

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

PALO ALTO
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
October 19, 2017

1 Thursday, October 19, 2017

6:44 p.m

2 P R O C E E D I N G S

3 MR. SIMITIAN: Start with Alice Smith.

4 MS. SMITH: Thank you. I'm Alice Smith. I live
5 at 850 Webster Street, Palo Alto. I'm a long-term
6 resident. Since it took an hour to go down University
7 Avenue the other day just to get out of the town, it
8 seems to me that transportation is not being addressed
9 by your -- adequately in this plan.

10 I would like the following: I would like you to
11 have dedicated land for a school at Stanford which is --
12 will mitigate on transportation alone; dedicated daycare
13 center for children who be additional to this, if this
14 went through -- I don't think it should go through. Not
15 as -- that you look at the runoff from the mechanization
16 of the lands because this is actually a very intense
17 area for tropical rains. And right now, the land would
18 become more and more cemented. And as a result, it'll
19 have tremendous runoff, and we already have a problem at
20 San Francisquito Creek.

21 I want you to look at not allowing any student at
22 Stanford to be able to drive a car, that if you really
23 want to have transportation control, you have to stop
24 the cars at Stanford.

25 In addition, this is just for this university. It

1 has nothing to do with the -- I believe it's \$2 million
2 additional development at Stanford industrial park.
3 These are going on at the same time.

4 So, therefore, I think you need to -- and the
5 hospital is going -- hasn't even opened yet. When the
6 hospital opens, we don't even know what the impact will
7 be. So what you're doing is you're saying give us till
8 2035 at a time when the entire area has ground to a halt
9 with the quality of life in the Palo Alto mid-peninsula
10 area is becoming extremist from both the transportation
11 and the housing.

12 You offer no housing with 20 percent of something
13 or other into low income houses. Well, you must build
14 housing. You cannot just say, "Okay. We'll give
15 somebody else the problem." I see the light going on.

16 MR. SIMITIAN: You have a minute left.

17 MS. SMITH: But, in fact, this is just, what can I
18 do for Stanford University? It has nothing to do with
19 the quality of life in Santa Clara County or San Mateo
20 County which is also impacted. I think Stanford has a
21 duty of care, and they're not exercising it. When
22 they've did a tradeoff for three sports parks, that was
23 for 50 years. I don't want to see these deals that say,
24 "Well, we can do it to a certain time, and then after
25 that we don't have any obligations."

1 Stanford has a very high duty or care, and
2 frankly, I don't think this makes it. Thank you.

3 MR. SIMITIAN: Thank you for your comments, and
4 by the way, Ms. Smith, I know you've reached out to me
5 at my office on another matter. I have not forgotten.
6 I just want to let you know.

7 Is it Neva Farkin?

8 MS. FARKIN: Neva Farkin.

9 MR. SIMILIA: Excuse me Neva.

10 MS. FARKIN: I live at 133 Churchill Avenue. I
11 have two questions. What about the infrastructure, new
12 roads -- which I think you'll need -- elementary
13 schools, supermarkets, gas stations, shopping malls, and
14 medical clinics? Where will the land be for all this?
15 What about emergency services? Police and firefighters?
16 Where with the money come for this? Thank you.

17 MR. SIMILIA: Thank you, and let me just ask
18 County staff to briefly mention the extent and nature
19 of -- to which the process addresses infrastructure
20 needs briefly.

21 MR. GIRARD: There are an analysis of --

22 MR. SIMITIAN: And what services they would
23 require and --

24 MR. GIRARD: -- the suability of those services in
25 the area. So those are all available in the draft EIR

1 analysis.

2 MR. SIMITIAN: And do I remember correctly that
3 the population increase is, from the project, a little
4 bit greater than 9600.

5 MR. GIRARD: That's correct, and that's a
6 combination of students and faculty and staff.

7 MR. SIMITIAN: Okay. Forest Peterson.

8 MR. PETERSON: My name is Forest Peterson. I'm a
9 graduate student at Stanford and civil environmental
10 engineering, and I'm also a resident at Palo Alto
11 apartment on Grant Avenue. So I'd like to speak about
12 the low income employees at Stanford. I think that
13 includes, right now, graduate students, post docs, and
14 then, you know, the maintenance staff and things like
15 that.

16 So as the lower-salaried or hourly employees, we
17 are dependant on the housing and the community. And so
18 as part of the proposal mitigation, Stanford has talked
19 about contributing to the low income housing stock. So
20 when I looked at the general use permit application
21 summary, on page 17, it proposes 1600 net new beds and
22 EV, but then over on -- and this is in addition.

23 MR. GIRARD: Why don't you tell everybody what EV
24 stands for.

25 MR. PETERSON: Escondido Village, the graduate

1 housing for the students with -- and these are
2 everything from single parents to, you know, full-family
3 units live there. So the 1600 is in addition to the
4 1400 units that were recently approved. So it actually
5 comes out closer to about 3,000.

6 So then on page 21 to 23, it goes into affordable
7 housing contribution, and this is where I'm generally a
8 little bit confused on exactly what it means, and that's
9 why this is a question I have to ask is, specifically,
10 is how is Stanford contributing to that affordable
11 housing contribution, because it says here that Stanford
12 contributes 800 units under the 2,000 GUP, and then
13 they're contributing 450 units under the 2018 GUP, but
14 then it says that the value of the affordable housing
15 that they're contributing is \$100 million, which is \$45
16 per square foot, and that's contributed completely
17 through student housing for graduate students and
18 students like myself.

19 But they are proposing under the GUP to contribute
20 \$50 million to the community housing low income fund; so
21 it sounds like the entire amount by far that's being
22 contributed to the affordable housing fund will be
23 satisfied simply through graduate student housing. So I
24 just want to see -- if I'm understanding this correctly.

25 MR. SIMITIAN: Let me ask staff to lean in, and

1 then I may have a comment of my own.

2 MR. GIRARD: I'm surprised that that's confusing
3 because there are really two ways to look at the
4 project. One is of the housing that Stanford is
5 proposing on the campus, how much of that housing would
6 be considered affordable using the standards that apply
7 to affordability in the area. And the number you
8 mentioned about the graduate student housing satisfying
9 this number of affordable units, that's true; but that's
10 apart from the contribution that Stanford would make to
11 low income housing projects off the campus.

12 So -- and there's no necessarily -- there's no
13 proposal for a trade-off between the two. In other
14 words, they provide more affordable housing on campus
15 then they would pay less in the off-site impact -- the
16 proposal is \$20 per square foot of academic space that
17 would go from the off-site campus. And then what
18 they're saying is that if they build the academic -- or
19 the graduate housing that they're planning to build, a
20 certain number of them will meet the affordability
21 criteria that are established in our housing element.

22 So they cover both bases, and I'll give you an
23 analogy. A developer will build some affordable units
24 on their development, but they will also pay for
25 off-site housing impact fees, and Stanford's proposing

1 to do both.

2 MR. SIMITIAN: And let me just say from the
3 standpoint of one of the five elected officials who has
4 to consider these factors, again, I'm going try and
5 simplify a little bit and leave out some of the details.
6 There are 9600 more folks who are going to be on campus,
7 and that's going to create some housing demand. The
8 question the how much? And the question is how much for
9 what range of folks at various income levels? So we've
10 got to grossly oversimplify, facility, staff, students,
11 and then other workers. And different folks have
12 different levels of income and will be able or unable to
13 access housing to greater or lesser degrees depending on
14 their income. So the first question we're going ask is
15 if we'd got 9600 new folks, what level of demand does
16 that create for housing?

17 Then we'll look at what the university is
18 proposing to provide in the way of housing and ask
19 ourselves, does the level of the demand match up with
20 the level of housing provided, including the various
21 income levels or levels of affordability?

22 Then, as our staff has indicated, in addition,
23 there is a development fee just as the City charges a
24 developer fee. There's a developer fee built into the
25 process at present, and there would be consistent with

1 the proposal from Stanford going forward, but it's on us
2 as the decision-makers to ask ourselves what kind of
3 demand would be generated, and are the proposed
4 mitigations adequate to meet that the demand? And if
5 not, what are we going to do about it?

6 Let me just turn to the planning staff and say
7 understanding you're apolitical in this process, if I
8 said anything that's factually inaccurate about the
9 process, permission to speak freely in front of 125 of
10 my closest friends.

11 MR. GIRARD: The -- I'll say that that is an
12 absolutely fair analysis. The amount of which a
13 particular applicant has to provide housing for their
14 development is a policy decision.

15 MR. SIMITIAN: All right. Ms. Peak.

16 MS. PEAK: Hi. So I just have a few comments. I
17 think it's important to remember that Stanford always
18 pretends that they're just this little university, but I
19 think of them as this massive research and development
20 conglomerate of real estate investment to management
21 corporation and an enormously oversized hospital
22 complex, and lastly, you know, a sort of midsized
23 university that apparently has so much endowment money
24 that we just can't spend it fast enough trying to
25 overdevelop the area all around their campus.

1 So I feel like they just came off of many millions
2 of square feet that they've added from the 2000 GUP.
3 They're not even finished building all the housing they
4 said they were going to build.

5 We've got -- you know, if you look at the campus
6 it used to be open, green. I mean, I went there
7 30 years ago, but now it's just building after building.
8 It's all filled in. It's obviously changed quite a bit.
9 They're one of the largest employers in the area. You
10 know, I feel that that their growth has been really
11 irresponsible and degrading the surrounding community
12 and our quality of life.

13 And I feel that, you know, they've had all that
14 other development. They've got the hospital that hasn't
15 even opened. They're just building like crazy, and we
16 don't even know what's going to happen; and yet here
17 they are back again asking for millions of more square
18 feet, you know, when we don't even see what's happened
19 with the last millions that they built.

20 I think it's time to wait a while and see what's
21 going to happen. You know, they claim they don't add to
22 the traffic, but if you look closely at all the
23 exemptions to their traffic plans, they do. You know,
24 if you live on campus, you can have a car, you know,
25 there's parking. If they're not adding any traffic,

1 what are all the new parking garages going up
2 everywhere? I mean obviously they're adding traffic.
3 Traffic not just from them, but everywhere is getting
4 worse, but they are a big part of it.

5 You know, my big question is does anybody ever say
6 what's the max? How big can they get? I'd really like
7 to know a number that at some point I can say they will
8 stop one day, and we can start to deal with this all.

9 I mean, it seems like everything here is more,
10 more, more. How can we cram more in? You know, can we
11 have a number for what they're maximum size and their
12 maximum population will be? It would be nice if it was
13 not just Stanford. Palo Alto, every other city around
14 here, it would be really nice. I think, personally,
15 that that area's already surprised a reasonable
16 population.

17 Ecologically, you know, California is in bad
18 trouble, you know, but quality of life here,
19 transportation, getting around in your car, you know,
20 infrastructure, community services, all these things are
21 impacted by too many people. So I would just like to
22 know how big do they get, or do they just come back
23 every 15 years and ask for another 3, 4, 5 million
24 square feet?

25 You know, sometimes it seems like Stanford thinks

1 that they are housed in this large metropolitan area.
2 You know, they have this hospital that was approved by
3 the Palo Alto City Counsel that's bigger than the
4 hospital at UCLA which is in Los Angeles which has 4
5 million people. You know, how much stuff do they need?

6 Okay. So finally what I'd like the Board of
7 Supervisors to say a one-word response to their
8 application which is no.

