

From: [Janet Davis](#)
To: [Rader, David](#)
Subject: Fw: STANFORD'S 2018 GUP
Date: Thursday, January 12, 2017 3:01:45 PM

Sorry I mistyped your address first go around

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Janet Davis <jadadjad@sbcglobal.net>
To: "david.rader@plan.sccgov.org" <david.rader@plan.sccgov.org>
Cc: Don Horsley <dhorsley@smcgov.org>; Michael Callagy <mcallagy@smcgov.org>; Diana Shu <dshu@smcgov.org>; Catherine Carlton <cat.carlton@me.com>; Raymond Mueller <rdmueller@menlopark.org>; Tom Gallagher <tgallagher@smcgov.org>; Kristina Bell <kbell@smcgov.org>; Jean McCown <jmccown@stanford.edu>; Lucy W. Wicks <lwicks@stanford.edu>; Brian David Shaw <bshaw2@stanford.edu>
Sent: Thursday, January 12, 2017 2:59 PM
Subject: STANFORD'S 2018 GUP

I received notice of Stanford's update to the GUP and had a few comments related to the potential impact to Alpine Road and the surrounding neighborhood of the significant construction planned. *In addition* to those comments I would ask that any plan have very specific directions as to construction trucks, since the last major construction effort generated double semi construction trucks racing down Alpine at the rate of one every 17 seconds for long periods of time.

STANFORD UNIVERSITY EIR FOR THE 2018 GUP COMMENTS

I have lived on Alpine Road for 50 years and have seen the traffic to and from Stanford increase very significantly almost every year. It has now become intolerable. In the morning residents of Stanford Weekend Acres have great difficulty accessing the road towards Menlo Park until after 10:30. It is also virtually impossible to cross the road and head towards I-280 at that time. In the mornings traffic is backed up on 280 and a virtual parking lot between 280 and Campus Drive West. In the evening the reverse is true. When the road is not a parking lot for a few hours during the day, it is a speed track, particularly for double trailer construction trucks that favor alpine over Sand Hill because it lacks traffic lights. At times it has taken 20 mins. and 6 iterations of traffic lights to get from Stowe Lane to Junipero Serra[JS]. The gap between the lights at Alpine and those at Sand Hill is jammed so that even if the light at Alpine is green, motorists cannot continue to Sand Hill. This is exacerbated by the "bulb out" in the gap that prevents vehicles coming from JS to change into the left hand lane to make the turn onto Sand Hill. In the morning the right hand lanes on Alpine are jammed with cars turning onto JS or heading towards the right hand turn to the SUMC. This causes drivers from Portola Valley [PV] to use the left hand lane up to the Sand Hill intersection and then there are fierce competitive battles in the short distance between Sand Hill and the fork at Santa Cruz/Alameda with drivers cutting into their desired lane.

Careless drivers often use the bike lane from Bishop Lane to Rural Lane as an additional vehicular lane. Between Wildwood and Stowe they even use the pedestrian pathway, to the extent that the County stopped repairing knocked down signs.

There are two stop places for the school buses: one at Bishop and one at Stowe. There are no pull-over slots for the buses and vehicles frequently race right past the buses even when the red lights are flashing.

The intersection dangers are such that the "spandex" cyclist crowd frequently avoid the bike lanes which are blocked by vehicles, and use the below road level "trail." Since this has a sharp incline those riders can reach 25-30 mph easily, which is life threatening to pedestrians. Since this is the only way that children can walk or bike to La Entrada Middle school, this is highly hazardous.

Cyclists coming from the upper part of Sand Hill who try to negotiate the intersection to access JS have to risk their lives by swerving across the traffic heading towards PV or JS. There are two vehicle lanes at the Alpine intersection: one that heads only to PV, and the other which allows drivers to go straight ahead to PV, or make a left turn to JS. I have seen many near misses where a cyclist is in the left hand lane hoping to get to JS, where he has almost been run down by a driver behind him going straight, towards PV. The left hand lane needs to be ONLY a turn lane. This would also mitigate the sometimes vicious competition in the merge lane by the Buck estate gate.

Another problem for cyclists coming from Upper Sand Hill to Lower Sand Hill is that during busy times both access to the multiuse trail, and the roadway bike lane is blocked by cars and they often have to swing out into the car lanes.

The PV bound merge lane at the Alpine intersection is too short. In the evenings there are some very aggressive drivers competing for access and they veer into the bike lane. The road signs indicate that the inside lane should merge with the outside, but this should be reversed to lessen this competition.

The back gate to the Buck Estate is often used as a parking area for people on the phone or for a highly dangerous U-turn on the blind corner for cars to back track to Santa Cruz or J.S. The median brickwork needs to be extended to prevent the latter problem. (I have even seen vehicles with the SU logo on them make this U-turn)

Pedestrians coming from Campus Drive West to Stanford Weekend Acres [SWA] or to walk at the Dish have no way to cross J.S. There needs to be (as there once was, before Larry Horton) a crosswalk at the Alpine intersection. This might also slow down the flood of vehicles from I-280 that totally ignore the red light at the corner of Alpine and J.S. Joggers/walkers are often seen using the bike path between J.S. and Sand Hill. This is highly dangerous. Some of the more athletic people clamber down the hill to the below ground "trail" to avoid this danger in favor of another. Because of the non-ADA compliant and dangerous Larry Horton-inspired "trail" from Rural Lane to Sand Hill Road people no longer have the surface route along Alpine/Santa Cruz to get to Safeway. There needs to be a crosswalk at Alpine/J.S. by the Buck Estate so that people trying to get to the store could cross Alpine and use the (presently blocked off) brick walkway alongside the Buck Estate wall. This way they could avoid the dangers of the Larry Horton "Trail" by the creek. An even better solution would be allow pedestrian passage through the Hewlett Foundation or along the Fire Trail that runs between Alpine and Sand Hill.

The "Larry Horton" boondoggle trail under the cantilevered section is always in bad repair. The initial engineering was so poor that the bank is constantly eroding. Part of this problem is that the storm "drain" from the road is merely a hole in the road that sends storm water cascading down the hillside. Eventually this entire hillside may have to be redone since the roadway is buttressed by metal bound rocks that obviously have a limited useful life. The surface of this "trail" is subsiding and has constantly re-appearing gashes which could cause major bike accidents. The large number of gigantic 18 wheeler construction trucks using the cantilevered section of Santa Cruz may contribute to this erosion. The rest of the trail within the City of Menlo Park's jurisdiction along Alpine is often in bad repair. There are frequent tree problems and fallen rocks. It was poorly designed at the intersection of Alpine in that there was no provision for a right hand turn for cyclists, so they have made a path for themselves across the drip line of the oak trees.

The back gate to the Stanford dish creates a death trap for commuters, pedestrians and cyclists. Motorists park illegally and make U-turns across Alpine right by the I-280 off ramp. All parking should be removed, especially since there is easy access with safe parking by the Stanford Avenue front gate. This parking lot has become a target of thieves which draws criminals to the residential area which, unlike the Stanford Ave entrance has no monitor and no police presence. It was much safer when the only access was by foot except for SU employees who could proceed up to the Dish.

This is not an exhaustive list, and others can feel free to add their concerns. Below are my suggestions for mitigations that Stanford could provide since it is obvious that there will be more traffic to and from SU in the years to come.

- The county has agreed to reduce the speed limit within their jurisdiction along Alpine to 35 mph. However, Menlo Park has a 40 mph sign by the Buck Estate that needs to come down.
- Some means has to be provided to enforce the speed limit. Perhaps :SU Sheriff could provide patrols under the supervision of the CHP?
- The county would like to see a traffic light at I-280 to make it possible for SWA residents to access Alpine Road
- Because of the vast numbers of cars already going to the Campus, the Shopping Center and SUMC, which number will surely increase despite SU's attempts to limit traffic, there needs to be a park and ride area south of I-280 perhaps on the old Tree Farm site. Stanford has many community members in the PV, Ladera and SWA districts and several facilities on Alpine and Arastradero Road, they could provide an expanded shuttle service.
- Metering lights are needed at the freeway
- Improvements need to be made at Page Mill/I-280 to facilitate better traffic movement
- Increased access to SU campus via Stanford Ave, and other side streets needs to be provided
- Improved access and better signs are needed for SUMC especially the ER
- Cross walks needed at J.S/Alpine, Alpine/Santa Cruz
- Considerable improvement needed for the Larry Horton "trail" as suggested above plus speed limits for cyclists
- Provision of some kind of access through the Hewlett Foundation between Alpine and Sand Hill
- School bus pull ins at Bishop and Stowe
- Barricades should be provided to prevent injury to pedestrians all along Alpine from Piers Lane to Stowe Lane
- Stanford officials should work with Menlo Park, Palo Alto and San Mateo County to get a **REGIONAL** traffic analysis and **plan**. This would prevent one jurisdiction dumping problems on another.
- Financing needs to be made available to San Mateo County and Menlo Park to make physical improvements like crossings, signage and road surface maintenance.
- There is no drainage along Alpine and road run-off is dumped on homeowners' property. It would improve safety if an environmentally sensitive drainage system could be installed along Alpine, since there have been flooding problems that impact traffic.
- The fence along Rural Lane needs to come down and an at-surface (possibly cantilevered) pedestrian pathway needs to be installed to avoid the Larry Horton non ADA compliant, dangerous sub-surface trail.
- Some thought and money needs to be provided for a turn lane into Wildwood. (There were at least 7 accidents there during 2016)
- A considerable amount of design and construction improvements need to be made by the rear gate to the Buck Estate, including the merge lane, the median and the utility box. The ATT people and the PGE crews are frequently there and since there is no place for them to park while working on their equipment this creates a traffic hazard.

From: [Janet Davis](#)
To: [Rader, David](#)
Subject: Re: Stanford GUP
Date: Thursday, January 12, 2017 7:00:52 PM

Thanks David. I already replied to this because there are a huge number of problems on Alpine Road and in W. Menlo Park because of the construction already in progress at SU. I want to make absolutely certain that Santa Clara County pays attention to the problems that they cause when approving GUPs. Nobody talks to anyone outside their jurisdiction, and this time around it is to be hoped that San Mateo County and Menlo Park get involved in the process. The continual development at Stanford has created all kinds of problems in my area. Santa Clara county needs to have traffic engineers look at this GUP.

From: "Rader, David" <David.Rader@pln.sccgov.org>
To: Janet Davis <jadjad@sbglobal.net>
Cc: Don Horsley <dhorsley@smcgov.org>; Michael Callagy <mcallagy@smcgov.org>
Sent: Thursday, January 12, 2017 3:49 PM
Subject: RE: Stanford GUP

Here you go. A hard copy was also mailed to San Mateo County Planning and Development.

Dave

From: Janet Davis [mailto:jadjad@sbglobal.net]
Sent: Thursday, January 12, 2017 3:23 PM
To: Rader, David <David.Rader@pln.sccgov.org>
Cc: Don Horsley <dhorsley@smcgov.org>; Michael Callagy <mcallagy@smcgov.org>
Subject: Stanford GUP

Would you please e-mail a copy of the NOTICE to Don Horsley and Mike Callagy of San Mateo County so that they have an idea of what is planned prior to the actual EIR.
Thank you

From: [Giudice, Linda](#)
To: [Rader, David](#)
Cc: [Giudice, Linda](#); [Sakis Theologis](#)
Subject: Stanford University EIR
Date: Saturday, January 14, 2017 2:26:45 PM

Der Mr. Rader,

We are in receipt of the “Notice of Preparation of an Environmental Impact Report for the Stanford University ‘2018 General Use Permit’”. We live on Mandoli Drive in Los Altos Hills – a street that is perpendicular to Arastradero Road and very close to Deer Creek Road. As we have read the Notice, Figure 3 is uninterpretable, and I write to request a finer resolution of Figure 3 be reissued. We cannot discern where Deer Creek is or where our street is. Can you please provide this?

Also, there is a statement about a “goal of no net new commute trips”. With all this expansion and additional housing and occupants, this goal seems untenable. What is the projected increase in commute trips – zero is not a realistic or acceptable projection unless alternative transportation is projected and paid for – which is not addressed in the Notice – but still would count as new commute trips. Please advise

Finally (for now), what is the environmental impact on human health for the increased traffic and new settlements – exhaust emissions, e.g. - will you be addressing and quantifying these - especially along the routes that will be even more burdened once the new plans go into effect – e.g., Sand Hill Rd, Page Mill Road, Arastradero Rd?

Thank you for considering my inquiries, and I look forward to your reply.

Sincerely,
Linda Giudice

From: [Bill Youstra](#)
To: [Rader, David](#)
Subject: Comments for EIR for Stanford 2018 GUP
Date: Wednesday, January 18, 2017 5:03:09 PM

Mr. Rader,

I'm a neighbor of Stanford's and want to convey my full support for the 2018 GUP modification and Stanford itself. The university has been a trusted, valuable and responsible neighbor over the years. You can't please all of the people all of the time, but they are more than generous with community use of their lands and financial support for improvement of local infrastructure.

Regards,
Bill Youstra
187 Cervantes Road
Portola Valley, CA

From: [Janet Davis](#)
To: [Rader, David](#)
Cc: [Don Horsley](#); [Warren Slocum](#); [Dave Pine](#); [Michael Callagy](#); [Raymond Mueller](#); [Catherine Carlton](#); [Kirsten Keith](#); [Jean McCown](#)
Subject: COMMENTS ON SU 2018 GUP
Date: Friday, January 20, 2017 2:28:34 PM

**STANFORD 2018 GUP FILE 7165-16P 16Z 16EIR
COMMENT**

I have not yet had time to carefully study the GUP **Application** which is on line at: <https://www.sccgov.org/sites/dpd/Programs/Stanford/Pages/Stanford.aspx> but in response to your request for comments, below is some of what I would like to see detailed in the EIR.

Stanford has built or is building, large numbers of student and faculty/staff housing. However, there are thousands of university *staff* who do not presently qualify for Stanford housing. Many of these employees come from distant cities and commute many miles to work on a daily basis. Their number will only increase over the next 30 years with the expansion of the facilities detailed in the GUP summary. The EIR should address this part of the housing issue and the increase in commercial supplier vehicles. More employees is going to strain the already inadequate supply of **affordable** housing, and increase the purchase price of properties in the vicinity of the university which in turn, will reduce availability. These factors are going to have significant negative impacts on the surrounding community.

