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[The meeting began at 6:38 p.m.]

LISA GIBSON: Good evening. Welcome to tonight's public scoping meeting for the environmental impact report of the Glen Park community plan project. My name is Lisa Gibson. I'm an environmental planner with the San Francisco Planning Department. And my role is to be the coordinator for the EIR.

The purpose of our meeting today is to obtain public comment concerning the scope of the issues to be addressed in the draft environmental impact report, or EIR, for the project. My function for this evening is to moderate this scoping meeting.

Seated in the room with us tonight are some people that I would like to introduce. If you can stand, John Swae is the community plan coordinator. Next to him is John Billovitz, who is the community plan director. Chelsea Fordham is there at the front of the table; and she is with the Planning Department and is my assistant working on this project and the EIR. We have Randi Adair standing over there; she's with the consulting firm PBS&J, who are assisting the Planning Department in preparing the environmental documentation for the project. In the back there we have Kim Walton, who is the project manager with the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency.
And I'm sorry. Do we have a representative here from BART? I'm not recognizing any face. We are expecting a representative from BART. And when he arrives, I'll be sure to introduce him.

Supervisor Dufty could not be here tonight, but he did want us to convey the message that he is excited to see this milestone in the environmental review process being achieved and knowing that the project is moving forward. The department has been in close contact with Supervisor Dufty and keeps him informed and will continue to do so as we move towards completion of the EIR.

So, hopefully, as you came in, you signed in on the sign-in sheet there and picked up a copy of the meeting agenda. And Chelsea is there to assist you. If you need any materials at any point, just raise your hand and she'll help you out. If you plan on speaking, it's important that you get a speaker card. It's not quite a card; it's a piece of paper that you fill in your name and organization, if you're with one, and your address. And we will collect those and use those to call people up to speak. Later, during the public comment period of the meeting, we'll call your name when it's time for you to speak.

Another item you might wish to pick up is the
comment form. And this is a written form that you can use to write down any comments that you might have whether or not you speak tonight. And the box over there is where you can drop them. There's some other handouts at the table over there that I'll mention a little bit further in my presentation.

So a couple of housekeeping issues. The restrooms are located to the right when you go out the door and then to the left. Please, we would request that you turn off your cellphones, ringers, and pagers; and if you do need to speak that you step outside of the room.

Now I'd like to take a minute to talk about the purpose of tonight's meeting. The EIR process, as required by the California Environmental Quality Act, is a very public one. This is the first step. The main reason for this scoping meeting is to receive oral comments as well as written comments on the scope of the environmental issues to be addressed in the EIR. This is your opportunity to assist the Planning Department in scoping and focusing the EIR by sharing any information that you may have or concern that you have that might be useful in preparing the EIR. Your comments could help to identify significant environmental effects of the project, help us identify issues that maybe aren't as
great a concern where we don't have to put as much
attention to them, or to identify reasonable project
alternatives.

    It's not a meeting about the merits of the
project or about project approval. I and the others
that I introduced to you here tonight are here to listen
to your comments. We're not here to discuss or debate
your views with you. It's not a question-and-answer
session, although we may ask questions for a point of
clarification.

    In just a moment you're going to hear a
presentation from John Swae regarding the proposed
project. After that I'll speak with you briefly about
the CEQA review process. And then we'll open the
meeting for public comment and for those who submit
speaker cards. And everybody will be given three
minutes to speak.

    We have an official stenographer here this
evening who will be making a verbatim transcript of
tonight's meeting. The transcript will be part of the
official record for THE CEQA process. After all the
speakers have commented, we will wrap up the meeting.

    So now I'd like to hand things over to John
Swae, who will speak with you about the proposed
project.
JOHN SWAE: Hi, I'm John Swae. I work with the San Francisco Planning Department. I'm the community plan manager for the Glen Park community plan.

So thanks for coming out. I do want to say that this is like a pretty big event, actually, with the EIR. As many of you know, we introduced this plan in 2003; and then it was put on hold until we could get the environmental review started. And it's taken a while and we acknowledge that, but it's finally started. So I think it's a pretty exciting moment for the plans to move forward.

Lisa's going to talk a little more about the environmental review process, but I'm just curious how many people are familiar with EIRs and that kind of process involved. Okay. So this is not a meeting about the community plan per se. It's about the environmental impacts that will be analyzed of the plans. So Lisa will talk about that. But I can talk basically a little bit about the plan.

These maps show the plan area. So it extends mostly around the BART station, the downtown village area, and then up Chenery and Bosworth to Glen Park. And there's a number of improvements proposed -- a lot of transportation improvements were called out in the 2003 plan. There's a proposed bus loop that would go
around the BART station to allow buses to get out of traffic on Diamond and Bosworth. There's two roundabouts proposed for traffic calming at the intersections of Bosworth and Arlington and Lyell. There's a proposal to explore looking at daylighting portions of Islais Creek that flows under parts of Glen Park and a number of other improvements.

