



PLANNING COMMISSION STAFF REPORT

FOR THE PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 14, 2009
AGENDA ITEM C1

LOCATION:	100 – 190 Independence Drive and 101 – 155 Constitution Drive	APPLICANT AND OWNER:	Bohannon Development Company
EXISTING USE:	Offices, Research and Development (R&D), Light Industrial, Vacant Land		
PROPOSED USE:	Offices and R&D, Hotel, Health Club, Cafe and Restaurant, Neighborhood- Serving Retail and Community Facilities	APPLICATION:	General Plan Amendment, Zoning Ordinance Amendment, Rezoning, Development Agreement, Architectural Control, BMR Agreement, Environmental Review, Tentative Parcel Maps, Heritage Tree Removal Permits
EXISTING ZONING:	M-2 (General Industrial)	PROPOSED ZONING:	M-3 (Mixed-Use Commercial Business Park)
EXISTING GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION:	Limited Industry	PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION:	Mixed-Use Commercial Business Park

PROPOSAL

The Bohannon Development Company has submitted an application for a General Plan Amendment, Zoning Ordinance Amendment, Rezoning, Development Agreement, and Environmental Impact Report (EIR), associated with a proposal for a mixed-use office, research and development (R&D), hotel, and health club development on nine properties addressed 100 to 190 Independence Drive and 101 to 155 Constitution Drive. The proposal is currently branded as the Menlo Gateway project, although it has also been referred to informally as the Bohannon hotel-office mixed-use project.

The proposed project would require the following actions:

1. **General Plan Amendment** to create a new Mixed-Use Commercial Business Park land use designation, which would allow research and development (R&D) facilities, offices, hotels/motels, health/fitness centers, cafes and restaurants, and related commercial uses.
2. **General Plan Amendment** to change the land use designation of the properties from Limited Industry to Mixed-Use Commercial Business Park;
3. **Zoning Ordinance Amendment** to create a new M-3 (Mixed-Use Commercial Business Park) zoning district and undertake associated modifications, in particular the creation of specific parking requirements for the M-3 district;
4. **Rezoning** the properties from M-2 (General Industrial) to M-3 (Mixed-Use Commercial Business Park);
5. **Development Agreement** to create vested rights in project approvals, address implementation of the proposed design and infrastructure improvements in the project area, and specify benefits to the City;
6. **Architectural Control** approval of specific project plans for the construction of new buildings with a maximum of 955,170 square feet of gross floor area (137.5 percent FAR) and a maximum building height of 140 feet;
 - The Constitution Drive site would include two eight-story office buildings totaling 494,669 square feet; potential neighborhood-serving convenience retail and community facility space; and two multi-story parking structures;
 - The Independence Drive site would include a 200,000-square-foot, eight-story office building; a 171,563-square foot, eleven-story, 230-room hotel; a 68,519-square-foot health and fitness center; a 4,245-square-foot restaurant; potential neighborhood-serving convenience retail and community facility space; and a shared multi-story parking structure;
7. **Tentative Parcel Maps** (one on the Independence site and one on the Constitution site) to merge lots, adjust lot lines, and establish easements.
8. **Heritage Tree Removal Permits** to remove 40 heritage trees on the Independence site and 32 heritage trees on the Constitution site;
9. **BMR Agreement** for the payment of in-lieu fees associated with the City's Below Market Rate Housing Program; and
10. **Environmental Impact Report (EIR)** to analyze the potential environmental impacts of the proposal.

In addition, the development review process includes the review of a Fiscal Impact Analysis (FIA), which is currently available in draft form. Comments on the Draft FIA are due in conjunction with the October 5, 2009 Planning Commission meeting, which is discussed in further detail in the Process section.

The following is a summary table comparing the development standards of the existing M-2 and proposed M-3 zoning districts.

Development Regulation Comparison

	Proposed M-3 District Requirements	Existing M-2 District Requirements
Lot Area	0 sf min.	25,000 sf min.
Lot Width	0 ft. min.	100 ft. min.
Lot Depth	0 ft. min.	100 ft. min.
Setbacks		
Front	0 ft. min.	20 ft. min.
Rear	10 ft. min.	0 ft. min.
Sides	5 ft. avg.	10 ft. avg.
Height	140 ft. max.	35 ft. max.
Floor Area Ratio (FAR)		
Office	100% max.	45% max.
Hotel	24% max. additional	Not applicable
Other	13.5% max. additional	10% max. additional
Total	<u>137.5% max.</u>	<u>55% max.</u>
Coverage	45% max.	50% max.
Paving	0% min.	0% min.
Landscaping	0% min.	0% min.

In addition to the creation of the proposed new M-3 district, the applicant is proposing to undertake several associated amendments to the Zoning Ordinance, such as the creation of use-based, shared off-street parking standards specific to the M-3 district. The proposed M-3 maximum office FAR of 100 percent would be larger than what is permitted in any of the existing commercial zoning districts, which have maximums of between 20 and 50 percent. The proposed M-3 total maximum FAR of 137.5 percent would be larger than any other existing commercial district, with the exception of the C-3 (Central Commercial) district, in which an FAR of 200 percent may be permitted by use permit, provided the required parking for the square footage above the 100 percent FAR is provided on site or on nearby private property.

BACKGROUND

The current application was preceded by an alternate development proposal, which incorporated eight of the nine parcels and had a lower overall FAR due to a smaller, generic hotel component (the office FAR was identical at 100 percent). In 2006, prior to the release of a Draft EIR, the project was put on hold at the applicant's request, in

order to consider modifications to the proposal to accommodate a specific hotel operator. The applicant submitted a revised application in early 2007 incorporating the Marriott Renaissance ClubSport product. The following is a comprehensive listing of past public meetings and milestones associated with the original and revised proposal:

Date	Body	Topic
04/23/2004	<i>Milestone</i>	<i>Original Proposal Submitted</i>
07/14/2005	Community Meeting	EIR Scoping Session
10/04/2005	City Council	Study Session
03/09/2006	<i>Milestone</i>	<i>Original Proposal Put on Hold</i>
01/16/2007	<i>Milestone</i>	<i>Revised Proposal Submitted</i>
03/20/2007	City Council	Presentation
06/04/2007	Planning Commission	EIR Scoping Session
06/19/2007	City Council	EIR Scoping Session
07/10/2007	City Council	EIR Scoping Session
07/31/2007	City Council	FIA Procedure Review
08/27/2007	Planning Commission	Study Session
10/23/2007	City Council	Study Session and Regular Business
01/15/2008	City Council	FIA Request for Proposals (RFP) Review
04/22/2008	City Council	FIA Proposal Approval
07/30/2008	Community Meeting	FIA Workshop
09/09/2008	City Council	Subcommittee Appointment
04/14/2009	City Council	Review of Public Outreach and Development Agreement Negotiation Process
06/16/2009	City Council	Finalization of Public Outreach and Development Agreement Negotiation Process (Information Item)
07/23/2009	<i>Milestone</i>	<i>Release of Draft EIR and FIA</i>
07/23/2009 07/29/2009	Community Meetings (3 total)	General Review of Proposal, Draft EIR and FIA, and Public Benefits
08/05/2009	Housing Commission	Review of Draft EIR Summary and Population and Housing Chapter and Individual Comments
08/05/2009	Transportation Commission	Review of Draft EIR Summary and Traffic and Transportation Chapter and Individual Comments
08/19/2009	General Commission Meeting	General Review of Proposal, Draft EIR and FIA, and Public Benefits (<i>Targeted at the Bicycle, Environmental Quality, Library, and Parks and Recreation Commissions</i>)
09/02/2009	Belle Haven Homeowners Association	Staff Presentation of Summary of Draft EIR Conclusions at the Request of the Homeowners Association
09/08/2009	Atherton Transportation Committee	Staff Presentation of Summary of Traffic and Transportation Chapter of the Draft EIR at the Request of the Town of Atherton

The approved minutes for the August 5, 2009 meetings of the Housing and Transportation Commissions are available as Attachments C and D, respectively. Although minutes were not prepared for the General Commission meeting, video is available for review on the City's web site. In addition, the staff reports and minutes for the Planning Commission and City Council meetings and the referenced documents are available on the City web site and at the Community Development Department.

PROCESS

The purpose of the September 14, 2009 meeting on the proposed project is to give Planning Commissioners and members of the general public an opportunity to comment individually on the Draft EIR during the 60-day public comment review period, running through September 21, 2009. (The comment period was extended and additional 15 days beyond the 45 days required by State law.) Comments should be informed by the summary analysis in the Environmental Review section below and presentations by the City's consultants at the September 14 meeting. Comments received during the public hearing on the Draft EIR will be transcribed by a court reporter and responded to as part of the Final EIR. Comments may also be submitted as written correspondence before the end of the comment period. The response to comments in the Final EIR will be reviewed at a subsequent Planning Commission meeting. No staff recommendation on the requested applications is being provided, and the Planning Commission is not required to take any action as a body at this time.

Following the September 14, 2009 meeting, the Planning Commission will hold a study session on October 5, 2009 to discuss public benefits, the Draft FIA, and the overall application and development program, including the architectural design and development regulations. The intended outcome of the October 5 meeting will be for the Commission to review and comment on any aspect of the proposal aside from formal comments on the Draft EIR. Next, the City Council will hold a study session, tentatively scheduled for November 3, 2009, to consider feedback from the Planning Commission and to discuss the environmental impacts and mitigations, public benefits, the Draft FIA, and the overall application and development program. This study session will be followed by a City Council regular business item, tentatively scheduled for November 17, 2009, to provide direction or parameters to guide the Development Agreement negotiations. Following this meeting, the City's consultants would prepare the final environmental and fiscal documents, which would include responses to comments received during review of the draft documents. Concurrently, staff and the applicant would negotiate a draft Development Agreement, which would be available for review by the general public and considered by the Planning Commission and City Council in early 2010.

The public outreach and Development Agreement negotiation process, constituting all meetings from the July 2009 Community Meetings onward, was reviewed and approved by the City Council in April and June 2009. The process recommendation was the result of focused work done by the project's Council Subcommittee, made up of Council Members Cohen and Fergusson. The Council Subcommittee will continue to have an active role throughout the remainder of the process, including in particular through the

provision of oversight and advisory services for the Development Agreement negotiation.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The Draft EIR analyzes the potential impacts of the project across a wide range of impact areas. The Draft EIR identifies potentially significant environmental effects that would be less than significant level, some of which would require mitigation, in the following categories: Aesthetics, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Hydrology and Water Quality, Hazardous Materials, Land Use, Population and Housing (described below), Public Services, Utilities and Services Systems (other than Water Supply), and Climate Change. The Draft EIR identifies potentially significant environmental effects that are significant and unavoidable in the following categories: Air Quality, Noise, Traffic and Circulation, and Utilities and Service Systems (Water Supply only). These significant and unavoidable impacts are explained in more detail below. A complete list of impacts and mitigation measures is included in Table 1-1 of the Draft EIR on pages S-7 through S-50. Given the significant and unavoidable impacts associated with the project, the City Council would be required to adopt a Statement of Overriding Consideration, if it determines that the project's benefits outweigh the impacts.

Summary of Population and Housing Analysis

The Draft EIR considered whether the project would induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses), or indirectly (for example, through the extension of roads or other infrastructure). In addition, the Draft EIR reviewed whether the project would displace a substantial number of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere, or displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. The analysis is informed by a Housing Needs Analysis (HNA), included as Appendix F of the Draft EIR, which discusses both the projected market demand for new housing, as well as the potential regulatory demand for new housing (articulated through the Regional Housing Needs Allocation and Housing Element processes). The Draft EIR concludes that the project would have no impacts or less-than-significant impacts under the CEQA criteria, due to the fact that the project would not directly affect residential development (new or existing) or indirectly through the extension of roads or other infrastructure.

Summary of Significant and Unavoidable Project Impacts

Transportation

The project would generate 1,146 net new trips in the AM peak hour, 1,235 net new trips in the PM peak hour, and 11,113 net new average daily trips. The traffic analysis studied 21 intersections, nine roadway segments, and three Routes of Regional Significance. The project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts to intersections, segments, and routes in both the near-term and long-term (cumulative) conditions as described below.

Intersections

The following chart shows the intersections that are affected in the near and/or long term with the proposed project, descriptions of the impacts, and potential mitigation measures for the impacts. Because the identified mitigation measures would only partially mitigate the impacts or approval is required from other agencies such as Caltrans, all but one of the traffic impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. Other mitigation measures that were reviewed, but deemed infeasible are discussed in the Draft EIR.

