

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

PALO ALTO

10

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

11

November 30, 2017

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 Thursday, November 30, 2017

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

3 CHAIR CAUBLE: Okay. Let's get started. Good
4 evening, Everyone, and welcome to the November 30th, 2017,
5 special meeting of the Planning Commission of the County
6 of Santa Clara. It's good to see you all here.

7 As I indicated, please grab a speaker card if you
8 haven't done so already if you intend to speak tonight.
9 And we have a basket up front, and at some point before we
10 all get started, we'll determine how many speakers we have
11 and allocate time.

12 I would ask that all of us check our electronic
13 devices and make sure the sound -- the ringer is off. And
14 I think we're ready to call the roll, Madam Secretary.

15 MADAM SECRETARY: Thank you.

16 Chairperson Cauble?

17 CHAIR CAUBLE: Here.

18 MADAM SECRETARY: Members Lefaver?

19 COMMISSIONER LEFAVER: Here.

20 MADAM SECRETARY: Moore?

21 COMMISSIONER MOORE: Here.

22 MADAM SECRETARY: Resendez?

23 COMMISSIONER RESENDEZ: Here.

24 MADAM SECRETARY: Schmidt?

25 COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: Here.

1 MADAM SECRETARY: Escobar?

2 COMMISSIONER ESCOBAR: Here.

3 MADAM SECRETARY: And Rauser?

4 COMMISSIONER RAUSER: Here.

5 MADAM SECRETARY. We have a quorum.

6 CHAIR CAUBLE: Thank you very much. Good job
7 without your notes.

8 As I think everyone knows the purpose of our
9 meeting tonight is to receive comments on the Draft EIR
10 for the 2018 Stanford General Use Permit application.

11 I want to make it clear that the Commission will
12 not be deliberating tonight. We won't be discussing the
13 project among ourselves. We won't be taking any votes.
14 We are here to listen.

15 On later dates that will be determined, we will
16 be considering the adequacy of the final EIR and
17 considering the project. But no decisions tonight, just
18 information gathering. We would like to hear from as many
19 people as we can tonight.

20 During the brief staff report we'll have, we will
21 be figuring out how many speakers we have and giving up
22 the time we have available, and we'll let you know how
23 much time you have to speak. It's likely to not be as
24 long as you'd like. We have good attendance tonight,
25 which is fabulous.

1 Remember that there is an opportunity to make
2 comments in writing, and so I see tonight as a way to
3 highlight perhaps your most important comments, but if you
4 don't have enough time to say everything you want to say,
5 please do get your comments in before the deadline, which
6 our planning director will speak to in just a minute.

7 A couple other sort of organizational points. We
8 do have a stenographer tonight taking notes of everything
9 that is said so that there is a record of it. Let's
10 please help her by being as clear in our speech as we
11 possibly can.

12 And when you come up to speak, if you could state
13 your name, that would be great. We can correlate it with
14 the cards, and it will help her prepare the transcript.

15 I am going to leave a little bit of time at the
16 end of the meeting in case there are any commissioners who
17 also want to offer their questions for comments for the
18 record. Any comments made tonight -- or I say all
19 comments made tonight as well as all of the written
20 comments on the Draft EIR will be responded to in writing.
21 All right?

22 Mr. Girard, are you ready for a staff report?

23 MR. KIRK GIRARD: Yeah. May I have the mike
24 back, please.

25 CHAIR CAUBLE: Kirk, hang on a second. I forgot

1 to offer the opportunity for anyone who would like to
2 address us on a matter that is not on tonight's agenda.
3 Is there anybody that's here to talk about Morgan Hill or
4 Gilroy?

5 Seeing none. Sorry. Go ahead, Kirk.

6 MR. GIRARD: Chair Cauble and Commissioners, Kirk
7 Girard and the director of planning development. And I
8 welcome everybody here as well. I see many of you in
9 meetings we've been having in the community about the
10 Stanford Draft EIR, and I'll say that the purpose of this
11 meeting and the purpose of the preceding meetings is to
12 try to make sure that we get the perspectives that the
13 community have on this project to the decision makers that
14 are ultimately going to decide on the accuracy of the EIR
15 and the consistency of the project with our rules.

16 So they've been very, very rich meetings, and
17 this is the final public (unintelligible) meeting that's
18 scheduled. I did want to say just as a -- get the message
19 out immediately if you haven't heard that we've decided to
20 extend the 60-day public comment period on the Draft EIR
21 another 60 days so that the new deadline is February 2nd.

22 And the primary reason for that is it is a large
23 project. Many of you have looked at the Draft EIR. It's
24 voluminous. There's a lot of technical issues, and we
25 want to error on the side of public interest and input to

1 the project at this stage of the game. So we have a new
2 deadline.

3 I want to very quickly provide some context for
4 the comments, but I'm going to do it very quickly. Many
5 of you know, but this is for those that may not, this is
6 an application for development at Stanford in the
7 unincorporated Santa Clara County portion of their lands.

8 They are proposing an expansion of their academic
9 space, expansion of number of housing units, some minor
10 adjustments to the property boundaries, some daycare
11 facilities, and they're projecting to do this over a
12 17-year period with no development proposed in the
13 foothills of faculty San Juan area.

14 This puts this increment of development in
15 context with what's at the campus now and what was
16 approved in 2000 in the first General Use Permit that was
17 issued.

18 The red shows the amount of -- in the top bar,
19 the red shows the amount of academic square footage of the
20 campus at the time the 2000 community plan was adopted and
21 2000 General Use Permit was granted.

22 The orange is the amount developed that was
23 approved as part of the 2000 General Use Permit.

24 The yellow is what is requested as a part of this
25 2018 General Use Permit.

1 The lower bar is the same data for faculty and
2 staff and student housing beds.

3 So this General Use Permit to really understand
4 you have to understand some of companion documents and
5 regulatory framework that governs land use at Stanford.
6 The community plan is an element of the County general
7 plan, has a whole suite of policies, and the individual
8 general use permits must be consistent with the community
9 plan.

10 As I mentioned there has been one use permit
11 issued since the 2000 community plan was adopted, and the
12 final EIR was prepared for both community plan and that
13 use permit. So this is the second in a series of EIRs
14 that have been prepared for development of the campus
15 since the 2000 community plan was adopted.

16 And in midway through the build-out of the 2000
17 General Use Permit, a sustainability study was conducted
18 to look at the development of the campus through the year
19 2035.

20 As I mentioned this application is proposed to be
21 consistent with the parent community plan and community
22 plan policies in these ways. One, is to maintain a
23 developmental academic growth boundary, continue to meet
24 the no new net commute trips -- I'll speak to that
25 potentially later, and I'm sure it will come up in some of

1 your comments -- to link the amount of academic
2 development with the amount of housing that's created at a
3 ratio of 605 housing units per half a million square feet
4 of academic development, and then the proposal is to
5 continue to pay the housing impact fee linked to Palo
6 Alto's charges for commercial development.

7 Actually, this is -- the proposal for this is to
8 actually unlink it and pay \$20 a square foot. I don't
9 want to go and belabor what's in the Draft EIR.

10 Fundamentally it's to inform decision makers and the
11 public what the environmental effects of the project are,
12 how those might be mitigated and how there are
13 alternatives to proposed project that could reduce the
14 impact on the environment, and I'll just go immediately
15 into the process.

16 The notice of preparation for this Draft EIR was
17 issued back in January. We have a lot of public scope
18 (unintelligible) to make sure that we had the most
19 significant issues analyzed in the EIR, and we've
20 published the Draft EIR back in October with the extended
21 public review period. The deadline is now February 2nd.

22 The comments received will be published in the
23 form of the final EIR with the Draft EIR and presented to
24 our decision-making bodies, initially the Planning
25 Commission and then ultimately the Board of Supervisors to

1 make a determination of its adequacy.

2 The best place to get the document is off our
3 website, but there are paper copies available in the
4 community. And there are -- you can also access some of
5 the companion documents that I mentioned, the community
6 plan, the first EIR.

7 There are compliance reports that were presented
8 to the Planning Commission on an annual basis since the
9 adoption of the 2000 General Use Permit to track
10 Stanford's compliance with the permit conditions of the
11 2000 General Use Permit and then a compliance report on
12 Stanford's ability to comply with a no new net trip method
13 or goals. And those are also on our website.

14 So this is the last meeting that we have
15 scheduled for verbal input to the Draft EIR, but as I
16 mentioned, those written comments, the new deadline is
17 5 o'clock on February 2nd.

18 And that concludes my presentation. Thank you.

19 CHAIR CAUBLE: Thank you. All right. We're
20 ready to hear from those of you who wish to speak. And
21 again, if new people come in, they can bring a card up
22 here.

23 Based on the number of speakers we have, I was
24 afraid it was going to be really short, but we'll -- each
25 person will have three minutes, which is our standard time

1 at public hearings.

2 What I will do is call several names at once so
3 that you can be kind of -- it's going to be hard for some
4 of you to get out of your seats, so you have a moment to
5 get up and be ready to go. All right?

6 Our first speaker is John Stewart. John? And
7 after John will be Forest. I don't know if that's a first
8 name or a last name or an only name, and then Irene Kane.

9 Welcome.

10 MR. STEWART: Thank you very much. Good evening.
11 My name is John Stewart. I work out at Stanford
12 University.

13 (Audience commenting.)

14 MR. STEWART: That's something I've never been
15 accused of is somebody not being able to hear me.

16 My name is John Stewart. I work at Stanford
17 University. I've been an employee for 20 years.

18 (Technical difficulties.)

19 CHAIR CAUBLE: Okay. Let's start John's time
20 new. We had technical difficulties.

21 MR. STEWART: Take three.

22 Hello, my name is John Stewart. I'm an employee
23 at Stanford for 20 years. I just wanted to say thank you
24 for having this meeting. I mean, it's a rare circumstance
25 nowadays when people get together civilly, have a common

1 discussion about something that is very important to the
2 entire community, and I wanted to start it off by saying
3 thank you to everybody for showing up.

4 And this is kind of what our forefathers wanted
5 us to do is have these discussions and talk to one another
6 as opposed to yelling and screaming.

7 So to me it's very important that we talk about
8 commuting. I live in Acampo. If anybody knows where that
9 is, it's a little town similar to Campbell, California
10 between Stockton and Sacramento.

11 One of the main reasons that I live out there --
12 I'm sorry?

13 AUDIENCE MEMBER: I couldn't hear you.

14 MR. STEWART: Oh. One of the main reasons that I
15 live out there is that living around here, even though I'm
16 paid generously at Stanford, it is literally out of
17 question, and I am one of the higher end earners for the
18 university.

19 Because -- because I do like to work at Stanford,
20 I do love Palo Alto community. I was born in San Jose. I
21 continue to work out at Stanford. I think we need to work
22 together to move more towards public transportation, and I
23 would like the general community to realize some things,
24 is that over the next 20 years, the population of
25 California is due to increase by 17 million.

1 Those people have to go somewhere. Palo Alto as
2 a community has been very blessed in that there's a lot of
3 things that they do not have to and are not encumbered by.
4 There's no prisons here. There's no gas stations.
5 There's no garbage dumps. There's no air -- I mean,
6 international stuff. Really, really big things.

7 We've been very blessed in this area in that
8 through the Planning Commission and stuff of that nature
9 that you've been able to plan this community out well.
10 But as we start getting cumbered by more and more people
11 over the course of the next 20 years, these meetings are
12 very important, and we need to do stuff to make sure that
13 persons like myself can commute in and not impact the
14 general area.

15 Thank you very much.

16 CHAIR CAUBLE: Thank you. Forest?

17 And then Irene will be after Forest.

18 FOREST: Hi, my name's Forest. I'm a graduate
19 student at Stanford. I'm in the civil environmental
20 engineering department, and so I wanted to introduce
21 myself also as -- before I attended Stanford, I was a
22 laborer, which meant that I shoveled concrete on concrete
23 highways.

24 And so last night I was at my union meeting with
25 the laborers, International Union of North America, and I

1 think from that perspective it gives me a unique
2 perspective, because it took me longer to get to Stanford
3 than most students.

