Attachment L

Caporgno, Julie

From: Rod Jeung [RJeung@eipassociates.com]
Sent: Friday, February 18, 2005 9:55 AM
To: Brian Jackson
Cc: Caporgno, Julie; Tricia Schimpp
Subject: RE: Stanford/Mayfield Residential Alt Memo

Thanks for the information. I'll forward to the City folks, but they are probably already aware of these conclusions. Was the intent of this assessment, in part to see if redistribution might also affect/alter cut through traffic volumes? If so, then another line or two in the memo on this impact would be worthwhile. Another line explaining why the conclusions don't change would also be helpful. I assume that we will insert the body of the memo into either one of the responses or in a Master Response on traffic analysis assumptions (along with your earlier examination of different distribution assumptions) – lot of assumptions in that one sentence, eh?

From: Brian Jackson [mailto:brianj@hextrans.com]
Sent: Friday, February 18, 2005 9:28 AM
To: Rod Jeung
Subject: Stanford/Mayfield Residential Alt Memo

Hi Rod, since attaching the memo that summarizes the results of the residential alternative analysis is not working, I've pasted it below. The memo is brief, but there isn't much more to say.

MEMORANDUM

TO: Rod Jeung, EIP Associates
FROM: Brian Jackson
DATE: February 17, 2005
SUBJECT: Residential Alternative Analysis for the Stanford / Mayfield EIR Traffic Study

At the request of the City of Palo Alto, Hexagon has conducted additional work for the Stanford Mayfield project. The work includes a level of service analysis based on a redistribution of the residential component of the project between the Upper California site (Site C) and the El Camino Real site (Site B). For this analysis, upper California was assumed to have 255 units and El Camino Real 90 units.

The results of the analysis show that the redistribution of housing between Sites B and C would not change the intersection, roadway or freeway ramp levels of service compared with the original project description. These results are consistent with what we anticipated, since both residential sites are located on California Avenue.

To be *really* specific for your information, redistributing the housing would result in 1 of 3 things at the study intersections:

1) Absolutely zero change (the majority of study intersections),
2) An increase in the average delay of 0.1 seconds during the PM at El Camino/Embarcadero-Galvez and Foothill-Junipero Serra/Page Mill, or
3) A decrease in the average delay of 0.1 seconds during the AM at Hanover/Page Mill and El Camino/Charlston-Arastradero.

In other words, the alternative would not change the results of the traffic study.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

Thank you,

Brian C. Jackson
Associate
HEXAGON TRANSPORTATION CONSULTANTS, INC.
40 South Market Street, Suite 600, San Jose, CA 95113
Tel: 408-971-6100, Fax: 408-971-6102, Cell: 408-504-9731

Attachment M

STANFORD
UNIVERSITY

LARRY HORTON
Associate Vice President and Director of Government and Community Relations

April 27, 2005

Mr. Frank Benest
City Manager
City of Palo Alto
250 Hamilton Avenue
Palo Alto, CA 94301

Dear Frank:

We have carefully considered your concern that Stanford Research Park employees be eligible to rent market-rate housing units built under the Mayfield Agreement. This letter proposes a priority for Research Park workers if Stanford establishes a rental housing program that includes a priority for Stanford employees. Let me explain the details.

As we have discussed, Stanford has not made any decisions about what kind of housing we will build in the future. We currently do not know whether we will build rental housing or housing that will be sold under a long-term leasehold program. We are also not likely to make such a decision until we begin planning for such housing sometime during the life of the development agreement.

We do know that the BMR units will be assigned and operated under specific rules spelled out in the Development Agreement. No priority system is specified in the Development Agreement for non-BMR housing. Stanford could, therefore, exercise its rights as a property owner to establish an appropriate and rational priority system.

Stanford could, for example, allocate all of the market-rate housing to its faculty-staff housing program through long-term leaseholds that provide benefits and responsibilities similar to for-sale ownership housing. Under this option, only Stanford employees would be eligible for long-term leases.

