

STANFORD UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY PLAN TEXT AND LAND USE MAP AMENDMENTS AND ZONING MAP AMENDMENTS FINDINGS

1. The County of Santa Clara's Stanford University Community Plan ("Community Plan"), a component of the General Plan, was adopted in 2000 and has been updated and amended over time to incorporate desired policy changes, reflect changing conditions, and satisfy state requirements.
2. On November 21, 2016, Stanford University submitted the 2018 General Use Permit (GUP) Application to authorize campus growth and land use development on Stanford's lands in unincorporated Santa Clara County through 2035 consisting of 3.5 million square feet of new academic space/student beds and 550 housing units. In conjunction with the GUP Application, Stanford requested amendments to the Community Plan text and Land Use Map and amendments to the Zoning Map.
3. The Community Plan allows a maximum of 17.3 million square feet of academic/student bed development on unincorporated Stanford lands within Santa Clara County. Buildout of the GUP Application would bring the total development to 20.4 million square feet, exceeding the maximum development permitted pursuant to the adopted Community Plan.
4. The Community Plan amendments include text amendments requested by Stanford that remove and revise outdated text, tables, and figures regarding future housing sites and Stanford's requested Land Use Map amendments to change the land use designation of the golf driving range site from Campus Residential – Medium Density to Academic Campus and the land use designation of nine faculty/staff housing sites from Academic Campus to Campus Residential – Low Density.
5. In addition to Stanford's amendment requests, the Community Plan amendments update background text and figures to reflect current information; and update policies and implementation measures to reflect existing conditions, including relocation of the potential future school site designation; to ensure continued effectiveness of the Community Plan. The policy updates include an increase in the maximum academic/student bed development to 20.4 million square feet to allow for the 3.5 million square feet of net new development proposed by the GUP Application.
6. The amendments to the Zoning Map amendment change the zoning designation of the golf driving range site from R3S – Medium-Density Campus Residential to A1 – General Use and the zoning designation of nine faculty housing sites from A1 – General Use to R1S – Low-Density Campus Residential.
7. The Zoning Map amendments for the golf driving range site and nine faculty housing sites are consistent with the proposed Community Plan land use designations for these sites; Academic Campus for the golf driving range site and Campus Residential – Low Density for the nine faculty/staff housing sites.

8. The 17.5-acre golf driving range site is identified as a housing opportunity site in the County's 2015 – 2022 Housing Element with the potential for new housing to be developed at 8 to 15 dwelling units per acre. With the land use designation change to Academic Campus and related zoning change to A1 – General Use, high-density housing above 15 units per acre would also be allowed by the Community Plan (SCP-LU 2) and the County ordinance code (§2.50.010.A) thereby increasing the housing potential of the site.
9. The proposed amendments, together with the GUP Application and proposed amendments to the Zoning Map (collectively referenced as the Project) have been reviewed under the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”), Pub. Res. Code § 21000 *et seq.*; the Stanford University 2018 General Use Permit Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) has been prepared.
10. Amendments to the Community Plan would not create any internal inconsistencies within the Community Plan, or with the General Plan, of which the Community Plan is a component.
11. The amendments to the Community Plan are in the public interest because they update background text and figures to reflect current information; update policies and implementation measures to reflect current conditions; and, update the development limit to establish future maximum levels of academic/student bed development consistent with what is proposed in the GUP Application.
12. The County conducted public outreach on the Community Plan amendments. The County consulted with California Native American tribes located within the County's jurisdiction in accordance with Government Code section 65352.3. Specifically, the County sent letters dated, October 24, 2018, to Andrew Galvan, designated representative of the Ohlone Tribe, Ann Marie Sayers, designated representative of the Indian Canyon Mutsun Band of Costanoan, Charlene Nijmeh, designated representative of the Muwekma Ohlone Indian Tribe of the San Francisco Bay Area, Irenne Zwierlein, designated representative of the Amah Mutsun Tribal Band of Mission San Juan Bautista, and Katherine Erolinda Perez, designated representative of the North Valley Yokuts Tribe. The letters summarized Stanford's proposed development and invited the tribes to request consultation pursuant to Government Code section 65352.3, within 90 days. The County received no response to these letters.
13. The proposed zoning amendment is consistent with State law, the general purposes of the Zoning Ordinance, the General Plan, and the Community Plan, and the land use designations in the Community Plan. The overall purpose of the A1 District is to provide for uses that do not fit neatly into the rural, residential, commercial, or industrial category but are necessary to implement the general plan. Community Plan implementation measure SCP- LU (i) 1, specifically states that the A1 Zoning District is intended for areas of Stanford lands designated with the Academic Campus land use designation, with allowed uses governed through the General Use Permit. Rezoning of the golf driving range site from R3S to A1 is consistent with the proposed Academic Campus designation and allows for increased

residential density (above 15 units per acre) in support of the General Plan Housing Element which identifies the driving range as a housing opportunity site.

The Zoning Ordinance states: *“The purpose of the R1S Zoning District is to provide for urban low-density housing (up to eight units per acre) on the lands of Stanford University, and to provide for limited neighborhood-supporting non-residential uses. This designation implements the specific land use policies for low-density housing prescribed by the 2000 Stanford Community Plan by encouraging more compact and efficient urban development.”*

The R1S District is consistent with the Campus Residential-Low Density designation which the Community Plan indicates applies to lands immediately adjacent to the Academic Campus area that have a low-density residential character and are used for housing University faculty and staff (SCP-LU 5). The nine faculty house sites proposed for rezoning from A1 to R1S are predominately developed with low density faculty and staff housing and are located on the edge of a residential neighborhood proximate to the academic campus.

STANFORD UNIVERSITY GENERAL USE PERMIT FINDINGS

In accordance with Zoning Ordinance of the County of Santa Clara, § 5.65.030, a use permit may be granted if all of the following findings are made.

- A. **Finding.** *The proposed use conforms with the general plan, with the zoning ordinance, and with all other standards and guidelines applicable to the proposed use that have been adopted by the Planning Commission or Board of Supervisors.*

General Plan Conformance.

1. The General Use Permit (“GUP”) regulates development and use of Stanford University lands within unincorporated Santa Clara County (“the Stanford site”). It is a program-level approval that does not explicitly authorize future development projects without further discretionary land use approval (Condition of Approval A.6). The GUP requires that all development projects that occur under the GUP comply with all provisions of, and be consistent with, the Stanford University Community Plan, the County General Plan, the County Zoning Ordinance, and all other applicable federal, state, and local laws, regulations, and ordinances (Condition of Approval A.5).
2. The Stanford University Community Plan (“SCP,” as currently proposed for amendment) is a component of the Santa Clara County General Plan which specifically guides development on Stanford lands in unincorporated Santa Clara County. The SCP establishes strategies, policies, and implementation measures that guide the Stanford site in regard to growth and development, land use, housing, circulation, open space, resource conservation, and health and safety.
3. The SCP calls for review of applications for individual building projects under the GUP for consistency with the SCP, the conditions of the General Use Permit, and all other relevant County requirements (SCP-GD (i)¹ 5). Consistent with this policy, the GUP, as conditioned, requires the following:
 - a. All development projects under the GUP must conform to the County General Plan and Stanford Community Plan (Condition of Approval A.5).
 - b. Development projects must undergo Architecture and Site Approval (“ASA”)(Condition of Approval E.1.a). ASA approval requires findings that the project conforms to zoning standards and the General Plan (Zoning Ordinance Section 5.40.040).
 - c. The GUP provides for review of development project compliance with the GUP’s Conditions of Approval (including the requirement for General Plan and SCP conformance) in the Annual Monitoring Report to be considered by the Planning Commission (Condition of Approval D.2) and prior to the Planning Commission’s authorization of an additional development phase (Condition of Approval B.2).
4. Development authorized by this GUP, including 2,275,000 net new square feet of academic development and the 1,225,000 net new square feet of student housing (minimum/maximum of 2,600/2,807 beds) (Condition of Approval B.1 and C.4), is consistent with the maximum

¹ All references to SCP provisions are to the 2000 SCP, as proposed to be amended.

20,400,000 square feet of academic and student housing development the amended SCP identifies for the site.

5. The SCP Growth and Development Strategy #1 promotes compact development and conservation of natural resources through use of an Academic Growth Boundary (“AGB”). Additional Growth and Development policies call for maintaining the AGB and focusing future development within the AGB (SCP-GD 1); retaining the current AGB for 99 years (SCP-GD 2); implementing a mixture of uses within the AGB of a design and intensity that supports transit, pedestrian, and bike trips (SCP-GD 4); and limiting development outside the AGB to very low intensity uses (SCP-GD 5). The GUP is consistent with these SCP policies because the Conditions of Approval allocate academic and housing development to development districts located within the AGB and significantly limit development outside the AGB (Conditions of Approval B.3, C.9.b and A.5). (See attached Figure 1 – Development Districts)
6. Stanford lands outside the AGB are designated with either the Open Space and Field Research (OS/FR) or the Special Conservation Area (SCA) land use designation. Policies supporting the OS/FR designation identify allowed uses, limit new structures, and seek to protect environmentally resources, open space, and scenic vistas (SCP-LU 26-30). The SCA designation applies to lands outside the AGB deemed unsuitable for development due to natural resources and development constraints (riparian areas, sensitive habitat areas, steep or unstable slopes, and seismic or geologic hazards,). Policies supporting the SCA designation limit uses to conservation activities, field research, and appropriate agriculture and limit structures to those supporting conservation efforts. Consistent with the SCP, the GUP, as conditioned, requires the following:
 - a. The GUP Conditions of Approval direct academic and housing development to development districts located within the AGB and restrict development outside the AGB (Condition of Approval B.3). This GUP does not allocate development to the Foothills Development District (the 2,293 acres of Stanford land in Santa Clara County located outside the AGB); however, 1,540 square feet of development in the Foothills District has been carried over from the 2000 GUP. The GUP prohibits housing units within the Foothill District (Condition of Approval C.9.b).
 - b. Any new uses located outside the AGB would be reviewed by County staff for conformance with the use regulations, new structure limitations, and requirements for protection of resources of the OS/FR and SCA land use designations and the regulations of the SCA Special Conservation Area and OS/F Open Space and Field Research Zoning Districts (Condition of Approval A.5).
7. The Santa Clara County General Plan specifies that planning for supply and diversity of housing in the urbanized areas of the county should provide for existing and expected employment and household needs and a diversity of affordability that matches the diversity of household incomes (Policy HG-1) and that the County and the cities should work cooperatively to ensure that there is a balanced housing supply sufficient to achieve countywide economic, social, and environmental objectives (Policy HG-4). In addition, the General Plan calls for reduction in the separation between housing and employment by strategic location of housing, including location of increased housing density along transit corridors and provision of on-site housing for employment centers (C-GD 39). The GUP, as conditioned, is consistent with these policies by

requiring that a minimum of 70% of housing is located on Stanford lands, with a maximum of 30% housing located within a six-mile radius of the University's boundary, unless the Planning Commission determines it is infeasible. Any housing located outside the six-mile radius must be within 2,000 feet of a major transit stop. (Condition of Approval C.8.)