Intersection	Signalized or Unsignalized	Jurisdiction	Description of Impact	Feasible Mitigation Measure(s), Including Partial Mitigations
Marsh Road/ Bohannon Drive	Signalized	Menlo Park	>0.8 second increase to critical local approaches in the PM peak hour	Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program, Traffic Impact Fee (TIF), Adaptive Signal Timing (AST) improvements, add a westbound right turn lane of 350 feet
Willow Road/ Newbridge Street	Signalized	Caltrans	>0.8 second increase to critical local approaches in the AM peak hour	TDM program, TIF, AST improvements
Bayfront Expressway/ Willow Road	Signalized	Caltrans	>0.8 second increase to critical local approaches in the PM peak hour	TDM program, TIF, AST improvements, add eastbound right turn overlap phase and a third right turn lane OR convert the existing eastbound shared left-through lane into a left only lane and add a second westbound left-turn only lane
Bayfront Expressway/ University Avenue	Signalized	Caltrans	>4 second increase to intersection delay in the PM peak hour	TDM program, TIF, AST Improvements
Bayfront Expressway/ Chilco Street	Signalized	Caltrans	LOS becomes E or worse and 0.8 second increase to critical local approaches in the AM and PM peak hours	TDM program, TIF, AST Improvements, add eastbound left turn lane
Bayfront Expressway/ Chrysler Drive	Signalized	Caltrans	LOS becomes E or worse and 0.8 second increase to critical local approaches in the PM peak hour	TDM program, TIF, AST Improvements, convert the existing right turn lane to a left turn lane and add a shared left turn and right turn lane
Bayfront Expressway/ Haven Avenue	Signalized	Caltrans	> 0.8 second increase to critical local approaches in the AM and PM peak hours	TDM program, TIF, AST Improvements
Marsh Road and US 101 NB Off- Ramp	Signalized	Caltrans	LOS becomes D or worse in the AM peak hour	TDM program, TIF, AST Improvements
Marsh Road/ Middlefield Road	Signalized	Atherton	> 4.0 second increase to critical approach in PM peak hour	TDM program

Intersection	Signalized or Unsignalized	Jurisdiction	Description of Impact	Feasible Mitigation Measure(s), Including Partial Mitigations
Independence Drive/ Constitution Drive	Unsignalized	Menlo Park	LOS becomes D or worse in the AM peak hour	TDM program, TIF
Constitution Drive /Chrysler Drive	Unsignalized	Menlo Park	LOS becomes D or worse in the PM peak hour	Signalization of the intersection plus modification of the lane geometry

Roadway Segments

The Menlo Park Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines include a set of impact criteria for minor arterial, collector and local streets based on average daily traffic volume (ADT). To determine if there is an impact, the daily increase in traffic volumes associated with the proposal were compared to the City's impact criteria for its respective street type. The following chart shows the affected roadway segments, descriptions of the impacts, and partial mitigation measures for the impacts. All of the impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

Roadway Segment	Roadway Classification	Description of Impact	Partial Mitigation Measure(s)
Marsh Road (Bohannon to Bay)	Minor Arterial	>100 average daily trips	TDM program and TIF
Constitution Drive (Independence to Chrysler)	Local	> 25 average daily trips	TDM program and TIF
Constitution Drive (Chrysler to Chilco)	Collector	>25% average daily trip increase	TDM program and TIF
Independence Drive (Constitution to Chrysler)	Local	>25% average daily trip increase	TDM program and TIF
Chrysler Drive (Bayfront to Constitution)	Collector	>25% average daily trip increase	TDM program and TIF
Chrysler Drive (Constitution to Jefferson)	Local	> 25 average daily trips	TDM program and TIF
Chilco Street (Constitution to Bayfront)	Collector	>12.5% average daily trip increase	TDM program and TIF
Chilco Street (Constitution to Hamilton)	Local	> 25 average daily trips	TDM program and TIF

Routes of Regional Significance

The San Mateo County 2007 Congestion Management Plan establishes the Routes of Regional Significance in the vicinity of the project. The following chart shows the affected Routes, descriptions of the impacts, and partial mitigation measures for the impacts. All of the impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

Route	Segment	Description of Impact	Partial Mitigation Measure(s)
SR 84	East of University	>1% increase of estimated capacity	TDM program
US101	South of Willow Road	>1% increase of estimated capacity	TDM program
US101	North of Marsh Road	>1% increase of estimated capacity	TDM program

Mitigation Measures

The three tables above identify transportation mitigation measures. The only measures that fully mitigate impacts are the intersection improvements. The other three types of measures, Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Program and Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) and Adaptive Signal Timing (AST) Improvements, are considered partial mitigations. Each of these partial mitigation measures is described in more detail below.

- **TDM:** The project sponsor has prepared a preliminary TDM plan, which is included as Appendix J of the Draft EIR. The TDM program would reduce the overall number of trip associated with the project, but exact amount of the trip reduction is difficult to quantify. Therefore, the impacts would not be reduced to a less than significant level.
- **TIF:** Although payment of a TIF would provide the City with funding to be used towards traffic improvement projects, it would not reduce the impacts to a less than significant level. It should be noted that the City is in the process of updating its TIF. The City Council held a study session on September 1, 2009, and is scheduled to introduce the ordinance establishing the new fees on September 22, 2009. The earliest the fee would go into effect is mid-November 2009. As proposed, the new fees would be applicable to the Menlo Gateway project.
- **AST:** An option that is currently being utilized on other busy roadways in Menlo Park, such as the El Camino Real corridor, is the implementation of an adaptive signal timing program that would operate in real time, adjusting signal timing to accommodate changing traffic patterns. The timing programs adjust the split, offset, cycle lengths, and phase order of the signals using sensors to interpret characteristics of traffic approaching an intersection, and using mathematical and predictive algorithms, adapts the signal timings accordingly, optimizing their performance. Although the program would improve flow, it would not fully reduce the impacts to a less than significant level.

Air Quality

The increase in air pollutants, including nitrogen oxide (NO_x) and particulate matter (PM₁₀), during project operation caused by vehicle emissions would exceed the Bay Area Air Quality Management District significance thresholds. There is no mitigation available, beyond what the project sponsor is already doing (e.g., Transportation Demand Management program) to reduce emissions from project operation. Therefore, the impact is significant and unavoidable.

Under cumulative conditions, the project's contribution to the increase in air pollutants associated with new stationary and mobile sources associated with project operation would be considerable resulting in a significant and unavoidable cumulative impact.

Noise

In the near term, the increase in traffic associated with the proposed project would result in increased noise levels along Marsh Road near Page Street in Redwood City that would expose people or generate noise levels in excess of applicable standards. The noise at this location would increase by 1.3 dBA Ldn, which is greater than the Federal Transit Administration's (FTA) significance threshold of 1 dBA Ldn for residential uses that are currently exposed to relatively high ambient noise levels. Therefore, the proposed project would expose persons to noise levels in excess of established standards. There is no feasible mitigation available to minimize this impact. Therefore, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

The near term increase in traffic associated with the proposed project would result in increased noise levels along Marsh Road near Page Street, as discussed above. This would result in a substantial, permanent increase in the ambient noise level within the project area. The noise would increase by 1.3 dBA Ldn, which is greater than the FTA significance threshold of 1 dBA Ldn for residential uses. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity. In the Near Term, there is no feasible mitigation available to minimize this impact. Therefore, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

In addition to the significant and unavoidable operational noise impacts, vibration associated with pile driving during project construction could expose adjacent uses to vibration levels that may damage sensitive research and manufacturing equipment as well as any on-site occupants in the short term. Even with mitigation this impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

Water Supply

The Draft EIR evaluated the following three scenarios for water usage in addition to the hotel and health club components:

- Menlo Gateway Project – 100% Office;
- GPA/ZOA – 100% research and development (i.e., wet lab); and
- Split Option – 63% Office/37% R&D.