4 So when I got to Stanford, I was married, but I
5 didn't have kids. And I found there's a lot of students
6 like that with me that somehow found their way to
7 Stanford. It took them a little bit longer. And so we
8 don't have a lot of support that's helping us at Stanford,
9 you know, from family and things like that. It's just
10 whatever we brought with ourselves and whatever we're able
11 to find once we're there.

12 So I realize there's a lot of parallels between
13 me and a lot of the membership at SEIU like John who just
14 spoke, and I realize that, you know, it's not all that
15 different between me being a student at Stanford and
16 working as a teaching assistant or working my way through
17 the university as a consultant or all the other things we
18 go through or working at the campus as one of the -- one
19 of the, you know, signatory employees.

20 So now I have three kids and I'm finishing my
21 Ph.D., but now I find out that I need childcare for my
22 kids. I mean, these aren't things I think about when I
23 started at Stanford.

24 And we have one childcare center at Stanford that
25 in the 1970s was essentially given to the graduate

1 students and said, "This is your childcare center. We
2 know you can't afford childcare, so you can volunteer at
3 that childcare center to pay for your kids' childcare."

4 And I'm not even going to try to come up with the
5 amount that childcare costs right now because I know it's
6 as astronomical, and probably every one else on the Board
7 knows better than I do what the real rates are in Palo
8 Alto.

9 And this childcare center is right across the
10 street from Bing school, right across the street from the
11 elementary school, but yesterday when I was walking home,
12 they were putting fences up around that one child center
13 that we've had since the 1970s, and they're going to
14 demolish it.

15 And after that child center is gone, they're
16 going to build another one. But the new child center
17 doesn't have preference for graduate students. It's been
18 given to the faculty or maybe some other employees. Now,
19 I don't think John would be bringing his kid because he's
20 all the way over from Stockton.

21 So I just want to bring up that there's a
22 transition, and I don't know how the GUP can address that,
23 that paving over the university isn't just paving over and
24 building more buildings, sometimes it's removing some of
25 those institutions that are so important to graduate

1 students and to the employees of Stanford, the lower paid
2 employees, that helps them get through there each day.
3 Thank you.

4 CHAIR CAUBLE: Thank you. Irene Kane, and then
5 after Irene will be John Zhao and Chiamaka -- oh, I'm
6 going to mess this up -- Og --

7 CHIAMAKA OGWUEGBU: Don't worry about it.

8 CHAIR CAUBLE: You'll tell me, and we'll get it
9 right when you come up. Welcome.

10 IRENE KANE: Hello, my name is Irene Kane. I
11 live here in the neighborhood. I can walk over here.
12 I've lived in the area since I moved here to the Bay Area
13 in 1980. I've lived here in Palo Alto for 14 years -- or
14 longer than that, actually. 35 years.

15 At any rate, I am against this expansion, and I'm
16 actually against any kind of growth around here.
17 Everybody's boo-hooing we don't have enough housing, we
18 don't have affordable housing, we don't have enough -- we
19 have so -- way too much traffic. You guys are always
20 pushing people to take public transportation. Do you take
21 public transportation? Really? Have you tried to take
22 Caltrain during commute hours?

23 And Caltrain, by the way, doesn't even have
24 dedicated funding. So anytime the economy starts to go
25 down, that's the first thing they do is cut train routes,

1 you know, times and routes. And so where Stanford is
2 there is no -- there is no hope of public transportation.
3 From -- from Portola Valley there's not even a bus, not
4 one single bus goes from Portola Valley over here in Palo
5 Alto.

6 So where are -- how are all these people going to
7 get to where they're going? There's not enough -- I mean,
8 we could build enough housing eventually, but how are
9 those people going to get anywhere? They're not -- the
10 only way they're going to be -- you know, it's walking or
11 biking. And biking's dangerous. I mean, I tried biking
12 and I -- down by the high school, and I had an accident
13 and -- it's crazy over there. You can't even walk without
14 it being dangerous.

15 Anyway, this is going to sound, you know,
16 shocking, but what needs to happen is companies need to go
17 elsewhere. No more expansion for Facebook, no more
18 expansion for Google. There are tons of places in the
19 country that desperately need jobs, and it's not here in
20 the Bay Area.

21 Of course, everyone wants to live here. It's
22 fabulous -- or was fabulous until you couldn't get
23 anywhere, but -- I'm sorry. It's just not enough space,
24 not enough room here, not enough -- not enough public
25 transportation. Thank you.

1 CHAIR CAUBLE: Thank you. John?

2 MR. ZHAO: Good evening, Planning Commissioners.
3 My name is John Zhao, and I'm a member of Scope 2035,
4 Stanford Coalition for planning of Scope 2035. We are a
5 coalition affiliated with SEIU Local 2007.

6 Members and supporters have showed up tonight.
7 Could you all please rise just to show the numbers? Okay.
8 Thank you.

9 I'd like to thank the County for convening this
10 meeting at a time and place that's convenient for both
11 Stanford students and local residents that will be
12 impacted by the outcomes from the General Use Permit. And
13 we also have five speakers today to talk about five key
14 points, and I'll be giving my first.

15 Scope is greatly concerned about the threat of
16 climate change and the dangers it will pose for vulnerable
17 populations worldwide. At minimum, we would like to
18 ensure that Stanford's development plans are in line with
19 California 2030 and 2050 decarbonization targets.

20 However, from the Draft EIR, we are concerned
21 that the metrics California -- the metrics used to
22 determine consistency with these targets are inaccurate
23 and that Stanford's plans are actually significantly over
24 thresholds required by the state.

25 The Greenhouse Gas analysis uses an efficiency

1 metric determined as the total greenhouse gas emissions
2 per service population member, defined as the sum of
3 projects residents and project workers.

4 Currently the report shows that this metric is
5 below the significant thresholds for 2030 and 2035. In
6 the Greenhouse Gas technical report, this metric is
7 calculated from a service population of 68,781 in 2035,
8 but we disagree with this number.

9 First, this analysis assumed that all graduate --
10 undergraduate students and graduate students are workers,
11 which is clearly incorrect. In addition, jobs should be
12 discounted if they are not full time equivalent as is done
13 elsewhere in the report.

14 Lastly, faculty residents living in areas zoned
15 by right for residential use should not be included since
16 they are not part of the project population.

17 Based on the assumptions that Scope 2035 makes,
18 we independently calculated the service population to be
19 44,398 with 19,353 residents and 25,045 jobs. This is
20 dramatically lower than the 68,781 used in the report.

21 This suggests that the efficiency metric used in
22 at Greenhouse Gas emissions technical report would
23 actually be 2.82 megatons of CO2 equivalent per service
24 population member. This shows that Stanford's development
25 is, in fact, over both of the significant thresholds in

1 the report.

2 Stanford's development profile will be locked in
3 for the next two decades, and their own numbers show that
4 they are not in line with the carbon intensity reductions
5 required by the State.

6 CHAIR CAUBLE: Thank you.

7 MR. MERRICK: We ask for these numbers to be
8 revised and mitigation measures to be proposed. Thank
9 you.

10 CHAIR CAUBLE: Thank you.

11 And if Christina Fernandez and Hal Mickelson
12 could get ready, you'll be the next two speakers.

13 CHIMAKA OGWUEGBU: How are you? Good evening,
14 Planning Commission. My name is Chimaka Ogwuegbu, and I'm
15 a member of Scope 2035 and (inaudible) -- no, I'm just
16 kidding. Members and supporters have showed up tonight.
17 I'm actually standing in so they don't forget that you're
18 here.

19 I'd like to thank the County for the convening of
20 this meeting at this time and place that's convenient for
21 Stanford students and local residents that will be
22 impacted by the outcomes of the governing decisions you
23 make.

24 I'm going to talk a little bit about the EHD
25 metric, so the plans to house faculty and staff for

1 (inaudible).

2 Stanford does not have an adequate plan to meet
3 the challenges of population growth and housing demand.
4 It is not building nearly enough housing and the
5 inadequate amount of housing built is not available to all
6 workers at Stanford.

7 With the numbers the university has given, we
8 calculated a significant housing deficit for faculty,
9 postdoctoral and grad students. However, none of these
10 projections include any additional housing for the
11 majority of Stanford's staff and workers. The projections
12 plan to only provide housing to faculty.

13 It is well known that the university reserves
14 housing benefits for faculty, postdocs, medical residents,
15 and only some staff. The majority of staff and workers
16 are ineligible for Stanford housing. Therefore, we are
17 looking at an even greater housing crisis than what we are
18 currently facing and Stanford's development plan refuses
19 to acknowledge its current role and future exacerbation of
20 the housing deficit.

21 The current General Use Permit application does
22 not show that it wants to be proactive about supporting
23 low income community members. The DEIR omits any analysis
24 on how Stanford's under provision of low-income housing
25 impacts surrounding jurisdictions.

1 We ask that Stanford be more upfront about its
2 housing impact and recalculate the number and type of
3 housing it is responsible for accommodating.

4 First, we argue that the housing linkage ratio
5 does not reflect actual local job-housing figures and,
6 therefore, significantly underestimates the number of
7 housing needed -- well, the amount of housing needed for
8 projected increases in faculty, postdocs and grad
9 students.

10 Second, to address the housing deficit for all
11 other staff members and workers that Stanford currently
12 does not assume responsibility for, we ask that Stanford
13 follow the example of the 2000 GUP EIR and 2012 Facebook
14 Campus Project FEIR and provide housing needs broken down
15 by income categories, so very low, low, moderate, above
16 moderate, and type as well.

17 Third, Stanford intends to count approximately
18 450 units of grad residences as low and very low income
19 units for unincorporated Santa Clara County's Regional
20 Housing Needs Allocation. However, these so-called
21 affordable housing units are not available to Santa Clara
22 low income -- Santa Clara County low income residents.
23 This is not a genuine contribution to affordable housing
24 needs in the area.

25 And finally, before my time runs out, Stanford

1 made misleading statements that by housing additional
2 faculty on campus, there will be a net decrease in housing
3 demand. This is due to assumptions made about the living
4 situations of the faculty -- faculty members, which led to
5 housing needs calculations that are skewed in Stanford's
6 favor.

7 Thank you for your time.

8 CHAIR CAUBLE: Thank you. Christina Fernandez,
9 then Hal Mikelson, and it looks like Suzanne Keehn.

10 Let's remember, all of us, that our stenographer
11 is trying to take things down and maybe slow down, hit the
12 high points. You've got three minutes. You guys are
13 getting a lot of good information in in three minutes, so
14 I know you can do it.

15 CHRISTINA FERNANDEZ: Good evening. My name is
16 Christina Fernandez, and I'm a public policy associate
17 with SAMCEDA.

18 On behalf of the San Mateo County Economic
19 Development Association, SAMCEDA, and our members, I would
20 like to express our support for Stanford's 2018 General
21 Use Permit and associated Draft EIR.

22 Stanford is a tremendous asset. It's one of the
23 highest rated universities in the nation and provides a
24 high quality education for the next generation of
25 employees to enter the work force.

1 Companies formed by Stanford have generated world
2 revenues of 2.7 trillion annually and have created 5.4
3 million jobs. Stanford's alumni and faculty have created
4 nearly 40,000 companies. Stanford University is an
5 extraordinary resource for our region, and if the
6 university needs to expand its academic facilities to
7 accommodate new research and teaching, we should support
8 it. I encourage you to support Stanford's 2018 General
9 Use Permit.

10 Thank you for your consideration.

11 CHAIR CAUBLE: Thank you. Mr. Mickelson?

12 HAL MICKELSON: I'm Hal Mickelson. I live in the
13 Greenmeadow neighborhood of Palo Alto, and I appreciate
14 this opportunity. Several things briefly.

15 I've served on a couple of civic committees and
16 civic groups that have looked at the issue of traffic
17 demand management. Stanford is a world class example of
18 successful traffic demand management. The Marguerite
19 Shuttle System with 3.2 million trips per year is
20 something that's envied by people who want to take
21 realistic steps to control traffic and provide commute
22 alternatives throughout the country.