I'm happy to talk more about those, but hopefully you'll have a chance throughout tonight to get up and walk around and check out some of these boards, which kind of describe parts of the plan.

So basically what is the plan? So there's three big components of the plan. One of them is going to be the zoning heights proposal for the area. As the study area shows, it's not going to affect much of the residential areas around Glen Park. It's focused mostly on the downtown part of Glen Park. So we'll develop the zoning and heights proposal for the study area. We will develop some plan area guidelines, so some design guidelines for how new development should look or what types of development will fit in with the character of Glen Park. And then looking at site-specific guidelines, some of the potential development sites, such as the BART parking lot. So we want to get your input or your feelings about what should happen there or
what shouldn't happen there and how it should look.

And then the third piece of the implementation program: So we're really focused on getting improvements on the street; and we do have federal earmark money -- some money to spend on some transportation improvements. So out of this process we're hoping to identify some of those improvements that we can actually build in the neighborhood. So out of the implementation program we will get a transportation and parking strategy for the study area. We're going to be looking at developing streetscape plans for the area and for downtown Glen Park; and then looking at some open space, greenway, and possibly creek ideas for the neighborhood.

So in the process where we currently are right now is we are getting the environmental review rolling. And we're also at the transportation improvements that I mentioned here that were proposed as part of this 2003 plan. So we had some engineers and the MTA are looking and studying these improvements to see can we really -- is it feasible to build a bus loop because of the grade change. Can we build these roundabouts at the intersection that are big enough to accommodate them? So we have people cranking on that.

And the next steps: We're going to have the
results of those studies in the next month or two. And what we hope to do is have our next public workshop in September -- early fall. We'll be talking about the transportation improvements and the results of those studies. So we had an open house in April where we officially relaunched the planning process and then our next big public workshop will be this fall. It will focus on transportation issues.

And then the other things: I just want to emphasize I know this is not a forum to get into the details of the plan. We're focusing on environmental review, but I'd like to leave my cards up at the table here. And I just want to encourage all of you to give me a call or talk to me this evening if you have concerns. We know there are a lot of concerns about parking and the BART parking lot; so those are things we want to hear about. So please feel free to contact me.

I think I'll turn it back to Lisa.

LISA GIBSON: Thank you, John. I'd like to do one additional introduction before we move on. Bruno Peguese, if you could stand up, please.

He's with BART. He's the principal development director --

BRUNO PEGUESE: Principal property development
LISA GIBSON: He is joining us here today to hear the comments that may pertain to the development -- the impacts regarding development of the BART parking lot.

Just to follow up one thing that John said, I just want to clarify, as he did the environmental review process versus the community plan process, there's one e-mail list that is on the table over there for individuals who wish to receive information regarding the community plan process. You can do so by getting on the e-mail list there for the environmental review.

I just want to make sure that everybody has signed in on the sign-in sheets. And because of some problems that we had with the e-mail distribution on the NOP -- the notice of preparation -- for this meeting, we would prefer that we stick with the "snail mail," as it were, as our principal means of communication for the environmental review process.

So the first step in the EIR process was the issuance of the notice of preparation and the notice of the scoping meeting that we sent out on July 1st 2009. That was to elicit participation in the scoping of the EIR for the agencies and for the public. That included a brief description of the project and the environmental
effect it had we'd be looking at. It included a notice of where the written comments should be submitted and a deadline for that. We are accepting written comments on the scope of the EIR through July 31st at 5:00 p.m. And there are extra copies of this notice of preparation at the table over there. And it indicates where you should send those comments. Also, there's an agenda. There's information there on where to mail any comments that you have.

The next step of the EIR process will be the publication of an initial study. And that's a preliminary analysis tool that we use to focus the EIR on the potential significant impacts of the project to avoid unnecessary analysis of environmental concerns that are not potentially significant. The initial study will include a more detailed description of the project than was in the notice of preparation. And it's going to discuss the project's less-than-significant impacts; and it'll identify the potentially significant impacts that we would be taking a closer look at in the EIR.

The initial study uses a checklist format like the document that we have in the table over there that looks like this. And this can give you an idea of the issues that we will be looking at and the kinds of questions that we'll be seeking to answer. The initial
study will be sent out to agencies and interested parties, including those people that signed in here tonight. We published a notice in the newspaper. We send it to the State Clearinghouse for state agency review; and we anticipate that we will publish the initial study towards the end of this year. And the Planning Department will accept your written comments on that document for a period of 30 days.