8. The SCP acknowledges the connection between expansion of academic facilities and the resultant increase in housing demand (Policy SCP-H 5). It calls for provision of a variety of housing types and supply adequate to meet the needs of faculty, staff, students, postgraduate fellows, hospital residents and other workers (Policy SCP-H 1); specifies that the County, through the General Use Permit, permit development of additional on-campus housing, including housing for designated extremely low-, very low-, low- and moderate-income persons, including faculty, staff, other workers, students, postgraduate fellows, and hospital residents (SCP -H 6). The GUP, as conditioned, includes housing requirements consistent with these SCP provisions.
 - a. Based on findings of the September 2018 Stanford Specific Housing Nexus Study, the GUP requires provision of a minimum of 2,172 net new housing units and 2,600 student beds to accommodate the housing demand created by the project (Condition of Approval C.3).
 - b. The GUP requires that the minimum net new housing units include construction of 933 affordable units (72 Extremely Low Income, 133 Very Low Income, 381 Low Income, and 347 Moderate Income). These units meet the affordable housing demand associated with the additional faculty, staff, postgraduate fellows, medical interns and other workers resulting from development of this GUP. In addition, the GUP requires inclusionary housing units pursuant to the Inclusionary Housing Ordinance that address the affordable housing demand of private and public sector workers who provide services to residents of Stanford's new market rate units (Condition of Approval C.3). The GUP allows payment of fees pursuant to the Affordable Housing Impact Mitigation Fee Ordinance to be credited towards provision of the required affordable housing in conformance with the level of affordable unit demand mitigated by the fee rate (Condition of Approval C.5).
9. The SCP specifies that new housing development should occur commensurate with campus population growth and academic development approvals (SCP-H 7); encourages Stanford-developed housing in other jurisdictions; and indicates that such housing should be assessed for eligibility to meet quantified housing development requirements on a case-by-case basis (SCP-H 9). The GUP, as conditioned, is consistent with these SCP provisions.
 - a. The GUP provides for development in four phases, each consisting of 568,750 square feet of academic development and requires concurrent construction of 543 housing units and 650 student beds within each phase of academic development (Condition of Approval C.7).
 - b. The GUP requires 70 percent of constructed housing units to be located on site, but allows Stanford to seek County approval of off-campus housing units (up to 30 percent of the total required housing units) so long as the units are located within a six-mile radius of the area covered by the Stanford University Community Plan (Condition of Approval C.8).
10. The SCP specifies that to the extent feasible, housing should be required on campus and in other areas close to Stanford jobs (SCP-C 3). The GUP, as conditioned (Conditions of Approval C.8), requires:

- a. That a minimum of 70 percent of housing constructed, by income category, be located on the Stanford campus and that a maximum of 30 percent of constructed housing may be located off campus; and
 - b. That off-campus housing to be located within 6 miles of the area covered by the SCP, but allows the Planning Commission to grant an exception under following circumstances: 1) it is infeasible to locate the housing within a six-mile radius due to a lack of adequate housing site, 2) the housing is located with Santa Clara County and within 2,000 feet of a major transit stop, and 3) Stanford has demonstrated compliance with CEQA for the off-site housing.
11. The SCP includes Circulation Strategy # 1 and Policy SCP-C 1 that applies a “no net new commute trips” standard for campus-related trips in the commute direction during peak hours to the fullest extent allowed by law. Circulation Strategy #2 provides for alleviating local traffic congestion. Other supporting policies require for reducing automobile dependency (SCP-C 2), and limiting travel at non-commute times, outside of peak hours, and in the reverse commute direction (SCP-C 7). The GUP includes Conditions of Approval that support these SCP provisions.
- a. Peak Hour and Peak Period. As proposed by Stanford in the 2018 GUP Application, the GUP requires that Stanford achieve the No Net New Commute Standard (i.e., avoid exceeding the commute direction, AM and PM peak hour traffic baselines by 1% or greater in any year). In addition, it requires that Stanford achieve no net increase in commute trips in the peak period (i.e., avoid exceeding the AM and PM peak period commute trip baseline by 1% or greater during any year). The peak period baselines will be established based on the 2001 traffic monitoring data as approved by the County of Santa Clara Department of Planning and Development Director. (Condition of Approval F.2.a)
 - b. Reverse Commute – Peak Hours and Periods. The GUP requires Stanford to implement all feasible measures to achieve no net increase in reverse commute trips in the AM peak hours and periods and the PM peak hours and periods. (Condition of Approval F.2.b.)
 - c. Average Daily Trips. The GUP requires Stanford to use its best efforts to achieve no net increase in Average Daily Trips (“ADT”) and specifies that beginning in Phase 2, there shall be no net increase in ADT (i.e., avoid exceeding the baselines by 3% or greater in any two (2) consecutive years within a single academic development phase). (Condition of Approval F.3.)
12. The SCP calls for identifying opportunities to improve access and circulation for pedestrians, transit and bicycles (SCP-C 13), and for enhancing pedestrian and bicycle access and safe routes to school to and through the campus (SCP-C 4). The GUP, as conditioned, includes requirements consistent with this objective.
- a. The GUP requires Stanford to contribute funding for on-campus safe routes to school improvements, as proposed by Stanford in its 2018 GUP Application (Condition of Approval F.9).

- b. The GUP also specifies that if a new school or change in attendance boundaries results from additional K-12 students generated by new development pursuant to this GUP, Stanford is required to fund safe routes to school survey/s and provide fair-share funding to the City of Palo Alto for safe routes to school improvements (Condition of Approval F.9).
13. The SCP calls for regulating parking supply as a mechanism for transportation demand management (“TDM”), while avoiding spillover of parking in neighborhoods (SCP-C 6). The GUP, as conditioned, includes requirements consistent with this objective by establishing a cap of 21,651 parking spaces (allowing for 1,480 net new spaces) to moderate expansion of parking on the Stanford campus as a mechanism for transportation demand management in conformance with the SCP. The following circumstances support the parking cap:
 - a. The total number of active campus commuter and residential permits has declined from a high of nearly 21,000 permits sold in 2004-2005 to fewer than 18,000 sold in 2015-2016. During this time frame, enrollment in the Commute Club has steadily increased, more than doubling since 2004-2005. These two trends reflect Stanford’s development of a robust TDM program to contain traffic growth in response to the No Net New Commute Trips standard. Notably, permit sales declined, even as the square footage of the campus increased under the 2000 General Use Permit. Additional TDM measures that continue to reduce the drive-alone rate and associated parking ratios are needed for compliance with the trip reduction requirements of this GUP.
 - b. Based on data from the Fall 2015 Stanford parking inventory, approximately 86% of campus spaces were occupied on a typical day when Stanford was in session, which indicates that there is enough supply to minimize spillover parking in the areas surrounding the campus.
 - c. Residential permit parking has been implemented by the City of Palo Alto in areas around the Stanford campus to prevent spill-over parking from a variety of sources (including Stanford) from impacting residential neighborhoods. The GUP requires Stanford to provide fair-share funding for additional parking studies and residential permit parking programs as needed (Condition of Approval H.3) to ensure that spillover parking does not impact residential neighborhoods, consistent with SCP-C 6.
14. The SCP includes policies and implementation measures that require Stanford to maintain recreational open space to meet existing and future recreational needs of the Stanford community (SCP-OS 10); plan for parks and open space within the AGB; provide campus parks and open space within the AGB at a rate of 5 acres per 1,000 population (SCP-OS (i) 8); and provide and maintain parks near residential areas of the campus (SCP-H 16). In conformance with the SCP, the GUP, as conditioned, requires the following:
 - a. That Stanford comply with the minimum five (5) acres of park land per 1,000 residents standard (Condition of Approval I.1); and,
 - b. That Stanford fund a study prepared or directed by the County to identify how adequate parks designed for community recreational use will be provided to serve development (and associated population) planned pursuant to this GUP (Condition of Approval I.2).

15. The SCP specifies that trees greater than 12 inches in diameter that are removed should be replaced at a 1:1 ratio, except for oaks, which should be replaced at a 3:1 ratio (SCP-RC (i) 7). In conformance with this implementation measure the GUP:
 - a. Requires conformance with the County's Tree Preservation and Removal Ordinance (Condition of Approval J.1.a);
 - b. Requires all existing trees over 12 inches in diameter be designated as protected trees (Condition of Approval J.1.a);
 - c. Requires protected trees approved for removal by the County be replaced at a 1:1 ratio, except for Oak Trees, which require a 3:1 replacement ratio (Condition of Approval J.1.b); and,
 - d. Allows for preparation of a vegetation management plan for the entire campus that provides the same or greater level of tree replacement as indicated above. Compliance with the vegetation management plan is to be assessed in the Annual Monitoring Report (Condition of Approval J.1.b).
16. The SCP requires the identification of urban service levels and service needs of Stanford residents; if Stanford is not providing an appropriate level of urban services to its residents, Stanford is required to either provide any needed municipal services, pay in-lieu fees, or contract with appropriate agencies to provide them (SCP-GD 9; SCP-GD (i) 2). In conformance with the SCP, the GUP, as conditioned, requires the following:
 - a. Preparation of a Municipal Services Study under the County's direction within 18 months of approval of this GUP with approval by the Planning Commission. This Study is to define appropriate service levels for students, residents, faculty, staff, and visitors; analyze the amount and types of services needed to serve the GUP's planned population growth; and assess whether Stanford provides those services at appropriate levels (Condition of Approval O.9).
 - b. If the Municipal Services Study concludes that Stanford would not provide sufficient municipal services to serve the projected population increase, Stanford shall be required to provide these services directly through construction and operation of the necessary facilities and/or programs, or the County may consider a request to provide the services through an in-lieu fee established by the Board of Supervisors pursuant to a nexus fee study (Condition of Approval O.9).
17. The SCP policies provide that the County shall maintain and update information databases and formal evaluations of heritage resources for purposes of appropriate tracking and designations (SCP-RC 21). The SCP also seeks to protect heritage resources by way of careful campus land use planning, individual project design, project review, use of appropriate guidelines, and other implementation actions (SCP-RC 22). These policies are implemented by way of development applications for specific building projects to be accompanied with documentation of existing and potential historic resources for inclusion on the County's Heritage Resource Inventory (SCP-RC(i)(19)) and to require adequate background information and site plans to assist in evaluation of potential impacts to heritage

resources resulting from project development (SCP-RC(i)(20)). In conformance with the SCP, the GUP, as conditioned, requires the following:

- a. Any building over 50 years old will be subject to a historic evaluation, unless it has already been deemed eligible for the California Register based on prior analysis, is listed on the County Register, or is listed on the 2017 Stanford Historic Resources Survey prepared by Stanford University. (Condition of Approval N.2.a.)
- b. Buildings previously identified as ineligible must be revisited and reviewed by the County to confirm the ineligibility status based on criteria for listing a historic structure on the California Register. (Condition of Approval N.2.b.)
- c. Architecture and Site Approval applications including proposed demolition, relocation, or modification of buildings 50 years or older will be reviewed by the County for possible inclusion on the County's Heritage Resource Inventory. (Condition of Approval N.2.c.)

Based on the evidence listed above, the GUP, as conditioned, conforms with the General Plan and Community Plan.

18. Conformance with the Zoning Ordinance and Other Standards and Guidelines. The County of Santa Clara Zoning Ordinance Code establishes processes for review and approval of specific development proposals pursuant to this GUP and provides regulations that implement the SCP through five zoning districts: 1) A1 General Use; 2) R3S Medium-Density Campus Residential; 3) R1S Low-Density Campus Residential; 4) SCA Special Conservation Area; and 5) OS/F Open Space and Field Research. The GUP, as conditioned, requires consistency with the Zoning Ordinance as follows:

- a. The GUP requires that all development projects conform to all applicable state, federal and local laws, regulations, and ordinances (Condition of Approval A.5) and that Stanford obtain required permits (Condition of Approval E.1);
- b. The GUP requires that development projects undergo Architecture and Site Approval ("ASA"), in conformance with Zoning Ordinance Code Chapter 5.40. (Condition of Approval E.1). ASA approval requires a finding that the project conforms to zoning standards (Zoning Ordinance Section 5.40.040);
- c. The GUP provides for review of compliance with the GUP's Conditions of Approval (including the requirement for Zoning Ordinance conformance) in the Annual Monitoring Report to be considered by the Planning Commission (Condition of Approval D.2) and prior to the Planning Commission's authorization of an additional development phase (Condition B.2 of Approval); and,
- b. The GUP requires Stanford to provide affordable housing units in conformance with the Inclusionary Housing Zoning Ordinance (Condition of Approval C.2).

19. The GUP Condition of Approval C.1 requires Stanford to construct Academic Development Mitigation Units (deed-restricted affordable housing) or pay lieu affordable housing impact fees consistent with the requirements of the County's Affordable Housing Impact Mitigation

Fee Ordinance (NS-300.929).

20. The GUP Conditions of Approval require conformance with mitigation measures identified in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the project, consistent with provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act.
21. The 1985 Land Use Policy Agreement (“Agreement”) between the County, the City of Palo Alto and Stanford University specifies that Stanford lands in unincorporated Santa Clara County that are planned for academic use are to remain unincorporated and are subject to the County’s General Plan, Zoning Ordinance, and General Use Permit. The Agreement stipulates that Stanford will provide all municipal services to unincorporated portions of Stanford lands, including contractual arrangements for services as needed and that such services may include operation of on-site facilities or purchase from public or private entities, or membership in regional facilities.
 - a. This GUP, as conditioned, provides for development of Stanford lands in unincorporated Santa Clara County in conformance with the County’s General Plan and Zoning Ordinance, and in conformance with the Agreement. (Condition of Approval A.5)
 - b. The GUP provides for preparation by the County of a Municipal Service Study to define appropriate municipal service levels for the Stanford community, analyze the amount and type of service required to serve the population increase planned for pursuant to this GUP, and indicate whether Stanford should provide those services and at what levels. The GUP indicates that the County may consider a request to utilize an in-lieu fee (set by the Board of Supervisors) to obtain services through an alternative provider (Condition of Approval O.9). This requirement is consistent with the Agreement.

Based on the evidence above, the GUP, as conditioned, conforms to the Zoning Ordinance and all other applicable standards and guidelines.

B. Finding. *The site is adequate for the proposed use, including but not limited to being of adequate size and shape to accommodate all facilities and development features to integrate the use into the surrounding area and to provide any necessary or appropriate buffers between the use and the surrounding area.*

1. The site subject to this GUP consists of the approximately 4,000 acres of land within unincorporated Santa Clara County covered by the Stanford University Community Plan. In addition to development authorized by the 2000 GUP, but not yet constructed, this GUP allows for maximum net new development of 2,275,000 square feet of academic and academic support uses, 1,225,000 square feet of student housing (2,807 beds), 2,892 housing units, 40,000 square feet of childcare/trip reduction uses, 50,000 square feet of temporary construction trailers/modular buildings, and 1,480 net new parking spaces. The development is focused on the Central Campus (approximately 1,018 acres), which includes that portion of the site located within the AGB except for the San Juan Development District.
2. The Conditions of Approval distribute development within the site by Development District. The bulk of the authorized academic and academic support development (approximately 79% of the total) is to be implemented within the Campus Center Development District,

located at the center of the site where the only adjacent off-site uses are the Stanford Hospital and Shopping Center. The remainder of the academic development and the housing are distributed among the Quarry, DAPER & Administrative, East Campus, West Campus, Lagunita, and Lathrup Development Districts. The GUP does not allocate new development to the San Juan, Arboretum and Foothills Development Districts (Condition of Approval B.3).

3. The Conditions of Approval require Architecture and Site Approval for site-specific development projects in conformance with the Zoning Ordinance Code (Condition of Approval E.1). The purpose of ASA is to maintain the character and integrity of zoning districts by promoting quality development in harmony with the surrounding area, through consideration of all aspects of site configuration and design, and to generally promote the public health, safety and welfare. The ASA procedure augments the use permit process by providing a means for establishing detailed conditions on proposed developments.
4. Condition of Approval K.1 restricts development within 200 feet of El Camino Real until the County directs the preparation of an update to the El Camino Real Frontage Plan for Stanford lands along the west side of El Camino Real, except for housing development in the Quarry District. The Plan will be prepared in consultation with the City of Palo Alto and will provide objective criteria, including setbacks, height limits, and other standards to guide the future location and design of development along the El Camino site frontage.
5. Existing buffers along the Central Campus perimeter include the Arboretum Development District, within which the Conditions of Approval preclude all structures, grading, parking or pavement, consistent with the area's Campus Open Space land use designation. The southerly campus edge, adjacent to the College Terrace neighborhood, is buffered by existing two-story residential development along the west side of Stanford Avenue.
6. The westerly boundary of the Central Campus is adjacent to the Foothills District, which is located outside the AGB, where only limited uses such as agriculture, field research, and low intensity recreation are permitted. Junipero Serra Boulevard, which bisects the site, is visually buffered from future development in the Lagunita and West Campus Development Districts by the Stanford Golf Course (within the Foothill District) and by Lake Lagunita and areas adjacent to the Lake that are protected from development by the Campus Open Space land use designation.

Based on the evidence listed above, the GUP, as conditioned, is located on a site that supports the proposed use authorized under the GUP.

C. **Finding.** *The proposed use, by its nature, scale, intensity or design, will not impair the integrity and character of the zoning district or neighborhood, and will not be significantly detrimental to any important and distinctive features of the site's natural setting.*

1. The 2018 Sustainable Development Study Supplement, which includes a detailed analysis of the development potential of available land within the Central Campus area and a review of the development intensity of comparable university campuses, indicates that the area covered by the Academic Campus land use designation, which is entirely within the Academic Growth Boundary, could reasonably accommodate significantly more intense

development (i.e., an FAR of 1.0) than that authorized by this GUP. The intensity of development authorized by this GUP is also consistent with the SCP, which provides for up to 20,400,000 square feet of academic development. This GUP provides for up to a total of 3,500,000 square feet of academic and student housing development and 2,892 housing units.

2. The project site is regulated by five zoning districts: 1) A1 General Use; 2) R3S Medium-Density Campus Residential; 3) R1S Low-Density Campus Residential; 4) SCA Special Conservation Area; and 5) OS/F Open Space and Field Research. Any individual building project approved under the GUP must comply with the development standards of the applicable zoning district.
3. The A1 General Use Zoning District, within which most of the academic development and residential development authorized by the GUP will be implemented, allows general residential and agricultural uses, and provides opportunities through the use permit process for other uses and developments that are appropriate for a particular location, consistent with the objectives, goals and policies of the General Plan. The academic and residential development authorized by this GUP within the A1 General Use Zoning District will be located within the Academic Campus land use designation of the *Stanford University Community Plan*. This designation specifically allows for academic and residential development, including high density residential (15 or more units per acre). The SCP sets forth strategies, policies, and implementation measures to guide academic and residential development within the A1 District.
4. The R1S and R3S Zoning Districts were created specifically to regulate low and medium density residential uses on the Stanford campus. New development in these zoning districts will be reviewed for conformance with the applicable district's use and development regulations.
5. The OS/F Open Space and Field Research Zoning District is intended to implement the SCP policies for the Open Space and Field Research land use designation and to maintain the open space character of those Stanford University OS/F lands outside the Academic Growth Boundary and within the Foothills Development District and protect sensitive environmental and visual resources. The OS/F regulations allow only low-intensity uses such as agriculture, field research, limited outdoor recreation, and specialized astronomical facilities and development regulations include detailed requirements intended to ensure that permitted uses and structures do not negatively impact scenic foothill viewsheds and riparian areas. Condition of Approval A.3.b authorizes a total of 1,597 square feet of development in the 2,293-acre Foothills Development District, within which this zoning district is located, and specifies that this development would require a transfer of authorized development from another development district.
6. The SCA Special Conservation Areas Zoning District, located outside the Academic Growth Boundary and within the Foothills Development District, is intended to implement the SCP policies for the Special Conservation Areas land use designation, protecting lands deemed unsuitable for development due to their natural resources and development constraints. The regulations of the SCA District include measures to limit agricultural uses in sensitive habitat areas and to protect riparian areas. No new permanent development in the form of

buildings or structures is allowed, other than construction, modification, and maintenance of improvements to support conservation efforts and very limited utility facilities. The SCA regulations require review of proposed uses and structures for conformance with the Habitat Conservation Plan. Any structure that adds floor area would be subject to the overall limit of 1,540 square feet applicable to the Foothills Development District.