23 So one of the variables under the EIR is whether
24 Stanford should be successful. Stanford has an exemplary
25 record of success in traffic demand management and has

1 numbers to prove it. It has -- it has measured every year
2 the number of people coming and going, and they have solid
3 data. I have neighbors who look out the window and they
4 say, "I notice there's a lot of traffic, I think I'm going
5 to blame it on Stanford." The numbers indicate otherwise.
6 The numbers indicate that their goal of no new commute
7 trips has been consistently met.

8 Second point. When other colleges and
9 universities across the country need to build new
10 buildings, we're usually talking about gobbling up
11 existing residential neighborhoods. Gobbling up close-by
12 properties because that's the only place that someplace
13 like University of Texas or University of Washington or
14 University of Chicago has to expand.

15 The relevance here is we sometimes forget how
16 lucky we are. Through the foresight of its founders
17 Stanford is proposing to expand on its own land. If you
18 were the County Board of Supervisors responsible for
19 University of Chicago or University of Washington, you'd
20 be talking about tearing down housing to permit the
21 university. We're lucky enough not to be talking about
22 that.

23 And the third thing, a little bit historical and
24 architectural trivia, the people who tell you that
25 Stanford is in the style of the California missions have

1 not been educated on the history of American architecture.

2 The Stanford quads are in a style called
3 Richardsonian Romanesque made famous by Henry Hobson
4 Richardson, by Trinity Church in Boston,
5 Boston Hall and Harvard.

6 Stanford has been a scrupulous guardian of its
7 architectural heritage, and insofar as the EIR report
8 relates to a variable about preserving buildings, I think
9 Stanford has come through in doing that. This proposal
10 should be supported.

11 Thank you very much.

12 CHAIR CAUBLE: Thank you. After Suzanne we'll
13 have Terry Holzemer and Stanley Gu.

14 SUZANNE KEEHN: Nobody can deny that Stanford's
15 been a great asset in this community, and -- but sometimes
16 too much of a good thing is too much. And with your plans
17 and the amount of land you're going to be using on new
18 land is going to expand even more than this area can
19 contain.

20 We already are not doing very well. In fact,
21 we're doing pretty bad when it comes to congestion,
22 liveability and the environment right now. I don't see
23 how you can say -- Stanford can say that we will not be
24 adding more pollution to the air, in the building and the
25 more traffic that will happen back and forth to the

1 hospital and to work.

2 And that -- the other thing I'm very concerned
3 about is they're adding 900 housing units that will
4 include 3,150 new beds within the campus. The EIR paid
5 64. It will include 550 units for faculty, staff,
6 postdocs and workers. This means more than 1200 other
7 family members, many who will be children, located near
8 the center of the campus.

9 This will imply here will not be enough --
10 probably be enough to open a new school on campus. Again,
11 because most school funds come from local property taxes
12 that Stanford is exempted from. Special attention must be
13 paid to the financial commitments of Stanford to the
14 school district.

15 And there will be many, many cumulative impacts
16 from all this building. And as far as -- somebody said I
17 think we are already filled up in this area. She didn't
18 identify herself.

19 CHAIR CAUBLE: Thank you. Terry? And then
20 Stanley.

21 TERRY HOLZEMER: Good evening. Thank you very
22 much for the opportunity to come and speak to you,
23 Commissioners. I'm here as a resident of Palo Alto. I've
24 lived here for over 25 years, and it's been a community
25 that I moved to on purpose.

1 From the day I started here, I knew that this was
2 the place for me. It's a beautiful community with
3 beautiful parks, libraries and an environment that makes
4 everybody feel, I think, comfortable and at ease. It
5 reminds me of my home in Ohio in many respects.

6 But a key part of the Stanford EIR is their
7 pledge for -- that any new development will produce no net
8 new vehicle trips on campus. But it's very important to
9 understand -- you probably already know that -- to get
10 around this pledge, they often state in the EIR that they
11 will participate in any off-campus trip reductions and
12 that they will be given credit for that that help Stanford
13 maintain their no net vehicle trips pledge.

14 These credits include monetary contributions that
15 they will make to various projects outside the campus area
16 that include supposedly no more vehicles trips. Questions
17 need to be asked how this is going to be measured and who
18 is going to give these credits and how many credits will
19 be given. I think this is one issue that needs to be
20 examined very closely.

21 Another section of the EIR talks about the
22 cumulative impacts on intersections in the surrounding
23 commute, which is mine, of course, which I live only a
24 mile away from campus. Those impacts in the EIR state
25 clearly that they are significant and unavoidable. If you

1 go down to the corner, and I encourage all of you
2 commissioners to stand at El Camino and Embarcadero roads
3 anytime in the afternoon after 4:00. You'll see the
4 impacts as they are today, not as they'll be 15 years from
5 now, but as they are now. Anybody that stands there for
6 more than five or ten minutes knows those impacts.

7 I think it's time that we look at these impacts
8 very closely and how they impact the surrounding
9 community. Our lives and quality of our life is -- is
10 being -- being changed.

11 One more thing I'd like to mention, and that is
12 the responsibility that I think Stanford has not only to
13 Palo Alto, the community, which they are surrounded by,
14 but also by commitments to Caltrain and also commitments
15 to the school district as well. I'm a member of that
16 school district, and I think it's time that Stanford make
17 a major contribution to the school district, because when
18 they add this new housing, they're going to need more
19 school space, and they should be adding more to that as
20 well.

21 CHAIR CAUBLE: Thank you. All right. After
22 Stanley, we'll have Dan Sakaguchi and Jose Escanuela it
23 looks like.

24 STANLEY GU: Hello, Planning Commission members.
25 I am a member of Scope 2035, and we believe that it is

1 most important that Stanford fully house its academic
2 campus population. We are also concerned that the current
3 fee that Stanford can pay in lieu of creating housing does
4 not adequately offset its housing impact.

5 The fee, established in Condition F.6(c) in the
6 2000 GUP, is there linked to Palo Alto's below market
7 rate, or BMR, fee for commercial development, presumably
8 because Stanford's impact would be similar to a commercial
9 development in Palo Alto.

10 In its 2018 GUP application, Stanford has
11 proposed to de-link its fee from Palo Alto and to adopt a
12 \$20 per square foot fee rising with inflation. Yet even
13 if it were still linked with Palo Alto's fee, this fee
14 would drastically underestimate Stanford's housing impact.

15 Palo Alto's 2016 Nexus study, conducted to inform
16 an update of Palo Alto's fee, found that the maximum
17 justifiable fee for Palo Alto Office, slash, medical
18 office, slash, R&D commercial development was \$264 per
19 square foot. The suggested fee for this category was \$35
20 per square foot, largely due to financial feasibility for
21 Palo Alto in order to continue to tract commercial
22 development.

23 Santa Clara County does not need to be concerned
24 about Stanford's ceasing to develop or moving to a
25 neighboring jurisdiction due to an imposed BMR fee,

1 although Stanford has already begun relocating some of its
2 operations. The bulk of the main academic campus, most
3 likely, will remain. Thus, requiring Stanford to pay an
4 even higher portion of the full fee makes no sense. We
5 believe that Stanford's fee should either be re-linked to
6 Palo Alto's office and commercial development fee, or that
7 a separate study should be completed that looks at
8 Stanford specifically.

9 Indeed, there still remains the question of
10 whether commercial development in Palo Alto can be used as
11 a reasonable proxy for Stanford development. Our own
12 calculations using Stanford's specific data show a rate of
13 \$177 per square foot is a conservative estimate of
14 Stanford housing impact.

15 We have provided these calculations in our
16 written comments, and we look forward to seeing the
17 results of the Stanford-inclusive Nexus study set to be
18 released by the end of the year.

19 We are interested in how that study will be
20 incorporated in the final EIR and what opportunities for
21 public comment will exist as a result of the fact that it
22 will be released after the -- well, before the new
23 deadline for the Draft EIR. But we are still interested
24 in how that will fit in. Thank you.

25 JOSE ESCANUELA: Good evening, Commissioners and

1 committee. My name is Jose Escanuela, and I've been an
2 employee at Stanford University for 15 years. I'm also
3 the president of SEIU Local 2007, and we represent all the
4 professional service and technical workers, the Stanford
5 campus and its slack.

6 And we're here tonight to support a greater
7 access to affordable housing on campus and greater
8 transportation options for the entire community.

9 We've seen, you know, 15 years that we've been
10 here the huge impact that it's causing here locally and in
11 the extended region. Thank you.

12 CHAIR CAUBLE: Thank you. After Dan, Erica Knox
13 and Robert Moss, if you can be ready.

14 DAN SAKAGUCHI. All right. Good evening. My
15 name's Dan Sakaguchi. I'm also a member of Scope 2035 and
16 (inaudible).

17 I'm going to speak a little bit about
18 transportation issues which were brought up already.

19 Scope sees transportation as tightly connected to
20 other issues, greenhouse gas emissions, housing and
21 ultimately labor justice on campus. And after our
22 reviews, scope is concerned about what we've seen in the
23 DEIR's transportation analyses.

24 First, several impacts were deemed less than
25 significant without clear significant standards. For

1 example, projected delays to local buses were not
2 considered significant, even though delays to car traffic
3 were. Impacts on vehicle miles traveled were also not
4 considered significant, but the analysis makes several
5 questionable assumptions. For instance, both on and off
6 students are counted as part of the worker VMT
7 calculations, which conceals a significantly higher VMT by
8 actual workers on campus that are commuting long
9 distances on a daily matter.

10 In addition, because Stanford does not survey its
11 own construction, janitorial and third party contracted
12 workers, regional averages were used that just don't seem
13 right for the purposes of the calculations.

14 Secondly, improvements to Stanford's
15 transportation demand management program should be
16 considered. Contracted and part-time workers remain
17 ineligible for many of the financial incentive TDM
18 programs that they would benefit from, students like
19 myself are in benefit from, given that they're already
20 most likely commuting great distances to campus.

21 Third, Stanford asks for a reserve of 2000
22 parking spaces in addition to spaces left over from the
23 previous General Use Permit. However, if Stanford intends
24 to implement a success TDM program, a parking reserve
25 should not be necessary.

1 Finally, the No Net New Commute Trips standard
2 does not account for lengthening peak commute hours and
3 increasing numbers of off-peak trips.

4 The VMT report show that there are many trips
5 produced during the day that do not adhere to peak hours,
6 such as visitors, guests and supply deliveries, and it
7 makes little sense to only monitor Stanford's impact
8 during a very narrow window during the day. We ask for
9 this window to be increased to more fully capture
10 Stanford's actual impacts.

11 In summary, we believe the EIR can set more
12 stringent standards for impacts on transit and vehicle
13 miles traveled, and that Stanford's TDM programs can be
14 more ambitious and inclusive. Thank you.

15 CHAIR CAUBLE: Thank you.

16 ERICA KNOX: Good evening, Planning
17 Commissioners. My name is Erica Knox, and I --

18 CHAIR CAUBLE: Can I interrupt you?

19 ERICA KNOX: Yes.

20 CHAIR CAUBLE: This is, again, to remind
21 everybody to try to speak -- I know you have conflicting
22 desires to say as much as you can in three minutes, but
23 it's also important that it becomes part of the record.
24 So balance it with a little slower --

25 ERICA KNOX: Absolutely.

1 CHAIR CAUBLE: Go.

2 ERICA KNOX: All right. Good evening, Planning
3 Commissioners. My name is Erica Knox. I'm a grad student
4 at Stanford, and I'm a member of Scope 2035.

5 So the Scope is also concerned about the lack of
6 consideration of maximum build-out in the GUP application
7 in DEIR. We understand that Stanford's academic campus is
8 not bound to specific density requirements from the County
9 that would provide a natural cap on the growth of the
10 university.

11 Under its unique circumstances, Stanford is able
12 to apply indefinitely for additional growth. However,
13 endless growth can ultimately harm the communities it is
14 situated within. The DEIR does not truly evaluate
15 Stanford's impact on the region, through its role in
16 fostering industries that produce high-wage jobs that are
17 outpricing communities in the -- across the Bay Area.