9 MR. SIMILIA: Let me add a couple things. First,
10 thank you for your comments. Second, I'm going ask
11 folks not to applaud, boo, hiss. And the reason for
12 that is that it's not easy for everyone to come up to
13 the microphone, particularly if they feel like the point
14 of view they share may not be the majority point of
15 view. So if we can just ask you to nod and smile or
16 shake your heads in concern, but I want to just try to
17 keep a safe space for everybody, no matter what their
18 point of view is at the microphone.

19 Second things is I do want to respond to the
20 question was asked about maximum build-out, and let me
21 just say, this is one of the issues that we -- I
22 certainly had hoped would be addressed by the 2000 GUP
23 and that still remains open, and that's the matter of
24 understanding what I call the ultimate carrying capacity
25 for the site. Or, in other words, what is full

1 build-out? The maximum amount of development that would
2 be accommodated on the site. When we did the 2000 GUP
3 17 years ago now and the community plan, we required the
4 university to submit something called a sustainable
5 development study that -- and I'm going to quote
6 directly from it because this issue's been coming up.
7 As part of the GUP and community plan, Stanford was
8 required to submit a sustainable development study that,
9 quote, "shall identify the maximum plan to build-out
10 potential for all of Stanford's unincorporated Santa
11 Clara County land." End quote.

12 Now, that study was to have been submitted and
13 approved by two and approved by the Board of Supervisors
14 prior to acceptance of applications for the second half
15 of the academic development allowed by the old 2000 GUP.
16 And in 2009 when the university submitted a sustainable
17 development study to the Board of Supervisors, there was
18 not -- there was not a maximum plan build-out potential
19 for all of the Stanford's unincorporated Santa Clara
20 County land identified at that time.

21 Instead, the study that was submitted looked at
22 the ability of the campus to absorb different amounts of
23 development over a 25-year time horizon, and while the
24 study did provide important information about how much
25 development could be accommodated on the campus, which

1 is a question that you've raised, it didn't get to the
2 actual requirement in the 2000 GUP and community plan of
3 identifying build-out potential.

4 That's information that I think would be helpful
5 to have -- and on a track separate and apart from the
6 draft environmental impact report. We're certainly
7 looking at options for understanding that important
8 piece of the picture, which, in my view, remains
9 incomplete. Okay. Hope that is responsive to the
10 question, and the story goes on.

11 All right. I think that takes us to Isaac Achler.

12 MR. ACHLER: To summarize quickly, I'm -- I didn't
13 have a chance to I think about it, but you want, first
14 of all, to change the nomenclature of development to
15 destruction [sic] which basically is a destruction of
16 the environment. We do not develop the environment.
17 This is first -- now another thing I heard that 10,000
18 people are going to be added, through this project, to
19 Palo Alto. This is about a 20-percent increase in the
20 population, more or less, of Palo Alto.

21 And one other thing that I found is the traffic in
22 Palo Alto and in the Bay Area is already choked. Now --
23 and they -- also the pollution that the traffic brings
24 into the Bay Area, I think until there is a plan for
25 public transportation in the whole Bay Area, we should

1 not at all think about this project development. That's
2 what I want to summarize.

3 MR. SIMILIA: Thank you. Could you just share
4 your name so I know who's spoken and who hasn't?

5 MR. ACHLER: Issac Achler.

6 MR. SIMILIA: Thank you very much, Mr. Achler, and
7 I apologize for mispronouncing your name earlier.

8 MR. CORNETT: Hi. James Cornett. Resident of
9 Palo Alto, 420 Sequoia Avenue. Thank you for the
10 opportunity to speak. One question and then one
11 comment. The question is I noticed with the additional
12 number of living units on the campus, I looked for
13 something that might talk about where those residents
14 might park their car. I didn't see it in the draft DEIR
15 thus far. It might be that I missed it, but I don't
16 think the idea of restricting that the students or other
17 people can't have a car would be a good solution.

18 So perhaps maybe a solution would be if there's
19 not in the plan now, make a parking structure for those
20 new residents that are coming. That's the question.
21 It -- will there be a parking structure?

22 MR. SIMILIA: I'm going to let staff respond, and
23 then I'm also going to note that as I flip through the
24 cards, that there's a least of couple of folks from the
25 university who have asked to speak. And I'm guessing

1 that they're going to use their time to respond to some
2 of those comments and questions.

3 MR. CORNETT: I don't need an answer at this
4 point.

5 MR. SIMILIA: So does staff have a quick and easy
6 answer or...

7 MR. GIRARD: Yes. There is a proposal to make use
8 of spaces that weren't developed as a part of the 2000
9 general use permit and have an allowance for asking for
10 permission for another 2000 spaces as a part of the
11 project if certain conditions are met. So there are
12 some parking requests in the permit application those
13 are analyzed in the draft DEIR.

14 MR. CORNETT: 2,000 additional spaces, and
15 there's, what, 5,100 new resident units. So it sounds
16 like it might be a little bit short, but I'm sure you're
17 going to look at it. So that's my comment, basically is
18 there parking? The other was just a follow-on from some
19 of the comments earlier. In the decades that I spent in
20 the -- I was always amazed in differences in business
21 practices here in US versus abroad, and one of the
22 things we seem to be occupied with is quarterly results
23 and always trying to get to the next quarter without
24 making it long-term. I think other people have
25 addressed this. So I would just reiterate the fact that

1 maybe one of the things we can do as a community -- and
2 I certainly support the Stanford campus and their
3 research and development is that -- think about is there
4 some time when we can say we have enough? And why do
5 with have to continue to grow? Why do we have, at the
6 risk of deteriorating the quality of life, continue to
7 add more and more things to our environmental or living
8 conditions? Thank you.

9 MR. SIMILIA: Thank you for your comments.

10 David Millson.

11 MR. MILLSON: Yes. Thank you. My name is David
12 Millson, and I live in Hanover Street in College
13 Terrace. Near on Stanford -- on California Avenue,
14 opposite Columbus, there's a new residential
15 development. And if you trace the route between that
16 and Stanford Avenue, it would go a long Columbus down
17 College and then on Hanover Street. So from the point
18 of view of someone living in Hanover Street would feel a
19 little bit as though we're thrown under the bus.

20 So I'm concerned about your expressions of
21 mitigation of traffic problems, and I have to tell you
22 that I am very skeptical about whether they're real.
23 And if this is -- if I'm right in this skepticism, my
24 question really is that you're proposing three different
25 ways of approving this. One is the general way, and one

1 then one is building by building and so on.

2 And my concern is that as this thing develops, we
3 may see a sequence of failure of these traffic
4 mitigation projects and ethics. And I want to be sure,
5 and I think everyone wants to be sure, that if they do,
6 that there's a way of rolling them back, stopping them,
7 changing them, and doing whatever is necessary for them
8 to make sure that the traffic impact is not bad for us.

9 So I guess my question is what sort of incentive
10 does Stanford offer me and anyone else here to go for
11 the general overall permit process rather than a
12 building-by-building process? Can Stanford give me an
13 assurance -- give me faith that if they have a general
14 permit, that we will be able to handle all the problems
15 with traffic that may occur as they develop? Thanks.

16 MR. SIMILIA: Mr. Girard, comments, if any?

17 MR. GIRARD: I'll say that any project that's
18 proposed after the general use permit is issued has to
19 be evaluated to make sure that it's consistent with the
20 general use permit. And in some cases, that requires
21 project-specific traffic transportation study.

22 So if you want to understand the relationship
23 between the programmatic permit and the evaluation of
24 individual practice, the annual reports that are
25 prepared provides a very good connection between the

1 programmatic and the individual project approval process
2 and...

3 MR. MILLSON: Just let me add, the point I'm
4 making is that if things don't go the way they're
5 supposed to, is there a way of rolling them back and
6 facing the problems? What I feel -- as -- right now
7 that once an approval has been done, have been made, it
8 gathers a kind of momentum which makes it very, very
9 difficult to stop and make changes.

10 MR. SIMITIAN: Mr. Millson, let me interrupt and
11 if you'll stay at the microphone. I'm going to -- some
12 of you know, but most of you have no reason to know I
13 have a background in planning as well; so I have a
14 masters in city planning and [INAUDIBLE] law background
15 and was the certified planner back in a younger time in
16 my life. So I have some experience with planning as a
17 second language, and I'm going try and do a little
18 translation here.

19 So let me ask the staff, if three years in, it
20 turned out that traffic had not been successfully
21 mitigated, that the No Net New Trips was not being met,
22 which is one of the critical standards here; and there
23 were, in fact, 20 percent more new trips during the peak
24 hour. What would the consequences of that be for the
25 university?

1 Mr. Millson, does that help get us a little
2 closer?

3 MR. MILLSON: It does. Thanks.

4 MR. SIMITIAN: Under the proposed program, they
5 would have to spend more money on more traffic demand
6 management, and if there weren't projects that would
7 reduce the traffic in an area that's been affected, they
8 would have to pay to fix the large intersections and/or
9 freeways.

10 MR. MILLSON: What happens if you can't fix it? I
11 mean, the point is you could create problems that are
12 simply beyond being able to fix just because of the
13 number of people and number of trips being taken? Once
14 you have the people in place, then you have the people
15 in place, and they are going to make their trips
16 regardless; right?

17 MR. GIRARD: I'll say that the short answer is
18 they aren't entitled to additional development unless
19 those impacts are mitigated.

20 MR. MILLSON: True, but can you ask them to roll
21 back the development that led to the problem that
22 exists?

23 MR. SIMILIA: Point made. Thank you very much.
24 We're going to go on to the next speaker which is Donald
25 Barr.

1 Mr. Barr, welcome.

2 MR. BARR: Good evening. I'm Donald Barr. I
3 really apologize for wearing all these hats of top of my
4 head. I know it's kinds of awkward, but I do wear many
5 hats, and you hear this at the [INAUDIBLE] first, that's
6 because I am a professor on the faculty at Stanford, and
7 I've been teaching at Stanford for about 25 years. But
8 notice on top of the motor board I have a Palo Alto
9 little league hat. I've lived in Palo Alto since 1993.
10 I raised two children, and I have spend countless hours
11 on the little league field as both coach and parent
12 rooter. So I wearing both hats and that's the point I
13 would actually like to make is that I'm going to focus
14 on the community housing fund because, as you know, I've
15 worked in the community on affordable housing.

16 The 2000 GUP community housing fund had somewhat
17 recruiting 36- \$39 million, of which it used \$13 million
18 for new affordable housing. Fortunately, leaving about
19 20-some-odd million -- fortunately, that was available
20 to preserve Buena Vista Mobile Home Park, but that did
21 not create any new units. But it's because the old
22 model didn't work, that the proposal to expand the area
23 beyond the local six-mile radius to wherever along the
24 transit corridor, and I'm not sure those housing units
25 are going to go to people at the university because it's

1 our community that's impacted in terms of the service
2 workers, both on campus and off campus.

3 All you have to do is go to Trader Joe's and
4 Peet's and University Avenue, and you will see how the
5 university growth impacts the service community. So what
6 I'm simply going to suggest is rather than say we are
7 going to come up -- we're going to scrap the old model,
8 let's look for an innovative approach to the old model
9 as to how to use the community housing fund. And let's
10 use many hats, let's buy a new table, and let's put four
11 chairs around it, and one of the chairs would be
12 Stanford University representatives, one of the chairs
13 would be a community representatives, city government
14 representatives, and affordable housing representatives.