7. The GUP specifies that all development projects pursuant to this GUP must conform to the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance (Condition A.5). Any violation of applicable Zoning regulations would be considered a violation of this GUP (Condition A.11).
8. The GUP requires Architecture and Site Review for site-specific development projects in conformance with the Zoning Ordinance (Condition of Approval E.1). The purpose of ASA is to maintain the character and integrity of zoning districts by promoting quality development in harmony with the surrounding area through consideration of all aspects of site configuration and design, and to generally promote the public health, safety and welfare. The ASA procedure augments the use permit process by providing a means for establishing detailed conditions on proposed developments. ASA approval requires a finding that the project conforms to zoning standards (Zoning Ordinance Section 5.40.040).
9. Prior to additional development within 100 feet of the El Camino, the GUP provides for the phased preparation and adoption of an updated El Camino Real Frontage Plan for Stanford lands along the south side of El Camino Real to identify setbacks, height limits, and other standards to guide the future location and design of development along the El Camino site frontage, except for housing development in the Quarry District(Condition of Approval K.1).
10. The GUP includes conditions to protect the natural setting of the campus. It includes measures to preserve native oak woodlands and provide for oak woodland replacement if removal is deemed necessary Condition J.9). The GUP also includes requirements for County approval prior to removal of protected heritage trees, trees that are 12 inches or more in diameter (except those located in the R1S Zoning District), and trees located within a County right-of-way or easement and specifies minimum tree replacement ratios (Condition J.1.b). The GUP includes conditions that require setbacks and other measures to protect riparian areas (Condition J.8), jurisdictional waters and wetlands (Condition J.10), special status plant species (Condition J.6), and special status animal species – including migratory and other nesting birds (Condition J.3), bats (Condition J.4), dusty footed woodrats (Condition J.5), and steelhead (Condition J.7).

Based on the evidence above, the GUP, as conditioned, will not impair the integrity and character of the zoning district or neighborhood, and will not be significantly detrimental to any important and distinctive features of the site's natural setting.

D. Finding. The proposed use will not be detrimental to the public health, safety or general welfare.

Open Space Preservation.

1. The GUP preserves existing open space lands in the Foothills Development District and the associated viewsheds and environmentally sensitive resources by allocating academic and

housing development to development districts located within the AGB and restricting development outside the AGB (Condition of Approval B.3). This GUP does not allocate development to the Foothills Development District (the 2,293 acres of Stanford land in unincorporated Santa Clara County located outside the AGB). No development is allowed in the Foothills District except for the 1,597 square feet of development carried over from the 2000 GUP (Condition of Approval A.3.b). The GUP prohibits housing units within the Foothill District (Condition of Approval C.9.b).

2. Any new uses located outside the AGB would be reviewed by County staff for conformance with the use regulations, new structure limitations, and requirements for protection of resources of the OS/FR and SCA land use designations and the regulations of the SCA Special Conservation Area and OS/F Open Space and Field Research Zoning Districts (Condition of Approval A.5).

Housing.

1. Housing Demand Created by the General Use Permit.

- a. New academic space development within the SCP Area will create demand for new workers, including workers in lower-income categories. In addition, new residents of market-rate housing, including faculty and staff housing within the Stanford University Community Plan Area, create demand for new public and private sector workers.
- b. This GUP authorizes construction of 2,275,000 square feet of new academic and support space and 1,225,000 s.f. of student housing. The 2018 General Use Permit application prepared by Stanford estimates that by buildout of this academic space, 5,556 employees will be added (2,438 staff, 789, faculty, 961 postdoctoral scholars, 57 janitors, 72 third-party contract workers, 966 casual and temporary, and 273 contingent workers).² After making adjustments, the estimated housing impact of new academic space on Stanford's campus is 4,010 net new workers and a total need for 2,172 net new housing units.³ Stanford has proposed to construct 550 units, which is 1,622 units fewer than what is required to mitigate Stanford's impact on housing as a result of academic and academic support space development authorized under the GUP.
- c. Some of these new workers earn incomes that are only adequate to pay for affordable housing. Of those 2,172 net new households, it is estimated that there will be an affordable housing demand of 933 new affordable units to house the portion of those

² Stanford University, 2018 General Use Permit Application (November 21, 2016), p. 5.3 (Table 2) p. 5.9 (Table 5), https://www.sccgov.org/sites/dpd/DocsForms/Documents/SU_2018GUP_App_Voll.pdf.

³ County of Santa Clara Affordable Housing Nexus Studies, Attachment C, *Affordable Housing Nexus Analysis Addendum for the Stanford University Campus* (April 2018), p. 9 (Table II-2), <https://www.sccgov.org/sites/osh/HousingandCommunityDevelopment/Documents/County%20of%20Santa%20Clara%20Affordable%20Housing%20Nexus%20Studies%20Public%20Review%20Draft.%2004-04-2018.pdf>. The final Affordable Housing Nexus Studies (September 2018) are on file with the Clerk of the Board.

net new workers with income between 0% to 120% of Area Median Income (AMI).⁴ The resulting affordable housing demand includes the need for an estimated: 38 net new housing units for Extremely Low income; 108 net new housing units for Very Low income; 429 net new housing units for Low income; and 389 new housing units for Moderate income.⁵

- d. To mitigate the increased affordable housing needs from development of the GUP, a total of 1,131 net new affordable units⁶ and 1,041 net new market rate housing units are needed⁷. Of the 1,131 net new affordable units needed, 72 housing units are for Extremely Low income; 163 are for Very Low income; 470 are for Low income; and 426 new housing units for Moderate income.
- e. Because affordable housing is in short supply in the SCP and environs, such new workers may be forced to live in less than adequate housing in the area, pay a disproportionate share of their incomes for housing, or commute long distances to their jobs from housing located in more affordable parts of the County or outside of the region entirely.

2. Bay Area Regional Housing Supply and Jobs/Housing Imbalance.

- a. There is a severe shortage of housing in Santa Clara County that is affordable to Extremely Low Income, Very Low, Low, and Moderate Income Households.⁸
 - i. From 2010 to 2019, the population of Santa Clara County increased 9.7% (from 1,781,642 to 1,954,286), but the number of housing units only increased 6.25% (from 631,920 to 671,439).⁹

⁴ *Id.* at p. 16 (Table II-8).

⁵ *Id.* at p. 16 (Table II-9).

⁶ The total 1,131 unit affordable housing need reflects the sum of the 964 affordable unit need for academic space workers, the 198 affordable unit need for workers who provide goods and services to residents less a 31-unit adjustment to remove possible overlap between these two categories of housing need consistent with the methodology described at *Id.* p. 15. The 31-unit adjustment is additional to the 35-unit adjustment already reflected in *Id.* at p. 16 (Table II-8) and results in a combined 66-units removed in determining the net new housing need. The 31-unit additional adjustment is distributed proportionately by income category with 6 Extremely Low, 10 Very Low, 9 Low, and 6 Moderate-Income units removed.

⁷ The market rate housing need of 1,041 units is based on the identified 2,172 total housing units needed to house workers in the academic space and academic support space less the 1,131-unit portion of total housing need for households with incomes of 120% of AMI or less. The identified 1,041 market rate housing unit need is conservative in that it would be higher were additional housing demand from off-campus workers, in retail, restaurants and other services to residents in new on-campus housing units, as identified in *Id.* at p. 32, included as part of the total unit count.

⁸ See generally County of Santa Clara, County of Santa Clara Housing Element Update 2015-2022 (June 10, 2014), available at: https://www.sccgov.org/sites/dpd/DocsForms/Documents/HealthElement_2015_Adopted_Final.pdf; Association of Bay Area Governments, Planning and Research Department, Regional Forecast for Plan Bay Area 2040 (Feb. 2016), http://reports.abag.ca.gov/other/Regional_Forecast_for_Plan_Bay_Area_2040_F_030116.pdf.

⁹ State of California, Department of Finance, E-5 Population and Housing Estimates for Cities, Counties, and the State, 2011-2018 with 2010 Census Benchmark (May 2019), <http://www.dof.ca.gov/Forecasting/Demographics/Estimates/E-5/>.

- ii. According to the 2015-2023 Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) determined by the Association of Bay Area Governments, Santa Clara County had a total housing need of 58,836 units through 2023, which included the need to add 10,636 new Moderate Income units, 9,542 new Low Income units, and 16,158 Very Low-Income units within Santa Clara County. Although the current RHNA cycle is more than halfway over, only 48% of the allocated units across all income levels have been completed countywide.¹⁰ The percentage of allocated units countywide that have been completed are progressively worse the lower the income level: 23% of moderate income units completed to date; 13% of low income units; and 10% of very low-income units.¹¹
- iii. Because of the shortage of affordable housing units in Santa Clara County, many households overpay for housing. The Harvard Joint Center for Housing Studies compared 2015 home prices and household incomes across 100 metropolitan areas and found that only 22.3 % of all households in the San Jose-Sunnyvale-Santa Clara metropolitan area (which includes the City of Palo Alto and Stanford University) could afford the typical monthly payments for a median-priced home, and that only 12 % of renters earn sufficient income to afford payments for a median- priced home in the area — the second lowest proportions of households in each category of the 100 metropolitan areas examined.¹² Similarly, only 25.2 percent of all households in the San Francisco-Oakland metropolitan area (which includes San Mateo County) could afford the typical monthly payments for a median-priced home, and that only 13.6 percent of renters earn sufficient income to afford payments for a median-priced home in the area.
- iv. According to the National Low-Income Housing Coalition’s Out of Reach 2018 study, the San Jose-Sunnyvale-Santa Clara HUD Metropolitan Fair Market Rent Area is again the second most

¹⁰ Silicon Valley at Home, *Countywide RHNA Annual Progress Reporting* (April 2, 2019), <https://siliconvalleyathome.org/countywide-rhna-annual-progress-reporting-falling-short-on-affordable-housing-production/>

¹¹ *Ibid.*

¹² Joint Center for Housing Studies of Harvard University, *Who Can Afford the Median-Priced Home In Their Metro?*, <http://jchs.harvard.edu/son2017-housing-affordability-table>. The San Jose-Sunnyvale-Santa Clara metropolitan area includes the City of Palo Alto and Stanford University.

expensive metropolitan area in the country to rent.¹³ In the 2017, 2016 and 2015 reports, this metropolitan area was, respectively, the second¹⁴, third¹⁵ and fourth¹⁶ most expensive area of the nation in which to rent.

