

Lesley Lowe

From: Rader, David <David.Rader@pln.sccgov.org>
Sent: Friday, September 28, 2018 11:14 AM
To: Lesley Lowe
Subject: FW: Additional comments on Stanford 8/29/18 Reverse Commute memo

Lesley,

While the memo is still in Fehr and Peers hands, the County requests that the following changes (see below) be made, if possible. These are not part of AECOM's peer review but additional comments from internal County review. We will also be updating the master response with these clarifications.

Thanks,
Dave

From: Paul Mitchell <PMitchell@esassoc.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 27, 2018 6:11 PM
To: Rader, David <David.Rader@pln.sccgov.org>
Cc: Shadde Rosenblum <SRosenblum@esassoc.com>
Subject: Additional comments on Stanford 8/29/18 Reverse Commute memo

Dave:

Please forward the following comments on the 8/29/18 Reverse Commute memo for Stanford to reflect in a revised Reverse Commute memo:

- Page 3, first paragraph: Please provide more explanation. The alternative approach to intersection improvement mitigation would require not just monitoring reverse commute-trips, but also implementing a “no net new reverse commute trips policy,” with intersection improvements as a backup.
- Page 10, last paragraph, for the sentence: “*Some improvements are the same as identified in the Draft EIR or Recirculated Draft EIR, and others were adjusted because they were found to require lesser improvements to mitigate just the reverse-commute direction impact.*” Please clarify that these “adjustments” to mitigation measures were made only for purposes of identifying which improvements would be subject to the upfront fair share fees. Clarify that the full peak hour mitigation measures would continue to be implemented as described in the DEIR and Recirculated Portions of DEIR.
- Page 11, under Section D. Baseline for No Net New Commute Trips Monitoring: Please add a footnote clarifying that the NNNCT baseline is not the same as the CEQA existing conditions baseline used in the EIR.
- Page 11, under Subsection “Insufficient Data is Available to Modify the 2001 Baseline,” second sentence “*A full set of cordon count data from the 2001 monitoring were not preserved; therefore, an eight-week average of the reverse-peak direction trips at all 16 cordon gateways cannot be calculated.*” Please clarify this sentence.
- Page 14, under Subsection E. Summary, first sentence “*The analysis presented above indicates that, under the conservative assumptions used to prepare the sensitivity analysis, some significant intersection impacts would occur if reverse-commute direction trip growth occurs even if Stanford meets the No Net New Commute Trips*

standard." Please reiterate that reverse commute significant impacts are a subset of those identified in the DEIR and Recirculated Portions of DEIR.

Thanks.

Paul Mitchell

ESA | Environmental Science Associates

550 Kearny Street, Suite 800

San Francisco, CA 94108

415.896-5900 | 415.896-0332 fax

pmitchell@esassoc.com



AECOM
300 California, 6th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94104
www.aecom.com

415.896.5858 tel
415.882.9261 fax

Memorandum

To	ESA: Paul Mitchell	Pages 1
For	Santa Clara County: David Rader	
Subject	AECOM Peer Review of Stanford's 2018 General Use Permit (GUP) Application: Transportation Impact Analysis	
From	Greg Gleichman and Nichole Seow	
Date	September 13, 2018	

AECOM, as a member of the ESA team, is tasked with conducting a peer review of each transportation-related document submitted as part of the Stanford 2018 General Use Permit (GUP) application to verify that the documents follow generally-acceptable transportation planning practice, address the appropriate study area, and were conducted using methodologies that are clear and replicable.¹

This peer review memo represents AECOM's review of the latest version of Part 2 of the Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) for Stanford's 2018 GUP, revised in August 2018, as well as the memo '*Responses to Comments: AECOM Peer Review of Stanford's 2018 General Use Permit (GUP) Application: Transportation Impact Analysis (August 6, 2018)*' by Fehr & Peers (F&P) dated 8/13/2018 in response to AECOM's comments dated 8/6/2018.

AECOM finds that the clarification and additional information provided in the 8/13/2018 memo by F&P is sufficient. We have no other comments or questions regarding the memo.

With respect to the TIA, AECOM finds the revisions and updates presented in the document acceptable except that the Appendices need to be updated to reflect the information presented in the main body of the report. For example, the revised information for study intersection 31 presented in Table 6-1 of the main body of the report is inconsistent with the details presented in the Appendix F. We have no other comments or questions regarding the document.

¹ This language is from the scope of work in the AECOM contract for this project.