We have already begun collecting the preliminary information and conducted analyses that will be the basis for the initial study. The verbal comments that we receive here tonight and those that we receive in writing regarding the physical effects and the environmental effects of the project will be taken into account in our preparation of the initial study and then in the EIR, but we're not going to be preparing written responses to those comments. What we'll be doing is reviewing those comments in the oral transcript that we get and that will help us focus the EIR analysis as appropriate.

Then, after the initial study, the Planning Department will publish a draft EIR; and that will be the document that takes a closer look at the focused environmental issues that we identify in the initial study. And that will be sent out for public review for
a period of 45 days.

And after that is published, we'll be having a
hearing before the Planning Commission. So that will
allow another opportunity for oral comments at that
point. And there will be a hearing, also, before the
Historic Preservation Commission to allow them to look
at comments on any concerns regarding historic
resources.

We anticipate publishing the draft EIR
sometime in early next year. And, like the initial
study, the draft EIR will be sent out for public review
to agencies and to the State, having notice in the
newspaper. After the close of the draft EIR comment
period, the Planning Department will work on the draft
comments-and-responses document. This is going to be a
document that will provide written responses to the
substantive comments we receive on environmental issues.

We'll also be identifying any changes to the
draft EIR, as necessary, to be responsive to the
comments that we received. And we will distribute this
document out to those who commented and give two weeks
before there'll be a hearing before the Planning
Commission, where we will ask the Planning Commission to
certify the final EIR. Certification of the EIR does
not mean that the project is approved. It doesn't
constitute approval of the plan. It does not constitute
approval of any individual development project within
the plan area. That is a separate consideration from
the certification of the EIR.

I think that's an important point. I just
want to emphasize it. And that's why at tonight's
meeting we are not concerned, really, about the merits
of the project, whether it is good or bad. We really
want to hear about, if you feel something is good or
bad, how that relates to concerns you might have about
the environmental impact.

So, briefly, I'll just go over the kinds of
things that we'll be looking in the initial study and
draft EIR. CEQA, the California Environmental Quality
Act, which requires that we do this, encourages
protection in a wide range of environmental issues.
There are 18 topics that we will be looking at in our
environmental review. And that's the handout that I
referred to earlier. We anticipate that we will be
taking a close look at roughly a handful of issues in
the EIR.

Examples of those topics and the questions
that we will be asking include: Transportation
circulation. What effect will the project have on the
existing transportation system and circulation patterns?
Obviously, a purpose of some of the plan is to improve those conditions. How would the plan actually affect these things?

Land use. What effect would implementation of the community plan have on the character of the neighborhood and would their individual quality be any esthetic effect? Would this project have an effect on scenic views, issues of any kind?

For noise, we might look at whether any potential infill development will be significantly impacted by existing noise levels on Interstate 280.

And the air quality. Would the project result in any significant air pollutant concentrations?

So those are just some of the questions that we would be answering. And for each significant impact that we identify in the initial study or EIR we will identify feasible mitigation measures that will avoid or substantially reduce those impacts. And those are called "mitigating measures."

So then the EIR is also going to evaluate and consider alternatives to the proposed project. The alternatives that we are going to focus on are those that ideally avoid or reduce any of the significant environmental effects the project would have. We know that the EIR will assess the no-project alternative; and
that will allow us to compare the impact of the project against the impacts that would occur if the project were not to proceed. And other alternatives will be addressed as well. Those are in development; and they'll be based on impacts that we identify as we move forward in the environmental review process.

Because the city is receiving federal funding for the transportation improvements, as John mentioned earlier, this project is also subject to a federal law called the National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA. We anticipate that a separate environmental review document will be prepared to satisfy NEPA, either -- possibly an environmental assessment with the finding of no significant impact.

So now we're going to open the meeting up for public comments at last. And we'd like to say that this is an evening in which there may be contrasting viewpoints expressed and different values may be shared. So I just would like to ask your consideration for each speaker. Please let each speaker speak and refrain from any interruption. In the interests of time, speakers will be given three minutes. And I know that many of you might have more than three minutes would allow for you to say. So really consider this as an opportunity to highlight your principal points of view; and you can
supplement your comments with written comments either to
drop off here or that you send in any time up to July
31st.

So to ensure that we get a complete and
accurate record for our transcript, we'd like that you
please come up here in front of the room and speak
slowly and clearly and state your name and organization,
if you represent one, and what your capacity or role is
with that organization and then your address. And we'll
keep track of time and advise you when your three-minute
period is passed.

So we again remind you to please refrain from
making any comments regarding the merits of the project,
but instead to direct your comments on the scope and
focus of the EIR.