15 And as a mitigating measure, let's try to find a
16 new innovative way to use the community housing fund
17 locally, because I think it is possible, but we just
18 need innovative thinking. Thank you.

19 MR. SIMILIA: Thank you for your comment.

20 Don Price.

21 MR. PRICE: My name is Don Price. I live on
22 Addison Avenue in Palo Alto. I have a very long history
23 of Stanford. I started as a freshman in 1949, and I've
24 studied and have full employment there ever since. I
25 first point out that all of the Stanford staff who have

1 developed these fine plans, brochures, arguments, public
2 relations, they are all employees of Stanford, and the
3 role of an employee at Stanford, the primary role, is to
4 serve the professoriate, to meet the needs of the
5 professors.

6 I have learned that most professors have an
7 insatiable requirement for larger labs, more graduate
8 students, more office space, and so forth. And when
9 they talk about new housing, most of it's going to go to
10 new graduate students in the STEM fields or in the
11 professional schools. In the 1960s, we referred to
12 period here as the second stone age. Well, that stone
13 age has never ceased, and now we have a proposal before
14 us just like the one 20 years ago with -- to provide
15 housing for new programs, brand new research ideas, et
16 cetera, et cetera.

17 And I think that that has to come to an end
18 sometime. Otherwise in 20 years, we'll have another
19 proposal for another 2 or 3 million square feet of a
20 space, and in the meantime, Stanford is building a huge
21 complex in Redwood City that is also going to have
22 thousands of people too. So I just want to put that on
23 the record.

24 MR. SIMILIA: Thank you for your comments, sir.
25 Wayne Douglass.

1 MR. DOUGLASS: Thank you Joe. Last time I saw
2 you, I was running for office, and I'm in the odd
3 position here of just offering a comment that I support
4 somebody that I never thought I would, and that is Gregg
5 Sharps' appeal to the planning department to take a hard
6 look at the word he described -- and he wouldn't write a
7 letter to the planning office if he wanted to do a
8 superficial look. But, nonetheless, I agree the
9 mitigation flow of traffic and so forth is a very big
10 deal for Greg and maybe Eric or somebody who is in the
11 audience will tell us what he has in mind. But I'll
12 give you my impression.

13 I think Greg, as the mayor, knows more than I do;
14 and he knows that the City has gone full bore into
15 traffic-control management, a phrase that I find
16 abhorrently extreme, and he's probably afraid he bought
17 into some kind of snake oil; so he wants the planning
18 department to take particularly close scrutiny of it,
19 and I agree with that proposal.

20 It could really be a shuck, as we used to say when
21 I was a student protestor in the '60s, and it deserves
22 very close scrutiny indeed. I spent 25 years in high
23 tech, and I know buzzwords, and gibberish I'm very
24 fluent in, and I know how these things go. And it would
25 be very easy for elected officials to buy into some

1 cockamamie technical scheme that makes no sense at all.
2 So I'll just reiterate what Greg said in his letter to
3 the planning division and take a very, very close look
4 at it. Don't believe everything you read, whether it's
5 in the EIR or not or whether it comes from a Stanford
6 source or not. You know, make up your own mind. That's
7 what the elected officials are supposed to do, and so
8 that's what I urge you to do, Joe. Go at it.

9 MR. SIMILIA: Thank you. I'm tempted to say were
10 going to dialogue and interface about how you preserve
11 the human scale, but I think that would be contrary to
12 your request.

13 Caleb Smith.

14 MR. SMITH: Thank you. Good evening, Supervisor
15 Similia, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Caleb Smith.
16 I'm a Bay Area native, and I'm currently a master's
17 candidate in public policy at Stanford University. Now,
18 like many members of the Stanford community, I want the
19 university to grow and flourish, but my focus of study
20 is in housing and local government. And I'm writing my
21 thesis about the California Environmental Quality Act,
22 and am therefore forced to conclude that Stanford's
23 general use permit and the related environmental impact
24 report are both fatally flawed.

25 The underlying issue, I believe, is the method

1 that Stanford used to calculate the growth in the
2 population of students and staff at the university.
3 Although I can understand how trying to use past growth
4 as a measure would be the approach they would take, I
5 believe that they're failing to properly account for
6 recent changes in the composition of student body, such
7 as the increase in code terminal master students at the
8 university.

9 And if you take a look at the square footage to
10 housing unit ratio, that the university uses up a little
11 bit more than 800 square feet per housing unit, you see
12 it as considerably higher than the ratios that a number
13 of universities use around the United States.

14 Now, if we take a look at this ratio and we see
15 it's out of compliance, then we would find that Stanford
16 is going to most likely have more students and staff
17 than it's currently projecting, which means that the
18 housing mitigation measure it proposes are inadequate to
19 the task.

20 I would further be concerned that the university's
21 measures to ensure that there's an adequate supply of
22 affordable housing are not up to the task. You may
23 recall under the current general use permit that some of
24 the graduate student housing residences on campus, such
25 as Munger, are being used as affordable housing.

1 However, the university has failed to do one of
2 the most basic things to do when you operate affordable
3 housing which is to verify the income of the residents
4 to make sure that they are, indeed, low income.

5 Now, I'd say the vast majority of Stanford's
6 graduate students are low income, but there are some
7 that are not, perhaps some of the graduate school
8 business students and law students and such. And it's
9 important that Stanford fully mitigate the affordable
10 housing impacts of its new developments.

11 Now, these affordable housing developments they
12 were able to use for graduate students was unable --
13 Stanford -- if they were to instead mitigate it using a
14 similar fee to the amount than they spent per unit, it
15 would've been a considerable amount of money, upwards of
16 30 million. I understand that that's different, where
17 they have the amount that they would pay versus the
18 amount of affordable housing on campus. However, if
19 we're trying to look in totality at its efforts to
20 mitigate the affordable housing demand, I don't think
21 that what they're proposing is up to the job.

22 Now, this is very important because it would be a
23 significant impact under the California Environmental
24 Equality Act if it causes displacement which causes new
25 housing construction elsewhere in the Bay Area. And

1 unless this plan is modified to either increase the
2 amount of housing involved or to reduce the amount of
3 new development, I believe it will have this impact,
4 which is not properly accounted for in the Environmental
5 Impact Report, which would further aggravate the jobs
6 and housing imbalance that's plaguing our region. And,
7 indeed, I believe would make the Environmental Impact
8 Report subject to a possible legal challenge.

9 Now, I trust in your judgement to work with
10 Stanford to find a solution to this challenge, and if
11 there's any way I can be of assistance, I'd be more
12 than -- I'd be happy to do so. Thank you very much.

13 MR. SIMILIA: That takes us to Catherine Palter.

14 MS. PALTER: Great. Thank you my name is
15 Catherine Palter. I'm with Stanford's Land Use and
16 Environmental Planning Office. When Stanford pulled its
17 application in the fall requesting a certain amount of
18 academic and housing, we did a lot of our own due
19 diligence to try to determine what sort of environmental
20 possibility that development could cause in order to
21 build some mitigating factors into our application. And
22 we were very gratified to see in the draft environmental
23 impact report that's recently prepared by the County
24 that all of those efforts bore a lot of fruit.

25 There was a high-level analysis of -- the analysis

1 that was done. There's about 16 environmental resource
2 areas there are analyzed in the DEIR, each of those has
3 a number of subareas that looked at potential impacts
4 that the project could cause.

5 All in all, there's 80 different environmental
6 impacts that are associated with the project. Of those,
7 47 were found to be less than significant, and another
8 29 were considered less insignificant after the
9 identified mitigation would be implemented, which leaves
10 four impacts that are considered significant and
11 unavoidable. And all of those are a somewhat
12 conservative analysis because it's not known whether
13 they may or may not occur.

14 The first is potential impacts to historic
15 resources, which in the future, Stanford may need to
16 demolish a historic resource to replace it with another
17 more state-of-the-art building. We don't know if that's
18 going to happen. It only happened once in the 2000
19 general use permit.

20 The other is construction noise. There might be
21 times that the construction noise is adjacent to a
22 sensitive receptor, and the noise mitigation doesn't
23 take away to less-than-significant level, there may be a
24 temporary exceedance in a significant impact.

25 The other two are related to transportation, and

1 they are both at intersections and on the freeway, and
2 it's with the assumption that the No New Net Commute
3 Trips won't be successful. And so we did, as a
4 conservative analysis, because we fully intend for that
5 to work, in which case, those significant impacts would
6 go away.

7 The EIR also always thinks about deterrents to try
8 to minimize deterrents to the environment. There's
9 actually three areas kind of buried in the EIR where the
10 environment actually gets better in 2035 with the
11 implementation of project, and that's in the area of
12 criteria of air pollutants, vehicle miles traveled, and
13 greenhouse gas emissions.

14 So I know that two million square feet and three
15 thousand housing units over a period of 17 years can
16 feel like a lot of development, and they're feeling that
17 there must be impacts, that I urge everyone to review
18 this very rigorous study that was done to see that
19 Stanford has a unique opportunity to address its impacts
20 in a comprehensive way in, a very successful way, and we
21 have a track record of doing it since 2000.

22 I also did -- I hear a number of comments about
23 the feasibility on No Net New Commute Trips, and I do
24 have some additional information. I don't know if you
25 could allow me a little bit more time to go to that, if

1 that would be okay.

2 MR. SIMILIA: Briefly, please.

3 MS. PALTER: We have heard people say they don't
4 believe that Stanford can achieve No Net New Trips going
5 forward, and it's a very understandable question. We
6 had it ourselves before we even made our application,
7 wanting to know if we could actually make that
8 commitment to do No Net New Commute Trips. So we hired
9 some expert transportation consultants, Eric, Tharon
10 Peirs, and Alta, and they created a [INAUDIBLE] model
11 for us that looked the traffic model and integrated the
12 commute survey data that we have for our own people. And
13 that allowed us to see that we could feasibly add more
14 programs to get the needed people out of their cars and
15 meet the standard moving forward.

16 It's also a model we could be using in the future
17 to figure out, as we move forward, what is the most
18 efficient way to get additional peak-hour commuters out
19 of their cars. The way the math works is that we have
20 about 3,000 peak-hour commuters coming to campus every
21 day. It's about the same amount that we had in 2000.
22 The EIR found that there's going to be about 780 new
23 peak-hour commuters, if we're not successful with No New
24 Net Commute Trips. That's about 45 to 50 new peak-hour
25 commuters each year.

1 So we would be looking at our pool of about 3,000
2 people and saying what program could we add that could
3 get 50 people off this year. And it might be a program
4 like improving bike infrastructure around the campus,
5 which our model says could take 80 to 90 people off that
6 year and every year moving forward. It might be a new
7 express bus that takes 30 to 40 people off each year
8 from that bus.

9 Okay. So I just wanted to say that this is not
10 something Stanford took lightly just to say that we
11 thought we could do it, and we did it. Very rigorous
12 analysis to say that, and if anyone has more questions
13 about it, I'd be happy to talk about it after. Thank
14 you for allowing me the extra time.

15 MR. SIMILIA: Jeralyn Moran.

16 MS. MORAN: Hi. Thank you so much for listening
17 to all of us tonight. I'll be very brief. My name is
18 my name is Jeralyn Moran. I'm a resident here in Palo
19 Alto. I'm very concerned about climate change and the
20 commitments our city has made. This is a huge thing,
21 and Stanford needs to address this more aggressively.
22 In reviewing the EIR, I don't see the mitigation meeting
23 that need in housing or transportation. And this is
24 critical. It's time-sensitive, and I just don't see it
25 being addressed properly. I really implore you to step

1 back and take a hard look at that because this is -- we
2 don't have time to do it wrong this time. Thank you.

