

# County of Santa Clara

Department of Planning and Development  
Planning Office

County Government Center, East Wing, 7th Floor  
70 West Hedding Street  
San Jose, California 95110-1705  
(408) 299-5770 FAX (408) 288-9198  
www.sccplanning.org



February 9, 2021

**\*\*Sent via email \*\***

Paul Forti,  
340 Bonair Siding,  
Stanford, CA 94305  
Email: pforti@stanford.edu

**FILE NUMBER:** PLN20-048  
**SUBJECT:** Architecture and Site Approval (ASA) - Collaboration Building  
Project in the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences  
(CASBS) Complex  
**SITE LOCATION:** 75 Alta Road, Stanford  
**DATE RECEIVED:** 1/12/2021

Dear Mr. Forti:

Your application for Architecture and Site Approval (ASA) is **incomplete**. For the application processing to resume, you must resolve the following issues and submit the information listed below.

Please note that the Department is only accepting electronic submittals due to COVID-19 closures. Please refer procedures for Planning Resubmittals available on the County website at

<https://www.sccgov.org/sites/dpd/Iwantto/Permits/Pages/PlanningResubmittals.aspx>.

**AN APPOINTMENT IS REQUIRED FOR THIS RESUBMITTAL.  
PLEASE CALL ME AT (408) 299-5740 TO SCHEDULE AN APPOINTMENT.**

Please submit a complete revised plan set and a *written response* with the resubmittal materials, addressing the following items. All items must be addressed and included in the resubmittal.

## **PLANNING**

Contact Charu Ahluwalia - 408-299-5740 [charu.ahluwalia@pln.sccgov.org](mailto:charu.ahluwalia@pln.sccgov.org) for information regarding the following items.

1. Staff received the application materials for this project on January 12, 2021, which included a Statement of Compatibility (SOC), revised DPR form and plans. These documents were peer-reviewed by the County's consultant LSA Associates, Inc. (LSA). LSA provided the attached peer review memo with additional information requirements. Please **provide an updated DPR Form** in response to this memo, and a response letter describing the changes. County staff and LSA are available for further discussion.

If the requested information is not submitted within 180 days, you will be required to pay a fee of 10% of the application fee at the time the information is submitted. All requested information must be submitted within 1 year of the date of this letter and will not be accepted after 1 year. PARTIAL RESUBMITTALS WILL NOT BE PROCESSED. Fees required at the time of resubmittal will be those in effect at that time.

In submitting this land use application, the owner/applicant included an initial application fee. Application fees are categorized as "fixed fees" and "billable fees", based on the particular application type(s). "Fixed fee" applications do not require any additional fees to continue processing. However, when funds associated with a "billable fee" application have been spent, an additional deposit will be required to continue processing the application.

If you have any additional questions regarding this application or would like to meet to clarify Planning's incomplete comments, please call me at (408) 299-5740 or to schedule an appointment to do so.

Sincerely,



Charu Ahluwalia  
Associate Planner

Encl: LSA Peer Review Memo

## MEMORANDUM

**DATE:** January 28, 2021

**To:** Charu Ahluwalia, Associate Planner, County of Santa Clara,  
Department of Planning and Development

**FROM:** Michael Hibma, M.A., AICP, Associate/Architectural Historian, LSA

**SUBJECT:** Supplemental Peer Review for the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences Administration Buildings Project, Leland Stanford Junior University, unincorporated Santa Clara County, California (LSA Project No. SNC2001)

This memorandum presents the results of a supplemental peer review of a California Register of Historical Resources (California Register) eligibility evaluation of the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences (CASBS) Administration Buildings Project (Project) on the campus of Leland Stanford Junior University in unincorporated Santa Clara County. LSA completed this peer review at the request of the Santa Clara County Department of Planning and Development (County) to assist the County in the Project's environmental review process. The analysis addressed the technical adequacy of the revised California Register evaluation of the CASBS District (District) and an updated Statement of Compatibility (SOC) prepared for the proposed new construction.