The conclusions in the Draft EIR are based on an extensive water conservation program proposed by the project sponsor, including the use of water efficient plumbing fixtures and landscaping. Under near-term conditions, the increase in water supply for maximum development for the GPA/ZOA scenario under normal, dry, and critical dry years would be significant. No feasible mitigation measures would be available to reduce the impact; therefore, the impact would be significant and unavoidable.

Under cumulative conditions, the project's increase in demand for water supplies under all three development scenarios would be considerable, resulting in a significant and unavoidable impact.

Summary of Alternatives Analysis

Draft EIR analyzed five Alternatives as established by the City; the alternatives do not reflect input from the applicant regarding feasibility. Table 6-1 on pages 6-3 and 6-4 of the Draft EIR provide a detailed summary of the following alternatives:

	Land Use	Total Floor Area Ratio (FAR)
Project	Office and Hotel & Health Club	137.5%
Alternative 1	Office	31.5%
Alternative 2	Office	45.0%
Alternative 3	Office and Hotel & Health Club	82.5%
Alternative 4	Office and Hotel & Health Club	110.0%
Alternative 5	Office and Hotel & Health Club	117.3%

Alternatives 3, 4 and 5 include the hotel and health club components of the project with reductions in the amount of office space. Tables 6-2, 6-3, 6-4 and 6-5 on pages 6-5 through 6-8 of the Draft EIR provide summary comparisons of significant impacts of the various alternatives compared to the project. All of the Alternatives would eliminate the noise impact and the NO_x impact. Alternative 1 through 3 would eliminate the PM₁₀ impact. All of the Alternatives would lessen, but not necessarily eliminate, the water supply impacts. In regard to transportation impacts, all of the Alternatives would eliminate the following impacts:

- Intersection of Marsh Road and US 101 northbound off-ramp,
- Chilco Street (between Constitution and Bayfront) roadway segment, and
- US 101 north of Marsh Road Route of Regional Significance.

Alternatives 1 through 3 would eliminate the following transportation impacts:

- Intersection of Bayfront Expressway and University Avenue,
- Intersection of Bayfront Expressway and Chilco Street,
- Intersection of Independence Drive and Constitution Drive, and
- State Route 84 East of University Avenue Route of Regional Significance.

In order to eliminate additional transportation impacts, the hotel and health club component of the project would need to be removed.

CORRESPONDENCE

Since the release of the Draft EIR, staff has received two letters, from Nina Wouk and Patti Fry, which are included as Attachment E.

RECOMMENDED MEETING PROCEDURE

1. Introduction by Staff
2. Consultant Presentations
 - a. Draft EIR Overview: PBS&J
 - b. Housing Needs Assessment: Keyser Marston Associates
 - c. Traffic and Circulation: DKS Associates
3. Commission Questions of Staff/Consultant/Applicant on Draft EIR
4. Public Comment on Draft EIR
5. Commission Comments on Draft EIR
6. Close the Public Hearing

Thomas Rogers
Associate Planner
Report Author

Justin Murphy
Development Services Manager

PUBLIC NOTICE

Public notification consisted of publishing a legal notice in the local newspaper and notification by mail of all property owners and occupants within a quarter-mile (1,320 feet) of the subject property. The newspaper notice was initially published on July 22, 2009, and was republished as a courtesy on August 26, 2009. The mailed notice was supplemented by a citywide postcard mailing, which listed all meetings for the project between July and September 2009.

In addition, the City has prepared a project page for the proposal, which is available at the following address: http://www.menlopark.org/projects/comdev_iac.htm. This page provides up-to-date information about the project, allowing interested parties to stay informed of its progress. The page allows users to sign up for automatic email bulletins, notifying them when content is updated or meetings are scheduled. Previous staff reports and other related documents are available for review on the project page.

ATTACHMENTS

- A. Location Map
- B. Project Plans (select sheets – complete plans available for review at the City offices or on the City web site)
- C. Housing Commission Approved Excerpt Minutes, August 5, 2009
- D. Transportation Commission Approved Minutes, August 5, 2009
- E. Correspondence
 - Nina Wouk, September 3, 2009
 - Patti Fry, September 4, 2009

Note: Attached are reduced versions of maps and diagrams submitted by the applicants. The accuracy of the information in these drawings is the responsibility of the applicants, and verification of the accuracy by City Staff is not always possible. The original full-scale maps, drawings and exhibits are available for public viewing at the Community Development Department.

EXHIBITS TO BE PROVIDED AT MEETING

None

AVAILABLE FOR REVIEW AT CITY OFFICES

Draft Environmental Impact Report prepared by PBS&J, dated July 2009

V:\STAFFRPT\PC\2009\091409 - Menlo Gateway (Bohannon hotel-office).doc



HOUSING COMMISSION MINUTES

Approved Excerpts

Regular Meeting

August 5, 2009

5:30 p.m.

Administrative Building Conference Room, First Floor
701 Laurel Street, Menlo Park, CA 94025-3483

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Moser called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. in the Administrative Building Conference Room.

ROLL CALL

Housing Commission Members Present: Patricia Boyle (Vice Chair), Don Brawner, Elizabeth Lasensky, Anne Moser (Chair), Brian Steuer.

Housing Commission Members Absent: Clarice O'Neal.

Staff Present: Douglas Frederick, Housing Manager; Megan Nee, Management Analyst; Thomas Rogers, Associate Planner; Margaret Roberts, City Clerk.

B. BUSINESS ITEMS

2. 101-155 Constitution Drive and 100-190 Independence Drive (Menlo Gateway) Environmental Impact Report

Chair Moser introduced the item by commenting that the Commission received an immense amount of material on it.

