

E. PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES

This section presents information related to public services and utilities that may be adversely affected by the proposed project, including police service, fire service, parks and recreation facilities, schools, and water supply and wastewater facilities. Service locations, capacities, and expansion possibilities are described, in addition to relevant regulations and service requirements. Impacts to public services and utilities are identified.

1. Police Services

This section includes a brief discussion of police services in and around the project site and evaluates the project's potential impacts on police services.

a. Existing Police Facilities and Staffing. The Menlo Park Police Department is located at 701 Laurel Street, approximately 0.8 miles from the project site. The Department currently has 49 sworn officers, two Community Service Officers (non-sworn), and 29 professional staff.¹ Due to staff turnover and advancement, staffing numbers will occasionally fluctuate. However, once vacancies are filled, the Department is expected to meet approved staffing levels.²

The project site is located within the Department's Beat One service area. Beat One covers the area within the west side of Menlo Park bounded by Valparaiso Avenue on the north, El Camino Real on the east, Sand Hill Road on the south, and Lawler Ranch Road on the west.³ Two officers are assigned to this beat and patrol its boundaries in 12-hour shifts.

The Department has an average response time of 4 minutes, 7 minutes, and 9 minutes for Priority 1, 2, and 3 calls, respectively. Incoming calls are prioritized and responded to according to level of urgency. Priority 1 calls are defined as involving immediate danger of injury or loss of life, and Priority 2 calls are those which require an urgent response to prevent the situation from escalating to a Priority 1. Priority 3 calls are those which require a response when sworn officers are available. The primary law enforcement issues within the vicinity of the project site are related to traffic and property crimes. The Department actively combats these issues with proactive crime strategies, deploying the necessary resources to effectively enforce the laws and apprehend criminals.⁴

b. Police Services Impacts. An increase in demand for police services is not an environmental impact in and of itself. However, if the project necessitates new police facilities, the construction of such facilities could result in environmental impacts. Therefore, the project would have a significant impact on police services if it would require the construction of new facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for police services, and these new facilities would result in secondary environmental impacts.

(1) Less-Than-Significant Police Service Impacts. The proposed project would be expected to incrementally increase the demand for police services in the City because the project

¹ Romero, Jaime, 2011. Interim Commander-Operations Division. Menlo Park Police Department. Personal communications with LSA Associates, Inc. May 10 and 16.

² Ibid.

³ Ibid. Lawler Ranch Road is located in the Town of Woodside.

⁴ Ibid.

would increase the City's residential population, but this small increase in demand would be accommodated by existing Police Department facilities. Excluding unforeseen circumstances, the Menlo Park Police Department does not anticipate a significant increase in calls for service or an increase in the Department's response times as a result of the proposed project.⁵ Therefore, the proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts on police services.

(2) Significant Police Service Impacts. The proposed project would not result in a significant impact to police services within the City.

2. Fire Services

This section describes fire protection and emergency medical services in Menlo Park and evaluates the project's impacts on these services.

a. Existing Fire Facilities, Staffing, and Response Times. The Menlo Park Fire Protection District (MPFPD) provides fire protection and emergency medical services to the project site. The MPFPD covers approximately 30 square miles and serves approximately 93,000 people within the communities of Atherton, Menlo Park, East Palo Alto, and some unincorporated areas of San Mateo County.⁶ The MPFPD's headquarters are located at 170 Middlefield Road. Currently, the MPFPD has 88 staff, which includes three battalion chiefs, 24 captains, 50 engineers, and 11 firefighters. Forty of the staff members are paramedics and all personnel are emergency medical technicians (EMTs).⁷ The daily staffing/equipment minimum standard is 25 staff members and nine firefighting apparatuses for the MPFPD's seven stations, including one battalion chief, eight captains, and 16 firefighters/engineers, where a minimum of one paramedic staff member is required on each fire engine.⁸

Fire Station 6, Fire Station 3, and Fire Station 1, respectively would be the first, second, and third responders to a fire emergency within the project site.⁹ Fire Station 6 is located at 700 Oak Grove Avenue in Menlo Park, approximately 0.6 miles from the project site and includes a Type 1 fire engine. Fire Station 3 is located at 32 Almendral Avenue in Atherton, approximately 2 miles from the project site and also includes a Type 1 fire engine. Fire Station 1 is located at 300 Middlefield Road in Menlo Park, approximately 1.5 miles from the project site and includes a Type 1 fire engine, a 100-foot aerial ladder truck, and a battalion command vehicle.¹⁰

The MPFPD's response time goal is between 7 and 8 minutes maximum travel time for all emergencies. The MPFPD currently achieves this performance goal 90 percent of the time. Depending on factors such as travel route, time of day, and unit availability, the average response time from Fire Station 6 is under 7 minutes.¹¹

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ Menlo Park Fire Protection District, 2011. Fire District Information. Website: www.menlofire.org/districtinfo.html (accessed March 30).

⁷ Schapelhouman, Harold, 2011. Fire Chief, Menlo Park Fire Protection District. Personal communication with LSA Associates, Inc. May 9.

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ Ibid.