To prepare the supplemental analysis, County staff provided LSA with the following documentation:

- Department of Parks and Recreation 523 [DPR 523] form records. One form originally prepared January 23, 2017 and updated June 17, 2020, and an separate DPR record prepared in January 2021;
- Design and construction plans, and an
- Updated Stanford University-prepared SOC prepared January 8, 2021.

The DPR 523 form record containing the California Register evaluation was jointly prepared by Julie Cain, a Fremont-based historian and preservation planner; Laura Jones, Ph.D. Director of Heritage Services and University Archaeologist for Stanford University; Sapna Marfatia, Director of Architecture, Stanford University, and with further assistance from Lauren Conway, a doctoral candidate in archaeological conservation at the University of California, Los Angeles, and architecture graduate Naseem Baradaran Fallahkahir. Director Marfatia prepared the SOC document.

Michael Hibma, M.A., AICP, completed the analysis. Mr. Hibma is an architectural historian at LSA's Point Richmond office and has over 14 years of experience in cultural resources management. He holds an M.A. in History from California State University, Sacramento; meets the Secretary of the Interior's *Professional Qualifications Standards* as an architectural historian and historian (36 CFR Part 61); and is certified by the American Institute of Certified Planners (AICP #32009).

## PART 1- PEER REVIEW

The purpose of this supplemental peer review is to (1) assess the methodology and conclusions of the District evaluation as documented in the DPR 523 form record and (2) render an opinion as to the evaluation's conformity with professional standards and practices of cultural resources management. Recommendations follow the peer review findings, as warranted.

### Results

LSA finds the revised evaluation responsive to several principal issues raised and recommendations provided in the previous peer review. Examples include (but are not limited to) classifying the CASBS campus as a district, providing an expanded list of sources cited, including maps, scanned drawings and numerous photographs of current conditions, as well as reorganizing the DPR 523 form record according to official Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) guidance. LSA concurs with the conclusion that the CASBS complex appears eligible for inclusion in the California Register under Criterion 3 for its architectural qualities. However, the evaluation as currently presented continues to present insufficient information to ensure other potential themes and significance associations are adequately addressed.

While finding that CASBS is a historical resource for the purposes of CEQA, inadequately addressing other potential significant associations may result in an insufficient awareness of the CASBS's historical significance and will, therefore result in an insufficient understanding of which of the seven aspects of integrity are most important to conveying CASBSs historical significance. Which then in turn informs analysis of project-related impacts analysis to CASBS' character-defining features (National Park Service 1997:48-49).

LSA identified the following issues that should be resolved to strengthen the evaluation and meet OHP documentation standards.

- 1) *The portion of the DPR 523 form record documentation created in 2017 and included in the SOC submittal creates confusion, duplicate and unnecessary documentation, and would not follow OHP guidelines if submitted to the Northwest Information Center for processing.*

As an attachment to the SOC, the revised DPR 523 form record currently contains two Primary forms and a Building, Structure, Object (BSO) record as part of an earlier DPR 523 form record of CASBS consisting of a Primary and BSO record that appears attached to the District-level documentation. In a January 27, 2021, conversation with County staff, LSA understands Stanford included the original CASBS DPR 523 form record prepared January 23, 2017, as part of the SOC package submitted for project review. The rationale for why Stanford chose this approach was not clear. Accordingly, items 2 – 6 of the peer review that follows focuses on the 74-page District record.

Recommendation: Provide a clear statement in the SOC Content page (or earlier) that explains why the Primary and BSO record prepared January 23, 2017 is included in the SOC submittal so to prevent unnecessary confusion. Alternatively, incorporation of relevant (and peer reviewed) information from the January 2017, DPR 523 form record onto the January 2021 District record would capture relevant description and historical context information of CASBS in one record.

2) *The District Record does not clearly identify contributing and non-contributing elements.*

The District Record (DPR 523D) prepared January 2021 does not provide a list of the District’s contributing and non-contributing elements at line **\*D3. Detailed Description.** OHP guidance states, “Identify each element by property type and indicate whether or not that element contributes to the historic significance of the historic context used to evaluate the district” (OHP 1995:16). The Primary Records of each built environment element do provide a Status Code in the header (i.e. “3CD” or “6Z”), which follows OHP guidance to classify contributing and noncontributing elements.<sup>1</sup> However, in addition, placing a list in the District Record provides the reader (who may not know where to look or have a copy of the Status Code key available) with this information in one place early in the record. A Status Code glossary is attached to this document.