3 MR. SIMILIA: Thank you for your comment and I
4 apologize. I think I mispronounced your name.

5 Bing Heckman.

6 MR. HECKMAN: Good evening and thank you,
7 Supervisor Similia. We appreciate your good service,
8 and I must say first, I'm not well informed on all this
9 [INAUDIBLE] exposure to it. I do plan to look through
10 it further, but I have a couple of questions. One is
11 I'd be curious to know more about how many Stanford
12 students graduate on a grade- -- live off campus and if
13 more housing were built to accommodate them, freeing up
14 housing off campus, that might be a way to mitigate
15 housing impacts further.

16 I don't believe that would really affect peak
17 traffic because I don't think those people really hit
18 the peak traffic times in corners, but another thought
19 you might be interested to explore, since Stanford
20 already owns the land, they could feasibly profitably
21 develop housing that might accommodate Stanford
22 employees, perhaps they might expand that to teachers and
23 first responders. That would both free up housing and
24 perhaps mitigate traffic impacts as those people would
25 live closer to where they work. So it's a couple

1 thoughts you might be interested to explore. Thank you.
2 I also appreciate the [INAUDIBLE] process and thank you
3 for going through that for me.

4 MR. SIMILIA: Thank you. Steve Woodward.

5 MS. VRHEL: Or Rita first.

6 MR. SIMILIA: And Rita your last name?

7 MS. VRHEL: Vrhel.

8 MR. SIMILIA: Please?

9 MS. VRHEL: V-R-H-E-L.

10 MR. SIMILIA: V-E-R?

11 MS. VRHEL: No. V-R-H-E-L.

12 MR. SIMILIA: Got it. I just want to make sure we
13 have it right for the record.

14 MS. VRHEL: So, you know, if you're hearing a
15 little bit of dismay or disbelief from the good citizens
16 of Palo Alto, it's because we've been through this. We
17 have heard for years, as Greg Schmidt always said,
18 traffic is cumulative, you know, but we keep looking at
19 each individual project and going, "Oh my god. There's
20 no impact. This is wonderful." But then you see our
21 streets and our intersections, and they're awful. So,
22 no, we don't believe there's not going to be any impact.

23 And the woman who spoke about traffic mitigation
24 was a wonderful speaker but, you know, honestly I don't
25 believe any of it, because what we've been told by our

1 City Counsel is that there's no impact. There's no
2 impact of everything that goes in except then there is.

3 And, yes, Stanford is doing a lot of building
4 right now which has not be completed; so we really don't
5 know the impacts of what the "no impacts" are going to
6 be. So we're very skeptical, and I applaud everybody
7 who has come tonight and is skeptical, and I would
8 invite them to come to 10/23 that's about 7:00 p.m. City
9 Counsel meeting and speak to your concerns to the City
10 Counsel about the gutted comprehensive plan. Because if
11 Stanford's growing, and Palo Alto is growing, and
12 nobody's happy with it, everybody has to speak up before
13 it happens.

14 Now, I have a couple other comments. Thank you
15 for letting me do my advertisement. So they were
16 talking about 9,600 new graduate students and faculty.
17 Are these people all coming by themselves? No one has a
18 spouse or children? So what is the actual number, and I
19 don't know if that's the 9600 or if we get to add more
20 to that. Whatever you get to add to it or not add to
21 it, the amount of housing that you are proposing
22 definitely is not adequate, and what that means is that
23 you're going to push these people, all of those who are
24 I'm sure very nice, into the Palo Alto housing market,
25 which we all know is the whole Bay Area housing --

1 problem with housing, and the City Counsel is working
2 hard to address that.

3 The other thing is, you know, we have -- we have a
4 water problem in California. I'm a member of
5 Savepaloaltosgroundwater.org, and at a recent San Mateo
6 County Water meeting, I asked point blank one of the
7 fellows at Stanford who's in charge of water if he
8 would -- if he would entertain the thought of San Mateo
9 County and Palo Alto being allowed to recharge ground
10 water on Stanford land, and without a nanosecond, he
11 said no.

12 So I think if Stanford's going to build more and
13 take more ground water from the good city, then I think
14 they have to entertain the idea of being generous with
15 their land and allowing for ground water recharge.

16 The other thing is where are these children going
17 to be housed -- schooled? I think we have a big problem
18 in Palo Alto right now, if you've read the newspapers.
19 So I would hope that Stanford would -- I don't know how
20 it works. I know back east they don't pay -- you know,
21 schools don't pay anything for educating their kids. I
22 would hope that they make allowances so that they would
23 pay to educate their children.

24 Also I hope that they also build parks and
25 recreational facilities on Stanford land because we're

1 getting crowded in Palo Alto. I think that's all I have
2 to say. Thank you very much.

3 MR. SIMILIA: Thank you. Let me turn to staff and
4 see if either the staff or consulting team can perhaps
5 break down a little more clearly or fully who those 9600
6 folks are so that people have a better understanding of
7 that.

8 MR. GIRARD: These are for the residential
9 population on the campus as of 2035, and the details can
10 be found on Tables 5.12 dash 10. Non-student spouses
11 and children are figured into the total. They are -- or
12 it breaks out the population students and spouses and
13 children.

14 MR. SIMITIAN: All right. Mr. Woodward?

15 MR. WOODWARD: Thank you.

16 I heard a lot of enthusiasm in the room for the
17 notion of a maximum build-out plan. So I'd like to ask,
18 if the approval of the current proposal can be made
19 contingent on the creation, the publication of such a
20 plan.

21 MR. SIMITIAN: Well, as I mentioned earlier, there
22 was a condition built into the 2000 GUP and community
23 plan that required for a sustainable development study,
24 and I'm going to read the language one more time.
25 Please bear with me.

1 "The requirement of the existing plan approved in
2 2000 was that a sustainable development study shall
3 identify the maximum plan build-out potential for all of
4 Stanford's unincorporated Santa Clara County land."

5 There was a sustainable development study. It was
6 approved, I believe 3:2 by the Santa Clara County Board
7 of Supervisors in 2009, when I was not there, just to be
8 clear. And it is my judgement that the requirements of
9 the 2000 GUP and community plan were not satisfied by
10 the adopted sustainable development study.

11 That, obviously, is a point of view which the
12 university, I suspect, does not share. We've had
13 conversations about that. And the question separate and
14 apart from the draft EIR and the application is, where
15 are we in that process?

16 And you've raised, what I'll call yet another
17 question, which is, all right, we know what happened and
18 what didn't, but what happens now going forward in this
19 plan?

20 And perhaps, you know, the issue can be revisited,
21 as I say, as part of this application. But also
22 separate and apart with respect to what happened back in
23 2000.

24 MR. WOODWARD: So are there other things that
25 citizens can do to ensure that County government is not

1 stiffed as it were on the provision of such a plan?

2 MR. SIMITIAN: You can comment on that issue as
3 part of the draft EIR comment process, which is what you
4 are doing even as you speak, or even as I speak in
5 response, and anyone else who wishes to speak to that
6 issue certainly may. Anyone who wishes to provide
7 written comments on that issue one way or the other
8 certainly may.

9 For those of you who are wondering sort of what
10 this is about. The way our county zoning works on the
11 Stanford Campus for most of these lands -- and, again,
12 I'll turn to staff in a minute to correct me if I'm
13 wrong -- is a little different than what we're used to
14 in a typical city setting.

15 So if I were to talk to one of the council
16 members, who is here, and we were to walk downtown and
17 walk five blocks by two blocks and figure out, you know,
18 I've got ten-square blocks of downtown development. I
19 could look at the community general plan. Then I could
20 look at the zoning; and if I knew what the maximum
21 development pursuant to the zoning was and what the
22 floor area ratio was, I could do some relatively simple
23 math and say, here's the maximum development at
24 build-out in those ten-square blocks.

25 With me so far?

1 MR. WOODWARD: Mm-hmm.

2 MR. SIMITIAN: That is not possible on much of the
3 Stanford Campus because the zoning we have is, I
4 believe, Al, if I remember correctly.

5 And Al says, whatever you build, it's got to be
6 consistent with the community plan and the GUP. But it
7 doesn't lay out the kind of boundaries that I just
8 described that you would find in a more conventional
9 urban plan.

10 Now, there are supporters and detractors of this
11 approach. Some would say, well, look. You get to
12 approve every single project or deny it. So you have
13 ultimate control because you can vote a project up or
14 down.

15 Others would say it provides no maximum build-out
16 if, as some suggest, the GUP then can come back every
17 15 years and say, we'd like another couple of million
18 square feet.

19 Supporters of the current approach would also say,
20 however, look, having that flexibility is good because
21 when we come, again, you can vote it down if you want
22 to; but as long as we're putting an application in the
23 process, that it's consistent with the community plan
24 and the GUP, what's the problem?

25 And then we're in a circular argument because the

1 answer somebody would give is, the problem is there's
2 never any end to this.

3 This was the debate we had 17, 18 years ago, which
4 is why the document that we approved at the time called
5 for a sustainable development study to address this
6 issue, which is why you hear just a little bit of
7 frustration in my voice, that here we are again, having
8 a similar conversation.

9 MR. WOODWARD: Right. Well, I mean it is --

10 MR. SIMITIAN: Hang on a second. I want to check
11 with the County staff, if I said anything factually
12 incorrect, understanding you're not going to want to get
13 in the middle of this policy discussion.

14 MR. GIRARD: You were factually accurate, yes.

15 MR. SIMITIAN: All right. Good.

16 MR. WOODWARD: Well, I would just make the point
17 that at -- at the university's published rate of growth
18 of 1.2 percent per year, it will, in 60 years, be twice
19 as big as it is now. And so, you know, the
20 conversations are going to have to happen.

21 MR. SIMITIAN: All right. I think we're at the
22 three-minute point. And thank you, and I hope my
23 comments clarified rather than confused the nature of
24 the debate.

25 That takes us to Alice Kanfaman.

1 MS. KANFAMAN: Good evening, Supervisor Simitian,
2 and thank you for holding this meeting.

3 I'm -- my name is Alice Kanfaman. I'm with
4 Committee for Green Foothills. We're an environmental
5 organization working to protect open space and natural
6 resources in San Mateo and Santa Clara counties.

7 As an open space organization, we're concerned
8 about the potential of sprawl development into open
9 space areas.

10 Sustainable development is not just about water
11 energy conservation, waste reduction, TBM programs.
12 It's also about managed growth.

13 Unchecked growth is what we had during the 1950s,
14 at what used to be called The Valley of Heart's Delight
15 was turned into miles upon miles of suburban sprawl.

16 This kind of growth not only eats up open space,
17 it uses more energy, creates more pollution, and makes
18 transportation problems worse.

19 Now, when the Stanford community plan was approved
20 in the year 2000, it established an academic growth
21 boundary, or AGB, which was intended to prevent this
22 type of sprawl development into the open space of the
23 foothills.

24 Now, under the AGB, Stanford's development would
25 remain within this boundary and the AGB is --

1 (Reporter interruption.)

2 MS. KANFAMAN: She's asking me to slow down.

3 The AGB is protected -- this is what happens when
4 I type up my comments ahead of time -- as protected by
5 the requirement of a four-fifths super majority vote of
6 the Board of Supervisors in order to change it.

