

From: [herb](#)
To: [Council, City](#); [Clerk, City](#)
Subject: August 10, 2023 Council Meeting, Item #7: Shuttle Expansion (sic) to Stanford Research Park
Date: Sunday, April 9, 2023 5:43:59 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

**AUGUST 10, 2023 CITY COUNCIL MEETING, ITEM #7
SHUTTLE EXPANSION TO STANFORD RESEARCH PARK**

I don't understand why this proposal is referred to as an expansion of the shuttle contract, because the staff report describes that your prior action "provides on-demand transit service Monday–Friday for a 10-hour service span 8:00 am–6:00 pm. The service operates within most of the City, with exceptions only to the east and west ends that house large open spaces and conservation lands."

Is the purpose of this proposal to permit Stanford to replace or supplement its existing Marguerite Shuttle Researchh Park Line that serves commuters bewteen the University Avenue Caltrain station and the Stanford Research Park on a fixed route with designated stops (<https://transportation.stanford.edu/marguerite/rp>), or is it also supposed to pay for riders who commute to the Research Park from other Palo Alto locations, whether or not those riders live in Palo Alto?

If the shuttle service is such a good deal for Stanford, then why didn't they enter into their own contract with the provider for shuttle service?

Segmenting the current action from the previous action makes it difficult to determine how much of the VTA grant benefits Stanford, and how much benefits the City of Palo Alto.

Since Stanford appears to be benefiting financially by not entering into its own contract for shuttle services and by paying only an estimate based on a per-ride fare, maybe you should ask Stanford if that's their final offer.

Herb Borock