So if anybody has any speaker cards, could you
please hold them up and someone will come around and
collect them. Right now we can call up our first
speaker, Barry Krasner.

BARRY KRASNER: Hi, everybody. Since it seems
that we're limited to what we can talk about other than
just the EIR, I'm going to focus primarily on -- my
biggest concern is the BART parking lot and the
development of it. And I know there are a lot of issues
about whether there should be housing there or parking
there or whatever. But I'm going to mostly focus on the fact that I think that what is being proposed in the EIR is too big. I think it's too tall for the residences that are around it. In the document you sent out, it indicated height limits of up to 65 feet. That area is surrounded by mostly two-story houses. So 65 feet or even 40, 45 feet would tower over everything else. And the number of units -- 40 to 65 units is just too much for that area.

And the one last thing I want to say, even though it's not part of the EIR, but since I don't know when I'll get another opportunity, is the fact that the housing element plan which this would fall under wants 40 percent of these units to be for low- and ultra-low-income residents. 40 percent. I think that's too much.

So anyway that's it for now. But I have a question about when will we be able to -- you said the next meeting was September and will be on transportation issues. So when will there be times for residents to ask more questions about issues like this?

LISA GIBSON: Thank you for your comments.

What I'd like to do is I will note any questions that anybody has here. And the purpose of the meeting is to hear comments from everybody. But as time
allows, at the end I can respond to questions of this nature which are procedural and just seeking basic information. So I'll take note of that and respond to that afterwards, if that's okay.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Will you publish minutes of this meeting?

LISA GIBSON: Again, I'd like to -- I will note that I prefer that people could come and speak. And then I'll answer any questions at the end. I just want to make sure that the people that came here to present their comments have an opportunity.

So next speaker, Margie Cleland.

MARGIE CLELAND: My name is Margie Cleland. I live at 163 Flood Avenue, San Francisco.

And I basically have three concerns. I kind of looked everything over today. And one thing I didn't notice that there was any automobile passenger dropoff. I don't know if it's going to be in the same place -- pick-up/drop-off that's right in front of BART, which is heavily used. So I just didn't see anything concerning that. I, like the other gentleman, am concerned about the BART area.

And I personally think there ought to be parking. The reason I do is some of the concerns in the area seem to be from not only residents but businesses
in the area. There's not enough parking. And I just feel that it would give the owners and workers there -- patrons, BART riders, neighborhood businesses, even like Zipcar places -- you know, the ride-share -- a place to be. And I know that I have gone down to a restaurant and I've circled four times to try to find parking. And I figure that maybe it would lessen congestion if you actually had some place to go that you could drive into instead of having to go around the block several times.

Also, that part of what's been talked about is taking some parking away in the neighborhood areas to beautify and put trees and things like that, which is all lovely, except it's going to, again, take parking away and just reduce the amount of parking that's already in the neighborhood.

And the other thing, just to mention, they were talking about bicycle lanes. I guess there's going to be a whole lot more bicycle lanes connected. And all I would say about that is that bicycles are great and wonderful, except can't they stop at the stop signs? Can't they stop at the stop lights? Do they have to whiz through? And then you feel like you're going to flatten them. I don't want to flatten anybody, but I don't want to feel like it's terrible if I do, if it's not even my fault.
So anyway that's what I have to say. Thank you very much.

LISA GIBSON: Any other speakers? I don't have any other cards at the table here. Come on up. And anybody else who wishes to speak, please hold up your card and we will collect it.

VINEETA HIRANDANDANI: Hi. My name is Vineeta Hirandandani. I’m representing Glen Park Marketplace Homeowners Association, which is the condos, the market, and the library. We are an entity collectively at 53 Wilder Street.

And we are concerned with the impact of the structure and the pass-through greens that's going to go through, as it relates to the issues of height, which was already brought up by the last person. So how tall is the structure going to be? What's the impact of the structure and the pass-through green on the sound in the surrounding area?

Pollution.

Also, light, with a tall structure and whatever they build in the green, that's going to impact the western side of our structure so that the homeowners will not have any light in their units. It will be completely gone.

Traffic flow to Wilder Street, which is
related to the parking issue. So if parking goes away, people will now start to go a different way into Wilder Street and park on Wilder Street, so it will affect flow as well as parking in the whole community.

Our second area of concern is this is the city doing an environmental impact report. I'm just curious why BART isn't doing their own environmental assessment of what they're proposing to do.

And then, also, we're concerned about the impact on Wilder Street and the community as it relates to the actual construction process. So if this does, in fact, go through how long is that construction process going to be? What's the noise impact? With all the residents in the area, what's that construction process impact?

So those are some of our concerns.

LISA GIBSON: Thank you. Any other speakers?