Specific Questions:

What plans – if any – are there for lower income employee housing?
What type and how many employees would be required for the various additions?
The summary indicated the possibility of a large child care facility. What plans – if any - would there be for a school, or what would be the impact on existing schools for those additional personnel living locally?
What plans are there – if any - for local shuttle buses or park and ride spots?
What plans are there for regional employee transportation such as the Dumbarton Express/Ferry?
Has any thought been given to additional access points to the main campus from the surrounding arterials?
The summary indicates that the Traffic Impact Study will only be included in the EIR “if appropriate.” That study would seem to be utterly essential to any EIR
The summary references in fill and vacant sites. Could those be identified with specificity?
Under Housing Linkage the summary refers to Condition F.7 in the 2000 GUP that would allow SU to build additional housing beyond the limit of 3,150 subject to additional environmental review. This needs fleshing out since the 3150 figure is already in excess of the Housing Linkage amounts in Table 2.
Parking limits are to be exempted for various vehicles including electric vehicles. Since many vehicles are currently electric this does not reduce the number of vehicles as much as one might wish
Water quality/Amount: The summary notes that this will only be included in the EIR “if appropriate.” This would seem to be something that needs to be in the EIR. Is a gray water system to be installed? What plans are there for ground water pumping, extracting water from San Francisquito Creek etc.

1-23-19

Dear David

I have the note ~~me~~

RECEIVED
PLANNING DEPT
2017 JAN 26 AM 11:53
COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA

to Stanford because

I am sick of paying the
park in front of my own

house it was not

that way when I bought

it in 1984, there is no

logic in this, it is not

a city area its rural -

let Stanford pay my parking

period. For that!
Thanks

David. Pearson
650-947-8029

* 2018 General
Use Permit

From: [Janet Davis](#)
To: [Rader, David](#)
Subject: Fw: Stanford's 2018 GUP Comments
Date: Sunday, January 29, 2017 9:57:26 AM

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Janet Davis <jadjad@sbcglobal.net>
To: Don Horsley <dhorsley@smcgov.org>; Michael Callagy <mcallagy@smcgov.org>; Warren Slocum <wslocum@smcgov.org>; Raymond Mueller <rdmueller@menlopark.org>; Catherine Carlton <cat.carlton@me.com>; Kirsten Keith <kkeith@menlopark.org>; "David.rader@pln.scc.gov.org" <David.rader@pln.scc.gov.org>
Cc: Lennie Roberts <lennie@darwin.ptvy.ca.us>; Jean McCown <jmccown@stanford.edu>
Sent: Saturday, January 28, 2017 9:19 AM
Subject: Stanford's 2018 GUP Comments

YET MORE COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED 2018 STANFORD GUP

The brainpower at and from Stanford is largely responsible for the economic growth and prosperity of the region. The world famous hospitals and clinics are something for which many of us have cause to be very grateful. However, this very prosperity has made the area unaffordable to many of those who work at, or provide services to, the University and Hospitals, causing them to live further and further away which has generated a traffic nightmare and a housing shortage.

The amount of construction contemplated in this GUP, on top of that constructed during the last GUP, is phenomenal. Given the potential construction of the Western Quad for scientific disciplines, the interrelationships with Silicon Valley companies and other organizations is staggering. Since this impact is, at this time so speculative, it would seem imprudent to incorporate this part of the development in the GUP.

The planned projects are also expansion-generating throughout the Bay Area and this needs to be addressed.

There is also a complicated inter-relationship between the academic campus and other interconnected entities, making it difficult to segregate impact of events on the core campus from events at other related entities. Examples:

- The fastest way to the ER is often via Campus Drive West or Palm Drive
- The Psychology Dept. has studies that sometimes involve the Research Center on Hillview in Los Altos
- The Physics Dept. has students using SLAC
- The Bioengineering Dept. has had studies involving the MRI facility in the Physics Dept, the V.A. Hospital in Palo Alto, and the SU Med Center
- Some studies originating on campus involve travel to the Stanford Campus in Redwood City

Since traffic on all roads surrounding the university are already at gridlock and there is dire need throughout the region for “affordable” housing it would seem that traffic and housing are two of the items of most concern to most people. It would be helpful to have some idea of the number and type of employees, contractors and service personnel that might be required for each of the projects anticipated.

NO NET NEW COMMUTER TRIPS:

This is a simplistic and inadequate approach to traffic impacts of the development. Several other highly

critical and relevant aspects need to be addressed.

Construction Vehicles:

For many years there has been constant construction on the campus and adjacent to the campus. At one point a few years ago there were double semi dump trucks racing down Alpine Road at the rate of one every 17 seconds. There is also traffic from the multitude of construction workers, materials suppliers, concrete trucks, backhoes and bulldozers etc.

What is needed: A count of how many construction trucks and workers/project are planned, and the routes that they are to take to and from SU.

Service Vehicles:

As new facilities are added to campus there are myriad service vehicles/trucks such as Praxair Gases, Plumbers, Restaurant supply companies, Catering companies supplying offices, Shredding companies, Furniture suppliers, PGE vehicles, Equipment suppliers etc.

What is needed: An estimate of how many such vehicles are likely for existing facilities and for those being contemplated.

Employees:

As more facilities are built there will be more employees, many in the lower income category, who will not qualify for the on campus housing.

What is needed: An actual number of projected employees for each phase of the construction by job classification and, some indication of home locations for present employees so that some idea of traffic patterns can be assessed.

Shuttles:

The shuttles would appear to be well used but more are probably needed as the campus grows.

What is needed: An analysis of present and future shuttle traffic, and potential new routes. There also need to be more access points to the campus such as from Stanford Avenue, or the side roads off Junipero Serra.

Tourists:

Stanford is world renowned and many visitors can be seen throughout the campus on any given day. Not only are there tour buses, but many also drive to Stanford, adding to the vehicular traffic.

What is needed: An estimate of no. of visitors and vehicle trips.

Public Events/Sports Events:

Stanford has many public events such as e.g., concerts, art shows, football, basketball, tennis, golf, lectures, scientific studies, poetry readings, demonstrations, national track/cross country meets, etc., all of which draw crowds that can sometimes number in the thousands.

What is needed: An estimate of attendees and employees at the various happenings and the expected vehicular traffic and its impact on neighboring roads.

Other Events Peripheral to the Central Campus:

- The golf course, its restaurant, and the driving range draw considerable traffic - not just from the immediate campus area.
- The Horse Barn also involves traffic from participants, guests, service personnel, Hay suppliers, etc.
- The Dish trail has generated a huge amount of traffic from other neighborhoods that floods the Alpine Road and the Stanford Avenue areas.

What is needed: A tabulation/estimate of this vehicular impact.

Associated Growth/Development:

- ***The Hospitals/Med Center*** have expanded almost beyond recognition <https://mg.mail.yahoo.com/neo/launch?.partner=sbc&.rand=fmb01t02at6oo#mail> and the traffic impact on the surrounding areas has been phenomenal even before the projects are

complete. As a result it appears the number of employees has also escalated dramatically. In addition, as the hospitals have expanded, the *medical services, labs and physician offices* area along Welch Road also seem to have proliferated, as have the number of clients and employees.

- *The Stanford Shopping Center* has expanded with numerous new employees and many more shoppers
- *The industrial Park* has increased in size as spin offs from University research have formed companies which has resulted in even more traffic
- *SLAC* has expanded and has included a Guest House.
- *The Ronald MacDonald House for Families of Lucile Packard Patients* has doubled in size
- *The SU Portola Valley Clinic* has opened along Alpine Road drawing a multitude of patients. There are also other clinics/facilities at least in Redwood City, on East Embarcadero, on Page Mill Road and on Hillview in Palo Alto.

What is needed: An in depth analysis of the cumulative effect, (and the potential for generating further development in the area,) of the enlargement contemplated on the central campus. This is way too much construction of too diverse types, having so many variables and unknowns, to be incorporated into one GUP, especially given the last GUP plus the hospital expansions and the Redwood City Campus. All the other factors are important, but the two most critical for the area directly adjacent to the university are traffic and affordable housing.

Jan. 28, 2017

From: [Paul Machado](#)
To: [Rader, David](#)
Subject: Evergreen Park
Date: Wednesday, February 08, 2017 7:22:43 PM

In the last GUP we were offered \$100,000 for a RPP for College Terrace and Evergreen Park. College Terrace got a RPP but none of the money was used for us. After much work from residents, the city appears to have granted us a one year trial RPP. Unfortunately some dentists who were evicted from their offices on Welsh Road, for University/Hospital expansion, have rented/leased under parked facilities all over the city. They are totally opposed to the neighborhoods as we struggle to maintain our livability while being choked by traffic and parking. Will the University turn their back on Evergreen Park. Will these dentists be allowed to again rent on Stanford land where there is room to address their parking needs as in the past?

The current plan to place a LARGE student housing facility on Serra Street across from Evergreen Park is also a concern. We know the University has tried to mitigate traffic and parking but I know of nothing that will stop students from using Evergreen Park for parking that is not supposed to occur but of course will occur.

Also will the University ever address the Stanford employees and campers that line the El Camino from University to Stanford Ave.. Is this part of the general plan?

Lastly since the University began charging for parking at football games, Evergreen Park has become the default free University parking lot for the games. Will the University do nothing to address this iniquity.

Thank you for noting my concerns.

Paul Machado

EIR Scoping: Stanford 2018 General Use Permit Project

SCOPING COMMENTS (Please print clearly and legibly)

Please hand in during the meeting or mail (address on back) or email by **February 17, 2017**.

Name: Sea Reddy

Organization (if any): _____

Address (optional): 747 Stanford

City, State, Zip: Palo Alto, Ca 94306

E-mail: paloalto1ife@gmail.com

This comment form is being furnished to obtain suggestions and information from the public on the scope of issues and alternatives that will be addressed in the EIR. All comments received, including names and addresses, will become part of the official administrative record and may be made available to the public.

Comments (Please print clearly and legibly)

1. Traffic on Stanford Ave

2. TCE concerns

3. El Camino & Stanford Ave intersection

(More space on reverse side)

EIR Scoping: Stanford 2018 General Use Permit Project

SCOPING COMMENTS (Please print clearly and legibly)

Please hand in during the meeting or mail (address on back) or email by **February 17, 2017.**

Name: Richard Patrone

Organization (if any): SF 10 ZOO 7

Address (optional): _____

City, State, Zip: Woodside CA 94062

E-mail: rpatrone @ stanford.edu

This comment form is being furnished to obtain suggestions and information from the public on the scope of issues and alternatives that will be addressed in the EIR. All comments received, including names and addresses, will become part of the official administrative record and may be made available to the public.

Comments (Please print clearly and legibly)

Can the county investigate the
social impact of the University's request
to combine all affordable housing
eligibe groupe into one group

(More space on reverse side)

EIR Scoping: Stanford 2018 General Use Permit Project

SCOPING COMMENTS (Please print clearly and legibly)

Please hand in during the meeting or mail (address on back) or email by **February 17, 2017**.

Name: David Perkins

Organization (if any): SEIU

Address (optional): _____

City, State, Zip: _____

E-mail: Vice_President@SEIU2007.org

This comment form is being furnished to obtain suggestions and information from the public on the scope of issues and alternatives that will be addressed in the EIR. All comments received, including names and addresses, will become part of the official administrative record and may be made available to the public.

Comments (Please print clearly and legibly)

We ask the county to analyze the demographics of the workers that do and do not qualify for the Stanford Transit Program

Thank you

(More space on reverse side)

EIR Scoping: Stanford 2018 General Use Permit Project

SCOPING COMMENTS (Please print clearly and legibly)

Please hand in during the meeting or mail (address on back) or email by **February 17, 2017**.

Name: MING-FIE J TING TRUSTE

Organization (if any): _____

Address (optional): _____

City, State, Zip: _____

E-mail: WWW.PEGASUS.COM HOTMAIL.COM

This comment form is being furnished to obtain suggestions and information from the public on the scope of issues and alternatives that will be addressed in the EIR. All comments received, including names and addresses, will become part of the official administrative record and may be made available to the public.

Comments (Please print clearly and legibly)

#1 - ^{Need} Traffic light on Stanford Ave and El Camino for that interaction

- Need Electric ~~car~~ for Margarita to campus for better air quality,

- Hope Stanford will build their parking lot - don't create traffic like Google Campus day care,

We Evergreen ^{park} just finish the RPP w/ Palo Alto Transport

(More space on reverse side)

Hi, my name is Francisco Preciado and I'm the Executive Director for SEIU Local 2007. I wanted to express our appreciation to SCoPE 2035 for asking very important questions about equity. In looking at the vast array of Stanford's accomplishments, it's important to recognize it as a world class leader in many respects. Whether its research, technological developments, or being recognized as one of the most beautiful campuses in the world. However, the reason we are here today is to express our concern that Stanford is not being that exemplary leader when it comes to treating their workers with respect or valuing them as part of the Stanford family. Examples of this include the fact that Stanford won't recognize the Public Safety Officers who want to unionize [pause] and the fact that the majority of workers do not qualify for affordable housing on campus. This relates directly to the GUP and the Community Plan. In Stanford's Community Plan, it specifically states that in order to address Stanford's housing needs, Stanford's Strategy Number One is to "Increase the Supply and Affordability of Housing." Given that the 2018 GUP proposal is 550 units for Faculty & Staff, does the county believe that Stanford is actually committed to providing affordable housing for staff when its cumulative faculty/staff units after the 2000 GUP was 937 units? Can the county examine the impact of developing 1,000 staff units on campus as it relates to decreasing the total commute trips? Lastly, would the county consider funding these additional 1,000 units for working class staff using Stanford's Affordable Housing Fund?

Hi, my name is _____ and I'm a member of SEIU Local 2007. I work at _____. I have a couple questions. (1) How does the county calculate Stanford's contribution to the Stanford Affordable Housing Fund? (2) Should the county calculate the contribution by examining what developers in the surrounding cities contribute? Maybe instead of contributing \$20 per square foot, Stanford align itself with Palo Alto's standard at around \$60 per square foot. Thank you.

Hi, my name is _____ and I'm a member of SEIU Local 2007. I work at _____. I would like to thank SCOPE for their important comments. Can the county look at the effect on the net new commute trips if Stanford provided 1,000 additional affordable housing units for their service and technical workers and their families? Thank you, that is my question.