We could find, however, that a rental program (that is, housing that is not part of a long-term leasehold program) would be desirable for some or all of the units. Such short-term (generally year-to-year) rental housing could be open to all applicants on a first come, first served basis, but we may also decide to establish a priority system which would include Stanford employees and others. In the Stanford West housing, for example, we offer units on a priority basis that includes Stanford University employees and then

Office of Public Affairs
Government and Community Relations
Building 170, First Floor, Stanford, CA 94305-2040 T 650.725.3324 F 650.725.3577

employees on Stanford lands in Palo Alto in the top two categories of eligibility, and we also include a third priority for Palo Alto and Menlo Park workers.

If the housing were open to all applicants on a first come, first served basis, Research Park employees would enjoy the same rights as Stanford employees. But if a priority system were set up, we would need to provide for priority for Research Park employees in order to meet your concern. Accordingly, Stanford will agree to the following priority for Research Park workers. For any short-term rental program involving 30 or more market rate units, if we establish a priority system that includes a priority for Stanford employees, Stanford will offer full-time workers in the Stanford Research Park top priority for 30% of the units. This Stanford Research Park priority will apply as long as a priority program for Stanford employees is in effect for such housing during the life of the Development Agreement. Stanford will publish rules describing the process and distribute it to Research Park tenants. (For example: Priorities must be exercised in a timely manner, i.e., vacancies not filled by a readily available person with priority will be open to applicants with lower priorities.)

Stanford will retain final decision on other priority categories (other than top priority for 30% of the units for Research Park workers), but we will work with the City in establishing priorities so that we are fully aware of the City's views and community interests.

We hope this responds to your concerns, and we look forward to working with you and your successors in implementing the Mayfield Agreement. Please understand that Stanford will need to keep its options open and will not decide how to meet its guarantee to build housing until it understands the market conditions and University and community factors at the time we apply for this housing.

Sincerely,

Larry Horton

cc: John Hennessy
Bill Phillips
Jean Snider

Attachment N

STANFORD
UNIVERSITY

LARRY HORTON
Associate Vice President and Director of Government and Community Relations

June 10, 2003

The Honorable Dena Mossar, Mayor
The Honorable Bern Beecham, Vice Mayor
City of Palo Alto
250 Hamilton Avenue
Palo Alto, CA 94301

Dear Mayor Mossar and Vice Mayor Beecham:

In the fall of 2000, Stanford responded to the City's request for assistance in finding a site that could be used for relocating the Jewish Community Center, which was about to lose its home at the old Terman Junior High School. Stanford offered to the City a 51-year lease for $1 per year of the six-acre Mayfield site at the corner of El Camino and Page Mill Road in exchange for a transfer of development rights.

The terms of the offer were set forth in Stanford's letter to Mayor Kniss of October 5, 2000. Subsequently, Stanford and the City Manager, operating under direction from the Council, negotiated a Development Agreement to implement the terms of Stanford's offer. In September of 2001, the negotiated Agreement was submitted to the Council.

Consideration of the Agreement was postponed while the Jewish Community Center sought a suitable property for purchase. The Center's search was ultimately successful, and it was able to acquire property that would permit it to remain in Palo Alto. This happy outcome was welcomed by all.

In light of the changed circumstances, the Council's Stanford Liaison Committee and the City Manager requested that Stanford consider revising its offer of the Mayfield site. The Committee and the City Manager requested that we take into account the need for more housing and the City's need for recreational facilities, particularly playing fields.

As requested, we have reviewed our Mayfield offer and given special attention to the needs that the Council's Liaison Committee and the City Manager discussed with us. Accordingly, we offer to the City a package that responds to the City's request, and we are prepared to negotiate and enter into a Development Agreement to implement it. The package consists of the following six conditions, each of which has been agreed to by Stanford and must be agreed to by the City:

1. Stanford will lease the Mayfield property to the City for 51 years at a rent of $1 per year for community purposes in accordance with the terms of the Ground Lease submitted to the City on September 4, 2001.

