

# Appendix A – Written Comments and Transcript of Verbal Comments

Part Eight:

- Verbal Comments from August 2, 2023 Meeting

*Page intentionally left blank to facilitate double-sided printing.*

Michael Griffin:

1.1

My name is Michael Griffin and I'm going to be speaking about construction noise. The EIR draft states construction noise levels even when meeting local codes can still be disruptive to normal daytime residential activities. The noise level of a multi-year, multi-site, multi-storied construction project in the heart of a densely populated residential setting far exceeds residential norms, especially when work sites are immediately adjacent to the domicile of retired folks who take naps in the afternoon who are subjected to noise levels in excess of 80 decibels over a timeframe of supposedly 24 months.

I question why the Draft Report didn't make use of a more rigorous rating standard for noise that took into consideration the sensitivity of retired occupants living in the middle of a job site over a period of years. The FTA standard is for highway construction, not hospitals, not old folks' homes and not other sound-sensitive construction.

1.2

I question how the draft report calculated the timeframe of the project. The longer a project takes to complete, the more noise are created, are impacted. Was use made of a bid from a building contractor or was the duration of construction months based on architectural estimates provided by the applicant? Complex projects of this nature are prone to last far longer than early estimates, especially in the case of infill developments requiring excavation in proximity to existing structures where soil conditions are problematic, and in the case of the matter, foundations are 100 years old.

Building A requires the excavation of rock in a hillside for a subterranean garage. The report estimates only five months for this grading and foundation work, and the meeting room with its garage excavation, the time is only three months. I'm asking for a timeline based on substantial real world data from similar projects with similar geology.

1.3

I question why the draft didn't suggest the use of noise measurement devices to monitor the noise of heavy equipment, rock-drilling machinery, as well as trucks off-hauling dirt and rock. Sometimes older tractors and vehicles lacking modern sound-deadening features are used. Why were sound meters not recommended? Thanks.

Jill Hunter:

2.1

Hi, I'm Jill Hunter. I'm not a member of the SRC. I don't live there, but I have a 40-year history of working with the SRC with the Odd Fellows. When I first ran for office in the 1980s, I was allowed to go to the upstairs building, the upstairs offices and rooms and knock on the door and I urged them to vote for me. And then in the late '90s, the Heritage Preservation, I was the chairman of it when it came time to vote on the Odd Fellows renovation, and we fought very long and hard to save that building. It's the most magnificent building in Saratoga and I hope you all realize that, including the developer.

And from then on, we went through, after I was on the City Council, we also went and worked on American Bloom and where did we go, the first to take all these judges from across the United States, but to the SRC so they could see how beautiful that building was and what a wonderful group lived there.

2.2

I'm here primarily because of trees. I am astounded that 70 beautiful redwoods and oak trees are to be removed. I'm so offended by that. Saratoga is proudly a Tree City USA, and to remove 70 of our most protected trees for something that nobody wants is unheard of, and to add another 50 or so that are not protected but are beautiful trees.

The President of the United States spoke the other day and I happened to hear him on the radio urging everybody to plant trees because with the climate change the way it is, we have to start encouraging tree planting, and Saratoga has lost a lot of its canopy in the last storms and they're going to lose a lot more with this project and the project on Quito Road, which is also going to lose a lot of trees. And I urge the Planning Department and the City Council to consider how important trees are to this community and please be careful and not cut down all our trees. Thank you.

Tsing Bardin:

3.1

Good evening. First of all, can you hear me? Yeah. Thank you, EIR consultants, for your hard work. I'm a resident at the Saratoga Retirement Community for the last 17 years. When I read the DEIR, I found the report ignoring the environment and the lives of our residents on campus. There's issues which cannot be mitigated to less than significant as suggested in the drafted EIR. Here are a few examples on recreation and open space.

One, we lose our Odd Fellows Historical Park if Building A is allowed. The EIR Section 3.15.1 listed 28 acres of existing public park facilities within one mile of the project site. SRC expansion will have no impact on a single existing public recreation facility.