"However, as housing supply and affordability trends within Santa Clara County and the Stanford area worsen, it is in the interest of both Stanford University and the public to ensure balance between housing demand and supply as it pertains to Stanford University's development. Stanford lands represent one of the most important opportunities in the County to improve the balance between jobs and housing, due to the potential to provide housing on Stanford lands for designated University populations. While this housing is directly accessible only to Stanford students, faculty and staff, it also benefits the wider community by augmenting the local housing supply. To that end, development of additional housing on the campus is a fundamental policy direction of this Community Plan."
Stanford Community Plan

From: [Susan Wilson](#)
To: [Rader, David](#)
Subject: Stanford GUP 2018
Date: Thursday, February 09, 2017 8:57:22 PM

Dear Mr. Rader,

I'm writing in response to the 2018 GUP. I was at the recent presentation at Mitchell Library on January 25, 2017 and feel a need to write on the following topics: Infrastructure, Stanford's Responsibility, Deal Making with Stanford, and Past History with Stanford.

1. Infrastructure. It seems the issue of cars gets discussed a lot. Yes, our roads are congested, but it's also the rest of community infrastructure that is not sustainable. We don't have enough grocery stores, dentist offices, gyms, etc. Traffic is just one part of the problem as we increase our density.

We are being asked to approve 3,150 more beds and 2,035,000 sq feet of academic space without first realizing the effects of the Mayfield Housing Project will have on our community. That's another 180 household with probably only one person in the family working at Stanford and the other one driving a car to his/her employment. And that person will probably be taking their child to his tennis lessons, to soccer, or whatever, after already having driven to Safeway on her way home from work. All of that spells more cars, more lines a grocery store, more parking problems, less access to the amenities that make life work.

We are being told there will be no more "commuter traffic." Big deal, because traffic is now a constant, not contained to a few hours a day. It doesn't really matter if there is less commuter traffic because all day long people are living their lives moving from one event to the other. The quality of life continues to be downgraded with no consideration about stopping the trajectory. Just what is "commuter traffic" in this age when people go to work at all different times of the day and night?

2. Make Stanford responsible. So my question to you, the representative for the county, why is there not a Safeway on Stanford campus? Or any of the other amenities of living—like more schools, dentists, ballet teachers, etc. Why is there not an exit off 280 that goes directly to the Stanford inner campus through Stanford land. Why is my neighborhood of College Terrace congested with Stanford traffic when Stanford has all the land in the world to move people from 280?

3. Deal making. I don't understand why Stanford was ever allowed to count dorm rooms as low income housing? Absurd! to say the least. They are not the poor. These students are getting a world class education, with the idea of making way more than a living wage. Allowing dorms to count as low income housing means that the responsibility to create housing for the people that clean the Stanford toilets and mow lawn becomes either the traffic problem or a low-income-housing problem for Palo Alto and Menlo Park. It just doesn't seem fair.

Why can't your deal making involve some really good public transportation in the form of a subway system that goes from a parking lot on 280 and 101 to the the main campus. A subway system for the entire peninsula/South Bay should be your goal when dealing with any project that involves more people.

But really what's preventing the county and the City of Palo Alto from simply saying "no" to Stanford OR to put conditions on Stanford that move the burden away from Palo Alto and Menlo Park? I'm not talking about little handouts like speed bumps in College Terrace or a soccer field on the choice piece of land that should have been low income housing. I'm talking about forcing Stanford to provide its own infrastructure and housing for those who work there—yes especially the low wage earners.

At the meeting at Mitchell Library, there was something said about upgrading a park in College Terrace. Really? And for that we get what? More cut through traffic, longer waits at the light at El Camino and Stanford Ave. The density of Mayfield Housing? Stanford deals are never good for our neighborhood.

4. Past History I am reminded of the last GUP when the Mayfield Housing Project was sold to Palo Alto by saying that there would be housing for the people of Palo Alto. What a joke. Certainly the County must have known that a housing benefit was not for real. Guess what? Looks like Mayfield will be flushed out with Stanford folks, big surprise.

So please, we don't need to get tricked yet again. Make Stanford pay the full price of expansion—not Palo Alto, not Menlo Park.

Sincerely,
Susan Wilson
College Terrace
Palo Alto

From: [Sharleen Fiddaman](#)
To: [Rader, David](#)
Subject: Stanford expansion
Date: Monday, February 13, 2017 7:43:58 PM

David Rader,

I strongly object to the massive expansion planned for Stanford campus!
I do live in Palo Alto relatively near the University.
Such development has detrimental impact on our community ...
traffic, emissions and air quality, and general land use.

Sharleen Fiddaman

From: [Jo Ann Mandinach](#)
To: [Rader, David](#)
Subject: Totally Opposed to Stanford Expansion
Date: Monday, February 13, 2017 9:31:51 PM

Dear Mr. Rader,

My partner (a Stanford graduate BS MS) and I are totally opposed to any further expansion of Stanford University and Stanford Medical Center that further undermines the quality of life in Palo Alto without any type of benefit to the community.

Charles R. Karish and I live at 1699 Middlefield Road near Embarcadero and experience the daily gridlock of so much new traffic that we now have to look out our window to see how backed up the traffic is before leaving our house on days without football games. Enough.

The traffic and air quality are already horrible and getting worse. Enough with the expansions.

Do you compensate PA residents with free or discounted events or classes for the inconveniences of traffic jams? No. So enough with the expansion unless Palo Alto taxpayers and residents see some type of personal benefit like reduced property taxes and/or free classes, discounted tours-- something.

Do to provide adequate parking for visitors to the museum or the gardens? No. They're already totally over-parked so we can't benefit from them. So enough with expansion.

If people can't park on campus, the encroach on residential neighborhoods and shopping centers so we can't conduct our daily business now so why should we approve your expansion? We don't, Enough with expansion.

Every year paid Stanford phone surveys insult our intelligence by asking which argument would be most effective in getting us to support a Stanford expansion but fail to ask if we support or oppose the expansion. We don't support it. Enough.

For years we've had to listen to our Stanford alum friends in Stanford Weekend Acres complain about broken promises re the dam and the hiking trails and how they won't go to alumni events with us because of the broken promises. Enough.

For a decade, we've been told that the expansion of the Stanford Medical Center and the university was going to benefit us/ I ask how? For years it's been increasingly time-consuming was i to get to my dentist at Welsh Road.

ENOUGH with the expansion!

Let me know if you want to expand on any of the above.

Most sincerely,
Jo Ann Mandinach
1699 Middefield Road
PA CA 94301

Jo Ann Mandinach
Need To Know Info Solutions
<http://www.needtoknow.com>
650 329-8655 or cell 650 269-0650
Palo Alto, CA 94301

From: [Jim Colton](#)
To: [Rader, David](#)
Cc: [Lydia Kou](#)
Subject: Stanford GUP
Date: Monday, February 13, 2017 10:06:07 PM

David,

My concerns about the proposed GUP are as follows:

1. As you know, traffic in Palo Alto is already a big problem. Stanford has reduced the number of trips into the campus but some of this comes about by Stanford employees and students parking in Palo Alto and finding their way into campus by a means other than driving. During rush hour, the roads around campus are near a choking point. Adding only a small percentage of cars would bring some of these roads to a complete halt. What measures are being taken to insure that the "zero net trips" in the proposed GUP doesn't result in even more Stanford people parking in Palo Alto.
2. Are there any plans for providing housing to lower-paid workers at Stanford? This is not only a traffic and parking issue, but it's simply right to consider all people involved in Stanford business.
3. There will be more children living on campus with this proposed development. Has the impact on Palo Alto schools been evaluated?

Thanks for your consideration.

Jim Colton
Georgia Avenue
Palo Alto

From: [Lenore Cymes](#)
To: [Rader, David](#)
Subject: Stanford's expansion plan
Date: Tuesday, February 14, 2017 5:31:54 PM

Dear Mr. Rader

I want to express my very HUGE concern over Stanford's latest expansion plan. Over my 50 years in Palo Alto, I have seen Stanford act like the behemoth organization it is to get what it wants. Stanford's growth does not just affect Stanford - it imposes itself on the entire neighboring communities. There is absolutely no way build millions of sq ft academic related facilities and over 3000 housing units and not overwhelm our community. Schools, air quality, cultural resources, noise, public services, construction/vehicles, transportation etc etc. No matter what they claim about mitigating all these concerns (PLUS MANY MORE) ---living and working on campus does not come with a fence around it and it will affect every person living in this city..

There is absolutely no way this type of instant huge development can avoid infecting the life of those of us living in Palo Alto. I am sure some growth is necessary for this 1st class university - HOWEVER.....slow it down..... way down to a sensible scale.

I don't have the skills to write academic reasons this project that is over the top. What I do have is abundance of common sense to understand that this will swallow up the quality of life ,we in Palo Alto, are already working hard to protect. Please put these, and so many more factors related to this project in perspective as you work with Stanford to develop their next phase of growth.

Thank you
Lenore Cymes
Palo Alto, Ca

From: [J McFall](#)
To: [Rader, David](#)
Subject: comments for inclusion in the Stanford EIR
Date: Tuesday, February 14, 2017 5:56:58 PM

Hi David-

I would like the following included for study in the EIR:

-impacts on nearby neighborhoods from vehicle traffic resulting from the project.

-impacts on street parking within adjacent neighborhoods caused by off-site parking of vehicles belonging to Stanford students, staff ,etc.

and possible mitigations to address these issues.

Thank you.

--

Jim McFall
1530 Escobita Avenue
Palo Alto, CA 94306
wmjmcfall@yahoo.com

From: [Eric Filseth](#)
To: [Rader, David](#)
Subject: Stanford GUP - EIR
Date: Wednesday, February 15, 2017 10:58:10 AM

David,

The proposed Stanford expansion is substantial – almost as much office space as the entire downtown of Palo Alto – so it makes sense for the EIR to be comprehensive. Three things I think it's important be included in the EIR are:

- 1. How many additional K-12 kids will need to be enrolled in the Palo Alto Unified School District?**
- 2. How many new jobs will be created in the new academic area?**
- 3. How much lower-income housing demand will be stimulated by the new jobs created?**

The first issue is pretty much standard practice for Stanford / PAUSD planning, but it ought to be explicitly included in the EIR.

The second issue is relevant for traffic, parking and as a contributor to housing demand in the area. Presumably more jobs will be created than housing created for them.

The third issue is a bit more complicated, but the City of Palo Alto periodically commissions “Nexus Studies” on this subject in order to determine affordable-housing development-impact fees. Essentially the idea is that creating new white-collar jobs (stem-cell research, for example) also drives demand for lower-paying support jobs, whose holders would be looking for nearby housing like everybody else; but whose needs would be specifically for affordable housing. This kind of assessment necessarily relies on a number of broad assumptions, but it probably makes sense to have one in the EIR.

Thanks very much,
Eric Filseth
160 Palo Alto Avenue, Palo Alto

From: [John Moran](#)
To: [Rader, David](#)
Cc: [Loquist, Kristina](#); Stanford2018GUP@stanford.edu
Subject: Comments on the Stanford GUP EIR
Date: Wednesday, February 15, 2017 11:18:58 AM
Attachments: [Stanford Graduate Housing Affordability Report.docx](#)

Dear Mr. Rader,

As I expressed in oral comments at the EIR scoping meeting, I have been a resident of Santa Clara County for five years and contribute over 50% of my income to on-campus graduate housing at Stanford. I represent an organization of graduate student employees who are "severely rent burdened" by Stanford as defined by U.S. HUD, and who are concerned about how the County may represent the issue of affordable housing in the "Population and Housing" section of the EIR. We are concerned that Stanford's 2018 GUP may be portrayed as alleviating the County's affordable housing crisis, rather than contributing to it.

In the "Population and Housing" section of the EIR, we would like the question of not just the number of housing units, but the cost burden of those units to the people who occupy them in relation to income, to be addressed in relation to the county's housing affordability crisis, which as we understand, is within purview of the EIR.

Because neither Stanford nor the County have made a substantial inquiry into the affordability of the housing designated as "affordable housing" on Stanford lands, a designation which will be wrongfully expanded in the proposal GUP, we have conducted a case study concerning the affordability of this housing for Stanford graduate students and graduate student employees, the only class of Santa Clara County residents who may access it. Please find this report attached. We consider this report to be professionally produced and would encourage its inclusion and citation in the EIR.

We believe both the University and County have benefited financially, and are poised to continue to benefit financially, from the wrongful designation of on-campus graduate housing at Stanford University as "affordable housing" meeting the County's RHNA obligations, while burdening the very population this California state law is meant to protect.

Thank you very much for your efforts as a public servant.

Best,

John Moran
Graduate Student Organization, Department of Anthropology

PhD candidate
Dept. of Anthropology
Stanford University

From: PHYCASSEL@aol.com
To: [Rader, David](#)
Subject: Stanford EIR scoping comments
Date: Wednesday, February 15, 2017 4:04:12 PM

RE: Scoping Comments for the EIR

Please review the demand for housing for all employees of the academic area that you are reviewing. Stanford talks about the needs of its students, faculty and academic growth and their development plans. The academic area is also a major employer of talented employees of all skill levels and they need housing.

- 1. Where do they live? How are they transported to Stanford?**
- 2. What happens if some of those employees are housed on campus or near campus?**
- 3. Is Stanford considering the needs of all its employees and the demands of those employees on the surrounding community?**

**Phyllis C. Cassel
621 Wellsbury Way
Palo Alto, CA 94306**

From: [Suzanne Keehn](#)
To: [Rader, David](#)
Subject: Stanfords Expension
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 2:09:22 PM

Thank you for taking comments from the surrounding community.

I am very concerned about more major development in the Palo Alto/Stanford area. Stanford's proposed development and growth will have huge negative impacts on Palo Alto and the surrounding environment.

Some of these major concerns are:

- Aesthetics
- Air Quality
- Cumulative Impacts
- Greenhouse gas emissions
- Growth Inducement
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Population and Housing, what about the lower income employees of Stanford?
- Impact on Schools, parks, which we already are in short supply
- Traffic and circulation,

Our community needs to be heard and best would be face to face.

