

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

PALO ALTO
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
October 12, 2017

1 Thursday, October 12, 2017

7:49 p.m

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

3 MS. FURTH: So in looking at the alternatives,
4 they don't seem to include one objective ratio
5 [INAUDIBLE] now. Is that because there's no addressed
6 impact on population?

7 MR. GIRARD: I think the ratio of -- I'll answer
8 this -- this is a really good question, but I'll answer
9 the best that I can. But I don't want to short shift it
10 by making something off-the-cuff. And David help here,
11 if you may, that you look for alternatives that would
12 have a significant affect one way or another by the
13 environment.

14 MS. FURTH: But that would reduce impacts.

15 MR. GIRARD: Yeah, and so if you increase the
16 amount of housing, the most significant -- let's say on
17 campus.

18 MS. FURTH: I'm thinking about the job housing
19 balance.

20 MR. GIRARD: Yeah. That is not necessarily -- I'll
21 say that's more of a policy issue than a --

22 (Overlapping speakers.)

23 (Reporter interruption.)

24 MR. GIRARD: I think the short answer is, if you
25 don't to come to the mike, is that variable project

1 isn't so much an environmental driver as it is a
2 possibility issue. Because the biggest effect of
3 increasing the amount of houses is that you could
4 improve the profit demand management program.

5 So you're reducing trips that somebody might have
6 the live in the East Bay or come from Tracy could
7 potentially keep on-campus housing. But that would be
8 figured and captured under the No New Trips, and the
9 objective is to achieve that with the current ratio.

10 So doing better could potentially be -- do better
11 than No New Trips. But that's the biggest variable. I
12 think the jobs housing balance is as much if not more a
13 policy issue than the environmental.

14 David does that ring true with the sequel
15 perspective?

16 MR. RADER: Yeah, and I mean, you could change the
17 ratio, but it wouldn't be consistent with the -- you
18 know, the community plan goal and the continuity from
19 the original 2000 GUP. So I think the idea was to be
20 consistent with that -- with that goal. But
21 theoretically if you increase the ratio of housing, you
22 might have some affect on vehicle trips.

23 But there are types of housing, like, facility
24 housing that actually have the possibly the reverse
25 affect where you have off-campus commuting by supposes,

1 for example.

2 MR. GIRARD: And maybe I could ask, Gregg, do you
3 have an opinion there -- if you think about -- I find
4 that variable affect on VMT and an affect on road
5 segments and intersections.

6 MR. RADER: Well, in general, if you have more
7 housing on the campus at a higher ratio, the travel
8 would -- would go down. Dave's right that there are
9 some types of housing that that increment isn't as big
10 because there are people living in the house that start
11 going away from campus to their jobs, to their schools.

12 So, you know, there would be, most likely, a net
13 positive affect in the sense of reducing trips. But,
14 you know, how much that would be would have to be
15 studied with a specific new ratio.

16 MR. GIRARD: It's a fair comment.

17 MS. FURTH: It was really more of a question, but
18 I'll turn it into a comment. My name is is Wunne Furth,
19 and I remember the previous GUP and its EIR well, and I
20 was asking you the question about alternatives for two
21 reasons. One was I was curious that there wasn't a
22 proposal with a better jobs housing ratio. And,
23 secondly -- because I wondered if it would've improve
24 traffic, which I presume can be considered an adverse
25 impact. And I think your -- in the situation, I think

1 you're telling me that you think that the No Net Trips
2 policy will solve that.

3 And then secondly, an alternative you don't
4 analyze, what is one that hasn't been analyzed. So if
5 the board wants to approve a project which has a more
6 favorable jobs housing ratio, you'll need to do
7 supplemental environmental work.

8 MR. GIRARD: And I'll say not necessarily if it
9 reduces the impact -- known impact. You have to, for
10 example, recirculate, if you change the projects so that
11 it increases an impact. If the board decreases an
12 impact, then it doesn't re-trigger recirculation.

13 MS. FURTH: Because you have to analyze to
14 determine that it's increasing.

15 MR. GIRARD: You know, I'll say that the
16 analyst -- the analysis is in the EIR right now. It
17 really is. That is -- the affect of on-campus housing,
18 and VMT and the congestion travel impact analysis has
19 been considered. So that is considered in the document.

20 Did that rise to crating a fourth -- a specific
21 alternative with increased the housing? It's not to say
22 that it shouldn't, but the analysis conducted, it just
23 didn't spur a specific environment alternative.

24 MS. FURTH: Thank you.

25 MR. HEARN: My name is Gerry Hearn. I sit on the

1 community resource group that gets to see all these
2 documents on an annual basis, including all the traffic
3 studies, which I'm beginning to actually find
4 interesting, yet complicated. So I have a suggestion, I
5 would also put on of the EIRs in the Menlo Park library.
6 I think there's a lot of concern in that neighborhood
7 about this, and you'll get a lot of people in Menlo
8 Park, and I know those libraries are very well used.

9 Second thing, Kirk, I wanted to ask you, my
10 understanding of the flexibility/responsibility part of
11 that really sort of general community plan is that
12 there's flexibility within the -- the EIR actually
13 analyzes some fairly specific places, for example, that
14 housing is going to be, right. And that's how it's
15 built up to the to the however many units; right?

