

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

PALO ALTO
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
TUESDAY, JANUARY 23, 2018

Reported by: LUCY CARRILLO-GRUBBS, CSR #6766
RPR-RMR-CRR-RPR-CCRR

1 Tuesday, January 23, 2018

6:00 P.M.

2 -O-

3 PROCEEDINGS

4 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: If I could get the
5 chambers to please come to order. Thank you so much.

6 We had agreed to start tonight's meeting at 6:00
7 o'clock. We wanted to be respectful of your time.
8 Start as close to 6:00 as we possibly can.

9 Good evening, I'm Santa Clara County's supervisor
10 Joe Simitian. I have the privilege of serving as the
11 representative for the fifth supervisorial district, the
12 designation which means almost nothing to almost
13 everybody.

14 So in plain English what that means is that I
15 represent the north northwestern portion of Santa Clara
16 County, about 400,000 people in the north northwestern
17 part of the county, and that includes Palo Alto,
18 Mountain View, Los Altos, Los Altos Hills, Cupertino,
19 Saratoga, portions of Sunnyvale and portions of San
20 Jose.

21 And I hope I didn't leave any of my district out.
22 Unincorporated areas, which, not coincidentally,
23 includes 4,000 acres of unincorporated Stanford lands in
24 the unincorporated community.

25 The purpose of the meeting tonight is to provide one

1 last opportunity for people to attend the public hearing
2 and present, make comments on the draft environmental
3 impact report, which was issued some months ago. There
4 was a 60-month comment -- excuse me, 60-day comment
5 period, only feels like 60 months. A 60-day comment
6 period that has been extended by an additional 60 days.

7 So I should just mention right up front that
8 there is a deadline now of 5:00 p.m. on Friday, February
9 the 2nd, and I'm looking to the staff to correct me if I
10 happen to misspeak, Friday, 5:00 p.m., February the 2nd,
11 that will be the last opportunity for written comments
12 on the draft environmental impact report.

13 This, however, is opportunity for folks who not
14 only want to submit written comments but also to simply
15 come and make comments at the microphone.

16 We're doing it here close to the property in
17 question as a matter of convenience to the local
18 residents. Thank you all for being here.

19 Your comments tonight will be recorded, and I
20 should mention that we have a court reporter who is
21 here. She's going to take every word down, plus we will
22 record the comments, and your comments tonight will be
23 considered formal comments on the draft EIR, that means
24 that your comments will be included in the environmental
25 document, the final EIR, with a response back to any

1 comments that you make.

2 And that is the value of having you here
3 tonight, it is so much more helpful to hear from folks
4 early on in the process rather than at the 12th hour
5 when it could be tougher, frankly, to incorporate your
6 good thinking, so thank you again for being here.

7 Couple quick announcements. As people file in
8 and take their place, I should mention there is a
9 sign-in sheet on the back table.

10 Candace Joy, if you would raise your hand.
11 Candace, would you raise your hand?

12 MS. JOY: Sorry.

13 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: That's all right. Candace
14 is in the back by the sign-in sheet, and if you would
15 like to be kept informed, if you sign in on the contact
16 sheet there, we will add you to the interested parties
17 list for both the planning department and my office, and
18 going forward you will receive updates about the
19 project.

20 If you would like to speak, then we ask that you
21 fill out a speaker card, it looks something like this,
22 and give it to one of my staff people and you will
23 recognize them, because they're going to walk forward.

24 So, Gabe, would you walk forward, please. Gabe,
25 would you walk forward, please, to the center aisle over

1 here, and then also Kristina Loquist who is here from my
2 office. And Antonia Zavala, where are you, Antonia?
3 Antonia's helping somebody, but we're going to pull her
4 into the mix as well.

5 And if you see any one of these three people
6 wandering up and down the aisles, you should hand them a
7 comment card or simply do it in the rear of the
8 chambers, we will call on you then.

9 A couple of you asked about how we pick folks
10 who are going to be called in terms of comment cards.
11 It's my custom and practice to do it randomly, and I
12 know for some of you that will be just great and others
13 will say, oh, but I wanted to be first, and others will
14 say, no, but I wanted the last word and others will say,
15 oh, but I had a series of three speakers planned.

16 I'm sorry, just to keep folks from gaming the
17 system, I just shuffle the deck and call them randomly
18 and that means everybody gets treated in the same way.

19 There is information in the rear of the chambers
20 that will give you additional information on how to
21 submit those written comments, again, before the
22 February 2nd deadline, and as I mentioned earlier
23 tonight, the meeting is being taped and it's also being
24 broadcast live. And I want to introduce a few folks who
25 are here with us tonight.

1 Again, if we can ask folks in the rear of the
2 chambers to be just a little bit quieter. I haven't
3 done that in years. Thank you. That was great. If we
4 could ask folks in the back to try and keep it a little
5 bit quieter.

6 With me tonight -- with us tonight is Kavitha
7 Kumar, director of planning, right here in front of me.
8 Thank you very much. We also have Lizanne Reynolds
9 who's from our county counsel's office. We have deputy
10 county executive Sylvia Gallegos, who I think is on her
11 way. She has not yet had a chance to arrive. Kavitha
12 Kumar who is project planner. And we have consultants
13 who are here, we ask them to lean forward and introduce
14 themselves.

15 But before we do that, David Radar also from our
16 planning department. David, where are you?

17 Raising your hand right there. Thank you.
18 Right by my side.

19 And our consultants are?

20 MR. MITCHELL: Paul Mitchell from Environmental
21 Science Associates.

22 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: And, Paul, what do you
23 consult on for everybody here who doesn't know that?

24 MR. MITCHELL: Prepared the environmental impact
25 report for the proposed project.

1 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: Thank you. And also with
2 us tonight are?

3 MR. BOXER: I'm Brian Boxer also with the ESA.

4 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: These folks are here on
5 sort of emergency standby in case we need them, but
6 tonight has been primarily designed for comment by
7 members of the public, as I said, to be part of the EIR
8 process.

9 I should mention that -- and there may be others
10 here, my apologies if I haven't spotted you, but I do
11 see our local vice mayor Phil Smith who's here. Phil
12 Smith, thank you for joining us tonight, in addition to
13 the many other regular meetings I know you attend on a
14 regular basis.

15 Again, I want to thank all of you for
16 participating. It really has been helpful to have your
17 early comments and that ensures that they will be
18 responded to as part of the final EIR, which will be
19 prepared in the coming months.

20 All right, then let's ask that either Kavitha
21 Kumar or Kirk Girard give us an initial presentation.

22 Ms. Kumar, go right ahead.

23 KAVITHA KUMAR: Good evening, everyone. Thank
24 you for coming. And I'll give you a very short
25 presentation and leave the rest of the time for you-all

1 to make your comments, which we're here to listen and
2 take note.

3 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: Bear with us as we make
4 the technology work.

5 All right.

6 Ms. Kumar, what do we have on the screen?

7 KAVITHA KUMAR: Give me one moment. I'm going
8 to advance it.

9 Sorry about that.

10 So here's a short meeting agenda. I'm going to
11 talk about the purpose of the meeting, the proposed
12 project that Stanford has submitted to the County of
13 Santa Clara, which we are referring to as a general use
14 permit 2018, the draft environmental impact report and
15 finally, I will go over the public review and input
16 process to be -- to make sure that everybody has that
17 information.

18 This map here shows all the lands owned by
19 Stanford in the -- in the area, and what is shown in
20 green is the -- the portion of Stanford lands that is
21 within the unincorporated Santa Clara County. And the
22 general use permit that they've applied for, which is in
23 front of the County, is that portion which is in the
24 green.

25 And the -- so the proposed development for 2018

1 GUP, the request from Stanford is to add another 2.275
2 million net new square feet of academic and academic
3 support uses, an additional 3,150 new on-campus housing
4 units or beds, 40,000 new net square feet of childcare
5 centers and facilities, and this project is -- has a
6 lifetime horizon of 17 years, starting from when it's
7 approved and goes through 2035.

8 And also, I'd like to note that there is no
9 development proposed in the foothills or the San Juan
10 development district, which is where the faculty housing
11 is located.

12 This graphic gives an idea of what is already
13 existing on Stanford, and that is in the dark brown,
14 tan, that is the amount of square feet that -- a million
15 square feet that's existing on Stanford. And 2.03
16 million square feet, which is in the orange, which was
17 part of the 2000 GUP that was approved in 2000.

18 And the yellow part is what is proposed, the
19 2.275 million square feet that's being requested by
20 Stanford for the next development.

21 And similarly, the bar in the bottom shows the
22 number of student beds and faculty and staff units. The
23 first part shows what's -- what's already on campus, the
24 12 -- 12,219 units.

25 And currently under the current GUP in the 2000

1 GUP, Stanford has allocated 4,468 units, which they're
2 almost built out, and they are requesting another 3,150
3 units or beds in the next phase of development.

4 The draft environmental report is -- has been
5 available to us since October 6th when it was made
6 available to the public. And that -- and that report is
7 in effect -- has detailed information on the effects of
8 the proposed project on the environment in ways in which
9 the significant effects can be mitigated, and it also
10 has alternatives to the proposed project that could
11 reduce or eliminate any significant impacts of the
12 project.

13 This is a very brief overview of the EIR process
14 itself, so in January the notice of preparation was --
15 January 2017 the notice of preparation was -- was sent
16 and then the draft EIR was available to the public in
17 October 2017. And they're currently in the 120-day
18 public review process, which ends on February 2nd, 2018,
19 as was mentioned before.

20 And once we have the final EIR done, sometime
21 around late spring 2018, the findings and the notice of
22 determination will be in fall of 2018, where there will
23 be more public hearings -- public notice and public
24 hearings when the County will take action on the
25 proposed project.

1 The draft EIR has been available in -- on the
2 County website and is still currently available at this
3 website and is also listed on the information that you
4 may have picked up in the back of the room. It's also
5 available in the local libraries and in most of the --
6 in all the city halls and planning offices in the -- in
7 the area.

8 How to comment. So there are various ways you
9 can do that, provide verbal comments today at the
10 meeting, which as Supervisor Simitian said is being
11 recorded. You can submit written comments tonight or
12 via e-mail or by sending it by regular mail to the
13 address provided.

14 And all written comments will be accepted until
15 5:00 p.m. on February -- on Friday, February 2nd, 2018.

16 With that, I'll turn it over to Supervisor
17 Simitian to take your input. Thank you so much.

18 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: Thank you.

19 I do have a number of cards. As I mentioned,
20 we're going to take them randomly. Each speaker is
21 invited to speak for up to three minutes.

22 The microphone is right here. I know a number
23 of you are regulars here. We are going to hit the
24 toggle switch when the time comes. You'll get a warning
25 light when your time is starting to wrap up.

1 And I should also mention that we're going to
2 give the applicant, Stanford University, five minutes
3 max at the end of the meeting to correct any material
4 mistakes that they feel have been made during the course
5 of the conversation.

6 Again, that's for correction purposes only, not
7 for advocacy purposes tonight, because the goal is to
8 get comments on the record. And I think I saw council
9 member Karen Holman who walked in. Thank you, council
10 member, for joining us as well.

11 All right, so let me look to my capable staff.
12 Ms. Loquist, anything else that I should be sharing with
13 the public here before we get -- I think we're good to
14 go.

15 I do notice that there are some folks who have
16 noisemakers. I'm going to ask you to do me a favor,
17 rather than applaud or use the noisemakers following
18 individual speakers, my experience is that that can make
19 it a little intimidating for folks who are shy coming up
20 to the microphone, and even in my district I have people
21 who are shy about coming up to the microphone.

22 What I'm going to ask you to do is hold off for
23 that if you would out of respect to creating sort of a
24 safe space for people, no matter what their point of
25 view, they can still feel comfortable being heard. It's

1 a little less intimidating if we give everybody that
2 courtesy.

3 All right, the first speaker is going to be
4 Edith Eddy, to be followed by Stephen Rosenblum and
5 Julianne Frizzell. Come on up to the microphone.

6 And again, if you can line up a little bit, at
7 least be ready on the aisle, Stephen Rosenblum will be
8 next and then Julianne Frizzell.

9 Ms. Eddy, welcome and thank you.

10 EDITH EDDY: Thank you.

11 My name is Edith Eddy. I live at 2579 Cowper
12 Street in Palo Alto. I've lived there for 45 years.

13 My remarks will be very brief this evening. I'm
14 here because I want to draw attention to part of an
15 article that was printed in the Palo Alto Weekly on
16 December 1st, and in it -- it's by Gennady Sheyner and
17 in it, in the next to last paragraph he refers to some
18 comments made by Mr. Palter representing Stanford
19 University.

20 Specifically, that Mr. Palter noted that of the
21 80 environmental impacts that the report looked at, a
22 total of 76 were deemed less than significant. Of the
23 remaining four, two of them acknowledged by Stanford
24 University were deemed not just significant, but
25 unavoidable.

1 Those two were additional traffic on roadways
2 and additional traffic at inter- -- intersections. So
3 those were considered by the university significant and
4 unavoidable.

5 I want to encourage attention to be paid to what
6 it means to say that those things are unavoidable, and I
7 urge you to pay attention to exactly how severe they
8 will be.

9 Thank you.

10 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: Thank you for your
11 comments. Thank you for your comment.

12 Now it's Stephen Rosenblum to be followed by
13 Julianne Frizzell, welcome.

14 STEPHEN ROSENBLUM: Thank you. Thank you,
15 Supervisor Simitian, for organizing this session.
16 Really appreciate the chance to speak to you directly.

17 Ever since high speed rail decided to root
18 itself through Palo Alto on the Caltrain tracks, I've
19 been extremely interested in the issue of grade
20 separation.

21 As we all know, the -- the -- even with the
22 increase in Caltrain service, the four grade level
23 crossings in Palo Alto are not only dangerous, create a
24 lot of noise, but also are severe impediment to traffic.

25 With Stanford suggesting that they're going to

1 bring almost 10,000 new people into the -- into the Palo
2 Alto area as a result of this general use plan, I think
3 it's incumbent on Stanford to make a significant
4 contribution to grade separation.