Thank you,
Suzanne keehn
4076 Orme St.
Palo Alto, 94306

From: [Jennifer Wolosin](#)
To: [Rader, David](#)
Subject: Stanford EIR Feedback
Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 5:25:16 PM

To Whom it May Concern:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the scope of the Stanford EIR. I am a resident of the City of Menlo Park and Chair of Parents for Safe Routes (www.parents4saferoutes.org), a new Menlo Park community advocacy group committed to getting kids to school safely. In the less than a month since we launched, we now have over 160 concerned citizens who are united in our mission to do everything we can to make the streets safer for kids. The upcoming Stanford development and associated transportation impacts directly affect the kids in our community.

As our neighbors in Palo Alto have shown us, to have a truly successful Safe Routes to School program, a community partnership is needed. A community partnership involves the Parents, Schools and City(ies)/County (and other related jurisdictions) working together. We have learned through experience that any one group alone can not be successful in truly making a difference in Safe Routes. We are all interconnected and we all need each other.

As Parents for Safe Routes first "win", along with the Menlo Park Bicycle and Transportation Commissions, we successfully lobbied the Menlo Park City Council to make Safe Routes a priority. On February 7, 2017, the City Council voted to add a comprehensive Safe Routes program to its 2018 Work Plan. We are now continuing to make the rounds to the school districts and other key stakeholders to get more buy-in on the community partnership model. We are making great progress (last week the incoming Superintendent of the Menlo Park City School District agreed to support a community partnership as well!).

The timing couldn't be better for Stanford to join in the efforts to make our streets safe, for everyone. While the campus of Stanford may seem like an island, the regional impacts felt stretch far and wide. If Stanford really wants to keep its single occupancy vehicle trips down in the face of its rapid expansion, investments in biking and pedestrian infrastructure and the creation of true, low-stress Safe Routes, will be critical. In addition, working with neighboring jurisdictions in the spirit of cooperation is also key.

As for specific feedback, I respectfully request the following:

- Your transportation study should consider a 5-mile radius/bike commute shed and should consider the needs of bicyclists of all ages. Many Stanford employees live in Menlo Park and have children that attend our schools. It would be a huge incentive to Stanford employees to be able to bike their kids to school and then on to work. We suspect that in order for Stanford to maintain its commitment to no net new trips that bicycle investments for families will need to be made to enable parents who work at Stanford to bike to campus. It is unlikely that parents would drive their kids to school and then go home to get on their bikes. Five miles is a feasible distance to travel by bike for ordinary people without an extraordinary level of fitness.
- Consider a bicycle infrastructure improvement study that lists projects that would be needed within 5 miles of Stanford to allow for low-stress biking to campus. The study should include cost estimates for each project. The City of Los Gatos recently completed a Safe Routes study through Alta (<http://www.losgatosca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/17309>) that is an example of how to look at a bicycle network in a strategic way.
- Consider all 6 E's of Safe Routes to School in your analysis (Engineering, Enforcement, Education, Encouragement, Evaluation and Equity). While Safe Routes to School is typically thought of in the context of K-12 Education, a university campus can greatly benefit from analyzing its transportation program through the lens of Safe Routes.

The Peninsula, and the Menlo Park/Palo Alto/Stanford area is suffering greatly from a traffic crisis. We are all struggling with collective road rage and the frustration we feel on our streets is leading not only to physical danger (accidents and near misses), but a mental health crisis as well. Parents are stressed. Kids are stressed. The streets are not safe and fewer are riding their bikes and cars because of it...so traffic gets worse and the streets become less safe.

Stanford has done a great job in mitigating its traffic to date. It must continue its efforts and expand them to be part of a regional solution to our current traffic nightmare. Safe Routes is a do-able solution. We must stop the vicious cycle of single occupancy vehicle traffic on our streets.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Jen Wolosin

Parents for Safe Routes

jenwolosin@gmail.com

415-710-5838

www.parents4saferoutes.org

**Southgate Neighborhood Committee
Palo Alto, California**

c/o Tom Vlastic
1540 Mariposa Avenue
Palo Alto, California 94306

February 16, 2017

Transmitted by email: david.rader@pln.sccgov.org

County of Santa Clara Planning Office
Attention: David Rader
County Government Center
70 West Hedding Street, 7th Floor, East Wing
San Jose, CA 95110

Subject: Comments on NOP for Proposed Stanford University 2018 GUP

Dear Mr. Rader,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the subject NOP. Our committee members and our neighbors live in the Southgate Neighborhood of Palo Alto. This neighborhood is bounded by El Camino Real, Churchill Avenue, Alma Street and Park Avenue. Southgate is Stanford's immediate neighbor northeast of the University and just across El Camino Real from the DAPER/Administrative and East Campus districts of the Stanford plan area. Of the plans proposed 2,275,000 sf of new academic space and 3,150 new dwelling units (dus), 220,000 sf of the academic space and 1,600 of the dus are planned in the two districts adjacent to our neighborhood.

Southgate has been, and continues to be, impacted by traffic and parking from non-residential uses outside of, and immediately adjacent to, our part of the City of Palo Alto and this is what concerns us about the proposed 2018 GUP. We have been struggling to cope with and address the parking problems from non-residential uses and have been working with the City in this regard. Traffic on the Churchill corridor between Alma and El Camino Real is compounding each year, therefore the anticipated growth of Stanford University as set forth in the proposed 2018 GUP plan causes additional alarm within our neighborhood. We are particularly concerned with the lack of a truly verifiable plan for monitoring and dealing with off campus traffic and parking impacts, particularly when we consider the manner in which the Transportation Demand Management (TDM) plan proposals are set forth in the Stanford application. We find them inadequate and to rely on only committing to partially solving problems well after the impacts are felt by the adjacent neighborhoods.

Under section 7.1 No Net Commute Trips Goal in the plan application, we specifically request that the draft EIR fully evaluate the practical application of the proposed TDM programs, and particularly their ability to be realistically monitored and implemented to reduce potential impacts of traffic and parking to insignificant levels. There should be detailed implementation strategies for the TDM operations that, under direct Santa Clara County Planning oversight and control, require Stanford to fully address evolving off site traffic and parking problems well BEFORE they mature to significant impact levels. Specifically, these strategies should ensure verification that TDM mitigations are functioning as intended and that, for example, the TDM stipends, VTA,

Caltrain, SamTrans, carpool gas cards and other passes or subsidies issued to workers/commuters, are being used and, most importantly, achieving the intended results.

Today, modern TDM programs can incorporate technology that correlates directly to a commuter, and their public transportation activity to verify that trips into Palo Alto are based on public transit, not driving and parking adjacent to a Marguerite shuttle route in a local neighborhood. What we are suggesting will likely require a hands-on TDM management program that issues subsidies directly to Clipper Cards, gas reimbursement applications, and other trip reduction techniques that can verify transit use and commute activity.

Our concerns are underscored by comments we have heard recently from Stanford representatives about the potential for off site parking, traffic and other impacts as “not Stanford’s problem” since this is a typical issue between universities and adjacent neighborhoods. Instead, they argue that such problems should be addressed by the City of Palo Alto. Southgate objects to this conclusion, and believes that Stanford does and will contribute to increased traffic congestion in and around our neighborhood, the city and other communities and therefore should be responsible for this impact with mitigations that include clear and specific verification methods that ensure workers offered TDM programs are using public transit for the entire commute.

As a reminder, Stanford is not a public university and does not have the same relief from the discretionary review process that a California public university would. Stanford should be held accountable for its share of off site impacts as would any other private use seeking such a permit. At the same time, we recognize the many benefits that a private school like Stanford offers, and the efforts it has made relative to TDMs. Our request is that Stanford update their TDM techniques so that there is verifiable accountability so that neighbors like Southgate can be confident these programs will achieve trip reduction mitigations to fully offset potential growth impacts relative to the proposals set forth in the requested GUP application.

Again, we thank you for the opportunity to comment on the NOP and look forward to a full and complete draft EIR addressing not only our concerns, but the many other growth impact issues the 2018 GUP proposals will trigger.

Sincerely,

Southgate Neighborhood Committee:

Nancy Shepherd
Jim McFall
Christine Shambora
Keith Ferrell
Tom Vlasic



Signed by Tom Vlasic on behalf of the Southgate Neighborhood Committee

cc. Palo Alto City Council

From: [Steve](#)
To: [Rader, David](#)
Cc: fbalin@gmail.com; [doria s](#); [Ed Schmitt](#)
Subject: Re: Stanford 2018 GUP EIR
Date: Friday, February 17, 2017 2:20:50 PM

February 17, 2017

Dear Mr. Rader,

We the undersigned long-term residents of College Terrace in Palo Alto, a neighborhood bordered by Stanford lands on three sides, including the academic campus via Stanford Avenue (from El Camino Real to Amherst Street), and extremely susceptible and vulnerable to negative impacts from increased traffic from campus along Stanford Avenue, as well as cut-through traffic in the neighborhood, request the following with regard to how the GUP EIR transportation and traffic section is conducted:

1. Conduct a baseline count of current vehicle traffic over a Tuesday-to-Friday 3-day period, of expected normal weekday vehicular usage, covering all directional flows at the following Stanford Avenue curb cuts:
 1. Yale Street, 4-way intersection
 2. Wellesley Street, 4-way intersection
 3. Oberlin Street, 4 way intersection
 4. Harvard Street, 3- way intersection
 5. Escondido Road, 3-way intersection
 6. Dartmouth Street, 3 way intersection
 7. Bowdoin Street, 3 way intersection
2. Provide College Terrace Residents' Association with a work plan of how the College Terrace neighborhood traffic study is to be conducted in the EIR so that a resident expert team selected by the CTRA board can review, comment, and come mutual final agreement on the document.
3. Hire a respected, independent traffic analysis peer reviewer to assess the assumptions, projections, and conclusions in the traffic and transportation EIR as it relates to College Terrace. (The neighborhood can provide one or more recommendations.)
4. Evaluate the potential positive impacts on College Terrace traffic obtainable by enhancing the capacity of Campus Drive east of Junipero Serra Blvd and by disincentivizing the use of the Bowdoin Ave entrance into campus via a FastPass-based entry fee. (Such as system could accommodate local Stanford leasehold users as well as off-peak entries and exits.)

Incorporating these components into the traffic analysis of EIR of the Stanford 2018 GUP proposal will enhance neighborhood confidence at a time of calamitous traffic increases elsewhere in the city and provide a sound basis for future mitigations that may be required to protect College Terrace.

Thank you,
Steve Woodward
Fred Balin
Doria Summa
Ed Schmitt

From: [Steve](#)
To: [Rader, David](#); [doria.s](#)
Subject: 2018 Stanford GUP EIR
Date: Friday, February 17, 2017 2:26:33 PM

Dear Mr. Rader,

We the undersigned request that the EIR consider whether and how the GUP process could accelerate electrification of Caltrain and require all "baby bullet" trains to stop at both University and California Avenues. We believe these developments would enhance the use of mass transit by employees of Stanford University and Stanford Research Park.

Doria Summa
Steven Woodward

From: [Fred Balin](#)
To: [Rader, David](#)
Cc: [Steve Woodward](#)
Subject: GUP 2018 Scoping Comments
Date: Friday, February 17, 2017 4:20:41 PM

Dave,

This comments are in addition to the two emails submitted by neighbor Steve Woodward (yesterday and today) and of which I am a co-signer.

-Fred Balin
2385 Columbia Street
Palo Alto, CA 94306

GUP 2018 EIR Scoping Input

1a. What is the additional number of people that Stanford plans to have as students and hires as per the GUP 2018 proposal?

What will be the cumulative totals, including those from the GUP 2018 proposal?

1b. Break down all totals above into categories of undergraduates, graduate students, post-doctorates, faculty, staff working usual business hours, and staff working other than usual business hours?

1c. How many people will be housed on campus (both in GUP 2018 and cumulative)?

1d. How many people housed on campus will be children, for the purpose of better determining impacts on neighboring public facilities

2a. What will be the mix of housing (both in GUP 2018 and cumulative) for each category in #1

2b. Define the terms “beds” and “units” and how they used?

3a. Provide the current overall jobs to housing ratio on campus, in each employment category in #1

3b. What will be the jobs to housing ratio on campus for each employment category in #1 for the GUP 2018 growth additions and the cumulative totals?

4a. Examine the results of the GUP 2000 EIR and carefully determine the accuracy of projections made at the time and whether mitigations specified in GUP 2000 adequately addressed those impacts. If not, explain how and determine why?

4b. In detail, review GUP 2000 Condition Section I. 2, which begins:

"Stanford shall dedicate easements for, develop, and maintain the portions of the two trail alignments which cross Stanford lands ... "

Determine if the end result fulfilled the intent and spirit of this condition. Explain clearly why or why not.

Describe what additional protections should be included in GUP 2018 to prevent a repeat of the problems of interpretation of this section of GUP 2000

5. The major check on potential development in the Foothills District will expire midway through GUP 2018. Growth projections in Stanford's 2000 Community Plan indicate that both the constraint of 17,300,000 sf of building area of academic and support facilities and student housing as well as its co-condition in the community plan (Page 16, Policy SCP-GD2) to retain the current academic growth boundary, will expire in 2025.

It is essential that the GUP 2018 EIR determine a "maximum build out" or "maximum carrying capacity" for the Stanford academic campus so the public, governmental agencies, and the university can adequately address the community's desire for uninterrupted and permanent or very long term protections for the Foothills District.

6a. Obtain a current, accurate, baseline of traffic in areas around the campus using actual counts

6b. Extend the areas of the baseline beyond the typical Level of Service intersections to key entry points in surrounding neighborhoods.

6c. Extend the baseline traffic analysis to cover non-peak hours.

6d. Obtain expert, independent, third party review of (a) the traffic and transportation analysis work plan, and (b) the final projections and conclusions made in the draft report/analysis.

6e Fully determine any additional impacts in off-campus traffic and transportation against various growth scenarios.

##

From: [Penny Ellson](#)
To: [Rader, David](#)
Subject: 2018 Stanford GUP Scoping Comments
Date: Friday, February 17, 2017 4:48:47 PM
Importance: High

Dear Mr. Rader,

Here are my comments on the 2018 Stanford GUP Application. Kindly confirm receipt by deadline.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Penny Ellson
513 El Capitan Place
Palo Alto, CA 94306

2018 Stanford GUP Scoping Comments February 17, 2017

Suggested Routes to School & The GUP

P. 35, Tab 3- of the Project Description refers to the recommendations in the Palo Alto Suggested Routes to School Walk & Roll Maps (incorrectly called Walkabout maps). It mentions a few improvements for Nixon and Escondido Elementary School routes on Stanford land. The EIR should go further and look at the following additional potential areas of school route improvements for these two schools, and connections from Stanford residences to Gunn High School, Barron Park Elementary School, and Terman as well. Please consider that these improvements also will improve the comfort and safety of bike commute routes for Stanford employees, faculty and students.

