loudness, and would almost certainly cause an adverse change in community response.

(b) Structural Attenuation. Typical structural attenuation is 12-17 dBA with open windows. With closed windows in good condition, the noise attenuation factor is around 20 dBA for an older structure and 25 dBA for a newer dwelling. Sleep and speech interference is therefore possible when exterior noise levels are about 57-62 dBA $L_{dn}$ with open windows and 65-70 dBA $L_{dn}$ if the windows are closed.

(c) Typical Noise Levels. Levels of 55-60 dBA are common along collector streets and secondary arterials, while 65-70 dBA is a typical value for a primary/major arterial. Levels of 75-80 dBA are normal noise levels at the first row of development outside a freeway right of way. In order to achieve an acceptable interior noise environment, bedrooms facing secondary roadways need to be able to have their windows closed; those facing major roadways and freeways typically need special glass windows.

13.1.2 Sleep and Speech Interference

The thresholds for speech interference indoors are about 45 dBA if the noise is steady and above 55 dBA if the noise is fluctuating. Outdoors the thresholds are about 15 dBA higher. Steady noise of sufficient intensity (above 35 dBA) and fluctuating noise levels above about 45 dBA have been shown to affect sleep. Interior residential standards for multi-family dwellings are set by the State of California at 45 dBA $L_{dn}$. Typically, the highest steady traffic noise level during the daytime is about equal to the $L_{dn}$, and nighttime levels are 10 dBA lower. The standard is designed for sleep and speech protection and most jurisdictions apply the same criterion for all residential uses.

13.1.3 Existing Noise Environment

The existing noise environment in the project vicinity consists primarily of transportation noise sources, including vehicular traffic along US 101 and local arterial and collector roadways traversing the area, and adjacent light industrial and commercial noise sources (including occasional testing of emergency generators in accordance with BAAQMD regulations). Intermittent aircraft over-flights are also audible.

(a) Noise Monitoring Study Results. A noise monitoring survey was conducted in the project vicinity from January 8, 2009 to January 9, 2009, including two long-term (24-hour) noise measurement locations and one short-term (10-minute) noise measurement location. Noise measurement locations are shown on Figure 13.1, and the results are summarized in Table 13.3. Long-term measurement LT-1 was located on 2nd Avenue, across from Andrew Spinas Park, approximately 15 feet from the center of 2nd Avenue. The primary source of noise at this location was local traffic and distant traffic along Bay Road and Broadway. Hourly average
noise levels ranged from 59 to 66 dBA $L_{eq}$ during the day, and from 50 to 64 dBA $L_{eq}$ at night. The calculated day-night average noise level ($L_{dn}$) at this location was 66 dBA CNEL.
Mitigation 13-1 (continued):

sources, and, or in combination with, other noise barriers. The approval of future commercial uses near the child care center may, at City discretion, require a noise study demonstrating how the proposed new commercial uses—including associated loading docks, refuse areas, and ventilation systems, and emergency generators—would meet these standards.

Implementation of these measures would reduce the potential impact on the proposed child care use to a less-than-significant level.

Impact 13-2: Project-Facilitated Construction Noise. Construction activities facilitated by the project would include building demolition, site grading and preparation, construction of new buildings, and installation of utilities. Noise levels at 50 feet from the demolition or construction equipment source could reach approximately 105 dBA, resulting in intermittent interference with typical existing residential and business activities, as well as any on-site sensitive uses developed during earlier phases of Precise Plan buildout. Because construction noise could elevate noise levels at the nearest residences by more than 5 dBA, at some locations the proposed project could cause a potentially significant intermittent and short-term impact (see explanatory text in subsection 13.3.1, "Significance Criteria," above).

Construction activities generate considerable amounts of noise, especially during demolition activities, site grading activities, and excavation for foundations. The effects of noise resulting from construction depend on the noise generated by various pieces of construction equipment, the timing and duration of noise-generating activities, and the distance between construction noise sources and noise-sensitive receptors. Table 13.5 presents A-weighted noise levels generated by specific pieces of construction equipment at a distance of 50 feet. Table 13.6 presents typical ranges in hourly average noise levels at a distance of 50 feet generated during different phases of construction. The highest maximum noise levels generated by project construction would typically range from about 90 to 105 dBA at a distance of 50 feet from the noise source.

Construction of a recycled water pipeline (both off- and on-site) is proposed to serve the project. Hourly average noise levels generated by public works-type projects typically range from 79 to 88 dBA $L_{eq}$ measured at a distance of 50 feet from the center of a busy construction site. The pipeline installation would occur in daily increments along the proposed route from the point of connection, along East Bayshore Road, and then across U.S. 101 to Douglas Avenue and Broadway to the Precise Plan area. Therefore, construction noise levels would only impact any individual receiver or group of receivers over a short period of time, typically for less than a few days and rarely for more than a few weeks. The only noise-sensitive receivers identified near the potential recycled water route are the mobile homes on East
dBA measured near the fans. Conversely, properly selected centrifugal fans of comparable size generate noise levels 10 dBA to 15 dBA lower. Noise controls typically are incorporated into the design of these ventilation systems to achieve acceptable noise levels at sensitive receivers.

**Mitigation 13-4.** During the project detailed design phase for the potential parking structure at the corner of Bay Road and Barron Avenue, the project applicant shall submit an acoustical study to demonstrate how the parking structure design would meet the following noise standards at the most affected receiver: 60 dBA CNEL and 60 dBA $L_{eq-hr}$ daytime (7:00 AM to 7:00 PM), 55 dBA $L_{eq-hr}$ evening (7:00 PM to 10:00 PM), and 50 dBA $L_{eq-hr}$ nighttime (10:00 PM to 7:00 AM). The design measures may include, for example, the installation of silencers and baffles as necessary to reduce the noise level at the nearest residential property line to the existing ambient noise level. Implementation of this measure to the satisfaction of the Redwood City Community Development Department would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

Regarding the testing of emergency generators—including existing and proposed generators on the development site, and existing generators at the Stanford Medicine Outpatient Center and 550 Broadway—theses occasional operations are regulated by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) and occur less than 50 hours per generator per year. Therefore, emergency generator testing is considered to result in a less-than-significant noise impact.