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PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

OCTOBER 10, 2006

6:30 P.M.

1. ROLL CALL

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – (None)

3. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

   This agenda category is limited to 15 minutes to be allocated as determined by the Chair. If you wish to address the Planning Commission, please complete a Speaker's Card and give it to the Secretary.

4. PLANNED DEVELOPMENT PERMIT AMENDMENT AND USE PERMIT - Stanford Medical Outpatient Clinic (420, 430, 440, and 450 Broadway)

   Project Description: Stanford proposes to locate an outpatient medical center within four existing commercial buildings (360,500 sq. ft.) located within an 11-acre portion of the larger 48 acre Midpoint Technology Park campus that will provide numerous outpatient services. Stanford also proposes to request approval of a Use Permit to allow outdoor storage of two new emergency generators and reduced parking.

   Recommendation:
   Approve the Planned Development Permit Amendment and Use Permit subject to attached conditions and adopt the following:
   - Project Findings per the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)
   - Statement of Overriding Considerations for significant unavoidable and cumulative significant unavoidable environmental impacts
   - Mitigation Monitoring Program
   - Findings for the Planned Development Amendment Permit and Use Permit

   Project Planner: Maureen Riordan; 780-7236; mriordan@redwoodcity.org

5. DRAFT DOWNTOWN PRECISE PLAN WORKSHOP (Panel Discussion)

   Project Description: The Draft Downtown Precise Plan is the City's blueprint that describes the City's future vision for the Downtown. It also describes the urban design regulations and guidelines necessary to achieve that vision. Staff unveiled the document on October 3, 2006. Staff now wishes to discuss some of the recorded themes and questions raised at that meeting via a panel discussion.
Recommendation: Hear staff discussion on written comments made at the October 3\textsuperscript{rd} meeting. Also, if necessary, ask clarifying questions and listen to public comments. No decision on the Draft Downtown Precise Plan is required at this time.

Project Team: Jill Ekas, Blake Lyon, Susan Moeller, Tom Passanisi, and Daniel Zack

6. MATTERS OF COMMISSION INTEREST

- Planning Commission Schedule

7. ADJOURNMENT

Adjourn to October 17, 2006, to the regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting in the Council Chambers, City Hall, 1017 Middlefield Road, Redwood City, CA.

City staff will provide agenda materials in appropriate alternative formats, or disability-related accommodation. Please send a written request to Tom Passanisi at Planning Services, City of Redwood City, P. O. Box 391, Redwood City, CA 94064 or email at tpassanisi@redwoodcity.org including your name, address, phone number and brief description of the requested materials and preferred alternative format or auxiliary aid or service at least 72 hours before the meeting.

ATTENTION

Speaker cards are on the rostrum. If you wish to speak, complete the card and give it to the Secretary.
DATE: October 10, 2006

TO: Planning Commission

SUBJECT: Stanford Medical Outpatient Center Planned Development Amendment and Use Permit request.

RECOMMENDATION
Approve the Planned Development Permit Amendment & Use Permit for the Stanford Outpatient Center project located at 420, 430, 440 & 450 Broadway and adopt the following: 1) Resolution: Project Findings per the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and Statement of Overriding Considerations for significant unavoidable and cumulative significant unavoidable environmental impacts caused by the project that can not be mitigated to less than significant impacts; and 2) Exhibit A: Supplemental Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP)—Stanford Outpatient Center Project. Refer to attached Resolution and Exhibit A.

Also adopt the Findings for the Planned Development Amendment and Use Permit. Refer to pages 4-5 of this staff report.

SITE DESCRIPTION: The property is approximately 11-acre in size and contains four existing commercial buildings with common underground and surface parking, an outdoor sport court, and landscape and hardscape improvements.

ADJACENT LAND USES: The Broadway Tower Apartments and Friendly Acres Neighborhood lie to the south; Midpoint Technology Park commercial office/R&D buildings lie to the north and west; and Highway 101 lies to the east.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Stanford proposes to locate an outpatient medical center within four existing commercial buildings (360,500 square feet) located at 420, 430, 440 and 450 Broadway. Their application is to amend the original Planned Development Permit (PD10306-7) approved for the previous office/R&D user of the site (Excite @Home). Their application also requires a Use Permit to allow the outdoor storage of an emergency generator and for reduced parking.

Planned Development Amendment and Use Permit
The proposed Planned Development Permit Amendment (PD) involves the following new site and building tenant improvements: patient drop-off area, a new west entry lobby with an enclosed bridge, a covered walkway between 430-440 Broadway, a covered loading dock, window sun screen system, additional rooftop mechanical
systems, a new outdoor emergency generator, generator screening, two underground storm water retention basins, new signage, landscaping and other site modifications including a "Campus Quad" area, an outdoor dining terrace, decorative paving, seating areas, and additional street trees. *Refer to PD plan submittal provided under separate cover.*

These improvements are consistent with the objectives of the City’s Planned Development Permit Ordinance, which encourages flexibility of design and development of land in such a manner as to promote its most appropriate use; encourage the development of innovative projects which incorporate the highest quality architectural solutions, building materials and landscaping concepts; promote the most functional and aesthetic relationships between building structures, signs, open space and parking areas . . .; incorporate storm water treatment provisions in site planning; and provide an environment of physical and functional desirability, in harmony with the character of the surrounding district.

The Project is a modern, state-of-the-art outpatient medical center that incorporates quality architectural design solutions, building materials and relationships among project element including the addition of landscape and hardscape site improvements.

The project will also employ sustainable design strategies. For example, a substantial portion of the existing landscaping (the large area of grass in the central courtyard and non-native plant materials) will be replaced with native species that typically require less water consumption. The project will also incorporate a window sunshade system along most of the east, south and west-facing facades that will help to reduce energy consumption. The sunshades will reduce the solar heat load passing through the single-glazing and will contribute to substantial energy savings over time. The thermal comfort of patients and staff will also be improved.

In addition, the installation of new underground storm water retention basins will help to remedy existing flooding during storms.

On March 14, 2006 and September 12, 2006 the Architectural Review Committee reviewed and recommended approval of the proposed site, building, landscaping, hardscaping and permanent and temporary signage improvements with the following conditions:

- Staff to review future architectural details to determine if there are specific design elements that require future ARC review.
- Use architectural treatment(s) to create a better visual connection from Broadway to the building entrance (i.e. light standards, decorative paving pattern etc) for ARC review.
- Permanent signage shall be as shown on plans with no exposed conduits. Proper placement shall be reviewed and approved by staff.
- Remove all proposed temporary signs within 90 days of installation.
- The temporary 8 x 16 freestanding sign shall be below 15 feet in height and increased to higher than 18-inches off grade for enhanced freeway visibility.
Stanford staff also request approval of a Use Permit to allow the outdoor storage of a new emergency generator and reduced parking.

The emergency power requirements for the Stanford Outpatient Center exceed the capacity of the two existing generators. The original approach was to retain the two existing generators and add two new generators. That approach was described in the Stanford Supplemental EIR. The applicant has recently come to the conclusion that a single new generator with the capacity to serve all four buildings is a better solution. The new generator will initially serve 430, 440 and 450 Broadway and the existing generator adjacent to 420 Broadway will remain in service. When 420 Broadway is converted to serve clinical functions the new generator will be connected and the existing generator will be removed.

The new generator will be located on the north side of 430 Broadway (see Keynote A-13 on the illustrative site plan), which puts it at the greatest possible distance from adjacent properties, and will be housed in a sound-resistant enclosure that meets all current noise and emission requirements. The generator and generator enclosure design details will be brought back to planning staff and the ARC for review and approval at a future date.

Stanford staff also proposes 1,116 parking stalls compared to normally required parking, which ranges from 1,712 to 1,803 stalls depending upon what percentage of the project is used for office space (that is accessory to the primary, medical clinic use) and medical clinic space.

As outlined in the Stanford Outpatient Center Supplemental EIR, the provision of 1,116 total parking stalls is anticipated to be sufficient based on experience at similar Stanford medical clinic facilities in other Bay Area communities, the analysis of Fehr & Peers Transportation Consultants, and the peer review by George W. Nickelson, P.E. In addition, the City has required a parking monitoring program, funded by the applicant, to monitor any parking spillover onto local streets and, if necessary, to provide additional on-site parking. Refer to attached Appendix F: Parking Monitoring Program (and as further described in the Stanford Outpatient Center Supplemental EIR).

**Project Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations**
On September 19, 2006, the Planning Commission, at a public hearing, certified the Stanford Outpatient Center Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

The Planning Commission is now being asked to adopt findings under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) relating to the project. The findings provide the written analysis and conclusion of the Planning Commission regarding the project's environmental impacts, mitigation measures and alternatives to the project. The Planning Commission is also being asked to adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations for project related impacts that can not be mitigated to a less than significant level. *Refer to attached Resolution.*
Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Program (MMRP)

Finally, the Planning Commission is being asked to adopt a mitigation monitoring & reporting program (MMRP) for the project. The MMRP identifies impacts of the project, corresponding mitigation measures, designation of responsibility for mitigation implementation and monitoring, and the agency responsible for the monitoring action. Refer to attached Exhibit A.

CONCLUSION:

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission adopt the Project Findings under CEQA, Statement of Overriding Considerations and MMRP.

Staff also recommends that the Planning Commission approve the Planned Development Permit Amendment (PD) and Use Permit subject to the findings and conditions outlined below.

FINDINGS: PD AND USE PERMIT:

1. The Project meets the intent of Zoning Ordinance Article 46 (Planned Developments) which is to:
   - Encourage flexibility of design and development of land in such a manner as to promote its most appropriate use;
   - Encourage the development of innovative projects which incorporate the highest quality architectural solutions, building materials, and landscaping concepts;
   - Promote the most functional and aesthetic relationships between building structures, signs, open space, and parking areas in residential, commercial, and industrial zoning districts;

   The Project is a modern, state-of-the-art outpatient medical center that incorporates quality architectural design solutions, building materials and relationships among project element including site landscaping and hardscaping improvements. The project will also employ sustainable design strategies. For example, a substantial portion of the existing landscaping (the large area of grass in the central courtyard and non-native plant materials) will be replaced with native species that typically require less water consumption. The proposed window sun screen system will also help to reduce energy consumption. In addition, the storm water retention basins are intended to help to reduce flooding during storms.