- v. The San Jose-Sunnyvale-Santa Clara metropolitan area had the highest median sales price of existing single-family homes in the nation in 2018 according to data from the National Association of Realtors, with a median price for a single-family detached home of \$1.34 million and a year-over-year price gain of 13.6%.¹⁷
 - vi. According to the 2017 Santa Clara County Homeless Census and Survey, the number of homeless persons in the county is now estimated to be 7,394,¹⁸ an increase of 12.8% from 2015 estimates. The County of Santa Clara Office of Supportive Housing reports that the most significant increases in homelessness have been among families and unaccompanied children and youth.
- b. Jobs/housing imbalances in various portions of Santa Clara County and throughout the San Francisco Bay Area significantly impact housing availability and affordability and contribute to the severe traffic congestion in Santa Clara County and this jobs/housing imbalance is especially severe in the areas adjacent to Stanford.¹⁹
- 1. One measure of housing imbalance in a region is the ratio of jobs to housing units in the area. The County's General Plan has identified the imbalances between job and housing growth as an important regional issue since the 1960s and with the adoption of the 1980 General Plan. The County of Santa Clara Housing Element Update for 2015-2022 reported

¹³ National Low Income Housing Coalition, Out of Reach 2018, p. 14 (2018), https://nlihc.org/sites/default/files/oor/OOR_2018.pdf

¹⁴ National Low Income Housing Coalition, Out of Reach 2017, p. 11 (2017), http://nlihc.org/sites/default/files/oor/OOR_2017.pdf

¹⁵ National Low Income Housing Coalition, Out of Reach 2016, p. 10 (2016), http://nlihc.org/sites/default/files/oor/OOR_2016_0.pdf

¹⁶ National Low Income Housing Coalition, Out of Reach 2015, p. 10 (2015) http://nlihc.org/sites/default/files/OOR_2015.pdf

¹⁷ National Association of Realtors, Median Sales Price of Existing Single-Family Homes for Metropolitan Areas, 4th Quarter 2018, p.3, <https://www.nar.realtor/sites/default/files/documents/metro-home-prices-q4-2018-single-family-2019-02-12.pdf>

¹⁸ Applied Survey Research, Santa Clara County Homeless Census & Survey, p. 1 (2017), https://www.sccgov.org/sites/osh/ContinuumofCare/ReportsandPublications/Documents/2017%20SCC%20Homeless%20Census%20and%20Survey%20Executive_Summary.pdf

¹⁹ See, e.g., County of Santa Clara, *supra* note 1, at pp. 65-67.

that, although there have been fluctuations in the jobs-to-housing ratio as economic conditions changed, an overall imbalance persists.²⁰

2. According to data from the State of California's Employment Development Department and Department of Finance, from 2010 through 2017 the number of jobs in Santa Clara County increased by 26.3 percent (from 860,330 to 1,086,900),²¹ but the number of housing units only increased by 4.7 percent (from 631,920 to 661,875).²² This reflects an increase from 1.39 jobs per housing unit in 2012 to 1.58 jobs per housing unit in 2016. Similarly, in San Mateo County, from 2010 through 2017 the number of jobs increased by 25.9 percent (from 317,700 to 400,300),²³ but the number of housing units only increased by 2.3 percent (from 271,031 to 277,189).²⁴ This reflects an increase from 1.17 jobs per housing unit in 2010 to 1.44 jobs per housing unit in 2017. A jobs-housing ratio over 1.5 indicates that the region is likely to experience traffic congestion associated with people coming to jobs from outside the areas, as well as pressure on the cost of available housing in the region.²⁵
3. Data from the 2010 census indicates that significant numbers of people who work in Santa Clara County live outside of the County, including but not limited to: 64,696 from Alameda County; 50,215 from San Mateo County; 19,087 from San Francisco County; 17,451 from Santa Cruz County; 11,526 from Contra Costa County; 7,345 from San Benito County; 4,750 from Monterey County; 4,118 from Merced County; and 2,022 from Sacramento County.²⁶
4. Nearly 190,000 workers commute from outside the nine-county Bay Area region to the business parks in Silicon Valley and the Tri-Valley area, and

²⁰ County of Santa Clara, *supra* note 1, at pp. 65-66 (citing Santa Clara County job/housing ratios of 1.5 in 1991, 1.8 in 2001, and 1.3 in 2011).

²¹ State of California, Employment Development Department, <http://www.labormarketinfo.edd.ca.gov/data/employment-by-industry.html>.

²² State of California, *supra* note 2, <http://www.dof.ca.gov/Forecasting/Demographics/Estimates/E-5/>.

²³ State of California, Employment Development Data, *supra* note 12, <http://www.labormarketinfo.edd.ca.gov/data/employment-by-industry.html>.

²⁴ State of California, *supra* note 2, <http://www.dof.ca.gov/Forecasting/Demographics/Estimates/E-5/>.

²⁵ U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, EnviroAtlas, Fact Sheet: Employment to Housing Ratio (Nov. 2014), <https://enviroatlas.epa.gov/enviroatlas/DataFactSheets/pdf/Supplemental/EmploymentHousingRatio.pdf>.

²⁶ State of California, Employment Development Department, County-to-County Commute Patterns (US Census Bureau) in Santa Clara County, <http://www.labormarketinfo.edd.ca.gov/cgi/databrowsing/localAreaProfileQSMOREResult.asp?viewAll=yes&viewAllUS=¤tPage=¤tPageUS=&sortUp=G1.AREANAME&sortDown=&criteria=commuting+patterns&categoryType=population+census+data&geogArea=0604000085×eries=&more=More&menuChoice=localAreaPro&printerFriendly=&BackHistory=-4&goTOPageText=>

more than 220,000 East bay residents cross the toll bridges to the Peninsula each workday.²⁷

5. The housing supply and affordability concerns that are experienced countywide are particularly acute at and around Stanford University due to the high housing prices in the area around Stanford that result in a small supply of affordable housing. The jobs/housing imbalance that is characteristic of Santa Clara County generally is more acute in the communities that surround Stanford's campus, including Palo Alto and Mountain View, and Menlo Park in San Mateo County. According to projections by the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), the city in Santa Clara County with greatest imbalance between jobs and housing units in 2014 was Palo Alto, with a jobs/housing unit ratio of 3.49.²⁸ The City of Mountain View had the third highest imbalance of jobs to housing units in the county, with a ratio of 2.37.²⁹ In 2015, the City of Menlo Park had approximately 2.42 jobs in the city for every housing unit.³⁰ These local imbalances between jobs and housing acutely affect both the regional housing market and traffic congestion.

3. Statewide Housing Supply.

- a. The acute housing shortage experienced in the Bay Area is being experienced statewide.
 - i. While 200,000 units of housing in California are needed annually to keep up with population growth, only 113,000 were permitted in 2017, and fewer than 750,000 units were permitted since 2007, accounting for only 40% of the projected need.³¹
 - ii. Between the economic peak of 2007 and 2017, California had a robust overall growth in both employment (adding 8.7% more jobs) and population (9.1% increase), and based on this population growth, California would have needed to build at least 1,819,568 additional units during these ten years to

²⁷ Metropolitan Transportation Commission and Association of Bay Area Governments, *CASA Compact* (January 2019), p. i, https://mtc.ca.gov/sites/default/files/CASA_Compact.pdf

²⁸ Local Agency Formation Commission of Santa Clara County, *Cities Service Review*, p. 7 (Dec. 2015), http://www.santaclaralafco.org/file/ServiceReviews/CitiesSR2015/2CSRR_ExecSumm.pdf

²⁹ *Ibid.*

³⁰ City of Menlo Park, Facebook Campus Expansion Project, Draft Environmental Impact Report, pp. 3.12-5 – 3.12-6 (31,920 jobs/13,180 housing units) (May 2016), https://www.menlopark.org/DocumentCenter/View/10293/Ch03-12_PopulationHousing_Draft-EIR

³¹ 2019-20 Governor's Proposed Budget, Housing and Local Government (January 9, 2019), p. 89, <http://www.ebudget.ca.gov/2019-20/pdf/BudgetSummary/HousingandLocalGovernment.pdf>

house the added population.³² With both new construction and demolitions factored in, the housing stock grew by only 5.3% from 2007 to 2017, and the total increase in new housing units was 708,112, less than half of the estimated need.³³

- iii. While no state in the nation has an adequate supply of rental housing affordable and available for extremely low-income households, California has the largest deficit of such units of any state with 1,019,190 (only 22 affordable and available rental homes for every 100 extremely low-income renter households).³⁴ And 76% of those extremely low-income households within the state are severely housing cost-burdened, spending more than half of their incomes on rent and utilities.³⁵
- iv. Californians spend a larger share of their income on rent than households in the rest of the nation at every income quartile, and households with the lowest income face the highest cost pressures.³⁶
- v. High housing costs drive California's official poverty rate from about 13% (slightly higher than average) to 19% (highest in the nation) under the Census Bureau's Supplemental Poverty Measure, which takes into account food, clothing, shelter, and utilities.³⁷
- vi. Low-income households are the most likely to be cost burdened (spend more than 30% of their incomes on housing); in the state, around 2.5 million low-income households are cost burdened and over 1.5 million low-income renters face even more dire cost pressures - spending more than half their income on housing.³⁸ According to a statewide survey in 2017, 47% of Californians - including 61% of renters - say housing costs are a financial

³² Turner Center for Housing Innovation, *Housing Policies in California Cities* (March 1, 2019), p. 3, http://californialanduse.org/download/Mawhorter_Housing_Policies_in_California_Cities.pdf