5 It's an extremely important issue for point of
6 view traffic, a lot of Stanford people use Caltrain to
7 get to Stanford, and a lot of us have to cross the
8 tracks and a lot of Stanford people have to cross the
9 tracks if they're coming from 101.

10 So there's going to be an unavoidable amount
11 of -- of traffic that's going to be increased, and if
12 there are grade separations, then there will no longer
13 be barriers to the -- the streets at Charleston Meadow,
14 Churchill and Alma, the crossing near downtown.

15 So I think as part of this general use plan, I
16 think Stanford should be asked to make a contribution
17 for grade separations for Caltrains. Thank you.

18 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: Thank you for your
19 comments.

20 That takes us to Julianne Frizzell, and she will
21 then be followed by I believe it's Richard Mates, Jeff
22 Brown, and Gabby Badica.

23 Ms. Frizzell, welcome.

24 JULIANNE FRIZZELL: Thank you.

25 Julianne Frizzell, 1175 Channing Avenue, Palo

1 Alto, and I have lived in the Palo Alto area since the
2 early 1970s, and first in Menlo Park and for the last 22
3 years in Palo Alto.

4 And I am especially concerned with what appears
5 to me to be massive growth, seemingly without end on the
6 Stanford campus.

7 The infrastructure and environment of our area
8 can not handle this growth. I believe it's
9 unsustainable. We in Palo Alto, Menlo Park area already
10 experience too many of the negative impacts of
11 Stanford's growth.

12 I'm in agreement with the ideas that Peter
13 Drekmeier has put forth and the following are a few of
14 the requests that I would like to see incorporated into
15 the Stanford GUP.

16 First is a maximum build-out plan, and I'm not
17 going to go into the details, other people can do that.

18 And secondly, permanent protection of the
19 foothills.

20 Third, creation of at least as many housing
21 units as increasing campus daytime population.

22 And fourth, greater transportation demand
23 management measures.

24 And thank you for the opportunity.

25 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: Thank you. Thank you for

1 being here. That brings us to Richard Mates, Jeff Brown
2 and Gabby Badica, and I hope I'm pronouncing these names
3 correctly.

4 RICHARD MATES: I'm Richard Mates. I've lived
5 in Palo Alto most of my life. I even had a fine
6 gentleman by the name of Simitian as a high school
7 English teacher once upon a time.

8 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: For the record, that was
9 not me.

10 RICHARD MATES: No, it was your dad.

11 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: Thank you.

12 RICHARD MATES: I happen to live in the
13 neighborhood that is in Palo Alto that is being
14 unfortunately called the neighborhood of carmageddon.

15 We have situations regularly now where me, where
16 I and my neighbors can't even back out of our driveways
17 for hours a day. It's terrible. Stanford had no part
18 in that. The leadership of Palo Alto I would place
19 blame with rather than Stanford.

20 However, Stanford in a real way contributes to
21 that problem. And I believe that they should do
22 whatever they want on their campus, but I don't think
23 that they should impact Palo Alto to the extent that
24 this project will. And that is to say that they will
25 add a lot of traffic to the traffic currently going

1 through Stanford.

2 My solution that I suggest is that even though
3 the presentation said that they're not looking to the
4 foothills, they have more than enough land in the
5 foothills to build parking facilities and transportation
6 to the center of the campus, whether it's a light rail
7 or buses or monorail, whatever it is, I suggest that the
8 traffic be vectored to the -- off of 280 and -- and make
9 it their problem, and leave Palo Alto out of the loop.

10 Thank you very much.

11 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: Thank you.

12 Jeff Brown, to be followed by Gabby Badica.

13 Mr. Brown. Two Jeff Browns.

14 JEFF BROWN: It happens.

15 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: And just so you know, we
16 have a system here, we're going to go with the Jeff
17 Brown who got to the microphone first.

18 JEFF BROWN: That's a good one.

19 Okay, so hopefully this won't -- it's telling me
20 to sum up already, so can I start over.

21 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: We're going to start over
22 again.

23 JEFF BROWN: Thank you. There we go for having
24 a new unique name.

25 The first thing I want to do is ask us all to

1 separate the concept of Stanford the educational
2 institution from Stanford the land management
3 corporation.

4 Second thing I'd like us to do is separate the
5 idea of development and construction.

6 Because what we're talking about is
7 construction, and construction comes with huge costs,
8 both to the environment at large and to resources
9 locally.

10 And you will never see in an environmental
11 impact report the statement that this project will make
12 your area unlivable, and that's because the same as with
13 the correlation between global warming and individual
14 hurricanes, you can't draw a one-to-one correlation.

15 But I've lived in this town for 34 years and for
16 the past 25 years there's been incessant construction on
17 that campus, and there has also been a lot of
18 construction in this city.

19 And the city has become, by what I consider to
20 be reasonable standards, unlivable. When you can't back
21 out of your driveway, when you can't see the foothills
22 when you turn to look at them because there's -- they're
23 covered in smog and whatever, that's a situation where
24 it's no longer the community that you bought in to.

25 And so I feel like a little bit addressing point

1 by point an EIR on this particular issue where
2 construction has been going on for this length of time,
3 massive construction, is a little bit like not seeing
4 the forest through the trees.

5 The trees are the items in the EIR. The forest
6 is at the area not -- is becoming or is threatened to
7 become but has become unlivable, and I would like people
8 to consider that.

9 It is amazing to me that we are asking how much
10 more can Stanford build in the year that we've just had,
11 the hurricanes and fires and the smoke, people having to
12 wear respiratory aids to go outside because of the fires
13 in Sonoma and the fire and mudslide down south in
14 December.

15 What are we thinking? I don't know what we're
16 thinking anymore.

17 So the question I want to ask is, what in the
18 world are we thinking?

19 Thank you.

20 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: Thank you.

21 Please, Gabby Badica.

22 GABBY BADICA: Hi.

23 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: How did I do on the
24 pronunciation?

25 GABBY BADICA: Perfect, A plus. And I'm a

1 languages teacher at Stanford. So I'm a grad student at
2 Stanford, I teach languages as well, thank you for
3 having this community meeting tonight.

4 Many important issues have been brought up and
5 many more will be as we move through the night. And I'm
6 here to speak on one, which is the grad student
7 perspective and that's probably because students are so
8 caught up studying that we really don't have much for
9 anything else.

10 We come here from all over the world. I'm from
11 Vancouver, Canada, for example, because we want to
12 improve our education, our professional prospects and
13 those of us who are in grad school because we want to
14 become professors at other universities all over the
15 world.

16 The situation is that we're told you have to be
17 able to get into one of the -- the list of seven elite
18 schools in the state in order to achieve that. And when
19 all of the schools have admission rates similar to
20 Stanford's, it's obviously very hard.

21 For those of us who are lucky enough to get in,
22 attending Stanford and learning from our world expert
23 thesis advisors is a wonderful life-changing thing and I
24 would like more students to have this opportunity.

25 So my comment tonight is in favor of the grad

1 student spot Stanford wants to make, and the GUP is how
2 we get those grad student spots through academic
3 research buildings and dorms for us to live in.

4 I was also happy to see that along with the
5 academic space they're building enough spaces for grad
6 students to live on campus if they want to do so.

7 Right now with the EVGR, the graduate residence
8 project, the idea is to build -- to bring students back
9 to campus and away from everybody else's way basically,
10 which I think is also good.

11 I think Stanford using its own land to house and
12 educate grad students is something I commend them for.
13 Many other universities just say sorry, the housing was
14 just full, you're on your own to go out into wherever
15 you can find a place to live. But Stanford is offering
16 enough housing for all of us.

17 I would also like to support the addition of the
18 new undergrad spaces because I think for undergraduates
19 it's not even any more like luck, can you get in, can
20 you not. I call an admission rate that low a lottery.

21 And so many of them -- as somebody else who's
22 one of their language instructors, so many of them are
23 such great students, they go above and beyond, so I'm
24 very much in favor of this small increase for
25 undergraduate students as well, because I do think that

1 having the opportunity that I do to attend Stanford
2 is -- is great, it's life changing, it really is a
3 wonderful thing that happened to my life, so I want more
4 students to have that.

5 And I hope that we can all work together to also
6 fix all of the other important issues mentioned tonight.

7 Thank you.

8 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: Thank you very much.

9 And before we call the next three, just a couple
10 of quick items. I think I see council member Elizabeth
11 Lewis from Atherton here, do I? Yes, thank you for
12 joining us, council member.

13 And the next thing I want to say is I see folks
14 standing and if that's by choice, great, but there are
15 still a few more seats and I'm going to ask my staff to
16 work with the City of Palo Alto staff to see if we can
17 pull out a few more chairs so that people can be seated
18 in the back.

19 If you're wondering how to do that, go to the
20 vice mayor, he's a very important powerful man, he's
21 right here in the third row, okay, he'll help you out
22 there.

23 And then the last thing I should say is people
24 are filing in to take their places. I mentioned this
25 previously, but this is a decision that will ultimately

1 be made by the County board of supervisors. There are
2 five supervisors, of those five, as I mentioned, I'm the
3 one district supervisor. The other four supervisors do
4 not represent the affected area but will all be part of
5 the five-member board that votes on this issue.

6 So while I am pleased to hear directly from my
7 constituents and near neighbors tonight, as the process
8 continues, you will want to be mindful of the fact that
9 there are five supervisors and ultimately it is a vote
10 of those five, including four who represent other parts
11 of Santa Clara County, who will be voting.

12 So we'll keep looking for a few chairs for those
13 of you standing in the back, and I will go to Jeb Eddy,
14 Arthur Keller and Stephanie Munoz. If you will all come
15 up in that order, please.

16 JEB EDDY: My message consists of two words,
17 should we -- it will take a lot of work to change the
18 amount of parking and --

19 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: Mr. Eddy, I'm going to ask
20 you to speak in the microphone so we catch it.

21 JEB EDDY: I'm holding up a sign that says less
22 parking, so my message consists of two words. It will
23 take some really interesting original thinking and -- to
24 accomplish this, but the effect of -- of reducing the
25 amount of parking that they're asking for will have a

1 very positive cascading effect throughout the City of
2 Palo Alto, throughout the region.

3 Thank you.

4 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: Thank you.

5 Arthur Keller, welcome.

6 ARTHUR KELLER: Thank you.

7 I think you want to reset my time.

8 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: No, I'm good, thank you.

9 ARTHUR KELLER: It's a sum up.

10 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: You have two minutes and
11 50 seconds.

12 ARTHUR KELLER: Okay, great, thank you.

13 Thank you very much for hosting this meeting,
14 and I think that Stanford is a great university and Palo
15 Alto would not exist in its form without Stanford.

16 However, as I mentioned at the last meeting, too
17 much of a great thing is not good. And so one of the
18 things about it is that it is important to realize that
19 there are spillover effects when you basically have a
20 lot of people who are brought on, hired in the Stanford
21 campus, not only does that require housing for the
22 people who are on -- who are on Stanford, and not all of
23 the new people are being housed and there are a lot of
24 people who are already not being housed that are working
25 there, but those people require additional follow-on

1 workers to support the people who are living -- who are
2 working on campus.

3 So there's actually an increased need for the
4 housing in there. And I think that that -- part of that
5 issue is -- is to support that and think about what
6 housing Stanford can have on the Stanford campus.

7 The problem, however, is that that -- that
8 housing does not come without its own pain. And the
9 consideration is that if you -- if you put more housing
10 on, for example, the west side of campus, over by Sand
11 Hill Road, where are the students of those -- of the
12 people being housed there go? There's no elementary
13 school over there. And there already is some housing
14 there that Stanford built without building an elementary
15 school.

16 So we do need Stanford to provide land and pay
17 for the building of a new elementary school on the west
18 side of campus.

19 Also consider that if Stanford puts in housing
20 that is rental housing for employees on campus, those --
21 there will not be any property tax to pay the school
22 district for the cost of the teachers to educate these
23 students.

24 So you need to think about that issue, because,
25 you know, the school district will have increased

1 expenses. We are a basic A district and, therefore, we
2 don't get additional funds for the -- for educating the
3 students if we basically have -- for each additional
4 student. It's just a slice of the pie smaller,
5 especially if there's no additional revenue from
6 Stanford to pay for these students.

7 So firstly in terms of the schools, a site for
8 the school district, elementary school. Second,
9 Stanford to pay for it, and then some sort of in lieu
10 fees in terms of this.

11 Now, I realize that this is not a CEQA issue,
12 but the consideration is that it is nonetheless an issue
13 that is available to talk about at the GUP, and it can
14 be talked about at the County because GUP is like a
15 development agreement, you can negotiate anything you
16 want. So it is within the realm of the City -- of the
17 County to negotiate that.

18 Thank you very much.

19 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: Thank you.

20 And actually, thank you, Mr. Keller, for
21 pointing out that the summing up light has been coming
22 on at the start of people's comments, which I'm guessing
23 is a little bit confusing for them.

24 I think I can master the technology and we can
25 adjust that when you have one minute of your three

1 minutes left. If you see that yellow light on, it
2 should mean that you are two-thirds of the way through
3 your three minutes, you have one minute left. And of
4 course when the red light comes on, that's the signal
5 that three minutes is up.

6 Stephanie Munoz, would you like to come forward,
7 you have up to three minutes.

8 STEPHANIE MUNOZ: Good evening, Supervisor
9 Simitian and your colleagues. My name's Stephanie
10 Munoz. And I want to address one sentence of Palo
11 Alto's letter on this first page in response to
12 Stanford's proposal for GUP. And the sentence is this:
13 "Stanford proposes to create a demand for housing
14 without creating the commensurate housing to fulfill
15 that demand."

16 As far as I'm concerned, that if the one whole
17 thing in the entire GUP that must be addressed, you
18 can't do that. This is part of the part of the movie
19 where I came in. Back in 1959 the Russians put up a
20 satellite, Sputnik, and the United States was much
21 embarrassed not to be the leader anymore.

22 And a very brilliant engineer named Terman at
23 Stanford saw an interesting idea, that if you put
24 together Stanford's enormous lands and Stanford's
25 enormous talent, you could have a whole new world.

1 I have nothing against Stanford. My son
2 graduated from Stanford. My grandson graduated from
3 Stanford. My daughter has a master degree. My father
4 graduated from Stanford.