NICHOLAS DEWAR: I'm Nicholas Dewar.

I only have two things I want to say. First is that the study area as it's described is just simply lines going down the middle of the street; and that really worries me. I don't know if that means it's included in the study area or excluded from the study area. I'm particularly concerned about Chenery going down to Elk and Bosworth going down to Elk, just to make
sure they really are included in the study area and
concerning the traffic in that.

Second thing is about bicycles. We do have
some bike lanes that have just been approved that affect
us locally. But I also think it's important to think of
bicycling as a way of getting around the neighborhood,
not just in terms of getting downtown. And I don't see
any provision for that in the stuff that I read. I
think that somehow we need to be considering are these
streets safe and useful for local bike trips.

That's it for me.

CHANCE ELLIOTT: My name is Chance Elliott. I
just want to voice my concern again about the BART
project.

One thing I don't think has been mentioned
thus far is between the two projects -- the BART project
and the additional project on Diamond street -- they
propose 120 units; approximately triples the number of
units within that corridor area. So that's a huge
increase in the number of people. And the current
proposal says zero -- minimum of zero parking up to -- I
don't think it gives a maximum. So that's 120
additional units with no parking structures whatsoever.
So 120 additional people in an area that previously
supported about 60 units, all parking on the street.
Just seems like a pretty big concern to me. That's all.

PAUL SILBERSCHATZ: My name is Paul. I live on Bosworth Street.

And I'm also concerned about the parking. I'm a strong supporter of public transportation. And part of the reason I live in the neighborhood is the BART station. And a lot of other people in the city don't have the luxury of a BART station in their neighborhood and have to drive to get there. I'm very concerned that the scope of the area that's being looked at for this EIR doesn't include nearly a wide enough area that's impacted by the BART parking. I know that people park as far away as Congo and then walk down to the BART station. And by getting rid of -- reducing the amount of parking for BART riders, it's just going to push them even further. And certainly on Bosworth -- I'm up by Lippard -- we have tons of people who park there and use the BART station -- and certainly the side streets in the area as well. So I'd like to see that included and also understand what the impact to BART ridership through the station is by reducing the amount of parking. If we lose ridership on BART, we lose as a city, not just a neighborhood.

That's all I've got.

CAROL KOFFEL: I'm Carol Koffel. And I
actually own a commercial building outside the scope of this particular small exploration. I consider it a small exploration of the city itself. I understand there's a larger plan that includes rerouting bicycles. And I think it's really critical because we're talking about the future structure of this town, or this part of town. And I went to a meeting about the implementation of the market space, because I've been a building owner for nine years in this district. And I think that there was a lot of resistance initially to that unit and I still feel resistance to it. But I feel like it's really enhanced the village life in the sense of the -- it's a very nice market. It is incredible to have a great resource library there. And I have seen lots of changes in town in terms of there's some nice destination restaurants and those sorts of things.

If we consider the transit in a larger picture of what's going on with how people are choosing to live and where they want to live. We have a good BART station. We have good bicycling. There are over a thousand people in this city bicycling to work every day. They're not going to live in those homes and then have a car. We have stations for cars to be Zipcars and all that kind of stuff. They're all over the city.

There's an entire population of people that
want to live that way; and if we don't allow it by making infrastructure changes that facilitate that lifestyle, it won't happen. So the village could become more vital as a village and a community of locals who walk, like European towns, where you get to know the people because you're walking past them, as opposed to sitting in your car and trying to get through that stoplight and stop sign.

So I encourage and support the community to consider a longer-range plan and not be car-centric. I'm for the authority to look at the larger picture of transit. It isn't just about parking today. Bicycles will impact the rest of the village.

Thank you.

LISA GIBSON: Thank you. More speakers?

Anyone?

MARY MOSS: My name is Mary Moss; and I live on Congo.

And, actually, people are parking even up past Congo and Martha Street all the way up, because they do need to get to BART. People who don't live within walking distance like I do of BART have for 30 years paid taxes. And they have a right to be able to use the BART station; and they do need parking.

And as far as bicycle riders and all that,
that's all well and good, but it's discouraging a lot of families. Families want to stay in San Francisco. If you have children, children don't go to local schools. You need a car to transport them here, there. There's a lot of us who are seniors and we are not necessarily able to bike up those hills and down the hills. And the city shouldn't be designed just for young, single people who are between the ages of 20 and 45 or 50. Most of us have lived here a lot longer than that. And we should be able to co-exist and we shouldn't just design this area for young people who have no responsibilities other than for themselves. We do need housing that takes care of families and seniors and not just people who ride bicycles.

I also want to say I've lived here since '75 and have seen a lot of changes. And density has just made the quality of life harder and harder to achieve. Bringing in all that housing squeezed into that little area makes the quality of living quite much different.