2. The project as proposed complies with Zoning Ordinance Article 17.2 F since quasi-public uses and office space accessory to the primary quasi-public use, pursuant to Article 17.3 D., are permitted in the "IR" (Industrial Restricted) zoning district.

3. The establishment, maintenance and operation of the proposed use would not, under the circumstances of this particular case, be detrimental to the health, safety, peace, morals, comfort, or general welfare of persons residing or working in the neighborhood of the proposed use or would not be detrimental or injurious to property or improvements in the neighborhood or to the general welfare of the City provided the applicant implements the PD and Use Permit conditions of approval.
and the mitigation measures contained in the Stanford Outpatient Center Supplemental EIR and accompanying Mitigation, Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP).

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:
1. The applicant is subject to all applicable (i.e. that have not been completed) mitigation measures, as determined by the City, contained in the certified 1996 Midpoint Technology Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and accompanying Mitigation, Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP).

2. The applicant is also subject to all mitigation measures contained in the certified Stanford Outpatient Center Supplemental EIR and accompanying MMRP, including but not limited to, mitigation relevant to aesthetics, cultural resources, traffic and circulation, parking and hazards and hazardous materials.

3. The applicant is subject to sewer service mitigation outlined in the attached letters from Doug Henry (Stanford Hospital and Clinics) and Eric Swanson (Brian, Kangas and Faulk (BKF)) to Maureen Riordan (Senior Planner) dated September 19, 2006 on file with the City of Redwood City. Refer to attached letters.

4. The use shall substantially conform to the application materials and development plan and elevations prepared by Anshen + Allen Architects, recommended for approval by the Architectural Review Committee and on file with Planning Services, except as modified by the conditions contained herein.

On March 14, 2006 and September 12, 2006 the Architectural Review Committee reviewed and recommended approval of the proposed site, building, landscaping, hardscaping and permanent and temporary signage with the conditions outlined below. The applicant shall conform to all the following conditions:

- Staff to review future architectural details to determine if there are specific design elements that require future ARC review (i.e. plans for the generator and generator enclosure shall be brought back to planning staff and the ARC for review and approval).
- Use architectural treatment(s) to create a better visual connection from Broadway to the building entrance (i.e. light standards, decorative paving pattern etc) for ARC review and approval.
- Permanent signage shall be as shown on plans with no exposed conduits. Proper placement shall be determined by staff.
- Remove all proposed temporary signs within 90 days of installation.
- The temporary 8 x 16 freestanding sign shall be below 15 feet in height and increased to higher than 18-inches off grade for enhanced freeway visibility.

5. A final landscaping and irrigation plan and hardscape improvement plan shall be submitted for review and approval by Planning Services prior to Building Permit submittal.
6. The generator and generator enclosure design details shall be submitted for review and approval by Planning Services prior to Building Permit submittal.

7. In the event that the proposed use causes detrimental impacts to the surrounding area/neighborhood, the City shall reserve the right to amend the PD Amendment Permit and/or Use Permit conditions of approval pursuant to the provisions of the Zoning Ordinance.

8. The use shall not be changed and the subject building shall not be altered except in conformity with this PD Amendment Permit and Use Permit and any conditions established therein or unless a new PD Amendment and/or revised Use Permit have been granted by the Planning Commission.

9. This PD Amendment permit is non-transferable. Any changes in business type or operation will require a new PD Amendment application to determine compatibility with the neighborhood, consistency with the Zoning Ordinance and General Plan and certified Stanford Outpatient Center Project Supplemental EIR.

10. The applicant shall meet all necessary requirements of the City Engineering Division.

11. The applicant shall comply with all applicable Fire and Building codes.

12. The applicant shall obtain a Building Permit prior to the commencement of construction.

13. This project shall comply with all applicable local, state and federal laws.

14. Where a Planned Development Permit has not been used within one (1) year from the date of granting, either by beginning of construction of the improvements or by the initiation of the activity which is the subject of the Permit, said Permit shall automatically terminate and be of no further effect. The Zoning Administrator or the Planning Commission, as the case may be, may extend this time once for an additional year upon written request of the applicant. Every Planned Development Permit project which construction has started shall terminate five (5) years from the date of granting if such construction has not been completed.

If approved, no building or zoning permit shall be issued, and no use shall be established except in accordance with and subject to the terms and conditions outlined above, and in no case shall such permit be issued or use established prior to the final action on any appeals that may be filed within the appeal period. Any appeal made in accordance with the provisions of Article 48, Section 48.2, of the Zoning Ordinance, must be received by the City Clerk no later than seven calendar days after the date of the official action. As such, this Planned Development Permit Amendment shall become effective on the eighth (8th) day following the date of
approval by the Zoning Administrator unless an appeal to said decision has been filed in accordance with the provisions stated above.

Senior Planner

Enclosures: Planned Development (PD) Plan submittal provided under separate cover.

2. Exhibit A: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP), Final Supplemental EIR for the Stanford Outpatient Center Project, June 2006
4. Letter from Doug Henry (Stanford Hospital and Clinics) to Maureen Riordan (Senior Planner) dated September 19, 2006 on file with the City of Redwood City.
5. Letter from Eric Swanson (Brian, Kangas and Faulk (BKF)) to Maureen Riordan (Senior Planner) dated September 19, 2006 on file with the City of Redwood City.
RESOLUTION NO. _____

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF REDWOOD CITY ADOPTING THE MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM; MAKING FINDINGS CONCERNING SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS; AND ADOPTING A STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT FOR THE STANFORD OUTPATIENT CENTER PROJECT FOR WHICH A SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT HAS BEEN PREPARED.

WHEREAS, the City of Redwood City ("City") prepared a Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Report ("Final SEIR") for the Stanford Outpatient Center Project ("Project"); and

WHEREAS, the Final SEIR examines whether the changes in use and the tenant improvements included in the Project will cause new or substantially more severe environmental impacts than those identified in the Final EIR (December, 1996) and Final Supplemental EIR (December, 1998) prepared for the Midpoint Technology Park, within which the Project would be located in four currently vacant buildings, and also examines whether new mitigation measures or alternatives have become feasible since the Midpoint EIRs were certified and would substantially reduce the environmental impacts of the project; and

WHEREAS, on September 19, 2006, after a duly noticed public hearing and an independent review of the Final SEIR, the Planning Commission of the City of Redwood City certified by recorded vote that the Final SEIR was completed in accordance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") and state and local guidelines and reflected the independent judgment of the City; and

WHEREAS, CEQA requires that, in connection with the approval of a project for which an EIR has been prepared which identifies one or more significant environmental effects, the decision-making agency make certain findings regarding the significant environmental effects.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF REDWOOD CITY, AS FOLLOWS:

1. General Findings. The Planning Commission hereby finds and affirms that the Final SEIR has been completed in compliance with CEQA; that the Planning Commission has reviewed and analyzed the Final SEIR and other information in the record and has considered the information contained therein, including the written and oral comments received at public hearings on the SEIR and the Project prior to acting upon or approving the Project; and that the Final SEIR represents the independent judgment of the City of Redwood City.
2. Mitigation and Monitoring Reporting Program (MMRP). The Planning Commission hereby adopts the Mitigation and Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for the Project which the Commission has reviewed and is attached to these findings as Exhibit A and incorporated herein by reference. The MMRP identifies impacts of the Project, corresponding mitigation measures, designation of responsibility for mitigation implementation and monitoring, and the agency responsible for the monitoring action.

In adopting these mitigation measures, the Planning Commission intends to adopt each of the mitigation measures proposed in the Final SEIR. Accordingly, in the event a mitigation measure recommended in the Final SEIR has inadvertently been omitted from Exhibit A, such mitigation measure is hereby adopted and incorporated in the findings below by reference. In addition, in the event the language describing a mitigation measure set forth in Exhibit A fails to accurately reflect the mitigation measures in the Final SEIR due to a clerical error, the language of the mitigation measure as set forth in the Final SEIR shall control, unless the language of the mitigation measure has been specifically and expressly modified by these findings.

3. Findings Regarding Impacts and Mitigation Measures. These findings are made with reference to the Draft and Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (the "Final SEIR") for the Project certified by the Redwood City Planning Commission on September 19, 2006 and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) adopted concurrently with these findings. The MMRP (Exhibit A) summarizes the environmental determinations of the Final SEIR about the Project’s impacts before and after mitigation. This exhibit does not attempt to describe the full analysis of each environmental impact contained in the Final SEIR. Instead, Exhibit A provides a summary description of each impact, describes the applicable mitigation measures identified in the Final SEIR and adopted by the Commission, and states the Commission’s findings on the significance of each impact after imposition of the adopted mitigation measures. A full explanation of these environmental findings and conclusions can be found in the Final SEIR and these findings hereby incorporate by reference the discussion and analysis in the Final SEIR supporting the Final SEIR's determinations regarding the Project’s impacts and mitigation measures designed to address those impacts. In making these findings, the Commission ratifies, adopts and incorporates in these findings the determinations and conclusions of the Final SEIR relating to environmental impacts and mitigation measures, except to the extent any such determinations and conclusions are specifically and expressly modified by these findings.