5 However, what happened when they -- when they
6 started the Stanford industrial park was a -- you
7 couldn't get out of your -- the -- the -- the towns
8 around were really very much impacted. The -- you
9 couldn't -- you couldn't really match.

10 Palo Alto with its general plan, they had one
11 then, and they converted what would have been houses to
12 industrial park. So it was a double whammy, a double.

13 There was not any place for people to live, and
14 everything, Los Altos, Cupertino, even the people had to
15 come from San Jose to work and it was -- it was a total
16 mess.

17 And that's what we're going to have now. Oh,
18 and they took out the train, supervisors took out the
19 train. There was a train from the west valley that --
20 that was right where they wanted to put an expressway to
21 carry people, rubber tire transportation to this
22 industrial park. Took out the train.

23 I would implore you, whatever else you do,
24 whatever else you put on that place, schools or no
25 schools -- well, it does matter with the schools because

1 the result of having all the work in one place and the
2 workers' children in a different town means the dreadful
3 imbalance of education in between the -- the wealthy and
4 the poor that led to the Cyrano decision.

5 You have got to not let them put in workplaces
6 without houses for the workers, every single one.

7 Thank you very, very much.

8 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: Thank you very much.

9 That takes us to our next three speakers,
10 Doroteo Garcia, Nadia Naik, and Jose Escanuela.

11 Doroteo?

12 DOROTEO GARCIA: Yes.

13 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: Welcome.

14 DOROTEO GARCIA: Thank you. Good meaning.

15 Thank you very much for letting me -- this opportunity
16 to let me speak to you.

17 I work in Stanford University by a janitor for
18 20 years, and I am East Palo Alto resident. I feel
19 very, very proud work on this big institution. And I
20 feel very proud how Stanford getting bigger and bigger.
21 Every morning before go to my work, I go my bicycle,
22 because I saw too many cars, too much traffic the
23 University Avenue.

24 I feel proud how Stanford create more job for
25 people, but my question is, where these people can live

1 like the janitor, like a garden, like a cafeteria
2 workers? We need affordable housing for these people.

3 Stanford have more land than East Palo Alto, and
4 East Palo Alto we have a rent control, I think that we
5 need.

6 Thank you very much.

7 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: Thank you.

8 Nadia Naik, to be followed by Jose Escanuela.

9 NADIA NAIK: Good evening. So I have concerns
10 about the Caltrain data that's presented in the GUP.
11 Stanford plans to keep its commitments to no net new
12 trips by relying on a TDM program, and that program
13 relies heavily on Caltrain.

14 Caltrain is already at capacity. Even under
15 electrification, there will not be enough increase in
16 capacity to address for a standard regional growth, much
17 less Stanford's expansion.

18 If Caltrain puts its faith into the role in the
19 TDM program, then their mitigations should be transit
20 focused and not car focused.

21 Train cars would increase capacity, and grade
22 separations would help with safety and road congestion.

23 Although this project is for the academic
24 campus, it is clear that Stanford uses other land that
25 it has for other academic functions.

1 For example, Stanford at Porter Drive is an area
2 of new buildings in the research park that has been
3 described as, quote, a total of seven buildings in the
4 Porter Drive vicinity that will be occupied by the
5 School of Medicine and Stanford University
6 administrative units.

7 It also describes that the three buildings that
8 the university will occupy include 3160 and 3145 Porter
9 Drive and 1841 Page Mill Road. These buildings house
10 administrative groups that support operations of the
11 main campus, including LBRE, human resources and
12 purchasing.

13 Why am I telling you this? The university plans
14 to be in those facilities for five to ten years. Now,
15 these are services that are for the university, so
16 they're moving them into the research park.

17 At peak it's anticipated there will be 1500 or
18 more Stanford employees occupying the seven buildings
19 that comprise Porter Drive. Of the 1500 staff members,
20 40 percent are expected to be Stanford University staff
21 and 60 percent are School of Medicine staff.

22 It's unfair and unreasonable to expect the
23 County and the public to limit their analysis of the
24 impact of the university expansion to the area within
25 the cordon of the university, when clearly the

1 university is shuffling functions outside of the cordon,
2 but only county no net and trips within the cordon.

3 The university is also seeking to get credit for
4 the area beyond the cordon when, for example, they use a
5 Marguerite shuttle, so they're parking people off the
6 campus so they're not tripping the cordon count. And
7 then the Marguerite shuttle that picks up all these
8 people also count as a credit.

9 This makes it clear that the Marguerite data is
10 very important. If you were to put it together with
11 detailed Caltrain ride share data, we can see how many
12 Caltrain riders are Marguerite riders.

13 We can also see how many Marguerite riders are
14 using satellite parking areas and then coming into the
15 cordon. By offering only total numbers it's unclear
16 exactly what's going on. Much like it's unclear how
17 real estate outside the cordon is being used for the
18 Stanford academic use.

19 In addition, Stanford has included very low job
20 multiplier numbers in their calculations. They put a
21 multiplier of 0.73 indirect jobs. The Bay Area council
22 has put out a number of 4.3 for high tech jobs, and
23 Stanford has made it its mission to do technology
24 transfer directly to the area, so they have lots of
25 technological spinoffs.

1 None of the indirect job growth is included in
2 the housing numbers or in the transportation numbers, so
3 when we're looking at the effects, they're trying to
4 limit us very specifically on what's being built and
5 we're not looking at the impact in the greater area.

6 Thank you.

7 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: Thank you.

8 Folks, please. Jose Escanuela, to be followed
9 by I believe it's Neva Yarkin, the other Jeff Brown, and
10 Wynne Furth, welcome.

11 JOSE ESCANUELA: Good evening, good evening,
12 everybody. My name is Jose Escanuela, and I'm an
13 employee of Stanford University. I've been there for 15
14 years. I'm also the president of SEIU Local 2007, and
15 we represent about 1200 of the service employees on the
16 campus. I'm also here on behalf of United Healthcare
17 workers west, which also represents about 1,400 workers
18 at the Stanford Hospital, and we're also here on behalf
19 of United Service Workers West, which represents about
20 200 janitors on the Stanford campus and other parts of
21 the university.

22 And we're here -- basically we would like to be
23 a part in -- we are in full support of the community's
24 needs, especially protecting the environment, that's
25 important. We have a large group of workers who are the

1 premiere gardeners of the institution. We take care of
2 all the resources and so we definitely want the
3 university to do all it can to protect the foothills,
4 protect all of the open space, the arboreta and
5 everything else, because it's so vital to the valley,
6 especially with all the concerns that everybody's
7 bringing up about the fires and everything else.

8 We want the university as part of this general
9 use permit to make a firm commitment to providing
10 affordable housing to its staff on the campus through
11 the below market rate program. We want that for all of
12 the service workers on the campus, not just our members,
13 because everybody is in need of that, and the university
14 can provide that.

15 We also would like the university to make more
16 improvements to the transportation programs, especially
17 the link between East Palo Alto and the university,
18 where many of our members and other community members
19 live. There is no real way to get from Stanford to East
20 Palo Alto that is nowadays safe or quick, and I think
21 really looking at that would help address a lot of the
22 problems that the Palo Alto community has.

23 I want to thank you for listening to me.

24 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: Thank you for being here.

25 Neva Yarkin, followed by Jeff Brown, and then

1 Wynne Furth. Welcome.

2 NEVA YARKIN: My name is Neva Yarkin. I live at
3 133 Churchill Avenue in Palo Alto.

4 The dust hasn't settled from Stanford projects
5 not completed since 2016, there are -- 26 projects are
6 still ongoing.

7 Stanford middle plaza, 8.4 acres at the 300 to
8 500 El Camino hasn't started yet between Palo Alto and
9 Menlo Park. This will cause significant and unavoidable
10 impact to traffic, which hasn't been addressed. This is
11 not acceptable.

12 Everyone wants a piece of Embarcadero Road in
13 Palo Alto, which is already severely congested.
14 Stanford wants Embarcadero Road because it's the main
15 artery on to campus. Hundreds of cars, buses, small and
16 big trucks travel down Embarcadero Road every day and
17 then travel out the same way.

18 On the weekends with football games and other
19 events at Stanford, Embarcadero is at a standstill.

20 Castilleja, a private school wants to use one
21 lane of Embarcadero as an entrance and exit on to their
22 campus with their expansion increase. The electric
23 train will have 20 trains an hour, all that backup of
24 cars waiting at lines to turn on to Churchill Avenue
25 will be pushed on to Embarcadero, Oregon Expressway and

1 side streets.

2 Who is watching new development on Embarcadero
3 Road? How much more traffic can Embarcadero Road
4 handle? Stanford expansion doesn't make sense for
5 Embarcadero Road and all the increased traffic that will
6 occur.

7 What happens when emergency vehicles rushing to
8 Stanford Hospital, a fire or police emergency can't get
9 through traffic jam? Stanford hasn't taken into account
10 any of the future developments on infrastructure in the
11 area.

12 If Stanford is allowed to expand, Stanford needs
13 to build new roads, grocery stores, gas stations,
14 schools to accommodate this influx of people.

15 Stanford needs to help pay for the new electric
16 train cost, new road crossings on train tracks,
17 firefighters, et cetera, that will be benefitting the
18 Stanford community as well as Palo Alto and surrounding
19 cities.

20 Palo Alto and other cities can't and shouldn't
21 carry this burden by ourselves. Like I said before, let
22 the dust settle first before approving new developments
23 at Stanford.

24 Thank you very much.

25 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: Thank you very much.

1 And my apologies, I did not set the timer that
2 time, I'll try and be a little more diligent here by
3 making sure everybody knows just how much time they've
4 got. I believe I now have the other Jeff Brown.

5 JEFF BROWN: Yes. Hello, Supervisor. I am the
6 other Jeff Brown, and thank you for giving me an
7 opportunity to speak as well.

8 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: Thank you.

9 JEFF BROWN: I've been a ten-year homeowner in
10 the North Palo Alto neighborhood, and as a homeowner in
11 the neighborhood of North Palo Alto I absolutely support
12 the growth of Stanford University.

13 I believe the goal of no net new trips proposed
14 in the document is an admirable one, but it does
15 uncorrect two realities that impact the family, and the
16 other families in our neighborhood on a daily basis.

17 Even if the goal is achieved, the existing
18 infrastructure is already over capacity, especially on
19 Embarcadero Road, due in no small part to Stanford
20 University.

21 Two, it does not address local traffic
22 circulation and mobility, particularly in the
23 neighborhoods adjacent to Embarcadero.

24 After reading the second volume of the draft
25 environmental impact report, you notice how well

1 extensively studied traffic flow mitigation strategies
2 on the major thoroughfares and some of the neighborhood
3 intersections. It did not include a comprehensive study
4 of the old Palo Alto neighborhood, even while the nearby
5 neighborhoods of Evergreen Park and South Gate are
6 explicitly called out.

7 This is a major oversight because Embarcadero is
8 one of if not the primary routes to access Stanford and
9 a large percentage of the traffic that would ordinarily
10 traverse it is forced down our smaller neighborhood
11 streets causing traffic congestion in our neighborhood
12 and dangerous conditions for cyclists and students
13 commuting to Palo Alto High and Walter Hays Elementary.

14 Let's make two requests, that the DEIR to be
15 updated to include the traffic infusion of residential
16 environmental tire methodology on the North Palo Alto
17 neighborhood, and the GUP include provisions for
18 widening Embarcadero from three lanes to four near the
19 Alma Street underpass, and for adding a pedestrian
20 crossing through college at Town & Country.

21 Finally, more generally, I didn't see any
22 mention in the DEIR of how Caltrain electrification will
23 impact existing level crossings. This is another
24 serious oversight since the proposed mitigation
25 strategies of all these crossings are insufficient

1 before the expiration of GUP 2035. And the goal of no
2 net new trips is contingent upon increased ridership be
3 made available by the electrification process.

4 Given this, I feel the DEIR should be updated to
5 account for the increased traffic congestion at impact
6 of intersections and with the GUP include a provision to
7 help fund the great separations.

8 I would urge you to make acceptance of the GUP
9 contingent upon these conditions.

10 Thank you for your time and consideration.

11 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: Thank you very much.

12 Wynne Furth, and then Ms. Furth will be followed
13 by our next three speakers, who are Penny Ellson, Lesley
14 Lowe, and Pria Graves in that order.

15 Welcome, Ms. Furth.

16 WYNNE FURTH: Thank you.

17 My name is Wynne Furth. I've lived in Palo Alto
18 for the last 20 years, and long before that I spent four
19 years living in Stanford, studying economics. And our
20 professors impressed upon us that markets were generally
21 a good thing, but they failed as signaling systems that
22 would advance the community welfare if they didn't have
23 an adequate regulatory framework that made them
24 internalize the externalities.

25 So if you had a business model that depended on

1 free pollution of water and air or enslavement of your
2 workers, that was a failed market and we didn't get to
3 where we ought to be.

4 And in this case, of course, Stanford is the
5 enterprise, it's the business, and it's the County
6 that's the regulator with the responsibility for making
7 that -- those externalities internal.

8 I don't know how many students and researchers
9 and support staff Stanford and its campus can help, but
10 I do believe that the EIR needs to analyze an
11 alternative that provides enough housing for everyone
12 who will be supporting the incremental development,
13 including the support staff of course and also to
14 address the existing externalizing of Stanford's housing
15 shortage to the surrounding communities and the rippling
16 damaging effects.

17 And after the EIR is analyzed, that then the GUP
18 needs to require it.

19 Stanford is so big and so wealthy I tend to
20 think of it as a Dutcheys, but it's an unusually
21 brilliant Dutcheys. And I'm confident it has the money,
22 the land and the intelligence to provide the necessary
23 housing, childcare, education and other services that
24 its enterprise demands.

25 And if it fails to do so, it's not only a

1 practical failure upon the part of the board of
2 trustees, because they interfered with their own
3 enterprise, but it's a moral failure with regard to both
4 their workers and the larger community.

5 Right now, one of the ways we handle the housing
6 shortage is by imposing a time tax on workers, with
7 their -- and their families, with their long commutes
8 and sometimes we joke that Palo Alto, pretty soon
9 everybody's going to have to spend two hours washing
10 dishes in their favorite restaurant or making coffee in
11 their favorite coffee shop, but of course it's much more
12 serious than that.