Let me ask, where is the study for the impact on the SRC residents? Even though there are 28 acres nearby, would you ask your elderly parents to take Uber to one of these parks with their walkers? At present, the park on campus is accessible anytime and day. Residents take their walkers to the park, sit on the chair, and enjoy fresh air. Neighbors come with their dogs, walk or bike around the campus. This park serves many citizens. To eliminate this park has a very significant environmental impact, but the drafted EIR REC-1 never studies the impact on the residents if you eliminate the park.

Two, loss of the open space on SRC. Building A and Meeting Room take away the remaining 6% of our accessible open green space. EIR 3.15.1, Environmental Setting, listed that the new trail connects the project to the San Marcos Open Space approximately 300 feet southeast of the project site. Please note the 300 feet is as the crow flies distance; one has to climb up a steep embankment, inaccessible except by a 2.5-mile round trip along the road or by helicopter. While on campus, we currently have safe and smooth paths for the seniors to enjoy the Open Space. Many seniors have mobility issues, poor eyesight, hard of hearing, and limited physical strength. They're not able to go on any of the suggested Open Space or hiking trip.

DEIR ignores the special needs of the seniors on campus. The analyses are inappropriate, irrelevant, and discriminating the senior population. Thank you.

Marian Chan:

4.1

Thank you for taking time out to hear our input. My name is Marian Chan. I became a resident at SRC just about a year ago. I hold a degree in architecture and a graduate degree in structural engineering from UC Berkeley. My husband and I have been commercial real estate developers for the last 45 years, so I understand clearly the primary objective of the proposed expansion plan.

The proposed expansion plan comes down to only one thing: additional income stream from the new independent living units. I think the thinking is quite flawed because the ratio of independent living units is paled by comparison to the overbuilt units in assisted living and the healthcare center. Even with the increased independent unit, a proposed 195 units versus the current 143, there will still be 103 assisted living units and 52 skilled nursing beds. This ratio will not make a profitable operation. The residents of independent living units will still be supporting the money-losing portion of the assisted living and healthcare center.

4.2

Please note that there's very high vacancy currently in the assisted living. So as I see it, this project going ahead, the claim of improved quality of life for independent living residents will not materialize.

I have many other things to say regarding dining, parking, landscape maintenance. I'm just going to go and tell my final thinking as an architect, the layout of five haphazardly placed building, it hardly blends in and it's not a good design for elderly people who have to walk steep hills.

4.3

So in conclusion, to meet the project objective, there should be much reduced assisted living and healthcare units and the residents' alternative proposal is totally logical, less disruptive to the campus, all 52 units in one place. Thank you.

CK Chan:

5.1

My name is CK Chan, I'm a professional engineer registered in California and I was an engineering professor at UCLA. Today, I came before you as a concerned SRC resident. I want to bring up the areas of controversies associated with the expansion project currently under review.

Both the owner and the operator of the facility have the common statement to serve the senior residents' interests in the community. What happened in the EIR report is they neglect to mention the human factors, the human beings that are living in the communities, and the quality of life of those people who live in the community. So here are the facts that have been in absence in the present Draft EIR.

The average age of the residents are over 80 years old with serious mobility and health issues. The facilities are located on a hilly lot with very narrow driveways and with limited access to the public streets. There's only one entrance to the facilities. The effect of the project, such as noise, pollution, safety, handicap access, emergency vehicle access on the residents' daily life have not been evaluated. The DEIR have not addressed how horrible the situation will be.

In addition to that, what happened to the disclosure requirement to future residents that are coming to the project to know about the impact of the project?

So here are the conditions that I think you have to be incorporated in your consideration of the project: the effect of the project on the resident's daily life has to be thoroughly studied; the applicants have to provide a detailed, reasonable, workable plan to mitigate all the negative effects; the construction staging and timetable has to be severely enforced with heavy penalties for not compiling. If they propose to do it in six months, they have to finish it in six months; a written signed disclosure to outline the effect of the project on the daily lives shall be given to future potential residents; and all the PRS employees who work in the SRC facilities are asked to be not to harass any residents who are exercising their first right of... I thank you for your attention.

