



STANFORD UNIVERSITY
 DEPARTMENT OF PROJECT MANAGEMENT
 LAND, BUILDINGS AND REAL ESTATE

September 28th, 2020

Ms. Charu Ahluwalia
 County of Santa Clara
 Department of Planning and Development
 County Government Center, East Wing
 70 West Hedding Street
 San Jose, CA 94110-1705

Re: Architecture and Site Approval (ASA) and Grading Approval – Land, Buildings & Real Estate (LBRE)
 Replacement Building
 File number PLN20-081

Dear Ms. Ahluwalia,

I am responding to your letter dated 8/14/2020 regarding the referenced submittal.

PLANNING OFFICE

Demolition at Bonair Siding

1. Provide grading quantities associated with proposed demolition at the Bonair Siding site. Clarify if any of the proposed structures to be demolished have basements.

Response:

There will be no cut/fill at Bonair Siding site. EIF question 6 response has been clarified (see below for snapshot. Bonair structures proposed for demolition do not have basements. Project description has been clarified as well.

Cut/Fill at LBRE Replacement Building (West Campus district) only.
 No cut/fill none at Bonair Buildings (DAPER district).

IMPROVEMENT	EARTHWORK QUANTITY (cubic yards)		MAXIMUM DEPTH (feet)	
	CUT	FILL	CUT	FILL
Driveway, Access Road	3,300 cy	3,100 cy	3 ft	1.5 ft
Building Pad	500 cy	400 cy	1 ft	1 ft
Landscaping	500 cy	200 cy	3 ft	1 ft
Other Improvements	0 cy	0 cy	0 ft	0 ft
TOTAL	4,300 cy	3,700 cy		

2. Supplement the project description with details on treatment of the Bonair Siding site post-demolition.

Response:

At the Bonair Siding demo area, all areas under existing buildings will be mulched after demolition. Existing asphalt will remain. Project description has been updated to reflect this. Updated GUP checklist now includes pervious and impervious calculations at Bonair site.

New LBRE Replacement Facility

3. *Clarify if the number of employees at the proposed LBRE replacement facility will remain same as currently existing on the Bonair Siding site. The submitted Environmental Information Form states maximum number of employees at the new facility would be 295 (163 office employees and 132 technicians). The form has no information regarding the current number of employees at Bonair Siding.*

Response:

This is a combined response to Planning Item 3 and also Item PK-1 from the AECOM comment memo.

Please see the Master Response to traffic and parking related comments. The Master Response explains that changes to population are not monitored under the 2000 General Use Permit. The populations and programs housed in individual buildings fluctuate over time. The 2000 GUP EIR evaluated the impacts of full buildout of the entirety of the development types and square footages permitted by the 2000 General Use Permit. The total number of trips associated with occupancy and use of all campus buildings is monitored each year as part of the No Net New Commute Trips condition of approval. The monitoring program does not assign trips to individual buildings.

Here, Fehr & Peers did not take any credit in its project-specific traffic study for commuters who would no longer travel to the Bonair Siding buildings that are proposed to be demolished. While not directly relevant to the analysis of transportation and traffic, we can confirm the current number of employees at Bonair Siding is 295 (163 office employees and 132 technicians). All 295 will be relocated to the proposed site.

4. *Demarcate removal of 250 commuter parking spaces in the existing Searsville Parking lot (L-22), on the site plan, sheet C2.0.*

Response:

The Master Response describes how Stanford flexibly manages its parking inventory comprehensively, to support a variety of populations and needs. The number of spaces in a given lot can and does fluctuate over time. Stanford reports changes to the existing parking inventory on campus in every Annual Report, to demonstrate continued compliance with the maximum parking allocation per district, which would include any change to the number of commuter spaces in the future.

The project team has identified that the central and west parts of the Searsville Lot (Lot 22) would be the most likely areas to accommodate the university's maintenance vehicles. Stanford requests some flexibility in the ASA process in determining the exact locations of spaces in the Searsville lot to be initially redesignated from commuter parking to university maintenance

vehicle storage, as we expect some incremental tweaks or improvements may need to be implemented between ASA and construction of the project. As occurs in all campus parking areas, additional changes to parking configurations can occur over time, and are reported in each Annual Report to demonstrate compliance with the overall parking cap.

By way of background, the Searsville parking lot was approved in 2013, with a modification approved in 2014 (County File No. 10486-13A-13G). The application was approved together with a traffic study conducted according to GUP Condition G.11 for parking lots of over 400 spaces. The total new commuter permit spaces analyzed and approved for Searsville lot was 611. Please also see the responses from Fehr & Peers to Items PK-2 and PK-3 in AECOM's letter.

Sheet A1.0 has been updated to include a note that project will remove up to 250 commuter parking spaces in the existing Searsville parking lot (L-22) to create a storage site for University maintenance vehicles.

5. *Update building elevations to include color rendering or clarify color of building materials with color samples of listed materials on sheets A3.1 and A3.2.*

Response:

The building elevations have been updated to include color on elevations. See A3.1 and A3.2

6. *Clarify on sheet A1.1, which lighting fixtures are for the roadways and provide specifications of the existing lighting fixtures.*

Response:

See A1.1 site plan with updated lighting annotations. The exterior lighting strategy is consistent with the lighting strategy used across campus. The path lighting and pedestrian crossings are designed to campus standard. The specifications for the existing lights on Electioneer Rd. and the pedestrian path along Fremont Rd. have been provided. Light level analysis will be provided with the appropriate permit packages

7. *Please provide an updated Local Access and Circulation Study in response to the attached peer-review memo from the County's consultant AECOM dated August 14, 2020. Include a response letter describing the changes to this study.*

Response:

The Master Response provides a description of the County-approved scope and methodology for the Local Access and Circulation Study. We note that many of AECOM's comments seek information that is beyond the scope of the approved methodology for this type of study. Please see the memo from Fehr & Peers, attached. The memo includes an updated attachment to support the response to Comment OU-1, showing corrections to pedestrian volumes. However, given the negligible effect of the correction on the results, Fehr & Peers does not recommend updating the original report appendices, but rather include the updated attachment as part of the Local Access and Circulation Study.