13 This housing needs to be analyzed and then it
14 needs to be required in my opinion.

15 Thank you.

16 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: Thank you for your
17 comments.

18 Penny Ellson, to be followed by Lesley Lowe, to
19 be followed by Pria Graves.

20 Ms. Ellson.

21 PENNY ELLSON: I'm sorry to tell you that your
22 tricky sum up button is still on.

23 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: There we go.

24 PENNY ELLSON: There we go.

25 I have a few general comments. After wading

1 through 5,000 DER plus -- DER pages I came to the
2 realization that though Stanford's DER relies very
3 heavily on Caltrain to mitigate transportation impact,
4 there is no proposed mitigation that would require
5 Stanford to contribute a fair share towards contributing
6 the additional rail capacity they need.

7 Instead the mitigations include partial funding
8 for motor vehicle intersection capacity improvements on
9 county expressways and VTA controlled roads. Projects
10 that will support county engineering jobs. These road
11 capacity increases are coupled with proposals with
12 thousands of new auto parking spaces.

13 Why are the obviously needed mitigations related
14 to supporting Caltrain capacity improvements ignored?

15 I find the emphasis on motor vehicle parking and
16 operational capacity worrisome. For starters, it's
17 inconsistent with the policies of our comp plan.

18 We know what the outcome of that kind of
19 planning will be, an increase in car trips which are
20 likely to undermine gains made toward mode shift during
21 the term of the last GUP.

22 Risk associated with increasing car trips makes
23 streets feel less comfortable to people who walk and
24 bike. It pushes foot-powered commuters back into cars.
25 How does this set of mitigations align with Stanford's

1 no new net trip goals?

2 The FEIR should consider planned growth and the
3 comp plan EIRs of Palo Alto, Menlo Park and Mountain
4 View. Aggregates matter.

5 The County recently overestimated available
6 transit capacity in the ER of another project for a
7 stadium with devastating consequences. Let's learn from
8 that experience.

9 And finally, I agree that further evaluation is
10 needed regarding impacts at specific intersections,
11 including Caltrain grade separation at Alma, Charleston.

12 The analysis should assess impacts with and
13 without grade separations. And I'm being told to sum up
14 so I'm going to stop here and submit the rest of my
15 comments in writing.

16 Thank you.

17 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: Thank you very much.

18 That takes us to Pria Graves, and she will be
19 followed by Alice Kaufman, Jean McCown and Peter from
20 San Lorenzo.

21 LESLEY LOWE: You skipped one.

22 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: Well, let's not do that.

23 LESLEY LOWE: Thank you.

24 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: Lesley Lowe.

25 LESLEY LOWE: Thank you.

1 Good morning.

2 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: Hang on, Ms. Lowe. Let me
3 make sure you get the full three minutes as well.

4 All right, go to it.

5 LESLEY LOWE: Good evening. My name is Lesley
6 Lowe, and I'm a senior planner at Stanford. I'd like to
7 address comments about the no net new commute standard,
8 specifically the concerns that Stanford can't make the
9 no net new trips under the 2018 GUP.

10 Stanford takes it very seriously when we say we
11 want to make the no net new trip goal under the 2018
12 GUP. Our TDM program is nationally recognized as
13 effective and innovative, and we did not take it lightly
14 when we were committing to that standard for the next 17
15 years.

16 Under the 2018 GUP we need to move roughly 50
17 drivers a year to other modes of transportation. The
18 pull of which to convert these drivers is over 3,000
19 existing commuters and any future drivers that may be
20 coming to Stanford's campus.

21 Our mode share model that we built as part of
22 the 2018 GUP analysis shows that we can do that in
23 multiple ways, and not just with Caltrain.

24 Examples include a new commuter shuttle which
25 could put 50 people on just one bus. Key bicycle

1 infrastructure projects or van pools. We can infuse ten
2 new van pools and move with five people enough up to 50
3 people. So we really feel that this is an achievable
4 goal.

5 We believe our TDM program needs to continue to
6 be flexible, because it needs to adapt to changing
7 technologies such as automation, which all the
8 transportation planners are looking for, where are
9 people living and what infrastructure becomes in place.

10 Building out over 17 years means that lots of
11 things will change both locally and regionally, and we
12 need to be flexible to implement programs that work so
13 we can continue to be successful.

14 I'd also like to address comments from the
15 community that state that Stanford's existing trip
16 monitoring program doesn't go far enough to reduce
17 traffic congestion, specifically because it focuses on
18 the peak hour, that the university's been able to push
19 traffic outside the peak hour in order to meet our
20 requirements.

21 The peak hour monitoring is a limited snapshot
22 of traffic conditions. However, two other metrics that
23 are tracked point to all -- our all day success that
24 Stanford has been able to move trips.

25 Our single occupancy vehicle rate has dropped

1 from 17 -- from 72 percent in 2002 to 43 percent today.

2 This reduction illustrates that our TDM program
3 is working and is successful at moving commuters to
4 other modes of transportation.

5 Our vehicle miles travel analysis considered the
6 average amount of travel -- car travel driven by a
7 person in our population. The VMT analysis for the 2018
8 GUP found that Stanford's commuter VMT in 2035 will be
9 70 percent below our regional average of 15 miles per
10 capita.

11 The way -- the rate the VMT decreases is not by
12 moving a person closer for a shorter trip, but it's
13 about moving people out of their cars, which points to
14 the success of our TDM program.

15 Thank you.

16 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: Thank you.

17 And I believe that now it's Pria Graves,
18 followed by Alice Kaufman, Peter from San Lorenzo and
19 Jean McCown.

20 Welcome.

21 PRIA GRAVES: Good evening, mayor -- former
22 mayor and Supervisor Simitian.

23 My biggest concern with this project is that we
24 are looking at it in a piecemeal fashion. I understand
25 that that's how CEQA works, that we're talking only

1 about the Stanford campus.

2 But this campus cannot be looked at without also
3 looking at the hospital, without also looking at the 180
4 units of housing coming online in the Stanford park
5 area, and the north end of California -- or south end I
6 guess it is of California Avenue.

7 All of these things are interrelated. Ms. Naik
8 spoke to the folks that are being housed out in the
9 research park -- or not housed, but officed in the
10 research park, all of these things need to be looked at
11 as a unit.

12 Stanford is a monumental institution. We all
13 acknowledge that and we acknowledge that we have
14 benefits from it. But if we bifurcate all this stuff
15 into little compartments, we have no control over the
16 effect that it has on our community.

17 With respect to traffic, the one hour -- the
18 peak hour problem. We're looking at ten hours a week of
19 when the traffic is happening. The other 158 hours
20 there's kind of like, okay, well, just traffic whenever
21 you want to.

22 We need to be looking at overall traffic, 24/7,
23 particularly now that the commute hour has spread to a
24 three- or four-hour window.

25 Finally, the issue of long-term sustainability,

1 the build-out plan. Stanford needs to step up and take
2 a leadership role in setting an example of how a major
3 institution can achieve sustainability.

4 Sustainability all across every aspect of its
5 existence, sustainability with its construction,
6 sustainability with traffic, sustainability with
7 population, open space, everything. And Stanford is
8 well positioned to play that leadership role in setting
9 an example of how to get to sustainable.

10 Thank you.

11 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: Thank you very much.

12 Alice Kaufman from Redwood City, and then Peter
13 from San Lorenzo, and then Jean McCown. Welcome.

14 ALICE KAUFMAN: Thank you. Alice Kaufman, I'm
15 the legislative advocacy director with the Committee for
16 Green Foothills, which is an open space and natural
17 resources organization working in San Mateo and Santa
18 Clara Counties.

19 Our concern is about the academic growth
20 boundary which limits development on the Stanford campus
21 to within a boundary line that's roughly aligned with
22 Junipero Boulevard.

23 The academic growth boundary was established by
24 the Stanford community plan in the year 2000, and it
25 requires a four out of five vote by the county board of

1 supervisors to change, move or abolish the boundary line
2 or to permit any development beyond it.

3 That four votes requirement was established for
4 a period of 25 years, meaning it will expire in 2025.

5 We believe that the super majority vote
6 requirement should be a requirement for the academic
7 growth boundary. Santa Clara County's general plan
8 states that the unincorporated county area is not the
9 place for intense development uses.

10 Cities, if they want to annex unincorporated
11 land in order to grow beyond their boundaries, must
12 apply to Santa Clara County LAFCO, the agency which is
13 required to waive the important -- preserving open space
14 and agricultural land, as well as the ill effect of
15 sprawl on the open space and efficient delivery of
16 services before including any annexation requests.

17 Since Stanford is not under the jurisdiction of
18 LAFCO or any other independent body whose mission is to
19 examine these impacts, it becomes more than ever
20 important that the barrier to improving development in
21 the foothills is higher than the simple majority of the
22 five-member board.

23 Committee for Green Foothills was founded to
24 protect the open space of the Palo Alto foothills.

25 Although we have now expanded and work on many

1 issues in both San Mateo County and Santa Clara County,
2 including feasible rides, urban parks, agriculture,
3 wildlife borders, preserving old growth redwoods and so
4 on. We still remember our founding members who gathered
5 in a living room in 1959 with the mantra of keep
6 factories out of the foothills.

7 We still value the foothills and believe they
8 should be preserved for the next generation to enjoy.

9 Thank you for your time.

10 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: Thank you very much.

11 That takes us to Peter from Lorenzo, followed by
12 Jean McCown.

13 Peter, welcome.

14 PETER EMANUEL: Good meaning, everyone.

15 My name is Peter Emanuel. I'm here and I'm a
16 member of SEIU Local 2007. I work on campus and dining
17 as a storekeeper.

18 I'm here representing my fellow coworkers. I
19 believe that if Stanford wants to show that they value
20 their coworkers or their workers, they would make a
21 commitment, a solid commitment to housing the workers
22 like myself, my coworkers and I would benefit from
23 having access to the below market rate housing on
24 campus. This would mean that I wouldn't have to commute
25 as far as I do and I would have more resources to take

1 care of my family.

2 I think that the current draft EIR doesn't
3 address the housing shortage that exists and Stanford
4 could help mitigate.

5 Thank you for your time.

6 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: Thank you for your time.

7 Jean McCown, and McCown will be followed by
8 Cecily Foote, Sea Reddy and David Shen, in that order.

9 Welcome.

10 JEAN McCOWN: Good evening, thank you very much,
11 Jean McCown, Stanford University. I want to speak
12 briefly to why we propose this plan.

13 The university's mission of teaching its state
14 of the art research and the commitment to
15 interdisciplinary collaboration depends on growth of our
16 physical spaces to continue to facilitate discoveries
17 that address problems of flow with significance.

18 Knowledge is continually expanding. New fields
19 of research continue to emerge. Academic space needs to
20 meet the needs of these new academic fields and sustain
21 leadership in them.

22 Many fields of research require highly
23 specialized facilities to conduct experiments with
24 stringent safety standards. Other fields require large
25 physical spaces for large scale instruments to

1 accomplish the work.

2 Opportunities will develop over the course of
3 the 2018 general use permit that we cannot predict
4 today. The flexibility to accommodate unexpected
5 emerging opportunities has allowed the university to
6 produce some of its most exciting innovations.

7 For example, under the 2000 general use permit,
8 Stanford did not foresee the Stanford energy systems
9 innovation facility, which has completely changed the
10 way the campus is able to do its heating and cooling.

11 We understand why people are concerned about the
12 impact of growth, and in submitting the application in
13 2016, Stanford took care to include many elements in it
14 in order to avoid negative environmental impacts, so we
15 are actually encouraged by the results of the draft EIR.

16 The County's draft EIR studied 80 potential
17 significant impact areas in a variety of resources. It
18 found that there are no significant impacts at all in 47
19 of these areas. 29 can be mitigated to less than
20 significant, leaving four that are labeled significant
21 and unavoidable.

22 Two of these are temporary construction noise
23 impacts and a possible impact on historic resources.
24 The remaining two impacts do concern traffic, local
25 intersections and freeway road impacts.

1 However, the conclusions are based on the very
2 conservative assumption that Stanford will do nothing
3 more to reduce automobile trips through its
4 transportation demand management programs.

5 As you heard from my colleague, Lesley Lowe, we
6 do not believe that is the case. In fact, Stanford
7 intends to continue to expand its TDM programs so as not
8 to add new commute trips. We have accomplished this
9 goal for the last 15 years and we intend to continue to
10 do so under this GUP or in the next GUP.

11 Also, the DER does show reductions in campus
12 related air pollutants, vehicle miles traveled and
13 greenhouse gas.

14 In sum, Stanford is committed to grow in a
15 manner that will not result in significant adverse
16 impacts. Our growth is necessary to further the mission
17 of teaching and research, resulting in local, regional
18 and worldwide innovations, discoveries and benefits.

19 Thank you very much.

20 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: Thank you.

21 Then we have Cecily Foote, Sea Reddy and David
22 Shen.

23 CECILY FOOTE: Hello, my name is Cecily Foote,
24 and I'm a graduate student at Stanford and I'm a member
25 of the Stanford Coalition for Planning an Equitable

1 2035.

2 In the past we have commented specifically about
3 our concerns with the analyses on greenhouse gas
4 emissions, housing, transportation, and the need for
5 consideration for a maximum build-out scenario.

6 We will be submitting these comments to the
7 County, and tonight would like to simply highlight a few
8 issues in each of these areas.

9 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: Ms. Furth, excuse the
10 interruption. Before you highlight, I want to make sure
11 that everybody can hear and let me just mention a couple
12 things.

13 One is, the system is a little interesting,
14 which is if I turn off my microphone, then you get a
15 little louder, which is a good thing. But I think we
16 also just need folks to speak right up, because I'm
17 getting enough looks from the rear of the chambers that
18 suggest that it's a little hard to hear.

19 So if you can just all speak right up in the
20 microphone, we'll also see if we can get staff in the
21 back to give us a little bit more volume, but you do
22 have to speak up.

23 I'm hearing you pretty well, but I want to make
24 sure that everyone who's in the room can hear you as
25 well, all right?

1 WYNNE FURTH: No problem.

2 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: Go ahead, start your time
3 again, go to it.