So that's all I'm going to say now. Thank you.

CARRIE HELSER: It's Carrie Helser; and I live on Moffitt Street.

I just want to counter the long view of making it more livable by catering to public transit. I
certainly do use public transit. I have a car. I use the car hardly ever. I use this almost all the time, but we have to accept the fact that we have freeway on-ramps and off-ramps right here next to our BART station. Not all BART stations are so close to a freeway nexus as ours is. People are going to be wanting to get on the freeway; they will want to get off the freeway. There's going to be a complete jam of people constantly passing through our neighborhood, whether we decide we want to be all bicycles and all pedestrian, all public transit neighborhood or not. They're going to be here. And if we want those people to be able to use the businesses, the neighborhood has to offer -- we have to offer them some parking.

We also -- I totally agree with my previous speaker here that if you live at an elevation -- you know, you buy your groceries, the bus doesn't come. You know, what are you doing to do with your groceries? So you want to bring your car down to the neighborhood to do your shopping and find a parking space somewhere. So I believe that the BART development should have a component of parking in it. There should be a parking structure on that property at the very least, because every other neighborhood around here has some public parking spaces. You go to Noe Valley, there are two
public parking lots that are owned by the City that are public parking. And there is at the community center there -- the church in Noe Valley has one they make available to people. You go to West Portal, they have two very good-size off-street parking spaces that are owned by the City for the use of going into the commercial area. You go to the Castro -- these are the three contiguous neighborhoods to ours -- and there are two off-street parking areas run by the City there. We don't have a single one run by the City. We can't take away the very last little bit of off-street parking that we have to accommodate transit only and densification and more densification and more densification.

LISA GIBSON: Other speakers?

MARNIE DUNSMOOR: I guess I'm middle of the road. I have a family -- a child. I love to walk all over the city. I do walk. I often park several blocks away from Glen Park and walk with my child to Canyon Market. I do see the need for parking, but I think there's a lot of lost opportunity for walkability. For instance, I actually live just on the other side of San Jose Avenue and I use the overhead walkway. On that side of San Jose Avenue there is lot of available parking, especially during the day. And the fact that the scope of the Glen Park plan is so limited and
doesn't consider people that would be willing to park
out of the Glen Park core and then walk to BART, I think
that's a lost opportunity. So several people on our
side of San Jose Avenue did write in asking for them to
expand the scope to perhaps increase the possible use of
street parking where there is street parking five, six,
seven blocks away from the Glen Park core. So that's
another opportunity I hope, perhaps, that can be
considered rather than thinking we're just going to
solve parking by building a parking garage. Maybe we
need a parking garage. I don't think that's going to
solve the problem.

And so that's -- I think the scope of the plan
needs to be increased, not just for parking but also for
considering -- there's a walkway on both sides of San
Jose Avenue that's falling apart; and it could actually
allow people to walk all the way from Randall into Glen
Park; and yet the City is just allowing it to fall to
pieces. That's another lost walking opportunity.

It seems kind of -- to me it's like disparate
from the business of live/work and walkable. The actual
on-the-ground implementation right now is another world.
The city is falling apart. Infrastructure and
walkability is falling apart. And we're talking about a
few parking garages. I think we need to really think
about what walkable means.

    Thanks.

    LISA GIBSON: Thank. You more speakers?

    ANDREA O'LEARY. I'm Andrea O'Leary and I live
up the hill. And I want to reiterate my concerns as
somebody who does live up the hill.

    And that is this is not just Glen Park you're
talking about. You're talking about all of us who live
up the hill who have no other place to go but up the
hill or down the hill to do what we do. Either it's
going someplace or shopping or whatever. And I'm sorry,
but I'm not 21 anymore. And it's just not that easy
getting around. I'm too busy. I've got too many places
to go, got too many things to carry. And for those
people who have children, it's just an impossible
situation for those of us up the hill.

    I think the scope is too small. I think it
needs to go beyond it. I think you really need to take
into consideration those of us who don't live right
here.

    I've just taken a look at this initial study;
and I'm wondering why you're even doing an EIR at all.
Everything here is not applicable. Nothing is covered.
So what's the point? I really have a sense that maybe
this is a done deal. I don't know. Maybe it isn't.
But I can't imagine how everything is not applicable.

I'm wondering why BART is not taking more of a leadership role in this. They seem to very quiet about this. The last meeting we asked them why housing on that lot? Are you mandated to do that? They did not answer the question. I don't think they're mandated to do housing. I think that housing is going to create a dense urban environment. It's not going to be a village anymore.

And I think a lot of the kind of community that you're inviting into here are not vested in the kind of village we have here. I know that might sound like a bad thing to say, but I think it's something that a community like this really has to consider.

