

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

- - -

TRANSCRIPTION OF AUDIO-RECORDED SCOPING MEETING
CEQA - STANFORD 2018 GENERAL USE PERMIT APPLICATION
PALO ALTO ART CENTER
1313 NEWELL STREET
PALO ALTO, CALIFORNIA
FEBRUARY 8, 2017

ATKINSON-BAKER, INC.
COURT REPORTERS
www.depo.com
(800) 288-3376
TRANSCRIBED BY: Tonia L. Webb
File No.: AB01F84

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

FEBRUARY 8, 2017

[Transcriber's Note: All proper names not spelled on the recording are presented here phonetically; all speakers not identified on the recording, or not able to be identified by the transcriber, are presented here as UNIDENTIFIED MALE or UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE]

- - -

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

[Begin audio file 1 of 1]

SANTA CLARA COUNTY PLANNING DIRECTOR KIRK GIRARD:
Welcome to the formal scoping meeting under the California Environmental Quality Act for Stanford's 2018 general permit application.

So we held this and you've been invited because the public is a really important process -- part, a really important part of the permitting process and the CEQA process.

So the -- the purpose of CEQA is to try to understand the environmental effects of a project and these scoping sessions are an opportunity for the people that might be affected by the project, or have special knowledge about the project, to communicate to the lead agency what they feel their concerns might be, and what they would like to see studied in the EIR.

And the timing of this session is important

1 because it's the very beginning of the permitting
2 process and the very beginning of the CEQA process. So
3 the comments that you make tonight will allow us to
4 consider those comments in the drafting of the
5 environmental impact report so that we could have the
6 best possible opportunity to think about, in a
7 nice, deliberative, thoughtful, early way how we might
8 be able to mitigate those concerns.

9 So this is primary -- primarily a listening
10 session for us, but it's an opportunity for you to give
11 us your insights on what the effects of this project
12 might be.

13 It's also an opportunity to get -- to introduce
14 our staff and so you can have a relationship with them
15 throughout this process.

16 This is Kavitha Kumar. She is the project
17 manager for the permit application process. And then
18 David Rader, he is our CEQA specialist. We have Rob
19 Eastwood, who is our planning manager, and he is
20 managing the CEQA aspects of the project. And I'm the
21 overarching project manager for the application.

22 We also have some Stanford representatives
23 here. And they're here to, to listen. We can answer your
24 questions if, if we think that -- or if you have questions
25 that would help you better understand the project so you

1 can give more thoughtful comments, then we're happy to
2 answer questions.

3 And that's one of the reasons that Stanford is
4 here, to act as a resource in that capacity. Kovita is
5 gonna describe the project, and she's going to describe
6 the permit application process. And then David's gonna
7 get up and he's gonna describe our CEQA process and then
8 give you specific guidance on how you can get your
9 comments into the process.

10 Tonight, we're happy to take verbal comments,
11 but as you'll tell him, the best comments, quite
12 frankly, are written comments that are a formal part of
13 the record, and, and this is gonna be your invitation to
14 submit those formal written comments.

15 So that concludes my introduction. And -- and I'd
16 like to introduce Kavitha Kumar for the project
17 description.

18 Sorry. Let me help that. And how's that?

19 MS. KUMAR: That's good.

20 MR. GIRARD: Okay.

21 MS. KUMAR: Thank you. Thank you, Kurt.

22 And, again, I am Kavitha Kumar, I'm senior
23 planner with the County of Santa Clara Planning and
24 Development Department, and I'm also the project planner
25 for this application from Stanford.

1 The first slide -- is there any way we can
2 lower the lights?

3 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes. The - you know, the
4 spotlights are -- I feel like we're on performance here.

5 MS. KUMAR: Yeah.

6 [Multiple unintelligible speakers]

7 MS. KUMAR: Thank you.

8 Can everyone hear me? Oh, on the screen.

9 [Multiple unintelligible speakers]

10 MS. KUMAR: We have lights in the back, but they're
11 lowered here.

12 [Multiple unintelligible speakers]

13 MS. KUMAR: Can you see?

14 [Multiple unintelligible speakers]

15 MS. KUMAR: Yeah, there. Perfect. Yeah. I'm not
16 performing, so people need to see that. Okay. Thank
17 you.

18 I'm gonna start off with setting a context
19 to the area that is under a review in this application.
20 Many of you may be aware that Stanford owns lands in a
21 lot of jurisdictions in the area, and they - they have
22 lands in City of Palo Alto, Menlo Park, the Counties of
23 Santa Clara and San Mateo Counties, also the Town of Woodside
24 and Town of Portola Valley.

25 In this map, you see the green area is the

1 County of Santa Clara, and the application we have in
2 front of us at the County is for this area. So it's --
3 they're requesting an update to their general use permit
4 for the area in the green.

5 So currently Stanford operates under a
6 regulatory framework with the Stanford community plan
7 and a general use permit.

8 These -- the -- these approvals were approved
9 by the Board of Supervisors in 2000, December 2000, and
10 that allows them to operate under the general use
11 permit, a general framework to construct new academic
12 buildings, and residential buildings, and dormitories, and
13 roadways, and water irrigation facilities - all the
14 different projects that they do under this overarching
15 general use permit.

16 Just to go over what -- the principles of the
17 community plan and general use permit, just very
18 briefly. The community plan was -- established policies
19 for the Stanford lands in the county and it is a part of
20 the overall general plan of the County itself.

21 Some key policies that were memorialized in
22 the community plan were compact urban development,
23 conservation of natural resources in the foothills,
24 establishment of an academic growth boundary where
25 academic growth would be concentrated, housing that would

1 be built concurrent with academic development on --
2 within the academic growth boundary, and a goal of no --
3 no net new commute trips coming into the core campus.

4 And the 2000 general use permit authorized
5 development and established conditions of approval
6 consistent with the community plan policies that you just
7 saw in the previous slide.

8 The 2000 general use permit set a cap on
9 academic facilities at 2.035 million square feet over
10 4-0 - 4400 housing units, and then, well, another 40,000
11 square feet of children -- child care community centers.

12 In addition, it also established over a
13 hundred conditions of approval, which is monitored by
14 the County Planning Office and -- to make sure that
15 Stanford is in compliance with the community plan and
16 the general use permit.

17 Currently, Stanford has applied for an update
18 to the general use permit to -- to get -- to get into
19 their next phase of academic development. And in general,
20 we are -- we have been calling it a general use permit
21 2018 - in short, GUP 2018.

22 This application was submitted to the County
23 in November 2016 for all lands that are in the Santa
24 Clara County, and here in this map, you can see that in
25 green. This application includes updates to the 2000

1 general use permit, the Stanford community plan and some
2 zoning -- zoning adjustments.

3 This map here shows the academic growth
4 boundary. You -- if -- yeah, I think it's a faint red line
5 that is the academic growth boundary. I'll try to point it.
6 That's this -- so it runs along Junipero Serra Boulevard. So
7 everything north of that is the concentrated academic
8 growth that is allowed under the 2000 GUP, and everything
9 south of the -- the -- Junipero Serra is the foothills, which
10 is preserved.

11 The 2018 development propo- -- request
12 includes -- includes 2.275 million square feet of new
13 net academic and academic support uses; over three
14 thousand -- 3100 net new campus housing units; another
15 40,000 square feet of community space and child care
16 facilities; and no development is proposed in the
17 foothills and in the San Juan Development District where
18 the faculty housing is located.

19 And the application -- planning horizon for this
20 application is 2035; so it goes from 2018, or whenever
21 it's approved, through 2035.

22 The 2018 GUP also -- request is proposed to be
23 consistent with the general principles of the 2000
24 Stanford community plan, which was approved in 2000. It
25 retains the academic growth boundary in the same -- same line,

1 maintains no new net trips goal to limit automobile
2 congestion in the surrounding areas, and provides
3 housing that is concurrent with academic growth on the
4 campus.

5 So we are -- right now, the application is with
6 the County. We are doing -- we have done a completeness
7 review and we have a complete application to get into
8 the environmental assessment.

9 So after I'm done, Dave Rader will get into
10 more of that. So while that is going on, so -- we
11 will go through a complete EIR process for our
12 environmental impact report.

13 And once that is done, the County will
14 agendize the -- the application, the entire packet, and it
15 will go through the public hearing process; it'll go
16 through the Planning Commission and finally be approved
17 by the Board.

18 And we don't have any anticipated dates for
19 any of these hearings, but anybody who signed up on our
20 website, or today at the sign-in sheets, will be
21 notified. And we have a, we have a really robust outreach
22 program that we are going through so people will be notified
23 of all the public hearings.

24 And Stanford is also doing something similar
25 in parallel. They have a big mailing list that they are

1 sending out these notices to, so keep your eyes open.

2 And this graphic here just shows us where we
3 are in the process. So we are right here, and there's
4 gonna be more community feedback opportunities going
5 along this process, and before it's -- public hearings,
6 at the Planning Commission and the Board hearings.

7 And just so -- I have mentioned many different
8 documents here today; the Stanford community plan, the
9 general use permit, annual reports. All these are on
10 the County website, at this website I have noted
11 here, and also it's included in the NOP that you many have
12 picked up when you -- when you came in the door.

13 So all the resources are there, and if you
14 have any other questions, or if you need someone to talk
15 to, you can always contact me. My contact information
16 is also on the County website.