2. Stanford will install on the entirety of the Mayfield site "The Stanford/Palo Alto Community Playing Fields" under a pre-defined scope of work consisting of the following: two natural grass competition soccer fields, one natural grass practice field, restrooms and storage facilities, intramural level lighting for the competition fields, approximately 100 surface parking stalls, and accent landscaping at the corner of Page Mill and El Camino. The fields will be designed collaboratively by the City and the Stanford Athletic Department and will be installed by Stanford. Upon completing the installation, Stanford will turn over the fields and associated facilities to the City, which will have sole responsibility for operations, maintenance, and liability under the terms of the lease.

3. The City will vest, upon approval of the Development Agreement, 100,000 square feet of commercial development in the South Research Park area under essentially the same conditions specified in the September 4, 2001 Development Agreement.

4. To address the City's concerns for housing, Stanford will guarantee the construction of 250 units of housing (including the city's requirement for below market rate units) under the following terms:

    a. The housing will be clustered in two areas: i) El Camino Housing (to be located at the addresses 2450, 2470, 2500 El Camino) and ii) Upper California Housing (to be located at the addresses 1451, 1501, 1601 California Avenue).

    b. Assuming full site utilization, the El Camino Housing will be constructed with an overall average density no less than 23 units per acre and no greater than 30 units per acre and the Upper California Housing will be constructed with an overall average density no less than 11 units per acre and no greater than 20 units per acre. The foregoing site densities may be reviewed and refined during the negotiation on the Development Agreement.

    c. The sites selected for the guaranteed housing are currently under lease and will not be available until the leases expire. Construction of the housing will commence as soon as feasible after the expiration of the current ground leases for these properties. Applications for at least 185 units will be filed

with the City by December 31, 2013. Applications for the remaining 65 units will be filed by December 31, 2020. Stanford will diligently prosecute construction upon receipt of building permits.

d. Although 300,012 square feet of commercial buildings now sit on the sites selected for the 250 units of housing, Stanford will only require that 200,000 square feet of that displaced commercial space be relocated elsewhere in the research park. The City will vest Stanford's right to construct the housing in accordance with current City regulations (modified as necessary to accommodate above-referenced densities), and will vest Stanford's right, after the first 100,000 square footage of commercial space is displaced, to relocate any additional displaced commercial square footage, but not to exceed 200,000 square feet, in the South Research Park area under essentially the same conditions specified in the September 4, 2001 Development Agreement. Processing and construction of the displaced commercial space may occur simultaneously with the housing. The housing and the displaced commercial square footage may be done in phases. No certificate of occupancy for the applicable commercial square footage may be granted until the housing that displaced it is completed.

Note: Condition number 4 on housing mirrors a similar provision in the September 4, 2001 Development Agreement, except that the housing here is guaranteed; in the September 4 Agreement, the housing was not required but an incentive was granted.

5. The City and Stanford will enter into a mutually acceptable Development Agreement, generally in the form previously submitted to the Council, but modified as necessary to reflect this package.

6. The City will prepare a Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) to update the Comprehensive Plan EIR with respect to future Research Park development and to consider the impacts of the proposed project described above. Stanford may withdraw this Mayfield offer if the EIR establishes mitigation measures that are not acceptable to Stanford. Stanford will pay 50% of the cost of the SEIR up to a maximum Stanford contribution of $200,000.

We believe this package will permit the City to enjoy significant immediate community benefits in exchange for assurances that Stanford endowment lands involved in the package can be put to use in a manner that supports the University and meets community needs.

In this package, we seek to achieve the objective we sought in the previous package: a collaborative agreement that is good for Palo Alto and good for Stanford.

Of particular importance to Stanford and the community will be the opportunity to address traffic and transportation issues in the SEIR, both with regard to the elements of this offer and other future development in the research park. Stanford will bring its experience and expertise in traffic demand management and transportation programs to bear on this matter. Stanford will work with the City and the SEIR consultants to achieve workable mitigations appropriate to the research park and with the goal of reducing the use of single occupancy vehicles as the transportation mode choice for the new development.