Recommendation: Insert a list of contributing and non-contributing elements in line **\*D3: Detailed Description.**

3) *The DPR 523 form record applies Stanford faculty significance to CASBS visiting scholars.*

Pages 13 and 14 of 74 of the DPR 523 form record contains a section titled “**Scholarship, Moral leadership and Public Service Context.**” The discussion establishes a *de facto* significance to all Stanford faculty members via appointment as Professors and is therefore an ineffective basis to ascertaining notable relative significance. This section fails to link or make equal the qualities of Stanford faculty to CASBS Fellows and Visiting Scholars.

According to the CASBS webpage, “CASBS is a collaborative environment that fosters the serendipity arising from unexpected intellectual encounters. We believe that cross-disciplinary interactions lead to beneficial transformations in thinking and research. We seek fellows who will be influential with, and open to influence by, their colleagues in the diverse multidisciplinary cohort we assemble for a given year. No teaching or formal administrative responsibilities are required while serving as a CASBS Fellow.<sup>2</sup> It may be assumed that a similar level of professional excellence and ethical leadership are required to merit a position as a CASBS Fellow, but this section does not make that clear.

Recommendation: Remove this context to prevent confusion or adapt the discussion using CASBS-sourced criteria to keep the discussion focused on CASBS and not its host university.

<sup>1</sup> *California Historical Resource Status Codes*, 2020. Source:

<https://ohp.parks.ca.gov/pages/1069/files/Resource-Status-Codes.pdf>

<sup>2</sup> CASBS Fellowship webpage: <https://casbs.stanford.edu/apply-casbs-fellowship>

4) *The California Register evaluative criteria are misquoted.*<sup>3</sup>

LSA understands the evaluative criteria as currently presented in the DPR 523 form record mirror the implementing regulations for the California Register available via OHP.<sup>4</sup> Understandably, this can create some confusion as to exact wording. Care should be taken to accurately quote statutory language so to prevent confusion and perpetuating the use of misquoted language further along into the Project’s environmental review process (e.g., staff reports and review board resolutions) and into future California Register evaluations prepared for future projects. It is LSA’s opinion that in a typical CEQA project review process, such as this, the evaluative criteria stated in the code should prevail over criteria stated in the regulations, which are designed to be explanatory, interpretive, and user friendly to help apply the code in practice.

Each evaluative criterion language quoted from the HRE and DPR 523 form record is listed below followed by the statutory language found in the *CEQA Guidelines*.

1. The HRE and DPR 523 form record states Criterion 1 as *“Associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history or the cultural heritage of California or the United States.”*

This does not follow the statutory language that reads, *“Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California’s history and cultural heritage.”*

2. The HRE and DPR 523 form record states Criterion 2 as *“Associated with the lives of persons important to local, California or national history.”*

This does not follow the statutory language that reads, *“Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past.”*

3. The HRE and DPR 523 form record states Criterion 3 as *“Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent [sic] the work of a master, or that possess [sic] high artistic values.”*

This does not follow the statutory language that reads, *“Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, regional, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values.”*

4. The HRE and DPR 523 form record states Criterion 4 as *“Has yielded, or has the potential to yield, information important to the prehistory or history of the local area, California, or the nation.”*

This does not follow the statutory language that reads, *“Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.”*

Recommendation: Revise each criterion language to match language in the code.

<sup>3</sup> Per Section 5024.1(c)(1)(2)(3)(4) of the California Public Resources Code and Section 15064.5(a)(3)(A)(B)(C)(D) of the California Code of Regulations.

<sup>4</sup> Source: [http://ohp.parks.ca.gov/?page\\_id=21238](http://ohp.parks.ca.gov/?page_id=21238).