17 With that, I will turn it over to Dave Rader,
18 and we'll be happy to answer questions after we are
19 done. Thank you.

20 DAVID RADER: Yeah. Hear me okay? Okay.

21 So the California Environmental Quality Act
22 was enacted back in 1970 with the intent that decision
23 makers and the public would understand the environmental
24 consequences of projects under consideration.

25 The County has -- has determined that this

1 application for a general use permit -- that for this
2 application, the appropriate level of environmental
3 review is an environmental impact report.

4 And the purpose of an environmental impact
5 report is to determine the effects of the proposed
6 project on the environment, propose ways, or -- that -- that
7 those effects can be mitigated or avoided, and also to
8 evaluate alternatives to the proposed project,
9 alternatives that would lessen or -- or eliminate impacts of
10 the project.

11 So the County released a Notice of Preparation
12 for this environmental impact report that we're
13 preparing, back in January, January 10th of this year,
14 so we are now in the scoping period, which ends, I
15 believe, end of next week, February 17th.

16 And the purpose of this scoping period is to
17 receive input from the public on what they feel that the
18 environmental topics, issues that should be analyzed in
19 the environmental impact report.

20 So -- so that is the period we're in, and this
21 scoping meeting is another opportunity for you to
22 understand the project and what the process is for
23 submitting comments.

24 Next, next slide. Well, one thing I, I want to
25 emphasize, this -- this general use permit application is for

1 overall allocation of square footage, and housing units, and other
2 aspects. And so it's really more of a program than a
3 project. So -- so the EIR is gonna be analyzing the totality
4 of -- of those allocations and consequences of -- of -- of that
5 build-out.

6 Specific projects would come in when -- when those plans are
7 available for, you know, buildings and other -- other facilities.
8 So -- so this is a program EIR.

9 The overall process for the EIR is -- starts
10 with, as I said, the -- the release of the Notice of
11 Preparation, and the scoping period, generally a minimum
12 of 30 days, and then the County and its consultants will
13 begin preparation of the environmental impact report,
14 and that takes a number of months.

15 And at the end of that period, we will publish
16 a Notice of Availability, and release the draft EIR for
17 public comment. We are planning on a 60-day public
18 comment period. Similar to the Notice of Preparation,
19 or the scoping period, it's generally -- we're looking for
20 written comments, and the comments should be focused on
21 the adequacy of the draft EIR, whether - whether you think that
22 it adequately addressed the environmental impacts of the
23 project.

24 And then the County will respond to those
25 comments in a final EIR document, and we will also notify

1 the public when that's available. Generally, the
2 County's policy is to have the final EIR completed
3 before the first public hearing for the project.

4 And as part of that process, findings will
5 have to be made relative to CEQA before the project can
6 be adopted.

7 And then -- next slide, please. This is -- this is
8 our assessment at this point of what the environmental
9 topics are that should be covered in the environmental
10 impact report. So it's a pretty full range. Also, we'll --
11 we'll be looking at cumulative impacts of the project, and --
12 and alternatives.

13 So we're looking for public input on whether
14 there are additional topics that should be considered in
15 the EIR, and how you think -- what the -- what the content of
16 that analysis should be.

17 So the way to comment is you can -- you can
18 send me written comment through email or snail mail. I
19 think we're out of speaker comment sheets, but we can --
20 we can provide those additional -- additionally. And then you can -
21 -
22 you know, we will try to capture comments that you make
23 tonight. We would still encourage you to submit those
24 in writing.

25 NOP comments are actually included with the

1 EIR as -- as an appendice -- as -- as an appendix so, you know, it
2 is part of -- it's --it is part of a written record. And those
3 comments need to be addressed in the EIR.

4 So that's the general process, and I guess we
5 can open it up for questions or comments at this point.

6 We don't. Yeah. So -- yes, Sir.

7 SEA-SEELAM REDDY: Thank you for the really
8 [Unintelligible] just doing a great job, and Stanford was just
9 (unintelligible) last - a couple weeks ago, (unintelligible). I am a
10 resident of Palo Alto, the closest to Stanford location. I live on
11 Stanford Avenue, which, which, [unintelligible] area, and all the housing
12 that they have. And there is a [unintelligible] of 900 families, units,
13 and doing a lot of development in that area. And I have expressed a few
14 things to think about, and I have written, and passed on to you. And for
15 me to elaborate, I think [unintelligible] to look at these things.

16 The first thing is, traffic on Stanford Avenue - [unintelligible]
17 thousand people, especially the University families, tend to come up, you
18 know, [unintelligible] late at night, and there are families that have
19 school children and things like that, [unintelligible] early that are
20 [unintelligible]. So we need to look at it, what impact it has, and
21 there is - there is no stoplights until Escondido - about a mile and a
22 half, I think, from El Camino. But that - a lot of traffic might be
23 going towards El Camino. So we need more traffic lights. So how do we
24 manage that? and there are bikes, bike paths on both sides of it. It's
25 an undivided road, and a lot of traffic, a lot of early morning, getting

1 kids to, to school, and leaving the school, so that's all that stuff.
2 And there's an elementary school, [unintelligible] school, people going -
3 going east and west on it. So - but those are things to be looked at.
4 And [unintelligible] opportunity to come up with some solutions.

5 The second thing also, is the intersection of
6 El Camino Real and Stanford Avenue. It -- it's already
7 jammed now, you know. The prime time, from 7:00 to 9:00, 9:30, it's
8 -- it's almost like a highway, you know. They are going at about

9 So those are the three things that I think, as a resident,
10 as a resident, that comes across to me, and that we do have a, a
11 [unintelligible] Association that have might have more things to
12 [unintelligible]. But I'm going to leave that to you here, and --

13 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: You can leave it at the table.

14 MR. REDDY: Yeah. And thank you for the
15 opportunity for me to say those things.

16 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: You're very welcome.

17 MR. REDDY: Thank you.

18 MR. RADER: Yeah. Oh, yes. And by the way, if
19 you want your name in the record you can state it before
20 you make your comments.

21 PETER DREKMEIER: Good evening. I'm a Peter
22 Drekmeier. I'm a Palo Alto resident. A couple questions
23 and some comments. My first question:

24 Can you explain zoning works in general in
25 unincorporated Santa Clara County, and how it differs on the

1 Stanford campus?

2 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Well, probably either of you be
3 better than I.

4 MR. GIRARD: In a general sense, it works the
5 same way in both instances. In the individual areas of
6 land, you have a specific zoning designation that creates certain
7 allowable uses.

8 There's one distinction that -- that
9 I can make, is that typically you can divide the allowable
10 uses, and those that are allowed, without a further
11 discretionary decision, so that you could just, for
12 example, build your house with a building permit and not
13 have to go to the Planning Commission for approval;
14 and then those that require discretionary
15 decisions.

16 In Stanford's case, the projects that they
17 propose have to go through a review, and they're almost
18 always conditioned by a discretionary review to make sure - and
19 this is an important concept to make -- that they're
20 consistent with the programmatic community plan and
21 an environmental review that's been done.

22 Does that help?

23 MR. DREKMEIER: Well, that's actually
24 more specific to a floor area ratio and density --

25 MR. GIRARD: Ah, okay.

1 MR. DREKMEIER: Is there a
2 difference between Stanford campus and
3 the rest of the County, according to the [unintelligible].

4 MR. RADER: Yeah. The -- the -- the specific
5 standards that have been applied depend upon the zone
6 designation at Stanford. But there's, I think, three or
7 four zoning designations -- three zoning designations
8 that cover Stanford lands.

9 And -- and the devil is in the details, that you
10 would look at that particular zoning designation in our
11 ordinance, and it would tell you exactly what development
12 standards apply - setbacks. I mean -- and -- and they do differ.

13 That - a commercial zone will have a different
14 set of criteria for development in unincorporated Santa
15 Clara than a like commercial zone for Stanford. They've been
16 -- and effectively, we have specific zones that apply only to the
17 Stanford lands.

18 MR. DREKMEIER: And -- thank you. And
19 same question is: Does -- are there any property taxes
20 paid by Stanford for the family centers?

21 MR. RADER: That's a good question for
22 Stanford.

23 [Multiple unintelligible speakers]

24 MR. RADER: Yeah, or - that's where I wish we
25 -- we did have that

1 answer. Do we -- do we know? Supervisor Simitian, I
2 don't wanna put you on the spot. But the question arose
3 about Stanford's -- or maybe I shouldn't put you on the spot --
4 Stanford's property tax requirements.

5 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: I -- I think there's a
6 distinction and I would add, it's [unintelligible] to Stanford. I -
7 - I'm not the assessor, Dave.

8 MR. RADER: Yeah.

9 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: I think there's a distinction between
10 academic lands and the lands of the Stanford Research Department.
11 Stanford would be - doesn't --

12 MR. RADER: Okay, got you.

13 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: -- Doesn't share that distinction.

14 MR. RADER: Do you -- do you have that, [unintelligible]?

15 CATHERINE PALTER, ASSOCIATE VICE PRESIDENT, LAND USE AND
16 ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING, STANFORD UNIVERSITY: [Unintelligible] useless.

17 MR. RADER: Do you -- do you know?

18 MS. PALTER: I, I - Stanford [unintelligible]
19 and this isn't something I deal with as well, but I do believe
20 that the academic uses are exempt from property taxes,
21 but the homeowners -- the lease holders are on campus do
22 pay property tax.