Associate Planner Rogers introduced himself as the City's project planner for this item, known as Menlo Gateway or the Bohannon Hotel and Office project. He noted it is a private development project put forward by an individual land owner and developer, as opposed to a City-sponsored project such as the Downtown El Camino Real Visioning project. He explained the proposed project is located on two sites near the Marsh Road and Highway 101 interchange. On the Independence Drive site the applicant proposes a hotel and health club, one office building, and a shared parking garage, he said. And on the Constitution Drive site, he said, there would be two office buildings and two parking garages. The proposal includes amendments to the City's General Plan and Zoning Ordinance, as well as approvals of specific developments. The proposed project site is currently in the M2 zoning district and would require a change to the new M3 zoning district, he said. The new M3 zoning district would increase the maximum height from 35 feet to 140 feet and the maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) from 55 percent of lot size to 137.5 percent of lot size. He added that hotels, which are not currently permitted, would be permitted.

Associate Planner Rogers explained that the proposed project has been under review for quite some time and noted it will also be discussed at the Transportation

Commission meeting later tonight. Currently, he said, the draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and draft Fiscal Impact Analysis (FIA) have just been released for public review and discussion. He said the focus of the meeting tonight is to review the housing related topics of the draft EIR. He explained that the Commissioner's comments will be summarized in the standard minutes format and approved by the Commission at its September meeting. These minutes will be included in the project's final EIR, he said. He added if Commissioners have more detailed comments they can submit them directly to him or at the Planning Commission meeting on September 14th. In addition, he said, a general commission meeting will be held on August 19th in order to leverage the expertise of the City's commissions.

Associate Planner Rogers invited the project applicants to introduce themselves. Mr. David Bohannon, the project's developer, introduced himself and noted he does not have a formal presentation but invites questions. He introduced Ms. Jennifer Renk, an attorney with Luce Forward.

Associate Planner Rogers provided an overview of housing related topics in the EIR. He explained the EIR is a requirement under the California Environmental Quality Act, or C.E.Q.A. EIR's are informational documents that disclose impacts to the public and decision makers, he said. The impacts analyzed need to be direct physical impacts, he said. They are not social or economic impacts. Associate Planner Rogers explained that with regard to population and housing specifically there are three potential impacts criteria, as follows:

- 1) Would the project induce substantial population growth in the area, either directly (for example by proposing new homes or businesses) or indirectly (for example by extending new roads or infrastructure)?
- 2) Would the project displace a substantial number of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?
- 3) Would the project displace a substantial number of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

Associate Planner Rogers said that impacts criteria numbers two and three are fully excluded from this initial study because the proposed project does not replace or provide housing. He said number one is informed by a Housing Needs Analysis, which is part of the submittal we gave the Commission and included as an appendix to the EIR. The Housing Needs Analysis reports that the proposed project is estimated to employ 2,566 new employees and displace 688 if the existing buildings were fully occupied, he said. The number of net new employees considered for the proposed project is 1,878, he said. Because households have multiple workers, he explained, we need to look at the typical number of workers per household for Menlo Park and San Mateo County. Analyzing the census data then gets us to an approximation of housing units, he said. Then we need to ask: what would be the number of these housing units that could be potentially correlated with Menlo Park? Based on historical trends in the census in which ten percent of Menlo Park employees live in the city, we would estimate that 109 of the total households could wish to live in Menlo Park, he said.

Separately, Associate Planner Rogers continued, the City Council requested the Housing Needs Analysis consider any potential changes to Menlo Park's Regional Housing Needs Allocation, or RHNA. This is what feeds into the Housing Element as far as Menlo Park's requirement for new units to be built over a specified planning period, which is usually about seven years, he said.

Associate Planner Rogers noted that the Housing Needs Analysis is an interesting but speculative analysis. Keep in mind, he said, some things could be implemented, maybe or maybe not. He said the consultants considered the proposed project's impact to Menlo Park's RHNA and the result is a range, from zero units up to 76 units for the seven-year planning period. In conclusion of his presentation, Associate Planner Rogers said the Housing Needs Analysis can be considered by the commissions and the City Council to help in their decisions, but as far as the draft EIR looks at potential indirect housing demand it is not technically an impact under CEQA because the project does not include housing units or the creation of new infrastructure.

Chair Moser clarified that no action is needed from the Commission tonight but its comments will become part of the EIR.

Vice Chair Boyle asked if SB 375 will change the EIR process and could it have any bearing on this project. Associate Planner Rogers responded that SB 375 does not have a direct bearing on the project/EIR process now because its implementation has not been worked out. However, he added, anything could change and he cannot say how the future RHNA process will be affected.

Vice Chair Boyle asked if the next Housing Element round will be impacted by these new jobs. Associate Planner Rogers said yes, it could be. Vice Chair Boyle said that from the reading it seems our share of the total RHNA sub region will increase because of the increase in jobs. Associate Planner Rogers responded that this was the theory behind requesting the analysis. Housing Manager Frederick said he thinks we're confusing how the formula goes together. He said he thinks the formula says "what is the job growth going to be for this coming period and how many housing units do we need to apply to cover this job growth?" Associate Planner Rogers commented that this is where the range comes in, so a potential increase of zero means it is simply absorbed. Vice Chair Boyle replied that the way she read it, these new jobs would be factored into the next Housing Element round, not this one. Housing Manager Frederick said right but I really think what you see is job growth for the coming period, not this one. Vice Chair Boyle said okay, we have the same understanding then.

Vice Chair Boyle noted that a net of 1,090 new housing units would be required according to the analysis. In reference to the sub region, she asked, are we looking at opportunities to do something with another city? Housing Manager Frederick responded that this opportunity for the current planning period has passed, however we could have traded housing units. Vice Chair Boyle commented that the proposed project is very close to Redwood City. Housing Manager Frederick replied that Redwood City was one of the only pair of cities that swapped numbers so it sounds like they would be open to it. Vice Chair Boyle commented that she wants to state for the record that Menlo Park provides less (affordable) housing than other jurisdictions and only ten percent of Menlo Park employees can afford to live here.

Commissioner Lasensky said, considering that the analysis says only ten percent of Menlo Park workers live in the city and the project's Belle Haven location, do we have any way of estimating how many residents would actually be employed in this complex? Associate Planner Rogers responded that we do not have any way of knowing with certainty but the applicant has suggested a local hiring initiative through JobTrain (formerly O.I.C.W.). The local hiring initiative is more about opportunity than certainty, he said, but it has been announced publicly.

Housing Manager Frederick asked Associate Planner Rogers if we have figures regarding the number of Menlo Park residents hired by the new Rosewood Hotel. Associate Planner Rogers said that from his understanding the applicant's proposal would be a more targeted initiative, not just giving residents early interview hours. Ms. Renk from Luce Forward stated that at the moment they have a letter of intent with JobTrain to work closely with them so employees would be trained for the jobs they'd provide on-site. She said they want to work together to maximize opportunities. Chair Moser asked how this would work. Ms. Renk responded that the JobTrain relationship would extend to the hotel, Marriott, and the office component as well. She said it would be "first source," giving the clients of JobTrain the first crack.