7 Now, the Committee for Green Foothills are very
8 pleased that Stanford is not proposing changes to the
9 academic growth boundary. However, the super majority
10 requirement for changing of AGB was only established for
11 a period of 25 years, which means that it expires in
12 2025.

13 And we'd like to propose that this super majority
14 requirement be extended for another 25 years.

15 I'd like to point out this is not just about
16 preserving landscapes for recreational wildlife. It's
17 also about climate change.

18 The State of California's policy on preservation
19 of natural and working lands -- "working lands," meaning
20 agricultural or ranch land -- states, in part,
21 "California's climate objective for natural and working
22 land is to maintain them as a carbon sink, i.e., net
23 zero or even negative greenhouse gas emissions."

24 And Santa Clara County recently declared its
25 support for the Paris Climate Agreement and pledged to

1 lead the way in reducing greenhouse gases and combating
2 climate change.

3 We can't reach our climate change goals merely by
4 driving electric cars and building LEED-certified
5 buildings if we do nothing to prevent sprawl into open
6 space.

7 And I'd also like to comment that the discussion
8 about maximum build-out is also relevant to this issue
9 because it's the development pressures. It's the belief
10 that there needs to be, you know, further growth and
11 that creates the perceived need for development into
12 open space.

13 So for people who are concerned about that issue,
14 this should be a concern of yours as well.

15 MR. SIMITIAN: Thank you. And you fit in three
16 minutes even more slowly; so good for you.

17 Thank you very much.

18 Jem McCown?

19 MS. McCOWN: Thank you very much.

20 Excuse me, Jem McCown, Stanford University. I'm
21 at the Government and Community Relations Office.

22 First, I want to very briefly thank the County
23 staff, including Supervisor Simitian for the devotion of
24 many hours already this week in doing these types of
25 meetings in the community.

1 This is the third night out for all of you and all
2 of us, and there's at least a half a dozen more of those
3 coming up in other jurisdictions.

4 MR. SIMITIAN: Good to see you again, Ms. McCown.

5 MS. McCOWN: Yes.

6 The relationship between Stanford and the County
7 is, as Joe said, "We're the applicant; the County is the
8 ultimate decisionmaker."

9 But we are absolutely aligned on the commitment to
10 provide you the facts and the analysis to assist in the
11 public's understanding and participation in this
12 process. And that is clearly the intent of this drafted
13 environmental impact report.

14 We want that information to be available and
15 accessible for those that want to learn more about how
16 these impacts are addressed and in a variety of forms.

17 Now, that's quite challenging. The document,
18 which many of you may not have seen it yet, it's
19 approaching a thousand pages, covering all of those
20 issues that were shown up on the screen.

21 But we would encourage people to go in and find
22 the sections that are of a particular interest. Many of
23 the comments and questions made this evening are
24 addressed in the document, and answers are given to some
25 of the concerns that have been expressed. That's the

1 way that the responses to these comments will respond to
2 demonstrate whether those issues have been taken care of
3 and how they've been addressed.

4 One quick example I'll give before closing is,
5 Alice Smith made the question about whether there's
6 going to be runoff, stormwater runoff, off the campus
7 because of additional development.

8 There's a whole section in the document that talks
9 about that, talks about how stormwater retention will be
10 maintained on campus so that there wouldn't be any
11 allowed runoff.

12 So that's just one short example of the concerns
13 that people have expressed understandably. The document
14 has only been out for ten days. I'd be surprised --
15 some of you may have looked at it, but probably most
16 people have not had a chance. And I would just
17 encourage people to use the County's website. Go find a
18 section that's of particular interest. Take a look at
19 what it is saying on that topic. Make your comments if
20 you don't think it's adequate as Joe said.

21 We're very interested in hearing these
22 conversations. We welcome you offering them directly to
23 the University, as well as through the formal County
24 process. A lot of you know how to reach me. And I'm
25 more than willing to engage in those individual

1 conversations.

2 MR. SIMITIAN: Thank you very much. And for those
3 who are watching, I neglected to turn on the
4 three-minute light, but Ms. McCown is a practiced-public
5 speaker, and I think was pretty much spot on; so thank
6 you for that as well.

7 Let me just look to my staff. For those who find
8 the planning site a little more difficult to access,
9 we'll have an easy access portal on my website. So if
10 it's easier for you to just go Supervisor Simitian, pop
11 it into your search, feel free. And that may give you a
12 more intuitive path or not, depending.

13 Sea Reddy. Mr. Reddy, welcome and thank you.

14 MR. REDDY: Thank you. Good evening, Supervisor
15 Simitian and Mr. Girard. I've seen you come speak a
16 couple of days ago in another meeting, and I'm going to
17 repeat for the audience that are listening to us.

18 I honestly think that this Stanford proposal is
19 not innovative enough. For the national interest, we
20 are Stanford. We are Palo Alto. We are the best that
21 we can offer to the country and to the world. We are
22 still not cancer free; we need research. We are still
23 not gasoline-engine free; we still need research.

24 So I think we need to go be more innovative and we
25 need to educate. Stanford needs to take on like what we

1 did in 1994 to 2015. You know, we helped build the
2 Internet. We helped populate the world with all the
3 information. We need to do the same thing.

4 I think Stanford could -- I would recommend
5 Stanford to look for a 50,000 campus. It doesn't have
6 to be in Palo Alto. It could be east Palo Alto,
7 somewhere else on the Bay. Somewhere else, another part
8 of the world.

9 But I think it's short-sightedness for my
10 6,000-square foot home to not have this near my home,
11 and I have to sit in traffic. I think we need to get
12 beyond that and look for the national interest so we
13 don't get hit by North Korea and Chinese and Japanese --
14 not Japanese -- but right now we have a lot of threat.

15 We need to be able to survive in this world. And
16 the biggest challenge is the traffic and the gasoline
17 engines. We have a land mass sitting next door
18 literally about two miles away. We need to get more
19 creative and to move the people around.

20 I was in Switzerland two months ago, you know,
21 there's a lot of moving people. Frankfurt, we have --
22 you know, London -- there is a lot of innovative
23 aspects. We all need to get together and move people
24 like the one person sitting in the Tesla or any, you
25 know, any SUV with six-people space, but there's only

1 one person.

2 So I think we need to think better, think
3 innovative. That's not in this plan. This is just a
4 patchwork. I think we should do better. Thank you.

5 MR. SIMITIAN: Thank you for your comments.

6 Mary Okicki.

7 MR. MOSS: I put my card in and you haven't called
8 me. I put it in long before they did.

9 MR. SIMITIAN: Mr. Moss, I'm going to do two
10 things: First, I'm going to ask you not to shout out
11 from the audience again.

12 Second, I'm going to tell you, as I told everyone
13 earlier this evening, I have shuffled the cards. And I
14 shuffled the cards for a very deliberate reason which is
15 to prevent folks from gaming the system by arriving
16 early and turning a half dozen cards in or putting them
17 all in one particular order.

18 So it's on me to be the shuffler of cards. And I
19 have shuffled those cards very deliberately and with
20 that intent to make sure that it is as close to random
21 as possible.

22 There you go.

23 Ms. Okicki.

24 MS. OKICKI: Hi, thank you.

25 So I'm Mary Okicki, and I am both a homeowner and

1 a resident of Palo Alto.

2 And first, I would like to commend Stanford on its
3 green building initiatives.

4 Both the Y2E2 building and the Cessy project were
5 truly outstanding ones, but I do think I'm going to
6 sound redundant here.

7 I don't think there's a way to overstate the
8 housing crisis. And I would like to see Stanford make
9 the commitment to give a hundred percent housing to it's
10 graduate students.

11 Just today, I was talking to my neighbor, and she
12 told me about a graduate student she knows who's living
13 in a van on campus because she can't find affordable
14 housing.

15 I am supportive of increasing the undergraduate
16 cost population. Stanford is an amazing resource. And
17 I think providing access to that resource to more young
18 people is a lofty goal.

19 However, I can't be supportive of increasing the
20 total research facilities if it's going to increase the
21 graduate population. So even if you increase graduate
22 housing, but if you don't end up increasing it enough,
23 you're still just going to overall add to the graduate
24 homeless population.

25 So that's what I'd like to see as a commitment

1 from Stanford for graduate housing.

2 Thank you.

3 MR. SIMITIAN: Thank you for your comments.

4 And Mr. Mickelson, you're up first in this next
5 batch of four, but don't rush because I want to do a
6 quick poll of the audience before we lose anymore of
7 you.

8 If we schedule subsequent meetings, there's always
9 the question of what's the best time to schedule the
10 meeting on a weeknight? There is no perfect time I have
11 discovered over the years.

12 But if we were choosing between 6 o'clock as a
13 start time and 7 o'clock as a start time, let me just
14 ask, how many of you would prefer 6 o'clock as a start
15 time, and how many of you would have preferred 7 o'clock
16 as a start time?

17 (Public vote.)

18 MR. SIMITIAN: And now you know why it's a
19 difficult decision.

20 All right. Thank you.

21 Mr. Mickelson, welcome. It's nice to see you,
22 sir.

23 MR. MICKELSON: I'm Hal Mickelson. I'm a resident
24 of Palo Alto. I've lived in Santa Clara County since
25 1975, and in the City of Palo Alto since 1982.

1 I'm strongly in support of Stanford's application.
2 We sometimes forget here in Silicon Valley just how
3 lucky we are. We have daily reminders of a lot of our
4 good luck, but we sometimes lose perspective.

5 If we were in almost any other part of the country
6 talking about almost any other college or university
7 needing to expand, we would be talking about the college
8 or university gobbling up existing housing, having to
9 invade neighborhoods on its boundaries. And the
10 mitigation we would be discussing would be a mitigation
11 of the housing units that were destroyed by the growth
12 of those colleges and universities.

13 Just look at the map of places like Harvard and
14 the University of Chicago and Caltech down in Pasadena.
15 They can't grow without absorbing some of the housing
16 next to them. Through good planning, through foresight.
17 Stanford is able to do these things without encroaching
18 on the adjoining community.

19 The main point I would make is that a key to a
20 great many of the proposed mitigations is traffic demand
21 management; and in that area, I would point out that
22 Stanford has been notably successful. Its traffic
23 demand management program, its Marguerite shuttle
24 program are examples to the whole country of how this
25 can be done right.

1 I've heard several speakers say, you know, they
2 doubt that traffic demand management can do the job;
3 they doubt that it's feasible.

4 I think we have to look at facts. We have to look
5 at numbers. We have to look at the numbers that
6 Stanford can show of the success that it has had in
7 encouraging commute alternatives and traffic demand
8 management. I think its performance has been admirable.

9 So in short, I'm one of the people who believe
10 that Stanford has been a good neighbor. That it has
11 been consistently responsible in dealing with the
12 communities around it. And I think it's earned
13 credibility when it talks about the steps that it would
14 take by way of mitigation.

15 Thanks very much.

16 MR. SIMITIAN: Thank you, Mr. Mickelson.

17 Eric Filseth. Come on up.

18 MR. FILSETH: I guess this -- this -- this is the
19 town gown discussion, right? That's why they have them
20 here, is it?

21 All right. I'm Eric Filseth, resident of Palo
22 Alto. And with the -- with the observation among others
23 that environmental degradation tends to follow human
24 activity around. I guess I'd like to add my voice to
25 those calling for clarity on what the max build-out is

1 going to look like.