23 MR. DREKMEIER: Thank you. So the comments are, first
24 of all, I think Stanford's done a lot of commendable work
25 on sustainable, green buildings and transportation demand

1 management.

2 But my concern is that there's really is no end
3 of growth in sight; that it doesn't appear to be
4 -- the campus doesn't appear to be zoned as, for example,
5 the City of Palo Alto, where you have a [unintelligible]
6 ratio. And so every 10 or 15, 18 years, Stanford comes
7 back for more development, which has impacts on the
8 community.

9 And it's almost as if - as if a business in Palo
10 Alto were to come back to come back every 15 years and
11 ask to add another story on a building, that
12 wouldn't be allowed.

13 And I think that the -- the EIR needs to study
14 communal impact long term, so not just spatial, but
15 temporal, and we need to look seriously at maximum
16 build-out. What can the community sustain?

17 I think that it's -- we need to protect the
18 open space, and I'm glad to see that they're proposing
19 no development there for 25 years, except in the
20 Laker District, which I would argue is partial open
21 space.

22 But what we really need is a transfer of
23 development rights from the foothills to the core
24 campus, to make sure that they're protected in perpetuity,
25 because it's just - not just fair that they can come

1 back every, every time and use that as a bargaining chip.

2 And so also, something I think that should be said
3 is, to -- to look at fairness in development rights. What is
4 the density of Stanford land in unincorporated Santa Clara
5 County -- so that includes the foothills -- both
6 space-wise and population-wise, so that in - in comparing
7 it to the surrounding communities, to look to see - it's like,
8 how - has Stanford been treated fairly with development.

9 The second thing that I think should be looked
10 at is: A lot of this development sounds like it's for
11 research, it's mentioned, stem cell research. You know,
12 might be great things, but really, historically a lot of that has
13 been done by business, because you're coming up with a product, or
14 service, and it's very lucrative.

15 And I'm -- if -- if this kind of research is taking
16 place on campus and there's not really much return to
17 the community in term -- terms of taxes for community services,
18 that seems unfair - if you're doing the same research in
19 the Stanford Research Department, you're, you're paying something to
20 the surrounding community, if you're doing it on
21 campus. And it's somewhat related to academics, but I
22 think it's a little bit of a stretch. I think it's really driven
23 by the profit motive.

24 So those are a few things I would encourage you
25 to do look at in the [unintelligible]. And thank you for the

1 opportunity.

2 MR. WOODWARD: My name's Steve Woodward and
3 I'd like to personally chime in on the same points that
4 -- that Peter just made.

5 That -- when Stanford presented, a couple weeks ago,
6 they referenced a growth rate of one, 1.2 percent as the long-term
7 growth rate, and that -- that as - having been at those for many
8 years, it was being very sustainable. But in 60 years,
9 that means the campus population will be about twice what
10 it is now.

11 And if -- if my -- if the estimates on the web are - are
12 correct and
13 my calculations are correct, that -- that will push it
14 somewhere near 50,000 people will be campus based.
15 I don't think there's any way that that could be
16 sustained without destructive impacts, severely
17 destructive impacts on the surrounding community, despite
18 the always commendable efforts on the part of the
19 University to control traffic, et cetera.

20 I just don't see how that level of population
21 could -- could be accommodated. So I -- I would like
22 to see a capitation discussion -- a public discussion on
23 capitation, as a requirement of -- of approval of the GUP.

24 Secondly, the -- along the same lines, the --
25 despite two or three [unintelligible], there's

1 opportunities for locally destructive traffic impacts.
2 The -- the corner of - I -- I'm not entirely unselfish in
3 bringing this up. I live at the
4 corner of Stanford and Bowden, which
5 is one of the choke points, for example,
6 that -- that might easily -- which is already heavily
7 impacted, and which could get a lot worse.

8 The -- there's really no way to mitigate the
9 -- that region directly on -- on public
10 streets. Mitigations might be -- might be - extracted
11 from modification of internal campus roadways, and I
12 think those should be considered, as well. Thank you.

13 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you.

14 REYNA GUZMAN: [unintelligible]. Hi, everyone.
15 Good evening. My name is Reyna Guzman, and I am an
16 organizer with SEIU Local 2007. I have the privilege
17 of representing about 1200 members. They're service
18 employee workers for Stanford and Santa Clara
19 University.

20 And my question is a two-part question. And
21 it goes along the lines of, I think we would all agree that
22 housing is a human right, and everyone deserves to have
23 affordable housing. So my first question
24 is:

25 How does the County calculate Stanford's

1 contribution to the Stanford Affordable Housing Fund?

2 And then the second question is:

3 Should the County calculate the contribution
4 by examining what developers in the surrounding cities
5 contribute?

6 We think that maybe, instead of contributing \$20
7 per square foot, Stanford could align itself, and follow out
8 those standard at around \$60 per square foot. Thank
9 you.

10 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I have a couple of
11 questions. You said it's 40,000 square feet for child care
12 and for community. That seems like a huge amount of
13 building, and I wondered if you could expand on that.

14 And also, you're -- you are proposing to keep the
15 hill -- foothills pretty well sacred for 25 years.
16 As I was driving down Junipero Serra the other day, I saw
17 a huge, big building that is supposed to be for golf carts,
18 and I'm wondering how many of you [unintelligible].

19 And you have 20,000 square feet to be built in
20 Lathrop -- in the Lathrop area. That's a whole lot of square
21 feet. And the other thing that I think you should be
22 looking at is, all the employees that are coming to
23 Stanford in the future, where -- where are these
24 employees going to be housed?

25 You need to make some provisions, not just for

1 the professors or the students, for which you've done a
2 good job, but for the lower level employees who
3 have to commute long distances, and create problems with
4 traffic.

5 That's about all I had to say.

6 MR. HOLSNER: Good evening, [unintelligible].
7 My name is Kevin Holsner. I've been a long-time Palo Alto
8 resident for over 22 years. I live in the California Avenue
9 neighborhood, which is very close to the Stanford properties.

10 I really think it's really critical that the
11 County look very closely at the huge impacts that
12 Stanford University makes to our neighborhoods in Palo
13 Alto. We are impacted daily by traffic, by parking
14 issues.

15 Recently, the City made a determination that
16 one of the neighborhoods closest to Stanford, Evergreen
17 Park, should be included in the residential
18 parking program, which is great.

19 However, there are other areas closer
20 to Stanford that don't have these protections, and so
21 these impacts will increase, because as you increase,
22 obviously, the employee needs at Stanford, and -- and student
23 needs, they'll be pushing those people probably off
24 campus into the neighborhoods and the surrounding areas.

25 And it's true that Stanford has these traffic

1 development plans that -- which help to mitigate the situation.
2 But often, we find out that the employees, rightly or
3 wrongly, park in our neighborhoods and the
4 surrounding areas, and of course this impacts the
5 surrounding neighborhoods greatly.

6 And we'd like to encourage the County to look
7 at these problems in a unified way with the City of Palo
8 Alto. I think sometimes government agencies look at
9 things in a singular way from their perspective, and I
10 would like to see more cooperation between the City and
11 the County, especially when these -- when they're asking so
12 much more square footage of commercial space in
13 Stanford Research Park and also in the University lands
14 as well.

15 So I would encourage, especially, more
16 cooperation and more input from the citizens who surround --
17 who are affected daily by the traffic and the parking issues,
18 and have to live with that every day. Thank you.

19 MING-FIE J TING: My name is Ming-Fie J Ting,
20 and I'm a property owner, both in Palo Alto and in San Jose.
21 I have very little to say. I totally, I went through all the
22 [unintelligible], every single one, in Palo Alto.

23 And if you would -- simplifies -- and
24 previously we have been engulfed by some of the
25 Stanford staff parking, to hop on Ash Avenue, the

1 [unintelligible] to go to the campus, and all the
2 car parked, stay [unintelligible].

3 And now April 1st, we see the lights that we will
4 have, RBP, but my concern is I hope Stanford -- which I
5 highly admire the -- the academic university -- will
6 team well with Josh [unintelligible], of City of Palo Alto,
7 the chief, traffic transportation.

8 Right now, City of Palo Alto, from what I
9 heard from the last two meetings, we are not projecting
10 the inflow, incoming -- the impact from the Stanford
11 University, when you ask the Chief of Transportation.

12 This is very serious. Palo Alto's been trying
13 very best to make different types of bicycle
14 structures and lanes to accommodate the safety of the
15 University students, that sometimes they trespass on the
16 Evergreen property.

17 And I part of the Evergreen Park property owner. I
18 see the danger of the traffic light, which I previously
19 reported, that that's a two-way traffic, and Josh immediately
20 add on to it, and put a sign to say this is two-way
21 [unintelligible] stop, and so the next car will not bump into it.
22 That's on Stanford Avenue.

23 Needless to say, for Evergreen Park people, to
24 make the left turn onto El Camino, some cars are not
25 behaving, and going straight, or making their turns at

1 bicycle, and also you have the sidewalk people.

2 I feel strongly Stanford, or the City
3 of Palo Alto, they need to have a traffic light
4 right there. Okay.

5 For - as far as myself, I see so many Stanford
6 staff with Evergreen community people. They try their
7 best to park, to go to the ditch. For what? For exercise and
8 good-quality air.