Pat McGuire:

- 6.1 Hello. I'm Pat McGuire from Unit 4201 in Saratoga Retirement Community. I have a few comments on the Draft EIR and a couple questions for understanding how some of my other concerns can be met and when.
- First of all, energy generation on-site was one of the elements suggested in the mitigations, and if that's being considered, there's no indication where that would be. If it's solar panels, that's not necessarily going to be benign visually, so that's one concern of mine. Also, groundwater was another idea to be mitigated. Are you aware there are springs on site? We're all recently dealing with a newly emerging one.
- 6.2 My other questions have to deal with the fact that this is really the wrong site for expansion. Rather than increasing the crowding on the north side of campus, why not use all that big space on the south side of campus? And so when is the right time to bring that up and have that discussion or is it too late?
- 6.3 Next is the fitness facility. Eight years ago when I saw the size of the existing fitness facility, I said, "This is ridiculously small," and so on the back of an envelope, I measured the existing facility, put in a request for a comparable amount to be added for the existing population, not for a larger one, and it's still quite inadequate for the existing population at doubling the space, and I'd like to know when we can discuss that.
- 6.4 Third, we need to fix the problems stemming from our address being on Fruitvale Avenue, which is not mentioned at all. Wasted gas of those trying to find a resident with a cab, a grocery delivery to a resident, even our friends coming to visit for the first time, they're wasting a lot of gas trying to find us. I'd like all of that to be addressed at some point. Thank you.

Marilyn Basham:

- 7.1 Thank you for allowing us this comment period. This is great.  
My name is Marilyn Basham. I'm an independent resident at SRC. I'm also a retired physical therapist and I've worked many years in skilled nursing facilities very similar to the one we have on campus. I was very disappointed in the Draft EIR. There was a lot of lack of details.  
For instance, in recent post-COVID studies, one of the contributing factors for the high amount of deaths of the elderly in skilled nursing facilities was shared bedrooms and shared bathrooms. Why is this important? At our HCC, which is our healthcare center, we still have shared bedrooms and shared baths. In the Draft EIR, it shows that the remodel, when it happens for the HCC, it'll happen in phase four. That's way too late. It needs to be the number-one priority for the health and safety of the SRC residents.
- 7.2 Another omission: the Draft EIR has no ventilation details. Why is that important? Again, post-COVID studies show that those skilled nursing facilities that had the latest in ventilation had less cases and a better job of mitigating the pathogen.  
Another omission: the Draft EIR does allow temporary relocation for residents who finds the construction disruptive, but there is nothing for the inpatient at that HCC who's recovering from a major medical event who's trapped in their own beds in their rooms. While the HCC undergoes a remodel, there is no accommodation for that inpatient resident.
- 7.3 Another omission: there is no analysis of the Draft EIR for the internal environment, nothing about the impact for that inpatient of the mold, the dust, the noise, the vibration. In fact, in 2019, the Cleveland Clinic was very concerned just about this. They did a study and their findings were reported in an article, "What Are the Risks to Inpatients During a Hospital Construction or Renovation?" They found increased mold disease, increased legionnaire's disease, increased sleep deprivation, and increased lung disease.
- 7.4 Another omission: the Draft EIR does not show any details for energy saving, for water saving, or solar panels for the HCC.  
In summary, make the remodel of the HCC the number-one priority for the health and safety of the SRC residents. Include the latest in ventilation, filtration, and purification of the air quality. Include the energy and water saving and solar panels. Thank you very much.

Audience:

Hear, hear.

Barry Lamé:

- 8.1 My name is Barry Lamé and my wife and I are residents of the Saratoga Retirement Community.

Audience:

Louder. Who's got the mic? Where's the mic?

Barry Lamé:

Where, after a long search, we chose SRC because of its serene space located within the City of Trees. We had to pay a huge amount to buy into the facilities and then pay another huge amount each month to rent an apartment and enjoy the peaceful and enriching environment for the rest of our lives.