4. Statement of Overriding Considerations. As discussed in Exhibit A, the Planning Commission has found that several impacts of the Project remain significant and unavoidable following adoption and implementation of the mitigation measures described in the Final SEIR. Pursuant to Public Resources Code § 21081 and CEQA Guidelines § 15091 et seq., the Planning Commission adopts this Statement of Overriding Considerations, finding that the Project includes all feasible measures that would eliminate or substantially lessen the significant unavoidable impacts of the Project on the environment, and that the remaining significant unavoidable impacts of the Project are acceptable in light of the environmental, economic, social, and other benefits and considerations set forth in Section 4a below, because the benefits of the Project outweigh the significant and adverse impacts of the Project. The Planning Commission finds that each of the overriding considerations set forth in
Section 4b constitutes a separate and independent ground for finding that the benefits of the Project outweigh its significant adverse environmental impacts and sets forth an overriding consideration warranting approval of the Project. These matters are supported by evidence in the record.

a. Benefits of Project. This Planning Commission has considered the Final SEIR, the public record of proceedings on the Project and other written materials presented to the City, as well as oral and written testimony at all public hearings related to the Project, and does determine that implementation of the Project as specifically provided in the Project documents would result in the public benefits set forth below. The Planning Commission has weighed the benefits of the Project against its unavoidable environmental effects identified in the Final SEIR and hereby determines that the public benefits outweigh the unavoidable environmental effects and, therefore, further determines that these unavoidable environmental effects are acceptable.

(i) Project supports implementation of General Plan. The City has adopted a General Plan Guiding Principle of planning for sustainability within our finite resources. By renovating and converting existing buildings in the Midpoint Technology Park, the Project supports the Guiding Principle of sustainability by reusing the buildings and not allowing them to remain empty.

(ii) State-of-the-art medical facilities for Redwood City. Stanford Hospital & Clinics is proposing to use the site as an outpatient medical clinic. This use will bring significant medical services to Redwood City. Stanford Hospital & Clinics will bring the latest in outpatient medical technology and clinical research functions to Redwood City.

(iii) Employment opportunities with optimum commute access. The City has adopted a General Plan objective of providing sufficient land for a variety of employment opportunities with optimum commute access. The Project will renovate and convert four of the existing buildings within the Midpoint Technology Park that were vacated by @Home Corporation in 2002 and are now completely vacant. The Project will also implement a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program to ease commuting by modes other than single-occupancy vehicle. Therefore, the Project advances the City’s policy of employment opportunity combined with optimum commute access.

(iv) Economic Benefits to the City of Redwood City. The Project may provide significant market support to the City’s ongoing revitalization efforts. The employees could be a source of potential business, patronizing restaurants and retail services in Redwood
City. The patients of the Project could also be a source of potential business.

(v) **Increase in Number of Jobs.** The economic development goals and policies of the Redwood City General Plan include creating more job opportunities. The Project may promote such goals and policies by potentially generating additional jobs for local residents, and by potentially generating spin-off/secondary biotechnology employment in the area.

b. **Significant Unavoidable Impacts and Overriding Considerations.**

**Project Impacts.** The following impacts were determined by the EIR to be impacts directly resulting from the Project. The letters and numbers assigned to each impact below correspond to the letters and numbers assigned to each impact in the SEIR.

- **Housing Impact (no Impact number given in SEIR): Project impact on City’s residents/job ratio and on citywide demands for new housing units.** The 1996 Midpoint Technology Park EIR, upon which the SEIR for the Project was based, concluded that the potential effects of the overall Technology Park development on the City’s residents/job ratio and on citywide demands for new housing units (including demands for affordable housing units), represented a significant unavoidable impact. No mitigation specific to these impacts was adopted, and an associated Statement of Overriding Considerations was adopted by the City in 1997. The Project would reduce the overall Midpoint Technology Park employment total (assuming full buildout) and the associated overall residents/job ratio impact, but not to a less than significant level.

**Mitigation:** No mitigation specific to this impact was adopted, and an associated Statement of Overriding Considerations pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15126.2(b), *Significant Environmental Effects Which Cannot be Avoided if the Proposed Project is Implemented*, was adopted by the City. No additional mitigation is required.

**Finding:** A Statement of Overriding Considerations was already adopted by the City for the office use at the Project site. In that Statement, it was determined that while job-related housing was not proposed to be constructed on or near the Project, nor were in-lieu housing fees required, implementation of the City’s Housing Element with regard to Citywide Housing Program Strategies would assist the City to provide additional housing, including affordable units. Nonetheless, impacts to the residents/jobs ratio and housing demand would remain significant and unavoidable.

**Overriding Consideration:** For the Midpoint Technology Park EIR, the Planning Commission found that the environmental, economic, social and other benefits of the project override the significant impact described above. That Statement of
Overriding Considerations is hereby adopted for the Stanford Outpatient Clinic Project.

- **Supplemental Impact 12-2: Project traffic impact on Rolison Road Roadway Segment.** Project traffic would increase PM peak-hour and daily traffic on Rolison Road south of Second Avenue by more than five percent. Since this segment of Rolison Road currently carries fewer than 3,000 vehicles per day and is therefore operating as a "local street," the increase in traffic due to the project represents a significant impact. This impact is similar to Impact 3-3 identified in the 1996 EIR.

**Supplemental Mitigation 12-2:** The applicant shall implement traffic calming devices to help maintain vehicle speeds at posted limits along Rolison Road south of Second Avenue. The installation of these devices shall be made in accordance with City standards and shall be coordinated with City Traffic Engineer and emergency services (Fire Department). A traffic consultant shall prepare a traffic calming options study with recommendations and shall monitor the traffic calming installations to ensure appropriate mitigation. The traffic consultant shall be hired by the City and paid for by Stanford Hospital & Clinics.

**Finding 12-2:** Supplemental Impact 12-2 is significant and unavoidable because even though Mitigation 12-2 has been required in and incorporated into the Project, implementation of the mitigation would not reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, the Project impact on Rolison Road south of Second Avenue would represent a significant unavoidable impact.

**Overriding Consideration:** The environmental, economic, social and other benefits of the Project described in Section 4a override the significant impact described above.

**Cumulative Impacts.** The following impacts are considered cumulative, describing the incremental impact of the Project when added to other closely related past, present or reasonably probable future projects (identified in Chapter 9 of the SEIR). In conjunction with these reasonably foreseeable projects, the various changes to the Project site would cause the following two significant cumulative impacts, both associated with traffic. Again, the letters and numbers assigned to each impact below correspond to the letters and numbers assigned to each impact in the SEIR.

- **Supplemental Impact 12-5: Cumulative with Project traffic impacts at Woodside Road/Broadway Intersection.** Traffic under Cumulative with Project Conditions would cause an unacceptable increase in delay at the Woodside Road/Broadway intersection during the PM peak hour. This delay increase would represent a significant cumulative impact. This impact is similar to Impact 3-2 identified in the 1996 EIR.

**Supplemental Mitigation 12-5(a):** The project applicant shall pay an additional traffic impact fee for the approximately 393 net new PM peak-hour trips generated by the Stanford Outpatient Center Project. The traffic impact fee program is
planned to include citywide traffic improvement needs, including improvements that
would reduce congestion in the Woodside Road corridor and in the area
surrounding the project site on Bay Road.

**Supplemental Mitigation 12-5(b):** The project applicant shall implement a
Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program to reduce the number of
drive-alone auto trips generated by the project.

**Finding 12-5:** The combination of Supplemental Mitigation Measures 12-5(a) and
12-5(b) has the potential to reduce the Project's contribution to the cumulative
impact at the Woodside Road/Broadway intersection to a less-than-significant
level. However, Supplemental Impact 12-5 is significant and unavoidable because
the City of Redwood City cannot implement planned improvements at the
Woodside Road/Broadway intersection because it is within the responsibility and
jurisdiction of another agency, i.e., the California Department of Transportation
(Caltrans). It is uncertain when or if Caltrans will implement the planned
improvements.

**Overriding Consideration:** The environmental, economic, social and other
benefits of the Project described in Section 4a override the significant impact
described above.

- **Supplemental Impact 12-9:** Cumulative traffic impact on Rolison Road
  Roadway. Cumulative with Project traffic would increase PM peak-hour and daily
  traffic on Rolison Road south of Second Avenue by more than five percent. Since
  Rolison Road carries fewer than 3,000 vehicles per day, the increase in traffic due
to the project would represent a significant cumulative impact. This impact is
similar to Impact 3-3 identified in the 1996 EIR.

**Supplemental Mitigation 12-9:** The applicant shall implement Supplemental
Mitigation 12-2 above (traffic calming).

**Finding 12-9:** Supplemental Impact 12-9 is significant and unavoidable because
even though Mitigation 12-9 (and by reference Mitigation 12-2) has been required
in and incorporated into the Project, implementation of the mitigation would not
reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, the Project impact on
Rolison Road south of Second Avenue would represent a significant unavoidable
impact.

**Overriding Consideration:** The environmental, economic, social and other
benefits of the Project described in Section 4a override the significant impact
described above.

5. **Alternatives.** The 1996 Midpoint Technology Park EIR included an identification
and evaluation of a range of alternatives to the proposed Midpoint Technology Park project.
The proposed Stanford Outpatient Center Project represents a modification to a portion of the
Midpoint Technology Park office/R&D project addressed in the 1996 EIR. The size and
employment characteristics of the proposed Outpatient Center fall within the development parameters assumed in the 1996 EIR. The total floor area of the four Midpoint Technology Park buildings to be converted to the outpatient clinic use (360,500 square feet) would not change. The total anticipated maximum staffing of the outpatient clinic, approximately 670 employees, would be less than the approximately 1,200 employees anticipated for the four buildings in the 1996 EIR. Therefore, no further discussion of alternatives to the Project is required.

6. Location of documents. The Planning Commission hereby designates the Planning Manager of the City of Redwood City, at the Planning Division offices at 1017 Middlefield Road, Redwood City, California 94064 as the custodian of documents and record of proceedings on which the decision is based.

7. The Planning Commission does hereby make the foregoing findings with respect to the significant effects on the environment of the Project, as identified in the Final SEIR, with the stipulation that all information in these findings is intended as a summary of the full administrative record supporting the Project, which full administrative record should be consulted for the full details supporting these findings, and that any mitigation measures and/or alternatives that were suggested by commenters to the Draft SEIR and were not adopted as part of the Final SEIR are hereby expressly rejected for the reasons stated in the responses to the comments set forth in the Final SEIR and elsewhere in the record.