9 Now, may I address to Stanford, that these
10 days, clean costs, electric costs, Marguerite
11 [unintelligible] clean air busses to commute from foothills,
12 all the way to the campus, to reduce car emissions, to
13 reduce global -- you know that temperature, you know,
14 that -- that would enhance all our air quality. It seems
15 very little, but if every car give out so much; or
16 even the [unintelligible] are not electrical
17 -- electrical.

18 Number two, it's only tonight that I hear
19 about everything -- the day care. Are we going to have the
20 same traffic patterns like the Google campus, with their
21 Google day care, and end up with so many traffic problems? This
22 one - when parents need to be on time, drop
23 off, and would that impact all these Palo Alto residents
24 that - who are here, they also need the traffic to
25 report to their job on time, be it - be, let's say, in California,

1 like, Molly Stone, a [unintelligible] worker, or be it be - you
2 had a CEO of [unintelligible].

3 So this is how I feel. It's like we share.
4 But we are so adjacent to Stanford University, and I feel like that,
5 no doubt about that, it will impact the Evergreen community because
6 we are right next to it.

7 And how are they going to solve their problem?
8 The only way is to link Stanford to the City
9 of Palo Alto, to the chief to discuss how you
10 can encourage commute and then to set up the full - the Marguerite
11 [unintelligible].

12 Last but not least, I know Stanford, or any of
13 you [unintelligible] - if you wanted to expand your
14 business, can you be a little bit more generous
15 into your architect planning that build parking, and not using
16 other people's residential areas, who pay quarter of a million or
17 more for the properties.

18 And every day, you cannot take out your trash cans.

19 And this is why I call daily impact.
20 Okay? Who needs all these cars generating emissions in
21 our neighborhood? It's not fair. You want quality air
22 and you have to dash up the hill, and we all trying to park
23 it and every day, we junk up the hill. Okay?

24 But when you think about the long term, when you
25 bring in so many faculty members, child care. Can you

1 imagine the traffic? Can you imagine the emission?
2 Are they all going to use the bicycle? Or how are we going to
3 solve this traffic?

4 And right now in Palo Alto we already are having
5 impact. If you look at El Camino, and people
6 are complaining - [unintelligible] cannot get out of their
7 house. So have some mercy when you do that planning - that I
8 hope you will truly look into - build parking lots in your day
9 care center, and spend money to create your own buildings.

10 When you do you your buildings, and if this be
11 a new hospital, you know, do a nice planning for the
12 surrounding, to let people who admire the campus to come
13 to visit, they have the ability to park. It's not like
14 I took of someone, you know, less than a minute, that - over -
15 and somebody earn a ticket. It's not a friendly gesture, either.

16 So I hope all the community, if you are --
17 this is Palo Alto. This is Palo Alto, and Santa Clara County,
18 and this is also a talented city. I hope together we can solve
19 - to give all the residents, that the air quality; start out with
20 electrical carpool, Marguerite from Stanford. Thank
21 you all.

22 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you.

23 MR. MORAN: Hi. Good evening. Thank you all so
24 much for listening. My name is John Moran, I've been a
25 resident of the County now for five years, and I live on

1 Stanford's campus and Stanford University is my employer
2 -- I'm a resident student employee -- and they're also
3 my landlord.

4 And I'm severely rent-burdened, which means
5 that I pay over 50 percent to housing as defined by a
6 U.S. Title. And I'm here on behalf of the graduate
7 student organization in the Department of Anthropology,
8 which represents 84 graduate student employees.

9 And we believe that the majority of
10 graduate-student, on-campus residents are actually
11 severely rent-burdened. And so we sort of have a
12 contention with section 3.3 of the general use permit
13 application, which is entitled "Affordable Housing on
14 Stanford Lands."

15 Now, our contention would begin with the title
16 of that section, when we really don't believe that there
17 is any affordable housing on Stanford lands. And if you
18 go back and look at the housing that has been classified
19 as affordable housing for the purpose of, you know,
20 making Stanford contribute less money to the County's
21 affordable housing mitigation funds, one of them is
22 among the graduate residences, which cost between \$1,493
23 and \$1,910 per person per month, and that has been
24 designated as affordable for low and very-low income
25 population.

1 And I think that's a totally wrongful
2 designation to begin with. Maybe it was based on the
3 County's AMI. Well, you have to keep in mind that the
4 housing on Stanford campus, it's only accessible to one
5 class of Santa Clara County residents, which is the
6 graduate students and graduate student employees. And
7 so the AMI isn't really relevant for whether or not that
8 becomes affordable housing for us. What's relevant is
9 our [unintelligible] mean income.

10 So anyways, we conducted a survey -- because
11 there's information data that the County doesn't have
12 information on whether the housing is actually
13 affordable, and Stanford University doesn't have the
14 data on whether it's actually for.

15 But we surveyed the students in our
16 department. There were 32 graduate student employees
17 responded to the survey, and 97 percent reported
18 contributing 30 percent or more of their income to
19 housing costs, which is the federal definition of
20 unaffordable housing; and furthermore, 60 percent of
21 graduate students would be classified by U.S. Title as
22 severely rent-burdened, because they contribute 50
23 percent or more of their income to housing costs, and 71
24 percent of graduate students describe on-campus housing
25 as unaffordable or very unaffordable.

1 So we're curious, in that section 3.3,
2 Stanford claims a 103 million-dollar affordable housing
3 subsidy based on the, quote, affordable housing building
4 on Stanford campus. Since we do not believe that that
5 housing could, in any meaningful sense, be designated as
6 affordable housing, we're curious.

7 If Stanford could not claim that 103
8 million-dollar affordable housing subsidy, would they
9 have to contribute more to the County's affordable
10 housing fund, which is so desperately needed, since we
11 have unaffordable housing prices - and we all know
12 that -- and would the 102 [sic] million dollars need to
13 be contributed to the County?

14 And we believe that that would be proper.
15 Thank you.

16 MR. SCHOEN: My name is Richard Schoen, I'm
17 from SEIU, I'm the secretary of the union, we represent
18 1200 members on Stanford campus.

19 Affordable housing seems to be a major issue
20 for our members, and a number of people have come up
21 talking about the environmental impacts of the people
22 coming into Stanford every day, employees coming in and
23 how that's going to get enforced in the future.

24 We'd like something to be done about that. At
25 this point, there are very, very few of our 1200 members

1 that can actually live on campus. If Stanford increases
2 the affordable housing on campus by an enormous amount
3 -- not just the small number that they are suggesting --
4 then that would mitigate a lot of the issues,
5 environmental issues that some people have brought up
6 before, and allow our members not to have to commute 50,
7 60, 70 miles away, but live on campus and not have to
8 drive their cars in.

9 This would be a huge way in determining
10 whether Stanford is actually going to be generous to
11 their employees and generous to the recipients in the
12 surround communities. And that really needs to be done.

13 JENNA MAINS: Make Stanford labor
14 friendly.

15 JOHN ZHAO: Hi, my name is John Zhao and
16 I'm a student at Stanford University and a member of the
17 Stanford Coalition For Planning and Equitable
18 2035, otherwise known as SCoPE 2035.

19 While we applaud Stanford's commitment to
20 sustainability and its intention to reduce
21 net emissions, carbon and greenhouse gas
22 emissions by 8 percent between 2018 and 2035, we
23 would like to see the university set more rigorous and
24 concrete targets.

25 While we understand that Stanford has already

1 met its legal responsibilities in accordance with state
2 rules, we believe that, given the urgency of the climate
3 crisis, Stanford should, as a leader in the realm
4 of sustainability, and in line with actions by
5 other institutions, such as the UC system, do
6 more. So I have a couple of questions for the
7 County.

8 We're interested in how the EIR
9 may act as an opportunity to provide Stanford and the
10 County with the necessary information to adopt these
11 targets, as well as identify means to achieve them.

12 Does the report only examine mitigation
13 measures for emissions arising directly as a result of
14 the new construction under the GUP only, or can it
15 examine the feasibility of Stanford adopting more
16 ambitious emission reduction targets in general?

17 So should I keep going with questions,
18 or ...

19 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah, just go ahead
20 [unintelligible].

21 MR. ZHAO: Okay. Yeah, great. Thank you. Okay.
22 My other question is: Will the report include an analysis of
23 different alternative targets for reductions, such as looking
24 into Stanford becoming carbon neutral as a whole by 2035, or
25 adopting different possible emission reduction targets

1 within the range of 40 to 80 percent reduction between
2 2018 and 2035, or making all new buildings at least be
3 carbon neutral?

4 And the final question is: What would such an
5 analysis include? Will the study lay out different ways
6 in which each of these targets could be achieved by
7 Stanford as well as the social and environmental
8 benefits of each of them?

9 Can it examine instruments, such as carbon
10 offsets, renewable energy credits or a carbon pricing
11 program, in determining what the most cost effective
12 means to make meeting any of these objectives are?

13 Thank you very much.

14 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: Hi, I'm County
15 Supervisor Joe Simitian and, for the record, I represent
16 a supervisorial district, including the Stanford campus,
17 that has been identified in the lands that have been
18 identified tonight.

19 I just thought it might be helpful or
20 important to clarify a couple of things before the
21 meeting breaks up. I'm gonna ask County staff to work
22 with me here a little impromptu, to make sure we get
23 these things clarified.

24 First a small [unintelligible]. I think the
25 chart earlier had some completion dates for the process

1 of 2016 and they meant to be 2017. We're not planning
2 for completion 2016, as much as everyone would like the
3 process to end. So 2017, 2018.