18 Without Stanford taking a proactive role in
19 creating prosperous, vibrant communities in the region,
20 rather than injecting wealth and displacing residents, we
21 believe that Stanford should be seriously considering an
22 end-date for its growth.

23 In terms of policy, Stanford has already failed
24 to study maximum build-out as has been required by Santa
25 Clara County. In particular, Stanford has not complied

1 with its Community Plan Policy GD(i)E -- or (i)3, excuse
2 me, which requires that Stanford prepare and submit a
3 Sustainable Development Study to determine the maximum
4 appropriate build-out for all of -- all of unincorporated
5 land.

6 The Sustainable Development Study completed in
7 2009 only determined build-out until 2035, which does not
8 satisfy the policy requirement. At the minimum, the 2018
9 GUP should ensure that a study of absolute maximum
10 build-out be conducted. Thanks so much.

11 CHAIR CAUBLE: Thank you. Mr. Moss?

12 And next will be Edie Keating and then Judy
13 Kleinberg.

14 ROBERT MOSS: Thank you, Commissioners. First, I
15 didn't see a real justification for why Stanford needs the
16 specific amount of development that they're talking about,
17 and I thought it was strange that they're talking about
18 increasing the amount of what's called occupancy space at
19 about ten percent from your last permit, but they're
20 reducing the amount of housing by almost 20 percent. So
21 they're putting in more offices and less housing support.

22 Then let's talk about traffic. When the Stanford
23 talks about traffic impacts, they're blowing smoke. I
24 want to give you a couple of examples. First of all, they
25 talk about looking at traffic not on campus or near campus

1 but off campus and ignore the traffic that's coming in
2 Stanford. That's nonsense.

3 Secondly, let me give you an example. I had a
4 consulting contract at Stanford some years ago and I was
5 told, Don't come to campus before 10 o'clock and leave
6 before 3:00 so you won't be counted against the traffic
7 impasse. To find out what traffic on Stanford impacts
8 really are, we should do what Palo Alto does and put
9 traffic counters down for 24 hours a day for at least one
10 or two straight days on all the streets around campus.

11 The most congested intersections in Palo Alto, El
12 Camino and Page Mill, El Camino and Embarcadero, El Camino
13 and University, Page Mill and Foothill, all are Stanford
14 created. So Stanford requests to ignore traffic impacts
15 is nonsense.

16 Second, when they talk about people taking
17 transit and using passes, get real data. Don't just take
18 their word for it, but go on campus and talk to people who
19 work there and ask them how did you get in here today?
20 Find out what people are really doing, not what Stanford
21 says they're doing.

22 Finally, this additional development and this
23 amount of additional employment is going to have
24 tremendous negative impacts on the need for housing in an
25 area which is already overwhelmed with a need for more

1 housing. That housing should go on campus, and if you're
2 talking about adding 3000, 3500 housing units now, it
3 should be at least 5 or 6,000 even if you don't reduce the
4 amount of additional office space significantly from what
5 they're proposing. We need more housing. We need less
6 traffic. We need real data on what the traffic impacts
7 are, and we real data on how people actually get to work
8 at Stanford. I don't believe their figures.

9 CHAIR CAUBLE: Thank you.

10 EDIE KEATING: Edie Keating. I'd like to speak
11 about open space and housing. The academic square footage
12 that's added will never go away. Open space is a
13 mitigating protection, but it's only guaranteed until
14 2025. Open space protection through the AGA will only be
15 in place for less than ten years. This GUP goes until
16 2035.

17 Like the last GUP open space protection should
18 extend well beyond the next GUP expiration, but
19 remembering the permanence of this development, it should
20 also be a requirement for at least some of Stanford's open
21 space to be permanently protected.

22 What does it mean when the academic growth
23 boundary expires? Is this -- is there underlying zoning
24 that would allow development? This should be made more
25 clear.

1 With housing I am disappointed at CEQA in general
2 regarding housing. It seems the designated design is
3 almost never identify increased demand for housing as a
4 significant impact, but the families who cannot afford to
5 buy, the renters who live with the annual threat of
6 needing to relocate, any increase in the jobs, housing and
7 balance is significant.

8 What is Palo Alto's jobs, housing and balance? I
9 looked at our 2015 housing element. In 2010 jobs were
10 almost 90,000. Employed residents? Just over 30,000. We
11 have a lot of people who want to live here bidding up the
12 price of every housing unit by these numbers at a
13 three-to-one ratio of jobs to housing.

14 Stanford's proposal? They are very clear about
15 the housing they propose. 3,150 units. You need to look
16 a lot deeper, and this is an EIR issue, that this should
17 be more up front and clear to find their anticipated
18 increase in jobs. 7,509 added jobs. Over a two-to-one
19 ratio of new jobs to housing.

20 I'm sure not all of you live in this district.
21 Is the jobs-to-housing ratio of your district system
22 balance? Perhaps not. So should you care if district
23 five is making itself even less affordable? You should
24 care.

25 The employees Stanford adds without housing are

1 going to be shopping for housing in your districts,
2 increasing prices and displacing your long-time residents,
3 disrupting children's schooling and family ties in your
4 communities.

5 So yes, I hope you take a good look at granting a
6 General Use Permit that only add jobs that are matched by
7 housing. Keep the housing, reduce the academic square
8 footage.

9 Last and related to the expiring General Use
10 Permit. It called for a stay to propose the maximum
11 build-out for Stanford within County lands.

12 CHAIR CAUBLE: Thank you. Your time's up.

13 EDIE KEATING: We could stop meeting like this if
14 you set the final ultimate build-out. Thank you.

15 CHAIR CAUBLE: And Jim Maples and Winter
16 Dellenbach are the two up.

17 JUDY KLEINBERG: Thank you very much for having
18 this meeting. My name is Judy Kleinberg. I'm a CEO for
19 Palo Alto Chamber of Commerce. I'm here to speak about
20 this GUP from sort of 3,000 feet up. There are going to
21 be a lot of comments about the details, and I'm not going
22 to speak to any of them except to just make one comment
23 about the previous speakers with reference to jobs,
24 housing and balance in GUP.

25 Units do not equal people. There are more people

1 per unit in many of the units. So I just wanted to
2 correct that misinterpretation.

3 Stanford, as we know, is the reason probably that
4 most of us are here, that there is a Palo Alto, a Menlo
5 Park, a Mountain View, a Los Altos Hills. Even San Jose,
6 which had 50,000 people some 50 years ago and is now a
7 million, can trace its growth and its prosperity to
8 Stanford.

9 Stanford is the linchpin on our economic
10 vitality. It is an economic driver. It is the reason
11 that we have so many wonderful jobs and innovations, and
12 the quality of life not only of our residents in this
13 region but around the world has been improved
14 immeasurably. Immeasurably.

15 It is a jobs creator in a good way. Those jobs
16 are things that are changing our world, providing services
17 and products, creating new ways to create infrastructure
18 that is sustainable, new treatments for disease.
19 Everything that comes out of Stanford in terms of their
20 academic improvements has changed for the better our
21 world.

22 What do they want to do now? They want to do
23 more. They want to provide for the next 50 years, not the
24 GUP numbers, but the 50 years of what they think is going
25 to be needed for the 21st century of the future, not right

1 now. They need to provide the kind of facilities and
2 teaching staff and environment for that kind of innovative
3 education that we don't even know is going to happen right
4 now.

5 That's what they're trying to do, and we want to
6 support that. The importance of Stanford to the business
7 vitality of not just our area but the whole world can't be
8 denied, and we hope that when you consider their request
9 for this GUP, that that's kept in mind.

10 I also want to speak about the open space.
11 Stanford, as many of you know from being around here a
12 long time, agreed to the Greenbelt preservation. In my
13 years with the committee for green foothills, we were
14 delighted that Stanford saw fit to agree that the green
15 foothills needed to be preserved.

16 What does that mean? It means they have to do
17 in-field development. They have to put the housing and
18 the buildings and students on the campus. We're delighted
19 that they're doing that. They're keeping the preservation
20 of the green foothills. A lot of campuses sprawl.
21 They're keeping it contained, and we applaud that.

22 So as you consider the GUP without going into all
23 those details, thank you for thinking about the positive
24 impacts of Stanford on our world. Thank you.

25 CHAIR CAUBLE: Jim Maples, then Winter and then

1 Lenore.

2 JIM MAPLES: Good evening. My name is Jim
3 Maples. I would like to speak in opposition to the
4 proposed expansion of Stanford campus. As I read the
5 Draft EIR, it's largely about predicting and trying to
6 manage the impact of the increased population from this
7 development. It can't be managed.

8 The simple fact is that there are too many
9 people. Too many people in the Bay Area, too many people
10 in California, too many people in the world. I have lived
11 here for just over 40 years, since 1977. In those 40
12 years, the population of the Bay Area has increased by
13 50 percent, from 5 million to over seven and a half
14 million.

15 Over the same time period, world population has
16 increased by 80 percent. People love to talk about
17 climate change, but they don't talk about the real
18 problem. Too many people. And it just isn't about the
19 air we breathe. We don't have enough water. The freeways
20 are clogged. There's not enough housing. We can't even
21 find a spot to park our car. These are not isolated
22 problems. Too many people.

23 Now, I have nothing against Stanford. I have
24 fond memories of grad school at Stanford. I love
25 Stanford, but we need to start pushing back. This is how

1 it happens. Expansions like this provide more jobs,
2 attract more people and create more crowd.

3 And there's nothing special about Stanford with
4 regard to this problem. The same argument could be made
5 for Facebook, Apple, Google and all the rest. I would
6 just hope that Stanford could show some leadership here.
7 There are plenty of other places with where they can start
8 satellite campuses if they really want to expand.

9 So what could we do? This is a worldwide
10 problem, and the only solutions are long term. We're
11 talking about educating people to not have so many
12 children, and that will take decades to have any effect,
13 but we need to start somewhere. We need to push back. We
14 need to recognize the problem and work to fix it, and the
15 most disheartening part is that you don't even hear the
16 conversation.

17 Thank you.

18 CHAIR CAUBLE: Thank you.

19 MS. DELLENBACH: Good evening. I'm really glad
20 you came to Palo Alto. Thank you so much.

21 My name is Winter Dellenbach. I live in the
22 Barron Park neighborhood of Palo Alto, and sometimes
23 there's too much of a good thing. I have a very personal
24 association with Stanford. Stanford gave me -- my husband
25 grew up in the Stanford campus. He went to Stanford, so

1 Stanford's very personal in my life, and Stanford, it's
2 true, has enriched the Palo Alto community, and Palo Alto
3 enriches the Stanford community. It's not a one-way
4 street. It's very much of a two-way street, and speaking
5 of streets, we share in on the good and the bad that is --
6 that is produced by Stanford.

7 Those streets are clogged with traffic that comes
8 into Stanford, comes into Palo Alto and leaves during the
9 day. Our shared infrastructure around the campus, our
10 schools that Stanford children go to, this is not a vacuum
11 that there is only Stanford. There is the surrounding
12 community of Palo Alto.

13 So it's not just the richness that Stanford
14 provides, it's the impact that Stanford has. And so we
15 can't look at Stanford as -- with rose-colored glasses.
16 We have to look at it with realistic glasses, and that's
17 one of the reasons there's so many people here tonight
18 because we are the folks that are impacted by Stanford
19 while we also appreciate it.

20 So we want to be real, and we expect you folks to
21 be very, very real and not to go down an unrealistic path
22 when considering the Draft EIR.

23 The points that I want to make, I want to say
24 something about the affordable housing fund. Under the
25 current GUP, there is a rule that says that affordable

1 housing funds, the /EPB knew funds, are used within a
2 six-mile radius of the Stanford campus, and that's because
3 the impact of -- is felt with near -- near the campus.
4 That rule should remain. Since the impact is local, the
5 affordable housing fund should be used locally. The link
6 between the impact and the mitigation on the impact should
7 not be broken. That rule in the Draft EIR is different.
8 That should not be changed.

9 Also, the planned housing is not nearly enough.
10 Either the development should be cut back or the housing
11 should be increased, and the housing should be on campus
12 in terms of faculty and students. But the housing as
13 we've heard is pitifully less.