8. This Resolution is effective upon its adoption.

ADOPTED and ISSUED this ___ day of ______________, 2006, by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

______________________________
Chairperson, Planning Commission

ATTEST:

______________________________
Secretary
## SUPPLEMENTAL MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM--STANFORD OUTPATIENT CENTER PROJECT

The Stanford Outpatient Center Project has been conditionally approved to require implementation of the supplemental mitigation measures listed in the second column below. These measures are in addition to pertinent mitigation measures required from the 1996 and 1998 Midpoint Technology Park Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Programs, as identified in the 2006 Supplemental Environmental Impact Report for the Stanford Outpatient Center Project. A completed and signed chart will indicate that each mitigation requirement has been complied with, and that City and state monitoring requirements have been fulfilled with respect to Public Resources Code Section 21061.8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IDENTIFIED IMPACT</th>
<th>RELATED MITIGATION MEASURE</th>
<th>MONITORING</th>
<th>VERIFICATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Impl. Entity</td>
<td>Monitoring and Verification Entity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AESTHETICS (VISUAL FACTORS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental Impact 4-1: Roof top Modification Impacts on Views from Adjacent Apartment Building. The rooftops of 420 and 430 Broadway, the closest project buildings to the adjacent Broadway Towers apartment building, are generally at &quot;eye level&quot; with the top (seventh) floor of the apartment building. The proposed project modifications include installation of additional and replacement rooftop mechanical equipment and associated rooftop screening additions atop 420 and 430 Broadway. Assuming that the height of the rooftop equipment screening would be equal to or greater than the finished height of the modified rooftop mechanical equipment, associated visual effects on the adjacent apartment building would be less-than-significant. Nevertheless, until the project rooftop mechanical equipment and associated screening heights are finalized and the adequacy of the specified screening heights in relationship to the finished mechanical equipment heights can be verified by the City's Architectural Review Committee (ARC) and Planning Commission during the required Planned Development (PD) Permit Amendment approval process, it is assumed that the proposed project rooftop modifications may have a significant adverse impact on top floor views from the adjacent apartment building.</td>
<td>Supplemental Mitigation 4-1. To avoid adverse effects on views from the top floor of the adjacent apartment building, the height relationship between the proposed rooftop mechanical equipment modifications and associated equipment screening atop 420 and 430 Broadway shall, to the satisfaction of the ARC and Planning Commission as established through the City's normal design review process for the required PD Permit Amendment, be sufficient to block views of the modified equipment. Implementation of this measure would reduce this potential visual impact to a less-than-significant level.</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIR QUALITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental Impact 5-1: Project Construction Period Emissions. Although</td>
<td>Supplemental Mitigation 5-1. Dust emissions from demolition and construction</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDENTIFIED IMPACT</td>
<td>RELATED MITIGATION MEASURE</td>
<td>MONITORING</td>
<td>VERIFICATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>limited to renovation of existing buildings and grounds, project construction activities, including excavation and grading for the proposed underground storm water retention basins, landscaping modifications, new underground utilities, possible future parking decks, associated construction vehicle traffic (including exhaust emissions), and wind blowing over exposed earth, would generate a combination of fugitive particulate matter emissions and exhaust emissions that would affect local air quality. These possible effects represent a potentially significant impact. This impact is similar to Impact 4-2 identified in the 1996 Midpoint Technology Park EIR. The following modified mitigation, however, corresponds with the current BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines.</td>
<td>activities can be greatly reduced by implementing fugitive dust control measures. The significance of construction period particulate impacts is, according to the BAAQMD Guidelines, determined by whether or not appropriate dust control measures are implemented. Implementation of the following conventional BAAQMD-recommended dust control measures would be expected to reduce dust emission impacts to a less-than-significant level: (a) Watering shall be used to control dust generation during any break-up of pavement; (b) All trucks hauling construction debris from the site shall be covered; (c) Whenever possible, dust-proof chutes shall be used for loading debris onto trucks; (d) Water all active construction areas at least twice daily and more often during windy periods (i.e., gusting to 30 mph or more). Active construction areas adjacent to existing land uses must be kept damp at all times, or must be treated with non-toxic stabilizers or dust palliatives; (e) Water or cover all stockpiles of debris, soil, sand, or other materials that can be blown by the wind; (f) Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials, or require all trucks to maintain at least two feet of freeboard; (g) Sweep daily (preferably with water sweepers) all paved access roads, parking areas, and staging areas at construction sites; (h) Sweep streets daily (preferably with water sweepers) if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent public streets;</td>
<td>Impl. Entity</td>
<td>Monitoring and Verification Entity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verify implementation during grading and/or construction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDENTIFIED IMPACT</td>
<td>RELATED MITIGATION MEASURE</td>
<td>MONITORING</td>
<td>VERIFICATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Impl. Entity</td>
<td>Monitoring and Verification Entity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Hydroseed or apply non-toxic soil stabilizers to inactive construction areas;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(j) Enclose, cover, water twice daily, or apply non-toxic soil binders to exposed stockpiles (dirt, sand, etc.);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k) Install sandbags or other erosion control measures to prevent silt runoff to public roadways; and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(l) Replant vegetation in disturbed areas as quickly as possible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In addition, to reduce potential construction vehicle and equipment exhaust emissions to a less-than-significant level:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(m) Maintain properly tuned engines and equipment, minimize idling time, and limit the hours of operation of heavy duty equipment and/or the amount of equipment in use.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CULTURAL RESOURCES**

**Supplemental Impact 6-1: Potential Disturbance of Prehistoric Cultural Resources.** Excavation and grading for the proposed underground storm water retention basins, any additional underground utilities, new landscaping, and possible future parking decks could disturb as yet unidentified sensitive, on-site, subsurface cultural resources. This potential effect represents a potentially significant environmental impact. This is a new impact not identified in the 1996 EIR or 1998 SEIR.

**Supplemental Mitigation 6-1.** In the event that subsurface cultural resources are encountered during approved ground-disturbing activities, work in the immediate vicinity shall be stopped and a qualified archaeologist retained to evaluate the finds. The discovery or disturbance of any cultural resource shall be reported to the California Historical Records Information System (CHRIIS) and the Native American Heritage Commission. Identified cultural resources shall be recorded on State Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) brm 422 (archaeological sites). Mitigation measures prescribed by these groups and required by the City shall be undertaken before construction activities are resumed. If disturbance of a project area cultural resource cannot be avoided, a mitigation program, including measures set forth in the City's Cultural Resources Management Program and in compliance with sections...

