

## **June 6, 2017 All Neighbor Meeting Question, Answer, & Comment Period Minutes**

1. PNQL: Garage is impactful. Re-think parking solutions and look at Stanford techniques
2. Is garage safe for students/bikes? Will there be guards - yes, there will also be monitors for events and weekend events
3. Why is PNQL characterizing conclusions when studies are underway? PNQL - many years of process have led to no transparency; we support a reset. Negotiations are not representative of whole neighborhood.
4. Audience poll within 600 feet. How many saw the plan before 6/24/16? Small working group - neighbors polled on their concerns. Agreed that small group would meet over 2 years. Group had diverse opinions; they wanted remote parking, shuttles, and split campus. Though they were not authorized to negotiate on behalf of neighbors. No consensus was achieved; relocate to another site.
5. Why are expansion plans annoying the neighborhood? Castilleja has overstayed their welcome.
6. Construction attack on neighbors, air pollution, noise, increase in traffic, violation of zoning. Project will reduce property values and cause emotional duress

School response - notes show how school addressed concerns; 4 neighbors participated

7. PNQL: Defended 1200 people coming and going each day
8. IF Castilleja commits to no net trips will PNQL support the garage? PNQL - need a re-set. 6 acres is maxed out.
9. Neighbor/architect: how does Castilleja propose a win-win? Need a traffic light for garage. Garage exhaust? Pump station? Construction staging? Restrooms for construction workers? Fencing? Cranes? Concrete pouring? Pile driving and de-watering? Union unrest? Earthquake? Project incompleteness?

School response -- Construction impacts are premature. Do not have contractor present. EIR will address these concerns.

10. Neighbor - does not support expansion. Keep 415 enrollment
11. Neighbor - look for common ground for reasonable growth
12. What about the plan works for the neighborhood?

PNQL response - nothing works/no expansion. Neighborhood had no input. Look at totality; put all on the table.

13. Neighbor – why was the school overenrolled and expanded its events?

School response – events conditions are vague. Conditions need clarification. The reason behind the over-enrollment is not clear; that was done by the previous administration. Fine was paid and enrollment reduction plan was prepared. Castilleja will continue to comply with City direction. Wants to move forward.

14. How does Castilleja rebuild trust? Hard to understand it was over-enrolled. Penalty is small compared to tuition.

15. Castilleja student involved with accident. What will Castilleja do at garage and Melville? Need traffic calming.

School response – Turn turns only on to Emerson with traffic calming

16. Plan should have been reviewed with Melville and Emerson neighbors. Eliminate Emerson garage access. There are 140 staff members; will there be more on-street parking. What about the bus impact? FAR does not include basements. Excavation needed for basement, accounts for 60% of the FAR. Deliveries in early mornings. Plan proposes trucks from Emerson. Garbage pick-up. Too many events. 35' high buildings. Plan does not protect neighborhood. Suggestions: re-locate, split school, satellite parking, smaller delivery trucks.

17. Palo Alto Central Neighborhood Rep: Why can't school be split?

School response – Combined campus achieves education goals. Moving completely is a better option than splitting.