2 And I gathered it last time. In 2000, we
3 proceeded with the previous GUP with a plan to define
4 that; and for one reason or another, it didn't really
5 come together. And seems like this time around, given
6 that history, it would be nice to see the max build-out
7 plan before the GUP proceeds.

8 And I assume that that would cover some -- some --
9 some disposition of what's going to happen to the open
10 space, open space that we would --

11 The other issue that I want to talk about is a
12 little bit of a hand wave, but the GUP calls for, you
13 know, basically 2,000 faculty, post-docs, and up to
14 2,000 other various staff, some of which are part-time I
15 understand. And 550 housing units for that cohort.

16 And the long-term housing growth in Palo Alto,
17 it's been pretty consistent for decades now. Somewhere
18 between 100 and 200 units a year. And a year or two
19 ago, we established a nonresidential growth limit of
20 50,000 square feet a year in town.

21 And so here's the hand wave, and this is very
22 hand-wavey. It relies on some definitional assumptions
23 too as well as what about the research part and so
24 forth, right.

25 But if you look at it sideways, to first order

1 it -- if you do the arithmetic, right, you can make a
2 case that the City of Palo Alto is housing its entire
3 nonresidential expansion, and so you can't say that
4 about the Stanford planning.

5 So with that as an existence proof, I'd urge
6 Stanford to take another shot at that, because the
7 benefits in terms of both housing and, of course,
8 secondary things like traffic and so forth, would be
9 positive. Thank you.

10 MR. SIMITIAN: Thank you for your comments,
11 council member.

12 Stephanie Munoz.

13 MS. MUNOZ: I'm here to speak on behalf of
14 somebody who hasn't been heard of for a long time.

15 The woman's name was Jane Stanford, and she was
16 married to one of the most powerful men in the world,
17 Senator Leland Stanford, also governor of this state.

18 Extremely wealthy; extremely powerful; and perhaps
19 not too well-loved by the people who've felt the burden
20 of being under the thumb of the Southern Pacific
21 Railway.

22 It was her intention to make the world a better
23 place. And she'd been taught like other women of our
24 generation, that she could do that through her children.
25 And so she decided she would raise a paragon.

1 She would rear a child who would be fit to govern.
2 He would know all about countries in the world and all
3 about the culture and all about what made life worth
4 living, and he'd put it all into California.

5 And then he died.

6 Stanford is a memorial. It's like those memorial
7 chapels in the cathedrals in Europe. It's meant to take
8 the place of that kid that Mrs. Stanford wanted to be
9 the best person in the world to govern. It was not
10 meant to be a search engine to make more wealth. They
11 already had made wealth, lots of it, lots of it.

12 This was for the poor boys of California and the
13 poor girls, as sort of an afterthought, to make it a
14 better place to live.

15 I submit that the reform back in the '50s and '60s
16 and in response to the Russian Sputnik advance, which
17 seemed to put the United States in the shade, was not
18 what she had in mind. And you have to remember that the
19 Palo Alto that had been made as a town just for a backup
20 for this University, had housing in the Stanford
21 foothills, and that changed. The housing was removed,
22 and the knowledge factories were put in, and we have had
23 a housing shortage ever since.

24 The man who preceded me by a couple of places
25 spoke about Harvard's gobbling up. Well, they do, half

1 of Cambridge, but Stanford did too.

2 The people who worked at Stanford -- and we're not
3 talking about the students because students always did
4 live in Palo Alto. My mom had students when we were
5 kids.

6 But the grown ups, the workers that lived there,
7 had to live in Menlo Park, Palo Alto, and Mountain View
8 and every place, and it's gone on like that.

9 All I ask you is please, do not let Stanford build
10 as much work as it wishes and not have housing for every
11 worker.

12 MR. SIMITIAN: Thank you, Ms. Munoz.

13 MS. MUNOZ: You're welcome.

14 MR. SIMITIAN: Arthur Keller.

15 MR. KELLER: Thank you. Thank you, Supervisor
16 Simitian the staff. You know, I think that Stanford is
17 a great institution. However, too much of a great or a
18 good thing is not good also, as those of us who have
19 eaten a little bit too much know about.

20 I also align myself with those who think that the
21 missing carrying capacity study for Stanford should be
22 put as part of the approval, should be required as part
23 of the approval process for the general use permit.

24 Now, I know that you expounded on the issue of how
25 such approvals are done, but let me give my

1 understanding, which you can correct, after I speak, if
2 I'm wrong. And that is that the EIR goes according to a
3 state-regulated process. But the general use permit is
4 a discretionary permit. And, therefore, the County can,
5 as it wishes, impose whatever rules are appropriate
6 through appropriate nexus on Stanford that make sense.

7 So with that being said, I indicate that we do
8 have some flexibility in terms of implementations on
9 Stanford. So the first thing is that Stanford, they did
10 something very innovative and very successful in terms
11 of the No New Net Trips limitation on traffic.

12 However, there were a lot -- that implementation
13 is being somewhat relaxed in the EIR process with
14 indulgences paying for mitigations in the City and then
15 mitigations beyond that if they don't succeed. And I
16 think that the indulgence process of paying for that is
17 a problem.

18 And also, part of the issue is that Stanford
19 employment has been impacted with parking in the City.
20 We noticed that in terms of the College Terrace parking
21 permits process, that displaced a bunch of cars that
22 would've been there, and now they're elsewhere.

23 Because the reliance of the No New Net Trips is
24 impact -- in fact, on -- on the increase of Caltrain,
25 Stanford should contribute towards Caltrain for its

1 operations.

2 The jobs housing ration for Palo Alto -- for
3 Stanford is worse than Palo Alto's. We should include a
4 outcome measure that it not get worse, that it, in fact,
5 get better. That Stanford include house all of its
6 undergraduates, graduate students, and post-docs in
7 order to avoid displacing them outside.

8 We should think about -- because Stanford lands
9 for certain -- most of its housing does not pay property
10 taxes. There will be no contribution to Palo Alto
11 Unified School District for the increase of school
12 population; and, therefore, Stanford should be providing
13 a land for the increase of school population that's
14 projected. Because for schools -- and I do note that
15 Stanford used to house Stanford Elementary School which
16 is where this housing now -- where this Stanford housing
17 is going on now. So we should do that.

18 MR. SIMITIAN: Wrap it up, please.

19 MR. KELLER: And finally, we should think in terms
20 of upstream flood control protection provided for San
21 Francisquito Creek as part of this. So I think an
22 appropriate nexus can be made.

23 Thank you.

24 MR. SIMITIAN: Thank you for your comments.

25 Sandy Sloan.

1 THE PUBLIC: She left.

2 MR. SIMITIAN: All right. Mr. Moss, you're up.

3 MR. MOSS: Thank you, gentlemen.

4 First, one of the concerns that we obviously have
5 is that Stanford has not been responsive to questions
6 asked by the community and by the Board of Supervisors.

7 So I would suggest that when the approval of new
8 development is given, there be a requirement that
9 Stanford has to satisfy all questions and requests
10 proposed by both the City and the Board of Supervisors,
11 such as, what is the build-out potential for the site?

12 If they don't add to them satisfactory, no
13 building permit; that might get their attention.

14 One of the concerns I have -- and this isn't just
15 Stanford -- in general, developments, they tend to look
16 only at their own site and not what's happening around
17 them.

18 Both Menlo Park and Palo Alto have continued to
19 develop. Menlo Park is making us, for example, increase
20 the number of residential units significantly.

21 Palo Alto has between 50 and a hundred-thousand
22 square feet of commercial space every year. They've
23 been doing that for years in hundreds of housing units.

24 All that has an impact on traffic and how that
25 interacts with traffic at Stanford should be looked at.

1 For example, the most congested intersection in
2 Palo Alto is El Camino on Page Mill.

3 And also Page Mill and Foothill and El Camino and
4 Embarcadero, those are right around Stanford.

5 So Stanford is complying on campus, perhaps, but
6 they're not necessarily complying with the overall area.

7 Stanford has an easy interesting way of addressing
8 traffic problems. About 10 or 12 years ago, I had a
9 contract for one of the organizations at Stanford.

10 And they said, "Don't come on the campus before 10
11 o'clock in the morning."

12 "And when you leave, leave before 3:00 or 3:30."
13 So you don't count in the peak traffic hours. So you
14 should be taking a look at all the traffic that goes in
15 and out of Stanford all day.

16 Now, one of the other issues is how do we identify
17 that the mitigations actually are working? If you'll
18 approve all two-and-a-quarter-million square feet,
19 they're not going to build it all at once.

20 So I would suggest that incrementally, say, every
21 500,000 square feet, you verify that the mitigations
22 have, in fact, happened and been consistent with what
23 was promised. If they haven't been, then they can't
24 continue building. That would give them an incentive,
25 and it will also give you a quantitative way of

1 verifying that mitigations can happen. Otherwise, we
2 have no way of controlling, and you have no way of
3 knowing what's going on.

4 MR. SIMITIAN: Thank you.

5 Penny Ellison.

6 MS. ELLISON: Good evening, and thank you for
7 holding this meeting. It's great to have an opportunity
8 to have a community conversation about this.

9 I haven't had a chance to get through the
10 voluminous DEIR yet, but I have a few comments just to
11 the summary that I have read and some things that I've
12 heard this everything.

13 This week I had two interactions with Stanford
14 that I'd like to relate a little bit about.

15 I attended the Stanford safe routes to everywhere
16 meeting yesterday. And also had the opportunity to see
17 their May report. The Stanford bicycle commuter access
18 study and I was heartened to see a vision for partnering
19 with neighboring jurisdictions to support bicycling
20 investments, to improve local and regional connectivity.
21 And I hope I'll find appropriate mitigations laid out in
22 the DEIR that'll serve to implement that vision.

23 According to the Stanford study, 21 percent of
24 Stanford commuters choose to bike. 17 percent use
25 Caltrain. 43 percent are still driving alone. It's

1 that last figure that worries me.

2 Stanford is building for, I think you said tonight
3 9000-something --

4 MR. SIMITIAN: 9600.

5 MS. ELLISON: Thank you -- new people. And I
6 think I read that there's a little over 3,000 net new
7 on-campus housing units and beds.

8 MR. SIMITIAN: 3,150.

9 MS. ELLISON: Thank you, Joe. You're so good with
10 the numbers.

11 Okay. So, you know, conservatively, I mean,
12 we're -- I'm not going to estimate the thousands of new
13 drivers we're talking about here in town, but as a
14 former safe-routes-to-school mom, this worries me. It's
15 the cars that are the problem. Getting people on bikes.
16 And we're going to have to manage that.

17 Stanford has done a wonderful job with their TDM
18 program. But at 21 percent, you guys are levelling out.
19 You're going to have to really step it up.

20 And I know, I've done this work. It's hard. It's
21 hard with kids who want to ride. It's harder with
22 grown-ups who are stuck in a rut. So I'm going to be
23 very interested to read the transportation section of
24 this.

25 And I just want to say that I hope what I'm going

1 to find in there is a really robust new, stronger TDM
2 program.

3 And then the second thing I want to relate is a
4 story. Really quick: I had a visiting cousin from
5 another university that will remain unnamed -- much less
6 prestigious than Stanford -- came to visit this week.
7 It was his first time in Palo Alto, so I gave him a
8 quick tour of the Stanford campus. And he was stunned
9 to see the amount of land on the campus.