5) *The California Register Criterion 1 evaluation remains inadequate.*

Association with events are based on a singular event “such as the founding of a town, or with a pattern of events repeated activities, or historic trends, such as the gradual rise of a port city’s prominence in trade and commerce. The event of trends, however, must clearly be important within the associated context: settlement, in the case of a town, or development of a maritime economy, in the case of the port city.”<sup>5</sup>

During the July 2, 2020, pedestrian survey, a Stanford University representative stated that the CASBS complex was the first behavioral science center on the West Coast and the first in the world to operate independent of its host university.<sup>6</sup> CASBS pioneered a semi-communal setting that required visiting scholars and scientists to share meals and engage in group activities and social functions to nurture cross-disciplinary collaboration in a relaxed environment. The representative also stated that the CASBS complex was a pioneering behavioral science research institution whose general approach was replicated worldwide. This would seem to align CASBS with an association with a pattern of events, i.e., the development of behavioral science in the western United States via an independent collaborative environment.

Today, CASBS offers scholars specializing in the “core social and behavioral sciences (anthropology, economics, history, political science, psychology, and sociology) but also the humanities, education, linguistics, communications, and the biological, natural, health, and computer sciences” the opportunity to collaborate and conduct independent study to further knowledge in the their fields of study. Given the apparently pioneering role of CASBS in the field of behavioral science, it appears that associative themes related to Anthropology, Consumer Science, Communications, Education, Psychology, Health/Medicine, Science, Social History, Public Relations, or possible others, should be considered in the context of its development, at least peripherally. The SOC prepared by Stanford states that CASBS is a “leading incubator of human-centered knowledge. CASBS facilitates collaborations across academia, policy, industry, civil society and government to collectively design a better future” where scholars “wrestle with this century’s greatest challenges” (SOC page 7). The Criterion 1 evaluation in the DPR 523 form record remains silent on this context and provides an abrupt and conclusory statement of non-eligibility under Criterion 1.

Recommendation: The evaluation should provide a more robust presentation of relevant historical context and provide additional analysis under Criterion 1 to bolster findings. This information may come from previously prepared studies; however, the record should contain sufficient evidence-based narrative from other sources to inform readers and decision makers.

<sup>5</sup> National Register Bulletin 15: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation. National Park Service 1997: page 12. Source: [https://www.nps.gov/subjects/nationalregister/upload/NRB-15\\_web508.pdf](https://www.nps.gov/subjects/nationalregister/upload/NRB-15_web508.pdf).

<sup>6</sup> During the 7/2/2020 site visit, the CASBS staff member indicated that CASBS is now formally a part of Stanford University and is no longer an independent entity.



Additional supplemental research may be required. Sources that may contain information about CASBS include (but are not limited to):

CASBS history: <https://casbs.stanford.edu/about/history>

CASBS timeline: <https://casbs.stanford.edu/about/about-us#timeline>

CASBS directorships: <https://casbs.stanford.edu/about/leadership-history>

- 6) *The Location Map scale is too large and presents excessive and irrelevant environmental information.*

The DPR 523 Location Map of the CASBS District is a scanned copy of the entire 1997 edition of the *Palo Alto, Calif. 7.5 minute topographic quadrangle*. This map depicts an excessive amount of environmental information that includes neighboring cities and neighboring San Mateo County. The CASBS campus and immediate environs under evaluation are lost and nearly indistinguishable. Moreover, the call-out arrow and text is in bold and nearly illegible.

**Recommendation:** Revise the Location Map. Crop out excess and irrelevant information to focus on the resource and its environmental setting (include a scale bar and north arrow). The revised map should clearly depict the proposed CASBS District boundary to assist readers in properly locating this resource and to correspond with OHP guidance to “Accurately plot the shape and location of the resource.”<sup>7</sup>

- 7) *The DPR 523 form record does not consider properties that have achieved significance in the last 50 years (California Register of Historical Resources, Special Consideration 2.*

As this evaluation is using the evaluative criteria of the California Register, it should use the following Special Consideration to consider possible associations with significant events, individuals that are associated with CASBS within recent history (quoted below) as afforded in the statute as appropriate.