4 WYNNE FURTH: For the greenhouse gas emissions,
5 it seems the draft EIR drastically overestimates the
6 population used to determine whether Stanford is on
7 track to comply with future statewide targets.

8 As a result, our analysis shows that Stanford's
9 development will exceed state targets. We ask for these
10 numbers to be revised for Stanford as a world leader in
11 sustainability to make appropriate adjustments to its
12 plans.

13 For housing analysis, it seems clear that
14 Stanford does not plan to provide enough housing, let
15 alone for those who need it, such as its own staff and
16 workers.

17 In part, this is because the housing linkage
18 ratio used significantly underestimates the number of
19 housing needed.

20 As far as off -- off campus impacts, Stanford's
21 proposed \$20 per square feet of development fee is
22 insignificant compared to the actual fee needed to
23 offset impacts.

24 Based on the nexus study conducted by Palo Alto,
25 it should be closer to \$264 per square foot, or 177 per

1 square foot based on our calculations.

2 UNIDENTIFIED PERSON: For the record, we'll
3 observe that that's more.

4 WYNNE FURTH: And for transportation, counting
5 trips only during peak hours provides only a limited
6 snapshot of Stanford's transportation impacts.

7 We ask for this window to be increased to more
8 fully capture Stanford's impacts and urge strongly to
9 expand the transportation benefits program to all
10 workers as a way to address these impacts.

11 Lastly, we find no indication that Stanford has
12 considered a maximum build-out scenario as was required
13 in the sustainable development study in 2009.

14 At the minimum, the 2018 GUP should ensure that
15 a study of absolute maximum build-out be conducted.

16 Thank you for your time.

17 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: Thank you.

18 All right, that takes us to Sea Reddy, to be
19 followed by David Shen.

20 Mr. Reddy, welcome.

21 SEA REDDY: Good evening.

22 My name is Sea Reddy, I live right across on
23 Stanford Avenue, 747, right across the campus. I've
24 been here four years. I came from Newport Beach and
25 Irvine and all that.

1 Just to put the right setting, as citizens we
2 all need to realize we're not in a Truman
3 administration. We are -- you're talking like we have
4 the small issues, you know, the GUP here, GUP there. We
5 need to think a bit higher. We're in the Trump
6 administration, where we are being -- possibly in five
7 years we would have North Korea attack us with the
8 missiles and all that, so Stanford is a national
9 institution, and it's also an international institution
10 to keep us our peace.

11 Are you kidding if you're talking about parking
12 here, parking there? You know, I need this housing, all
13 of these 25-30 speakers have spoken, everything we need.
14 But we need to go one step above. We need to work for
15 the -- keeping this country safe.

16 Who can do it? There are five minutes, just let
17 him do it. You know who made us win the war in 1947?
18 Berkeley. By inventing nuclear weapon to -- you know,
19 to be able to sustain the power of Germany and Japan.

20 Are you kidding? These are not small things.
21 Here I propose a few things for you to think about. We
22 all need housing. Who is going to disagree we need
23 housing? Nobody. We know it's expensive.

24 So one regard will not serve them all. You
25 know, who needs the Neiman Marcus, who needs

1 Bloomingdale's so close to us. Take them out of here.

2 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: Mr. Reddy, I'm going to
3 ask you to address your remarks this way, thank you.

4 SEA REDDY: Take all the stuff away, put housing
5 there, put very high end Ph.D.s and these people to
6 prevent nuclear wars.

7 Are you kidding? These are small stuff. You
8 know, my -- my neighbor says, you know, the Stanford
9 people can park in front of my house, yeah, that is
10 valid, but do you want to live here ten years from now
11 or you want to be attacked?

12 So I think the GUP, I give a grade of D, you
13 know, it's not F. GUP doesn't talk about what we need
14 to do as a nation. We are being attacked. Are you
15 kidding?

16 Cyanide's going to take over, East Germany --
17 not east Germany, North Korea is going to take over,
18 some rogue element in the Middle East is going to have a
19 nuclear weapon that's going to kill us all.

20 What do you want for us? You want to talk about
21 traffic? Traffic can be solved. You know, I went to
22 Boston the other day, everything's by train. You know,
23 it has been proven, the Tube in London. You know, this
24 is all noise. We didn't think about it long term.
25 Think about that.

1 Thank you.

2 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: Thank you.

3 That takes us to David Shen, and Mr. Shen will
4 be followed by Shani Kleinhaus, Gail Svedanovic and
5 Diane Bailey.

6 Welcome, Mr. Shen.

7 DAVID SHEN: Good evening, supervisors. I'm
8 Dave Shen. I'm a resident of Palo Alto. Stanford's
9 general use permit application proposes to grow their
10 campus significantly. As everyone knows, this will have
11 significant impact on Palo Alto.

12 I'm all for seeing the admirable institution
13 grow and prosper. However, the current structure under
14 which their growth is proposed to occur puts an unfair
15 cost burden on the surrounding areas. Their plans, if
16 executed to the fullest, will introduce an incredible
17 number of families, employees and thus traffic into Palo
18 Alto.

19 I would urge that the supervisors take the
20 following into consideration when evaluating the
21 Stanford GUP.

22 With the introduction of so many families into
23 Palo Alto, it is likely you would see a surge of
24 school-aged children into the area. I would urge that
25 Stanford provide resources and funding to create room

1 for their education either expanding existing schools or
2 creating new schools.

3 With the introduction of more people and
4 employees into Palo Alto, the existing transportation
5 infrastructure will be stretched to the maximum. I urge
6 that Stanford should contribute to the infrastructure
7 improvement to support the proposed influx of new
8 residents so that the cost burden is not placed solely
9 on the residents of the Palo Alto community.

10 My understanding is that Stanford's research
11 into traffic impacts does not include traffic flows into
12 the surrounding neighborhoods, especially through north
13 Old Palo Alto, where I live. I also urge that Stanford
14 include these traffic flows and impact studies.

15 As you may know, it is not unprecedented the
16 universities contribute some level of loss tax to its
17 surrounding communities.

18 For example, it is my understanding that
19 Harvard, MIT and Boston University have long-term
20 agreements with their cities and contribute 12 to 12 and
21 a half percent of lost tax.

22 Santa Clara County's assessor has noted that
23 Stanford has a tax exemption on over \$11.6 billion in
24 property value. Think of what we could do with a
25 portion of that lost tax revenue and the benefits we

1 could realize here in Palo Alto.

2 I would urge the supervisors to place these
3 requirements, among others, on Stanford and gain their
4 agreement before accepting their new GUP application.

5 Thank you very much.

6 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: Thank you for your time.

7 That takes us to Shani Kleinhaus, Gail
8 Svedanovic and Diane Bailey.

9 Ms. Kleinhaus, welcome.

10 SHANI KLEINHAUS: Thank you.

11 Supervisors Simitian, I'm Shani Kleinhaus. I'm
12 a resident of Palo Alto. I'm the advocate for Santa
13 Clara Valley Audubon Society. I am here to speak about
14 bird collisions.

15 Bird collisions are recognized these days as one
16 of the leading causes of the decline of birds in North
17 America. Hundreds of millions of birds every year.

18 It's a community impact. It cannot be mitigated
19 building by building. It has to be a policy that looks
20 at the Stanford campus as a whole, and looking at how to
21 mitigate the impact of glass in new buildings and new
22 structures, whether they're antennas, any other new
23 structure.

24 This is why cities like Berkeley, Oakland, San
25 Francisco, San Jose, Sunnyvale, Mountain View, Menlo

1 Park, Palo Alto and others have developed various types
2 of guidelines, mitigations, ordinances and other ways to
3 implement and to mitigate for bird collisions in those
4 cities.

5 The County itself and thank you, Supervisor
6 Simitian, has directed their own campus to be a bird
7 safe campus as it is developed in the next few years.

8 So I'm here to ask that detailed mitigations
9 should be developed or otherwise -- other ways to
10 enforce or to require bird safe design. You can use the
11 guidelines that are required by the City of Sunnyvale or
12 Mountain View, North Bayshore precise plan as an example
13 and have that in the EIR.

14 I want to say something about Oakland's as well.
15 They -- the discussion of whether loss of oak woodland
16 has significant impact and how you can mitigate for that
17 by potentially protecting oaks elsewhere or by planting
18 new trees.

19 I don't see how anyone can conclude that a
20 tree -- loss of a tree that's more than 300 years old
21 can be not a significant impact. And if it is, it
22 should be avoided.

23 I have a lot more, but I'll submit written
24 comments as well. Thank you.

25 And I have something for Director Girard.

1 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: Mr. Girard, I'm going to
2 ask you to take that for the record.

3 Thank you, Ms. Kleinhaus.

4 That takes us to Gail Svedanovic and then Diane
5 Bailey.

6 GAIL SVEDANOVIC: Good evening. I want to thank
7 Supervisor Simitian for having a hearing someplace near
8 Stanford that we can get to without driving a long
9 distance.

10 Want to remind everybody that Stanford is at the
11 very edge of Santa Clara County and has huge impacts on
12 San Mateo County while San Mateo County residents are
13 routinely excluded from having a vote on these matters.

14 I'm a Stanford alumna. My son is a Stanford
15 alumna. My excellent primary care is at Stanford, but
16 she was excellent before Stanford bought out her clinic.

17 I would notice that all cities and jurisdictions
18 continue to permit the building of more offices while we
19 all live with a huge jobs, housing imbalance. Insanity
20 is sometimes defined as continuing to do the same thing
21 while expecting a different outcome. It seems like it's
22 time to do something different.

23 And my comments are a little bit disjointed but
24 relate to things I've heard at this hearing. I question
25 the definition of peak hour. Yes, it's more like all

1 day, but concentrated mostly -- most heavily at four
2 hours.

3 I heard the percent of reduction in single
4 occupancy vehicles presented as a measure of success,
5 but if it's a percentage of a steadily growing number,
6 that's a little bit disingenuous. It could even be
7 called deceptive.

8 And I would note that Stanford Hospital has said
9 it needed more room. Of course it needs -- always needs
10 more room, but at the same time, they're spending huge
11 amounts of money on the ads in every single local
12 newspaper and on the television which no other
13 institution does.

14 I would say that below market rate housing was
15 mentioned, just remember that below market rate is
16 usually not affordable to the low wage earner. These
17 below market rate units are really only affordable to
18 people who have a pretty substantial income.

19 And finally I would say that when you have a
20 steady overgrowth of cells in the human body, it's
21 called a cancer. And as a person who lives right near
22 this, I -- I would say I agree with all the excellent
23 factual analyses of people who questioned the plan and
24 for myself personally, I would say I'm not all ready,
25 give us a break.

1 Thank you very much.

2 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: Thank you for your
3 comments.

4 And before I ask Diane Bailey to step up to the
5 microphone, which I'm going to do in just a moment, I
6 should mention one point that was raised that it may be
7 helpful for me to clarify is Stanford lands in the
8 immediate vicinity, which I believe are in the
9 neighborhood of 8,000 acres, are shared among six
10 different local governmental entities that have land use
11 authority.

12 So one of the challenges in having a thoughtful
13 and comprehensive discussion, let alone decision-making
14 process is that while 4,000 of those acres are in
15 unincorporated Santa Clara County and that is the area
16 for which the County has jurisdiction, as the comments
17 suggested there are other jurisdictions as well.

18 Some of those lands, I think as many here know,
19 are in the City of Palo Alto, some are in the City of
20 Menlo Park, Woodside, Portola Valley and unincorporated
21 San Mateo County.

22 So you got six different players, and one of the
23 challenges that we face is making sure that we have a
24 comprehensive view of what's going on in all six of
25 those jurisdictions and how the action in one

1 jurisdiction affects what's happening in the other
2 jurisdictions in total.

3 Last comment I should just make is just so you
4 know, for our friends in Menlo Park, I have op-ed in
5 this week's Menlo Park Almanac, specifically inviting
6 their comment prior to the February 2nd cutoff date for
7 precisely this reason, which is, we -- I know folks in
8 Menlo Park are not used to participating in public
9 agency discussions in Santa Clara County, let alone
10 Santa Clara County where the headquarters is in San
11 Jose.

12 So my hope is that anyone who feels affected in
13 any of these other jurisdictions will find a way to
14 participate and weigh in prior to that February 2nd date
15 for our comment period.

16 Diane Bailey, thank you for your patience, where
17 are you?

18 UNIDENTIFIED PERSON: Not to be rude, but when
19 there was a chance to vote on it, we didn't get to vote,
20 only Palo Alto residents vote.

21 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: I'm going to ask you to
22 please keep your comments to those at the microphone.
23 I'm going to call Diane Bailey one more time.

24 UNIDENTIFIED PERSON: Diane said she couldn't
25 stay, but she wanted to sign on to the -- Menlo Park

1 wanted to sign on to the scope comments.

2 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: Thank you.

3 That takes us to Hal Mickelson, Whitney McNair
4 and Karen Porter, so, Mr. Mickelson, you're up.

5 And welcome.

6 HAL MICKELSON: Supervisor, thank you for being
7 here to sit patiently through just a wealth of input.

8 I'm Hal Mickelson. I'm a resident of the
9 Greenmeadow neighborhood of Palo Alto. I'll comment
10 briefly on a minor matter and then on the big picture.

11 A relatively minor matter is the point of the
12 environmental impact statement that there could be risks
13 to historic structures that need to be considered.

14 Let's say a word about that. Stanford has been
15 an incomparably good steward of the historic buildings
16 and architecturally meritorious buildings on the campus.
17 The work done in the reconstruction of the history
18 corner, the work done in the imaginative reuse of the
19 Roble Gymnasium, the work done in the seismic retrofit
20 of the other historic structures shows that Stanford
21 values the historic buildings on campus and has a record
22 of preserving them responsibly.

23 So it has to be a point to check off in the
24 environmental impact report, but I think it's one in
25 which Stanford has built considerable credibility, that

1 leads to the bigger issue, which is that Stanford has
2 built great credibility in traffic demand management.

3 It has not only been successful with the
4 Marguerite shuttle system and moving people to Caltrain,
5 but it has been successful in attaining its goal of no
6 net increase in commute trips.