10 Because he has had grad students and postop
11 students come to his university because of the lack of
12 housing. They would probably live in a trailer for
13 themselves. But they're not going to put their wife and
14 their kids there.

15 So I have to wonder, you know, why Stanford is not
16 providing housing for these lower-income participants in
17 your community. And I hope you'll think about that
18 carefully because I think it's probably having an effect
19 on your school. Thank you.

20 MR. SIMITIAN: Thank you for your comments.

21 Terry Holzemer?

22 MR. HOLZEMER: Yes. I've been a resident of Palo
23 Alto for over 20 years, and I live in the California
24 Avenue area.

25 And I just like to say, I'm impacted almost daily

1 by what happens at Stanford University. I guess I'm
2 adding my voice to those people who say, how much growth
3 is enough?

4 And the impacts that I see every day are not only
5 in traffic and housing. But I also see the impacts in
6 just the normal congestion that people feel when they
7 feel like they're surrounded instead every day by
8 thousands of people coming and going. You know, going
9 through various lanes of traffic, but also just walking
10 down the street. You can't go down, at 5:00 p.m., at
11 Embarcadero Road and El Camino and not see tremendous
12 impacts of what Stanford is presenting to the City of
13 Palo Alto.

14 MR. SIMITIAN: If I could ask you to pause for
15 just a moment.

16 MR. HOLZEMER: Yes.

17 MR. SIMITIAN: Could we ask the folks at the
18 back to step out for the conversation? The acoustics
19 are surprisingly good at sending other conversations
20 forward. Even if we say -- it's always going to be part
21 of the podium for some reason.

22 So, thank you.

23 Go right ahead. We stopped your time.

24 MR. HOLZEMER: Those are my general comments. But
25 I have two specific issues that I think are important

1 for the EIR development, and one is housing.

2 Housing is a wonderful concept, and we need more
3 of it. However, we don't have enough of below-rate
4 market housing. And I'd like to see in this EIR -- at
5 least a plan from Stanford that they're going to add
6 more below-market rate housing. Not necessarily for
7 graduate students, which is wonderful.

8 And I've nothing against graduate students, but
9 actually for their staff. And the reason I say "for
10 staff," is because I read some studies recently. And
11 one of the studies I read said that for every student
12 that goes to a university, there's at least 2.3 percent
13 of staff needed to support that student. So that means
14 double the amount of room that you need for staff. And
15 you need below-rate market housing on Stanford campus to
16 support those students.

17 If you're going to add more students, then you
18 need more housing on campus.

19 My second point is really quick and that's about
20 fire protection. As we well know, living in the North
21 Bay, we've had a tremendous problem with fire. And so I
22 recently watched our own city council deal severely with
23 their own fire protection -- I won't say crisis -- but
24 challenges that they have.

25 And one thing I noticed in their debate, through

1 discussions, was the fact that Stanford has actually
2 reduced the amount of money they're paying the City of
3 Palo Alto for fire protection.

4 I think that's appalling. If you're going to add
5 more people more, more facilities on campus, then you
6 definitely need more fire protection. And you need to
7 pay for it. If you want Palo Alto to pony up, then you
8 need to support us. This is the citizens that live
9 here. We need better Stanford support for our firemen,
10 for our fire protection, and definitely for all the
11 things, facilities that go with it. We need more
12 support from Stanford to support the City of Palo Alto.

13 Thank you.

14 MR. SIMITIAN: Thanks for your comments.

15 Pria Graues.

16 MS. GRAUES: Thank you very much for hosting this
17 evening.

18 First I wanted to thank Supervisor Simitian for
19 reenforcing my memory that the sustainability plan was
20 supposed to include full build-out plans. This is
21 finite earth, and we can't keep growing forever. So I'm
22 pleased to hear that that's back on the table, and I
23 would like to see that made a condition of approval of
24 the GUP.

25 Second, I have a couple of comments about the

1 traffic. First of all, the No Net New Trips for a peak
2 hour in the morning and the evening, that doesn't cut it
3 anymore. The peak hour has expanded to be a peak three
4 or four hours each end of the day. And traffic all day,
5 all night is getting worse and worse. Added to that is
6 the fact that Stanford has added a lot of new sporting
7 events. They are hosting the Earthquakes. All of those
8 bring a lot of trips into the area. And I'm more
9 concerned about the greenhouse gases generated from
10 that, and I don't see that particularly covered anywhere
11 in the environmental impact report, although I haven't
12 had to chance the read the whole thing.

13 A second comment about the VMT, vehicle miles
14 traveled analysis, and that is the fact that it treats
15 differently a new facility or staff person living on
16 campus versus one who's not.

17 I live in College Terrace. On one side of
18 Stanford Avenue is Stanford housing. On the other side
19 of Stanford Avenue are a number of homes owned by
20 Stanford which were likely to be occupied by the same
21 kind of people. The fact that the other trips, not to
22 work and back, but the rest of the family trips to the
23 grocery store and so forth are not included in the VMT
24 calculation, if they happen to live across the street
25 from College Terrace is absurd.

1 So I would tag onto what was said about fire
2 danger. With the recent fires up north, I'm very
3 concerned that Stanford should not be shooting off
4 fireworks during drought periods, during high wind
5 periods. We have an increasing number of high-wind
6 events going on here. And if we get those Eucalyptus
7 trees -- which I love dearly -- in flames, we're all
8 going to go up. We've seen what happened in Napa and
9 Sonoma, and we don't need that happening here.

10 Finally I'd like to request that perhaps a copy of
11 the EIR be placed at the College Terrace library as
12 well, since that's a neighborhood that is very, very
13 much impacted by anything Stanford does. And if I have
14 to read a thousand pages or so of environmental impact
15 report, I'd really like to do so I don't have to bike
16 halfway across town. Thank you.

17 MR. SIMITIAN: Thank you for your comments.

18 Let me just make sure before I ask Nelson Ng to
19 begin.

20 Nelson Ng.

21 MR. NG: Hi, my name is Nelson Ng. I live at 1260
22 Emerson Street in Palo Alto, which is about five-minutes
23 walk to -- to Town & Country.

24 The reason I say "walk," is because I have front
25 row seats to the traffic congestion on Embarcadero; so

1 driving over there, I'm not sure how long it would take.

2 In addition, I also worked on Hill View at
3 Stanford Research Park after I graduated in 1983. And
4 also, mostly recently, the last two years on Deer Creek
5 Road, again, at Stanford Research Park, and the traffic
6 pattern is stunning, the contrast. I -- basically I
7 cannot drive there anymore; shouldn't be. So I've been
8 driving to work, and then I really feel sorry for the
9 people, the miles of congestion coming up that on Page
10 Mill.

11 So having said that, it's just that currently the
12 traffic in Palo Alto is unbearable. I hope a lot of
13 people agree with that.

14 And I understand you're coming up with this
15 proposal, Stanford's coming up with this proposal on No
16 Net New Trips and asked us to leave the -- the -- the
17 University will do a great job with it. However, it
18 just doesn't quite cut it because it's just -- looking
19 at the current situation, what happened if it failed.
20 The alternative is, after you guys are finished building
21 the buildings, we cannot ask you to knock it down or
22 keep out some of the students at that point. Just
23 putting money there, it might work, or it may not work.
24 And what is the limit to the monies that is -- will be
25 put in there?

1 One question that I also observed earlier is
2 somebody from Stanford was also asking about all these
3 great ideas of how can we reduce trip. I think it's a
4 great idea. Why don't we put it now in place to reduce
5 the congestion so we don't have to suffer like this
6 already? So let's see how well does it work right now
7 to reduce the traffic issue.

8 The other thing is, Mr. Bob, Bob Moss and also
9 Pria raised, also mentioned, the TDM really needs to be
10 measured 24 by 7. We cannot just measure one day or two
11 days in the year or a very selective period of time.

12 A lot of these can be gained very easily, driving
13 around a certain corridor. So we really need to look at
14 the whole area as a whole to really study a good TDM
15 program, to really result in some way to measure the
16 rate of traffic.

17 And now, last, I have a question for Supervisor
18 Simitian. You mentioned earlier that you were just one
19 of the four supervisors who will be voting on this.
20 You're the closest to us which Palo Alto has the most
21 impact. How are we going to influence the other four
22 supervisors to make sure that our concerns will be met?

23 MR. SIMITIAN: I'm sure they will be happy to know
24 that I would encourage you to be in touch with them
25 directly to share your concerns.

1 And just to be clear, this phenomenon affects us
2 all. I vote routinely on matters that are unfolding in
3 the Gilroy or Morgan Hill area and the unincorporated
4 St. Martine, I do not represent that part of the county.
5 It is not within my district. But I'm expected, when I
6 show up, to cast an informed vote, just as all five
7 members of the board are.

8 This instance is a little bit different because
9 Stanford is a unique case in our county in terms of the
10 unincorporated county. Most of the development in our
11 county goes into the 15 incorporated cities, whether
12 it's Palo Alto, San Jose. And that has been a policy of
13 the County now for decades, that urban growth goes into
14 urban population centers, meaning, incorporated cities.

15 Stanford, of course, is in some respects an entity
16 on to itself. And notwithstanding that, the half of
17 the campus, the roughly 4,000 acres out of the 8,000
18 acres that are in unincorporated Santa Clara County, are
19 governed by the Board of Supervisors which, as I said,
20 has one district supervisor that represents this area
21 but four others who do not. And, again, this is the
22 norm on all of our land use issues in Santa Clara
23 County.

24 So please be in touch with them. Please use this
25 EIR process to communicate; and at some point, there

1 will be an opportunity to communicate at the planning
2 commission, the County Planning Commission, where there
3 are seven appointed members. And you will be able to
4 communicate directly to them at the planning commission
5 meeting or meetings. And you will also be able to
6 communicate directly to the five members of the Board of
7 Supervisors at that meeting or meeting where this issue
8 is taken up as the process unfolds.

9 And I should just highlight because I was
10 particularly pleased about this, Mr. Garavich mentioned
11 that there will, in fact, be a meeting of the planning
12 commission here in Palo Alto in November, and I believe
13 it's to take comments on the draft DEIR at that time as
14 well.

15 So if you were thinking to yourselves, how do I
16 talk to somebody in addition to Joe Simitian? That
17 particular meeting with the planning commission presents
18 an opportunity next month, and it is -- thank you,
19 Mr. Girard -- it is November 30th, which is a Thursday,
20 from 7:00 to 9:00 p.m. at the Palo Alto Arts Center
21 auditorium. That's the old City Hall which probably
22 doesn't tell most of you much. It's next to what is now
23 the Rinconada Library or the building formally known as
24 the main library just to follow the bouncing ball of
25 history.

1 So corner of Embarcadero and Newell is easiest way
2 to say it, November 30th. And the draft DEIR comment
3 period will include that meeting which involves our
4 County Planning Commission as well.

5 But you really do need to engage at some point in
6 the process with all five members of the Board of
7 Supervisors because nothing gets decided with the Board
8 of Supervisors by one vote.

