

## Question 13

### Questionnaire for City Council Candidates 2009 Palo Alto Neighborhoods (PAN)

*Terminology:* "the City" refers to the government of the City of Palo Alto.

**Stanford Hospital Project:** The expansion of the Stanford Hospital will have substantial impacts on Palo Alto, most significantly increased traffic and requirements for additional housing. What do you think is appropriate for the City to require of Stanford as part of this project?

[J] Gail Price

An important factor for consideration is to what degree the details of a Community Benefit document include sufficient and appropriate types of benefits beyond what will be considered as mitigation measures for impacts identified through the CEQA process. A project of this significance and size should incorporate major community benefits to offset the anticipated immediate and long-term project impacts, including traffic, parking, housing, impacts to City services, jobs, design, and operations. The intensity and complexity of the project is daunting and will require multiple levels of review and critique through the planning process.

The Stanford Hospital Project will improve access to high quality, state of the art healthcare medicine and technology, including emergency services that will greatly benefit both current and future residents and businesses in Palo Alto.

---

[K] Greg Scharff : [ElectGregScharff.com](http://ElectGregScharff.com)

The Stanford Hospital and Lucile Packard Children Hospital Renewal and Replacement Project will provide at least \$139M in community benefits and it will make the hospital seismically safe and insure that Palo Alto's residents continue to have access to the best medical care in the world. We need to work with Stanford to ensure the success of this project, which is critical to the continued high quality of health care the residents of our City and region have come to expect. We of course need to critically review the traffic impacts and insure that they are mitigated. I would not support requiring the Stanford hospitals to build high-density housing as a requirement of approval and believe that we should resist burdening this important project with requirements that are above and beyond what would normally would be required.

---

[L] Nancy Shepherd: [www.electNancyShepherd.com](http://www.electNancyShepherd.com)

A modernized Stanford Hospital is a common good for this community and if this project is not approved and on schedule for seismic retrofit by 2013 the hospital could be closed. The city should require Stanford to help with mitigating increased traffic impacts and housing issues. Palo Alto and Stanford should also jointly look at structural changes to public transportation in our area that could bring better efficiencies between transit corridors.

---

[M] Brian Steen

I'm in favor of this regional hospital but only if related impacts such as traffic and housing can be mitigated.

---

[N] Mark Weiss: No response from candidate to this question.

---

[A] [Dan Dykwel](http://www.dandykwel.com) : <http://www.dandykwel.com>

I support the Stanford Hospital project but recognize that the impacts need to be carefully understood and mitigations negotiated in good faith. I have looked at the extensive list of possible mitigations that has been presented to Stanford and feel some are excessive. The development plan should not be used to extract things for which Stanford has no mission or responsibility. I struggle with the issue of housing and its relationship to this particular institution adding jobs. We don't ask the same of companies in the research park who add employees.

---

[B] Victor Frost: No response from candidate.

---

[C] Chris Gaither

Stanford has offered a great win-win situation to the City of Palo Alto for the Stanford Hospital project. The offer to contribute 23 million to the affordable housing fund is unprecedented. If managed and invested well, this fund could provide enormous future affordable housing opportunities for Palo Alto. Considering this was not even necessary for Stanford to do, it is a great compromise. There is no data to support that everyone or the majority of people want to live where they work. Personally, I am not a commuter by nature, so I enjoy rolling out of the bed and walking a very short distance to wherever I work. Commuting is not my cup of tea. However, some people choose to live outside of where they work for various reasons – family; personal affordability; childhood ties; they desire home and work separation; or they simply like the idea of working in a particular city over another, but as the saying goes, they would not want to live there- i.e. nice place to work, but not to live. Every time a company is started or expands does not mean that they have to answer the call to consider if their employees will be able to live in that city. In fact, the majority of employees might still want to live elsewhere. I have spoken to some city employees, and they enjoy working in Palo Alto and living in their chosen city outside of Palo Alto. And, I met a gentleman who works at Chris's Fish and Chips in Los Altos the other day. He lives in Hayward, and runs the store for the owner. The worker enjoys living in Hayward, and enjoys coming to Los Altos to work. The best of both worlds in his words.