7 And it has data to back itself up. This is the
8 third set of these inputs that I've sat through and I
9 keep on hearing people say, I look out the window and I
10 see more traffic and I blame Stanford. And that's not
11 fair.

12 Stanford has the numbers to show that its
13 traffic demand management efforts have been a
14 world-class success. And if you say, well, you can
15 improve the measurement by not measuring, you know, at
16 peak commute hours, surely Stanford would be open, I
17 think they've already said they're open to looking at
18 new measures for traffic demand management as they come
19 along.

20 We're lucky to have a university here which does
21 not grow by gobbling up adjoining neighborhoods. We're
22 lucky that it wants to do this building on the 900 acres
23 of existing academic reserve, as in field, the most
24 responsible kind of building and development. We're
25 lucky that thousands of acres have been set aside for

1 preservation in the foothills.

2 We're lucky that Stanford has brought so much
3 business and prosperity and it can maintain that
4 leadership, as Jean McCown said, only if it has the
5 opportunity to keep pace in the facilities it needs.
6 The Stanford proposal deserves strong support from the
7 County.

8 Thank you very much.

9 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: Thank you very much.

10 Whitney McNair, to be followed by Karen Porter.
11 Ms. McNair, welcome.

12 WHITNEY McNAIR: Good evening, Supervisor
13 Simitian, thank you for hosting the meeting tonight.

14 My name is Whitney McNair, and I do land use
15 planning at Stanford University. Stanford is committed
16 to providing more housing for its students and employees
17 on and near campus. A significant part of the request
18 before the County is actually to build 3,150 either new
19 units or beds, and the request supports the university's
20 mission to provide a residentially oriented educational
21 experience.

22 Because Stanford's long-standing commitment to
23 building housing, Stanford is fortunate to have a robust
24 housing portfolio on and near campus. By 2020 Stanford
25 will have over 14,000 student beds and additionally, we

1 will house close to 2000 faculty postdocs and staff near
2 campus or on campus.

3 The application provides the ability to add more
4 housing and play a continued leadership role in
5 supplying housing to the region. Stanford also
6 continues a unique planning practice of linking academic
7 space and housing so that housing is built on pace with
8 new academic facilities at a rate of, in this case, it's
9 605 beds or units for every 500,000 square feet of new
10 academic space. That is truly unique in the planning
11 world.

12 Beyond building on-campus housing, Stanford has
13 contributed \$26 million to Santa Clara County's
14 affordable housing fund and anticipates to contribute 11
15 million more under the current general use permit.

16 These contributions have funded over 280 units
17 of local affordable housing, as well as Santa Clara
18 County's portion of a joint effort with the City of Palo
19 Alto and the housing authority of Santa Clara County to
20 acquire and preserve the Buena Vista mobile home park.

21 The proposed 2018 general use permit includes an
22 additional approximately \$56 million contribution
23 through 2035 for a total of about \$93 million.

24 The combination of contributing to the
25 affordable housing fund and committing to new housing

1 construction is uncommon and demonstrates Stanford's
2 ongoing commitment to helping address the regional
3 housing challenges we all face.

4 Thank you.

5 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: Thank you for your
6 comments.

7 That takes us to Karen Porter.

8 Ms. Porter, welcome.

9 KAREN PORTER: Thank you. First of all, I'll
10 just echo many of the comments that have already been
11 made expressing some concerns about -- associated with
12 this development.

13 In particular, as someone who lives not far from
14 Embarcadero Road and who travels Embarcadero Road, I --
15 I am concerned with the increased traffic, not just once
16 the development is in place, but particularly with --
17 during the construction phase, having gotten stuck
18 behind a large truck not too long ago.

19 So I really hope all efforts will be made to
20 mitigate. I don't know exactly what can be done, but
21 just thinking about the amount of large trucks that are
22 going to be on Embarcadero is a little concerning. And
23 also the impact it's going to have on the roadway
24 itself.

25 Another comment I would just make, admittedly I

1 haven't studied their draft EIR so I'm not sure exactly
2 if this is addressed, but maybe because of recent
3 comments from our president it caused me to be thinking
4 about what do they do with all the biological waste
5 that's going to be associated with this increased
6 development. If it goes into the Palo Alto system,
7 perhaps there can be some resources dedicated to
8 improving Palo Alto's waste disposal system, and in
9 particular, the anaerobic digester project that Palo
10 Alto had considered a few years ago.

11 We have land set aside. Maybe Stanford could
12 as -- at least at a minimum as a good neighbor devote
13 some resources and planning towards developing this
14 digester system which would take care of not only
15 sewage, but also compostable waste and then generate
16 methane gas which would really be a net gain for the
17 environment.

18 Thank you.

19 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: Thank you very much for
20 your comments.

21 Our next three speakers will be John O'Connell,
22 Peter Drekmeier and either Tim or Tom I believe it's
23 like Lichti.

24 Mr. O'Connell.

25 JOHN O'CONNELL: Good evening. And to some

1 extent you've recognized my -- my first comment, which
2 is that Stanford is a multijurisdictional entity, and
3 we're focussing here tonight on the aspect of Stanford
4 University and the educational space which is in Santa
5 Clara unincorporated.

6 But Stanford is expanding throughout Palo Alto.
7 The Stanford Hospital is constantly expanding. The
8 Stanford business -- research park, which is now a
9 business park, is constantly expanding.

10 We've lived here for 20 years. We live in Los
11 Altos Hills, and our children went to school in Palo
12 Alto Unified School District. It is almost impossible
13 to be able to traverse the roads during school hours for
14 people to get their children to school because of the
15 massive numbers of people trying to get to the
16 facilities which Stanford is building in these other
17 areas.

18 So my -- my main comment is that this should be
19 looked at as a collective negotiation with Stanford. I
20 think most towns would love to have a university with
21 the credentials and reputation of Stanford.

22 If I had to choose between ten things to have in
23 the Palo Alto area, it would be one of the top ten. But
24 there are many other things which Stanford is building
25 in the research park which I believe they should be

1 asked to forego.

2 So my -- my input is, in order to negotiate with
3 Stanford, this should be looked at as a collective
4 expansion, including all of the things they want to
5 develop outside of just Santa Clara unincorporated.

6 The second issue is, I think most of us
7 recognize that the en- -- environment we live in is
8 struggling to deal with the demands that it's placed
9 upon it.

10 And we pay very high property taxes. I think
11 Stanford being able to claim that some or all of its
12 work is education and being exempt from paying tax
13 doesn't seem fair. So I think if they want to expand
14 primarily in Ph.D.s and postgraduate sort of areas, they
15 should probably start to have to pay for the facilities
16 that they're using in the community.

17 Those are the two main areas, I'll put my other
18 comments as written comments.

19 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: Thank you very much.

20 JOHN O'CONNELL: Thank you.

21 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: And again, for the many
22 speakers who have mentioned a reference to written
23 comments as well, please do remember, that's -- that's
24 immensely helpful and you can speak tonight and put your
25 written comments into the hopper as well, as long as we

1 are receiving them by that February 2nd, Friday,
2 5:00 p.m. deadline.

3 Peter Drekmeier, to be followed by Tim or Tom
4 Lichti, I forget Tim or Tom.

5 PETER DREKMEIER: Good evening, Supervisor
6 Simitian and others. I'd like to thank you for having
7 these meetings in Palo Alto, where it's easy for us to
8 attend.

9 My name's Peter Drekmeier. I was born and
10 raised in Palo Alto, born at the Stanford Hospital. I
11 live in Palo Alto now. I formerly was on the city
12 council here and I was the director of the Stanford Open
13 Space Alliance in 1999 and 2000.

14 And I'm a former employee of Stanford, something
15 very few people know, it was back in college during the
16 summers.

17 I'm -- I wanted to deliver a petition that we
18 have been working on and this calls for a few things.

19 One is establishing a maximum build-out on the
20 campus as was required to be studied in the 2000
21 community plan, Stanford community plan that was never
22 done. And I want to thank the City of Palo Alto for
23 embracing that idea at their meeting last night and
24 including that in their comments.

25 Permanent protection of the foothills above

1 Junipero Serra, making sure that any new people coming
2 to the area as a result of the new development are
3 housed on campus or nearby.

4 Make sure that there are no new trips generated
5 in the extended commute time. And we'd love to see
6 Stanford adopt a policy of carbon neutrality for all new
7 construction.

8 So we had -- we've had 450 people sign this
9 petition so far, I will leave it with you here, and if
10 anyone in the audience has not signed and would like to,
11 you can find it at iPetitions and look for support
12 sustainable development at Stanford.

13 A couple things I hope you'll pay special
14 attention to is cumulative impacts of Stanford
15 development amongst the different jurisdictions. I
16 think that there is an attempt at times to take credit
17 for some of the positive things happening in other
18 jurisdictions.

19 For example, housing in Palo Alto but not
20 looking at some of the negative things that happen in
21 Palo Alto, a lot of jobs without places to house those
22 people.

23 An example is the Stanford West Apartments,
24 which houses -- has more than 600 units. Across the
25 street is the Stanford Hospital, also in Palo Alto, and

1 that's going to bring 2000 new people to the area.

2 And the other is traffic, and I've seen a lot of
3 comments from people who I have a lot of respect for in
4 the community, who have found a number of flaws in the
5 traffic analysis. I'm sure you've heard some of those
6 comments tonight.

7 I'm sorry, I just got here a little while ago, I
8 didn't hear them all, but that's going to be a huge
9 issue for the future of our region.

10 Thank you again for making it easy for us.

11 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: Thank you. I'm going to
12 ask you to hand that petition to Mr. Girard to receive
13 it right there.

14 Tim or Tom, my apologies, the first and last
15 name.

16 TIM LICHTI: Sure. Hi, folks. It's Tim Lichti.
17 I'm new to Palo Alto and it's a pleasure to be part of
18 the conversation.

19 I just wanted to say I strongly support the
20 growth in general in the plan. I think that
21 education -- the education and innovative thinking that
22 Stanford brings is great for students, the city and the
23 world as a whole.

24 I think it's also very important to really
25 prioritize affordable housing. I think everybody

1 regardless of background and income should be able to
2 participate in this awesome ecosystem.

3 I wanted to really focus my time on technology
4 and the opportunity that some of the new emerging
5 technologies can bring to some of these challenges,
6 especially having to do with congestion and traffic and
7 whatnot.

8 As we know, technology is advancing faster than
9 ever and it's obvious to say that 17 years is an
10 extremely long time. You can't go down where I'm in in
11 Palo Alto without seeing some of the Waymo self-driving
12 vehicles going down the streets.

13 By 2035 most people are projecting that there
14 will be mass adoption of self-driving vehicles and that
15 millions of self-driving vehicles will be on the road
16 within five to ten years, so I think it's a great
17 opportunity to be thinking about how that could
18 fundamentally change some of the problems that we're
19 dealing with.

20 Let me be clear, I'm talking about self-driving
21 vehicles for traffic. I agree that traffic and lots of
22 cars in general on the road is -- is a bad thing, nobody
23 wants traffic.

24 But I think there is a big opportunity for
25 making use of self-driving vehicles for shared use,

1 movement of people within the campus, and so could
2 definitely be wrong in this, but one thesis would be
3 that some people choose to commute by car from outside
4 the campus because, you know, it's just kind of a pain
5 getting that last mile or the last two miles.

6 And I'd wonder how many people may actually
7 consider -- currently drive up to Stanford, might
8 actually consider taking a bus or might consider the
9 Caltrain, if they could simply get off, perhaps take a
10 Marguerite or some other kind of large shuttle on to
11 campus and then get right to where they're going a
12 little bit closer at the end of it.

13 I think that there's some great opportunity for
14 recognizing new space as well through those new modes of
15 transportation or through the new methods.

16 An example is there are several hundred Stanford
17 work vehicles alone, vehicles in general are used about
18 five to ten percent of the time so most of the time
19 their footprint is just sitting in parking lots or
20 sitting on the streets taking up space and not really
21 giving us much value.

22 If those could be used more towards shared use,
23 higher utilization of those vehicles means fewer parking
24 lots available for more space, more housing, and as well
25 when it's higher utilization of vehicles, it makes more

1 economic sense to go electric and to go hybrid.

2 I know Stanford's already working on some pilot
3 projects. In fact, they're working with the group that
4 I'm with as well. I really do encourage you to look at
5 those win-win opportunities.

6 Thank you.

7 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: Thank you.

8 Our next three speakers will be Rita from Palo
9 Alto, forgive me, I have -- just can't make out that
10 last name, and then Grant Dasher, I believe, to be
11 followed by Pat Burt.

12 Welcome.

13 RITA VRHUE: Rita Vrhue, so most of the comments
14 I was going to make have already been made. I would
15 hope that the transcript from the city council meeting
16 last night will be included in the comments that go to
17 the supervisors. Many speakers spoke eloquently about
18 some of the issues that have been brought up tonight.

19 You know, I think part of the problem is that as
20 a Palo Alto resident for more than 35 years, we have all
21 heard during the last particular 20 years that -- that
22 all of the projects that have been put forward by
23 Stanford and built in Palo Alto or built on Stanford
24 campus, actually if they do have issues they can't be
25 mitigated or they're not significant.

1 And as a person who lives in Crescent Park, I
2 realize that if you go down Lincoln, Middlefield,
3 Embarcadero, University, Center, that's Crescent, you
4 can't -- you can't move.

5 And so when you look out your window and you
6 can't get out of your driveway for three hours, somehow
7 the idea that nothing that has been built on Stanford or
8 in Palo Alto has significant consequences leaves one
9 wondering, why is this problem here if nothing was going
10 to cause any significance?

11 So I think there's actually an issue of trust
12 with both what is going on in the City of Palo Alto and
13 what is proposed to go on in Stanford.

14 The roads are clogged. It may not be all
15 Stanford's problem, but when you look at a build-out of
16 this size, it doesn't take a genius to figure out that
17 there are going to be new trips, that the 9500 people
18 that are being brought in are going to have families.

19 The 2900 new jobs up on 450 Broadway are going
20 to have an impact on the whole area, so I think the idea
21 of looking at this as a cumulative problem and looking
22 at where is the growth occurring and how does it impact
23 all of the area would be an admirable idea.