Memorandum

To	ESA: Paul Mitchell	Pages 1
For	Santa Clara County: David Rader	
Subject	AECOM Peer Review of Stanford's 2018 General Use Permit (GUP) Application: Transportation Impact Analysis	
From	Greg Gleichman and Nichole Seow	
Date	August 6, 2018	

AECOM, as a member of the ESA team, is tasked with conducting a peer review of each transportation-related document submitted as part of the Stanford 2018 General Use Permit (GUP) application to verify that the documents follow generally-acceptable transportation planning practice, address the appropriate study area, and were conducted using methodologies that are clear and replicable.¹ This peer review memo represents AECOM's review of the latest changes made to Part 2 of the Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) for Stanford's 2018 GUP, revised in July 2018 by Fehr & Peers (F&P).

As stated in the document, the changes were necessary as a result of public comments received for the Draft EIR on the 2018 GUP between October 2017 – February 2018, a change from 6 lanes to 4 lanes along Page Mill Road (between I-280 & Junipero Serra Boulevard) under the 2035 Cumulative scenario and errors in the previous version (August 2017) of the same document.

AECOM finds the revisions and updates presented in the document acceptable but request clarifications on the items listed below:

1. What leads to the change in analysis results for intersection #31 under the 2018 conditions compared to the August 2017 version of the TIA Part 2?
2. What leads to the difference in analysis results for intersection #13 and #14 in the 2035 Cumulative conditions compared to that from the December 13, 2017 memo documenting the sensitivity test results for lane change along Page Mill Road? Results for both the 'No Project' and 'With Project' scenarios are different between the 2 documents.
3. From Table 7-1, it seems that the delays at several intersections on roadways located east of Page Mill Road are reduced as a result of the lane change for Page Mill Road, which is counter-intuitive. Consequently the transit delays presented in Table 7-6 for several bus routes also are reduced. Please provide an explanation for this observation.

¹ This language is from the scope of work in the AECOM contract for this project.

Lesley Lowe

From: Rader, David <David.Rader@pln.sccgov.org>
Sent: Wednesday, August 15, 2018 12:40 PM
To: Lesley Lowe
Subject: FW: Stanford 2018 General Use Permit Revised TIA on Project

LL,

We are one typo away from completeness—just inches and goal.

DR

From: Paul Mitchell <PMitchell@esassoc.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 15, 2018 11:46 AM
To: Rader, David <David.Rader@pln.sccgov.org>
Subject: FW: Stanford 2018 General Use Permit Revised TIA on Project

Dave:

AECOM has only one final typo to point out in the revised TIA (highlighted in yellow, below). Would you please forward this to Stanford/F&P and have Stanford finalize and submit the TIA?

Thanks.

Paul Mitchell
ESA | Environmental Science Associates
550 Kearny Street, Suite 800
San Francisco, CA 94108
415.896-5900 | 415.896-0332 fax
pmitchell@esassoc.com

From: Seow, Nichole [<mailto:Nichole.Seow@aecom.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, August 15, 2018 11:39 AM
To: Paul Mitchell <PMitchell@esassoc.com>
Cc: Gleichman, Greg <Greg.Gleichman@aecom.com>
Subject: RE: Stanford 2018 General Use Permit Revised TIA on Project

Hi Paul,

We've reviewed the response memo provided by F&P and have no comments on those. But I do have a new comment on the TIA Part 2 write-up which I missed earlier and it is fairly minor:

The list of impacted intersections presented after the first para of Section 8.1.3 indicated that intersection #31 was also impacted in 2018 (marked with *). But this is incorrect - Section 6 of the report showed that intersection #31 was not impacted. Please remove the asterisk.

Thank you.

From: Paul Mitchell [<mailto:PMitchell@esassoc.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, August 15, 2018 10:27 AM

To: Seow, Nichole
Cc: Gleichman, Greg
Subject: RE: Stanford 2018 General Use Permit Revised TIA on Project
Importance: High

Greg and Nichole:

ESA is meeting with the County/Stanford at 1:00 today. In advance of that meeting, would you please let me know the status of your followup review on the revised TIA?

Thanks.

Paul Mitchell
ESA | Environmental Science Associates
550 Kearny Street, Suite 800
San Francisco, CA 94108
415.896-5900 | 415.896-0332 fax
pmitchell@esassoc.com

From: Seow, Nichole [<mailto:Nichole.Seow@aecom.com>]
Sent: Monday, August 13, 2018 11:17 PM
To: Paul Mitchell <PMitchell@esassoc.com>
Cc: Gleichman, Greg <Greg.Gleichman@aecom.com>
Subject: RE: Stanford 2018 General Use Permit Revised TIA on Project

Hi Paul,

There is a mention of an April 23, 2018 version of the Page Mill Road lane reduction memo. Please correct me if I am wrong, but I don't recall that AECOM has received it. Do you have a copy? If so, could you pls email it? Thanks.

