

19. Stanford

What is the most important aspect of the City's upcoming negotiation with Stanford regarding its General Use Permit?

Stewart Carl:

Stanford's General Use Permit is granted by the County. College Terrace's RPP is funded in part as a condition of the County issuing Stanford's permit. Palo Alto must stay aware and engaged in Stanford's General Use Permit negotiations with the County to make sure Palo Alto's interests are protected.

Leonard Ely III:

I believe that the most important part of this negotiation will be to set a tone of cooperation rather than confrontation. I believe that both parties need to realize that we are attached at the hip and in most cases what is good for one is good for the other.

Adrian Fine:

The most important aspect of these negotiations is the continuation and improvement of Stanford's TDM plan.

I see opportunities in dialogue with Stanford. I will push for more housing on Stanford land (shopping center and research park) and aggressive TDM programs. I value what Stanford brings to our community and want to work with them to find areas that benefit them and the residents of Palo Alto.

John Fredrich:

The most important issue with Stanford is getting them to stop their build-out, as we must stop ours, and to preserve the Dish, Coyote Hill and Deer Creek as they are. I favor retention of the status quo until the Searsville Dam controversy is solved as that will effect drainage and land subsidence at the very time that rising sea levels will be impacting San Francisco Bay. Stanford always maintains that they have no bigger plans right up until they announce their Next Big Plan.

Arthur Keller:

We must first acknowledge the landmark deal that the 2000 General Use Permit (GUP) represents. See https://lbre.stanford.edu/sites/all/lbre-shared/files/docs_public/SCC_SU_GUP.pdf In exchange for significant growth, Stanford University traffic incurred a "no net new trips" limitation. I note we are still waiting the mitigation to add a westbound right turn lane and change shared left/right turn to exclusive left turn lane at El Camino Road and Churchill Avenue as shown in Table 4 (page 15). So we must ensure that the prior agreement has been fully implemented. I acknowledge the hard work of then County Supervisor Liz Kniss in negotiating this agreement.

Unfortunately, Palo Alto negotiated a less strict deal for dealing with the impacts of the expansion by the Stanford Medical Center, where traffic reduction is effort-based (e.g., issue Caltrain passes) rather than outcome-based (e.g., no net new trips).

Stanford also paid \$100,000 for the Residential Parking Permit program for College Terrace, with remaining funding used for a parking study in Southgate and Evergreen Park neighborhoods. (Ibid., page 20.) We must ensure that this money is fully expended for these purposes or it will revert to Stanford. There was also funding for neighborhood traffic studies. (Ibid., page 16.) We must ensure that these were performed and that all mitigations are done.

Moving forward, we must build on the 2000 General Use Permits by retaining the “no net new trips” limitation and reducing Stanford’s impacts on the surrounding community. For example, I notice that southbound traffic on Alma Street approaching the Meadow and Alma Village traffic lights backs up significantly farther when Stanford is in session. Palo Alto must engage in traffic studies both while Stanford is in session and while it is not, so we determine a lower bound on Stanford University’s contribution to traffic congestion.

Stanford University has a significantly higher jobs/housing ratio (as a measure of jobs to employed residents) than Palo Alto. And this does not include the Stanford Medical Center and Stanford Research Park, both of which are part of Palo Alto. Stanford should reduce this ratio as it grows. And it should be required to make land available to PAUSD and/or provide a monetary contribution to expand our school capacity to accommodate the new students.

Liz Kniss:

The City of Palo Alto can only influence the general use permit. While they are in our sphere of influence the county of Santa Clara will negotiate with Stanford and determine the parameters of the final general use permit (GUP).

Lydia Kou:

I was not involved in city-wide politics during the last Stanford GUP, nor have I yet heard any significant discussion of the upcoming one.

Stanford has an even worse jobs-housing imbalance than Palo Alto. Although recent projects to provide more housing for graduate students and staff are welcome, the expected job increases and how to mitigate/offset their impacts should be a major concern.

Although Stanford has an aggressive Transportation Demand Management program, we need to be concerned about limits and diminishing returns. For example, a major component has been incentivizing Caltrain usage, but Caltrain is reported to be already operating near capacity during peak hours.

The multi-year controversy over the Stanford Trail is a reminder to carefully explore what Stanford thinks it is agreeing to and not to stop at what we believe that it has agreed to.

Perhaps, negotiations should include -

- the integration of the City’s shuttle program with Stanford Marguerite Shuttle,
- create a public/private joint venture with Stanford utilizing their resources to help establish a shovel ready solution for Caltrain grade separation,
- funding pedestrian crossings at places such as at Embarcadero and Palo Alto High School and opening pedestrian and bicycle pathways at Stanford Research Park to different parts of town.

Danielle Martell:

DID NOT RESPOND

Don McDougall:

I believe negotiations with Stanford provide a great opportunity to explore the subject of mutual benefit such as expanded housing on Stanford land and cooperation on reducing SOV auto use and no increase in traffic.

Greer Stone:

The two most important aspects of Stanford's General Use Permit will be housing and traffic. Stanford has made great gains in their traffic mitigation strategies, and I would expect them to continue, and improve these efforts. Currently, Stanford Research Park is exempt from our city's office cap. I would allow it to remain exempt. However, this exemption would be conditioned on one simple measuring tool – that they can reduce their traffic impact by 2018 to below 2016 levels. This means not just reducing the amount of traffic new development would bring, but reducing the total trips generated by the Research Park. Stanford has the means as common land owners, and we should ask them to be the stewards of the environment that we know they can and strive to be I would also prioritize the need for Stanford to build more housing in order to house their students and employees. Currently, Stanford houses most of their students, and approximately one-third of their faculty. Stanford should continue to increase their supply of on-campus housing in order to reduce the number of commuters into Stanford every day. In addition to these housing projects, I would strongly encourage increased below market rate housing units being built to further diversify the socio-economic statuses of residents in this area.

Greg Tanaka:

Traffic, parking and housing impacts. Also, securing open space like the Dish areas for general public use and recreation.