If you wish to move forward on this offer, a Stanford team is prepared to work with the City to negotiate a Development Agreement. We would appreciate a response within thirty days telling us whether the City wishes to negotiate a development agreement to implement the offer explained in this letter.

We look forward to working with the City and other parties to strengthen the community, which is a source of pride to all of us.

Sincerely,

Larry N. Horton
Associate Vice President
Director, Government and
Community Relations

cc: John L. Hennessy, President
Isaac Stein, Chairman, Stanford University Board of Trustees
Gordon Earle, Vice President for Public Affairs
Frank Benest, City Manager, City of Palo Alto

Attachment O

April 27, 2005

TO: Steve Emslie, Director of Planning and Community Environment (Palo Alto)

Please substitute this letter for one sent earlier on 20 April 2005.

First, thanks to you, Jean McCown (Stanford Director of Community Relations), and Jean Snider (Director of the Stanford Research Park), for taking the time to discuss the Mayfield project with Peter Coutts homeowners on the evening of April 14th. It was important for us to learn more about the intent and goals of the project, and the particular role that the property on Upper California Avenue is expected to play in the overall project.

As a direct result of the meeting on April 14, a balloon test was performed on April 26th. At that time, members of the Peter Coutts "Mayfield Agreement Committee", headed by Maria Meyer, met at Unit 100 with Jean McCown, Keith Schneider, Maryanne Welton, and Wynne Furth. Association Vice-President Elizabeth Conquest also attended.

The Association had requested that the balloon test include a 30-foot high balloon tethered at 20 feet and at 120 feet from the property line; a 35-foot high balloon tethered at 121 feet and at 300 feet from the property line; and a 40-foot balloon at 301 feet from the property line. We noted in our request that it was important that a 40-foot balloon be tethered in the back part of the property (at the 300 foot distance from the west property line), where currently there is a large parking lot, so that Peter Coutts residents could assess potential sight line impact on the currently building-free area. We pointed out that having such data prior to the May 2nd City Council meeting was critical to informed decision-making. Unfortunately, the balloons installed on 26 April reflected only what Stanford Management Company is proposing be built, and the only balloon tethered at 300 feet from our property line was 50 feet in height. In addition, winds on the day of the test reduced the intended heights of test balloons.

In spite of the resulting lack of data from the April 26th balloon tethering in assessing actual balloon heights, we feel that sufficient information was made available to us to allow us to frame a final response to the Mayfield Agreement. Please note that our response has been prepared in a very short period of time, given that Peter Coutts homeowners were only officially notified of the project in early April.

The Draft EIR notes that visual incompatibility can occur when neighboring buildings are of substantially different height and scale, but considers the height of the proposed California Avenue housing development to have a less-than-significant impact on College Terrace residential development because the 50-foot structures permitted by the proposed Development Agreement would not be viewed directly adjacent to the existing College Terrace development. The Report adds that College Terrace is further protected from the impact of the Upper California Avenue housing because the site is across the street from the College Terrace neighborhood, and the physical separation is made even greater by the front setbacks. As the Report notes additionally, the AS2 development

standards restrict building heights to 30 feet within 100 feet of the property line and 35 feet within the next 300 feet of the property line along California Avenue, and street trees and landscaping along the California Avenue frontage of the proposed housing site would serve to mask some of the height and bulk of future residential development. Accordingly, the Draft EIR finds that the proposed housing at the Upper California Avenue site would not be expected to create a significant visual impact on College Terrace residents.

Unfortunately, the Draft EIR does not address similar considerations for neighbors to the west of the Upper California site. Our condominiums at Peter Coutts are located in unincorporated Santa Clara County and sit atop a hill which affords panoramic views of the Stanford Research Park and beyond to parts of the East Bay Area and Mt. Diablo. The elevation between the Peter Coutts site and the Upper California site drops steeply eastward at the property line (which is approximately 100 feet above sea level). The average height of our buildings is 37 feet. The setbacks and height limitations proposed in the Mayfield Agreement create a significant visual impact on Peter Coutts residents.