1). Please study connections to Gunn High School, Barron Park Elementary School, and Terman via the Bol Park Path. The City of Palo Alto (CoPA) is in process of improving Bol Park Path to create a more comfortable multi-use trail. This seems an appropriate time to improve the Stanford connections to this city facility--especially because Stanford-affiliated residents are now attending Barron Park Elementary School, Gunn High School and Terman Middle School.

Consider the Hanover /Page Mill intersection. Note that bike lanes are incomplete along the Hanover route. Parents (and other bike commuters) complain about conflicts with motor vehicles at driveway entrances along the sidewalk along Hanover between California Ave and the entrance to the bike path to get to the park path and Matadero/Laguna Ave. Safety is a problem for bike commuters and pedestrians of all ages in this area and makes this important connection an unattractive link in the bike network that serves Stanford campus residents, faculty and staff, discouraging bike commutes.

2). Study the Peter Coutts/Nixon/Raimundo connection to the Nixon Elementary School path. At this location, young children (and adult foot-powered commuters) cross a wide intersection with auto speeds over 30mph, a safety problem that has been exacerbated by higher auto volumes related to growth from the last GUP. Again, this is a bike/pedestrian

connection with great potential, but its usefulness is weakened by safety concerns.

3). Questions re: student busing—The PAUSD bus that picks up students at Nixon to go to Terman has a wait list. Consider how Stanford’s existing bus/shuttle service might augment PAUSD service for Stanford–affiliated PAUSD students to reduce morning school commute auto trips across the cordoned area.

4). Please study a 5-mile radius/bike commute shed and consider the needs of bicyclists of all ages and abilities. Consider bike/pedestrian network improvements that would enable local Stanford employees to bike their children to school and then bike commute to campus. Work with City of Palo Alto Safe Routes to School staff to identify the best ways to engage more PAUSD parents who are Stanford employees to tag a work commute onto their daily school commute and improve Stanford’s bicycle mode share.

No Net New Commute Trips Goal

Though Stanford’s trip reduction program is greatly appreciated, community members observe Stanford traffic increasing much more than the cordon count indicates. Here are some things the EIR might study to understand why and to identify more appropriate mitigations.

1). Zero Net New Trips: Loopholes Prevent Accurate Counts

There are loopholes in the cordon count process. Stanford has surveyed employees to find out their arrival/departure times. They adjust employee schedules so car trips won’t be captured by peak hour counts. Further, when Stanford is concerned about missing their goals, Stanford sends emails asking people to change their behavior for a day. Everyone in town knows this goes on because we all have Stanford-affiliated friends.

Here are some suggested changes to eliminate these loopholes:

- The counts might happen randomly without informing Stanford in advance so they can’t “warn” commuters and a more accurate count will be taken.
- Cordon counts should be done throughout the day, not just am/pm peak hours, in order to capture all Stanford-generated car trips. (Congestion is no longer a problem limited to am/pm peak periods in Palo Alto, and afternoon auto commutes create risk for school commuting children.) This practice would support SCP-C7-Reduce auto travel in non-commute hours/directions.

2). Zero Net New Trips: Drivers Split the Trip to Game the System

At the recent Mitchell Park Community Meeting re: 2018 GUP Scoping a resident noted that she observes people parking in her neighborhood to pick up the Stanford Marguerite at El Camino to get to Stanford. These car trips are not included in the cordon count, but they are generated by Stanford and they impact Palo Alto.

- Please study this phenomenon in areas served by the Marguerite and other transit to understand how the cordon counting system could be augmented to capture all car trips in/out of town with Stanford as journey origin/destination—whether or not the car reaches the cordon area.
- In addition, consider the parking impacts of this practice and insure compliance with SCP-C6--Regulate parking supply while avoiding spillover.

AGB: Considering Long-Term Implications of Growth

The current proposal does not request any change to the Academic Growth Boundary, nor does it discuss any future plan for when the 25-year AGB period expires.

- Please study and discuss the potential benefits and impacts on both the university and surrounding community of moving the AGB. What is Stanford’s future intent with regard to preservation of open space?

“Flattening” Mode Shift: Mitigation of Future Growth

Is it realistic to assume that a specific growth rate since 1960 (200ksf/year) can or should be maintained? Note: The growth rate from 1875 to 1960 was significantly lower (52ksf), so it is not correct to characterize recent growth as Stanford’s “historic growth rate.”

- Stanford’s own documents acknowledge that results of their car trip reduction efforts are “flattening”. Please quantify that trend and study how the “flattening” of Stanford’s trip reduction results will affect mitigation of transportation impacts of future growth, including growth proposed in the 2018 GUP application. Should growth rate be reconsidered if mode shift is less robust? What additional transportation mitigations might be necessary.

Affordable Housing Subsidy

On page 3.41 (last paragraph) of the Project Description Stanford proposes eliminating the 6-mile radius limit on where Stanford Affordable Housing Fund mitigation dollars can be spent. This proposed change could divert housing funds to communities that are more distant from Stanford where the university’s impacts are far less acute—reducing the efficacy of the subsidy as a mitigation for campus growth.

Eliminating the 6-mile limit would give power to the SCC Board to divert housing funds from communities abutting Stanford which are most acutely impacted by campus population growth and traffic. Without the 6-mile limit, they could spend that money much farther afield—with no limit on distance from Stanford. This is unacceptable. Central-county controlled VTA is already cutting local fixed bus lines in City of Palo Alto areas with potential for affordable housing development. If the 6-mile radius limit is eliminated, this will leave in place only the “high quality transit corridor” limit which could result in Stanford Affordable Housing funds being diverted to communities where the money will do little to mitigate acute Stanford-generated housing and transportation problems in communities abutting the university.

- Please study how this proposed change could impact affordable housing development in close proximity to Stanford where commuters have multiple alternatives to driving—not just transit.
- How might a longer transit commute impact Stanford commuters’ decisions to choose alternative transportation or drive?
- Study what radius limit is appropriate based on trip reduction performance against the university’s transportation goals.
- Specifically, how might housing distance from campus affect commuter choices and trip reduction efforts toward mode shift? One example to consider: Many Stanford commuters say that they do not use transit because they have to combine trips to drop children at day care or school and run errands en route to work and home. They cannot do this with transit.
- This very significant change was dropped into the application as a one-liner with no explanation or substantive discussion. What is Stanford’s objective in proposing this change?

Population & Housing.

The application provides an incomplete picture of what percentage of undergraduates, graduate students (including PhDs), post doctoral students, faculty, on-campus staff, and non-matriculated students will be housed on campus. Please clarify these numbers for each of these categories.

Parking Supply Reserve

If there has been and will be no net new trips, why does Stanford need more parking? Please study and explain.

Intersection LOS For All Modes

Please look at potential impacts on intersections in the southern portion of Palo Alto and other outlying areas of Palo Alto, especially along El Camino and Foothill Expressway and Alma Expressway. Trips don't simply appear at the campus border. Many drivers travel through this part of town to get to Stanford.

Thank you for considering my comments.



Stanford Coalition for Planning an Equitable 2035
Stanford University

TO: David Rader, Santa Clara County Planning Office

FROM: Stanford Coalition for Planning an Equitable 2035

SUBJECT: Stanford GUP Environmental Impact Report Scope

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the scope of the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the 2018 Stanford General Use Permit (GUP). As University students, affiliates, and community members, we value community-informed, equitable development. Insofar as this objective can be realized through the EIR, SCOPE 2035 requests that the County consider the following potential impacts:

Comment 1: Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Although Stanford has made significant contributions to environmental sustainability in the past, it is more important now than ever before for Stanford to accelerate its pioneering leadership on climate action. Due to the growing urgency and magnitude of global climate change impacts and the simultaneous lack of initiative from the federal government, the situation demands that more stringent greenhouse gas mitigation measures be considered for the 2018 GUP. The 2018 GUP Application projects that Stanford will meet the BAAQMD CEQA threshold of significance of 2.7 metric tons of CO₂ equivalent per service population by 2030¹; however, the goal of California’s Senate Bill 32 is to reduce absolute emissions to 40% below 1990 levels in 2030. As a responsible leader in the California community, Stanford must contribute to these goals by reducing its own emissions at a comparable or more aggressive rate regardless of increased population. Therefore, the university should reduce greenhouse gas emissions by at least 40% from its own 1990 levels by 2030². Based on the GHG estimates provided in Tab 9A of the GUP Application, and information from Stanford’s Energy and Climate Plan concerning the University’s 1990 emissions, Stanford is only projected to reduce emissions by less than 25% from 1990 levels in 2030. For these reasons, it is important that Stanford pursue significantly more aggressive mitigation goals as part of its development strategy.

Comment 1a. The Coalition requests that the EIR evaluate the greenhouse gas emissions estimates provided by Stanford in Tab 9a of the 2018 GUP Application document to ensure accuracy.

¹<http://www.baaqmd.gov/~media/files/planning-and-research/ceqa/proposed-thresholds-of-significance-dec-7-09.pdf?la=en>

²https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201520160SB32

The Coalition requests that the EIR evaluate the greenhouse gas emissions estimates provided by Stanford in Tab 9a of the 2018 GUP Application document to ensure their accuracy. Tab 9a of the application (page 57) estimates that in 2018, Stanford's annual emissions will be equivalent to 136,555 metric tons with emissions decreasing to 125,620 metric tons in 2030. However, these projections do not correspond to the estimates provided on page 11 of Stanford's Energy and Climate Plan which demonstrate emissions in 2017 to be well below 100,000 metric tons; informal estimates provided by the Office of Sustainability are in accordance with the Energy and Climate Plan. We thus request that the EIR conduct a comprehensive analysis of Stanford's emissions to clarify this inconsistency.

The analysis for the estimates should include the largest scope of emission pathways due to university related activities, including not just direct emissions from new construction, but also increased airline travel and other university events, services and programs enabled by the new construction. Additionally, the EIR should identify channels of carbon leakage due to energy conservation policies and programs. Specific concerns include, but are not limited to, changes in market electricity demand and pricing due to investment in renewable energy production (i.e. Stanford Solar Farm and roof-top solar) and the displacement of emissions due to the electrification of the Marguerite transit system.

Comment 1b. The Coalition requests that the EIR evaluate the two possibilities of Stanford reducing its emissions to 40% below its 1990 levels by 2030 AND adopting a policy of carbon neutrality for all new construction.

As demonstrated, Stanford must pursue more aggressive emission reductions. The Coalition requests that the EIR evaluate the feasibility of Stanford reducing its annual GHG release to 40% below its 1990 emissions by 2030 at the minimum.

We also propose that the EIR evaluate the feasibility of Stanford adopting a policy of carbon neutrality for all new construction to meet this goal within the scope of the GUP framework. We propose that all building projects be carbon neutral through the entire life cycle, including construction, material extraction/ processing/transportation, use phase and demolition (scope 1, 2 and 3 emissions). This evaluation should address the economic burden to the university, as well as the social and environmental impacts that would be mitigated.³

Comment 1c. To facilitate Stanford's efforts in reducing future greenhouse gas emissions, the Coalition requests that the EIR investigate mitigation strategies for offsetting emissions resulting from new construction.

To facilitate Stanford's efforts in reducing future greenhouse gas emissions, the Coalition requests that the EIR investigate mitigation strategies for offsetting emissions that are the result of new construction. Yale University recently conducted a campus carbon tax pilot program to study the comparative results of various pricing programs. The study found that the most successful program reduced emissions from baseline values by 10.8% on average, with some buildings reducing emissions by up to 33%⁴. Given the feasibility of a university carbon tax as demonstrated by the study, the EIR should investigate various approaches to a carbon pricing program including revenue neutral and non-revenue neutral strategies, a range of CO₂ equivalent charging rates, and various channels for utilizing the tax revenues. It should also look into the impact of any such measure on students of different socioeconomic statuses.

³ 2016 CEQA Statutes and Guidelines Article 9, Section 15131 "Economic and Social Effects"

⁴http://carbon.yale.edu/sites/default/files/files/Carbon_Charge_Pilot_Report_20161010.pdf

Additionally, the EIR should investigate the possibility and challenges of utilizing carbon offsets and renewable energy credits to neutralize emissions. Carbon offsets often face obstacles such as ambivalent efficacy and carbon leakage; therefore, the EIR should examine pathways to ascertain and quantify the benefits and drawbacks. For example, the EIR might consider third-party carbon offset rating systems and an economic model for the impacts of large-scale, off site renewable energy projects.

Although the University has incorporated some successful low carbon buildings into its campus, such as the LEED platinum rated Y2E2 and the Knight Management Center, many recent building projects have not incorporated energy efficient and high performance design strategies. One example is the the graduate residence Lyman Hall, which fails to take advantage of building orientation strategies to minimize heating and cooling loads. Therefore, it would be useful if the EIR evaluated the economic and environmental benefits of a variety of these design strategies. Some examples include passive solar design, integrated building systems, smart monitoring and sensors, and night cooling, among many other options.

Comment 2: Transportation and Housing

Through 2035, Stanford has proposed a 9,188 person increase in the University's population, of which at least 6,288 are expected to be employees. With the addition of its proposed 3,150 residential units through 2035, the University would have 6,038 new members of the population living off campus. We would expect this to subpopulation to significantly contribute to the traffic congestion of the area, to the University's emissions and total vehicle miles traveled, and to the burden on public transit.

Of particular import for the impact of the University's development on emissions and the public transit system is the consequent increase in very low and low-income workers in the area. Using data from the ACS and IPEDS, we've estimated a lower bound of 1,193 very low or low-income households (2,192 if graduate students are included) will be added to the area over the next 18 years.

Given that of the total 3,150 new housing units Stanford has proposed, 550 will be allocated to staff/faculty and approximately 900 will be allocated to graduate students, at least 742 very low or low-income households will still need to reside off campus even in the most optimistic scenario where all 550 proposed staff/faculty units will be allocated to very low or low-income employees. These off-campus residents are likely to have significant impacts on emissions, traffic, and the public transit system. Though not a perfect proxy for rental information, Plan Bay Area provides some information on the location of affordable housing in the Bay. Although a small amount exists in the affordable range in East Palo Alto, the remainder is in San Jose or farther. These workers will need to commute by car, thereby contributing to the congestion of regional traffic, or by public transit, contributing to the disrepair and overcrowding already burdening public transit systems.