**EXHIBIT A**
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IDENTIFIED IMPACT</th>
<th>RELATED MITIGATION MEASURE</th>
<th>MONITORING</th>
<th>VERIFICATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Impl. Entity</td>
<td>Monitoring and Verification Entity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15064.5 and 15126.4 of the CEQA Guidelines, shall be implemented. Implementation of these measures would reduce this potential impact to a <strong>less-than-significant level</strong>.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supplemental Impact 7.1: Potential Exposure to Existing Soil or Groundwater Contamination.</strong> Excavation and construction of the proposed underground storm water retention basins, underground utilities, and potential future parking decks could expose construction personnel and members of the public to existing soil and groundwater contamination, if any. Implementation of previously certified Mitigation 9-2 from the 1996 EIR would help to reduce such potential exposure to less than significant levels. In addition, or more specifically, recommendations included in the recent Phase I Environmental Assessment commissioned by the applicant call for preparation by the applicant of a <strong>Site Management Plan</strong> prior to site development to address potential environmental issues associated with project construction activities (e.g., excavation, dewatering, etc.) and operation, and the recent Phase II Environmental Assessment commissioned by the applicant calls for preparation of a site-specific, construction period <strong>Health and Safety Plan</strong> (a standard CalOSHA requirement for work at hazardous waste sites). Until these two plans are completed to the satisfaction of the County of San Mateo's Office of Environmental Health, project-related potentials for construction worker and public exposure to existing soil and groundwater contamination, if any, are assumed to represent a <strong>potentially significant impact</strong>.</td>
<td><strong>Supplemental Mitigation 7.1.</strong> A construction period <strong>Site Management Plan</strong> shall be prepared by the applicant and approved by the County of San Mateo's Hazardous Materials Specialist, Office of Environmental Health, prior to site development, to ensure that potential environmental issues associated with construction (e.g., dewatering) and operation of the site are adequately addressed. The <strong>Site Management Plan</strong> shall include or incorporate by reference an applicant-prepared or appropriate contractor-prepared site-specific construction period <strong>Health and Safety Plan</strong> (a standard CalOSHA requirement for work at hazardous waste sites). In addition to measures that protect on-site workers, the plan shall include measures to minimize public exposure to contaminated soil and groundwater (e.g., measures for the evaluation, handling and disposal of groundwater effluent generated during project construction period during dewatering, in accordance with applicable regulations). Such measures shall include dust control, appropriate site security restriction of public access, and posting of warning signs. The plan shall apply from the time of surface disruption through the completion of earthwork construction. Implementation of these supplemental mitigations, in addition to Certified Mitigation 5-2 from the 1996 EIR, would reduce this supplemental impact to a <strong>less-than-significant level</strong>.</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>City; County of San Mateo's Office of Environmental Health</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IDENTIFIED IMPACT</th>
<th>RELATED MITIGATION MEASURE</th>
<th>MONITORING</th>
<th>VERIFICATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supplemental Impact 12-1: Project Impact on Broadway/Second Avenue Intersection.</strong> During the PM peak hour, project traffic would reduce the level of service (LOS) and increase individual vehicle delay by more than five (5) seconds at the Broadway/Second Avenue intersection. This change would represent a <strong>significant impact</strong>. This impact is similar to Impact 3-3 identified in the 1996 EIR.</td>
<td><strong>Supplemental Mitigation 12-1.</strong> The applicant shall install all-way stop sign control at the Broadway/Second Avenue intersection, which would achieve LOS D operations at this location under Project Conditions. Implementation of this measure would reduce the impact to a <strong>less-than-significant level.</strong></td>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supplemental Impact 12-2: Project Impact on Rollison Road Roadway Segment.</strong> Project traffic would increase PM peak-hour and daily traffic on Rollison Road south of Second Avenue by more than five percent. Since this segment of Rollison Road currently carries fewer than 3,000 vehicles per dayand is therefore operating as a &quot;local street,&quot; the increase in traffic due to the project represents a <strong>significant impact.</strong> This impact is similar to Impact 3-3 identified in the 1996 EIR.</td>
<td><strong>Supplemental Mitigation 12-2.</strong> The applicant shall implement traffic calming devices to help maintain vehicle speeds at posted limits along Rollison Road south of Second Avenue. The installation of these devices shall be made in accordance with City standards and shall be coordinated with the City Traffic Engineer and emergency services (Fire Department). However, implementation of the traffic calming devices, while improving public safety, would not reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level; therefore, the project impact on Rollison Road south of Second Avenue would represent a <strong>significant unavoidable impact.</strong> A traffic consultant shall prepare a traffic calming options study with recommendations and shall monitor the traffic calming installations to ensure appropriate mitigation. The traffic consultant shall be hired by the City and paid for by Stanford Hospital &amp; Clinics.</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supplemental Impact 12-3: Project Impact on Congestion Management Program Facilities.</strong> The project would increase PM peak-hour traffic volumes on Woodside Road and El Camino Real (County Congestion Management Program facilities) by more than 100 trips, representing a <strong>potentially significant impact</strong> on these roads. This is a new impact not identified in the 1996 EIR or 1998 SEIR.</td>
<td><strong>Supplemental Mitigation 12-3.</strong> Prior to Planned Development (PD) Permit Amendment approval, the applicant shall provide a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) plan for project impacts on Woodside Road and El Camino Real that complies with the C/CAG Guidelines for the Implementation of the Land Use Component of the 1999 Congestion Management Program.</td>
<td>Amendment</td>
<td>City; C/CAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDENTIFIED IMPACT</td>
<td>RELATED MITIGATION MEASURE</td>
<td>MONITORING</td>
<td>VERIFICATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implementation of this measure would reduce the impact to a <strong>less-than-significant level</strong>.</td>
<td>Impl. Entity</td>
<td>Monitoring and Verification Entity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental Impact 12-4: Project Consistency with General Plan Provisions for Alternative Transportation Modes. Since the project site does not currently have bus service, the project has the potential to conflict with Redwood City Strategic General Plan Circulation Element objectives and policies encouraging the use of alternative transportation modes. This potential inconsistency represents a <strong>potentially significant impact</strong>. This impact is similar to Impact 3-4 identified in the 1996 EIR.</td>
<td><strong>Supplemental Mitigation 12-4</strong>. Prior to Planned Development (PD) Permit Amendment approval, the applicant shall provide a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) plan as described in <strong>Supplemental Mitigation 12-3</strong> above, to City and C/CAG satisfaction. The TDM plan shall include measures to encourage use of transit services, coordinated with SamTrans. Implementation of this measure would reduce this impact to a <strong>less-than-significant level</strong>.</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>City; C/CAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental Impact 12-5: Cumulative With Project Impacts at Woodside Road/Broadway Intersection. Traffic under Cumulative With Project Conditions would cause an unacceptable increase in delay at the Woodside Road/Broadway Intersection during the PM peak hour. This delay increase would represent a <strong>significant cumulative impact</strong>. This impact is similar to Impact 3-2 identified in the 1996 EIR.</td>
<td><strong>Supplemental Mitigation 12-5(a)</strong>. The project applicant shall pay an additional traffic impact fee for the approximately 393 net new PM peak-hour trips generated by the Stanford Outpatient Center project. The traffic impact fee program is planned to include citywide traffic improvement needs, including improvements that would reduce congestion in the Woodside Road corridor and in the area surrounding the project site on Bay Road. In addition to the traffic impact fee contribution, the project applicant shall be required to fund pedestrian signal countdown displays and the capability for emergency vehicle pre-emption of the traffic signals at the Woodside Road/Broadway Intersection.</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Supplemental Mitigation 12-5(b)</strong>. The project applicant shall implement a transportation demand management (TDM) program to reduce the number of drive-alone auto trips generated by the project (see <strong>Supplemental Mitigation 12-3</strong>). The combination of these two measures has the potential to reduce the projects contribution to the cumulative impact at the Woodside Road/Broadway intersection to a <strong>less-than-significant level</strong>. However, until Caltrans commits to implementing the planned improvements at the Woodside</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>City; C/CAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDENTIFIED IMPACT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supplemental Impact 12-6: Cumulative With Project Impacts at Broadway/Charter Street Intersection.</strong> Traffic under Cumulative With Project Conditions would cause an unacceptable increase in delay at the Broadway/Charter Street intersection during the PM peak hour. In addition, under Cumulative With Project Conditions, traffic volumes at the intersection are expected to satisfy the peak-hour signal warrant. Cumulative With Project Conditions would therefore cause a potentially significant cumulative impact. This impact is a new impact not identified in the 1996 EIR or 1998 SEIR.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RELATED MITIGATION MEASURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Road/ Broadway intersection, the project's contribution to the cumulative impact at this intersection would represent a significant unavoidable impact.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONITORING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impl. Entity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant; City</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VERIFICATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Signature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IDENTIFIED IMPACT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supplemental Impact 12-7: Cumulative With Project Impacts at Broadway/Second Avenue Intersection.</strong> Traffic under Cumulative With Project Conditions would cause an unacceptable increase in delay at the Broadway/Second Avenue intersection during both the AM and PM peak hours. In addition, under the Cumulative With Project Conditions, the total delay on the minor street (Second Avenue) would satisfy the peak-hour delay signal warrant. Cumulative With Project Conditions would therefore cause a potentially significant cumulative impact. This impact is a new impact not identified in the 1996 EIR or 1998 SEIR.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RELATED MITIGATION MEASURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental Mitigation 12-7. The applicant shall implement Supplemental Mitigation 12-1 (install all-way stop sign control). Implementation of this measure would reduce the project's contribution to this cumulative impact to a less-than-significant level. Alternatively, implementation of either of the following two mitigation measures would similarly reduce the project's contribution to this cumulative impact to a less-than-significant level and would also result in improving intersection operation to an acceptable level of service (LOS D or better under Cumulative Conditions).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONITORING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impl. Entity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VERIFICATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Signature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**EXHIBIT A**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IDENTIFIED IMPACT</th>
<th>RELATED MITIGATION MEASURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A traffic consultant selected by and under the direction of the City, and funded by Stanford Hospital &amp; Clinics, shall periodically monitor, as determined necessary by the City Traffic Engineer, the intersection in a similar manner as other unsignalized intersections in Redwood City to determine if and when signalization, or other mitigation as determined by the City, would be warranted in the future. The project applicant shall also contribute its fair share, as determined by the City, to the design and installation of the mitigation measure at the time its installation is determined by the City to be necessary. and/or The City could have the applicant contribute its fair share, as determined by the City, to the design and installation of a roundabout at this intersection, assuming the roundabout is physically feasible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supplemental Mitigation 12-8. The project applicant shall pay additional traffic impact fees for the estimated 393 net new PM peak-hour trips generated by the Stanford Outpatient Center project. Implementation of this mitigation measure would reduce the project's contribution to the cumulative impact at the Bay Road/Fifth Avenue intersection to a less-than-significant level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplement Impact 12-8: Cumulative With Project Impacts at Bay Road/Fifth Avenue Intersection. Traffic under Cumulative With Project Conditions would cause an unacceptable increase in delay at the Bay Road/Fifth Avenue intersection during the PM peak hour. In addition, under Cumulative With Project Conditions, traffic volumes at the intersection are expected to satisfy the peak-hour signal warrant. Cumulative With Project Conditions would therefore cause a potentially significant cumulative impact. This impact is a new impact not identified in the 1996 EIR or 1996 SEIR.</td>
<td>Applicant City Condition of building permit issuance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplement Impact 12-9: Cumulative Impact on Rollison Road Roadway Segment. Cumulative With Project traffic would increase PM peak-hour and daily traffic on Rollison Road south of Second Avenue by more than five percent. Since Rollison Road carries fewer than 3,000 vehicles per day, the increase in traffic due to the project would represent a significant cumulative impact.</td>
<td>Supplemental Mitigation 12-9. The applicant shall implement Supplemental Mitigation 12-2 (traffic calming). However, implementation of this With Project Condition mitigation would not reduce this Cumulative With Project Impact to a less-than-significant level. No feasible additional mitigation has been identified; therefore, this Cumulative With Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Applicant City Condition of building permit issuance. Timing of traffic consultant study, traffic monitoring, and traffic calming installations shall be determined by the City Traffic Engineer.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EXHIBIT A**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IDENTIFIED IMPACT</th>
<th>RELATED MITIGATION MEASURE</th>
<th>MONITORING</th>
<th>VERIFICATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| This impact is similar to Impact 3-3 identified in the 1996 EIR. | impact on Rollison Road south of Second Avenue would represent a significant unavoidable impact.  
A traffic consultant shall prepare a traffic calming options study with recommendations and shall monitor the traffic calming installations to ensure appropriate mitigation. The traffic consultant shall be hired by the City and paid for by Stanford Hospital & Clinics. | Impl. Entity | Monitoring and Verification Entity | Timing Requirements | Signature | Date |
| Supplemental Impact 12-10: Project Impact on Parking. | Supplemental Mitigation 12-10. A parking monitoring program shall be undertaken by a traffic consultant selected by and under the direction of the City and funded by Stanford Hospital & Clinics. The parking monitoring program shall include completion of an initial baseline on-site and off-site (nearby on-street) parking analysis prior to Outpatient Center occupancy, followed by periodic on-site and off-site recounts (twice per year) for a period of two years following full Outpatient Center occupancy, as determined by the City. The residential streets to be included in the off-site parking counts are:  
- Second Avenue—Rollison Road to Bay Street,  
- Rollison Road—Second Avenue to Fifth Street,  
- Hoover Street—Second Avenue to Fifth Street,  
- Broadway—Second Avenue to Fifth Street, and  
- Page Street—Second Avenue to Fifth Street.  
Simultaneously with the parking counts, field observations shall be conducted at adjacent commercial sites, residential areas, and Andrew Spinas Park to determine if Outpatient Center employees or patients are parking in these areas. If parking demand in these adjacent areas increases by 15 percent or more over the base line surveys, consultations between City staff and the project applicant, based | Applicant; City | City | | Parking baseline study shall occur prior to building occupancy; monitoring shall occur twice a year for two years thereafter, assuming full building occupancy an patient capacity. | | |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IDENTIFIED IMPACT</th>
<th>RELATED MITIGATION MEASURE</th>
<th>MONITORING</th>
<th>VERIFICATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>on the field observation data, shall be conducted to decide whether the increased parking demand is due to Stanford Outpatient Center activities or to other development in the area. If the on-site parking demand exceeds specified occupancy levels, or if a 15 percent increase or more in spillover parking into adjacent areas is determined to result from Outpatient Center activities, the applicant shall provide additional on-site parking (e.g., through valet parking and/or installation of additional parking facilities at one to three possible on-site locations, as illustrated on Figures 12.11 and 12.12 of this SEIR), subject to review and approval by the Redwood City Traffic Engineer and Redwood City Planning Commission. Implementation of this measure would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.</td>
<td>Impl. Entity</td>
<td>Monitoring and Verification Entity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPPLIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPPLEMENTAL IMPACT 13-1: INCREASED PEAK WASTEWATER FLOWS IN THE LOCAL FAIR OAKS SEWER MAINTENANCE DISTRICT (FOSMD) COLLECTION SYSTEM. It is estimated that the proposed Stanford Outpatient Center would increase peak flows in existing collector sewers in Douglas Avenue and in Barron Avenue by approximately two percent over flow rates projected upon build-out of the Midpoint Technology Park. Since these lines were already operating substantially over their design capacities before development of the Technology Park, these additional project-related flows could represent a potentially significant project and cumulative impact.</td>
<td>SUPPLEMENTAL MITIGATION 13-1. The project applicant's engineer shall work with FOSMD and the San Mateo County Engineering Department to re-evaluate existing peak flow conditions in the local collection network, particularly Lines 100 and 200, to determine if peak flows expected to be generated by the proposed project changes would result in total flows exceeding adopted operational and/or pipe-flow criteria. In the event FOSMD determines that specific collection system improvements are required, the project applicant would contribute its fair share toward the design and construction of these improvements by the County. Implementation of these measures would reduce the identified impact to a less-than-significant level.</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>City; FOSMD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPPLEMENTAL IMPACT 13-2: INCREASED WASTEWATER DISCHARGES TO REDWOOD CITY FACILITIES. Preliminary calculations indicate</td>
<td>SUPPLEMENTAL MITIGATION 13-2. The project applicant shall be required to:</td>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>City; FOSMD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDENTIFIED IMPACT</td>
<td>RELATED MITIGATION MEASURE</td>
<td>MONITORING</td>
<td>VERIFICATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the proposed project changes would increase FOSMD flows to the Redwood City collection system by approximately 32,800 gpd, which could exceed FOSMD's current conveyance and treatment allocation. This would represent a potentially significant project and cumulative impact.</td>
<td>(a) Coordinate with FOSMD to identify and implement off-site measures designed to reduce existing wastewater flows originating from other properties, thereby freeing up the capacity needed to accommodate the proposed Stanford Outpatient Center's increased wastewater production, and (b) Pay its fair share toward FOSMD's acquisition from Redwood City of any additional sewer capacity required for the project. Implementation of measures (a) and (b) above would ensure that the identified project and cumulative sewer impact would be limited to a less-than-significant level.</td>
<td>Impl. Entity</td>
<td>Monitoring and Verification Entity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXHIBIT A
APPENDIX F:
PARKING MONITORING PLAN
Parking Monitoring Program
Stanford Outpatient Clinics
Redwood City, California