24 Thank you.

25 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: Thank you.

1 That takes us to Grant Dasher and to Pat Burt.

2 Welcome.

3 GRANT DASHER: Thank you.

4 Hi, I'm Grant Dasher. I'm a Palo Alto resident.

5 I've only lived here a couple years so I don't have the

6 30 years of history that some of our wonderful residents

7 have. But I wanted to point out I found this whole

8 topic interesting because I used to live in Cambridge,

9 Massachusetts and the relationship between the

10 universities and the city there is rather different than

11 what it is here.

12 This whole multijurisdictional thing is

13 certainly complicating the issue, but I also think that,

14 you know, it's an interesting opportunity, because

15 there's just so much land here to play with.

16 And I do think that unlike in Cambridge where

17 the -- it wasn't really practical for the universities

18 to build all of the housing for their students, I do

19 think there's an opportunity to build a lot more housing

20 here.

21 And I think Stanford is clearly committing to

22 building housing, but I think they could push that much

23 further than they've done in the -- in their proposals

24 and I think this is an opportunity to require that to

25 happen.

1 I have a lot of friends who are Stanford
2 graduate students or Stanford postdocs and none of them
3 live in Stanford University housing. All of them live
4 in Palo Alto or Menlo Park or Redwood City, and, you
5 know, many of them do commute via public transit but
6 some do cars.

7 And I think this growth issue rankles all of us.
8 My personal belief is that growth is ultimately
9 inevitable and we need to figure out appropriate
10 mitigations, and the appropriate mitigation in this case
11 is to try to minimize the transportation impact and try
12 and localize housing as close to jobs as possible.

13 And I think that Stanford is -- this is an
14 opportunity, you know, with higher impact fees, for
15 example, I certainly support something in the
16 neighborhood of what Palo Alto has in the 60 range, as
17 opposed to the proposed \$20 affordable housing impact
18 fee, but other policy proposals on the housing front and
19 just in terms of building more units both affordable but
20 also units for the student population.

21 Shifting to transportation for a second, I think
22 this is really important. I think that, you know, I'm
23 really optimistic and excited for the future of
24 Caltrain. I think it's an opportunity to really
25 radically change the way people commute in the Bay Area,

1 if the service becomes regular enough to actually
2 replace lots of car travel.

3 But I think in order to make that work, we need
4 things like grade separation. We need, you know,
5 redesigned multimodal interconnects. We need better
6 bike commuting from -- from the Palo Alto Caltrain
7 station to Stanford.

8 And I think, you know, Stanford could really
9 play a major role in this, and I would encourage the
10 County to require, you know, further investment from
11 Stanford in terms of public transit infrastructure,
12 specifically around the Palo Alto Caltrain station and
13 its bike interconnects with the main Stanford campus,
14 but also in terms of grade separation.

15 Grade separation is a massive unfounded
16 liability on the City of Palo Alto, just like it is on
17 other communities up and down the Peninsula, and I think
18 that major employers in the area really have an
19 obligation if not legally, morally to contribute to
20 solving that problem.

21 Thank you.

22 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: Thank you for your
23 comments.

24 And that takes us to Pat Burt.

25 Welcome.

1 PAT BURT: Thank you.

2 Well, first, thank you to Supervisor Simitian
3 for the leadership he has played in helping to assure
4 that the Palo Alto community is being heard. And as
5 well as in helping us have this 60-day extension so that
6 the public has been able to have a better understanding
7 and begin to uncover more relevant comments on the draft
8 EIR and the GUP in general.

9 I certainly hope that as we go forward, the City
10 is going to take on the strong role that it had in the
11 2000 GUP in -- in promoting community participation.

12 But we also have this oddity that's been spoken
13 about, that the County is the governing body with
14 oversight of the general use permit, but the impacts are
15 really on the City of Palo Alto and the surrounding
16 communities principally, and not for the most part on
17 the County as a whole.

18 So we're having to rely on the County government
19 to look out for the interests of Palo Alto and Menlo
20 Park and the East Palo Alto and Mountain View and Los
21 Altos. So thank you for doing that task.

22 I'd also like to put into context that Stanford
23 has done some really outstanding measures on both their
24 transportation demand management and more recently on
25 embracing an aggressive sustainability plan.

1 But we in this region are facing really a
2 different set of circumstances from when we did -- when
3 we looked at the 2000 GUP. It's hard to argue that
4 our -- today's traffic and housing and climate change
5 conditions are sustainable in our region. So merely
6 allowing a continuation of what seemed to be progressive
7 practices in 2000 is probably not the standard by which
8 we need to judge not only the GUP, but all of our
9 regional efforts.

10 To that end, just having some form of a
11 limitation on the impacts I think needs to be
12 reconsidered. When we look at what we're doing in
13 climate change, we aren't talking about simply
14 maintaining the status quo. We have to reduce.

15 So one point that was made earlier on the
16 transportation side is that what we thought no net trips
17 meant does not appear to be what it does mean.

18 We thought it meant that there would be a cap on
19 the trips that would pass through our community to
20 access the Stanford campus. We now understand that two
21 changes to that exist to some degree that we really
22 don't know the degree to which it's occurring.

23 There are credits for when the no net trips is
24 exceeded, and those credits are being able to be drawn
25 from Marguerite trips that are, in fact, in some cases

1 satellite parking that's coming to Palo Alto and then
2 traveling into campus.

3 So thank you.

4 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: Thank you.

5 And thank you for respecting the time.

6 Sue Dinwinkle will be followed by Jeff Lazarus,
7 who will be followed by Jason Matlof.

8 Sue Dinwinkle, then Mr. Lazarus, then
9 Mr. Matlof.

10 Folks, we're probably about half an hour away
11 from wrapping up, if you're trying to gauge just how
12 much more seat time you can take today, okay?

13 Ms. Dinwinkle, welcome.

14 SUE DINWINKLE: Thank you. My name is Sue
15 Dinwinkle, and thank you for having this session so
16 people can air their concerns.

17 I've been a resident of Palo Alto since 1963 and
18 I'm also a former employee of Stanford University and I
19 have great respect for Stanford University and I love
20 Palo Alto.

21 It's a wonderful, unique community, but it's
22 changing and it's changing very rapidly and not always
23 in a positive direction. The two areas I'm the most
24 concerned about are traffic, as you've heard tonight,
25 and parking. Parking is becoming a great problem.

1 There -- it is a problem on campus, but it's
2 also a problem just on the streets of Palo Alto in many,
3 many neighborhoods and I don't see us doing anything to
4 address that. I'm not sure what the answers are. I
5 think possibly a satellite parking area someplace like
6 in -- in the Baylands where then people would be
7 shuttled in. It might help somewhat. I don't know.

8 I'm not a traffic engineer, but I do know we
9 have a tremendous problem. We have a lot of gridlock
10 now, and if we add more and more units, that means more
11 and more cars. I'm afraid. So basically those are my
12 two concerns.

13 I'm also worried somewhat should we have a
14 national -- should we have a regional catastrophe, which
15 is probably going to happen unfortunately at some point.
16 Our emergency services, I'm worried about them even
17 getting into the area to be able to help us because of
18 the traffic situation that we have.

19 And I'm also concerned about other parts of the
20 infrastructure. For example, the schools, we have a
21 very fine school system in Palo Alto and we want to keep
22 it. We would like to have that all over the country.

23 So we have more children, we want to be sure
24 that we build up the infrastructure to support those
25 children, which could mean more schools and more

1 teachers.

2 So thank you for your time and again for having
3 this discussion.

4 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: Thank you.

5 Jeff Lazarus, to be followed by Jason Matlof.

6 JEFF LAZARUS: Hi.

7 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: Welcome.

8 JEFF LAZARUS: Thank you, folks, for coming and
9 thanks for this opportunity. I'm very embarrassed. I
10 went to the wrong meeting. I didn't realize that. I
11 missed the beginning presentation and I don't want to
12 waste anyone's time because of my faux pas.

13 I'm a resident of Menlo Park, and my big concern
14 is traffic, quite frankly. This has probably been
15 reviewed and I just want to go on the record as saying
16 it again to -- I'm -- right now when you think about
17 north/south, you think about El Camino, 280 and Alameda
18 or Santa Cruz.

19 The Stanford Hospitals, when they open up their
20 new hospitals, it's -- right now it's bad. Sand Hill
21 Road, if anyone lives here knows what Sand Hill Road is
22 like. And to have extra buildings and hospitals opening
23 up plus the new building at Stanford is -- is
24 constructing on Sand Hill. I just think, you know, it's
25 going to go from bad to worse. I'm very, very concerned

1 about this for a variety of reasons and I'm sure other
2 people have said this earlier and more eloquent than I
3 did.

4 Thank you.

5 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: Thank you. And thank you
6 for making it to be with us tonight.

7 Jason Matlof, and then we're going to hear from
8 Alan Kaiser, Jim Miguel, and Greg Welch.

9 Welcome.

10 JASON MATLOF: Thank you.

11 I'm going to add my voice to the opposition to
12 the Stanford GUP proposal. Specifically I find it
13 totally unacceptable that Stanford's proposing to add
14 millions of square feet of new development and almost
15 10,000 new bodies to the campus without specifically
16 being required to fund mitigation strategies to address
17 all the things that everybody's been talking about,
18 horrific traffic problems, terrible parking problems and
19 a housing shortage.

20 So I guess to start, what I would ask is that
21 before we approve anything, before you and your -- your
22 peers approve anything, please make the -- or make a
23 prerequisite that the GUP approval be dependent upon
24 them funding specific mitigations that are not yet
25 addressed. I think many people have talked about a

1 variety of different things so I'm just going to focus
2 on one particular thing, which is traffic.

3 The traffic is horrendous. I've lived here for
4 almost 25 years, you know, there's a variety of people
5 that have spoken that lived here 30, 40 years. I guess
6 what -- you know, I don't want to be emotional and
7 maybe, you know, bring emotionally charged comments
8 here, but the representatives from Stanford that spoke
9 were using all this self-congratulatory language about
10 how they've done all these traffic mitigations, the TPDs
11 and so forth.

12 But what I'm going to say is you have people
13 that lived here for decades, right? We've seen the mass
14 congestion problems, the parking problems, the housing
15 shortage issues. There's no new residences -- no new
16 housing that's driving that.

17 We had some commercial growth, but it pales in
18 comparison to the massive growth that's gone on at the
19 Stanford industrial park, the massive growth that's gone
20 on at the Stanford Shopping Center and the massive
21 growth that's gone on at the Stanford Hospital.

22 So tell me, where are those people and their
23 cars? How are they not producing traffic that are
24 patients at the hospital, that are shoppers at the
25 retail outlets at the -- at the shopping mall.

1 It's clear that those numbers that are produced
2 by them are producing the results that they want to see.
3 So while I'm sure that they're doing much great good in
4 reducing traffic, it's obviously not doing what they
5 claim.

6 Specific problems that I would bring up is the
7 claim and -- the mitigation that should be addressed and
8 required as a prerequisite is specific to the community,
9 and the claim that there's no net new commuter trips I
10 think is the claim that they use.

11 And specifically that there is an expectation
12 that that would be offset by increased Caltrain use.
13 One of the women that spoke said, oh, there's other ways
14 to deal with it. Well, the study itself specifically
15 refers to mitigations that will be done through
16 increased usage of Caltrain.

17 We all know and those of us who have been
18 involved in studying this incredible problem with grade
19 separation that's going to get exacerbated with
20 electrification of the train, we know that the train's
21 already at capacity.

22 What's going to happen? It's going to increase
23 the volume of trains. Electrification is going to
24 enable that. What's going to happen with that increased
25 traffic that's going to get mitigated through use of the

1 Caltrain corridor? It's going to exacerbate traffic
2 even worse.

3 So what I would ask is please make a
4 prerequisite for fund approval of this GUP, that
5 Stanford has to fund mitigations specifically, for
6 example, increasing capacity on Embarcadero, dealing
7 with the fact that we have Embarcadero Road that -- that
8 has a huge choke point because it goes from four lanes
9 all the way from 101 to Stanford and it's choked for
10 some reason I can't explain down to three lanes at Palo
11 Alto High School, and to fund other grade separations,
12 for example, the one where I live, at Churchill Avenue.

13 So please make mitigation funding requirements a
14 prerequisite of approval.

15 Thank you.

16 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: Thank you very much for
17 your comments.

18 Alan Kaiser, followed by Jim I believe it's
19 Miguel, and then Greg Welch.

20 Is Alan Kaiser still with us or he --

21 How about is there Jim Miguel?

22 How about Greg Welch?

23 GREG WELCH: Thank you very much for hosting
24 this meeting. I'm a little surprised, though, the
25 meeting occurred after the original deadline. It does

1 give the community a sense that this was sort of being
2 railroaded through until people stood up and took
3 notice, but thank you for the move on the extension and
4 hosting this evening's call for comments.

5 I'm not here to criticize Stanford's record on
6 traffic mitigation. I do believe that the steps that
7 they've taken probably are leading and a beacon to other
8 communities. But it's also equally apparent that while
9 necessary, they are insufficient.

10 As the largest landowner, developer and employer
11 in the Palo Alto area, the health of Stanford is tied
12 directly to the health of the community that surrounds
13 it. And that community is choking on traffic. You
14 know, it's no coincidence that virtually everyone up
15 here has commented on that.

16 It's gone way beyond being an inconvenience. It
17 is now threatening the safety and the well-being of the
18 citizenry. And while Stanford may claim that wait a
19 second, you know, at the edge of our property we've
20 taken care of the problem, it doesn't matter, the
21 problem exists.

22 If this leading institution, if this beacon for
23 light and leadership doesn't do more than just sort of
24 promise no new net trips, if it doesn't take a proactive
25 role, just as once the predecessors of the leadership of

1 Stanford took a proactive role in stepping off of the
2 ivory tower and founding what ultimately became Silicon
3 Valley, the people have come from around the world to
4 study and emulate, that ivory tower is going to choke
5 the community around it or stand by idly while it chokes
6 itself.