In order to ensure that the above points are adequately addressed, the Coalition requests that that the Environmental Impact Report look into the following:

Comment 2a. In its efforts to reduce traffic congestion during peak hours, as well as in reducing total greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, the Coalition requests that Stanford be accountable for all twelve employment categories identified in its Transportation Impact Analysis. We request that Stanford reports, and that the EIR considers, relevant data for all twelve populations.

Subcontracted workers, such as third party contractors, janitorial contractors, construction contractors as well as casual, contingent, and temporary employees, account for nearly a third of off-campus trips, and by the analysis conducted by Fehr & Peers, Third Party Contractors, Janitorial Shift Workers, and Construction workers have the highest VMT per capita among all Stanford workers (23.1 miles / capita)⁵. In terms of GHG emissions, casual, contingent, and temporary employees make up 11.9% of the university's total off-campus (Worker) trip emissions, while third party contractors, janitorial shift workers, and construction make up 15.5%, according to the Greenhouse Gases Technical Report Tab.

However, we note that Stanford does not include these categories of workers in many of its Transportation Demand Management (TDM) programs to decrease GHG emissions and vehicle miles traveled (VMT). For example, all of these positions are not eligible for the transportation benefits programs that incentivize lower emission trips, such as the GoPass⁶ and the VTA Eco Pass⁷. Without extending the transportation benefit program to these two groups of workers, Stanford neglects the opportunity to decrease the emissions from 27.4% of off-campus trips.

In addition, as noted in the VMT analysis tab of the GUP application, Stanford does not survey the needs, behaviors, and preferences of workers hired by "third party contractors, janitorial contractors and construction contractors" in its annual P&TS Commuter Survey. We find this particularly concerning, since this forces the VMT and GHG analyses to use proxy data for Commute Mode choice, Vehicle Occupancy, Trip Length, and Commute Frequency, which is likely less accurate. The VMT Analysis notes that available traffic models from MTC and VTA used in the analysis "do not accurately represent travel characteristics at Stanford." It seems that countywide data would similarly misrepresent the actual travel characteristics for this particular class of employees. We ask for the EIR to collect Stanford-specific information for these workers, rather than rely on less-accurate regional data.

In addition, we have found that this group of workers are often given later shifts that do not correspond to peak hour commute times. Given the lack of data from P&TS on shift times and commuting behaviors of this group of workers, it is difficult to assess their contribution to worker VMT.

More generally, without information regarding subcontracted workers in the transportation needs survey, Stanford has insufficient data to accurately design transit programs, such as commuter bus services, GHG reduction initiatives, and VMT reduction incentives. We ask that the EIR require Stanford to report on these numbers. In the Transportation Impact Analysis Part I of Stanford's GUP application, it is claimed that Stanford is considering the expansion of "commuter bus service" and "local Marguerite shuttle service" by identifying "employee transit markets" that would benefit from commuter bus services. Stanford must ensure that in its analysis of the relevant "employee transit markets" that it includes all Stanford employees, including those employed by outside contractors. Otherwise, this analysis is incomplete, leaving room for error in estimating the needs for commuter bus services.

Finally, we request a report on the locations that all workers in each of the 12 employment categories are traveling from, as well as a report on the TDM programs that are available and accessible to these workers, including free and reduced price passes, vanpool services, etc. Included in this analysis should be a study of workers' preferences for the most accessible transportation options.

⁵ https://www.sccgov.org/sites/dpd/DocsForms/Documents/SU_2018GUP_App_Tab8_VMT.pdf

⁶ <https://transportation.stanford.edu/transit/free-transit-incentives/caltrain-go-pass/eligibility>

⁷ <https://transportation.stanford.edu/transit/free-transit-and-incentives/vta-eco-pass>

Comment 2b. The Coalition requests that the county consider a transportation analysis that includes Vehicle Miles Traveled disaggregated by income and number of children.

Stanford's proposed development of on-campus housing for University employees is likely to significantly increase traffic congestion, University emissions, and the burden on public transit. In order to understand the environmental impact of the population growth created by the new development, and given high price of housing in the areas surrounding Stanford University land, VMT will likely differ based income. In order to fully understand the resulting VMT impact from proposed development, a commute analysis of Stanford University employees and students of all income levels should be assessed, and VMT should be calculated accordingly. Furthermore, the VMT assessment performed should include trips outside peak hours, when many low-income workers commute to and from campus.

Comment 2c. The Coalition requests that the EIR consider the alternative of providing more homes on-campus for Stanford staff and workers, particularly pertaining to the 12 employment groups included in the projected population increase.

As lower income employees may need to live further from the Stanford University campus due to the high price of buying or renting housing near Stanford campus (to the extent that efficient public transit may not be an option), the housing of more employees on campus may result in a significantly lower VMT rate.

We ask for more explicit data in regards to the potential VMT and GHG savings for new on-campus housing for employees. The Transportation Impact Analysis Part I notes that "While new on campus housing generates some new peak hour, peak direction trips, that residential trip generation is more than offset by the decrease in non-residential peak direction trips during the peak commute period." As a result, we believe that on-campus staff housing may yield significant GHG and VMT reductions. The EIR should quantify the total trip counts, VMT, and GHG reductions that would result from producing on-campus housing for each of the 12 employer categories.

Comment 2d. By 2035, Stanford is projected to bring in 7,901 persons who will be affiliated or employed by the University but live off campus. The Coalition requests that the EIR consider the impact of these affiliates in displacement, both as it pertains to significant physical impacts on the environment and public health. We request 1) that the EIR make public the costs of both increased prices and displacement, disaggregated by income and household size, 2) that the EIR includes both a Nexus study and market analysis to evaluate these costs.

Stanford's proposed development has the potential to displace local residents and raise area rents. Over the course of the next 18 years, Stanford's proposal will bring many people to the area whose impacts on the area's already-tight housing market need to be identified and mitigated. In addition to the 6,038 employees for whom the University is not proposing to provide housing for on campus, each year, some fraction of the proposed 2,900 new students brought to, and graduated from, the University every year will remain in the area. Assuming that, as was true of the class of 2014, 13.59% of students remain in the Bay Area after graduation each year through 2035, and that the distribution of students post-graduation matches the population distribution of the Bay Area, then 3.57% of students will remain in Santa Clara County each year.⁸ With the proposed additional 2,900 students per year, this

⁸ Census and CDC

results in a cumulative 1,863 persons brought to reside in the county over the next 18 years.

All of these 7,901 persons residing off-campus will require housing. Aside from the responsibility Stanford has to ensuring these people are housed (a point tangential to the EIR), it is obliged to mitigate the effect of the new residents on the area's housing physical development. All of these 7,901 persons residing off-campus will require housing. Aside from the responsibility Stanford has to ensuring these people are housed (a point tangential to the EIR), it is obliged to mitigate the effect of the new residents on the area's housing market. In the language of economics, they represent increased demand for housing across different segments of the market (in rough proportion, we imagine, to the income distribution of the group). Given that housing supply elasticities in the area are some of the highest in the country, we would expect to see this pressure manifest as a significant increase in the price of renting and owning a home for those segments of the market experiencing increased demand.⁹ Some will be able to bear the increased cost, but some will not and will be forced to relocate. We enjoin the County to account for the costs of both increased prices and displacement across the 7,901 persons we estimate will make this region home as a result of Stanford's proposed development.

Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines requires the environmental analysis of a project to consider whether it would displace substantial numbers of existing housing or people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

Additionally, CEQA Section 15126.2 states that an EIR must address the "health and safety problems caused by the physical changes," including "changes induced in population distribution, population concentration, the human use of the land." There is precedent for the public health impacts of displacement to be considered under this guideline. These impacts include: psychological stress, fear, and insecurity caused by eviction; substandard living conditions because of limited affordable replacement housing; food insecurity or hunger caused by increased rent burdens; and loss of supportive social networks owing to displacement. Given the multitude of empirical studies that document the negative health impacts of displacement, and the high possibility for displacement of low-income families the current Bay Area housing market, we request that the EIR analyze the number of people displaced by added University affiliates, the physical environmental impacts of such displacement, and the negative public health impacts of displacement.

Comment 2e. The Coalition requests that the EIR consider the acute chronic health effects of lead paint and air quality reductions related to both renovation and new construction, especially as it pertains to resident and worker safety.

The Coalition requests that the EIR consider the acute chronic health effects, such as, the exposure to lead, for construction workers and residents of new units. There is significant cause to believe that the Escondido Village area of campus has in the past been coated with at least two layers of lead paint, with the potential for runoff into soil.¹⁰ We ask that the EIR conduct soil testing for hazardous materials on campus, particularly lead, and make previous soil testing data publicly accessible.

Has there ever been a case in EV of elevated blood lead levels since 1960? What are the results of blood lead tests? If the University does not know, then fund a study to review the county medical records (records are held by State of California and publicly available though in a raw data format).

⁹Saiz 1284

¹⁰ Stanford Daily, *Construction in 2013 exposed Escondido Village residents and workers to lead*.

We additionally request that the EIR measure the adverse health effects of the proposed construction on workers and nearby residents, particularly children. Children are a sensitive and vulnerable population, whose bodies and brains are rapidly developing and should be protected from unsafe exposure to contaminants.

Comment 2f. The Coalition requests that the EIR consider the role of facilities on diversity.

A recurring theme is the need for Stanford to execute on their promise to support students with children through all stages of life, from deciding to have children, to care for infants, to activities for older children. We see a correlation between students from diverse backgrounds and students with children. Increasing diversity in the student body will increase the need for family housing. For example, women in academia are underrepresented. When women are equally represented in the tenure track pipeline - facilities relating to children will be insufficient such as childcare, housing, and lactation rooms. Additionally, both undergraduate and graduate students with children from a variety of backgrounds, experiences and ages provide important perspectives and contributions to Stanford as an intellectual and social community. As a result, maintaining housing for students with children is essential for continuing to build a more diverse student body. Only half of housing for students with children is occupied by students with children. This is a failure of the University to achieve the diversity that would regularly fill that housing.

Questions that SCoPE has on this issue for the EIR include:

- Off campus students with children
 - How many students are forced out before they finish their degree?
 - Can Stanford identify the population of students with children?
 - How to subsidize housing students ineligible for housing on-campus.
- Housing units forecast
 - Inclusion/access to housing for university staff
 - Is the current student body served by the housing units? (it is not)
 - What evidence of a connection between diversity and housing? (agree there is)
 - Is there a connection between background and the number of children?
 - A housing plan with the projected ramp to diversity (i.e. double over five years)
 - What prevents Stanford from collecting data on diversity? (groups are on this)
 - Does Stanford have data on housing eligibility?
 - A written statement with the units analysis and R&DE commitment to supporting students with children would help us know these priorities will be maintained.

Comment 3: Impacts on External Communities

Stanford's actions have impacts that reach far beyond its boundaries. In the 2018 General Use Permit application letter, Associate Vice President Catherine Palter asserts that the "flexibility with accountability" regulatory framework established by the 2000 General Use Permit has worked well.¹¹ Stanford University has stated their commitment to be held accountable for impacts that it creates and will consider ways to mitigate negative effects on the surrounding community. The members of the Stanford community are spread far and wide across the Bay Area and even as far as the Central Valley.¹² Moreover, development impacts issues and services that are regional in nature: housing, transportation, public services, etc. We acknowledge that the EIR process is limited to Santa Clara

¹¹ 2018 General Use Permit Application, *Tab 1: Transmittal Letter*

¹² KQED News, *Long Commute to Silicon Valley Increasingly the Norm for Many*

County, and encourage the county to further examine how Stanford impacts all of Santa Clara County. Rather than limiting the scope to a certain radius within Stanford lands, we must also look at the impacts in communities such as San Jose and Sunnyvale. In order to ensure that the above points are adequately addressed, the Coalition requests that the Environmental Impact Report look into the following:

Comment 3a. The Coalition requests that the EIR examine the impact on services of employees in all twelve employment categories (identified in its Transportation Impact Analysis) who live within Santa Clara County but outside the direct radius of the University.

According to Section 15064 (d)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines, the environmental impact review must address indirect physical change in the environment that is induced by a direct physical change in the environment caused by the General Use Permit. In this case, the development of new housing and academic buildings is a direct physical change that will also lead indirectly to population growth and physical development in other parts of the county, since Stanford is unable to house all of its affiliates. In addition to the analysis requested in Comments (2a) and (2e), the EIR must consider the projected services impact that these families and those of other Stanford-affiliated workers have on other localities within the county in which they live. This must include impact on schools, affordable housing, public transportation services, and child care, in the same way this impact is analyzed within a direct radius of campus for families living in University housing. This analysis should consider employees in all twelve employment categories identified in its Transportation Impact Analysis.

Comment 3b. The Coalition requests that the EIR assess the impacts of Stanford's development on transportation infrastructure outside of Stanford's borders.

According to Section 15064 (d)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines, the EIR should address indirect impacts resulting from direct impacts of the project. In this case, increases in academic development will lead to more jobs at Stanford University than the increase in housing will accommodate. Therefore, an indirect impact would be the population growth in Santa Clara County outside of Stanford University, and the associated impact on the transportation infrastructure by workers of all categories who commute to Stanford. Santa Clara County should determine how these additional commutes will place an increased strain on bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure, complete streets, and public transportation within Santa Clara County.

Comment 3c. The Coalition requests that the EIR assess Stanford's childcare needs and provided facilities to determine whether there is a significant increased impact of proposed development.

Stanford will be building a net increase in child care centers and facilities due to the General Use Permit. However, according to Section 15130 of CEQA Guidelines, the environmental impact report should also consider cumulative impacts. Santa Clara County should consider the cumulative impact of the 2000 General Use Permit and the 2018 General Use Permit by including the current level of services provided by the child care centers and facilities in its analysis to determine whether Stanford is adequately addressing the need for child care generated by its development. We would like to see the county analyze the historical and project need for childcare generated by Stanford and determine a standard for what is considered sufficient childcare provision. We would also like the county to determine whether Stanford is providing adequate community services in the form of childcare and if they are not, how much of a strain is placed on nearby communities' child care facilities.