Purpose:
The purpose of the parking monitoring program is to ensure that sufficient on-site parking is provided at the Stanford Outpatient Clinics to be located at 420, 430, 440, and 450 Broadway Street in Redwood City, California.

Timing of Monitoring:
The monitoring will be performed on a six-month basis during either the spring or fall months once the site has been 75% occupied by the Stanford Outpatients Clinics. The occupancy counts will be conducted during a typical week when there are no holidays and when schools are in session. Prior to occupying the site, a baseline off-site parking occupancy count will be conducted in the adjacent residential neighborhood (see survey definition below).

Monitoring Plan:
The parking monitoring program will consist of both on-site and off-site parking occupancy surveys combined with field observations of parking patterns. The on-site parking occupancy survey will be used to determine the peak parking demand for the site. The off-site parking occupancy surveys will be used to determine if there is spill over parking occurring in the adjacent residential neighborhoods. Field observations would be used to determine if there is any spill over parking occurring in the adjacent commercial properties.

On-site Parking Occupancy Counts – An initial inventory of the on-site parking will be collected to identify the number of handicapped and non-handicapped parking spaces. The on-site parking occupancy counts will be conducted for a five-day period (Monday through Friday) between the hours of (9:00 AM to 5:00 PM). This period reflects when the peak employee/patient parking demand will occur on-site. The number of occupied parking spaces will be counted each half hour during the survey period. The counts will clearly identify the number of occupied handicapped spaces and non-handicapped spaces.

Off-site Parking Occupancy (Neighborhood) Counts – As stated above an initial baseline count will be conducted in the adjacent residential neighborhood prior to the clinics opening. The residential streets to be included in the off-site parking counts are:

- Second Avenue – Rolison Road to Bay Street
- Rolison Road – Second Avenue to Fourth Street
- Hoover Street – Second Avenue to Fourth Street
- Broadway – Second Avenue to Fourth Street
- Page Street – Second Avenue to Fourth Street

An inventory of the available on-street parking spaces will be made prior to conducting the off-site occupancy counts. Parking occupancy counts will be conducted on each of the roadways for two, midweek-days (Tuesday through Thursday) between the hours of 7:00 AM to 5:00 PM. This survey period is designed to capture early morning parking demand of
residents as well as potential employee/patient demand during clinic operations. These occupancy counts will be collected hourly.

**Field Observations** — At the same time that the parking occupancy counts are conducted, field observations will be made at the adjacent commercial sites and residential areas to determine if Stanford employees or patients are parking in these areas. Observations will be made throughout the day including the morning employee peak period 7:00 AM to 9:00 AM as well as during the patient peaks which generally occur during the late morning and mid-afternoon periods. These observations will be made during at least two separate survey days.

**Summary of Survey Data** — The results of the on-site parking survey will be summarized showing the percent occupancy for each type of space (handicapped and non-handicapped) for each half-hour period for all survey days. The off-site parking occupancy survey will summarized for each hour for each survey day.

**Need for Additional Parking** — The need for additional on-site parking will be determined based on the following factors:

- If the on-site parking demand for handicapped or non-handicapped spaces exceeds 95% for more than two half-hour periods over the survey period, additional parking shall be provided at the site.

- If the on-site parking demand is in excess of 90% and the parking demand in the adjacent residential areas increases by 20% or more over the base line surveys, a determination will be made based on the field observations and consultation with the City staff as to whether the increase in residential demand is due to the operations of the Stanford Outpatient Clinic or due to other factors such as other new development or redevelopment in the area.

**Actions to Meet Parking Demand** — In the event that the parking demand exceeds the 95% threshold or there is a determination that spill over parking is occurring in either the adjacent residential or commercial areas, the following actions will be taken:

- **Valet Parking** — This would be an immediate option to increase the on-site parking supply.

- **Construction of Parking Deck(s)** — Three areas have been identified where single level decks could be added to the site. Two of the decks would add 69 spaces and the third area could add up to 180 spaces to the site. All three decks combined would represent approximately a 30% increase to the parking supply. Based on the results of the parking occupancy surveys, additional parking would be provided to meet the surveyed demand.

**Length of Monitoring**

Once the Stanford Outpatient Clinic has reached full occupancy (100%), the monitoring program will continue for a minimum of two years. If the parking demand does not exceed the supply during the monitoring period the parking demand program will be terminated.
POSSIBLE FUTURE PARKING STRUCTURES (CROSS-SECTION)
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SOURCE: BKF Engineers

Stanford Outpatient Center Project SEIR

Wagstaff and Associates • Urban and Environmental Planners
MEMORANDUM

To: Maureen Riordan  
   Senior Planner  
   City of Redwood City

FROM: Doug Henry  
      Senior Project Manager

RE: County of San Mateo Dept of Public Works Response 
    to Draft SEIR for the Stanford Outpatient Center

Date: 9/19/06

Maureen,

In accordance with the attached letter from the project's Civil Engineer, BKF Engineers, Stanford Hospital & Clinics does intend to provide its fair share of mitigation of the wastewater issues by upgrading the existing sewer pipes upstream of the project. We would do so by slip-lining the the sewer pipes; which is a process of installing a new interior lining to the existing pipes thereby reducing the amount of inflow and infiltration into the existing system. This same process was previously implemented to the main sewer line crossing our property as part of the original building construction. We would upgrade a sufficient additional length of existing piping upstream from our project in order to offset the anticipated 6% increase of wastewater generation by our project. This process would result in no net increase of wastewater downstream and the project would thus not be contributing to any existing deficiencies.

Let me know if you have any questions in regards to this matter.
September 19, 2006

Ms. Maureen Riordan, Senior Planner
City of Redwood City
1017 Middlefield Road
Redwood City, CA. 94064

RE: Sewer Service Mitigation Methods

Dear Ms. Riordan:

The Stanford Outpatient Campus will generate an approximate 6% sewer flow increase above the prior campus land use. As indicated in the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Report, as well as the report prepared by Brown & Caldwell in September 2000, the downstream trunk line is currently running near capacity during wet weather events. In order to mitigate this increase in flow, BKF proposes slip-lining sewer pipes upstream of the campus. This will decrease the amount of inflow and infiltration flowing into the sewer system which will increase the downstream capacity. This added capacity will mitigate the change in building use. This method was approved by the Fair Oaks Sewer District in 1996 and implemented for the original @Home campus.