Vice Chair Boyle said that looking at the salary spread for the proposed jobs, we have some above-moderate levels and lots of low-income but not much in the middle. She noted that those at the top of this range could possibly buy in Menlo Park. So, she said, we may see some people who could live here but it is not likely for those low-income employees. Commissioner Lasensky asked what sort of transportation would be provided for people in Belle Haven or employees in general? Mr. David Bohannon said that as part of the Transportation Demand Management (T.D.M.) program they are going to engage in several programs such as funding shuttles and purchase of transit passes, however he is not sure whether these would actually apply to residents of Belle Haven. He noted the way shuttles tend to work, if there is ridership demand in Belle Haven it would probably not be terribly difficult to add a pick-up there. He said at the moment there is no plan to develop pedestrian/bike plans. Commissioner Lasensky commented that the buses now stop at 10:00 at night and if you have hotel workers they will work all shifts. Mr. Bohannon responded that as part of the T.D.M. program there is something called Guaranteed Ride Home. He said he is not sure how it works but it has significant financing. Chair Moser said she heard the Belle Haven and East Palo Alto bus system may be reduced from current levels. Mr. Bohannon said you would think walking and biking from Belle Haven would be great and it would, but for those who choose to use their cars it would have a very small impact.

Chair Moser commented that the tables on pages 12 and 30 say so many new housing units are needed but if we anticipate people being hired from within Menlo Park then we don't need those units. Associate Planner Rogers responded that some people already living in Menlo Park will leave their jobs (for the new ones created) so it is an exchange and the demand is still there. Chair Moser inquired if Mr. Bohannon knows of available land to be used for new housing in Menlo Park. She said she heard the Post Office might move. Mr. Bohannon responded that the Post Office owns the land and is looking at facilities but that site does not look like a housing site to him. He said it may be possible for housing to be developed in Bohannon Park but it would

take some serious study to see if it would be a good idea. He said his understanding is that there are several small sites the City has identified as potential housing infill sites, largely in response to the RHNA. He said his own personal observation is that there is not a lot of political will to develop housing in Menlo Park. He said he does not know at what point the State will step in and make it painful for municipalities that are not building housing. There are parts of Belle Haven that look like good potential housing sites, he said, but there are Belle Haven residents who aren't excited about that and the lack of services like grocery stores, which really contributes to their feelings of disenfranchisement. He concluded the Hiller Helicopter site looks good for housing and mixed-use commercial/office. You could do a neighborhood center there and incentivize the developer to put needed services there in return for office and housing, he said.

Chair Moser asked if there has been any thought of a plan for a convenience store or food besides the hotel. Ms. Renk explained that the new zoning would allow for convenience retail and the market will determine if it happens. Commissioner Brawner asked what the current income is from the M2 zoning area. Associate Planner Rogers responded that he does not have a total but the fiscal analysis has figures from existing parcels. Commissioner Brawner said it is not a good idea to sacrifice that sort of property for office buildings that produce little or nothing. He also asked what formula the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) uses (to determine the RHNA) because he has been trying to get it for ten years. Associate Planner Rogers said ultimately we will not get the formula but the Housing Needs Analysis gives us a good idea. Mr. Bohannon said he has worked directly with a former director of ABAG and could bring him here to make a presentation. Chair Moser said that could be of interest to the Commission sometime in the future.

Commissioner Brawner asked about roads and traffic impacts. Associate Planner Rogers said no new freeway interchange would be needed but yes there would be traffic impacts. He said some of these impacts could be mitigated through improvements and some are in the jurisdiction of Caltrans so we are approaching them. Commissioner Brawner asked if Associate Planner Rogers is aware that the intersection at Ravenswood and Willow is bad now so this additional big office complex would add to that. Associate Planner Rogers said there is no doubt about that. Commissioner Brawner asked if he anticipates the Dumbarton rail will be a part of this. Associate Planner Rogers said it is not part of the current analysis.

Public Comment:

Menlo Park resident Mr. Elias Blawie addressed the Commission regarding the proposed project. During his address one additional member of the public donated his comment time to him. Mr. Blawie said that in addition to being a Menlo Park resident he has also worked in Menlo Park. He asked: do we know who the most likely tenant for this space will be? He said he questions the employee count for the office part of the project based on his direct personal experience. He advised that the Commission look at actual projects such as University Circle, which he said is the best proxy of what this project would be like. Look at the full build-out and full employment, he said. If you look at law firms and University Circle, he said, the lawyer-to-staff ratio is one to two. Many hundreds of professionals are prime candidates for housing in Menlo Park, he explained. There will be more employees and they will be high-end employees who

will also drive a lot across Menlo Park. The development will be growth-inducing, he said. He advised the Commission to think about it in plain English: how will the total project impact regional needs and housing needs? He said to also consider the underlying process, which he said is not a project but an “option to build” project with a 20-year horizon that ties our hands for several years.

Commissioner Brawner commented that the public should have at least five minutes to comment, especially at a casual meeting like this. Chair Moser invited Commissioner Brawner to talk to her if he would like to revise the Commission’s current policy.

Associate Planner Rogers concluded the discussion by inviting Commissioners to submit more comments directly to him or at the Planning Commission meeting on September 14.

E. ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 7:15 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Megan Nee
Management Analyst



TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION MINUTES

Regular Meeting
August 5, 2009
7:00 PM
City Council Chambers
801 Laurel Street

CALL TO ORDER : The meeting was called to order by R. Cronin (Chair) at approximately 7:05 p.m.

ROLL CALL:

Commissioners Present –P. Huang (Vice Chair), R. Alexander, C. Bourne, E. Doyle, M. Engel, R. Rice
Commissioners Absent – None
Staff present: R. Baile, C. Taylor, Thomas Rogers (Associate Planner)

A. PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

B. BUSINESS ITEMS

1. Approval of Minutes from the Regular Meeting of July 8, 2009

M/S. Bourne/Huang. Minutes of the Regular Meeting of July 8, 2009 were unanimously approved, 6-0, with Chair Cronin abstaining.

2. Commission Discussion and Comments on the Transportation-Related Portions of the Menlo Gateway Project Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR)

Staff Rogers started by saying that the City Council requested the different commissions, including the Transportation Commission, to comment on the Menlo Gateway Project DEIR. He said that there would be a General Commission meeting on August 19, 2009 and that the Planning Commission would consider the project's DEIR on September 14, 2009. The last day to provide comments on the DEIR would be on September 21, 2009. The purpose of the meeting tonight was to gather the comments by the Transportation Commission on the project's DEIR. These comments would then be summarized by staff as part of the meeting minutes, to be approved by the commission at its September meeting. Ultimately, these comments would be considered and addressed appropriately in the preparation of the Final EIR.