4 There's a couple references to 25-year
5 commitment on open space in the foothills. I just wanna
6 clarify, it's my understanding that that is not part of
7 the proposal going forward.

8 The 25-year commitment that has been
9 referenced is part of the current GUP, and it expires
10 in six or seven years. That issue has yet to be
11 debated and resolved, considered as part of the
12 process.

13 Am I correct in that understanding? Because
14 I -- I think a couple of folks thought that was part of the
15 proposal, by your -- your comments directly.

16 MR. GIRARD: Yeah, there's no proposal by
17 Stanford to change the framework for that 25-year
18 period. And under the current framework, if there's a
19 proposal to move the academic growth boundary within that
20 25-year window, then it would require a super majority of Board
21 of Supervisors, or four-fifths vote.
22 And then after the conclusion of that 25-year window, or
23 a maximum build-out in square footage, then it would
24 require a simple majority to move the academic growth
25 boundary.

1 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: But there's no proposal
2 going forward beyond the current 25 years, which expires
3 in six or seven years at the outset. Yes?

4 MR. GIRARD: That's correct.

5 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: Okay. Then on the issue
6 of traffic trips, I think it might be helpful to
7 distinguish for folks who are here tonight, the
8 difference no net trips and no net new commute trips,
9 because that's a very different thing and people
10 sometimes misunderstand that.

11 If I could ask you to clarify that for the
12 public.

13 MR. GIRARD: Yeah. The goal for no new net
14 trips is during the peak hour in the direction of the
15 impacted flow. And that is not necessarily more traffic
16 in and out of the campus during off-peak hours, or the
17 opposite peak direction of flow.

18 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: I say this respectfully.
19 I think that planners are playing with that may be a little
20 [unintelligible].

21 MR. RADER: Sorry.

22 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: My understanding -- my
23 understanding is that -- that the standard is no net new
24 commute trips.

25 Am I right about that?

1 MR. GIRARD: Yes.

2 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: And that that means
3 commute hours only in the commute path, so that it does
4 not measure or calculate other trips which might be
5 generated during non-commute hours.

6 Is that a fair statement?

7 MR. GIRARD: No, a simpler way to say it, yes.

8 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: Okay, thanks.

9 MR. GIRARD: Thank you.

10 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: And then I think it
11 might be important as well to explain to people why
12 the phrase is "a goal of no net new commute trips,"
13 which is different, of course, than "no net new commute
14 trips."

15 MR. GIRARD: Yes.

16 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: What "a goal of" means.

17 MR. GIRARD: "A goal" means that the best
18 intentions are to use traffic demand management methods
19 to prevent that increase in commute hour trips.

20 But there are proposed, under this plan, three
21 tiers of interventions, if you will, to mitigate traffic
22 congestion; one is the goal of no new net commute trips;
23 the second would be that Stanford could propose and
24 implement a traffic demand measurement that would reduce
25 the traffic in the impact area.

1 The way the traffic analysis works, the
2 question is asked: What is the geographic area that
3 would be influenced by people coming and going from
4 Stanford and what are the constraints in that impact
5 area?

6 If Stanford is able to propose a program, like
7 expanding the Marguerite service, that would reduce
8 trips within that impact area and take some of the
9 pressure off some of the net impact area, that could be
10 established as a credit to offset an increase in the
11 commute trips to and from the campus. That's tier two.

12 Tier three is that another entity -- for
13 example the City of Palo Alto, County of Humboldt, VTA
14 -- could accept funds from Stanford and propose some
15 traffic-demand management program, again within the
16 impact area, to reduce traffic in the impact area, as
17 credit, if they did exceed the cordon [phonetic] count
18 of the no new net commute trip goals.

19 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: Just to clarify -- it's
20 been a long day -- I think I heard you say "County of
21 Humboldt." I think you meant County of Santa Clara.
22 It's been a long day for everybody. Thank you.

23 MR. GIRARD: The County of Humboldt is always
24 hungry for money, and Sacramento

25 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: They really go well. I'm

1 sure [unintelligible].

2 And then, just to make it a little simpler:

3 So the goal is a goal, but it's not an absolute. If the
4 goal is exceeded, then there are some consequences that are
5 designed to mitigate the fact that there has been an
6 excess number of trips --[unintelligible] the goal.

7 Is that a true?

8 MR. GIRARD: That's correct.

9 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: Okay.

10 MR. GIRARD: Now, I will say that mitigation
11 program hasn't been designed yet, and that that would be
12 a product of the EIR analysis, the input that you see.
13 But that's the initial proposal made my Stanford as part
14 of our application.

15 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: And that was in place
16 for the current GUP as well. Yes?

17 MR. GIRARD: The tier one and tier two
18 standards were. The tier three's an addition to the -- a
19 proposed addition to the program.

20 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: And was there ever an
21 exceedance on those no net new commute trip standards?

22 MR. GIRARD: There were, I wanna say, two years
23 where there -- they have to be 1 percent above. Did we
24 have two years of exceedances that were offset by
25 credits or - in the main, I think the answer

1 is no. But weren't there two years where there was a --

2 MS. PALTER: Right. Through the -
3 the goal has been met every year since 2001, which is
4 the year that we're being compared to. There were a
5 couple of years where it was a combination of on campus
6 and the local reduction --

7 MR. GIRARD: And trip credit.

8 MS. PALTER: -- and net goal.

9 MR. GIRARD: So the cordon count was
10 exceeded in two years, and those
11 were offset by trip credits from the tier two
12 mitigation.

13 SUPERVISOR SIMITIAN: Thank you. I think
14 those are helpful to the community.

15 MR. RADER: Thank you.

16 TODD COLLINS: I'm Todd Collins, I'm a member of
17 Humboldt County School Board - I mean, the Palo Alto and
18 Unified School District.

19 I wanted to ask a couple of questions about
20 schools and then make a couple of comments about them.
21 How does the EIR process consider impact on local
22 schools, if at all?

23 MR. RADER: We would calculate the
24 school-age children that would be anticipated from --
25 from the development of the square footage. So, you

1 know, any additional employees that would be -- come to
2 the campus as a result of the build-out that they've
3 asked for.

4 So then -- then that im- -- then, of course,
5 you know, which schools would be impacted. So that
6 would be analyzed.

7 MR. COLLINS: So schools are explicitly
8 considered for the --

9 MR. RADER: Yes.

10 MR. COLLINS: The EIR process
11 and --

12 MR. RADER: Yeah, they're --

13 MR. COLLINS: -- and the impact on --

14 MR. RADER: Yeah, they're under the
15 public services portion --

16 MR. COLLINS: Of the EIRs.

17 MR. RADER: Yeah.

18 MR. COLLINS: Okay. Great. Well, let me -- let
19 me make a comment about that. I'm a member of the school
20 board. I'm not speaking as a school board member
21 tonight. Our school board has not had a chance to meet
22 and discuss the GUP, though we hope to, in time to
23 submit any comments.

24 But I did participate as part of a group that
25 did our enrollment planning effort over the last

1 -- during 2015, and actually looked in great detail at
2 the impact of housing built on Stanford campus during
3 the current GUP, and sort of have, I think, some insight
4 into what the impact that is having on our schools.

5 As I look at the application, two things
6 jumped out. One was that, overall, I think the impact
7 on the schools could be considerable. I would expect
8 between 500 and a thousand new students from the housing
9 that's been proposed, and that's out of 12,000 total
10 students in the district today. So it's a very
11 substantial district today.

12 For reference, an elementary is average about
13 400 students in Palo Alto, so that would be two and a
14 half, or one or two schools, if they were all
15 elementary school students.

16 And, you know, often -- often when we do enrollment
17 planning, or often when planners look at it, they assume that
18 the spread of students will go across all grade levels.
19 And, in fact, in practice, that's often not the case, or
20 usually not the case.

21 New housing tends to attract new families; new
22 families have young children. And so -- and we've --
23 well, I won't talk about all that we're experiencing. I
24 think the part of the plan, the housing plan that impact
25 -- well, that housing plan has two major components; one

1 is 550 faculty units over across the street, across
2 Quarry -- Quarry Road -- from the Stanford Shopping
3 Center -- some of which, I believe, is gonna be
4 single-family units, condominiums - and then 900 or
5 close to a thousand graduate student residences on the
6 eastern part of campus.

7 The 550, frankly, is the part that's --
8 concerns me the most, both because I expect those will
9 have the highest student generation rates. Single-
10 family houses in Palo Alto tend to have a student
11 generation rate of one, one student per house, though --
12 and we have some cases where it is meaningfully more
13 than one, depending on the mix in the community and the
14 type of housing.

15 The other thing that concerns me about that
16 particular housing, it is not well -- in an area that is
17 well-served by our schools today. In fact, the closest
18 school to those -- to that housing would be Addison
19 School, which would require crossing the train tracks,
20 crossing El Camino, crossing Alma, walking through the
21 downtown and then, eventually, if you can survive all
22 that, you get to Addison School.

23 So it's -- it's definitely a problematic area.
24 In fact, the attendance -- I don't believe there are any
25 children that live in that area today. If they did, I

1 believe they would be - they would be in the attendance
2 boundaries there for Nixon School, where, if you know
3 the geography of Palo Alto, is all the way --
4 kitty-corner at completely the other end of campus;
5 i.e., no elementary student will ever walk there.

6 The same is true of Stanford West, a
7 little further up Sand Hill Road, where those kids also
8 go to Nixon School today, and they do not walk to
9 school, they are driven to school.