Therefore, as President of the Peter Coutts Hill Homeowners' Association, and on behalf of 139 Peter Coutts homeowners (1 unit is currently owned by the University), I am therefore making a set of requests regarding the building requirements associated with the Upper California Avenue project.

1) We request that there be an adequate building setback relative to the property line between the Agilent property and Peter Coutts. After further reading of the Agreement, & especially the California Avenue frontage mentioned in Exhibit D of the Mayfield Agreement Document; examination of grading elevations; a look at the satellite photos of our property; and observations from the balloon test on April 26, we find that the setbacks proposed by Stanford are inadequate. We ask, to provide transition and buffering between existing Peter Coutts structures and the new development, that setbacks along the approximately 740 feet property line be mandated as follows:

a) a setback consisting of 75 feet of the existing green space between the Agilent site at 1601 South California Avenue and the Peter Coutts property line remain, running from the southernmost Agilent property line for a distance of 340 feet in a northwesterly directly parallel to the property line. This is the length of the existing green space on the Agilent site, along the Peter Coutts property line from Agilent's southernmost border; the greenbelt is approximately 150 feet wide at its southern end, narrowing to 50 feet at its northwestern end.

b) a setback, for the remaining 400 feet of our property line which abuts the Agilent site, of 35 feet from the Peter Coutts property line (i.e. along that section of our property line that separates our open space and the Agilent site).

2) Regarding height limitations, we ask the following:

a) A height limitation of 30 feet in height for structures that are east of the green belts proposed in Item 1 a and b above but still within100 feet from the Peter Coutts property line.

b) A height limitation of 35 feet in height for structures within the next 300 feet.

c) A height limitation of 40 feet in height for structures located between 400 and 500 feet east of the property line. [The 26 April balloon test does not substantiate Stanford Management's assumption that "beyond 300 feet the grade changes naturally protect the view"; the grade changes necessary to protect the view do not occur until just past the Agilent boundary, approximately 500 feet east of the Peter Coutts property line.]

3) We request that the maximum building height within the boundaries of the Agilent site be reduced from 50 feet to 40 feet, measured from grade to the highest point of the coping of a flat roof or to the deck line of a mansard roof, or to the height of the peak or highest ridge line of a pitched or hipped roof directly above point on grade from which height is being measured. The Upper California site, unlike the El Camino site, is not urban in character and the 50-foot height proposed by Stanford is therefore inappropriate for any part of the Upper California site within 500 feet of the Peter Coutts property line (i.e. within the Agilent section of the site). The balloon test of 26 April clearly demonstrates that a 50-foot building, set back even 300 feet from the Peter Coutts property line, significantly changes the views from Peter Coutts.

4) We request that the fully-grown height of any plantings be factored into landscaping the area between setbacks and the Peter Coutts property line so as to not exceed the building height restrictions we have requested.

5) We note that the full traffic analysis completed for the Mayfield Development Agreement concludes that the existing street network surrounding the Upper California site can accommodate the traffic generated by the housing. We request that no road between the Upper California property and Page Mill Road be incorporated into the design of this project, particularly a roadway along the Peter Coutts property line. Noise from traffic along such a roadway would negatively impact the relatively noise-free environment that the homeowners along that side of the property currently experience.

6) In addition to our request that part of this existing greenbelt remain (see 1a), we ask that the outdoor basketball court currently in the Agilent green belt be removed; and that no driveway, parking lot, or recreational facilities (such as playground equipment, tennis courts, etc.) be allowed within the 75-foot setback. Noise from use of such facilities would negatively impact the relatively noise-free environment that the homeowners along that side of the property currently experience.

7) We request that Peter Coutts residents be invited to participate in design reviews of the project as it moves from approval to development, in a manner similar to those planned for College Terrace residents.