14 CHAIR CAUBLE: Your time is up. Thank you.

15 MS. DELLENBACH: Thank you very much.

16 CHAIR CAUBLE: After Lenore we'll have Katherine
17 Clark and Peter Drekmeier.

18 LENORE CYMES: My name is Lenore Cymes, and right
19 now I live over in University and St. Francis. I moved
20 here over 50 years ago. Well, first let me just say I'm a
21 person who doesn't deal in statistics and (inaudible) and
22 all of those things. That goes way over my head.

23 But when I moved here 50 years ago, there was a
24 stoplight at Los Robles and Page Mill, Embarcadero, and
25 then I was down at University Avenue. And every year I

1 measure the growth by how much longer it took me from Los
2 Robles on El Camino down to University Avenue, and it
3 reached a point where there wasn't -- didn't make any
4 sense to count anymore.

5 Whatever project gets put in in Palo Alto and
6 whoever decides what it's going to be, there's always a
7 comment about zero net traffic. And we've gotten to this
8 place with hundreds of projects that say zero net traffic.

9 I can't accept easily the fact that this project
10 will produce zero net traffic, and people who are going to
11 live on campus and -- I'm lucky. I'm very lucky. I have
12 my house in Palo Alto, but for the people who are going to
13 live on campus, their kids are going to go to soccer
14 games. Is that zero net traffic? I think they need to
15 take a bus. They're going to want to go to a movie. We
16 want to have businesses in downtown Palo Alto grow and
17 thrive just as well.

18 I adore Stanford. It gives me a lot of
19 activities that I can do, a lot of mental stimulation with
20 concerts, classes and everything you can think of. But
21 Stanford is like this elephant in the room, and I really
22 can't see how they can keep growing as they are, be
23 considered a nonprofit, and by being considered a
24 nonprofit, they don't pay taxes, and we have to take care
25 of and absorb a lot of things that they do.

1 I don't want to move from this area. It is
2 great. That's why it's overpopulated, but I really hope
3 you take a lot of consideration about the things that
4 people have said tonight and who are a lot more articulate
5 with statistics and facts than I am and really weigh that
6 when you decide what you allow Stanford to do with this
7 project and hold them as responsible as an interactive
8 neighbor, not somebody who can bulldoze and get their way.
9 Thank you very much.

10 CHAIR CAUBLE: Thank you. We'll have Katherine,
11 then Peter Drekmeier, then Jeralyn Moran.

12 KATHERINE CLARK: Good evening. My name is
13 Katherine Clark. I'm a resident of the Crescent Park
14 neighborhood, which is --

15 (Technical issues.)

16 KATHERINE CLARK: Good evening. My name is
17 Katherine Clark. I'm a resident of the Crescent Park
18 neighborhood which, if you're not familiar, is an area
19 along University bounded by Middlefield and runs down to
20 101 basically to East Palo Alto.

21 I've lived there since 1984, and in the last few
22 years the traffic gridlock problem has become intolerable.
23 I have a picture here, just a typical picture, of an
24 evening November 21, 2017, that's a printout from Waze
25 that shows all of the cross streets going onto University

1 and particularly my street, Center Drive, completely
2 clogged with traffic.

3 This is a public safety issue. We cannot exit
4 our driveways. If a fire truck or ambulance had to get
5 along our street, they wouldn't be able to access our
6 residence. Sometimes my husband and I have had to park
7 our car three blocks away and walk in or drive down the
8 opposite side of the street just to get to our driveway.

9 I have to clear -- I have to go out into the
10 street and ask someone to stop so that I can get my car
11 out. I don't think that the traffic studies that have
12 been done here actually look at the impacts on the side
13 streets to University, because what's happened is, no one
14 wants to come down University because it's already maxed
15 out. So they take Hamilton, which is parallel, and then
16 cut over on the left side street they can, one of which is
17 my street. We have a traffic gridlock problem that's not
18 being addressed.

19 I don't think that any of this up-to-date 21st
20 century Waze data has been looked at, but that could be
21 obtained and analyzed. And I'd like to make this Exhibit
22 A if I could enter it into the record just so that you can
23 see a typical picture of our neighborhood and how it's
24 impacted.

25 I also asked a number of my neighbors who

1 couldn't come here tonight to give me short synopses of
2 how this traffic gridlock has affected them, and if I
3 could, I'd like to add as Exhibit B a compilation of some
4 e-mails that I received from them talking about safety
5 problems, such as an inability to get of their driveway to
6 take an ailing 94-year-old to urgent care. People have
7 had auto accidents trying to back out of their driveways.

8 This is a public safety problem for school
9 children. We have routes going to the public schools and
10 to St. Elizabeth Seton School. This is not a safe route
11 anymore for children.

12 I would ask you and urge you to vote no on this.
13 We have to fix our traffic problem before we add any more
14 development to Palo Alto or to Stanford.

15 Thank you. Can I add this as Exhibit B? Thank
16 you.

17 CHAIR CAUBLE: Peter's coming up. We'll have
18 Jeralyn Moran after him and Jerry Hearn.

19 PETER DREKMEIER: Good evening. First of all,
20 I'd like to thank staff for extending the comments at my
21 (inaudible) today. It's very, very important. Appreciate
22 that.

23 I also want to thank the commissioners for coming
24 up to Palo Alto to hear from the community.

25 My name is Peter Drekmeier. I was born at

1 Stanford Hospital. My parents taught at Stanford, and I
2 grew up in Palo Alto. I came back one day in 1989 to
3 attend the conference one of my Stanford students called
4 "You Can Make A Difference." The theme was the
5 environment. Dennis Hayes spoke. He was the coordinator
6 of the first Earth Day in 1970. He had announced that he
7 was going to organize the 20th anniversary headquartered
8 in Palo Alto. It would be international for the first
9 time.

10 So I moved back to Palo Alto. I've lived here
11 most of the time since. Earth Day 1990 we had 200 million
12 people in 141 countries participate, so it really launched
13 a modern environmental movement, and it was right here in
14 the Stanford/Palo Alto area.

15 I was very involved in the 2000 General Use
16 Permit. I ran a group called Stanford Open Space
17 Alliance. Really pleased with the effort the supervisors
18 (inaudible) with. He did a fantastic job of trying to
19 balance all the different interests. Not everyone got
20 everything they wanted, but he took a lot of bruises and
21 stood up for the community and made a lot of progress.
22 And I appreciate that. I'm glad he's back for round two,
23 and I wish him well.

24 One thing that we did get was commitment to a
25 maximum build-out study on the Stanford campus, and it's

1 repeated three times in the 2000 community plan. The
2 sustainable development study shall identify the maximum
3 planned build-out potential for all of Stanford's
4 unincorporated Santa Clara County land, demonstrate how
5 development will be cited to prevent sprawl into the
6 hillsides, contain development in clustered areas, and
7 provide long-term assurance of compact urban development.
8 Very, very clear.

9 What did Stanford say in this sustainable
10 development study? An ultimate build-out scenario is not
11 possible due to the viable views regarding density and
12 construction methods changing.

13 And somehow that got through the County and the
14 study got approved. We feel cheated. We worked so hard
15 for that measure, and now we're back here again.

16 Any city in the area has zoning. There's
17 floor-area ratio. If you want to go above it, like the
18 Stanford Hospital in Palo Alto did, you have to come to
19 the City and make a good case and -- but on Stanford
20 campus there's no zoning. So every 10 or 15 years they
21 come back with more development. That's not sustainable.

22 I also want to encourage you to look really
23 closely at cumulative impacts. And Stanford properties
24 not just on the campus and the unincorporated county, but
25 in Palo Alto, in Menlo Park and unincorporated San Mateo

1 County. There's talk in the EIR about housing Stanford
2 has created off campus, and I think there's mention of a
3 little over 2000 units. Well, along Sand Hill Road in
4 Palo Alto, there's the Stanford West apartments, 628
5 units, and across the street is the Stanford Hospital,
6 which is being expanded, and they're going to add 2200
7 employees.

8 So if you're going to look at housing created off
9 campus, also look at jobs created off campus 'cause that's
10 a big impact in Palo Alto is the Stanford Research Park.

11 I was going to just mention that we have -- we
12 started circulating a little bit more than a week ago a
13 petition, and we have about 400 signatures so far. I
14 don't have time to read those five bullet points but --

15 CHAIR CAUBLE: No, actually, you don't.

16 PETER DREKMEIER: But I will submit those.

17 CHAIR CAUBLE: Thank you.

18 PETER DREKMEIER: Thank you very much for your
19 time.

20 CHAIR CAUBLE: Thank you. Jeralyn Moran, Jerry
21 Hearn, Gabby Badica.

22 JERALYN MORAN: Good evening. My name is Jeralyn
23 Moran. I'm a resident here in Palo Alto. I was a child
24 here back in the 60s. My life took me elsewhere. I'm
25 back taking care of my 92-year-old mom. There's many

1 differences over those 45 years or so, but I'm here right
2 now to express to you my concern about the dissonance
3 between the Stanford General Use Permit and the
4 commitments that our City has made for climate change
5 mitigation. They don't match, and I'm very worried that
6 this is going to go through.

7 The impact of this project with employee
8 increase, student increase, all that, and I think a lot of
9 us agree tonight we -- it's super important that we see
10 this project -- at a minimum this project should be
11 mitigating what its impact is, even better to add more
12 mitigation, meaning housing general -- very specifically.

13 I can't even believe the traffic problems right
14 now. So -- and the lack of housing. So I implore you to
15 consider this very seriously. It should be a high
16 priority that this project take response -- there should
17 be a big responsibility to mitigate its impact on our
18 community.

19 I respect Stanford. My mom graduated from
20 Stanford. It's a big part of my history, but the
21 environment is top priority for everybody. Nobody's
22 excluded from this climate change priority. So please
23 consider this in your decisions. Thanks.

24 CHAIR CAUBLE: Thank you.

25 Jerry.

1 JERRY HEARN: Good evening. Thank you for this
2 opportunity and for holding it in the space where we can
3 all get together and easily get here.

4 My name is Jerry Hearn. I live in Los Trancos
5 Woods in San Mateo County. In interest of full
6 disclosure, I've been interacting with Stanford staff and
7 faculty for the past 25 years on environmental issues.

8 So I'm going to actually focus on a couple of
9 issues that have not been spoken very much of today, and
10 the first is biological resources. I put a lot of -- it's
11 hard reading those EIRs. That takes a lot of time and
12 energy. And as I sort of burst my way through something
13 and I know a little bit about, which is biological
14 resources, I find that I actually agree with almost
15 everything in there, that Stanford -- I think Stanford
16 over the years has done an excellent job of preserving its
17 biological resources.

18 I do have some comments I'll write in about some
19 of the issues, which are details, but one of the reasons
20 they've been able to do such a good thing is they've got
21 this whole entire area that is sort of marked off from
22 development by the economic growth boundary, and for those
23 of us who really focus on the environment and care about
24 it, that's the savings grace at this point, and there's no
25 assurance that that's going to stay there forever. So one

1 of the things I'd like to see is some kind of
2 understanding of how long that is going to be in place.

3 The second area that I'd like to speak about is
4 the hydrology and water. Water, of course, is just a
5 tremendously challenging issue here in the West.
6 Stanford, once again, I think has done an excellent job as
7 they have been expanding to actually cut their water use
8 and to bring on water reuse as -- for -- to enable them to
9 keep all their lawns green and things like that.

10 However, I think there's a lot farther we can go
11 with that, including advanced purified treatment and
12 things like this. So I would like to actually see a goal
13 by 2035 of Stanford being water independent, in other
14 words, utilizing all the water that they have on campus
15 and living without having to draw it from somewhere else,
16 which would be a good goal for most of us, actually. So
17 we may need to get there.

18 The third area is an area that came up quite a
19 bit in the last GUP and we spent a lot of time about it
20 and that's the recreation aspects. And for those of you
21 who were involved in that, that was all about the trails.
22 I found -- I was kind of surprised to see that with this
23 kind of growth that's happening, that basically there was
24 no significant impact on recreation use in the local
25 areas. That -- I didn't get to study that very deeply,

1 but it surprises me, and I think that ought to be
2 revisited.