7 And case studies of urban development in the
8 future will be written about how Stanford may have been
9 thinking globally, but didn't act locally. We need
10 traffic relief now. We don't need it promised in vague
11 and very complicated goals backed by an antiquated,
12 incomplete and dubious data collection method, all
13 wrapped up in an easily gerrymandered system that has
14 all sorts of credits that can be swapped. I mean, this
15 reads exactly like a system that can be gamed.

16 We're using pneumatic tubes to collect data at a
17 few intersections when the institutions, any one of us
18 can pick up our phones and look at any number of
19 realtime comprehensive data collection methods from
20 companies that spun out of this August institution and
21 see that the figures that are cited in the GUP are
22 woefully out of touch with reality.

23 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: Mr. Welch, speaking of
24 that technology, I forgot to click the updated
25 technology.

1 MS. KUMAR: My timing's perfect, I thank you for
2 your attention.

3 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: Thank you.

4 All right, we have I believe three more speakers
5 before we ask folks from Stanford if they have anything
6 they'd like to correct in just a few parting
7 announcements here.

8 Our next speaker is Ahmad Sheikholeslawi, Greg
9 Schmid and Michael Closson.

10 Welcome, sir.

11 AHMAD SHEIKHOLESLAWI: My name's Ahmad
12 Sheikholeslawi. Good evening, Supervisor Simitian and
13 staff. I represent the Menlo City School District,
14 Menlo Park City School District as a chief business and
15 operations officer.

16 The Menlo Park City School District opposes any
17 additional expansion of Stanford University beyond its
18 current authorized limits. They're not fully mitigated
19 with appropriate housing and traffic mitigation.

20 Any expansion of the university which results in
21 additional employees and students must have full housing
22 mitigation on the university's traditional boundary.
23 Without this mitigation, any expansion will have an
24 adverse impact on the Menlo Park City School District,
25 which is a community funded school district and does not

1 receive any additional funding for new students.

2 If adequate housing is not provided in the
3 university boundary, and Stanford rents or purchases
4 homes for staff and/or students and utilizes this tax
5 exemption status, all taxing entities, including the
6 Menlo Park City School District, will lose critical
7 funding.

8 It is the belief of the Menlo Park City School
9 District that the impacts to school facilities caused by
10 Stanford's proposed development of residential and mixed
11 use property, informally industrial, commercial and
12 institutional zoning districts can only be fully
13 mitigated by ensuring that the additional residential
14 load of Stanford's growth is accommodated on -- on
15 property that is already a tax benefit under the welfare
16 exemption and not to impose additional residential needs
17 on other lands in adjacent jurisdictions.

18 In addition to the housing impact, the expansion
19 project at the university will adversely impact traffic
20 along major corridors through the school district,
21 primarily traffic to Stanford University from 101
22 through Wheeler Road, from 280 through Sand Hill Road,
23 and increased traffic through El Camino Real, will
24 impact the Menlo Park City School District's safe routes
25 to school efforts, hazardous roadways and intersections

1 will impact the safe routes to school efforts, and
2 impact the safety of our students who we are encouraging
3 to walk and bike to school.

4 The university must develop measures that fully
5 mitigate any traffic level beyond currently unexpectable
6 levels. These measures -- these measures should not
7 only include the traditional traffic mitigation measures
8 but should also include funding of crossing guards to
9 assist schools and students in this effort.

10 Thank you.

11 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: Thank you very much. And
12 thank you to your board members and your district for
13 weighing in, we appreciate it.

14 Greg Schmid, to be followed by Michael Closson.

15 GREG SCHMID: Thank you very much for coming and
16 spending an extra evening with us.

17 The Stanford general use permit demands a
18 specific county transportation commitment. The EIR
19 openly admits that auto traffic in the area is
20 congestion, and that even with intersection and freeway
21 mitigation would leave any future traffic issues
22 significant and unavoidable.

23 Stanford is adding 2.3 million square feet of
24 nonresidential space on campus. There will be over
25 4,000 net new commute trips, many on Caltrain.

1 Note that Stanford will be adding substantial
2 numbers of new long distance commuters from
3 nonresidential buildings on their other surrounding
4 properties over the next 15 years.

5 In addition to the 2.3 million on campus,
6 there's 1.3 million square feet in Stanford Medical
7 Center, .8 million square feet in the Stanford Research
8 Park, and 1.3 million in the new Redwood City Center.

9 That's 5.7 million square feet altogether with
10 4,000 housing units.

11 The EIR notes that the communities of Palo Alto
12 and Menlo Park will be adding four times the number of
13 new jobs to new housing during that period.

14 Stanford's suggested traffic solution is to rely
15 heavily on Caltrain. But the rail line is already at
16 full capacity and will need substantial improvements to
17 handle thousands of new customers and the infrastructure
18 to avoid exacerbating the already troubled east/west
19 connections.

20 For this campus permit, the County can ask
21 Stanford to contribute their fair share of the costs of
22 the expansion of the rail infrastructure or take on the
23 burden themselves.

24 In the past the County has relied on the most
25 regressive of local taxes, sales taxes for their share.

1 Be explicit in your decision on this EIR, ask Stanford
2 to pay the fair share of the costs of the rail
3 infrastructure and make a clear pledge that the County
4 will not come back asking for regressive sales tax to
5 cover the costs of the real -- rail infrastructure
6 improvement needed by Stanford.

7 Thank you.

8 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: Thank you for your
9 comments, Mr. Schmid.

10 Let me just verify one more time, Jim Miguel and
11 Alan Kaiser are no longer prepared to speak. If not,
12 all right, then we can go to Michael Closson who is the
13 proverbial last but not least speaker tonight.

14 Mr. Closson, welcome.

15 MICHAEL CLOSSON: You stole my line, I was going
16 to say that.

17 Thank you, Supervisor Simitian, for organizing
18 this meeting, and I'm pleased to be able to -- to be
19 present at it.

20 I'm a long-term resident of this area, 45 years.
21 I first moved to the area in 1972 to work at Stanford.
22 My wife is currently employed at Stanford and I am
23 semiretired and we live in Menlo Park.

24 I have generally positive feelings towards
25 Stanford, but in this case, in the -- of the proposed

1 general use permit, I think the university's proposed
2 expansion is wildly excessive.

3 Like many people here this evening, I've
4 witnessed the massive decline in affordable housing and
5 the huge increase in traffic that's accompanied the
6 building and the high tech booms on the Peninsula.

7 Obviously other entities in addition to Stanford
8 are responsible for this, but Stanford sprawl is a real
9 concern and as has been mentioned by a number of
10 speakers.

11 I think that despite its best efforts to
12 mitigate its impacts, Stanford's proposed expansion is
13 bound to exacerbate these dire trends, thereby
14 contributing to a further decline in the quality of life
15 for the residents in this area.

16 Let me get philosophical for a second here, the
17 harsh reality is we live on a finite planet with limited
18 resources and limited space. In short, there are limits
19 to growth. There are limits to growth both globally,
20 regionally and locally.

21 There's a planning concept that's been invoked
22 for a number of years called smart growth, and I think
23 that Stanford has been a good practitioner of that, to
24 quite a degree. But at some point even the smartest
25 growth becomes dumb and destructive.

1 My concern that Stanford's leaders in their
2 desire to make the university even greater are confusing
3 quantitative expansion with qualitative improvement.
4 And I want to assert that the university can continue to
5 become better without becoming bigger.

6 So I suggest that Stanford do two things, step
7 back and reexamine its assumption that it needs to
8 physically expand in order to qualitatively improve. I
9 really encourage them to do that. I doubt they'll do
10 it, because I see there's a fixation on growth. We
11 heard tonight, knowledge is continually expanding, but
12 that does not mean that the university has to
13 continually expand. They've been seduced by a growth
14 imperative.

15 In conclusion, I think an important distinction
16 has to be made between knowledge and wisdom. In this
17 case, it appears that Stanford is long on knowledge and
18 short on wisdom. Now's the time for the university, the
19 people's university to step back and plan for the future
20 more wisely.

21 Thank you very much.

22 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: Thank you for your
23 comments.

24 And now let me turn to the folks at Stanford
25 University. Ms. Palter, are you going to take the

1 opportunity to offer a couple comments here to try to
2 clarify or correct?

3 Before you do that, let me just ask a couple
4 quick questions, if I may. If you don't have the
5 answers tonight that's okay because I know I'm being
6 prompted by some of the things I heard. I just want to
7 make sure you can take notes so we can get back to it.

8 We've been talking about 3150 units of housing,
9 and then sometimes the phrase beds or units. As I'm
10 looking at your draft environmental impact report
11 overview and summary, I'm seeing that it's 550 units of
12 housing that are being proposed for faculty and staff,
13 and 2,600 beds.

14 Do I have those numbers right?

15 CATHERINE PALTER: So the proposal is for 3,150
16 housing units. When those housing units support
17 students it's in the form of a bed, so that's the
18 technical definition of it. For the purposes of the
19 environmental analysis and in our application, we made
20 the assumption it would be 550 faculty and staff units
21 and 26 -- 2,700 or 2,600 student beds.

22 There is the ability to shift in those, but
23 there can be no more than 550 faculty staff units
24 without additional environmental analysis.

25 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: All right, I'll just turn

1 to the staff and say, as we go forward, I think some
2 clarity and precision on that is going to be important.
3 A bed is not what most people think of as a unit, that's
4 not to suggest that anybody's -- I mean, it's been very
5 clear in your document, so please let that be
6 understood.

7 But I think a bed is different than a unit. You
8 know, a unit of housing could have three bedrooms and
9 accommodate four or five people, that's different than
10 one bed that accommodates -- I guess I shouldn't get
11 into how many people are in a bed.

12 But I think you take my point.

13 And I'll have some impact both on the housing
14 calculations and on the traffic calculations for the
15 planning staff to be mindful of that as we go forward
16 and have this conversation.

17 The other is the issue that was raised by the
18 representative from Menlo Park School District about the
19 acquisition of housing units in Menlo Park and I believe
20 also in Palo Alto by the university in an effort to
21 provide housing for folks on the campus.

22 And the fact that that obviously creates housing
23 impacts for the larger community, and it also creates
24 for the school districts if they are locally funded,
25 what we used to call basic aid districts, some financial

1 impacts. Do we have hard numbers how many units in
2 Menlo Park and Palo Alto, for example, have been
3 acquired and where that's an issue?

4 CATHERINE PALTER: Well, let me also clarify, I
5 don't have hard numbers on the number of units, but when
6 faculty own homes in Menlo Park and Palo Alto, those do
7 not come off the tax roll.

8 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: Right.

9 CATHERINE PALTER: So there's no difference
10 between a faculty member living in there or a
11 nonStanford person.

12 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: And I think what the
13 representative from Menlo Park School District was
14 talking about was the university actually acquiring
15 housing in those jurisdictions and then by virtue of its
16 tax exempt status, those properties coming off the tax
17 rolls.

18 So do we know how great --

19 CATHERINE PALTER: That's still the same
20 situation, if the university acquires the land first,
21 the house, and then -- and it's then acquired by a
22 long-term leaseholder, a faculty member purchases it,
23 then it stays on the tax rolls.

24 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: Well, I'm going to ask
25 staff again to follow up on this particular issue,

1 because either there's something I'm not understanding
2 or there's widespread misunderstanding in the community
3 among folks who are crunching numbers at the Palo Alto
4 Unified School District and Menlo Park School District,
5 but again, there clearly is an answer and we should sort
6 it out. We'll deal with that some other time. Thanks.

7 What I'm going to do now is I'm going to give
8 you that five minutes and let me see if I can make the
9 technology work here for me, I think we can, and again
10 limit it to clarifications or corrections tonight.

11 Thanks so much. Go right ahead.

12 CATHERINE PALTER: Thank you. My name for the
13 record is Catherine Palter with Stanford University, and
14 I want to thank everyone that has put their time and
15 attention to trying to understand this proposal and
16 that's spent their precious evening coming out and
17 sharing your thoughts.

18 I don't have anything to, as you say, correct at
19 this point. I'm very confident that the County's
20 consultants will be able to provide clear and thoughtful
21 responses to all the comments that we've received in
22 these months, and so I just at this time want to thank
23 people and we look forward to continuing this discussion
24 as our consideration goes forward.

25 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: Thank you very much.

1 And just a thank you again to all who
2 participated this evening, all of you took time out of
3 your long -- getting longer days.

4 I'll remind you once again that written comments
5 can be accepted up until 5:00 p.m. on Friday, February
6 the 2nd. If you know how to get to the planning
7 department's website you can find it there. The URL is
8 relatively long so if it's easier, just go to my
9 website, which is supervisorsimitian.org and there's a
10 Stanford link that you can find there. I think we also
11 have some information on the table in the back.

12 One comment just to assuage any concern and that
13 is, things are likely to go quiet for a while because we
14 are coming up on the end of the comment period, and when
15 that happens, what that means is that the planning staff
16 and the consultants who have been engaged for this
17 effort go to work reviewing the comments and preparing
18 responses.

19 So if you're asking yourself, why am I not
20 hearing anything, it's because folks are at work
21 preparing we hope thoughtful responses to the comments
22 that have been made during this comment period.

23 Once the final EIR is ready, it will go to the
24 planning commission with the staff report and conditions
25 of approval that are recommended for consideration, and

1 then ultimately will come to our five member board
2 supervisors as I've referenced.

3 I do hope you will stay engaged as the process
4 continues. My office and I will do everything we can to
5 keep you informed about what's going on in the process,
6 and if you have suggestions for how we can do that
7 better, please don't hesitate to share them. We can't
8 always do it all, but we're open to hearing your
9 thoughts about how we can stay in touch.

10 I'm going to then say without objection and I
11 expect none whatsoever, the meeting is adjourned. Thank
12 you all for coming.

13 (Whereupon, the proceedings adjourned at
14 8:20 p.m.)

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I, Lucy Carrillo-Grubbs, Certified Shorthand Reporter No. 6766, hereby certify that the foregoing in the within-entitled cause was taken at the time and place herein named; that the transcript is a true record of the proceedings as reported by me, a duly certified shorthand reporter and a disinterested person, and was thereafter transcribed into typewriting by computer.

I further certify that I am not interested in the outcome of the said action, nor connected with, nor related to any of the parties in said action, nor to their respective counsel.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 31st day of January, 2018.

LUCY CARRILLO-GRUBBS, CSR No. 6766