³³ *Ibid.*

³⁴ National Low Income Housing Coalition, *The GAP: A Shortage of Affordable Homes* (March 2019), Appendix A, https://reports.nlihc.org/sites/default/files/gap/Gap-Report_2019.pdf

³⁵ *Ibid.*

³⁶ Legislative Analyst's Office, *California's Housing and Homelessness Challenges in Context* (February 21, 2019), p. 3, https://lao.ca.gov/handouts/state_admin/2019/Housing-Homelessness-Challenges-022119.pdf

³⁷ *Ibid.*

³⁸ *Ibid.*

strain.³⁹

- vii. At a roundtable discussion in San Jose to outline components of the state’s plan to tackle the housing affordability crisis for families, Governor Newsom stated that “[t]he cost of housing - both for homeowners and renters - is the defining quality-of-life concern for people across this state. Housing costs threaten to erode our state’s long-term prosperity and are driving hardworking Californians to look for opportunities elsewhere.”⁴⁰

4. Existing Regulatory Framework.

- a. On September 25, 2018, the Board of Supervisors approved Ordinances No. NS-300.929 and No. NS-1200.368, establishing a Housing Impact Mitigation Fee Ordinance for Academic Space and an Inclusionary Housing Zoning ordinance for the Stanford Community Plan Area and adopting Resolution No. BOS-2018-104 establishing the Housing Mitigation Fee amount.
- b. The Board of Supervisors established an Affordable Housing Impact Mitigation Fee of \$68.50/psf, a substantially lower amount than the \$143.10/psf which would have fully mitigated the impacts of academic space development.
- c. The Affordable Housing Impact Mitigation Fee mitigates only a portion of the of the total housing impacts caused by the 2018 GUP by mitigating approximately 60% of the affordable housing demand generated by development of academic space in the Stanford Community Plan.
- d. In adopting the Affordable Housing Impact Mitigation Fee, the Board of Supervisors opted not to require construction of units rather than payment of the fee, despite the fact that construction of units on or near the Stanford Community Plan better mitigates housing impacts.
- e. The Board of Supervisors further adopted an Inclusionary Housing Zoning Ordinance, requiring that 16% of housing units developed within the Stanford Community Plan Area be made affordable to Extremely Low, Very Low, Low, and Moderate-Income households.
- f. The Inclusionary Housing Zoning Ordinance mitigates the impact of residential development within the Stanford Community Plan Area on the area housing market.

³⁹ Public Policy Institute of California, *California’s Housing Challenges Continue* (January 2019), p. 1, <https://www.ppic.org/wp-content/uploads/californias-future-housing-january-2019.pdf>

⁴⁰ Governor Newsom Unveils Proposals to Tackle Housing Affordability Crisis (January 15, 2019), <https://www.gov.ca.gov/2019/01/15/housing-affordability-crisis/>

- g. The Inclusionary Housing Zoning Ordinance requires the construction of inclusionary units and does not provide the option of an in-lieu fee, but does provide several options for compliance, including off-site construction or conversion of existing units.
- h. The SCP – which specifically regulates Stanford’s lands in unincorporated county – includes measures for ensuring that housing is provided commensurate with population growth and academic development approval in order to minimize Stanford’s impact on the jobs-housing imbalance in the region, thereby enhancing the public health, safety, and welfare. (SCP-H 5; SCP-H 6; SCP-H 7.)
 - 1. It further requires that new housing development occur commensurate with population growth and academic development approvals on campus, and supports Stanford’s efforts to develop land in other jurisdictions (SCP-H 7; SCP-H 9).
 - 2. The SCP also calls for Stanford to provide financial assistance for housing faculty and staff (SCP-H 10)
 - 3. The SCP requires Stanford to provide a sufficient level of affordable housing on campus to meet the affordable housing needs generated by new academic development on its unincorporated lands or made an appropriate payment in lieu of constructing the housing (SCP-H 11).

5. Current Regulatory Structure Does Not Close the Affordable Housing Gap.

- a. Together, the Affordable Housing Impact Mitigation Fee and the Inclusionary Housing Zoning Ordinance partially mitigate the impacts of development of residential and academic space in SCP on the demand for affordable housing in the area, but do not fully mitigate those impacts.
- b. The Affordable Housing Impact Mitigation Fee, by its terms, mitigates only 48% of the impact of new academic space development on affordable housing thru the payment of fees.⁴¹
- c. Due to the high housing prices adjacent to the SCP, many lower income workers are forced to find housing at great distances from their employment.⁴²

⁴¹ The Board of Supervisors established an Affordable Housing Impact Mitigation Fee of \$68.50/psf, a substantially lower amount than the \$143.10/psf which would have fully mitigated the impacts of academic space development.

⁴² According to Zillow.com, average sales prices for the following communities near the SCP as of April 30, 2019 are: Palo Alto \$2.5 million, Mountain View: \$1.5 million, Los Altos, \$3 million, Menlo Park: \$1.9 million, Redwood City: \$1.4 million, East Palo Alto \$900,000. Commute data provided by Stanford University indicates 35% of Faculty commute from outside of a six-mile radius of the Campus while nearly twice as many staff (64%) commute from communities beyond a six-mile radius of the Campus. The greater commuting by staff relative to faculty likely reflects their lower incomes. Per data provided by Stanford and summarized in the County of Santa Clara Affordable Housing Nexus Studies, Attachment C, Affordable Housing Nexus Analysis Addendum for the Stanford University Campus (September 2018), pp. 19 and 20 (Table II-12 and Table II-13), approximately 96% of Faculty have

6. The Affordable Housing Gap will be Closed with Construction of Affordable Housing within the Stanford Community Plan Area.

- a. The Affordable Housing Mitigation Fee and Inclusionary Housing Zoning Ordinance do not fully mitigate the impacts of development under the GUP on affordable housing.
- b. Due to the size and the scope of the GUP, Stanford is in a better position to fully mitigate its impacts on the housing supply; rather than contributing to the worsening of an acute housing shortage.
- c. Full mitigation of impacts on the housing caused by development authorized under the GUP requires more housing units within the Stanford Community Plan area than what was proposed in order to adequately address housing impacts under the GUP.
- d. Full mitigation of impacts on housing requires that Stanford construct enough affordable housing units on or near the Stanford Community Plan area to fully mitigate the impacts of the GUP on housing.
- e. Full mitigation of impacts on affordable housing requires the construction of 933 below market rate units (including 72 Extremely Low Income, 133 Very Low Income, 381 Low Income, and 347 Moderate Income units) at buildout of the final phase. This means that in addition to the credits the GUP allows for construction of affordable units or payment to the County of housing mitigation fees towards the affordable units required by this GUP, in conformance with the Housing Impact Mitigation Fee Ordinance, as amended, an additional [56] Extremely Low Income or Very Low Income, [168] Low Income, and [149] Moderate Income units must be constructed.

7. Grounds to Fill the Affordability Gap.

- a. The requirement imposed under the GUP for an additional [56] Extremely Low Income or Very Low Income, [168] Low Income, and [149] Moderate Income units is supported by the fact that the GUP will result in the addition of 4,010 net new workers, requiring 2,172 net new households, of which it is estimated that there will be an affordable housing demand of 933 new affordable units to house the portion of those net new workers with income between 0% to 120% of AMI. Although the County’s current regulatory structure covers 560 of those 933 new affordable units, there will continue to be a demand of 373 affordable housing units—this is the affordability gap that the GUP will fill. Without the construction of these additional affordable units, the project would not be consistent with the SCP policies requiring Stanford to fully mitigate its impacts on the housing supply caused by new academic development and that new housing development occur commensurate with population growth and academic development. In addition, the GUP requires the provision of affordable units, consistent with the County’s Housing Element goals of protecting the

incomes above 120% of AMI and 76% have income of at least \$200,000, whereas for staff, just 53% have household incomes above 120% of AMI with only 20% earning at least \$200,000.

public welfare by fostering an adequate supply of housing for persons at all economic levels.⁴³ Moreover, the construction of the 373 affordable housing units will directly mitigate the impacts on the affordable housing supply caused by Stanford because it will require the construction of such units.

b. The Nexus Study documents that the academic development authorized under the GUP will create 4,010 net new workers, requiring 2,172 net new households, of which an estimated 933 new affordable units to house the new workers with income between 0% to 120% of AMI. The Nexus Study demonstrates that the construction of 933 new affordable units will offset demand on the regional affordable housing supply caused by new academic development authorized under this GUP. Furthermore, the GUP only requires that these units be constructed commensurate with the new academic development and, thus, no affordable housing units will be constructed unless the new academic development is constructed.

8. Grounds to Fully Mitigate the Demand for Market Rate Housing Units

a. The GUP requires a minimum of 1,239 market-rate and inclusionary units to be constructed. This number is based on the fact that the new academic development authorized under the GUP will create the addition of 4,010 net new workers, requiring 2,172 net new households, of which 1,239 of these households will be market rate (more than 120% of AMI). Without the construction of these market rate units, the project would not be consistent with the SCP policies recognizing the linkage between the expansion of academic facilities and the increase in housing demand and that new housing development occur commensurate with population growth and academic development. This GUP requires the provision of market-rate units, consistent with the County's Housing Element goals of protecting the public welfare by fostering an adequate supply of housing for persons at all economic levels.⁴⁴ Moreover, the construction of the 1,239 market rate units will directly mitigate the impacts on the market rate housing supply caused by Stanford because it will require the construction of such units.

b. The Nexus Study documents that the academic development authorized under the GUP will create 4,010 net new workers, requiring 2,172 net new households, of which an estimated 1,239 market rate units must be constructed. The Nexus Study demonstrates that the construction of 1,239 market rate units will offset demand on the regional affordable housing supply caused by new academic development authorized under this GUP. Furthermore, the GUP only requires that these units be constructed commensurate with the new academic development and, thus, no market rate units will be constructed unless the new academic development is constructed.

⁴³ Santa Clara County Housing Element Update: 2015-2022; Strategy #1, p. 32; available at https://www.sccgov.org/sites/dpd/DocsForms/Documents/HealthElement_2015_Adopted_Final.pdf.