- 8.2 We opposed the proposed expansion of SRC for many reasons, but here are two. First, our community has over 60 bocce ball players who sometimes travel to or host tournaments to challenge other senior communities. We have a standard-sized bocce ball court which is required for competition according to the US Bocce Federation. The proposed expansion would demolish this standard court with its room for teams of players and visitors and replace it with an inconvenient facility less than two-thirds of the standard size and without room for visitors. This would destroy the recreational opportunities of many of our present and future residents.

Second, the new Building A and Meeting Room would remove all of the remaining outdoor recreation green space. Our residents depend on this space for recreation and relaxation and to enjoy our views and fresh air. Indoor recreation activities cannot replace our enjoyment of the outdoor recreation activities.

We disagree with the Impact REC-2 analysis. The Impact Analysis for REC-1 concludes, "The project is not anticipated to cause substantial increased demand for public open space and recreation facilities within the city," but over 200 current independent living residents and an additional 100 new residents who use our outdoor space daily create a vastly increased demand for open space, which is proposed to be eliminated. Thus, the environmental impact of the proposed expansion would be huge. Our life savings invested into this Saratoga Retirement Community would thus be wasted. Thank you.

This transcript was exported on Aug 09, 2023 - view latest version [here](#).

Marilyn Manies:

- 9.1 My name is Marilyn Manies and I've been a resident of Saratoga for over 40 years. I respect the amount of work that went into writing this very detailed Draft EIR and I've spent many hours reading it, and I respectfully reject many of the items labeled as less than significant.
- It is more than significant to me and to hundreds of other SRC residents that 124 trees will be removed from our campus, and no amount of smaller trees can replace the towering oaks and the redwoods, some over 100-feet tall.
- 9.2 It is more than significant that the only campus park and bocce court would be destroyed and replaced by a huge apartment building. Suggesting that residents aged 75 to 102 go to the neighboring parks shows how out of touch the writers were. Many of our people do not drive and only get around with walkers, canes, and wheelchairs. Having close-by recreation is vital to their health.
- 9.3 It is more than significant that residents would be subjected to extremely loud noise for up to five years, and suggesting that they would get relief only at night is unrealistic. Retired people are home for most of the day and all day long would be subjected to noise from trucks, backhoes, air compressors, drill rigs, bulldozers, excavators, forklifts, generators, and many more. To describe this as less than significant is ludicrous.
- 9.4 Traffic now on San Marcos and Odd Fellows Drive is constant with vehicles going to SRC and Fellowship Plaza, daily UPS, FedEx, mail trucks, food delivery trucks, workers and residents. We are the number-one destination of fire trucks and ambulances in Saratoga, and with those vehicles that come almost daily, add this to the large number of construction workers and equipment, I do not believe this is less than
- 9.5 significant. Emergency evacuation is questionable now. What will it be when roads are jammed with trucks and equipment? That problem is more than significant.
- These and other factors lead me to believe that a high number of mitigations suggested in this document are misleading and incorrect. Thank you for listening.

Audience:

Hear, hear.

Robert Berglund:

10.1

My name is Robert Berglund. I've been a resident of Saratoga Retirement for eight years. The project description in the executive summary of the report includes the following statement: the number of skilled nursing beds within the health center will be reduced from 94 to 52. The number of skilled nursing beds is proposed to be reduced due to the conversion of double-occupancy rooms to private single-occupancy rooms where they each have their own accessible bathroom, including shower.

Later on in the project objectives, number four, it states essentially the same thing. That seems to be where the references to the renovation of the health center stop. There are no references to the construction work that will proceed in stages in the health center, nor are there any references to the impact on 50 to 60 vulnerable senior patients housed in the health center during this two-year construction period.

I refer to Table ES1 Impact Area MFS3: Direct or Indirect Adverse Effects on Human Beings. No reference. Additionally, there are no references to the required mitigation of the noise, vibrations, dirt, dust, or displacing these senior patients to make way for the demolitions and construction which will raise significant health hazards to the patients. I again refer to Table ES1, numerous impact areas such as HAZ1 and 5, LUP1, NOI1 and 2, POP2, UTI1 and 3, WF3, and again MFS3.