10 So I'm concerned that that particular housing
11 development will generate hundreds of students, and
12 hundreds times two of car trips to get those students to
13 and from school in an area that is, as I'm sure you
14 know, is already very congested.

15 The second is the graduate student housing.
16 Now the - and the plan that Stanford points out, or
17 expects that the graduate students will not add any
18 students. They indicate there are 420 children living
19 in graduate student housing today and they anticipate,
20 after building the housing, there will still be 420
21 students.

22 And that's probably true. However, what we
23 found when we looked at our own history, is that there
24 is a displacement effect. You can see this goes from
25 the longer dorms that were built and completed in

1 2008/2009.

2 When the students moved into those dorms, we
3 saw a significant growth in enrollment in Palo Alto
4 Unified; not from the dorms - the dorms don't take
5 children, the dorms don't generate any students - but
6 from the places where the students used to live,
7 because, when they leave their Palo Alto housing to move
8 on campus, they leave behind apartments that families
9 move into, and they do.

10 And so that had an un- -- we didn't anticipate
11 that, we - our demographers didn't anticipated it, I'm
12 not sure Stanford anticipated it, but it had effects,
13 along with other things, where we have now a bubble of
14 three or four classes in our school district -- we
15 actually call it a bubble, because they are meaningful
16 larger than the classes before or after.

17 And it's incredibly destructive. Our middle
18 schools today are filled above capacity because of this
19 bubble. And we don't wanna build a new middle school,
20 because in three years, the bubble will be gone because
21 there was a surge that then goes down.

22 But these very large developments, hundreds
23 and hundreds of units built at the same time in the same
24 place, definitely have a significant impact,
25 disproportionate to just the numbers by themselves.

1 And it's also worth noting that in addition to
2 those 900 units Stanford currently [unintelligible] --
3 is planning to build 2,000 net beds at Escondido Village
4 - and in two towers, I believe -- that similarly are
5 not anticipating allowing children, but there will
6 certainly have some displacement effect.

7 So I think it's very, very important to look
8 at these impacts on the schools and on the community,
9 because, again, with schools goes kids, and with kids
10 goes -- for the most part, they don't drive, which means
11 somebody usually drives them. And that, at our --
12 managing commutes for school children is ours, and our
13 state school program is incredibly important, and
14 increasingly challenging as the traffic issues in Palo
15 Alto during school commute times tend to grow.

16 So I think it's incredibly important that we
17 work with Stanford to try and mitigate the impact of
18 these -- this increase in - in students on campus.
19 Thank you.

20 ALLISON PERRY: Hi. My name is Allison Perry,
21 I'm a new grad at Stanford and part of the Stanford
22 Coalition for Planning an Equitable 2035.

23 So I believe currently Stanford is committed
24 to a no net new commute trips policy that restricts the
25 number of trips to starting to there to peak

1 commute times, be we're wondering if the County has
2 considered extending this commitment to include a wider
3 window of trips to align with a commitment to Stanford
4 reducing greenhouse gas emissions that come from all
5 commute trips regardless of the time of day.

6 And along with these sustainability concerns,
7 we have heard of many [unintelligible] contracted workers
8 that have their hours shifted outside of the peak hours and
9 we're concerned that this may allow Stanford to provide fewer
10 transportation options for them.

11 So we're concerned about the impacts of these
12 peak hours commutes and just restricting the things
13 to that time of day. Thanks.

14 FRANCISCO PRECIADO: Hi. My name is Francisco
15 Preciado, I'm the executive director for SEIU Local 2007.
16 I want to express our appreciation to the scoping of
17 2035 and the grad students for asking very important
18 questions about equity.

19 So in looking at the vast array of Stanford's
20 accomplishments, it's important to recognize it as
21 world-class leader in many respects, whether it's
22 research, technological developments or being recognized
23 as one of the most beautiful campuses in the world.
24 Thanks to our members, by the way.

25 However, the reason we are here today is to

1 express our concern that Stanford is not being a
2 sensitive leader when it comes to treating everyone with
3 respect or valuing them as part of the Stanford family.

4 Examples of this include the fact that
5 Stanford won't recognize the public safety officers who
6 want to unionize and the fact that the majority of
7 workers -- we only have three members, in fact -- that
8 qualify for the affordable housing on campus. So that's
9 three members out of 1200 that come - and provide
10 services to the university.

11 So this is relates directly to the GUP in the
12 community plan, because Stanford's own community plan
13 specifically states that in order to address Stanford's
14 housing needs, it's gonna focus on strategy number one,
15 which is to, quote, increase the supply and affordable --
16 affordability of housing, end quote.

17 Given that the 2018 GUP proposal is 550 units
18 for faculty and staff, does the County actually believe
19 that Stanford is committed to providing affordable
20 housing for staff when its cumulative faculty staffing
21 is, after the 2000 GUP was 937 units, proposing 550 over
22 the last GUP, which was 937?

23 So can the County examine the impact of
24 developing 1,000 staff units on campus as it relates to
25 decreasing the total number of commuters?

1 Lastly, will the County consider funding these
2 additional 1,000 units for a working-class staff
3 members, using Stanford's own affordable housing fund?
4 Thank you.

5 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Hi. My name is
6 Courtney and I'm a current undergraduate student at
7 Stanford and I'm a member of the Stanford Coalition
8 Planning an Equitable 2035.

9 And I have two points today that are on the
10 topic of Stanford University's impact on the larger
11 community.

12 The first deals with impact fees. So, as we
13 know, currently Stanford pays Palo Alto Unified School
14 District an impact fee, a below-market rate housing fee
15 and a government entitlement fee, which is kind of the
16 overarching fee that covers a lot of other things.

17 But comparatively, in San Francisco,
18 [unintelligible] pays impact fees that cover other
19 categories, such as child care, jobs, housing,
20 linkage fee, a community stabilization fee, a
21 public artwork fee and a neighborhood specific
22 impact fee.

23 And so we're wondering: Has Santa Clara
24 County considered the possibility of applying a
25 similar type of impact fees to Stanford University,

1 given that, as we heard from a lot of community members
2 tonight, Stanford University has some impacts on a lot
3 these areas?

4 And we're also wondering whether these types
5 of impacts would be covered within the scope of the EIR
6 process.

7 Our second point, or question, related to the
8 2000 general use permit, condition P8 addresses
9 community services, and this is gonna be a community
10 service study. During our research, we noticed that
11 one of these community services studies has never been
12 conducted before, to my knowledge, and so, to clarify,
13 we wanted to know, first of all, what are examples of
14 community services that would apply to condition P8; and
15 also, have any new neighborhood jurisdictions requested
16 or performed such a study?

17 [Multiple unintelligible speakers]

18 JENNA MAINS: Hello. My name is Jenna Mains,
19 I'm with SEI Local 2007, we support scope 2035 as well
20 as our graduate students.

21 My question is: Can the County please
22 investigate impact to the daily and yearly trips if
23 Stanford extended their transit incentive program, to
24 casuals, contingent and temporary workers?

25 According to the Stanford 2018 analysis report

1 in the last year, this has a potential to reduce over
2 4500 single-driver commutes.

3 I also wanna show my support for their pilot
4 programs that include off-campus graduate students and
5 the post-doc scholars. If they continue this program,
6 it has the potential to save another 2500 commute --
7 same-driver, single-driver commutes.

8 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Good evening. My name is
9 [unintelligible], I'm a member of local 2007, I work at
10 the Stanford University, and I have a question: Can the
11 County look at the effect on the commuters if Stanford
12 provided a thousand additional affordable housing units
13 for their service and technical workers and their
14 families?

15 Thank you. That's my question.

16 MR. GIRARD: Are there any other
17 comments?

18 MR. GIRARD: What I've done, is I've
19 highlighted some of the questions that it sounded like
20 it would be helpful to have people understand the
21 project.

22 We're not gonna be able to answer some of the
23 questions that are basically saying, you know, please
24 study and evaluate this; we -- we urge you to
25 consider this, but --

1 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Go to the mike.

2 MR. RADER: Oh, oh, yes. Oh, thank you.

3 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Working on this?

4 DAVE PERKINS: Yeah. My name is Dave
5 Perkins. I'm the Vice President of Local 2007.

6 We would like to respectfully ask the County to analyze
7 the demographics of the workers that do and do not
8 qualify for the Stanford transit programs. Thank
9 you.

10 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I don't have a card, but
11 the very first thought that came up in the discussion,
12 in last general use permit, there was a section -- I
13 guess it's still there -- about community service impact
14 fees for the City of Palo Alto.

15 And that benefit section negotiated away by
16 the City of Palo Alto through Stanford in terms of the
17 major development agreement. And it just struck me now.
18 So just if that -- if the County has any input on any
19 agreement subsequent to approval of GUP that would
20 affect the relations between Stanford and the City of
21 Palo Alto, that could then be aggregated or negotiated away.
22 Thank you.

23 JACOB WAGGONER: Hi. As a fellow member
24 of scope 2035, I also just want to affirm our support for
25 SEIU 2007. Two, or one procedural question, and maybe a

1 follow-up after that.

2 To what extent will there be room for public
3 comments as it becomes more clear which difference, or
4 models for forecasting environmental impacts to be used
5 by the consultant conducting the EIR, what
6 room will there be, as that process becomes
7 more transparent, for a couple of comments on the model, and
8 also on some of the alternatives being studied.