⁴⁴ Santa Clara County Housing Element Update: 2015-2022; Strategy #1, p. 32; available at https://www.sccgov.org/sites/dpd/DocsForms/Documents/HealthElement_2015_Adopted_Final.pdf.

c. Lack of adequate market rate and affordable housing will create pressure on the housing supply within surrounding cities. This would be especially severe in vulnerable communities such as East Palo Alto, where the city has sought to protect tenants in the city from harassment and displacement due to rising market pressures on the city's existing housing stock.⁴⁵ Therefore, and based on the reasons described above, the GUP, as conditioned, will not be detrimental to the public health, safety or general welfare.

Pedestrian, Bicycle and Transit

1. The GUP promotes alternative modes of travel which reduce traffic congestion and air emissions and offer community health benefits.
 - a. The GUP requires Stanford to meet specific standards for AM and PM peak hour and peak period (3 hours) traffic and average daily trips to ensure that development does not substantially increase traffic in the surrounding area (Conditions of Approval F.2-7). These standards encourage Stanford's continued expansion of its Transportation Demand Management incentives for non-auto travel modes and its continued funding of transit services and bicycle and pedestrian improvements as a means of earning trip reduction credits.
 - b. Based on Stanford's proposal in the EIR, the GUP requires Stanford to provide \$1.2 million in funding for specific bicycle/pedestrian improvements in East Palo Alto, Palo Alto, Menlo Park, and unincorporated San Mateo County (Condition of Approval F.10).
 - c. Based on Stanford's proposal in its 2018 GUP Application, the GUP requires Stanford to make safe routes to school improvements that would benefit both pedestrian and bicycle circulation in and around Nixon and Escondido Elementary Schools, which include such improvements as improved sidewalks, high visibility crosswalks, additional signage, additional traffic control and a mid-block crosswalk (Condition of Approval F.8).
 - d. The GUP requires Stanford to participate in safe routes to school studies and improvements if a new school or modified attendance boundaries are needed to accommodate the increase in K-12 population on the campus (Condition of Approval F.9).

Municipal Services

1. The SCP requires that provision of urban services to Stanford's academic lands shall be the University's responsibility (SCP-GD 9) and calls for the identification of service needs and appropriate service levels [SCP-GD (i) 2]. The 1986 Land Use Policy Agreement stipulates that Stanford will provide all municipal services to unincorporated portions of Stanford lands, including contractual arrangements for services as needed. This GUP includes requirements intended to ensure that appropriate services at appropriate levels are provided to Stanford's students, residents, faculty, staff and visitors and that provision of these

⁴⁵ Metropolitan Transportation Commission and Association of Bay Area Governments, *CASA Compact* (January 2019), p. i, https://mtc.ca.gov/sites/default/files/CASA_Compact.pdf

services does not place a burden on surrounding jurisdictions.

- a. The GUP requires preparation of a Municipal Services Study under the County's direction with approval by the Planning Commission to define appropriate service levels for students, residents, faculty, staff, and visitors; analyze the amount and types of services needed to serve the GUP's planned population growth; and assess whether Stanford provides those services at appropriate levels.
- b. The GUP specifies that if the Municipal Services Study concludes that Stanford would not provide sufficient municipal services to serve the projected population increase, Stanford is required to provide these services directly through construction and operation of the necessary facilities and/or programs, or the County may consider a request to provide the services through an in-lieu fee established by the Board of Supervisors pursuant to a nexus fee study.

Parks

1. The GUP includes provisions to ensure that appropriate on-campus recreational facilities are available to serve the Stanford community. It requires that Stanford fund a Municipal Services Study to identify how adequate open and space parks designed for community recreational use will be provided to serve new development (with its resulting additional population) planned pursuant to this GUP (Condition O.9). The study will include an implementation schedule for provision of needed park facilities identified by the study.

Drainage

1. The GUP requires preparation of a Master Drainage Plan for design and construction of a storm stormwater drainage system, including conveyance and detention facilities, designed to mitigate all increased runoff generated from development within the Community Plan from the effective date of this GUP through the life of this GUP resulting from the 10-, 20-, 50- and 100-year storm events (Condition of Approval M.7).
 - a. The Plan must demonstrate that development will not increase peak flows and volumes; the frequency, severity, and lateral extent of flooding; and water surface elevations in San Francisquito Creek and Matadero Creek resulting from 10-, 20-, 50-, and 100-year storm events.
 - b. The Plan will include an implementation schedule for construction of identified improvements.
 - c. The Master Drainage Plan shall be reviewed and approved by the County in consultation with the Santa Clara Valley Water District, the San Francisquito Creek Joint Powers Authority, and any other regulatory agencies deemed appropriate by the County.
 - d. Following approval of the Plan, Stanford is required to design construct and maintain required drainage facilities consistent with the Plan.
 - e. The County may require revision of the Plan as needed to ensure that it continues to achieve the objectives identified in item "a" above.

Based on the evidence above, the GUP, as conditioned, will not be detrimental to the public health, safety, or general welfare.

D-1 Finding: Adequate off-street parking, loading and unloading areas (if applicable), and compliant access for individuals with disabilities will be provided;

1. The 2000 Stanford University General Use Permit (“2000 GUP”) established a parking cap of 21,651. The Stanford 2018 GUP Application estimates that after completion of development authorized by the 2000 GUP, campus parking will have reached 20,171 spaces, 1480 spaces short of the cap⁴⁶. This GUP retains the 21,651-space parking cap, allowing up to 1,480 net new spaces. The parking cap includes parking that is on-street, off-street, in surface lots, and in structures, regardless of any special designation (e.g., carpool, car share, accessible). It excludes parking provided in parking garages or structures associated with on-campus housing for faculty, staff, postgraduate fellows, and medical interns, where such parking is restricted for the sole use of the residents of such housing, up to a maximum of one space per unit (Condition of Approval H.1).
2. Between 2004 and 2015, demand for commuter parking permits fell from a high of 21,000 permits sold in 2004-2005, to fewer than 18,000 sold in 2015. Notably, permit sales declined, even as the square footage of the campus increased under the 2000 General Use Permit. Stanford attributes the decline in parking rates to a shift away from auto travel by the millennial generation, and the success of its Transportation Demand Management (“TDM”) programs.⁴⁷ Stanford’s robust TDM program has resulted in a steady increase in enrollment in the Commute Club, which more than doubled since 2004-2005, and a substantial decline in the commuter drive-alone rate from 72% in 2002, to 50% in 2018.⁴⁸ As result, Stanford will have added only 820 net new parking spaces at completion of development under the 2000 GUP.
3. Even greater reductions in automobile use and the commuter drive-alone rate are needed if Stanford is to meet the No Net New Commute Trips standard as it continues to add development. This GUP’s trip reduction requirements for the reverse commute direction and non-peak hour times will require a broadening of trip reduction efforts. Further reductions in the drive-alone rate and increases in other travel modes will continue to moderate the demand for parking to serve campus commuters. In addition, effective tools are available (including parking permit pricing, incentives for alternate modes of travel, and regulations governing undergraduate’s ability to have on-campus cars) that can be used to encourage continued reductions in car ownership by students and other campus residents.
4. Based on data from the Fall 2015 Stanford parking inventory, approximately 86% of campus spaces were occupied on a typical day when Stanford was in session, which indicates that there is enough supply to minimize spillover parking in the areas surrounding the campus. Allowing the occupancy rate to increase to 95 or 100 percent, consistent with best management practices for long-term employee and resident parking,⁴⁹ would make more efficient use of the parking

⁴⁶ Stanford University, “2018 General Use Permit Application”, Project Description: 3.31.

⁴⁷ Santa Clara County, “Stanford University 2018 General Use Permit Environmental Impact Report,” (2018) Appendix C.3: 4.

⁴⁸ Stanford University, “2018 General Use Permit Application,” Project Description: 3.35.

⁴⁹ Todd Litman, Parking Management Best Practices (Chicago: American Planning Association, 2006) 24-25.

inventory and utilize an existing significant parking reserve.

5. Residential permit parking has been implemented by the City of Palo Alto in areas around the Stanford campus to prevent spill-over parking from a variety of sources (including Stanford) from impacting residential neighborhoods. The GUP requires Stanford to provide fair-share funding for additional parking studies and residential permit parking programs as needed (Condition of Approval H.3) to ensure that spillover parking does not impact residential neighborhoods, consistent with Stanford Community Plan Policy SCP-C 6.
6. Based on the above evidence, the GUP provides adequate off-street parking. The architecture and site approval process for each development project pursuant to this GUP will include review for adequate loading spaces and conformance with building code requirements regarding parking and access for persons with disabilities.

D-2. Finding. *Appropriately designed site access will be provided, including safe and adequate access for fire and emergency vehicles (including secondary access where deemed necessary by the fire marshal);*

1. The Architecture and Site Approval process required for development proposals pursuant to the GUP includes project review for adequate site access and review by the County Fire Department to ensure adequate fire flow and emergency vehicle access.
2. The GUP requires that alternate emergency access and evacuation routes during construction be included on plan submittals during the building permit plan check process alternative evacuation and emergency routes to maintain response times during construction periods and shall inform the Stanford Police and Palo Alto Police and Fire Departments of construction locations and changes in emergency access (Condition of Approval R.5.d).
3. The GUP includes conditions requiring County approval of modification of transit routes and bicycle and pedestrian access during construction (Condition of Approval R.5.a-c).
4. Based on the evidence above, the GUP ensures that the site is appropriately designed for safe and adequate emergency access.

D-3. Finding. *The use will not adversely affect water quality. Adequate wastewater treatment, disposal and sanitation facilities will be provided and will satisfy all applicable local, state and federal requirements.*

1. The GUP requires Stanford to comply with the stormwater treatment facility and maintenance requirements of the current National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit; requires preparation of an annual report identifying stormwater treatment and detention facilities provided for compliance with the NPDES Permit (Condition of Approval M.2); and requires inclusion of Green Infrastructure and LID in the updated Master Drainage Plan for the campus (Condition of Approval M.7.a.4). GUP Condition M.5 restricts uses in the Unconfined Groundwater Zone that could pose a threat to water quality.
2. The GUP requires Stanford to document, for all proposed developments, that any inactive water wells on a development site have been closed in conformance with Santa Clara Valley Water District requirements (Condition of Approval M.6).
3. The GUP requires implementation of mitigation measures if soil or groundwater

contamination is discovered during construction to ensure that the contamination is isolated and protected from runoff and that remediation of actionable levels of contamination conforms to applicable County EH&S and Regional Water Quality Control Board standards (Condition of Approval R.7).