10.2

By the way, the only alternative which avoids this complete problem is alternative one, the residents' alternative. Speaking of alternative one, the Draft Report does not represent Section 4.4 correctly. It's a number of glaring errors included in this section. Starting with Figure 4.41, the conceptual site plan for the residents' alternative shows the layout of the new two-story apartment building, Building D. The layout of Building D is important as it's the same footprint as the current healthcare center and it would provide for 52 apartments and an auditorium.

There needs to be a lot of corrections in that report. Thank you.

Tony Vandersteen:

11.1

My name is Tony Vandersteen. My wife and I have lived at SRC since 2016. We were told when we first moved to the place, in fact, I made a special request of the marketing director at that time whether there was going to be any further extensive buildings at the place that we were just moving into and that we just spent a half-a-million dollars as the down payment on. And I was told no, there were not going to be any more buildings, except with the possibility of something going up on the staff parking lot, maybe sometime in the future, to do with the staff. That's all we were told about.

And not just a few months later, we heard about the expansion plan and we were horrified, particularly in the totally insensitive way that it was presented to all of us, old people that moved in there specifically with the idea of relaxing in the beautiful environment the SRC campus represents.

Well, to hear that the plans have changed and all this, a radical plan to add several buildings that would ruin the historical value of the beautiful Manor Building that we particularly liked when we came in, build all over our park and fill much of the available space with more buildings, we were very, very upset about the whole thing.

11.2

The other main objection of course, which is mentioned in the EIR in many places is the construction problems itself. And I've been associated with many building construction sites. I've been working for Habitat for Humanity for several years. It can be dangerous, dusty, dirty, noisy, completely disruptive of the quality of life of anybody living anywhere near it. And in our case, it'll be at least five years, which would be probably a majority of the years that we have left and which will completely upset our senior life.

11.3

So the only part of this EIR that I'm interested in is the very first alternative to cancel the whole thing. As compromising possibly, we could see that half the number of possibilities of the 52 people that they wanted or 52 places they wanted to move into, that might be an acceptable way, but as far as we're concerned, we don't like the whole thing. Thank you.

Chuck Cummins:

- 12.1 My name is Chuck Cummins. I'm an independent living in cottage number 6140. I've written three emails which I hope the consultants will consider carefully, and I hope they also get to the City Council and the city planning people. But they cover three topics, one and the first one people have talked about already, and that's the impact and probably the most important part of the environment to be considered and this environmental report does not consider it at all and that's the people who have to live in this place as it's being constructed and have to live in it after it's completed. And you can see by looking in this room, there must be at least 50 or 60 residents from Saratoga Retirement Community who would say, "We don't need it and we do not want it."

Audience:

Hear, hear.

Chuck Cummins:

I mean, this is our home. We're the ones that live here. This is for PRS, the manager, and for the Odd Fellows Corporation, the owner, this is a real estate transaction, but this is our home. The entire campus is our home, not just our apartment, not just our cottage, but the entire campus is our home and it's being violated.

- 12.2 Secondly, emergency response. I was horrified to see that really what the consultants have done is kicked the can down the road. There's discussion about emergency response and this and that, but the bottom line in your report is that it says if the fire department approves it, it's okay. No significant impact. They also say that when the fire department approves it, that happens during the permitting process. It's absolutely ridiculous to look at a project and say, "Well, we're not going to consider the emergency preparedness and response evacuation," until the permit has been applied for, you get almost into the project, and then say, "Oops, what's the fire department going to have to say about this?" That doesn't make any sense at all.

- 12.3 Thirdly, the trees. You've heard about that, the number of trees that are going to come out, but I'm going to tell the story about what happened last week when some ladies in the campus last Thursday put ribbons, yellow ribbons, around the trees that are going to be taken out. Friday morning I walked the campus and I was shocked, absolutely shocked. I knew they were going to take some trees out, but if you could see the visualization, actually visualize what that campus would look like without the trees, you would be shocked too.