If you have any questions regarding this process, please call me at (925) 940-2206.

Sincerely,

Eric Swanson, PE
Project Engineer
DATE: October 10, 2006

TO: Planning Commission

FROM: Downtown Precise Plan Team
      (Jill Ekas, Blake Lyon, Susan Moeller; Tom Passanisi, Dan Zack)

SUBJECT: Draft Downtown Precise Plan

RECOMMENDATION:
Hear staff discussion on written comments made at the October 3rd Downtown
Precise Plan meeting. Also ask clarifying questions and listen to preliminary public
comments on the Plan. No decision on the Plan is required at this time.

BACKGROUND
On October 3rd City staff unveiled the Draft Downtown Precise Plan. The Downtown
Precise Plan is the City's blueprint that describes the City's future vision for the
Downtown, and then describes the regulations and guidelines necessary to reach
that vision. Staff gave an overview of the Plan, its context in the Downtown and the
overall vision.

At the meeting the public was invited to participate and visit various "workstations"
which highlighted particular topics or themes in the Plan. Those themes consisted of:

- Our Downtown Neighborhood
- Economic Vitality
- Downtown Living
- Parking
- Walkability

At each workstation the public was given the opportunity to write down their
questions and issues for staff follow-up. Staff gathered these notes and categorized
them under broad themes. A copy of all the written notes is attached for your
information and review. The comments covered many topics with some specific
focus on design (e.g. height, gateways, and building architecture); multi-modal
transportation (e.g. accessibility, bicycle transportation, and the proposed elevated
railway); and resources (e.g. Redwood Creek, parks, and green building practices).
Housing comments and questions were also prevalent.
MEETING FORMAT
The October 10th meeting will have two major parts. The first part of the meeting will be conducted in a panel discussion format. Staff will provide general information based on the major themes, as well as answers to many of the specific questions collected at the October 3rd meeting. The public will also have the opportunity to ask the panel other questions regarding the Downtown Precise Plan. In the second half of the meeting, the Planning Commission will have the opportunity to start taking preliminary public comments on the Plan.

The agenda for this meeting will be as follows:

- Icebreaker with a “visual preference” format
- Panel discussion responding to the written comments made at the Oct. 3 meeting
- Public question and answer period
- Short Break
- Preliminary public comment period
- Planning Commission questions/comments
- Next Steps

The role of the Planning Commission will be to listen and to ask any clarifying questions. Again, the meeting on October 10th is not a formal public hearing, but a dialogue and discussion panel. No decision on the Downtown Precise Plan is required at this time.

FUTURE MEETINGS
There will be many more opportunities for the public to participate in the Downtown Precise Plan review process. The public is invited to attend a tutorial on October 12th for small group instruction on how to use the Downtown Precise Plan document. Additional tutorials will be offered dependent upon public request and need. Tutorials are not a public comment forum, but are information meetings. Outreach to adjacent neighborhood associations may also result in future informational meetings with those groups. The next meeting before the Planning Commission will be on November 14. The focus of that meeting will be further consideration of the plan contents and initial public review of the Environmental Impact Report. There will also be a public hearing in early December. The City Council will begin reviewing the plan document in Study Session format in early 2007.

ATTACHMENTS
Meeting notes from October 3
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Sub-Category</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Please Allow Architects to be Creative</td>
<td>Dislike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Living across from city hall is like looking at a beautiful sculpture</td>
<td>Like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Can buildings have a &quot;modern&quot; style built with contemporary materials etc.</td>
<td>What else do you want to know?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Gateways</td>
<td>All the images of new buildings illustrate nostalgic, traditional architectural styles. I hope the guidelines allow for well-detailed buildings that express contemporary materials and architectural style.</td>
<td>What else do you want to know?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Gateways</td>
<td>Entries to RWC are very unattractive - i.e., Woodside entry-first impression is Smart Final corner/P.O. corner &amp; Denny's.</td>
<td>What else do you want to know?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Gateways</td>
<td>I feel that the corner of Winslow &amp; Brewster should be made an attractive entrance to Redwood City downtown. It's a curved street that could be pretty if the height restriction followed Winslow not Brewster (but don't increase height on Brewster).</td>
<td>Dislike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Gateways</td>
<td>Like entrances to downtown - But think pretty corner of Winslow &amp; Brewster should be treated as entrance to downtown - It is for many.</td>
<td>Like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Gateways</td>
<td>Gateways into Redwood City Entrances to Downtown - But think should be entrance at Winslow &amp; Brewster. Height restriction should follow</td>
<td>Like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Gateways</td>
<td>Winslow-not Brewster.</td>
<td>Like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Gateways</td>
<td>Gateways into downtown Middlefield &amp; Veteran would also be a gateway to downtown</td>
<td>Like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Gateways</td>
<td>Want to re-evaluate the corner 'Special treatment' at Winslow &amp; Brewster. I think it's a very important gateway which has not been identified</td>
<td>What else do you want to know?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Gateways</td>
<td>Winslow &amp; Brewster should be a &quot;gateway&quot; to downtown</td>
<td>What else do you want to know?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I think the corner of Winslow and Brewster should start the higher density as the beginning (one of) of the Gateway into downtown.

What else do you want to know?

Design  Gateways
I think there should be a taller gateway/entry at the corner of Winslow and Brewster. Start the banners-start the walking into the mixed use high density of downtown. (only the corner)

What else do you want to know?

Design  Gateways
The height restriction along Winslow is Based upon East to West lines of ****-where's the major street-Winslow-**** North to South-If the height restriction follows Winslow the chance for a graceful curved Bldg exists.

Design  Height
Do not like the transition to the neighborhoods-it's a great idea, but not enough. Loft of 35ft (in Height) and then 5 stories right across the street from single story residential is too tall. Keep it at 3 stories for at least 1/2 blk width (one full building) then go to 5 on the back side of the block. Keep it shorter near the neighborhoods.

Dislike

Design  Height
Dislike 3-5 story buildings on west side of El Camino

Dislike

Design  Height
Regarding the west side of El Camino, starting just south of Sequoia H.S., the current plan wedges a wall of 3-5 story buildings right over the back fences of several one-story houses (e.g. 400 block of Arch St.). While the idea of transitioning from the Mt. Carmel neighborhood to the higher buildings across El Camino is logical, that stretch of El Camino should be shorter on the west side. High density is good, but 12 stories seems excessive.

Dislike

Design  Height
Be sure to step down to neighborhoods.

Dislike

Design  Height
Not over 8 stories (addition to comment above)

Dislike

Design  height
Winslow height restriction along street of ***

Dislike

Design  Height
Would like to see lower storied buildings near buildings of significance and single-family neighborhoods

Dislike
6-8 stories is Max that people can comfortably walk-so
going higher will increase energy use & make elevators
mandatory-Paris is dense & almost 5-6 stories.
Concern that 5 story buildings directly across the street
from existing neighborhoods is too tall, even w/ 3 story
setback, and will cast shadows, block light etc. on

Design | Height | houses and yards. | Dislike
Design | Height | Like the transition to existing neighborhoods. | Like
Design | Height | ht. of 3 stories along Brewster much better! | Like
Design | Height | Height | Like
Design | Height | "Height done right" is A-OK downtown | Like
Design | Height | Height is great | Like
Design | Height | Marshall street is great place for height 5-8 stories max
nothing historic there
I would like to know more about transitions from 4 story
developments on El Camino to single-family houses
behind | What else do you want to know?
Design | Height | The held back zoning height should not reach the corner | What else do you want to know?
Design | Height | 12 Stories, w/most 8 stories is too tall. | Dislike
Design | Height | 8-12 stories too tall; 8 story should be max | Dislike
Design | Parking | Parking wrapped on all levels | Like
Design | Parking | Parking structures should be multistory-not using up a
lot of land | Like
Design | Public Art | Redevelopment over 30K sq. ft. | What else do you want to know?
Design | Setbacks/Stepbacks | 20-foot setback is not enough-increase to **** | Dislike
Design | Site/Streetscape | Design with plenty of land scaping and design for curb
appeal | Like
Design | Street Alignments | Broadway should be straightened at the train station by
moving the train station South. This facilitates a
connection to the Mt. Carmel Neighborhood. | Dislike
Design | Streetscapes | Theater way is too "hard"-it needs more trees or
awnings to break up the concrete channel feel along the
theater side. Also, close this block to cars & parking-
make it an outdoor space devoted to people | Dislike
Could you expand some time into thinking of the looks of the corners of the downtown? Maybe the buildings pleasing from all angles-follow curves where present, angular where appropriate. Consider views from all angles. "Special corner treatment" should be re-evaluated for Winslow & Brewster.

Rather than wait for developers to submit plans RWC might determine what is acceptable. Be proactive rather than reactive.

Implementation

Implementation to the future plan? Land owners, developers co. operation Re: Existing Bank properties? Walkability reduces city cost in services. Like fire, water, water table pollution etc. Is it possible to use revenue saved or the taxable value increased to transfer development rights from remote areas like around Edgewood Park to the Downtown?

Redwood City needs a 'master plan' to determine how other areas can be developed to maximize addressing needs. Integrity of Design & follow through to set high standards that is equal to all.

What to do about mix of business etc. on El Camino-type of Businesses near Sequoia. Is it possible to Limit overcrowding of similar businesses (i.e. 15 ice cream shops or 30 jewelry shops viable or healthy for economics?)

If this became entertainment *** Lets have a live theater district like off Broadway.

Don't allow for many rentals. RWC has enough. Should be mostly ownership homes of all Econ. Levels. Small portion should be subsidized housing. Larger portion should be owner occupied.