16 Yet, there's flexibility about being able to move
17 those units, if things change, right? As long as it's
18 within the court campus area, right, that's the way I
19 understand it. And the we had an example of that not
20 too long ago where it felt to me like the demands kind
21 of changed; and, therefore, the housing changed and kind
22 of moved.

23 And then it's Stanford's responsibility to make
24 sure that all of the other conditions are met that that
25 change does not adversely affect everything else; is

1 that correct? Is that --

2 MR. GIRARD: That's correct, and there are -- on a
3 scale, there's some flexibility that can be exercised
4 with an individual project application. There's some
5 flexibility that can only be exercised after review by
6 CRG.

7 MR. HEARN: Right. And then planning commission,
8 yes.

9 MR. GIRARD: And then moving allegations between
10 districts.

11 MR. HEARN: That's one of them, okay. So I
12 actually kind of like that because this is such a huge
13 project overall, and the time lines are so long, and
14 things change. And while we're on the subject of things
15 changing, my memory is that with a 50-percent build-out,
16 the stainability study was required; is that correct?
17 Counselor, do you remember? Was it that somewhere
18 around there in 2009?

19 MR. GIRARD: Yeah.

20 MR. HEARN: And I actually find that to be one of
21 the most interesting things off all those documents to
22 read. I think Stanford's done an excellent job in that
23 regard, and I'm very interested in sustainable
24 development. Is there a requirement for that that
25 linked in this? I haven't -- to be quite honest with

1 you, I haven't read it very carefully. Is the there a
2 requirement to revisit the stainability thing, because
3 we know that things are changing very rapidly in
4 technology, and the ability to develop things more
5 sustainably, and I would hope that that's part of what
6 gets required or part an element.

7 MR. GIRARD: When the board approved and accepted
8 the same building study in 2009, a motion -- a motion
9 was approved saying that mid-way through the next
10 general use permit, another sustainability study should
11 be prepared?

12 MR. HEARN: Good.

13 MR. GIRARD: And I think there was a nod of the
14 the things do change and staying ahead of the approvals.
15 The approach of how a sustainability study could provide
16 a maximum -- as complimentary as possible to the
17 regulatory framework, for the plan, for the general use
18 permit community, is under discussion right now. And
19 the administration hasn't really determined what's going
20 to be ultimately going to be planning commission or the
21 board or how the sustainability study will work in
22 concert with the general use permit approval.

23 MR. HEARN: Okay. And including where the trigger
24 might be; right? To redo that; right. Because halfway
25 through, there's a lot of changes that might happen

1 within let's, say, ten years. Yeah, yeah.

2 MR. GIRARD: No, that's very much a current topic
3 of discussion.

4 MR. HEARN: Good. Thank you very much.

5 MR. BOWEN: Fred Bowen is my name. This is a
6 question rather than a comment on the report, and it
7 just kind of hit me as I was sitting here. Does an
8 involvement environmental impact report study impacts,
9 let's say, on staffing that relates to public safety?
10 Police and fire? The reason I bring that up is that
11 oddly Stanford has their own police; however, fire is
12 shared with the City of Palo Alto.

13 Actually, it's -- Palo Alto provides it under a
14 contract that's still under negotiation with Stanford.
15 Stanford has paid -- it started at a certain amount over
16 the past 50 years. We actually have the City counsel
17 coming on Monday on Palo Alto to decide if they're going
18 to cut a million and a half dollars from the fire
19 department budget in terms of level of service. And, of
20 course, you know, the news we have, fire safety all
21 around us. So just thinking about that in relationship,
22 if that's something that's studied.

23 MR. GIRARD: Absolutely.

24 MR. BOWEN: It is? So there's something in the
25 EIR that would be related to the impact of the growing

1 population.

2 MR. GIRARD: What the demand is or --

3 MR. BOWEN: And what demand would be --

4 MR. GIRARD: Yes, that's --

5 MR. BOWEN: And possible -- and this is a county
6 jurisdiction decision. So is -- can mitigation or can a
7 stipulation be put in there with regard to a level of
8 service that is required to public safety and who should
9 pay for that, things of that sort?

10 MR. GIRARD: It's one of those items that have
11 both environmental and policy ramifications; and yes, it
12 can be customary for a local jurisdiction to determine
13 what appropriate level service might be outside of the
14 EIR process, and it's usually guided by general plan.

15 MR. BOWEN: But it wouldn't be part of this --

16 MR. GIRARD: It could very well be --

17 MR. BOWEN: It could be a part of the mitigation.
18 It might not be part of the mitigation. It might be a
19 part of the agreement, whatever.

20 MR. GIRARD: I would suggest read the EIR, and
21 then just do a search of the existing general use
22 permit, and you see is the conditions that govern the
23 fire protection and [INAUDIBLE] sort of affect the
24 contract with Palo Alto.

25 MR. BOWEN: Right. Thank you.

1 MR. GIRARD: So anybody else have any questions or
2 like to get comment on the record? Then we can close
3 the matter, and anything else anybody would like to say?
4 Okay.

5 (Proceeding adjourned at 8:01 p.m.)

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Draft Environmental Impact Report Hearing

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

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

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

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

_____, 2017. _____
Date CSR Number 14053