9 That's what I was -- depending on the answer
10 to that question, we would also be interested in the
11 County considering something along the lines of planned
12 areas, equity environment and jobs alternative, which
13 has a number of different conditions for approval,
14 specifications, target metrics and
15 programs that would support something along the lines of
16 more approval development for 2035.

17 Thanks.

18 MR. GIRARD: Does that conclude all the
19 comments? Okay. Thank you.

20 I'll do my best to go back to the questions
21 that I thought were more important to try to answer.
22 One -- and I'll start from the last one and move back in
23 time.

24 So what are the opportunities for
25 participation in the EIR? Formally, there's a scoping

1 opportunity, so that if you want anything to be
2 considered in the EIR, a particular approach to modeling
3 or particular mitigation framework, then you would
4 provide that input.

5 The next opportunity really is when the draft
6 EIR is released and then you have an opportunity to
7 comment, and then between the release of the draft EIR
8 and the final EIR adoption, we receive those comments,
9 analyze them, respond to them formally, and then you
10 have an opportunity to look at our responses and your
11 final comments to the decision making body that's gonna
12 consider the final EIR.

13 MR. WAGGONER: Can I ask a follow-up
14 question?

15 MR. GIRARD: By all means.

16 MR. WAGGONER: Just because I think
17 it's sometimes hard for us as members of the public to
18 imagine what --

19 LUCY WICKS: Can you use the mic?

20 MR. WAGGONER: Yeah.

21 MS. WICKS: I'm sorry.

22 MR. WAGGONER: So I think just as
23 members of the public, for some of us, it might be hard
24 sometimes to imagine what different kinds of models
25 might be used in this process and some different

1 alternatives that can be imagined, and then what level of
2 specificity we have to give those alternatives.

3 Do you have any particular resources you might
4 suggest for looking into those? Because I assume
5 that those comments need to be submitted by the 17th.
6 Correct?

7 MR. GIRARD: Yeah. Within the scoping period.

8 MR. WAGGONER: Given that there's not gonna
9 be any more input, once it becomes more apparent what --

10 MR. GIRARD: Yeah.

11 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: -- models [unintelligible].

12 MR. GIRARD: I'll say, that there's - there
13 are some very large comparable projects on the Peninsula
14 that have recently gone through environmental impact
15 reports, like the Apple campus, for example, and the
16 Google expansion and the Facebook expansion.

17 So if you wanted to see frameworks for dealing
18 with a lot of the issues that are gonna be apparent in
19 the development at Stanford, they -- you'll see them and
20 how they've been handled in those EIRs.

21 MR. WAGGONER: Right. And those are
22 reasonably representative of what we might expect from this
23 EIR?

24 MR. GIRARD: Not necessarily, but if you were
25 looking for sort of a comparative -- means of comparison

1 just to see what the possibilities are and what EIRs
2 have been recently approved in this area for similar
3 amounts of development, those are good comparisons --
4 comparable EIRs.

5 MR. WAGGONER: Thanks.

6 MR. RADER: Yeah. I'd like to add,
7 there are technical reports available as part of the
8 application. They're on the County's website for this
9 project and so you probably get some idea of
10 methodologies, sort of accepted approaches to these --
11 analyzing these topics.

12 An example would be vehicle miles traveled.
13 The State of California Office of Planning and Research
14 has put forth a methodology for looking at vehicle miles
15 traveled and the -- so that approach will be used. I
16 think greenhouse gas emissions has -- you know, has
17 quite a body of accepted methodologies and targets -- you
18 know, state targets and thresholds.

19 So, you know, it depends on the topic, but
20 there are a lot -- you know, there are standard
21 methodologies out there that are generally used for most
22 environmental impact analysis.

23 You know, traffic has also standards; the
24 National Trans- -- or -- let's see, what's the --

25 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: NTSB?

1 MR. RADER: Yeah. I mean, there's a
2 professional organization, national organization, that
3 has put out, for example, trip -- you know, vehicle trip
4 standards.

5 This project will have its own -- you know,
6 the -- I think the general use permit 2000 had developed
7 its own trip rates because of the uniqueness of the
8 Stanford campus, it's sort of like its own community,
9 but, you know, there are standard traffic analysis
10 methodologies that have been used for, you know,
11 decades.

12 And so -- so there's quite a lot of
13 information about -- they're both in this project, the
14 technical reports that have been submitted so far, and
15 then, you know, as Kirk said, in other EIRs, you can get
16 an idea of what's generally done for each topic.

17 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I just wanna put a
18 question.

19 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Sure.

20 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Would you say - this is San
21 -- San Mateo County, so maybe you'd be more comfortable answering.

22 Would you say that the EIR for the Facebook
23 campus expansion accurately estimated the impacts of
24 traffic on the eastern extent of Willow Road?

25 MR. GIRARD: We can't answer that. I wish --

1 not - not politically. We just don't know.

2 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Just wondering about EIRs in
3 general.

4 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Can I throw a follow-up
5 on that?

6 MR. RADER: By all means.

7 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I was talking about
8 traffic, but I'm also trying to remember the name of the --
9 who approved those old trip generation tables.

10 In the Santa Clara County process, is there
11 independent peer review traffic analysis by consultants
12 who are paid for by the applicant but approved by the
13 County? Is that how it works?

14 MR. GIRARD: That's correct, yeah. And the
15 answer is yes, there are. That work is ongoing.

16 David spoke about the technical studies that
17 were provided to us by Stanford as a part of their
18 application. In every case, we're having those reviewed
19 by the consultants that we've hired to do the EIR, and
20 -- and we're meeting on a regular basis to -- so that we
21 fully understand the perspectives that the consultants
22 have taken and that our consultants can do on
23 independent analysis of the same topics.

24 I think there was -- the question, just in
25 general, about the adequacy of EIR's treatment of

1 traffic impacts, and I -- I think that's an important
2 question that answers several of the questions that have
3 been made tonight, and that is, you know:

4 What is the framework for determining whether
5 or not the jurisdiction has the ability to impose
6 mitigation on Stanford. And from an environmental
7 perspective, under CEQA, the analysis goes something
8 like this:

9 Is the -- what is the impact? Is the impact
10 above what might be considered a threshold of
11 significance for an environmental effect?

12 And those sources of thresholds of
13 significance vary. The gold standard is some standard
14 that has been adopted by your jurisdiction, or maybe the
15 state or federal government, that's been peer-reviewed
16 and is an accepted standard. But that isn't the only
17 requirement. And, in fact, the ultimate decision of
18 whether or not a threshold is an appropriate threshold
19 rests with the lead agency decision makers.

20 But in -- the general prospective, is you
21 can't require somebody to do more mitigation than the
22 impact they create. And they -- to ask for mitigation
23 in the first place, they -- in fact, has to be somewhat
24 significant, or deemed to be significant.

25 Now, that's a -- sounds like a very

1 black-and-white framework, and it is, but for anybody
2 that knows CEQA, it's considerably more gray than that.
3 Sometimes a project is designed inherently to reduce
4 impacts, other times it's designed in such a way that it
5 requires specific conditions or approval that would
6 mitigate the impacts.

7 So it's pretty much on the spectrum, but many
8 people are dissatisfied because the threshold isn't
9 zero. Before it's a considerable impact, it has to meet
10 the level of significance and then you can't require the
11 applicant to fix more than their fair share of the
12 problem.

13 And that gets to the point of why there's some
14 frustration even after something might be thoroughly
15 mitigated, the project might persist or remain, or even
16 worsen incrementally.

17 So the question came up, is -- is -- looking
18 at the, like, vehicle miles traveled effect of providing
19 more affordable housing on campus for workers.

20 And this would come up from the framework of
21 providing some substance to the traffic demand
22 management plans of Stanford and doing some what-if
23 scenarios to say: If housing was brought to the --
24 Stanford, how would that impact the traffic trips to and
25 from the campus?

1 And that is an -- potentially fair-game
2 analysis. Now, the - to be clear, the Stanford
3 application isn't proposing specific housing allocations
4 for specific groups. For planning purposes, they've
5 broken down the total housing allowance that they're
6 requesting into anticipated purposes for the housing,
7 but they're asking for flexibility for who they serve
8 with their housing allocations in the campus.

9 And the question of even: Would it be
10 considered within the realm of the EIR to say, well, you
11 have to provide this amount of housing to this
12 particular population on the campus? It might be, if it
13 comes down to mitigating the traffic impact associated
14 with that.

15 But the issue of sort of equity and social
16 equity of who does and doesn't receive housing on the
17 campus is really not an EIR topic, per se.

18 The question came up: Would the EIR deal with
19 more ambitious GHG reduction targets than what might be
20 required by the state framework? And I'll go back to
21 this issue of what would be considered to be a threshold
22 of significance for greenhouse gas emissions.

23 The framework that has been proposed is that
24 Stanford would do its share of meeting the state
25 greenhouse gas reduction goals. And -- and if they met

1 their share, they have an argument that they've met the
2 -- well, the sufficient mitigation of that impact
3 because that is effectively an adopted standard by a
4 regulatory agency that's been peer-reviewed, that
5 doesn't necessarily prevent them from proposing beyond
6 that; but if they had built that standard into their
7 project, then -- then the lead agency would be within
8 its realm to say that it has been mitigated below the
9 level of significance based on what they proposed.