Again, thanks for taking the time to discuss this project with Peter Coutts Residents. Could you please confirm that you have received this message and that it will be conveyed to the City Council?

Sheri Sheppard, President
Peter Coutts Hill Homeowners' Association Board of Directors

also emailed to:

Peter Coutts Homeowners' email list
Lisa Grote, Chief Planning Official, City of Palo Alto
Jean McCown, Stanford Director of Community Relations
Jean Snider, Director of the Stanford Research Park)

Attachment P

Alhouse • Deaton

MANAGEMENT & LEASING, INC.

COMMERCIAL • INDUSTRIAL • RETAIL • RESIDENTIAL

April 8, 2005

Ms. Lisa Grote
Planning Division
City of Palo Alto
250 Hamilton Avenue
Palo Alto, CA 94301

RE: Notice of Public Hearing of the City Council
Monday April 25, 2005
Mayfield Site Community Recreation Fields

To Whom It May Concern:

As the property manager for the building located at 2600 El Camino Real, next door to the proposed soccer fields on the corner of Page Mill and El Camino, I would like to express my concern regarding the use of the parking lots at 2600 by individuals and families involved with the soccer and the potential for increase vandalism, waste, debris, injury, etc. at 2600 El Camino. Please let us know what measures the City intends to use to protect the Owners of 2600 El Camino Real, Palo Alto.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Jeffrey S. Deaton/gcb

Jeffrey S. Deaton
President
Alhouse Deaton Management & Leasing, Inc.
650-857-0116 ex. 102

JSD/gcb

College Terrace Residents' Association Board of Directors

STATEMENT CONCERNING THE HOUSING PORTION OF THE MAYFIELD DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT

Overall, we concur that the proposed Mayfield Development Agreement provides significant benefits for Palo Alto. This statement focuses on the promised benefits for the College Terrace neighborhood, which include "improved interface" with the Stanford Research Park and "reduced traffic impacts" when existing commercial space on the El Camino site and on Upper California Avenue is converted to 250 units of housing.

We strongly support the second motion approved on February 9, 2005 by the Planning and Transportation Commission (PTC) in an attempt to assure residents that these benefits will be realized when the conversion to housing takes place between 2011 and 2020. Below, we identify key points regarding process and neighborhood compatibility as well as traffic access and circulation linked to the PTC recommendations. Some could be handled by simple changes to the text of the Mayfield Development Agreement by mutual agreement between the City and Stanford University; others might be addressed via a side letter to the agreement.

A. PROCESS

We believe that the interests of all parties (Stanford University, the City of Palo Alto, and College Terrace residents) will be best served by a defined process and format for ongoing consultation with neighborhood representatives regarding the compatibility and traffic access and circulation issues listed below. This consultation should begin now and continue until all the housing units have been constructed and occupied, around 2020.

CTRA representatives successfully engaged in dialogue with Stanford University when the 2475 Hanover project was proposed and designed, but in the Mayfield case a process should be more formalized for these reasons:

- Between now and 2020, there is likely to be substantial turnover in the persons representing the City, Stanford and College Terrace.
- Special zoning standards (AS1 and AS2) are proposed for the two housing sites, which has increased the uncertainty about the impact of the proposed redevelopment on these sites. Ongoing dialogue is the best way to ensure that concerns of all parties are heard and appropriate solutions considered prior to initiating the City's official approval process.

B. NEIGHBORHOOD COMPATIBILITY

We do support the proposed conversion of both the 1.8 acre El Camino site and the 17 acre Upper California site to housing. We believe the changes suggested below will allow the flexibility for good design while ensuring that the proposed housing does indeed result in an improved interface between the Stanford Research Park and the existing College Terrace neighborhood.

We propose a few simple changes to the wording of the Mayfield Agreement:

- Limit the maximum number of units on the Upper California site to 200 (180 if the 70 unit BMR option is chosen for the El Camino site).
- Under the AS2 development standards, reduce the 50 foot height limit for the rear of the Upper California site to 40 feet.