Thank you very much for taking these comments into consideration.

Student Group Endorsements

SSS (Students for a Sustainable Stanford)
FFS (Fossil Free Stanford)
MEChA (Movimiento Estudiantil Chicano de Aztlán)
SALA (Student and Labor Alliance)
AASA (Asian American Student Association)
SAAAC (Stanford Asian American Activism Committee)
Stanford NAACP (National Association for the Advancement of Colored People)
SAIO (Stanford American Indian Organization)
Resource Generation
Engineers for a Sustainable World

Individual Endorsements

Forest Peterson (CEE PhDc '17)
Emma Walker-Silverman (BA Psychology '17)
Kevin Keene (M.S., Civil Engineering)
Carl Hoiland (Ph.D. Candidate, Geological Sciences)
Arnaud Dusser (MS CEE '17)
Sierra Garcia (B.S. Earth Systems '18)
Co Tran (BA History '17)
Robert Young (BS Electrical Engineering '18)
Samuel Maull (PhD Anthropology '19)
Vivian Yan (Graduate)
Tyler Pullen (M.S. Sustainable Design and Construction '18)
Steven Cheng (2019)
Emma Fisher (BS Earth Systems '17)
Simone Speizer (class of 2020)
Erin Pang (B.S. Earth Systems '18)
Roxa Meyer (BS Physics '19)
Adam O'Regan (Class of 2020)
Joe R. C. Sponsler (BS Materials Science and Engineering '20)
Miranda Vogt (2019)
Christina Li (BS computer science 2020)
Emily Wilson (Freshman)
Sneha Ayyagari (17)
Carlos Ciudad-Real (BS Civil Engineering '20)
Eva Borgwardt (2019)
Sharon Tseng (B.S. Electrical Engineering '17)
Derek Ouyang (Lecturer, Department of Civil & Environmental Engineering)
Kimiko Estella Hirota (2020)

Justin Briggs (PhD Applied Physics '17)
Deirdre Paula Francks (2020)
Kirin Furst (PhD Civil & Environmental Engineering '20)
Elizabeth Andruszkiewicz (Current PhD Student - CEE)
Justin Alexander Wilck (20)
Yesid Antonio Castro Calle (BA Linguistics '17)
Tanvi Gambhir (2018)
Terence Zhao (Urban Studies '19)
Dr. Selby Wynn Schwartz (Lecturer, Program in Writing and Rhetoric)
Emily Nguyen (BA Human Biology '17)
Jack Lane (BS Earth Systems '17)
Jason Li (BA Human Biology '18)
Lily Zheng (BA Psychology '17, MA Sociology '17)
Stacy Villalobos (JD '15, BA '11)
Melissa Chen (BA Art Practice '19)
Daniel Murray (Associate Director of the Center for Comparative Studies in Race and Ethnicity)
Kate Ham (2020)
John Moran (PhD Anthropology '18)
Kylee Beck (2020)
Mark Gardiner (PhD Anthropology '16)
Flora Wang (19)
Allison Perry (BA anthropology '17)
Catherine Sanchez (2019)
Samil Can (PhD Anthropology)
Aaron Sherman Hopes (Graduate Anthropology)
Teresa Pratt (PhD Linguistics)
Colin Kimzey (BA Art Practice '17)
Becca Nelson (Freshman)
Gabriella Guerra (2019)
Jonathan Fisk (Earth Systems B.S. '16, M.S. '17)
Joshua De Leon (BA International Relations '17)
Vanuyen Pham (BA History '18)
Lina Khoeur (BA Human Biology, MS Community Health & Prevention Research '18)
Jennifer Perry (BA History '19)
Jonathan Engel (BS Symbolic Systems '17)
Thi Nguyen (BS Biology '18)
Sarah Brickman (BS Earth Systems '17)
Andrea Flores (2018)
Anna Krakowsky (BA English '19)
Arnav Mariwala (BS Physics '17)
Parsa Nowruzi (BA Anthropology '19)
Thea Rossman (2019)
Eva Reyes (BA CSRE '19)
Kirsten Willer (BA International relations '17)

Neil Tangri (ESS PhD '18)
Fanya Becks (Graduate Student Anthropology)
Ian Macato (BS Symbolic Systems '19)
Savannah Pham (2018)
Perry Simmons (MS Civil Engineering)
E'lana Jordan (PhD Candidate, Anthropology)
Kaylee Elaine Beam (BS Atmosphere/Energy '19)
Natalie Gable (BS Electrical Engineering '19)
May Peterson (BA Classics '17)
Emma Hutchinson (BS Earth Systems '17)
Rocio Hernandez (BA Urban Studies & Sociology '18)
Paloma Hernandez (Earth Systems 2018)
Jessica Schrantz (BA African and African American Studies '17)
Bernardo Velez (BA Art Practice & Chicanx/Latinx Studies '18)
John Ribeiro-Broomhead (BA Public Policy)
Dan Sakaguchi (BS Physics '16 MS Earth Systems '18')
Joy Zeng (BS Chemical Engineering 2017)
Niza Contreras (20)
Solveij Rosa Praxis (BA Anthropology '17)
Emma Hartung (African & African American Studies '17)
Brian Tran (BA Human Biology '18)
Alpha Hernandez (BA Architectural Design '19)
John Zhao (B.S. Environmental Systems Engineering '18)
Gabriela Nagle Alverio (BA International Relations and Feminist Gender and Sexuality Studies '18)
James Li (BA CS '19)
John Bonacorsi (JD '18)
Josh Lappen (Classics '17)
Elena Press (2020)
Tynan Challenor (2017)
Sijo Smith (2018)
Luke Miller (2019)
Emily Lemmerman (2019)

From: [Kathy Durham](#)
To: [Rader, David](#)
Subject: Scoping Comments for Stanford University's 2018 GUP application
Date: Friday, February 17, 2017 5:07:13 PM

January 17, 2017

Mr. David Rader
County Government Center, East Wing, 7th floor
70 W. Hedding Street
San Jose, CA 95110

Dear Mr. Rader,

These comments are being submitted for consideration in the scoping process and preparation of the Draft Environmental Impact Report/CEQA analysis for Stanford University's proposed 2018 General Use Permit, anticipated to extend through the year 2035.

The university's commitment to continue meeting the "No Net New Commute Trips" goal set in the 2000 GUP, despite the daunting square footage of the development they are proposing, is certainly commendable. And the renewed commitment to supplying additional housing to accommodate increases in resident population (undergraduates, graduates and faculty/staff) is very important to achieving both transportation and sustainability goals articulated in the project application.

However, in the last five years, Stanford's extensive trip reduction program has reached a plateau of around 50% drive-alone mode share shown in Figure 5 in Tab 8 of the project application (see p. 32 in the Tab 8 PDF here: <https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B0BM4gZWP7M6MnBGMUhzRXEwZFU/view>). In addition, Figure 5 in Tab 7A shows surprisingly high drive alone rates among Stanford Campus residents as well as in Palo Alto and Menlo Park (see p. 24 in the Tab 7A PDF here: <https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B0BM4gZWP7M6SGRSNINTMGFLTzA/view>).

My comments here focus on suggesting fruitful options to explore in the EIR transportation study how the chances of success in shifting mode choices from drive-alone (or SOV) to active transportation or transit might be improved for residents on and near campus as well as students and employees within a 5 mile commute shed around the university.

Within the GUP boundaries, much progress has been made in engineering improvements to increase safety for those choosing to bike and walk, as well as an overall goal of road users sharing the road safely. This has benefited both residents and commuters. But the low hanging fruit for the next decade is likely to be reducing the barriers for those living nearby who fit into the category of "interested but concerned" bicyclists to try biking to work, or to do so more often with less stress.

Here are a few example locations I'm most familiar with, but there certainly are others to the east, north and west of the campus that could entice more commuters out of their cars!

<!--[if !supportLists]-->• <!--[endif]-->**Hanover and Page Mill:** This intersection and the Hanover approaches on both sides are very daunting/stressful for many bicyclists, who end up riding on the side walk on the east side of Hanover between California and Page Mill because they do not perceive it as safe to bike with traffic on the street.

It's also one of the main barriers for commuters to Stanford University or to Stanford Research Park locations. And it's a critical barrier leading to parents driving their children to several PAUSD schools (principally Terman and Gunn students from the Stanford campus area but also including parents and students heading to Spanish Immersion at Escondido or overflowed from Nixon and Escondido to Barron Park Elementary).

o Safer crossings of Page Mill at this location could also make a difference for transit users in the Research Park area between Page Mill and California Avenue.

• **Hanover/California and Bowdoin/Stanford:** With the University Terrace housing development scheduled to open soon, and the successful model of the new campus roundabouts, consideration should be given to changing these three way stop intersections with bicycle access from the fourth leg into a safer design that allows safer legal crossings for bicyclists while reducing backups at peak periods. Children walking to Escondido School from the upper portion College Terrace and the new housing in the Research Park will also be safer when encouraged to cross Stanford at Bowdoin, and it would be a great way to encourage more "foot powered" employees to commute to Stanford via Bowdoin as well.

• **Peter Coutts/Kite Hill uncontrolled crosswalk and Peter Coutts/Raimundo:** Improving the safety of crossing at the first of these will be critical to families living in University Terrace and walking or biking to Nixon. Without improvements to slow down commuter traffic to Stanford on this roadway, parents may decide to drive to Nixon instead. Improvements would also benefit faculty/staff biking to Stanford from Peter Coutts and this section of the faculty housing area.

Thank you for considering these comments, which are in alignment with the goal of the City Managers' Mobility Partnership mentioned in Tab 7A, "to identify key bicycle improvements that would directly reduce the road stress for cyclists on access routes to campus."

Best regards,

Kathy Durham
College Terrace resident
kfdurham@earthlink.net

From: [Jane Harris](#)
To: [Rader, David](#)
Subject: Stanford land use plan
Date: Friday, February 17, 2017 5:42:05 PM

I'm writing to comment on stanfords land use plan. I have two primary objections to the plan:

1. Assumptions on traffic and parking needs assume alternative modes of transportation. In my experience in other cities e.g. Boulder Colorado and San Francisco, CA, that approved more intense uses/development believing they'd generate less traffic/parking demand, they were always wrong. I don't believe it.

I live in South Gate and it's hard to miss the stream of single passenger vehicles pouring in and out of Stanford esp. at commute hours when Churchill gets so backed up that traffic gets backed up on to el Camino real

So that leads to my next question

2. When is the city of Palo Alto, Santa Clara county and the state going to stop acquiescing to Stanford, because we're so connected to the university, that we don't insist they pay their fair share of the costs to improve infrastructure that they impact and benefit from.

So, any new development is approved should contribute to the cost to improve off-site infrastructure/transportation including:

1. Grade separation at Churchill (others too but I'm not as familiar with which) no more development should be allowed without funding and near term plans for that to happen.
2. Public transit - given Caltrain may very well lose its funding from the federal government and not have adequate funds to pay for electrification why shouldn't Stanford contribute to that. So far all I see is their empty shuttle busses that really only serve campus, meanwhile the traffic around Stanford is unacceptable.
3. Traffic congestion - I'm fairly sure that all the roads surrounding Stanford are already near tr at level F, including Churchill, sand hill, Embarcadero, etc.

Churchill and embarcadero in particular are a total safety hazard esp. with pedestrians crossing and for Churchill the train. It's a miracle we haven't had more fatalities esp, bicyclists and pedestrians crossing el Camino at those intersections at the Churchill rail crossing and high school students crossing to get to school. I've witnessed many near misses in the 8 years I've lived here.

4. Speaking of schools - as they expand, where are the faculty and staffs kids going to go school? Are they fairly compensating school districts including the cost to build new schools.

Palo Alto schools are already maxed out with temporary trailers and kids jammed into classrooms.

In summary, I hope the county will carefully weigh stanfords proposal and the tremendous impacts on our already stressed infrastructure and make them pay for their share of impacts. We have been too cozy with them for too long. Thanks for your time and consideration.

Jane harris

City of palo, South Gate neighborhood resident (south of Churchill and east of el Camino)

Sent from my iPad

Stanford University Graduate Housing Affordability Report

Completed by the Graduate Student Organization
Department of Anthropology, Stanford University

Introduction

In its annual survey, Stanford's Residential and Dining Enterprises solicits no data from graduate students about the affordability of on-campus housing at Stanford University. Although both Stanford University and Santa Clara County designate on-campus graduate housing at Stanford as "affordable housing," this designation is not substantiated by information about the affordability of this housing for the only demographic of Santa Clara County residents who may access it: graduate students and graduate student employees of Stanford University. Santa Clara County's designation of Stanford's on-campus graduate housing as "affordable housing" contributing to the County's Regional Housing Needs Allocation obligation saves the University millions of dollars by justifying a smaller contribution to the County's Stanford Affordable Housing Fund. Simultaneously, Stanford profits from graduate students who must pay large percentages of their income to meet basic housing needs. This study asks a question both Stanford University and Santa Clara County have neglected to provide a substantiated answer for: Is on-campus housing at Stanford University in any meaningful sense affordable? The results of this study are definitive: It is not. We seek relief from the County and University for the wrongful designation of on-campus graduate housing at Stanford University as "affordable housing," which has saved Stanford University millions of dollars while burdening the residents this designation is meant to protect.

Study Methodology

Using graduate student employees in the Department of Anthropology as a case study, this online survey solicited self-reported financial data and perceptions of housing affordability from the eighty-four graduate student employees in the department. Thirty-two graduate student employees responded to the survey.

Study Findings

97% of graduate students reported contributing 30% or more of their income to housing costs, which is the federal definition of unaffordable housing as determined by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. Furthermore, over 60% of graduate students would be classified by U.S. HUD as "severely rent burdened," as they contribute 50% or more of their income to housing costs. 71% of graduate students described on-campus housing as "unaffordable" or "very unaffordable." 94% of students believe Stanford has an obligation to provide on-campus housing that meets the federal definition of affordability for graduate students.

Study Conclusions

On-campus graduate housing at Stanford University, a self-designated residential university, does not meet any reasonable standard of affordability for graduate student employees, who are undercompensated by an institution that fails to provide them a living wage even as that institution profits on grossly unaffordable housing.