Staff Rogers made a Power Point presentation to the commission discussing the project as follows:

- The Menlo Gateway Project, also known as the Bohannon Office Development, is a privately proposed development project near Marsh Road and 101. It proposes amendments to the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance (Re-zoning from M-2 zone to

M-3 zone created to enable this project) as well as approval of specific development project. The specific development project would comprise of 1) an office building (200,000 sq. ft.), hotel (170,000 sq. ft.) & health club (70,000 sq. ft.) and shared parking garage on the Constitution site; and, 2) two office buildings (495,000 sq. ft.) with small retail and two parking garages (total 1649 spaces) on the Independence Site.

- The creation of the M-3 zone would permit: 1) increasing the building height from 35' to 140'; and 2) increasing the Floor Area Ratio (FAR – ratio of size of building to size of lot) from 55% to 137.5%.

Staff Taylor provided a Power Point presentation focusing on the traffic impact analysis (TIA) element of the DEIR as follows:

- In the traffic impact analysis, three traffic scenarios were considered as follows: 1) existing; 2) near term (2010 Horizon) – with or without project; 3) long term (2027 Horizon) – with or without project.
- The following transportation system facilities in the vicinity of the project or study area were analyzed during the AM and PM peak hours: 1) 21 intersections – 16 signalized intersections and 5 unsignalized intersections; 2) 9 roadway segments; 3) routes of Regional Significance – US 101 & Bayfront Expressway (SR-84); 4) public transit; and 5) pedestrian & bicycle facilities.
- In the TIA analysis, the public transit and the pedestrian & bicycle facilities were determined to have less than significant impact. In the near term scenario, seven intersections and eight roadway segments would have significant impacts while in the long term scenario, 11 intersections and eight roadway segments would have significant impacts. Most of the intersections that would have significant impacts are Caltrans intersections and consequently, the mitigation measures at those intersections have to be reviewed and subsequently, approved, via a permit process, by Caltrans.

Staff Rogers briefly talked about the different alternatives to the project that were analyzed per the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

Comments and questions on the DEIR were received from individual Transportation Commissioners and are summarized as follows:

- Were the vision plan specific goals, such as multi-level buildings and strong landscaping, considered in the project proposals? (Staff Rogers responded that this is a private project proposal and consequently, this was not transferred to the project.)
- Has the project DEIR been reviewed by pedestrian/bicycle activists? (Staff Rogers said that it has not been reviewed by pedestrian/bicycle activists but that they could certainly comment on it.)
- Are there any other variances asked for in the proposal? (Staff Rogers responded that the proposal requests for re-zoning of the project sites from M-2 zone to M-3 zone. The M-3 zone is crafted for this project and substantially different from the M-2 zone.)
- How did you get the employee count for the office component of the project - concerned that wrong assumption about the number of employees would significantly affect the traffic impact analysis? (Staff Taylor responded that the national standard is to get trip

generation numbers from the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Manual. For the office building, the trips generated were calculated based on sq. footage of the building). Was there any validation of these numbers with respect to local use? (Staff Taylor responded that there was no validation made of these numbers but that he thinks that they are very reliable.)

- Were specific figures (volume of traffic) obtained from the Whiskey Gulch development project, which is in direct parallel with the proposed project having a major hotel, major office and access to the freeway – concerned about the cookbook approach? (Staff Taylor responded that no specific figures were taken from the Whiskey Gulch project but that regarding the hotel and health club component, they look at a similar facility in Walnut Creek.)
- Was the project assumed to be fully built-out in the analysis? (Staff Taylor answered that in both near term and long term scenarios, the project was assumed to be built out.)
- Was Redwood City's Cargill Project included in the analysis? (Staff Taylor responded that it was not included because it is currently conceptual.) How about the Dumbarton Rail? (Staff Taylor responded that the report indicated that it could happen in the future but that it was not considered in the traffic analysis to reduce trips or impacts.)
- What is the Guaranteed Ride Home? (Staff Taylor answered that it is a program that provides cab vouchers to workers to be able to get home in case of emergencies or if they need to work late at night.) How about public transit option for after hour workers? (Staff Taylor answered that the City has shuttles that would transport workers to the Menlo Park train station. He said that he would not be surprised if the hotel would have its own shuttle in the future.)
- Were there any comments received from the Town of Atherton and City of Redwood City on the DEIR? (Staff Taylor responded that no comments from these cities have been received to date.) How about from the Menlo Park Transportation Division? (Staff Taylor responded that they oversaw the creation of the traffic impact analysis and ultimately, would review any comments received on the analysis.)
- Concern about the assumption that majority of the additional trips generated by the project utilizes 101 or Bayfront Expressway to go in and out of the project sites and consequently, would be underestimating the traffic that would come into Menlo Park local residential streets such as the Belle Haven neighborhood streets. (Staff Taylor responded that assumptions made for the trip distribution and trip routes in the analysis were based on previous trip surveys and analysis of this same kind of land uses in the same geographical area in Menlo Park.)
- Were cumulative effects of all projects in Menlo Park considered in the analysis? (Staff Taylor answered that trips generated from approved (but not built) and pending (awaiting approval from the Planning Commission or City Council) projects were included in the background traffic, which consequently, base the level of delay to a level where additional traffic would be more likely to cause a significant impact on a transportation facility.)
- Will the developer pay for all the mitigation measures? (Staff Taylor responded that not all of the mitigation measures would be paid by the developer. The developer might be

required to pay the Transportation Impact Fees or TIF and could get TIF credit for measures constructed.)