I hope we don't get to the point where we have to lie down in front of bulldozers and chain ourselves to trees because we don't want this expansion. Thank you.

Don Schmidek:

- 13.1 My name is Don Schmidek. I've been here at SRC for 12 years and my approach is a little different. I have gone through the 646 pages of the EIR and I have some comments.  
First, the organization of the EIR is baffling to me. I searched for a topic, I get a page number, but the pages do not exist on the EIR. It's amazing.
- 13.2 To get to more interesting topics, I expected to have two or three choices in EIR, but all of a sudden, I see four choices and the fourth choice is the opinion of the EIR writers. Well, I don't consider those writers to have the insight or the whereabouts of what's happening at the SRC campus. Is their task to analyze what is provided to them or is their task to provide an actual analysis on what is happening? My opinion is they were given three plans and they were supposed to select from the three.
- 13.3 The EIR is, I would say, 80% full of unneeded information, page after page after page of things that are of no interest, hardly pertinent, et cetera. So I think they were just a deterrent for us to get confused what is there.
- 13.4 The method that AECOM selected is an arbitrary, mysterious, and capricious method of selecting the best choice. And they gave us a table, which is 4.7-1, which happens to be on page 4-195, that supports alternative two, which is their opinion of what is to happen to the campus. And naturally, they also place a building in the park, which is a no-no.
- 13.5 The EIR has also some gross incorrect information, which makes me conclude that the plan is erroneous. Alternate one shows the EIR uses a PRS interpretation of Building D, what the residents have suggested. They came up with a three-story building, which is a similar configuration as the building 4,000 we have on the campus. The Preserve group suggested a different configuration, a configuration which is the same as the current configuration of the health center, which is much more prone and is only two stories high. Therefore, the conclusion that was reached is erroneous, grossly erroneous.  
I will not bother you with additional information since I've run out of time, but thank you for your attention.

Pat DuBridge:

- 14.1 My name is Pat DuBridge. I live at SRC. Yesterday morning, I was up about seven o'clock and I raised our blinds at the front of our house, looked across the park across Santa Clara Valley to the East Foothills, and as I looked across the park, there were ladies out there doing Tai Chi in the early morning sun.
- This park in the very middle of the SRC campus is not huge, but it is the only outdoor recreational space on the property and it is well-used by the 200 or so independent living residents. It is our environment. If this park is eliminated, it will affect not only present residents, but will be destroyed forever. The majestic oaks and redwoods, some a 100 years old, will be gone. The DEIR says that there are many nearby parks that residents can use. That's true. However, many residents no longer drive some use walkers, many use canes. They need a pleasant outdoor space for recreation within steps of their home.
- My favorite outdoor recreation is bocce ball. Besides that, the park is needed for picnicking, bridge and games under our umbrellas, or just sitting in the sun with friends. Please think about the environmental impact on the residents for generations to come if this park is destroyed. This is a plea to save our park. Thank you for listening.

This transcript was exported on Aug 09, 2023 - view latest version [here](#).

Dick DuBridge:

Good evening. It's nice to meet you all. My qualifications for being here, I've been a resident of Saratoga for 58 years and I like to tell you why I decided to come, and it's because Saratoga is a very unique place. The DEIR talks about-

Cynthia Richardson:

Could you state your name please?

Dick DuBridge:

Dick DuBridge.