3 Thank you very much.

4 CHAIR CAUBLE: Thank you. And we're getting
5 close to taking a short break so our wonderful
6 stenographer can rest her flying fingers. Gabby, and then
7 after Gabby, Karen Harwell.

8 GABBY BADICA: I'm sorry to delay the break. So
9 my name is Gabby Badica. I'm a grad student at Stanford.
10 Thank you very much for holding this meeting and for the
11 feedback opportunity.

12 My comment is about the grad student community
13 and the jobs, mainly the additional housing spaces and
14 academic spaces that we need to do our work. I'm a grad
15 student. I live on campus. I don't have a car. I walk
16 like a lot of grad students.

17 After living the grad student experience for four
18 years here, I'd like to express my support for the
19 development of the grad student community under the GUP.

20 If you don't get on-campus housing as a grad
21 student, it's very difficult, disastrous if you don't have
22 a car. So I'm happy to see that with the EVGR project,
23 the Escondido Village Residency Project, and the GUP, we
24 have enough spaces for the grad students who want to live
25 on campus.

1 I'd also like to speak in favor of something that
2 wasn't really talked about in detail -- or not from the
3 student perspective anyway, which is the addition of the
4 graduate and undergraduate spaces. I think that getting
5 to attend Stanford is a wonderful, special opportunity in
6 our lives. A lot of students describe it as life
7 changing, and I would like to see more students get this
8 wonderful chance.

9 It's not collectively that many more that they're
10 asking for, but the current -- the current acceptance rate
11 of five percent is a lottery. I know this because I teach
12 undergraduate students. They are amazing. They do
13 anything and everything you ask them to do. They read the
14 optional readings a thousand times and come prepared.
15 They're great kids.

16 But I also know that with a rate of five percent,
17 many deserving students can't get in. And I'd like to see
18 them or at least the number the GUP asked for, I'd like to
19 see them able to get in, especially if they want it, kids
20 from this community, kids from high schools in Palo Alto
21 who would like to go.

22 And some of the work -- one thing university of
23 the Escondido Village residency project, I know that they
24 are receptive to feedback and to working together. And
25 there's, well, sometimes mentioning of grad students are

1 sort of being in the way of the community, and we don't
2 want to be an imposition. We want to contribute. For a
3 lot of us the only time we get away from our work, from
4 our labs on campus is when we go volunteer in the
5 community.

6 So I trust that everybody in the room and beyond
7 can work together to resolve all of the other important
8 issues that we mentioned tonight so that we can all live
9 and get all these great chances that this community
10 offers. Thank you.

11 CHAIR CAUBLE: Thank you. A reminder, slow down.

12 Karen Harwell. Are you here? There she is.

13 And then after Karen, we'll do one more before we
14 take a short break, and that will be Kathleen Goldfein.

15 KAREN HARWELL: Good evening, Karen Harwell.

16 I've been a resident of Palo Alto since the mid 60s, and I
17 feel we could all agree in this room that our reality has
18 changed. And I'd like to suggest based on research done
19 in the 80s by a Jonas Saul on behavior, attitude, values
20 and population, in which he said we are caught in thinking
21 in either/or, emphasis on the individual, not the
22 community, emphasis on the part, not the whole and move to
23 what he called Epic B values, which is emphasis on the
24 individual and the community, emphasis on the part and the
25 whole, and emphasis on both and thinking.

1 Because he says with our sheer numbers, if we use
2 the Epic B values, we can actually have a chance to become
3 a cooperative species. But if we stay stuck in the Epic A
4 values, we're going to be fighting each other in silo
5 thinking and not caring about the whole.

6 And I just would like to put that out 'cause I
7 use it every day to challenge myself in which kind of
8 thinking I'm using. Does it match today's reality?

9 Thank you.

10 CHAIR CAUBLE: Thank you. Kathleen?

11 KATHLEEN GOLDFEIN: Yes. I've lived in Palo Alto
12 for 28 years, and I'm a proud mother of both -- mother and
13 mother-in-law of Stanford graduates, so I certainly
14 appreciate the Stanford (inaudible) community.

15 However, everyone in our community has a
16 responsibility. And when you look at growth, we need to
17 look at mitigating whatever we can. And so first of all,
18 I'd like to thank you for --

19 AUDIENCE MEMBER: We can't hear you.

20 KATHLEEN GOLDFEIN: Is this better? I like to
21 thank you for extending the commentary by 60 days so that
22 you have plenty of time -- well, I don't know if it's
23 plenty of time, but more time to evaluate the many
24 relative comments that have been made tonight not to
25 mention the comments you have not yet received from the

1 City of Palo Alto and Menlo Park.

2 And I have two points. As recommended by the
3 California Water Resources Board, please require Stanford
4 to build a water retention basin at the headquarters of
5 San Francisquito Creek, to do their part to reduce the
6 risk of flooding as it happened in 1998. I don't know if
7 any of you remember that, but it was very drastic.

8 The California Water Resources Board held up
9 approval of the San Francisquito drink water authorities
10 proposal in 2014 for months partially due to the lack of
11 any upstream plan to reduce the risk of flooding, and I
12 don't know if -- how that happened, why that happened, why
13 Stanford was so uncooperative and not -- and there was no
14 upstream and is no upstream proposal at the moment.

15 If they continue their noncooperation, I
16 encourage the Board of Supervisors to use their powers on
17 eminent domain to acquire the land for an upstream water
18 retention basin in which the State Water Resources Board
19 regarded is key to preventing future floods.

20 CHAIR CAUBLE: Kathleen, could you talk a little
21 more slowly.

22 KATHLEEN GOLDFEIN: Sorry. So that's point one.

23 Second point is, given the additional hundreds of
24 children that will result from the Stanford expansion,
25 please require Stanford to provide land for the additional

1 elementary school and possibly junior high school that
2 will be needed for these students within walking distance
3 of where these students will live in order to minimize the
4 number of car trips to drop off students.

5 None of Stanford's EIRs begins to include any
6 impact on traffic of the number of students and parents
7 taking their kids to school and around to other places.

8 Palo Alto Unified School District is close to
9 capacity, and we'll need at least one more elementary
10 school to meet the needs of all these new residences. In
11 addition, if any of the housing and land is not subject to
12 property tax, Stanford will -- should be required to pay
13 in-lieu funds -- fees to cover the cost of these new
14 students from Stanford housing and land.

15 Thank you.

16 CHAIR CAUBLE: Thank you. All right. We are
17 going to take a five-minute break.

18 (Short break taken.)

19 CHAIR CAUBLE: All right, Everybody. We're
20 going to reconvene, and as we do so, Kirk has an addendum
21 to his earlier staff report that will just take a sec.

22 Kirk?

23 KIRK GIRARD: Hi. I wanted to as part of my
24 original welcome to this to say we have the Planning
25 Commission here listening to your comments, but we also

1 have the consultants, the lead agencies the County used in
2 preparing the EIR. So they're hearing your comments.
3 There are representatives from Stanford here. We have
4 supervisors from the committee in here. So a lot of
5 people that are in the middle of this project are here to
6 listen to your comments as well as the Planning
7 Commission. Thank you.

8 CHAIR CAUBLE: Thank you for that addition.

9 All right. We're going to resume, and the next
10 three speakers are Art Keller, Todd Collins and Cheriell
11 Jensen.

12 ARTHUR KELLER: Thank you very much. My name is
13 Arthur Keller. I'm a resident of Palo Alto, and also I
14 was a graduate of a Ph.D from Stanford University. And I
15 worked there as researcher for a number of years, many --
16 many happy years.

17 And so first thing we should not allow the
18 Stanford GUP -- new GUP to be approved unless and until
19 the max -- the sustainable development studies requirement
20 of a maximum potential -- sorry, maximum plan build-out
21 potential is done. And that was a requirement of the last
22 GUP, it wasn't done. Don't allow the new GUP until that
23 happens.

24 The next thing is that Stanford's actually
25 dropped housing and balance overall. It's worse than Palo

1 Alto's. And when I was a resident at Stanford, I couldn't
2 find housing on campus. I had to live come off campus in
3 Palo Alto. So we should require -- we should require that
4 Stanford have a commitment to house on campus guaranteed,
5 not necessarily that they -- if the students don't want to
6 live there, that's fine, but guaranteed that all
7 undergraduates, grad students and postdocs be offered
8 housing on campus guaranteed. And that wasn't the case
9 and I don't think is the case now for all students.

10 Also, the no new net trips limitation, I think,
11 is inadequate. Part of the problem there is that with
12 peak spreading -- and you're doing an absolute number, you
13 should think in terms of the overall -- overall commute --
14 peak commute periods. So not just the hour, the whole
15 morning commute and the whole evening commute, total
16 number matching again total number, not just a single
17 hour.

18 Also, in Caltrain, the capacity's spoken for.
19 There's only a ten percent increase capacity from
20 electrification. So Stanford is basically relying on
21 grade separation -- on capacity that doesn't exist.

22 And it's sort of like The Producers movie where
23 everybody -- they keep on selling the same profits to
24 everybody else. The same thing is true about the Caltrain
25 capacity. It's been used by lots and lots of projects,

1 not available for Stanford. Stanford's also provide
2 funding for grade separations.

3 We also -- sorry. We have also have to concern
4 ourselves with the no new net trips limitation. It
5 doesn't take into account pass-through trips, which means
6 that Uber, Lyft, and taxis bringing people to campus are
7 so-called 21st century solutions. Don't count as trips,
8 and yet there are trips in and trips out to bring people
9 to Stanford campus. They must be counted, because
10 otherwise, it just adds to traffic.

11 The housing fee should be higher. It cost 50 --
12 it cost \$500,000 for a housing unit in terms of low-income
13 housing unit, and it should be linked to the cost of
14 housing. That's the inflation rates should be linked to.
15 How much did it cost to build that kind of low-income
16 housing?

17 And I think we should fund -- Stanford should
18 fund expansion of Palo Alto residential parking permit
19 programs to any neighborhood that wants one.

20 Thank you very much.

21 CHAIR CAUBLE: Thank you.

22 TODD COLLINS: Hey. I'm Todd Collins. I'm a
23 member of the Palo Alto School Board, though tonight I'm
24 speaking as an individual. The district will be
25 submitting comments. Thank you very much for the 60-day

1 extension. I texted our -- the person who is working on
2 our comments. I'm sure he's going to take the rest of the
3 night off now, but I will underscore and expand on some of
4 the comments that I expect will be made.

5 The main one is that the GUP application and the
6 DEIR have significantly underestimated the impact on our
7 enrollment. The student generation rate that's used is
8 too low. It uses an enrollment forecast that we don't
9 even use, and it ignores what we call the displacement
10 effect where on-campus housing frees up housing in the
11 City that is occupied by students -- by families with
12 children.

13 The estimate of 275 in the GUP application is
14 really more like 800 to a thousand. Now, those are just
15 numbers. What does that really mean? Well, for the
16 schools, it means two big things. One is simple capacity
17 where 800 students plus the housing that we're expecting
18 to come with a new comprehensive plan in Palo Alto is
19 going to not only exceed our current classroom capacity,
20 it's going to exceed the capacity of all the sites we have
21 that we are holding for new students. So we are going to
22 run out of sites for schools.

23 Second, the students on campus do not generate
24 any additional revenue for the district. So if there's
25 rental housing on campus, there's no property tax revenue

1 generated for the schools, which means that we'll get 800
2 students with no additional revenue to carry their
3 expenses. The incremental expenses are in the
4 neighborhood of \$12,000 per student, so that's 10 million
5 dollars of expenses with no additional revenue. We need
6 to get some compensation to be able to continue to deliver
7 the services we do.

8 The last area is traffic and safety, but
9 particularly the Quarry Road housing is 550 units in an
10 area that is two to five miles from the nearest schools,
11 two to five miles. So that means those students are going
12 to not be walking, they're not going to be biking, they're
13 going to be taking cars to school.