4. Wastewater generated by Stanford is conveyed from the on-site sanitary sewer system to off-site City of Palo Alto sewer lines for transmission to the City of Palo Alto Regional Wastewater Quality Control Plan for treatment. The Stanford 2018 General Use Permit EIR states that existing City of Palo Alto sewer line and wastewater treatment capacity are more than adequate to accommodate the wastewater generated by development pursuant to this GUP.⁵⁰ GUP Condition O.6 requires review of future development applications by the County Building Official to determine if capacity of existing on-site sewer lines and connections to the City of Palo Alto system are adequate to accommodate increased flows generated by the proposed project. If capacity is inadequate, the condition requires Stanford to replace the sewer lines with larger capacity pipes.
5. Based on the evidence listed above, the GUP will not adversely affect water quality.

D-4. Finding. *The use will not be detrimental to the adjacent area because of excessive noise, odor, dust or bright lights;*

1. The GUP requires compliance with the County of Santa Clara Noise Ordinance in regard to operational noise, limits the number of fireworks displays on the campus to four per year; requires a noise hotline for special events, and requires shielding of noise from emergency generator and HVAC equipment (Conditions of Approval Q.1-4). The EIR identifies that short-term construction noise constitutes a significant unavoidable impact, but identifies mitigation measures to limit construction noise to the maximum extent feasible that are required to be implemented. (Conditions of Approval R.1-3).
2. The EIR prepared for the GUP indicates that the project does not include uses that the Bay Area Air Quality Management District considers as odor sources of concern and that the potential for the project to result in objectionable odors is less than significant.⁵¹
3. The GUP requires implementation of Bay Area Air Quality Management District's *Best Management Practices for Controlling Particle Emissions* to prevent dust emissions from impacting air quality and adjacent uses during construction (Condition of Approval R.8) and requires Stanford to comply with Bay Area Air Quality Management District requirements for laboratory emissions (Condition of Approval P.1). In addition, the GUP requires Stanford to meet final Tier 4 standards for all construction equipment except chainsaws and paving phase equipment, requires all Marguerite buses to be electric by 2035, and requires 70 percent of Stanford Land Buildings and Real Estate and Bonair fleet vehicles to be electric by 2035 (Condition P.2).
4. The GUP requires submittal of a lighting plan for each development project that includes exterior lighting prior to Architecture and Site Approval. To reduce lighting impacts, the

⁵⁰ Santa Clara County, "Stanford University 2018 General Use Permit Environmental Impact Report" (2018) 7-234).

⁵¹ Santa Clara County, "Stanford 2018 General Use Permit EIR," 5.2-40)

lighting plan is to show the extent of illumination, prevent upward glow, and utilize high efficiency lighting with sharp cut-off and glare/spill control features (Condition of Approval K.2).

5. Based on the evidence listed above, the use will not be detrimental to the adjacent area because of excessive noise, odor, dust or bright lights.

D-5. Finding. *The use will not substantially worsen traffic congestion affecting the surrounding area;*

The GUP, as conditioned, identifies standards for assessing whether the use will substantially worsen traffic congestion affecting the surrounding area. The conditions of approval as recommended incorporate the mitigation measures for transportation identified in the final EIR, and in addition, impose requirements necessary to make this finding that the project will not substantially worsen traffic congestion affecting the surrounding areas. These standards are configured in three tiers that address commute traffic in the AM and PM peak hours and peak periods, reverse commute traffic in the AM and PM peak hours and peak periods, and Average Daily Trips (ADT).

1. **Peak Hour and Peak Period.** As proposed by Stanford in the 2018 GUP Application, the GUP requires that Stanford achieve the No Net New Commute Standard (i.e., avoid exceeding the commute direction, AM and PM peak hour traffic baselines by 1% or greater in any year). In addition, it requires that Stanford achieve no net increase in commute trips in the peak period (i.e., avoid exceeding the AM and PM peak period commute trip baseline by 1% or greater during any year). The peak period baselines will be established based on the 2001 traffic monitoring data as approved by the Director.
 - a. If the standard for either the AM or PM peak hours or peak periods is violated, the County will suspend approval of new development, pursuant to the process in Condition A.11, until Stanford demonstrates compliance through subsequent annual counts a minimum of one year preceding authorization of the next development phase (Condition of Approval F.2.a.3).
 - b. If the standard identified for the AM and PM peak hours is violated in any single year, Stanford is required to make fair share payments to mitigate its impacts to off-campus roadways and intersections as required by Mitigation Measure 5.15-2(a)(6) (Condition of Approval F.5)
2. **Reverse Commute – Peak Hours and Periods.** The GUP requires Stanford to implement all feasible measures to achieve no net increase in reverse commute trips in the AM peak hours and periods and the PM peak hours and periods. A violation of this standard occurs if the average annual traffic counts for AM or PM peak hour or peak period reverse commute trips exceed the peak hour or peak period reverse commute trip baseline by 2% or greater in any two out of three annual monitoring periods after this standard takes effect. The baseline will be established by the Planning Commission before authorization of any Phase 2 development, based on the annual traffic counts from the most recent year of the annual monitoring available. Prior to authorization of any Phase 2 development, Stanford shall submit a Reverse Commute Trip Management Plan to document measures to be taken to achieve compliance with the reverse commute peak hour and peak period baselines. This plan shall be forwarded to the Planning Commission for review and approval (Condition of Approval F.2.b).

- a. If the standard is violated, Stanford shall submit a Reverse Commute Deficiency Plan that identifies strategies and actions Stanford will implement to reduce the number of reverse commute trips to allow compliance with the peak hour and peak period reverse commute trip triggers. This plan shall be forwarded to the Planning Commission for review and approval.
 - b. Following approval of a Reverse Commute Deficiency Plan; if either the peak hour or peak period reverse commute trip triggers are violated for any one (1) annual monitoring period, a public hearing shall be scheduled before the Planning Commission. If the Planning Commission determines that the increase in reverse commute trips is in exceedance of the peak hour and peak period reverse commute trip triggers and the additional reverse commute trips have substantially worsened traffic congestion affecting the surrounding area, the Planning Commission may immediately suspend approval of any new development projects pursuant to the process in **Condition A.11** until Stanford demonstrates compliance with the standard(s) through subsequent annual traffic counts, at a minimum, of one (1) year of monitoring results preceding authorization of resumption of development.
3. The GUP requires Stanford to achieve no net increase in Average Daily Trips ("ADT") during weekdays. A violation of this standard occurs if the average annual traffic counts for ADT exceed the ADT baseline by 3% or greater in any two out of three annual monitoring periods after this standard takes effect. The baseline will be established by the Planning Commission before authorization of any Phase 2 development, based on the annual traffic counts from the most recent year of the annual monitoring available. Prior to authorization of any Phase 2 development, Stanford shall submit an Average Daily Trips Management Plan to document measures to be taken to achieve compliance with the ADT baseline. This plan shall be forwarded to the Planning Commission for review and approval (Condition F.3.).
- a. If the standard is violated, Stanford shall submit an Average Daily Trips Deficiency Plan that identifies strategies and actions Stanford will implement to reduce the ADT into compliance. This plan shall be forwarded to the Planning Commission for review and approval.
 - b. Following approval of an Average Daily Trips Deficiency Plan; if the ADT standards are violated in any one (1) annual monitoring period, when there is also a Standards for Commute Trips or Standards for Reverse Commute Trips violation, a hearing shall be scheduled before the Planning Commission. If the Planning Commission determines that the increase in ADT is in exceedance of the average daily trip trigger and the additional ADT has substantially worsened traffic congestion affecting the surrounding area, the Commission may immediately suspend approval of any new development projects pursuant to the process in **Condition A.11** until Stanford demonstrates compliance with the standard(s) through subsequent annual traffic counts, at a minimum, of one (1) year of monitoring results preceding authorization of resumption of development. If an *Average Daily Trips Deficiency Plan* is approved, an exceedance of the ADT standard only, without an exceedance of a Standards for Commute Trips or Standards for Reverse Commute Trips standard during the same monitoring period, shall not result in a consequence.

4. The GUP establishes the methods for conducting independent and verifiable annual traffic counts to determine compliance with the GUP's traffic standards (Condition F.4) and regulations for the County's granting of trip credits based on the actual number of trips reduced or shifted to a positive travel mode as result of Stanford's funding of trip reduction efforts or off-campus infrastructure improvements that shift travelers from automobile trips by enhancing safety or increasing mobility for pedestrians, bicyclists or transit users (Condition of Approval F.5).
5. The GUP identifies requirements for disclosure in the Annual Monitoring Report of annual traffic monitoring information and analysis regarding compliance with the traffic standards of this GUP, and information regarding trip credits granted and used, including a description of each project for which trip credits were granted and the methodology used to calculate/substantiate trip credits for each project.
6. Based on the evidence listed above, the GUP, as conditioned, will not substantially worsen traffic congestion affecting the surrounding area.

D-6. Finding. *Erosion will be adequately controlled; and*

The GUP requires that individual projects implement construction best management practices (BMPs), as detailed in the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and comply with all requirements of the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program. These measures are intended to prevent sedimentation from entering runoff from the construction site, and they also serve to prevent soil erosion and loss of topsoil occurring at the construction site. In addition, each project would be required to implement post-construction BMPs that include erosion control measures (Conditions of Approval M.2.a and M.3). Based on the evidence, the GUP, as conditioned, ensures that erosion will be adequately controlled.

D-7. Finding. *Adequate storm drainage management exists or will be provided and will comply with all*

applicable local, state and federal requirements.

The GUP requires that Stanford prepare and submit for review and approval by the County a Master Drainage Plan providing for a stormwater drainage system to mitigate all increased run-off from development on the site such that it will not increase downstream flooding or increase the frequency of down-stream flooding of San Francisquito Creek or Matadero Creek resulting from 10-, 20-, 50-, and 100-year storm events. The Plan must conform to all applicable NPDES permit requirements, the County Drainage Manual, and all other applicable standards. Once approved, the GUP requires that all development applications conform to the Plan. Until such time as the Plan is approved, all development is required to conform to the Master Drainage Plan approved by the County in 2003 and such development may not increase down-stream flooding or the frequency of down-stream flooding (Condition of Approval M.7). The GUP, as conditioned, provides for adequate storm drainage management and will comply with applicable requirements.