Cars are not going to go away. I don't know why BART could not consider a parking element in this housing element. I'm going to keep driving. I know that all my residents -- the people who live around me -- are going to keep driving. And if I can't come down here to spend my money, I'm going to take it somewhere else. And I would really rather not.

Thank you.

LISA GIBSON: Other speakers? Okay.

Thank you, everybody. So thank everybody who spoke for giving your comments and remind you again that
you can provide your comments tonight in writing in a comment form and placing your comments in that box. Then you can also submit written comment up till July 31st at 5:00 p.m. to the address that's listed on the agenda and in the notice of preparation.

There were several questions that were asked during the comment portion of the meeting. But let me say first, actually, I'd like to close with that, the public comment portion of the meeting. And this is not a question-and-answer session. It's not structured that way. But there were a few basic questions that I can answer for you.

One question was will there be minutes of this meeting? And as I indicated, we will have an official transcript of this, so they'll be even more than minutes. We will have actual verbatim what was stated. And that's a document that we will be receiving within a few weeks. I will be happy to share it with anybody who's interested. And I have my card here, so if you'd like a copy of that, please -- you have my contact information, so if you want to send me an e-mail and request that, I'll be happy to provide a copy for you of that.

Then there was a question -- Barry, I know you asked a question. Oh, when will be the time for
additional input in this process? And the process that I am facilitating in the environmental review process -- and this is a process that is in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act; and it specifically is focused on environmental impacts. So the next opportunity for comment will be on the initial study that we'll publish and then later on the draft EIR that will follow.

The draft EIR -- there will be a public hearing before the Planning Commission at that point and will be similar in structure, where there will be comments -- oral comments -- and a court reporter there to take those comments down. And then there will be an EIR certification meeting before the Planning Commission after we complete the final environmental review document. So those are the junctures for public input during this process. And all the documents, by the way, we'll accept comments.

BARRY KRASNER: What they really meant by that was not just the EIR but the project itself?

LISA GIBSON: So what you're interested to know is what are the other meetings and processes that are going to be followed for the community plan process, which is separate from the EIR review process. And so I will hold that question for John at the end here, if you
would be willing to respond to that.

Then are there any other points? Because we have a little bit of time, I'll entertain a few questions that are basic in nature.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: This is a process question. You talked about receiving input but not giving feedback to the input, that you will have a report. Isn't there a way that you can load that up to one of your government sites so we can download it instead of having to reach out to you and having to send you an e-mail and then you mail it? Isn't there a way that you can put some of the stuff online?

LISA GIBSON: Sure. I'd be happy to do that. That's a good suggestion. And we can provide that. I can't see any reason why we couldn't that, so I will make a note of that. I can't think of any legal reason why we wouldn't be able to do that. It is a public record document. That's a good suggestion. We have a Web page on the Planning Department Website that's dedicated to this project. We can provide that.

Okay. Next question.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I have a process question.

You were saying that alternatives to the community plan could be considered in the EIR. And,
specifically, the community plan doesn't actually
mention building a vertical parking structure. Is that
something that's going to be -- you know, it was
mentioned numerous times by comments here. Is that
something that's actually going to be addressed in the
EIR?

LISA GIBSON: That's a good question. We
don't yet. Basically, I can tell you at this stage we
have a project description, as stated in the notice of
preparation; and it provides a general -- for the
purpose of environmental review, we kind of provided a
general framework or conceptual plan for what might be
the maximum development that we can anticipate that
could occur within the plan area and on the specific
development sites that are within the plan area.

We don't have any specific development
proposals before us. But we want to ensure that, as we
are conducting environmental review for the plan which
has been ready for review for sometime, that we take
into account any potential development that might occur
within the plan area so that we can ensure we're taking
into account the full range of environmental effects.
So we're kind of having a holistic view.

In terms of alternatives beyond what we will
further develop for environmental review, we're going to
be focusing those alternatives primarily on alternatives that would avoid or reduce any significant environmental effects of the project.

We're also going to be receiving input from the public on alternatives. So we are open to suggestions about what those alternatives should be. And we may take into account alternatives that don't really specifically respond to our CEQA requirements and maybe are responding to suggestions from the community just in general in terms of what might be a good design. So if we can accomplish both those things, we'll do that.