14 Those cars are going to impact not only the other
15 people in cars, but also the kids on bikes and walking.
16 You can go to any major intersection in Palo Alto during
17 peak school commute time and see dozens of kids on bikes
18 jammed up against dozens of bumper-to-bumper cars, and it
19 doesn't take any -- it doesn't take a planning traffic guy
20 engineer to figure out that it's a deeply unsafe
21 environment.

22 So there are really two major mitigations that we
23 need. One, is that we need payment in lieu of taxes. We
24 can't carry 800 additional kids without additional
25 revenue, and the second is Stanford needs to set aside

1 five to ten acres of land for a new school on the west
2 campus. There are two schools on the campus now. They're
3 both on the east side. We need a west campus school to
4 handle the west campus kids.

5 Thank you very much.

6 CHAIR CAUBLE: Thank you.

7 CHERIEL JENSEN: Hi, my name is Cheriell Jensen
8 and years ago I worked in County planning. And the issue
9 of the Stanford plan came up, and we thought that we were
10 actually drawing a boundary and limiting the extent of the
11 development of the Stanford campus. This was in probably
12 the early 80s or mid 80s.

13 And then we find out that that wasn't the case at
14 all, and it seems to keep growing and growing and growing.
15 And they treat cancer at the hospital there, but they
16 aren't treating their own excessive growth.

17 I believe that Stanford takes about two hours of
18 my day on Tuesday as I get in traffic going on 280, 'cause
19 I have to go to San Francisco on Tuesdays, and it takes me
20 an extra hour coming and going. And thankfully, I don't
21 have to do it every day, but a lot of people do do it
22 every day. And that's not fair. I get nothing from
23 Stanford. I live in Saratoga. I get nothing from
24 Stanford except this extra time, and so they owe me.

25 And they owe us all that have to use those

1 facilities. And they're asking us to do something that
2 they admit can't be mitigated. Well, the -- all the
3 facilities now in our area, our big facilities that employ
4 people in the tech industry, have got access to buses
5 going back and forth to San Francisco, but we have none.

6 And if you try to get from the Stanford campus on
7 the 280 system going to South San Jose where there might
8 be some housing, you just can't get there from here 'cause
9 there isn't a bus. There isn't anything, and there isn't
10 anything proposed. And there is no money to get to get
11 anything proposed because we have already taxed ourselves
12 to the limit.

13 So I think here we need to face the fact that
14 Stanford needs to grow. I have a healthy admiration for
15 our academic academia. I got my master's degree, and I
16 taught at San Jose State for five years, and I really
17 think that everybody needs to get an education and go as
18 far as they can, but you need to do it someplace else.

19 You need to actually accept the fact that you
20 have an obligation to look elsewhere for additional growth
21 and establish another campus somewhere else. So that's
22 what I recommend. It's biting the bullet saying this is
23 something that everybody is suffering from now. We don't
24 have the same environment that we did when we spend an
25 extra hour a night trying to get home, we spend an extra

1 hour in the morning trying to get to work. It's not fair.

2 CHAIR CAUBLE: Thank you. Let me call the next
3 few speakers, and then I have an important public service
4 announcement. The next three speakers, Gregory Welch,
5 Kyra Brown and Carol Scott. If you line up.

6 (Public service announcement.)

7 Gregory Welch?

8 GREGORY WELCH: Hi. My name's Gregory Welch. I
9 am a resident of Crescent Park, and while I'm here as an
10 individual, I think I speak on behalf of the over 50
11 neighbors who on short notice showed up at my house a week
12 and a half ago when we all had enough of the traffic in
13 our neighborhood.

14 Five times that number said that they supported
15 something being done and speaking out as a community but
16 that they were not able to join us at our house.

17 To paraphrase former Clinton, it's very simple
18 the message that they want to convey. "It's the traffic,
19 Stupid." We sit here and listen -- and by the way, we all
20 agree.

21 Stanford is a tremendous asset to this community,
22 but we can't applaud all the things it brings and then
23 absolve them of any responsibility for dealing with the
24 problems that do exist in this community.

25 Stanford is also a world class institution in the

1 fields of science and technology, and yet the data that it
2 is relying upon is collected by a technology that predates
3 the computer. Do you think Singapore goes and puts
4 pneumatic tubes across the road to count tires in trying
5 to understand the traffic in its community?

6 In the environmental impact study, the data is
7 collected over a period of 24 to 48 hours at a few
8 intersections, and it doesn't measure actual traffic flow.
9 It only measures how many tires pass a point in the road.
10 It doesn't measure speed of the overall traffic.

11 Meanwhile, one of the spinoffs, the pride of
12 Silicon Valley has all of the data residence on their
13 computers, but we don't see any of that being evaluated in
14 solutions.

15 You've heard from others of my neighbors. This
16 is a safety issue. We have kids traveling on these
17 streets. We have irate drivers frustrated with they spend
18 an hour just trying to get from Stanford to 101, pulling
19 U-turns, violating stop signs, running red lights. Enough
20 is enough.

21 Stanford may say that it's not the creator of
22 this problem, but it's the largest landlord, employer and
23 developer in this community. You can't absolve them of
24 the responsibility for seeking solutions and leading the
25 way. They should be championing world class data analysis

1 and collection in solving this problem, not saying, well,
2 we rely on the County, and the County uses antiquated
3 technology that was around in the 50s. It's absurd.

4 CHAIR CAUBLE: Thank you. Kyra.

5 KYRA BROWN: Hello? Can everyone hear me? Okay.

6 Good evening, Planning Commission. My name is
7 Kyra Brown. I am with Youth United for Community Action
8 in East Palo Alto. I also wear several other hats that I
9 won't go into right now.

10 I would like to say thank you for extending the
11 comment period on this massive project, number one.

12 Secondly, I would like to ask that Stanford
13 considers limiting its expansion. 17 years of expansion
14 is far too long, and this carries adverse impacts on the
15 environment.

16 I would also like to ask Stanford to consider the
17 impacts of their expansion not just on Stanford
18 University's campus, but also on the Peninsula and
19 especially for East Palo Alto.

20 I would like to ask them to consider adding
21 housing to the region that is outside of what they've
22 allocated for their campus. That's one option.

23 Another option is that they consider housing
24 folks within their campus community that are not just
25 faculty members. If not, Stanford's entire community is

1 not being included in these housing plans, and it leaves
2 people out of the equation. These folks who are left out
3 of the equation in turn are forced to live in East Palo
4 Alto and look for housing elsewhere. This puts more
5 pressure on our are already strained housing stock.

6 Once again, I'm Kyra Brown from East Palo Alto.
7 Please consider these things. Thank you for your time.

8 CHAIR CAUBLE: Is Carol Scott still here and
9 wanting to speak? Got on her bike and rode away.

10 Isaac? And I'm not going to butcher your name
11 like I butchered Kyra's.

12 ISAAC ACHLER: I will speak slowly because I
13 can't speak fast. And I am very concerned about the
14 traffic in the Bay Area. There are millions of cars going
15 every day and the pollution that they bring is huge and
16 it's unhealthy, not just for the people of the Bay Area,
17 but also for you, for the community. We all breathe their
18 pollution of these cars.

19 Now, I understood that Stanford is going to
20 bring -- announced in their plan another 10,000 -- no,
21 sorry -- 10,000 people, which I think it's about
22 30 percent of the whole Palo Alto population.

23 Now, this will probably increase, also, the
24 number of cars they will bring to the Bay Area, which I
25 assume would be, more or less, at least 10,000 cars, but

1 what I'm -- what I'm going to say, I think that there is a
2 problem in the Bay Area, in the whole Peninsula of
3 traffic.

4 Until we solve the traffic problem, which the
5 solutions are public transportation or transportation,
6 which means bringing buses, trains, and so on and taxis to
7 the Bay Area and reducing the amount of cars that are
8 going on the roads.

9 In other words, every bus can reduce at least 40
10 cars, 4-0, by bringing their -- the car drivers into the
11 bus, and the bus drives them to their location. In other
12 words, public transportation is a known fact in every
13 country in the world. Europe, China, everywhere you go
14 you see high speed trains, you see public transportation,
15 buses and so on, and people go with the buses.

16 And they are -- they -- now, what I want to say
17 Stanford could implement their plan only after this
18 problem is solved, meaning the public transportation.
19 It's impossible to carry on. It's also a health problem
20 for us.

21 Now, another thing. If you go up to Mt. Hamilton
22 about close to the peak, you just turn your head towards
23 the Bay Area. You see the pollution there, and you start
24 thinking, wow, I breathe this every day. This brings
25 cancer, this brings huge diseases.

1 So please solve the problem of the traffic in the
2 Bay Area. Don't let the car industry, the oil industry,
3 the airplane industry to control our health. Thank you.

4 CHAIR CAUBLE: Thank you. The next speaker is
5 just simply the name Hamilton, and then after Hamilton,
6 Stephanie Munoz and Todd Davies.

7 HAMILTON: Good evening, Commissioners. My wife
8 and I have lived in Palo Alto for 20 years now, and I was
9 going to prepare my own comments, but Peter Drekmeier,
10 who's a former mayor of Palo Alto, ran out of time. So
11 instead, I'm going to read the petition that 377 of us
12 signed.

13 We encourage the County -- Santa Clara County
14 Board of Supervisors to impose the following requirements
15 as conditions of approval of Stanford's 2018 GUP.

16 Stanford cannot continue to grow indefinitely
17 without seriously compromising our quality of life on the
18 Peninsula. The County should establish a maximum
19 build-out for the university. Under the 2000 GUP Stanford
20 was required to study the maximum build-out potential for
21 its campus in its Sustainable Development Study but failed
22 to do so.

23 In exchange for the higher density of development
24 on campus, the Stanford foothills outside of the Academic
25 Growth Boundary should be preserved as permanent open

1 space.

2 The proposed development under the GUP should not
3 make the regional housing shortage worse. Stanford should
4 be required to provide housing on campus or close by for
5 the influx of new students, faculty, staff and contract
6 workers.

7 (Phone.) I'll let him get that.

8 Stanford's development should not make the
9 regional traffic crisis worse. Every new automobile
10 generated by the GUP should be offset by the removal of a
11 trip both during peak and non-peak hours. Furthermore,
12 the 2018 GUP should require no new net parking spaces on
13 campus.

14 And lastly, Stanford should be required to adopt
15 a policy of carbon neutrality for all new construction.

16 Thank you very much.

17 CHAIR CAUBLE: Thank you. Stephanie Munoz.

18 MS. MUNOZ: One second 'cause I need the whole
19 three minutes.

20 CHAIR CAUBLE: And please use the microphone.

21 STEPHANIE MUNOZ: Okay. I'm here to give the
22 voice to somebody that you're not likely to have heard
23 from, Jane Stanford. This woman was married to one of the
24 most powerful men in the world. He was head of Southern
25 Pacific. He was the governor of California. He was a

1 state -- he was a senator of the United States Senator --
2 Senate, sorry.

3 And she determined that she was going to do
4 something else with all that money and all that power.
5 And she had a son, and that son was going to save the
6 world. He was going to be the most enlightened ruler that
7 you've ever saw.

8 Well, he got -- and she took him all over and she
9 taught him all these good things and he got typhoid fever
10 and died. And so she said, Okay, the hell with it. What
11 we'll do is we'll go with all the other kids in
12 California. We're going to make a university so that the
13 rest of the children in California, the poor ones, the
14 ones that never get heard from, they get to be the princes
15 and they get to be the rulers in this country. And she
16 did that.

17 And she belonged to a religion -- maybe we have
18 forgotten about it. She belonged to a -- if you walk up
19 Palm Drive and look at the church and you look at the --
20 as I was taken with my -- I was taken with my
21 grandmother when I was three, because my father graduated
22 from Stanford like my son graduated from Stanford and my
23 grandson graduated from Stanford and my daughter has a
24 master's from Stanford.

25 Anyway, this woman belonged to this religion, and

1 the central tenant of it is we are put on earth to help
2 each other. There is competing ethic and -- oh, God --
3 there's a competing effort, and it's called we're on earth
4 to make money.