With respect to increased traffic from the Stanford Hospital expansion, well if you build it, hopefully they will come. People already choose to live in Palo Alto or close to it for the great medical services provided by Stanford. This fact is never going to change. Certainly the combined potential increase of both employees and patients (including family and friends) will have an impact, but we seem to over estimate traffic impacts. I am still waiting for the heavy traffic impact from the much talked about Sand Hill road project, and I take 280 to go to and from San Francisco on a normal basis – which is often. I feel that what Stanford has offered to address traffic concerns is ample. And, we can always take the approach that if traffic does increase exponentially, then a plan to deal with it can be created and attempted as we go along. Anticipation of every problem cannot be achieved. However, if we take the approach that everything is a Work In Progress, problems can be addressed, mitigated and solved as they occur.

---

[D] Tim Gray : [www.vote4Gray.com](http://www.vote4Gray.com)

I have to recuse myself from this issue. However, most towns would pay money to have such a world-class facility located in their back yard.

---

[E] John Hackmann

Stanford Hospital is of great benefit to Palo Alto and the entire region. Hospital earthquake seismic safety is required by state law in the near term, so of course a complete rebuild must be done. The hospital has presented a very good plan. Height is one concern to many. Most seriously, we need to look at traffic management and impact.

In the area of traffic impact, I can contribute. In 1974, I initiated the concept for a free transit service for a University community, implemented in 1989, and still continuing today for 33,000 students, and apparently copied around the country. I also created at Stanford in 1979 what may be one of the first car share programs in the United States for 53 students. We here in Palo Alto can continue to be creative and innovative in traffic impact and I can help.

---

[F] [Karen Holman](http://karenholman.org) : [karenholman.org](http://karenholman.org)

As the Stanford Medical Center project will be coming to the Council, it is recommended by the City Attorney's office that candidates not respond with opinions about the project outcome in the interest of good public process. The impacts such as traffic and housing will be assessed in the environmental impact report, and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that impacts be mitigated and that alternatives be considered that would eliminate impacts. It is also possible that a statement of overriding considerations can be made by the Council if there are compelling public benefits, but only after all reasonable and feasible alternatives are considered.

---

[G] Larry Klein [www.ReelectLarryKlein.com](http://www.ReelectLarryKlein.com)

As I answered to question # 3, my wife is a Professor at Stanford and I cannot vote on significant Stanford matters. Similarly, I am not allowed to publicly comment on such Stanford issues.

---

[H] Leon Leong : [www.leonleong.com](http://www.leonleong.com)

I believe that Stanford should show how the housing and traffic needs can be addressed, not just within Palo Alto, but on a regional basis, not just within Palo Alto. Stanford has already offered an "in-lieu" contribution to the housing fund of \$22 million, even though they are not required to do so under current law. This contribution is perhaps one of the largest in the history of development in Palo Alto.

---

[I] Corey Levens : [www.electcoreylevens.com](http://www.electcoreylevens.com)

My wife, Anjini Kochar, has been an employee of Stanford University since we moved to the Palo Alto/Stanford area 20 years ago. Initially, she was a member of the faculty in the Economics Department, and for about the last 10 years has been a Research Fellow at the Stanford Institute for Economic Policy Research. She is currently the head of SIEPR's India Program. As a result, I will need to recuse myself from the affairs of the Council that deal with issues concerning Stanford.

The City Council must recognize that Palo Alto and Stanford have a unique, symbiotic relationship and that the sum of the parts is much greater than each taken together individually. Palo Alto and Stanford are greatly defined by their proximity and connection to each other.

While we will inevitably have our disagreements and “sibling” spats, each must recognize that, in most cases, what is good for one will, and should be, good for the other.

We must work closely with Stanford on the development of projects such as the Stanford Hospital and expansions of the Stanford Shopping Center. While it is entirely appropriate for Palo Alto to fight for necessary improvements or changes in design that will benefit Palo Alto, I believe that Palo Alto has hurt itself in the past by taking overly aggressive positions, especially with regard to the Stanford Shopping Center. We are now paying for these and many other failures in the form of a \$10 million budget deficit.

While the Stanford Hospital project is an essential project for Stanford and is one that will also greatly benefit the Palo Alto community, Palo Alto must insure that basic City services are not disrupted, that the quality of life in Palo Alto is not adversely affected, and that the costs of this, or any other project, do not outweigh the benefits. It is entirely reasonable and appropriate, for example, that Stanford be asked to contribute to the cost of improvements to infrastructure which are necessary to accommodate such a project.

---