It is also important to address concerns about compatibility that have arisen because projects submitted under AS2 development standards are specifically exempted from architecture and design review using the City's current Multiple Family Residence District Guidelines. The stated purpose of these guidelines is "to protect existing single-family homes from the intrusion of multi-family housing projects, make new developments compatible with existing neighborhoods and enhance the desirability of living conditions in the proposed developments" (Chapter 18.28 of the Municipal Code).

We urge the City to clarify how the more limited design review specified under section 6.4.10 in the

Mayfield Development Agreement will still achieve the purpose quoted above. Incorporating the more flexible design principles outlined by Quigley and Associates into a side letter would be one way to show a commitment to this purpose. These principles, which have been presented in several recent public meetings, include:

- **"Stitch the Seam":** The Mayfield Development Agreement already includes a 30 foot height limit in the first 100 feet of housing on the Upper California site, and a commitment that buildings will "approximate the horizontal rhythm of building-to-side yard setback and façade areas" of the existing residences across the street. We suggest that a commitment to "stitch the seam" should also include diversity of style as well as front and side setbacks closely matching the R-1 houses on the north side of California Avenue.
- **"Hierarchy of Form and Texture":** This means the development on the 17 acre Upper California site should not be uniform in style, density, mass and height. More dense development and higher buildings will concentrate away from California Ave, toward the rear of the site.
- **"Buffer the Transition":** Design elements that aid in transition and buffering between the new housing and existing land uses should be incorporated on both the Upper California and the El Camino sites. Buffering could include use of public space along the border between existing and new development.

We would also like to propose a 4th principle:

- **Clear sight lines**: Someone standing on the sidewalk on the north side of California Avenue should not be able to see the roof lines of the buildings behind the first line of houses on the Upper California site. Similarly, the views from Peter Coutts Hill should be preserved.

C. TRAFFIC ACCESS AND CIRCULATION ISSUES

The Research Park was built without interior streets, so current access and circulation for both Mayfield housing sites is entirely via driveways off of California Avenue. The ongoing consultation between the city, Stanford University and neighborhood representatives should include ways to achieve better circulation design as well as minimize traffic impacts on both California Avenue and interior College Terrace streets. We urge that the following be considered:

- **Plan circulation and access for the two housing sites to create street segments within the Research Park "superblocks"** that will reduce the use of California Avenue by commuters, deliveries, office visitors, and new residents headed to and from Page Mill Road. This approach will also provide safer, more direct connectivity for pedestrians and bicyclists.
  - For the Upper California site: Provide direct access to Page Mill Road and Hanover Street, not just California Avenue.
  - For the El Camino site: Design circulation for the Lower California / El Camino project vicinity as a unified whole -- including the Bank of America, Wells Fargo and Wilson Sonsini parcels.

- **Begin efforts to acquire easements for key interior street segments along current leasehold edges**, so that over time the Research Park's duplicative driveways and disconnected parking lots can be replaced by better urban design, including the proposed "spine road" between El Camino and Hanover. This process should involve both the City and the Stanford Management Company, and will need to include leaseholds that are not part of the Mayfield Development Agreement.

- **Provide "complete streets" for all users, not just driveways for cars.** This means that all street segments for the two housing sites should have sidewalks on both sides, on-street parking and landscape strips to buffer the sidewalks, and should be geometrically designed to self-enforce slow, bicycle-compatible speeds of 25 mph or less.

- **Avoid spillover parking on College Terrace Streets**: Provide adequate on-site parking for the future residents of both Upper California and El Camino site – and their visitors – to minimize the temptation to park across the street on California Avenue or on other College Terrace streets.

- **Address the adequacy of neighborhood traffic calming measures with respect to traffic generated by the housing at both sites.** Before and after construction, monitor traffic volume and speeds on California Avenue and interior streets likely to be affected by traffic from the housing sites. Address any unanticipated increases not predicted by the EIR traffic analysis.