5 And when the (inaudible) came around (inaudible)
6 Russians put up that leaving the United States in a lurch,
7 a very wonderful, witty intelligent man, Frederick Terman,
8 saw an opportunity for making Stanford into a world leader
9 in technology.

10 They had all the land, they had all the brains,
11 and they had the incentive and the government money coming
12 in and they did it.

13 Now, money does have its uses. My son -- money
14 does have its uses. My son -- my -- my -- my husband's
15 great great great grandfather William Hartnell was a
16 Mexican civil servant. The Mexican government paid him
17 off in land. He had thousands of acres, but he had 22
18 children. So it wasn't all that much, but still it was a
19 lot. And when California conquered -- when the United
20 States conquered California, they made California a state.
21 And as soon as California was a state, they established
22 counties, and then the counties came and they demanded
23 tax, which the people didn't have, and so they were driven
24 off the land.

25 CHAIR CAUBLE: All right. I'm sorry, your time's

1 up. Thank you.

2 STEPHANIE MUNOZ: Okay.

3 CHAIR CAUBLE: Todd Davies?

4 TODD DAVIES: Hello. It's good to be here. My
5 name is Todd Davies, and I am a staff member at
6 (inaudible) of Stanford. I worked there for most of my
7 adult life, and I was a student there getting all three of
8 my degrees.

9 I loved working there. I believe in the core of
10 the commission and the research and teaching and services
11 to humanity at Stanford. I'm hear to speak as -- I mean,
12 I'm a former resident of Palo Alto -- or I am a former
13 resident for many years. I now live in San Francisco, but
14 I want to speak more about the regional impacts especially
15 in relation to housing.

16 And this was negated by having read something
17 recently that really hit me in the guts about this, and I
18 just wanted to share it with you.

19 This is from an article titled, "Working Homeless
20 Forced to Move in East Palo Alto," by Louis Hansen
21 published on November 15th, 2017.

22 This is in the real estate section of the Mercury
23 News, and it's talking about homeless people living in
24 RVs flooding the streets of East Palo Alto, many of who
25 are children, and the quote is this: The housing crisis

1 has shown acute symptoms in East Palo Alto schools.
2 Ravenswood City School District Superintendent Gloria
3 Hernandez-Goff said the homeless student population in the
4 district has swelled from 25 percent at the start of last
5 school year to 58 percent today. The district has stepped
6 up efforts to feed children at school and distribute
7 groceries to families in need.

8 When I read this, I thought how could we get --
9 in one of the wealthiest area -- most vibrant areas of
10 this country, in the heart of it a school district that
11 has 58 percent of its students being homeless? And it's
12 obviously the legacy of decades of policies that have
13 fostered jobs, housing and balance.

14 We have people coming to places like Palo Alto
15 and Santa Clara County not because it's a wonderful place.
16 It is. There are many wonderful places, actually, that
17 are not growing large numbers of people. People are
18 coming here because of jobs, and so whatever you do about
19 the GUP, I think Stanford should stand (inaudible) the
20 GUP.

21 Please pay attention to the jobs, housing and
22 balance. That to me is the number one issue, and the
23 impact of not providing housing for jobs is what we're
24 seeing today in East Palo Alto.

25 Thanks.

1 CHAIR CAUBLE: Thank you. I will call Carol
2 Scott again in case she was out of the room. She may have
3 had to leave. Going, going, gone.

4 Yoriko Kishimoto, Jeb Eddy.

5 YORIKO KISHIMOTO: Good evening. Thank you for
6 coming to Palo Alto and staying so late. I'm Yoriko
7 Kishimoto, former mayor of Palo Alto, serving out of
8 Regional Open Space, but I'm here as an individual
9 tonight.

10 So I'd like to start by actually complimenting
11 Stanford. It seems to me that over the last decade
12 Stanford has worked hard to be a better neighbor by
13 actively managing its transportation, energy, housing
14 climate change programs, and I do appreciate their
15 efforts.

16 But the question that people are rightly asking
17 tonight going forward is if Stanford can continue to hold
18 its commitment to no net new trips given the massive
19 gridlock that we see in our streets today and the -- the
20 fact that Caltrain is already struggling with its
21 capacity.

22 So just a couple comments on the alternatives
23 analysis. I would personally prefer the reduced
24 development scenario, so I hope you would take a serious
25 look at that.

1 Second, I would think it's worth considering that
2 as we structure the permit, if there's a way to phase it
3 so that if Stanford does fail to meet the no net new trips
4 goal, that further development is basically stopped
5 until -- until it figures out a way to do that.

6 Third, I do object to the additional 3500
7 potential new parking spaces they're asking for as
8 reserve. Some of it is reserve additional parking spaces,
9 always means additional traffic, and if there is an
10 emergency in the future that requires more parking, I
11 imagine Stanford can go to the County to ask for more.

12 And fourth, most importantly, this additional
13 2.3 million square feet is a huge ask, and Stanford cannot
14 continue to rest on its laurels even if it's -- what I
15 have already said if it's in innovative programs. There
16 has to be an additional game changer in order for this to
17 be successful.

18 And the CEQA process does a terrible job of
19 dealing with transit systems and walking and biking, and
20 so this -- it may not be true of the CEQA process, it
21 might be more the planning process.

22 So I would also like to provide a couple points.
23 One is that my wish list is that with that that we have a
24 regional transportation management association, a regional
25 TMA that Stanford could be an active part in, to -- with a

1 strategic and integrated plan to reduce regional traffic.

2 And second, that Stanford play an active role in
3 funding the guardrail and integrating Caltrain with a
4 fantastic regional rail system.

5 CHAIR CAUBLE: Thank you very much.

6 YORIKO KISHIMOTO: Thank you very much.

7 CHAIR CAUBLE: Jeb Eddy.

8 JEB EDDY: Thank you very much for giving us your
9 evening. My wife and I are just ending the three-year
10 period of a lease on our electric car, and we are going to
11 either buy or lease another one. How many of you guys
12 have driven an electric car? Okay. A few of you. Not
13 enough.

14 There's a very small practical thought.
15 Following up on what Yoriko just said, parking. I would
16 encourage you to consider the idea of not allowing parking
17 for gas-powered cars but allowing parking for clean energy
18 cars. I think in one year you would see a huge spike in
19 electric cars, and probably in many cases people would be
20 happy to carpool in electric cars.

21 So I just hope you'll all consider driving
22 electric cars if you have not done so yet. It's a really
23 fun thing. My wife has ours right now, but it's just a
24 small thing that you could do as an experiment. Stanford
25 might be very willing to cooperate with it, but I agree

1 with Yoriko, it's absolutely not okay to continue meeting
2 the demand for gas-powered cars. Please do not do that.

3 CHAIR CAUBLE: Thank you. Thank you very much.
4 We have run out of speaker cards, so this is the time if
5 there are any commissioners -- and again, we're not
6 deliberating, we're not deciding, but if any of us have
7 individual comments or questions that they would like to
8 put out there, this is the time to do so, and we will
9 impose the same time limit on ourselves.

10 So I'll start at this end and go down. And if
11 you have comments, fine. If you don't, fine.
12 Commissioner Rauser?

13 COMMISSIONER RAUSER: Pass.

14 CHAIR CAUBLE: Commissioner Escobar?

15 COMMISSIONER ESCOBAR: Pass.

16 CHAIR CAUBLE: All right. Schmidt?

17 COMMISSIONER SCHMIDT: I want to thank everyone
18 who came tonight and gave very thoughtful comments about
19 this EIR for Stanford over the next 17 years. I just have
20 a couple of things that I'd like to mention right now.

21 One is Stanford proposes to change the method
22 that they calculate the no net new trips, which it seems
23 like it should be -- it would be reasonable to keep it the
24 same way that it had been with this current GUP, and I'm
25 wondering why that is changing.

1 And that is actually the only additional things
2 that the audience covered a lot, and I will probably have
3 a few other written questions that I will provide.

4 CHAIR CAUBLE: And a reminder February 2nd is the
5 new deadline for written comments.

6 Pass it down and see who wants to talk.

7 COMMISSIONER LEFAVER: I think there were some
8 very good questions that were raised this evening, and I'm
9 looking forward to the responses to these questions.
10 Thank you.

11 COMMISSIONER MOORE: Hi. I also wanted to
12 commend those that testified and came today. I think
13 their points made were excellent. There were a few things
14 I'll just mention.

15 In the alternative analysis, whether there is a
16 potential to analyze a scenario where there is academic
17 development and housing parody where there's an actual
18 balance, the reduced alternative assumes the same ratio of
19 academic growth in housing, it just took a, you know,
20 percentage decrease, but very clearly from the data that
21 we see, there's -- there's not an equal number of housing
22 units based on the demand that would be required for that.
23 So I wanted to throw that out as a positive thing.

24 And also whether the -- a couple people have
25 mentioned the maximum build-out plan that was supposed to

1 be done as a condition of approval for the 2000 GUP and
2 whether or not that provides a very important context to
3 which to evaluate this proposed growth since I think that
4 that's really important. And as well as addressing
5 potential mitigation, because there's no proposal to
6 expand the deadline for the academic growth boundary, and
7 I think that should be analyzed in the EIR as well.

8 Right now the trigger that's in the sustainable
9 development plan, that trigger to reevaluate the academic
10 growth goes away after another 400,000 square feet of
11 development which will not take that many years. That's
12 under the current General Use Permit. So there's some
13 issues there that haven't really been addressed I think
14 that are very pertinent.

15 And the last question is we want more information
16 of how the service population is determined in determining
17 the greenhouse gas emissions. I forget the actual term,
18 but the greenhouse gas emissions per capita because it
19 does seem to be a significant difference between the
20 actual number of people on campus, the campus residential
21 and students and workers, everyone together at about
22 49,000 and the 68,000 service population. I'm curious how
23 that's determined and how accurate that is. Thank you.

24 COMMISSIONER RESENDEZ: Number one, I just want
25 to thank every one of you that came in tonight. I know

1 you skipped a family dinner tonight or something else to
2 come to this meeting. Thank you very much.

3 I was the only planning commissioner that came to
4 the first meeting last month, October 12th, and the
5 attendance, you know, was about maybe 20, 25 people, but
6 there were no public comment. Maybe two or three. And
7 this is huge for me. I like when we do the outreach like
8 it was today.

9 And after I came out from that meeting, I said to
10 me, to myself, this is a huge environmental impact. This
11 is a huge development, and we need more people from the
12 community, you guys that live over here, to say something
13 on this.

14 So after that meeting, I've been coming to Palo
15 Alto around 280, 101. Today it goes from Union City to
16 Menlo Park, and then here, and I see -- I was seeing all
17 the huge traffic impact, in Palo Alto and 101 and the
18 whole Bay Area.

19 So this will shape the development, and you have
20 to send letters, reach out to more people in the
21 community, and we will listen to all that because you are
22 the ones that live over here. Thank you.

23 CHAIR CAUBLE: Well, thanks everyone. I had a
24 short list that I was going to bring up, but you all
25 covered it, which is wonderful.

1 I particularly want to thank the staff. It's all
2 always hard to prepare for meetings where you think there
3 will be a lot of public comment, but it's really hard when
4 it's a road trip. And so it's a great facility, and you
5 did a great job.

6 And particularly, Michelle, thank you in
7 particular for what you did.

8 Thank you to our wonderful stenographer who tried
9 to keep up with all of us fast talkers.

10 It is time to adjourn. Maybe staff can be here
11 for another five minutes if anybody has scheduled
12 questions that came in late and didn't hear the good news.
13 Again, thank you all for spending your evening here to
14 enlighten us.

15 (The public meeting was adjourned at 9:19 p.m.)

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 STATE OF CALIFORNIA,)
2 COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA) ss.
3

4 I, LISA R. KEELING, a Certified Shorthand
5 Reporter in and for the State of California, hereby
6 certify that foregoing is a full, true and correct
7 transcript of the proceedings had at the taking of said
8 public hearing, reported to the best of my ability and
9 transcribed under my direction.
10
11
12

13 Date _____, 2017

LISA KEELING, CSR NO. 10518
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25