9 Okay. Thank you.

10 That was Mr. Ng, yes?

11 And then, Gabby, you have been very patient. And
12 it's Ms. Badica, yes?

13 MS. BADICA: Thank you.

14 MR. SIMITIAN: How am I doing on the
15 pronunciation?

16 MS. BADICA: Excellent. I'm language teacher at
17 Stanford, and you get an A-plus.

18 MR. SIMITIAN: Thank you.

19 MS. BADICA: So I'm actually a Ph.D. student, like
20 I said, at Stanford. I live in grad housing. I live in
21 Escondido Village. I'm from Vancouver, very posh city
22 with its own very big housing crisis. I think the
23 average rent for a student in Vancouver is about 1700 US
24 dollars right now. And very much the university tries
25 to cope with as much as it can, but the waiting list is

1 humongous, many times what it is at Stanford. And the
2 answer is basically, you know, "We've done all we can.
3 You're on your own."

4 So I would really like to commend Stanford as a
5 grad student for helping us in this situation for making
6 it as -- as you know, as much as -- as easy as possible
7 to pull us out of off campus which we all know about the
8 new graduate housing project that's being developed for
9 the university with our approximately 2,000 spaces.
10 They've been very good at working with the students.

11 What we want to avoid as soon as we can, you know,
12 it's already bad that it's happening, but is the
13 situation that we sited earlier about the graduate
14 student living in a van, that's what we want to avoid,
15 and that's why I think it's important to plan all the
16 spaces ahead.

17 And I know that it looks like a lot of growth, but
18 I agree with -- with the increase that they need, and I
19 think that I also agree with, like, somebody said
20 earlier the slight increase in undergraduate students.
21 I teach undergraduate student languages, mostly Spanish.
22 These are amazing students. They're a pleasure to
23 teach. The time I spend with them in the classroom is
24 by far my favorite part of the day. They're from all
25 walks of life, from all of the countries, some

1 international students as well. Right now so many of
2 them want to get in, and Stanford, being the smallest
3 percentage of admitted students, like the smallest rate.
4 It's the school that all the kids want to come to, and
5 they're so good when they come here that I think that
6 the small increase the project supports would be good.

7 And for graduate students, like I am one myself, I
8 just wanted to say that we very much want to be active
9 members of the community. We don't want to harm the
10 community or, like, do things to not make the life of
11 the residents better. We're very appreciative of being
12 given this tremendous chance to go to Stanford. It's a
13 life-changing opportunity. I'm not from the area. I'm
14 not from the country, but I'm so grateful for the time I
15 have here to study and live, and we don't really want to
16 be isolated. We want to teach and mentor the kids in
17 the Bay. Too many of us do that now. There's
18 everything from science programs to language teaching
19 programs who want to be engaged with your kids, and we
20 want to work together to find, like, the best way that
21 we can all grow together. And we don't want to be,
22 like, an imposition. We just want to -- to do the best
23 we can. So I hope that everyone can work together to
24 figure out the best solutions.

25 MR. SIMILIA: Thank you very much for your

1 comments.

2 Welcome, Dan Sakaguchi.

3 MR. SAKAGUCHI: All right. Good evening,
4 Supervisor Simitian. I just want to echo the thoughts
5 of others, and thank you for choosing a time and
6 location that makes it convenient for students like
7 myself to attend this event.

8 So my name is Dan Sakaguchi. I'm a graduate
9 student like others here, and I'm here speaking tonight
10 on behalf of the Stanford Coalition for Planning and
11 Equitable in 2035, also known as SCOPE 2035. We are a
12 coalition of graduate and undergraduate students at
13 Stanford University working with Stanford's union, SCIU
14 Local 2007, who care deeply about the future of our
15 community. We are here tonight as students because we
16 are concerned about the environmental review does not
17 accurately assess the true burdens of Stanford's
18 development of its neighbors. We were made aware about
19 Stanford's protected impacts on housing, transportation,
20 and sustainability. We will be submitting a complete
21 list of our concerns about the analysis contained the
22 EIR and provide it to accounting. Tonight though, we
23 would like to bring up three preliminary issues.

24 First, we are concerned that the EIR deems
25 population and housing impacts as less than significant.

1 The EIR estimates that Stanford's projected population
2 will contribute to 3.5 percent of East Palo Alto's
3 future household growth and up to 10 percent in some
4 cities, I believe.

5 However, the study does not consider the effects
6 of housing demand on different income levels as you
7 mentioned earlier. Considering that these off-site
8 households will include the lowest waged workers of
9 Stanford -- graduate students, post-doc students, and
10 other workers -- we're concerned that this population
11 increase could place significant housing pressure and
12 displacement effects, specifically over low income
13 households in East Palo Alto and other low income
14 jurisdictions.

15 As one piece of our critique, we believe that the
16 analysis should be revised to include a breakdown of
17 population growth by income demographic as a standard
18 that states the housing needs assessment methodology.

19 Second, we are concerned that no alternatives
20 focus on the management of Stanford's traffic during off
21 peak hours that others have already mentioned as well.
22 We believe that it's important to include a project
23 alternative in which Stanford expands its TDM programs
24 to benefit workers and staff who commute during off peak
25 hours. We ask that this analysis be added to the final

1 EIR.

2 Third, we are concerned about the finding that
3 climate change impacts of Stanford's expansion are also
4 deemed less than significant. California has codified
5 its climate goals through AB32 and SB32 to reduce
6 emissions by 80 percent from 1990 levels by 2050.

7 Following the global realization that
8 decarbonization is essential for avoiding the
9 irreversible impacts of a clean changing climate.
10 Stanford is directly contradicting this trend however,
11 by not fully mitigating the carbon emissions of its
12 expansion and not releasing a plan for a carbon-neutral
13 future. Universities of a similar magnitude, such as
14 the University of California system, has set
15 carbon-neutral goals for the upcoming decades
16 demonstrating that it is a feasible alternative.

17 Again, we will publish a full set of our comments
18 to the County in the coming weeks. We look forward to a
19 continued conversation about how the final EIR can fully
20 document the projects proposed impacts on housing,
21 transportation, sustainability, and more. Thank you for
22 you time.

23 MR. SIMILIA: Thank you very much for your
24 comments.

25 Edic Keating, welcome. Thank you for joining us.

1 MS. KEATING: Thank you. So like many others, I'm
2 just skimming so far, but on the transportation section,
3 part of TDM says, "direct incentives to commuters who
4 choose alternative modes." So perhaps it's there, and I
5 haven't found it, but I would like to see a list of
6 those incentives and what they are. And I also like to
7 see how compliance is monitored and enforced. This may
8 not be shocking, but I have met one person who accepted
9 one of those incentives and didn't really comply with
10 what they were saying they would do.

11 So I'm just curious about the enforcement and
12 monitoring. I would also like to know how No Net New
13 Trips looks like without the credits. And I wonder if
14 it's easy to get data, I wonder how many Uber trips on
15 the campus are taking place.

16 Then on another topic, I'm curious about the
17 process for a smaller alternative, and in particular, I
18 think a smaller alternative that did not have any --
19 that was even on the housing units additionally
20 provided, and the jobs that were being created would be
21 one that would address the huge upswell of community
22 interest in having this not make our community, sorry,
23 but worse.

24 So -- but I don't know how you, you know, move
25 forward a smaller alternative, and I'll be curious to

1 hear more about that. Thank you.

2 MR. SIMILIA: Thank you for your comments. And
3 that brings us to our final speaker Francisco Preciado.

4 Mr. Preciado, thank you for your patience. By
5 virtue of the Simitian Shuffle, you ended up being last
6 in the list. So I have to own that. Welcome.

7 MR. PRECIADO: Perfect. Thank you. So good
8 evening, Supervisor Simitian. Thank you for putting
9 this community input meeting together and for listening
10 how the community feels.

11 I'm here on behalf of SCIU Local 2007 which
12 represents over 1200 service and technical workers on
13 the campus at Stanford. And we'd like to echo some of
14 the SCOPE of 2035's comments and some of the community
15 member's regarding affordable housing. We're here to
16 ask specifically that that the university show that they
17 care about workers and the surrounding community by
18 creating affordable housing for the service workers on
19 campus. This would address the housing shortage and
20 mitigate the traffic impacts, because, of course, less
21 workers would have to commute.

22 We have workers coming from Tracy, Santa Cruz,
23 among other cities which takes several hours. Some
24 members say it takes four to six hours to commute to and
25 from work. That's not working; that's just the commute.

1 If Stanford really values its workers and the
2 surrounding community, it would build more affordable
3 housing for workers and provide more transportation
4 options like a bus from East Palo Alto to campus and
5 allow slack workers, which they currently do not have
6 access, to Stanford's transportation programs.

7 I believe we can be creative in developing
8 solutions to the various issues that were raised. What
9 about using the Stanford affordable housing fund that's
10 given to the County to build affordable housing for the
11 lowest income service workers on campus?

12 Lastly, I believe that Stanford -- I believe
13 Stanford doesn't plan to change its community plan, but
14 maybe through a community benefits agreement that
15 addresses many of the needs outlined and mentioned
16 today, Stanford can commit to taking a neutral position
17 when workers want to collectively organize and become a
18 part of the union. Thank you.

19 MR. SIMILIA: Thank you. For your comments. Now
20 before everyone bolts for the door, let me ask: Are
21 there any other cards from folks who wish to be heard
22 this everything? All right. If not, then let me say
23 thank you again for coming. Let me again remind
24 everyone that the next currently scheduled public
25 meeting to resolve comments on the draft DEIR is at the

1 Palo Alto Arts Center on November 30th 7:00 to
2 9:00 p.m., and that is hosted by the County Planning
3 Commission. The draft DEIR public comment period
4 extends through 5:00 p.m. on December 4th; so if
5 comments are going to be made, folks have a little more
6 time to take a look. That's the deadline date. As was
7 mentioned earlier, you can find the documents that have
8 been referenced either on the planning department's web
9 page or on my own, supervisorsimitian.org, and if you
10 click on the Stanford draft EIR button on my page,
11 you'll get right there. There are hard copies at the
12 planning counter here at City Hall, if I understand
13 correctly, and at Green Library at Stanford and at the
14 Rinconada Library and I think at the Mitchel Park
15 Library. But we heard the shout-out about College
16 Terrace, and I'll put the staff on the spot by saying
17 we're going to manage that in the next week?

18 MR. GIRARD: Yes, we are.

19 MR. SIMILIA: Thank you.

20 And I think we had a similar request, by the way,
21 from the folks in Menlo Park.

22 Again, a reminder, we can't take your comments
23 into consideration if the comments are not made, and
24 there are five members of the Board of Supervisors. And
25 with those last two reminders, let me just say again how

1 much I appreciate your willingness as a community to
2 come out and give the better part of your evening to
3 this process.

4 Thanks as well from the folks at Stanford who were
5 present, County planning staff who already had a long
6 day before they arrived, the consulting team, and the
7 two members of my office staff who pulled all this
8 together for all of us. And, of course, last but not
9 least, thank you to the City of Palo Alto for hosting
10 this. Without objection, our meeting is adjourned.
11 Thank you all.

12 (Proceedings ended at 8:37 p.m.)
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
) SS.
2 COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA)

3

4

5 I, SARAH K. MAKSIM, a Certified Shorthand
6 Reporter in and for the State of California, certify
7 that the proceedings in the within-entitled cause were
8 taken at the time and place therein stated; that the
9 proceedings was reported by me and was thereafter
0 transcribed under my direction into typewriting; that
1 the foregoing is a full, complete, and true record of
2 said proceedings.

3 I further certify that I am not of counsel nor
4 attorney for either nor any of the parties in the
5 foregoing proceeding and caption named, nor in any way
6 interested in the outcome of the cause named in said
7 caption.

8

9

_____, 2017. _____
Date CSR Number 14053

21

22

23

24

25