**(2) Historical resources achieving significance within the past fifty (50) years.** In order to understand the historic importance of a resource, sufficient time must have passed to obtain a scholarly perspective on the events or individuals associated with the resource. A resource less than fifty (50) years old may be considered for listing in the California Register if it can be demonstrated that sufficient time has passed to understand its historical importance.

**Recommendation:** Analyze whether or not CASBS appears eligible under Special Consideration 2 for significance associations in recent history.<sup>8</sup> There should be a high level of certainty that other significant associations *would not* be salient to the evaluation.

<sup>7</sup> USGS topo maps available online: <https://livingatlas.arcgis.com/topoexplorer/index.html>; *ibid.* page 5.

<sup>8</sup> Sources:

<https://govt.westlaw.com/calregs/Document/IFFC7DA00D48511DEBC02831C6D6C108E?originationContext=document&transitionType=StatuteNavigator&needToInjectTerms=False&viewType=FullText&contextData=%28sc.Default%29> and <https://ohp.parks.ca.gov/pages/1054/files/ts06ca.pdf>.



## PART 2 – STATEMENT OF COMPATIBILITY ASSESSMENT

LSA reviewed the updated Statement of Compatibility (SOC) prepared by Stanford on January 8, 2021. The purpose of the review was to (1) assess the degree to which the conclusions of the SOC conform to *the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties*<sup>9</sup> (Secretary’s Standards) with respect to compatibility with the CASBS campus, an identified historical resource; and (2) identify whether or not potential impacts to CASBS would be reduced to a level of less than significant.

This section solely assesses the compatibility assessment’s conformity with the Secretary’s Standards. It does not itself constitute a new or separate Secretary’s Standards analysis.

### Results

Based on a review of the updated SOC, LSA concurs with the conclusion in the SOC that the proposed Project conforms to the Secretary’s Standards and would result in a less-than-significant impact to historical resources near the Project site is adequately supported – provided that the evaluative findings in an accompanying DPR 523 form record reflect other potential associations with CASBS and important events (or pattern of events) and important persons are addressed.

**Attachment:** *California Historical Resource Status Codes*. Office of Historic Preservation, 2020.

---

<sup>9</sup> Source: <https://www.nps.gov/tps/standards/treatment-guidelines-2017.pdf>

# California Historical Resource Status Codes

Current as of 3/1/2020

## **1. Listed in the National Register (NR) or the California Register (CR):**

- 1D:** Contributor to a multi-component resource like a district listed in the NR by the Keeper. Listed in the CR.
- 1S:** Individually listed in the NR by the Keeper. Listed in the CR.
- 1CD:** Contributor to a multi-component resource listed in the CR by the State Historical Resources Commission (SHRC).
- 1CS:** Individually listed in the CR by the SHRC.
- 1CL:** State Historical Landmark (CHL) numbered 770 and above, or an earlier CHL reheard by the SHRC and determined that it also meets CR criteria. Listed in the CR.
- 1CP:** State Point of Historical Interest (CPHI) nominated since 1998 that the SHRC also found CR eligible, or an earlier CPHI reheard by the SHRC and determined that it also meets CR criteria. Listed in the CR.

## **2. Determined Eligible for Listing in National (NR) or California (CR) Registers:**

- 2B:** Determined eligible for NR both individually and as a contributor to a NR eligible multi-component resource like a district in a federal regulatory process. Listed in the CR.
- 2D:** Contributor to a multi-component resource determined eligible for NR by the Keeper. Listed in the CR.
- 2D2:** Contributor to a multi-component resource determined eligible for NR by consensus through Section 106 process. Listed in the CR.
- 2D3:** Contributor to a multi-component resource determined eligible for NR by Part 1 Tax Certification. Listed in the CR.
- 2D4:** Contributor to a multi-component resource determined eligible for NR pursuant to Section 106 without review by the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO). Listed in the CR.
- 2S:** Individually determined eligible for NR by the Keeper. Listed in the CR.
- 2S2:** Individually determined eligible for NR by consensus through Section 106 process. Listed in the CR.
- 2S3:** Individually determined eligible for NR by Part 1 Tax Certification. Listed in the CR.
- 2S4:** Individually determined eligible for NR pursuant to Section 106 without review by SHPO. Listed in the CR.
- 2CB:** Determined eligible for CR both individually and as a contributor to a CR eligible multi-component resource by the State Historical Resources Commission (SHRC).
- 2CD:** Contributor to a multi-component resource determined eligible for CR by the SHRC.
- 2CS:** Individually determined eligible for CR by the SHRC.