I hope that answers your question. Sort of? Okay. So I don't know. We have not developed alternatives yet, so I cannot say whether this alternative that you just suggested is one that would be considered. I recommend that you put that recommendation in writing and give us as much information about it.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It may or may not be my recommendation. I'm just asking because it's mentioned here. It's more of a process question.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So following up on his question, if, in fact, you don't put the parking garage as an alternative and you do your EIR -- your study, it
then comes down to the fact that --

LISA GIBSON: I'm sorry. I'm distracted while the phone is ringing. It's just so echo-y in here, it's kind of hard to hear. I apologize for the acoustics in here. Please continue.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So if, in fact, you did not include a parking garage as an alternative, you went through the EIR process. And then after that process then people said, Yeah, we really want a parking garage, we don't want all that housing, would you have to then go back? I mean it would be substantial, I assume, with this kind of project. So would you have to do redo an EIR again?

LISA GIBSON: The question was, if we prepare an EIR and it has certain set of alternatives in it and later a different project with something different than what we considered is proposed or considered for approval, let's say, would we have to go back and revisit the EIR?

And the answer is that we would need -- the purpose of the EIR is to identify the environmental effects of the project as we define it, as we know it, and also to look at a reasonable range of alternatives. And we hope that we're going to be looking -- considering alternatives that would -- that might likely
be implemented. We will be looking at the -- assuming that there will be some parking provided. So there -- to clarify, we will be considering either as part of the project or otherwise that there will be parking provided as well as what if there isn't parking. So we are going to look at that range. And the hope is that then whatever is defined as the project down the road, whatever proposals come forth for the BART site or the northwest parcels of Bosworth and Diamond, that we have provided environmental coverage for those.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Just a quick question. It sounds like in the plan you guys are going to review and not actually going to concentrate on the residential [inaudible] of the project the impact of having [inaudible] without the parking as well as looking at building housing units with parking. When you say parking, do you mean parking for those units or, in addition, parking -- community -- public parking?

LISA GIBSON: Good question. I wasn't speaking with regard to one or the other. My assumption was that we were looking at parking provided for those uses -- not what we heard tonight, some people suggesting a community public parking lot of some sort. But we're hearing those comments tonight; and we will be taking them into account as we frame the alternatives
that we're going to be looking at.

So the reason we don't usually do what I'm doing right now is because it -- I'm not able to answer on the spot questions that we don't have answers to yet. We are in the process of preparing an environmental review document. We're in the early stages. So this is input that we're going to be taking into account and it's -- these are the kinds of comments that are really useful to us. So please make them in writing in particular. It's most helpful.

[CROSS-TALK]

LISA GIBSON: Right. I would say that, yes, in this document we will be looking at options that will include the maximum parking provided as well as no parking provided, because that is also permitted.

All right. So I'll going to take one more question -- two more questions here -- and then we need to wrap up.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can you give us a quick explanation of the purpose of this initial study, in particular, if this study says that no environmental affects apply? So can you tell us what this is supposed to tell us?

LISA GIBSON: That initial study checklist is a tool for focusing our environmental review in the
draft environmental impact report. It's a rundown of
the kinds of environmental issues that we look at for
any project; and the checklist includes a column that
one could respond to the question by saying "no impact"
or "not applicable." "Not applicable" means there's a
question with the project impact -- you know --
pristine, agricultural land -- you know -- something
like that. We could answer "not applicable" for a
project where the existing site is completely
undeveloped with a building. So that's what "not
applicable" means there. With their -- we are going
to -- the other responses are "no impact" or "less than
significant impact" or "significant impact." So we will
evaluate as appropriate.

This is turning into a tutorial even more than
I gave in my presentation. And I see it might be
confusing people. So I'll be happy to stick around and
explain that to you in further detail, because I can
tell that I didn't answer your question.

Next question. This is the final question
before we wrap up.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I have a question.
Part of the plan includes daylighting Islais Creek. But
did anybody ever stop and think what would happen if you
have an El Niño-type winter, where there's torrential
rain and creek overflows and we have water ending up in
people's basements and flooding people's garages and
cau...
impact as part of the EIR.

So thank you, everybody, for coming.

JOHN SWAE: I just wanted to respond to Barry.

We have a series of scheduled meetings planned. It
seems to me that the next step would be to talk about
the land-use issues and the development issues downtown.
[inaudible] That will probably be the next meeting,
maybe later that fall. Of course, we're always
available if you have comments or want to talk about
things before that. Just contact us. We're available
to come out for meetings. If the neighborhood
association is having a meeting, we're happy to come out
to those as well.

BARRY KRASNER: Do you think that will be
September?

JOHN SWAE: The transportation one looks like
possibly September and then the land-use a few months
later than that. [inaudible]

LISA GIBSON: Thank you, everybody.

I just to say one quick note. I will be on
vacation for the next three weeks, but Chelsea Fordham
will be available in my absence to handle questions in
the interim. And when I return, I'll be looking at all
the comments.

Thanks, everyone. That will end the public
meeting.

[The meeting ended at 7:41 p.m.]
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