8. *Provide a signing and striping plan for the project site.*

Response:

Please see sheet C9.0. for the signing and striping plan.

LAND DEVELOPMENT AND ENGINEERING

9. *Based on a pre-submittal meeting, it was noted that the ASA and Grading Applications would cover a scope of work that would be constructed in phases with separate permits and separate construction timelines. Provide details of the anticipated permit/construction timelines for each phase of the project.*

Response:

Please see Sheets G0.3 and G0.4 which provide more information regarding the proposed permit package break down, permit submission sequence and construction sequence.

10. *The stormwater control plan notes the use of in-lieu credits from the East Campus Regional Stormwater Capture System. However, the project is in a different watershed (San Francisquito Creek) from the east campus (Matadero Creek). The applicable regional capture facility should be the West Campus Regional Stormwater Capture System (County File No. 10689-18C3). Revise the plans accordingly.*

Response:

Sheet C5.0 has been revised.

11. *There are discrepancies between the impervious area summary table in the plans (Sheet C5.0 – ASA Stormwater Treatment Plan) and the C.3 questionnaire. Please review and revise the plans and/or questionnaire to address the discrepancies.*

Response:

Sheet C5.0 and the C.3 questionnaire have been revised.

12. *The C.3 Questionnaire submitted with the application is not the most current version of the questionnaire. Please re-submit using the current version. The current version is available on the County website at:
https://www.sccgov.org/sites/dpd/DocsForms/Documents/Stormwater_CWP_Questionnaire_NC.pdf*

Response:

The C.3 questionnaire has been revised.

13. *Some line items in the questionnaire have not been completed (e.g., Project Description, Hydraulic Sizing Criteria, the Responsible Part for the O&M Agreement). Complete all fields in the questionnaire. This information is required and is reported to the State Water Board.*

Response:

The C.3 questionnaire has been revised.

14. *Please review Section 6 of the Questionnaire. Have all Site Design Measure and Source Control Measures for the project been identified? Are downspouts connected to storm drains? Isn't the trash enclosure for the LBRE Building being connected to sanitary sewer and covered? Will the corporation yard require source control measures (e.g., outdoor material storage protection)?*

Will storm drains be labeled? Please review and confirm that all applicable measures have been identified in the questionnaire.

Response:

The C.3 questionnaire has been revised.

FIRE MARSHALL

15. *In Section 6 of the Questionnaire, and more specifically, under the Treatment Systems section, please note Rainwater harvest and reuse as LID treatment. In the "Other" section, correct the regional facility reference to West Campus Stormwater Capture Facility – County File No. 10689-18C3.*

Response:

The C.3 questionnaire has been revised.

16. *List deferred submittals on the cover page (sheet G0.0), including but not limited to NFPA 13 fire sprinklers.*

Response:

Sheet G0.0 has been revised to include deferred submittals.

17. *Sheet C7.0 shows materials storage in front of a proposed fire hydrant (west of the proposed LBRE building). All hydrants are to be kept clear and operable at all times.*

Response:

Sheet C7.0 has been revised to indicate clear access to the fire hydrant in question.

18. *Sheets C7.0 and C8.0 show a fire hydrant symbol (not labeled on plans) located between the LBRE building and shed 2. Clarify if this hydrant will remain or will be removed.*

Response:

Sheets C7.0 and C8.0 have been revised to show the existing fire hydrant in question will be relocated

19. *Sheet C8.0 shows a "proposed ladder truck access and staging area" at the southeast portion of the LBRE building. Clarify in the plans if this area will be a paved or landscaped with grass. This section of the road is not marked as fire department access.*

Response:

Sheet C8.0 has been revised to indicate paved area for the ladder truck. It also notes the required roadway width at this location.

20. *Plans currently show a fire hose pull greater than 150 feet in length from fire department access. Per Ordinance Section 503.1.1 (exception 1.1) approval is needed from the Fire Code official to increase hose pull beyond 150 feet. This review will be conducted with the Building Permit submittal.*

Response:

Sheet C8.0 has been revised to show compliance with 150' hose pulls.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

21. *The proposed LBRE replacement facility would replace the current Bonair Siding facility, which consists of seven buildings and eight unenclosed structures proposed to be demolished. The submitted DPR form for the demolition of these existing buildings in the Bonair Siding facility will require peer review. The Planning Department is currently soliciting a scope of work to conduct this peer-review. Pursuant to GUP Condition B.4, the peer review would be paid for by Stanford; an invoice will be forthcoming shortly.*

Response:

Stanford has provided revised DPRs with this submission – please use these versions for the peer review.

AECOM Memo Responses

Please see the attached Master Response from Stanford, as well as the response memo from Stanford's consultant Fehr & Peers.

If you have additional comments or questions, please don't hesitate to call.

Will Howekamp | Project Manager
Stanford University
Land, Buildings, and Real Estate
340 Bonair Siding
Stanford, CA 94305
650.213.6892
howekamp@stanford.edu

CC:

Karen Hong