- Will there be enough parking? (Staff Taylor responded that there would be different patterns of arrival for the different land uses, different peaks for the different land uses, but with the full sites combined, there would be enough parking to meet the parking demand.)
- How about the trees that would be removed? (Staff Rogers referred to the comprehensive landscaping plan described in the DEIR.)
- The pressure is going to be on Marsh Road into 101 & into Bayfront Expressway. Does this mean that most of the traffic would be coming out of the East Bay. (Staff Taylor responded that that is not true. The bulk of the traffic would be using the freeways due to their proximity to the project sites.) Comment: This is not true with the Whiskey Gulch development project where the traffic through the local neighborhoods was considerably underestimated. We don't know where traffic is going to go. We are making a huge mistake in assumption that there would no traffic coming west at all.
- We are creating a new M-3 Zone just for this project. What if the middle parcels that remain under the M-2 Zone decide to apply for M-3 re-zoning? (Staff Rogers responded that a Fiscal Impact Analysis (FIA) was conducted to address this likely scenario. He said that the re-zoning process would not be an easy process and that many things would have to happen if ever there is a possibility for this to occur.)
- Why was a small portion of Marsh Road not included in the analysis? (Staff Taylor responded that this roadway segment is classified as a principal arterial and consequently, there is no volume threshold that it has to meet.)
- Was there an assumption made where people would go out for lunch? (Staff Taylor said that noon peak hour was not analyzed but typically should have less traffic than during the peak a.m. and p.m. hours.)
- Was the calculation of trips generated different for each land use? (Staff Taylor answered yes.)
- Who would be the target clientele for the hotel & health fitness center? (David Bohannon, the developer, responded that hotel occupants would more than likely be business people, who would potentially use the fitness center. There would be strong synergistic relationships among the hotel, office, and health club components of the project. The fitness center would certainly be open for Menlo Park residents. They looked at a similar facility in Walnut Creek, which has been well received by the community.)
- Comment: Not addressing poor bicycle access by the development is wrong.

The following people from the public spoke regarding the project:

Elias Blawie, Menlo Park resident, questioned the assumptions that drive the traffic analysis and suggested that specific local traffic data (from the Whiskey Gulch development, 2700 Sand Hill Road, University Circle) be used and not what the manual says. He said that this is the biggest project that the commission will ever see and consequently, should treat it as such. He

questioned why we are building a mid-20th century project, with no relationship to transit and pedestrian and bicycle facilities.

3. Commission Discussion and Comments on the City of Menlo Park Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) Mitigation Measures

Staff Taylor started by saying that it took a long period of time to develop this Transportation Impact Fee (TIF). Current action is driven by the development agreement with Sun Microsystems that required Sun to pay the City a certain amount of money for traffic mitigation only if there is an adopted TIF by November, 2009.

Joy Bhattacharya, TJKM Transportation Consultants, told the commission that the purpose of the meeting tonight was to gather feedback and comments on the mitigation measures that have been identified for the impacted intersections as part of the TIF. Then, he provided a Power Point presentation of the overview as to what impact fees are and the basic requirements for impact fees to be in place. He discussed the process that was followed as part of the study. He also briefly talked about the types of mitigation projects that were included in the calculation of the TIF.

Comments and questions from individual commissioners were received and summarized as follows:

- Will Sun Microsystems be paying for all the mitigation measures? (Staff Taylor said that it will not.)
- Will Bohannon's project pay the TIF? (Staff Taylor responded that it would be up to the City Council.)
- Comment: Attachment A, Table of Mitigation Measures, should be made legible.
- Why school busing was not included as a mitigation measure? (Joy Bhattacharya responded that California does not allow TIF to pay developments related to schools.)
- General suggestion on the diagrams – Changes on the receiving lanes should be shown as well. Make the arrows thicker where there are changes.
- Definitions of the types of bicycle facilities i.e. bike paths, bike lanes, bike routes, should be included in the report.
- Some of the mitigation measures propose widening but were not specific on what property will be taken.
- Comment: Glad that some mitigation measures would improve traffic flow on El Camino Real. If there is one that needs to be done on El Camino Real, it should be at the intersection of El Camino Real at Ravenswood Avenue.
- Comment: No time to comment on individual intersections. This would have been good for a commission study session.
- Is there a traffic impact fee being collected right now? (Staff Taylor responded that we have an unofficial fee for developments that have discretionary action and development agreement (conditions of approval).)

- Comment: Concern about linking mitigation measures with development projects and collecting fees.
- Will the TIF sunset? (Staff Taylor responded that it would be up to the City Council.)
- What is an adaptive signal control system? (Staff Taylor responded that this is the most sophisticated signal control system with the timing based on the traffic volumes at the moment. It has been found to reduce delay by 10% to 15%.)
- How do things get on the list on the Excel table (Attachment A)? Was ranking done? What does Y or N mean? (Joy Bhattacharya responded that the list included all the 42 signalized intersections in Menlo Park. The projects listed were not ranked. Y or N indicates whether the intersection would be significantly impacted by the new developments, based on the City's thresholds.)
- Mitigation measures were required in conjunction with the Hillview School project. Why not here? (Staff Taylor responded that not all intersections could be analyzed and so only signalized intersections were included in the analysis. However, there is some money allocated for unsignalized intersections that could potentially be warranted in the future for a traffic signal?)
- How were the sidewalk projects proposed? Some of these sidewalk locations have lower rankings than other locations in the City's Sidewalk Master Plan. (Staff Taylor responded that the sidewalk projects would be on corridors that would have significant impacts from the new developments.)
- Which mitigation measure would go first? Was there any prioritization done? (Staff Taylor answered that it would be up to the City Council to decide which mitigation measure would go first. There is no prioritization at this time.)

C. REPORTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. City Council Report (Commission)

Commissioner Alexander talked about her report on the Middlefield Road/Linfield Drive crossing that she provided to the Council at its meeting of July 14, 2009, particularly the explanation why the Transportation Commission made its recommendation. She indicated that ultimately, the City Council decided to move forward with the lighted crosswalk, with the remaining money to be put on hold for a year from the construction of the lighted crosswalk to do a study on the effectiveness of the lighted crosswalks. Commissioner Bourne said that he was surprised why Commissioner Alexander was only given three minutes to speak. He said that consequently, he had to donate time. Staff Taylor said that he would look into this and would provide feedback to bring back to the commission.

2. Alternative School Transportation (Doyle and Engel)

None.

3. Grade Separation/High Speed Rail (Cronin, Bourne, and Huang)

None.

4. El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan (Alexander and Rice)

Commissioner Rice talked about the letter he e-mailed to the newspapers regarding how to improve traffic flow on El Camino Real.

D. INFORMATION ITEM

1. Information Regarding Caltrain's Change in the Horn Location

The commission briefly talked about the press release from Caltrain about the location of the horns being moved to the top of the trains, consequently increasing the volume and the range of the sound.

2. Update of the City's Neighborhood Traffic Management Program (NTMP)

Staff Baile indicated that no new NTMP requests were received. He said that with the assistance of Commissioner Doyle and the Fire District, he was able to conduct the emergency response delay time study for the Oak Avenue NTMP project. He would schedule the traffic speeds and volumes after studies on Oak Avenue when school starts. The Monte Rosa Traffic Calming Project would be scheduled to be presented to Council sometime in September, 2009 to consider approving whether the traffic calming measures on Monte Rosa Drive should remain permanent or not.

3. Update of Transportation Commission's Previous Actions

None.

4. Upcoming Items

None.

E. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Cronin adjourned the meeting at approximately 10:30 p.m.

Prepared by: Rene C. Baile, P.E.