10 And there was the question of the development
11 in the foothill areas in reference to the large building
12 for golf carts that was constructed. And I'm not that
13 familiar with that particular building, but I will
14 describe the framework for the first GUP for
15 construction in the foothills. And then - you may need
16 to help me with some of the square footage.

17 But if my memory serves me, Stanford sought
18 and received permission to develop up to 15,000 square
19 feet in the foothills area.

20 MS. PALTER: Yes, that's correct.

21 MR. GIRARD: Okay. And so far, of that 15,000
22 that was approved, at least 7,000 has been consumed or
23 some --

24 MS. PALTER: There was about 5,000
25 square feet that was used near the Red Barn, which is

1 technically in the foothills district because of the
2 little jiggering of the line. That was a - an unreinforced
3 masonry building that was closed, and it we reactivated it we
4 had to get approval for about 5,000 square feet.

5 And then there was a 42-square-foot
6 guard shop.

7 MR. GIRARD: Okay.

8 MS. PALTER: And that - those were
9 the projects --

10 MR. GIRARD: And that's it.

11 MS. PALTER: -- under the 2000
12 general use permit.

13 MR. GIRARD: So there were -- the allocation
14 they sought in the original general use permit, they're
15 not proposing any changes in that allocation, and that
16 leaves a head room for the remaining -- for consuming
17 the remaining allocation that was originally provided.

18 MS. PALTER: Actually, we're not
19 carrying forward that head room. We're just saying from
20 here on --

21 MR. GIRARD: Even better.

22 MS. PALTER: -- Yeah. We're not proposing
23 any inputs.

24 MR. GIRARD: Okay. So that head room expires.
25 Okay? So ...

1 All right. So answers that. Thanks for
2 clarifying that.

3 And is there any -- those are the ones that I
4 highlighted. So tell me if -- do you have some more?

5 MS. KUMAR: I can respond to the one of
6 commissions [unintelligible].

7 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Are you taking any more
8 questions?

9 [Multiple unintelligible speakers]

10 MS. KUMAR: Somebody had a question about
11 condition P8. The way the condition is written is at a
12 written request of any neighboring jurisdiction which is
13 supported by substantial evidence that Stanford would
14 not provide adequate community services to new campus
15 residential - residents associated with the proposed
16 development under the GUP, then the County would take up
17 such a study and Stanford would pay for it.

18 So no such request has come forward from any
19 neighboring community, so that has not been done. But
20 it is there, that provision does exist -- you're right
21 -- in the Stanford GUP. But that has not been requested
22 by anybody at this point.

23 Thank you.

24 MR. GIRARD: And let me add to that, because
25 that was a question that I was gonna answer. The

1 question is: If a condition of approval was imposed
2 upon Stanford, could it be negotiated away after the
3 fact?

4 Like, apparently, in the Mayfield
5 development agreement, the services fee to Palo Alto has
6 changed.

7 And the answer is no, not if there was a
8 condition of approval or mitigation requirement of our
9 approval. The only agency that could modify that is the
10 lead agency, or the County.

11 If it was supplemental and wasn't a built-in
12 part of the project decision, and/or the CEQA
13 mitigation, then the answer is yes, that didn't have a
14 nexus to our permanent approval.

15 UNIDENTIFIED MALE 13: So Stanford University
16 has been here for a long time, and so when Stanford was
17 originally built, the material that they used in the
18 construction that were considered safe at that time are
19 now known not to be safe.

20 So one of the materials that seems to be
21 problematic is lead paint. And so, everybody knows,
22 lead is a powerful neurotoxin and it attacks the central
23 nervous system.

24 So Stanford has lead paint on the campus. And
25 at the last scope in 2000, I think lead paint at that

1 time wasn't necessarily fully, you know, understood, the
2 full impact. But now the EPA has come out with a new
3 ruling that says there's no safe level of lead paint,
4 whereas before, they had an action level, you
5 know, to what was considered to be the threshold, but
6 now they specifically said there is no threshold.

7 And so that's a major change in how lead paint
8 is handled; plus, there's a mega lawsuit in
9 California that - that's like in appeal right now, but
10 looks like it's going to probably pass against the lead
11 paint industry.

12 So I'm sure that the County -- it's a
13 County-wide problem, it's not just Stanford. But this
14 is the opportunity to get up to, you know, how does, you
15 know, Stanford address the lead paint hazard, not just
16 for the residents of Stanford, but also the employees
17 who come in and maintain Stanford, the construction
18 workers who come in and do the demolition, and then you
19 have the residents with children on campus and then all
20 of us.

21 So I'd like to hear how -- you know, not just
22 the effect to the human, but the environment, you know,
23 it runs off in the bay, of course. And so you have the
24 effect to the community, the effect to the construction
25 workers, the effect to the community of employees of

1 Stanford. So I'd like to understand that.

2 MR. RADER: So there will be a
3 hazard and hazardous material section of the EIR. And
4 at the beginning of each of these environmental topic
5 sessions, there's a description of the existing physical
6 setting of the environment and then also a description
7 of the regulatory environment.

8 And so all -- any of the changes that have
9 occurred in -- in either the physical setting or the
10 regulatory environment, you know, since the previous
11 general use permit, you know, will -- will have to be
12 included in the document.

13 So any of those kind of regulatory changes
14 that you mentioned would have to disclosed and they
15 would be part of the analysis or the way in which those
16 impacts are evaluated.

17 Obviously -- I mean, we're not evaluating
18 specific demolition or building construction projects
19 because they haven't -- they haven't been presented to
20 us, but we -- you know, obviously, demolition is a
21 reasonably foreseeable outcome of what Stanford has
22 asked for, so, you know, demolition will be -- will be
23 evaluated in terms of hazardous materials including, you
24 know, lead or asbestos, other materials like that.

25 MR. GIRARD: So the question came up of: Could

1 the County impose additional fees on Stanford as impacts
2 are known?

3 And the answer is yes, there's certain rules,
4 as you might imagine, in California, for imposing
5 mitigation impact fees. But I -- you talked about the
6 suite of fees that are imposed in San Francisco.

7 If the decision-making body from a policy
8 perspective proposes fees and/or from a EIR mitigation
9 perspective, then there are frameworks that would have
10 to be followed.

11 So the answer is that is a potential. But
12 it's still too early in the process to be able to answer
13 any -- any what-if scenarios for fees.

14 And then the question of valuating the
15 greenhouse gas reduction effects for changing parking
16 standards from just the commute hours.

17 The answer is yes, that vehicle mile traveled
18 analysis is being conducted which looks at the total
19 vehicle miles traveled from the campus as a result of
20 the expansion of the campus that ties directly to
21 greenhouse gas emissions.

22 And I think that's it for my review of the
23 questions that you've -- you've asked, but I'll say if
24 somebody feels like we didn't do justice to your
25 question or forgot it entirely, feel free to ask it

1 again now.

2 MR. GIRARD: Okay. Well, I'll say
3 this is a very rich set of comments. Oh, we have one
4 more question.

5 MR. ZHAO: So this is follow-up to the response
6 about condition P8: What would an example of a community
7 service be that could be studied as part of community
8 services study?

9 MR. GIRARD: Well, I think the classic ones are
10 parks and schools. Again, there's some specific
11 frameworks for both of those. But were there any
12 contemplated in P8 that were mentioned?

13 MS. KUMAR: [Unintelligible]

14 MR. GIRARD: Yeah, I -- other examples is
15 sometimes there are contributions to, like I say, say,
16 for after-school programs, they're --

17 MS. KUMAR: Police - police, fire.

18 MR. GIRARD: And then police, fire impact fees
19 are often assessed. So I think those are the big ones.

20 MR. ZHAO: Okay.

21 MR. GIRARD: Yeah.

22 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you.

23 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I'd just like to
24 understand the policies. I'm an accountant. And what
25 is your view on the -- on that paint hazard? Would you like

1 to see a more aggressive abatement program going into the
2 future, or are you satisfied with the current approach?

3 MR. GIRARD: Well, I think the points you've
4 raised, that the regulatory standards may have changed,
5 is something that we pay attention to.

6 I can -- I can tell you, traditionally, the
7 regulatory framework that's established for treatment of
8 hazardous materials and hazardous waste, is -- is fairly
9 exhaustive, and most lead agencies and jurisdictions
10 consider whether or not you are or aren't compliant --
11 for example, with a permitting program that might be
12 already in place for those materials. And if you are
13 compliant, then that is often deemed to be a threshold
14 of significance.

15 So it's too early to say if -- if we feel that
16 somehow what Stanford is proposing wouldn't be fully
17 mitigated by them complying with the federal or the
18 state statutes for -- for lead, lead paint.

19 But I'll say, in that area of regulatory
20 coverage, most lead agencies actually defer to the
21 permitting and oversight framework of the state and
22 federal government.

23 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you.

24 MR. GIRARD: But like I say, it's too early to
25 know now. But that's -- that's from this vantage point.

1 Okay. With that, thank you all for coming.
2 Really, we got a lot of -- a lot comments. So really,
3 thank you all for participating in this.
4 [End audio file 1 of 1 at 01:41:08]

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

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

TRANSCRIBER CERTIFICATION

I, TONIA L. WEBB, attest that the foregoing proceedings provided to me via audio were transcribed by me to the best of my ability.

I further attest that I am not a relative or employee to any attorney or party nor financially interested in this action.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Dated this ____ day of _____, 2017.

TONIA L. WEBB