### **3. Appears Eligible for National (NR) or California (CR) Registers:**

- 3B:** Appears eligible for NR both individually and as a contributor to a NR eligible multi-component resource like a district through survey evaluation.
- 3D:** Appears eligible for NR as a contributor to a NR eligible multi-component resource through survey evaluation.
- 3S:** Appears eligible for NR individually through survey evaluation.
- 3CB:** Appears eligible for CR both individually and as a contributor to a CR eligible multi-component resource through survey evaluation.
- 3CD:** Appears eligible for CR as a contributor to a CR eligible multi-component resource through survey evaluation.
- 3CS:** Appears eligible for CR individually through survey evaluation.

### **4. Appears Eligible for National Register or as State Historical Landmark through PRC§ 5024:**

- 4CM:** State agency owned resource added to Master List - appears to meet criterion.

### **5. Recognized as Historically Significant by Local Government:**

- 5B:** Locally significant both individually (listed, eligible, or appears eligible) and as contributor to a multi-component resource like a district that is locally listed, designated, determined eligible, or appears eligible through survey evaluation.
- 5D1:** Contributor to a multi-component resource that is listed or designated locally.
- 5D2:** Contributor to a multi-component resource that is eligible for local listing or designation.
- 5D3:** Appears to be a contributor to a multi-component resource that appears eligible for local listing or designation.
- 5S1:** Individually listed or designated locally.
- 5S2:** Individually eligible for local listing or designation.
- 5S3:** Appears to be individually eligible for local listing or designation through survey evaluation.

### **6. Not Eligible for or Removed from Listing or Designation as Specified:**

- 6J:** State Historic Landmark (CHL) or State Point of Historical Interest (CPHI) determined ineligible for or removed by the State Historical Resources Commission (SHRC).
- 6L:** Determined ineligible for local listing or designation through local government review process; may warrant special consideration in local planning.
- 6R:** Resource listed more than once on the National Register (NR) that has had some, but not all listings removed by the Keeper. Still NR listed.
- 6T:** Determined ineligible for NR through Part 1 Tax Certification process.
- 6U:** Determined ineligible for NR pursuant to Section 106 without review by Office of Historic Preservation (OHP).
- 6W:** Removed from NR by the Keeper.

**6X:** Determined ineligible for NR by the SHRC or the Keeper.

**6Y:** Determined ineligible for NR by consensus through Section 106 process – Not evaluated for CR or local listing.

**6Z:** Found ineligible for NR, CR or local designation through survey evaluation.

**6CR:** Resource listed more than once on the California Register (CR) that has had some, but not all listings removed by the SHRC. Still CR listed.

**6CW:** Removed from CR by the SHRC.

**6CX:** Determined ineligible for CR by the SHRC.

**6WM:** Removed from Master List because no longer state owned.

**6XM:** Removed from Master List because of historic feature loss or further evaluation.

**6YM:** State agency owned resource determined ineligible for Master List.

**7. Not Evaluated, or Needs Re-evaluation for National (NR) or California (CR) Registers:**

**7J:** Received by Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) for evaluation or action but not yet evaluated.

**7K:** Submitted to OHP for action but not reevaluated.

**7L:** State Historical Landmarks 1 through 769 that does not meet CR criteria.

**7M:** Submitted to OHP but not evaluated - referred to National Park Service.

**7N:** Needs to be reevaluated - formerly coded as may become NR eligible with specific conditions.

**7N1:** Needs to be reevaluated (former status code 4) - may become NR eligible with restoration or other specific conditions.

**7P:** State Point of Historical Interest that does not meet CR criteria.

**7R:** Identified in Reconnaissance Level Survey or in an Area of Potential Effect (APE): Not evaluated.

**7W:** Submitted to OHP for action – withdrawn or inactive.