Recommendations

We seek relief from Santa Clara County on four counts:

We ask that Santa Clara County deny Stanford University's claim of a \$103 million affordable housing subsidy in its 2018 General Use Permit, which the University claims despite constructing housing that will in no meaningful sense be affordable.

We ask that new on-campus housing in the 2018 General Use Permit not be designated as "affordable housing" unless projected annual rental costs are estimated to be less than 30% of mean graduate student income.

We ask that the county revoke its designation of Kennedy Graduate Residences and Munger Graduate Residences as affordable for "low- and very-low income populations" in accordance with the 2000 General Use Permit. We ask the county to explain through what criteria housing at Munger Graduate Residences, which costs between \$1,493 and \$1,910 per person per month, has been designated as affordable for very-low income populations.

We ask that since development of on-campus graduate housing at Stanford is available to only one class of Santa Clara County residents, namely Stanford graduate students and graduate student employees, these units should not be counted as "affordable housing" for the purpose of the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA), if their affordability is calculated based on the Area Median Income (AMI) for Santa Clara County, a calculation irrelevant to the only class of Santa Clara County residents who may access such housing, whose median incomes are much lower than the AMI.

We seek relief from Stanford University on four counts:

We ask that Stanford University, which wrongly claims a \$103 million affordable housing subsidy in its 2018 General Use Permit despite constructing housing that will in no meaningful sense be affordable, provide said \$103 million to the County of Santa Clara's Stanford Affordable Housing Fund.

We ask that within one year, Stanford University devise a plan to provide access to affordable housing for graduate students within five years. We ask that within five years, the mean annual on-campus graduate housing cost does not exceed 30% of the mean graduate annual income.

We ask that Stanford University make good faith efforts toward salary parity for graduate student employees across disciplines.

We seek evidence of Stanford’s unsubstantiated claim in their 2018 General Use Permit Application that “Stanford’s student rents are 40 percent less than what is charged in the surrounding rental market” (2018 GUP 6.10).

Further Research

Gender. Further research is needed to determine whether disciplinary pay disparity has disparate effects on female-identified graduate students. We hypothesize that the cost burden of unaffordable housing is placed disproportionately on female-identified employees, because Stanford compensates graduate student employees in disciplines with disproportionately male employees more than disciplines with disproportionately female employees. We seek data from Stanford University about variation in income among graduate student employees in different disciplines, and the distribution of gender across those disciplines.

National origin. Based on our preliminary study findings, we hypothesize that international students are more likely to live in efficiencies, the least expensive housing option, which contains limited amenities and space. We seek data on the distribution of the national origin of students across different levels of on-campus housing. We seek data on the national origins of occupants of double- and triple-occupancy rooms and data on what percentage students of a particular national background, such as Chinese nationals, are assigned roommates of the same national background.

Appendix A: Survey Results

Q1A. Are you able to cover your living expenses with the stipend/salary from the department?

Yes	63%
No	37%

Q1B-C. If not, how do you pay for your expenses or supplement your income? Is attending this graduate program more expensive than you anticipated? *Select responses:*

Yes, I am able to cover my living expenses with my stipend. BUT an efficiency is the only form of housing I can afford (among the options that let me at least have my own room), and if I hadn't gotten an efficiency, I wouldn't have been able to afford being here. I literally cannot afford any of the other housing options offered by Stanford, and I definitely cannot afford to live off campus.

Without taxes taken out, I am able to cover the expenses, but I live in constant fear that I'm going to owe more than I've been able to save for my taxes. Living here has been much more expensive than I thought it would be.

I can cover it with my stipend but it's tough, mainly because the department appears to believe that we do not pay rent, eat, or have medical expenses over summer quarter.

To supplement my income, I have done childcare, done odd jobs for the department, taught extra courses at Stanford in other departments, applied for supplemental funding, and found small paid gigs. However, one year I had to ask my parents to help me pay taxes, and I have not been able to pay them back due to the difficulties in having comfortable savings.

No - I have taken extra teaching jobs in order to cover cost of room and board. Attending grad school here has become much more expensive than I anticipated - had I realized it would have increased the way it has over the past 5 years I might have chosen a different program

Q2A. Do you have student loans?

Yes 41%
No 59%

Q2B-C. How much do you owe now? How much do you think you will owe upon earning your PhD?

The mean debt owed, among graduate students reporting student debt, was approximately \$27,000. The median student debt reported was \$16,500.

Q3. Could you calculate for us what percentage of your annual income goes to housing costs? The US Department of Housing and Urban Development defines affordable housing as costing less than 30% of one's income.

30% or more of income goes to housing:	97% of graduate students
50% or more of income goes to housing:	63% of graduate students
60% or more of income goes to housing:	19% of graduate students

Mean reported percentage of income going to housing costs: 49%.

Q4. Would you describe on-campus housing as "very affordable" "affordable" "unaffordable" "very unaffordable"?

Very affordable:	0%
Affordable:	26%
Unaffordable:	58%
Very unaffordable:	13%

Q5. Would you describe off-campus housing as “very affordable” “affordable” “unaffordable” “very unaffordable”?

Very affordable:	0%
Affordable:	3%
Unaffordable:	39%
Very unaffordable:	55%

Q6. In its ability to meet your expenses, would you describe your income as a graduate student as:

Very adequate:	3%
Adequate:	31%
Inadequate:	59%
Very inadequate:	6%

Q7. Which buildings have you lived in on-campus (please also name the housing style such as "efficiency" and monthly cost if possible), or which cities have you lived in in the Bay Area, and how would you describe your citizenship status, national origin, marital and parental status, race and ethnicity, gender, socioeconomic/class status, or any other identities and statuses? We are curious about the relationship between various backgrounds and accessibility to differently priced on-campus accommodations, and any reflections you may have. *Selected reflections:*

The cheaper living costs in Oakland are offset by the fact that getting to campus on public transit is not only expensive, but time consuming. My time commuting to and from campus is in average 5 hours a day, forcing me to limit the days I can go to campus because those days are unproductive.

The fact that I'm from a low-income family has had an impact on the fact that I have been content to live in an efficiency (though, my heart has ached -- ACHED -- when I have visited those of my friends who live in the studios, Munger, well, any other housing. Oh how I wish I could afford to live there too. But, I tell myself, I'm in grad school, and that's how it goes. But then I remember that Stanford has gone out of its way to demonstrate that it is very ok with inequality, by constructing grad housing buildings that are so ridiculously different from each other so that financial disparity is built into the very infrastructure of the university. Who ever heard of such a thing?! Even the furniture in the buildings is different. The beds - not just the size, the type of mattress.

As a foreign national there is almost no way to help yourself make extra money if you need to as the student visa is incredibly restrictive on how many hours/week you can work and in what field. On top of this, foreign nationals are subject to a hefty withholding tax of 30% so we lose 30% of our stipend/grant money

automatically and we do not qualify for many tax credits as alien residents, but DO qualify as residents for taxation.

My reflection is that I actually prefer not to live with people with same ethnic background, but I'm always assigned to apartment with Chinese roommates. It happens to many of my friends too, but the strategy of house allocation with regard to his aspect is not made clear in housing application system. The application asked you about everyday habits, I want to know if those issues are really taken seriously.

Q8. Do you believe Stanford should have stipend and salary parity across departments for PhD students, in which PhD students studying different disciplines are paid the same or close to the same stipend?

Yes: 84%

No: 6%

Did not know/want to learn more: 9%

Selected responses:

Yes. While there can be some differences, the fact that social science students make consistently less than their peers in some other schools is cause for concern. Students in some programs are clearing 34-35k per year, while we in Anthro earn less than 27k. The difference would be equivalent to a 30% pay increase for an Anthro student. However, even our peers in Classics and History have thousands of additional stipend dollars per year. So the School should at minimum move toward parity within similar programs.

Yes, I am aware. I am among those whose stipend is on the lowest end. When I first heard about the disparity, I was surprised and insulted. It mirrors the disparity among salaries paid to professors in different departments. CS professors get paid more than Humanities or School of Education professors. It's wrong. I do think that students should get paid the same across departments. I think female professors should be paid the same as male professors. I think professors of color should be paid the same as white professors. I think Anthro professors should be paid the same as Engineering Professors. Even within the school of H&SS, don't economics professor make much more than their anthropology or history counterparts? Yes. I think there should be pay parity for PhD students across disciplines. And I think this should not be accomplished at the cost of reducing the number of students admitted to those programs currently paying lower stipends i.e. they should be allotted more funding, instead of required to reduce size. All that said, I wouldn't trade places with my EE roommate. She gets paid more than I do, which I resent, and she is guaranteed summer funding (ie she gets 4 quarters of funding each year) but she is 'employed' by her advisor to work in his lab, which sounds awful. She's lucky if she gets to take a week off each year to go see her family. I work just as hard as she does, for

just as many hours each week, but on my own terms, because of my discipline and the structure of my program. Because I have the freedom to apply for external funding for the summers, I can do my own research, away from Stanford. Some university administrators would argue that it's ok to pay students differently because the 'work' they do 'for' the university is different, but that's not a correct assessment. Students in anthro only TA twice, sure, but students in TAPS and History TA a lot more quarters yet do not receive stipends as high as those in EE or CS. I'm not saying that stipends should depend on how many times students TA; I'm saying that extant 'justifications' for the disparities are flawed.

Yes, and this is beyond ludicrous, while certainly not beyond the capabilities of the university to fix. It is unclear to me why students in certain departments appear to have a right to a more comfortable living than others or why the university is fine with arbitrarily valuing students' work differently.

Q9. Have financial considerations ever impacted your sense of performance as a student?

Yes: 84%

No: 16%

Select responses:

Yes, absolutely. Every hour I spend earning the extra cash I need to visit my family, travel to conferences, and conduct fieldwork is time taken directly from my research and scholarly output. I make this trade off literally every week here.

Finding affordable housing, sometimes having to move from sublet to sublet on a quarterly basis, was a constant source of anxiety during my second and third years as a doctoral student and it had negative impacts on my overall wellbeing, and my extension on my performance as a student.

Absolutely. When I cannot make ends meet, I have to find income else where by working, and when working, I am not doing my job as a graduate student, and therefore fall behind in meeting deadlines. Not too mention being over-stressed and tired. It pushes one to their limits, and that effects work that requires extensive mental labor.

Yes. I did fieldwork for only 1/2 the summer after year 1 and year 2 so that I could work; if I hadn't done this, I would still have far more student debt than I do.

Yes – the stress of periodically not having access to cash (even if I, in theory, had the money) threatened my ability to make rent made studying for exams and applying for grants worse.

My family and relatives ridicule my pursuit of the degree because of my failure to maintain financial independence at my age.

Absolutely. When I had to live in [an affordable city far from Stanford] I couldn't get access to campus easily. I couldn't access amenities I deserved or attend lectures I deserved to attend. I was only able to come onto campus 1x per week or every other week.

Yes, it is very hard to keep up with work, deadlines, obligations when you are homeless for three months and moving from place to place of friend's or sublets for months on end because there is no affordable housing or housing vacancy

Low-level tension basically all the time. Some illegal housing situations to lighten that load somewhat, which add their own stresses.

Yes, I have taken on many additional or small jobs from the department, which is offered equally to all students but of course only taken up by those who need them.

Yes - it is a significant stress and I have to work extra to make enough money to live by

Q10A. Do you think Stanford has an obligation to provide housing to graduate students that meets the federal definition of affordable housing?

Yes:	94%
Want more information:	6%

Q10B. What percentage of graduate student income would be appropriate? (Open-ended question).

Select Responses:

Yes, absolutely. Regardless of its status and privilege as an elite educational institution, Stanford is not exempt from the national social contract that Americans have collectively decided is an appropriate minimum. It is completely ridiculous that we pay DOUBLE the affordable housing guidelines even as Stanford owns most of the properties in which its students live. But regardless of whether the property is owned by Stanford, the university must provide adequate housing which meets federal guidelines.

Yes, absolutely. The Bay Area is one of the most expensive places on earth. I believe Stanford, as one of the wealthiest institutions in the country, has a moral obligation to provide affordable housing to its graduate students. 30% of graduate student income would be appropriate and in keeping with federal guidelines.

I would want to know more about the economics of housing on campus before saying whether I think they have an obligation. I would have an issue with it if the residence & dining co is making big profits by charging phds 40% their income b/c the only alternative is off-campus, which is worse.

Yes. Or rather, preferably, and instead of undertaking enormous building projects that keep us (let's be honest) in dorms like children with the university in loco parentis, Stanford could just raise our stipends commensurate with the cost of housing in the Bay. Stanford's endowment is upwards of \$22,000,000,000. We live in the most expensive area of the country. I don't feel more needs to be said.

Absolutely. Stanford should be ashamed that its current graduate student pay and graduate student housing rate ratio does not meet federal (or anyone's) definition of affordable housing. Over 50% of my income goes to Stanford housing.

From: [Janet Davis](#)
To: [Rader, David](#)
Cc: [Don Horsley](#); [Michael Callagy](#)
Subject: Stanford GUP
Date: Wednesday, April 05, 2017 12:21:38 PM

When considering the GUP you need to look at the **cumulative impact** that Stanford has on the surrounding communities. For example they are planning a gigantic 38,000+ sq.ft. office structure at the corner of Sand Hill Road that is currently zoned for **housing**. The Sand Hill intersection is already one of the most congested in the county. They are also planning a multi-block, multi-use development along El Camino Real in downtown Menlo Park. This, together with the monumental expansion of Stanford hospitals, construction at the Shopping Center, development in the various industrial centers along Page Mill road and Hillview, make nonsense of any mythical "no new trips" computations

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: "Smith, Tom A" <tasmith@menlopark.org>
To: Janet Davis <jadjad@sbglobal.net>
Sent: Monday, April 3, 2017 9:54 AM
Subject: RE: 2121 Sand Hill project

Good morning Janet,

The CEQA documents for the project are available at the following web link:
<http://www.menlopark.org/1176/Mitigated-Negative-Declaration>. Please let me know if you have any trouble accessing it.

Thanks,

Tom Smith
Associate Planner, City of Menlo Park
Tel: (650) 330-6730
Fax: (650) 327-1653
Email: tasmith@menlopark.org

From: Janet Davis [mailto:jadjad@sbglobal.net]
Sent: Monday, April 03, 2017 9:51 AM
To: Smith, Tom A
Subject: 2121 Sand Hill project

The CEQA documents were supposed to be available today. I cannot find them on the web. Would you please supply the site where I can find them?