From: Paul Mitchell [<mailto:PMitchell@esassoc.com>]
Sent: Monday, August 13, 2018 5:49 PM
To: Gleichman, Greg
Cc: Seow, Nichole; Shadde Rosenblum
Subject: FW: Stanford 2018 General Use Permit Revised TIA on Project
Importance: High

Greg and Nichole:

Please see attached response to Stanford/F&P. If the responses are adequately, please prepare a final memo that documents that AECOM has completed its peer review of the revised TIA, similar to your prior final peer review memos.

Thank you.

Paul Mitchell
ESA | Environmental Science Associates
550 Kearny Street, Suite 800
San Francisco, CA 94108
415.896-5900 | 415.896-0332 fax
pmitchell@esassoc.com

From: Rader, David [<mailto:David.Rader@pln.sccgov.org>]
Sent: Monday, August 13, 2018 5:44 PM

To: Paul Mitchell <PMitchell@esassoc.com>
Subject: FW: Stanford 2018 General Use Permit Revised TIA on Project

From: Lesley Lowe <llowe@stanford.edu>
Sent: Monday, August 13, 2018 5:43 PM
To: Rader, David <David.Rader@pln.sccgov.org>
Subject: RE: Stanford 2018 General Use Permit Revised TIA on Project

Dave, attached are the responses from F&P on the TIA. Looks pretty straightforward, so I can ask them to start pulling together the Final TIA with the revisions once you give us the green light.

LL

Lesley Lowe, AICP CTP | Senior Environmental Planner
Stanford University | Land Use and Environmental Planning
650.721.4261 | llowe@stanford.edu

From: Rader, David <David.Rader@pln.sccgov.org>
Sent: Tuesday, August 7, 2018 9:14 AM
To: Lesley Lowe <llowe@stanford.edu>
Subject: FW: Stanford 2018 General Use Permit Revised TIA on Project

And also this.

From: Paul Mitchell <PMitchell@esassoc.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 7, 2018 9:14 AM
To: Rader, David <David.Rader@pln.sccgov.org>
Subject: FW: Stanford 2018 General Use Permit Revised TIA on Project

Dave:

Looks like there is one more minor comment (correcting a typo) below that came in a separate email; would you please forward this as well?

Thanks.

Paul Mitchell
ESA | Environmental Science Associates
550 Kearny Street, Suite 800
San Francisco, CA 94108
415.896-5900 | 415.896-0332 fax
pmitchell@esassoc.com

From: Seow, Nichole [<mailto:Nichole.Seow@aecom.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, August 7, 2018 8:52 AM
To: Paul Mitchell <PMitchell@esassoc.com>
Subject: RE: Stanford 2018 General Use Permit Revised TIA on Project

Hi Paul,
One more minor comment that wasn't included in the memo – 'Whipple' was misspelled on the first bullet point on first page of section 7 (no page #, after pg 135). Thanks.

From: Seow, Nichole
Sent: Monday, August 06, 2018 6:45 PM
To: Paul Mitchell
Cc: Gleichman, Greg
Subject: RE: Stanford 2018 General Use Permit Revised TIA on Project

Hi Paul,

As Greg promised, please find out review comments attached for your review and forward to the County if everything is ok. Thank you.

From: Gleichman, Greg
Sent: Friday, August 03, 2018 5:08 PM
To: Paul Mitchell; Seow, Nichole
Cc: Rader, David
Subject: RE: Stanford 2018 General Use Permit Revised TIA on Project

Got it. A quick review of the changes indicates that deadline is feasible.

From: Paul Mitchell [<mailto:PMitchell@esassoc.com>]
Sent: Thursday, August 02, 2018 4:05 PM
To: Gleichman, Greg; Seow, Nichole
Cc: Rader, David
Subject: Stanford 2018 General Use Permit Revised TIA on Project
Importance: High

Greg and Nichole:

I just sent you via ESA DeliverIt the following:

- TIA Part 1 – PDF
- TIA Part 2 – redline edits in Word
- TIA Part 2 figures – PDF
- TIA Part 2 appendices – PDF

Per your latest scope, please peer review the changes made to the original TIA. Please only focus on the edits made to the original TIA, not any of the original setting, approach or analysis.

Please provide this review by **Monday COB August 6, 2018**. Please call with any questions.

Thanks

Paul Mitchell
ESA | Environmental Science Associates
550 Kearny Street, Suite 800
San Francisco, CA 94108
415.896-5900 | 415.896-0332 fax
pmitchell@esassoc.com