- 15.1 I read through the EIR, the Draft EIR, and I think if you took out the word Saratoga and read that whole EIR, you would have no idea that they were talking about Saratoga. If they really wanted to know what Saratoga is like, they should ask some Saratogans, why did you come here? Why do you live here? Why do you retire here? It's because Saratoga is a very unique town. We have beautiful scenery that we can see from our own windows. We can look across the Valley, we can see the Eastern Foothills, we can see the Santa Cruz Mountains. We can see beautiful trees across the street. We can see nature at its best, including the wild animals that wander through our backyards. So that is why we came, and this development, if it goes through, we'll destroy it all.
- 15.2 Let's talk about preserving the Odd Fellows Home Historical Park. That was declared a park over 100 years ago by the Odd Fellows and it still has a 100-year-old sign designating it as the Odd Fellows Historical Park. We tagged all the trees so that people could see what it looked like. The management at SRC promptly took them all down, afraid of the truth, afraid that people would see this massive destruction that was about to occur to our park.
- 15.3 Prisons are entitled to recreational space outside. What are we supposed to do, break a few laws? Do we have to rob a bank? Do we have to change the name of SRC to SRC Prison in order to save our space? My study is across the street from the park. I can see what goes on there. It is enjoyed by people not only at SRC, but Fellowship Plaza. Our kids come and our grandkids come. They play in that park. We take their pictures in front of the trees and they love it. SRC has done their very best to keep that park simply a dirt platform to make it look as bad as possible. If it were properly developed, as the SRC residents want, it would be a beautiful place for picnics, et cetera, et cetera. Thank you.

This transcript was exported on Aug 09, 2023 - view latest version [here](#).

Nitin Jain:

Hi, good evening. I'm Nitin Jain. We live on San Marcos Road, so I'm not living yet in SRC. I hope to live here in a few years down the road-

Audience:

Louder. We can't hear.

Nitin Jain:

So I have... Oh, I'm sorry. Is it better?

Audience:

Yes.

Nitin Jain:

16.1 Sorry about that. Yeah, my name is Nitin Jain. We have been living on San Marcos Road for the last 22 years and we love it. And more than that, we love the beauty and the scenic nature of this retirement community. And I often walk around there.

And so going through the points, a lot of these points have been already mentioned, but I'll just touch upon it. One is the beauty of the place, and so I'm really concerned that the number of oak trees and the redwood trees that we are cutting. I think being a green city, I think it's really important that we take that seriously.

16.2 Number two is the beauty of the Manor Building. I'm kind of worried that by addition of this auditorium, it actually spoils the beauty of the Manor Building and we need to really look at why we need the auditorium, especially having a garage at the bottom that raises it up and spoils the view of Manor Building from the side. And so we need to look at that. We don't really need to have a garage underneath, if really, we can't do without it.

16.3 Number three, I couldn't see the drainage study in the EIR Report. So water drainage has been a main problem over my period of 22 years, and so I would urge that we consider the drainage.

16.4 Number four, traffic. So we've already mentioned that there's only one exit and it's a single one road in, one road out. And so during the construction, it's a big problem, and even after the construction, it's not enough. So we really need to consider the impact on the traffic and try to mitigate all these. I think that's all I have. Thank you.

Frank Tiernan:

17.1

Good evening. My name is Frank Tiernan. I'm a resident of SRC. I'm here to express this evening my concerns regarding two deficiencies in the Draft Environmental Impact Report for Saratoga Retirement Community. Given the time limitation, I'm only going to talk about the first one. I'll give you the other one in writing later on.

The first deficiency relates to the project summary and the omission of several relevant facts, specifically to balance some of the content in the applicant's objectives, which are included in the summary and which may be the only thing that some people read. Specifically, at least the following background material should be included in the project summary:

One, there is absolutely no indication that the proposed project is in any way needed for the financial viability of SRC. No financial projections showing the impact, let alone the need for this project to have ever been presented.

Two, SRC is on very solid financial footing, having contributed nearly \$30 million in profit to the parent, Od Fellows Homes of California, over the last 12 years. Given the demographics and economics of the area, there is every reason to believe that SRC, as currently built out, will continue to be on solid financial footing well into the foreseeable future.

Number three, the applicant's objective number three refers to the additional income stream resulting from the new independent living units as enabling upgrades and maintenance of the strong financial position. However, as no projection of either revenue or expense for the expansion has been provided, this statement should be balanced by one stating that there is no basis to assume that the additional units will generate any positive income, either now or in the future.

17.2

Number four, the applicant's objective number 11 refers to maintaining a high level of landscape design, amenities, and plant materials on the campus. This statement should be balanced with reference to the fact that the plan requires eliminating many, many trees and the only large open landscape recreational area on campus. Thank you.