Encourage the high Density housing.
Downtown Housing is vital to making this plan work no people-no business
Variety of housing types downtown: i.e. studios, live work/Lofts/luxury condos.
Dense Housing is Great. Will make the Retail viable.
Like
Like
Like
Like
We Need affordable housing in addition to mkt-rate housing!
Like
Well done-well thought out we need people that are prospering to live downtown
Like
Like
Are there any subsidies for low income/citystaff/teachers, etc..... Housing?
I Would Not like to see a *** Portion Designated for subsidized Housing to make it work-should be a ***
percentage of Home ownership
Like
Dislike
Dislike
Like
Encouraging development of smaller offices & Live/work space.
Like
Like
Like
Like
Mixed-use concept
Like
Land use concentration in the walkable area. Would prefer 1500 walkable **** circles with all services.
Like
I like working downtown in a small office & walking from my neighborhood-Mezesville
Like
Compatibility of housing & entertainment areas needs to be addressed
Dislike
Impact of ‘night life” on existing neighborhoods-parking, services (like garbage pickup)
Dislike
Noise from deliveries & trash collecting at all hours.
Dislike
Noise from services (e.g., garbage) impacts existing neighborhoods too.
Dislike
Draft Public Comments
October 3rd Planning Commission Workshop on the Draft Downtown Precise Plan

There should also (be) limits on intentional noise "entertainment". Is not an excuse to drive your neighbor nuts! Enough already!!!

What noise ordinances does RWC have? I live downtown RWC and have to contend with a very loud music from a café on Jefferson near the post office. This happens every weekend and calls to the cops does

Dislike

NO good. Please Help!

Along the same line (referring to above message) How do you balance residential noise limits with lively public events.. music... ETC.

What else do you want to know?

All housing in downtown must contain in the C, C & R's of the homeowners associations disclosures that they are in an entertainment district and with such noise, music, people, trucks, garbage. Alcohol consumption etc.. exists and that this is a nightlife downtown first and foremost.

I wonder about access, particularly for seniors & the disabled. If persons were **** or had mobility problems. Will these persons be able to fully integrate into this community?

What else do you want to know?

How will accessibility be addressed?

Fuller street should not be extended into Winslow

What else do you want to know?

Street: too dangerous on a blind turn

Mike focused on walkability, but also need to promote bike use downtown & bike connections between other TWC neighborhoods.

Dislike

Need more bicycle parking scattered all over downtown

Lack of emphasis on bicycle access and parking. Need to describe the bicycle routes through town and how they connect to the city-wide network.

Dislike

Need to provide for more (bike) parking all along the walking area district so bicyclist can keep an eye on their bikes

Dislike

Bike lockers, enclosed, that you pay a dollar to use for high security for bicycles.

Dislike
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multi-modal Transportation</th>
<th>Bicycles</th>
<th>What about bicycle parking? This needs to be planned for just as much as auto parking. Consider consulting with the bike/ped committee for ideas/feedback.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multi-modal Transportation</td>
<td>Bicycles</td>
<td>How are bicycles taken into account for parking &amp; getting around?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-modal Transportation</td>
<td>Bicycles</td>
<td>Would like plan to address bicycle parking. We should encourage bike park and walk too.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-modal Transportation</td>
<td>Elevated Railway</td>
<td>Elevated railways will cut off the neighborhoods on the east side of El Camino from the rest of the city. Other examples in the Bay Area prove this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-modal Transportation</td>
<td>Elevated Railway</td>
<td>Elevated train tracks will divide rather than unite the community. Other examples in the Bay Area prove this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-modal Transportation</td>
<td>Elevated Railway</td>
<td>Train should be kept at grade.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-modal Transportation</td>
<td>Elevated Railway</td>
<td>If train is 'Raised' will there be a road or ped walkway to Sequoia Station? The plan shows Both, but it should be specific.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-modal Transportation</td>
<td>Elevated Railway</td>
<td>Should be both ped &amp; Vehicular (comment to above statement)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-modal Transportation</td>
<td>Elevated Railway</td>
<td>Leave Train alone. Leave at Ground level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-modal Transportation</td>
<td>Elevated Railway</td>
<td>What are Menlo Park and Palo Alto doing about elevated rail tracks?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-modal Transportation</td>
<td>Elevated Railway</td>
<td>How does the Plan change if the train is or isn't elevated?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-modal Transportation</td>
<td>Elevated Railway</td>
<td>Is the R-R track going to be elevated in our neighboring cities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-modal Transportation</td>
<td>Misc.</td>
<td>Reconnecting Fuller to Winslow would be dangerous.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-modal Transportation</td>
<td>Misc.</td>
<td>Traffic is a problem—goes too fast around curve.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Needs better consideration of impact of limited parking downtown (particularly guest parking, or lack thereof for residential) on existing nearby neighborhoods. Our neighborhood just north of Brewster (Mezesville historic) is already over parked-residents can’t find parking near their house. Some exceptions have already been granted & already impact our neighborhood. Can residential permits be explored? Other ideas? People park in our neighborhood to avoid meters. Thank!

Underground parking-We should not encourage this because it requires pumping ground water 24/7. If this water is used on site or stored or re-charged-that would be O.K. Also-uses a lot of energy to pump. Current metering in downtown-prefer zoning like Palo Alto.

Continue to support validated parking downtown. Tell us more about shuttles!

Pg 2.210 Diagram A & B. Light Pole is in walkway. Present obstruction to walking, etc., in groups & more blockage if bicycles are locked to it. Suggestion. Move light Pole in line with trees.

I believe traffic VS. **** ***at Jefferson & Main you should consider main thoroughfare around city. How will the narrow Redwood City Streets handle the heavier traffic flow and parking?

Traffic in front of theatre & museum would love to see street closed-lots of palms and people

love downtown new businesses, restaurants, etc., love able to walk-condensed downtown area. Like mixed-use & walkability to existing neighborhoods. Like new reduction of lanes on Jefferson hope all downtown streets are reduced-safer for pedestrians.

Traffic flow into downtown
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multi-modal Transportation</th>
<th>Walkability</th>
<th>Reducing # of traffic lanes for autos and adding Bike lanes &amp; improving pedestrian safety. Traffic Calming?</th>
<th>Like</th>
<th>What else do you want to know?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multi-modal Transportation</td>
<td>Walkability</td>
<td>Keep traffic speed &amp; volume down-discourage people from going through downtown to get somewhere else.</td>
<td>What else do you want to know?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-modal Transportation</td>
<td>Walkability</td>
<td>Countdown PED signals at all signalized intersections Crossing Brewster as a pedestrian -dangerous Love walk way, bike friendly. The future is downtown RWC Great Job!</td>
<td>What else do you want to know?</td>
<td>Dislike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-modal Transportation</td>
<td>Walkability</td>
<td>Need walkable connector to open space maybe with bike boulevards like Bryant Street in Palo Alto What kind of foot traffic will there be in view of the car traffic going across the city?</td>
<td>What else do you want to know?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-modal Transportation</td>
<td>Walkabilty</td>
<td>Not enough downtown open space Need more open space downtown, even if it's small pocket parks or an bench here and there.</td>
<td>What else do you want to know?</td>
<td>Dislike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Spaces</td>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>I agree (with the comment above) maybe a neighborhood pocket park Need Green spaces downtown. All pavement doesn't seem too attractive Where is the park/open space?</td>
<td>Dislike</td>
<td>Dislike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Spaces</td>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>If we assume parks &amp; playgrounds are important assets to a neighborhood, where can they be placed downtown? What about community centers, etc.?</td>
<td>What else do you want to know?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Spaces</td>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>What about a park downtown for kids? Would like to know where &quot;active&quot; parkland and other places for young families and seniors can enjoy as these spaces become more important in higher density areas.</td>
<td>What else do you want to know?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Spaces</td>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>Pets &amp; Ordinances. Santa Cruz doesn't allow. Carmel pet Friendly Will there be a dog park anywhere in the Downtown? Public spaces need to focus on function and not just form</td>
<td>What else do you want to know?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Spaces</td>
<td>Pets</td>
<td></td>
<td>What else do you want to know?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Spaces</td>
<td>Pets</td>
<td></td>
<td>What else do you want to know?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Spaces</td>
<td>Placemaking</td>
<td></td>
<td>What else do you want to know?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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I think it is great that you are looking at creating a memorable downtown, but I would encourage the plan to look at not only the historic buildings, but also the natural features as well. There are quite a few precedent cities that have been quite successful with creating a *** downtown by incorporating their creeks into the infrastructure. They developed their creek as a *** rather than a ***  

Don't like the fact that creeks are completely ignored. They should be *** restored downtown & used as attractive pedestrian/bikeways. Dislike

Daylight our historic Redwood Creek is not done Dislike

I would like to see a pedestrian/bicycle corridor that follows the path of the creek Dislike

Focus more on natural features like creeks Dislike

Where is the Redwood Creek Park?-connecting downtown to bay. Dislike

I like that the City Hall parking lot is designated a new public space. I would like to see that the mentioned storm water demonstration project is sizable. Perhaps it could be incorporated into a larger Daylighting project of the creek Like

Do more to encourage green building approaches Dislike

What kind of requirements for energy efficiency? What else do you want to know?

Aggregate solar power into the community and provide shuttles to services outside the downtown such as schools. Consider "new schools Better Neighborhoods" for the downtown. What else do you want to know?

Shaded parking-trees cut "heat island" effect & soften ugly expanses of parking & keep cars cooler & absorb Co2 What else do you want to know?

Solar access to streets- In areas where tall buildings will be allowed, show us what shading will occur on March 21 & Dec 21 of any year. What else do you want to know?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Green Building</th>
<th>Under what circumstance can a historical locally designated house be removed?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>Historic/Significant Build</td>
<td>How about planting some Redwood trees in Redwood City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>Trees</td>
<td>Where is our water coming from for future residents?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>What else do you want to know?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Is the city looking into using paving for sidewalks that is made from recycled tires? This product may be more pliable when tree roots groom & Buckle sidewalk. Also some senior citizens have a hard time with cobblestone type walk.