The MPFPD maintains automatic aid agreements (allowing for immediate assistance) with San Mateo County and the City of Palo Alto. The MPFPD participates in the San Mateo County Automatic agreement, which includes an automatic deployment model and a central emergency dispatch center for all fire agencies in the County. This automatic aid model sends the closest available unit to respond, regardless of jurisdiction.¹² The MPFPD is currently working to expand its automatic aid agreement with the City of Palo Alto. Currently, the cities of Menlo Park and Palo Alto have automatic aid for fire engines only and mutual aid (aid upon request) for trucks and battalion chiefs.¹³

According to the MPFPD, no unusual fire hazards currently exist within the project site and its vicinity. However, since El Camino Real is a major arterial roadway, mobile hazards such as vehicles transporting hazardous and flammable materials could pose hazards to the project site.¹⁴

The Operation and Suppression Division of the MPFPD coordinates and manages all of the emergency operations and daily work activities for suppression personnel. Emergency Medical Services (EMS) activities include pre-hospital emergency medical services, continuing education training, quality assurance and improvement, infection control, and the paramedic preceptor program.¹⁵ The MPFPD participates in the Community Emergency Response Team (CERT) program, which aims to improve community preparedness in the event of a disaster. The goal of the program is for emergency personnel to train neighborhood residents, community organizations, and employees at workplaces in basic emergency response skills.¹⁶

b. Fire Service Impacts. The creation of the need for new fire services is not an environmental impact in and of itself. However, if the project were to necessitate new fire facilities, the construction of such facilities could lead to impacts. Therefore, the project would have a significant impact on fire services if it would require the construction of new facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for fire services, and these new facilities would result in secondary environmental impacts.

(1) Less-Than-Significant Fire Service Impacts. The proposed project would create a small increase in demand for fire and emergency services within the City because the project would increase the City's residential population. However, the increase in demand for these services would not exceed the physical and financial capabilities of the MPFPD. The project applicant would be required to meet MPFPD standards related to fire hydrants, water fire flow requirements, spacing of hydrants, and other fire code requirements. Automatic fire sprinklers would be installed in all 26 units per the California Building Standards Code, which requires all new one- and two-family homes and townhouses to have an automatic residential fire sprinkler system.¹⁷ The MPFPD would review the project's construction plans and inspect the construction work to ensure that the proposed project

¹² Ibid.

¹³ Ibid.

¹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵ Menlo Park Fire Protection District, 2011. Divisions: Operations. Website: www.menlofire.org/Operations.html (accessed March 30).

¹⁶ Menlo Park Fire Protection District, 2011. Services: CERT. Website: www.menlofire.org/cert/CERT.html (accessed March 30).

¹⁷ California Residential Code, 2010. Title 24, Part 2.5. Chapter 3, Part III, Section R313: Automatic Fire Sprinkler Systems.

meets State and local Fire Code requirements. The design of the project in accordance with these standards would ensure that the project would generate a less-than-significant increase in demand for fire and emergency services.

(2) **Significant Fire Service Impacts.** The proposed project would not result in a significant impact to fire and emergency services within the City.

3. Parks and Recreation

The following subsection describes park and recreational facilities in Menlo Park, and relevant policies, and evaluates the project’s potential impact on existing facilities.

a. **Existing Facilities.** The City of Menlo Park Community Services Department is responsible for parks and recreational facilities in the City. The City operates 13 parks, two community centers, two swimming pools, two child care centers, and two gymnasiums.¹⁸ There are over 236 acres of park and recreational facilities within the City.

The City-owned parks that are closest to the project site are shown in Table IV.E-1 below.

Table IV.E-1: Park Facilities Near the Project Site

Park Facility	Park Location	Distance From Project Site	Size	Main Characteristics
Nealon Park	800 Middle Avenue	0.3 mile northwest of project site	9.00 acres	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Five lighted tennis courts • Softball field • Playground • Picnic areas • Off-leash dog area
Burgess Park ^a	701 Laurel Street	0.8 mile northeast of project site	9.31 acres	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two lighted tennis courts • Two baseball fields • Soccer Field • Children’s playground, open play field
Fremont Park	Intersection of Santa Cruz Avenue and University Drive	0.8 mile northwest of project site	0.38 acre	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lighted walkways and benches
Jack W. Lyle Park	Intersection of Middle Avenue and Fremont Street	0.6 miles northwest of project site	4.55 acres	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open play field • Half-court basketball court • Playgrounds • Walkways and benches

^a Adjacent facilities include the Burgess Pool, Burgess Recreation Center (as of December 2011 the Gymnastics Center is under construction), Burgess Sports Center, Burgess Skate Park, and the Arrillaga Family Gymnasium.

Source: City of Menlo Park Community Services Department, 2011.

The San Mateo County Parks and Recreation Division provides regional recreational facilities, including 17 parks, three regional trails, and numerous County and local trails encompassing 15,680

¹⁸ Menlo Park, City of, 2011. Community Services Department. Website: www.menlopark.org/departments/dep_comservices.html (accessed March 30).

acres. These facilities are located in a diversity of natural settings including a marine reserve, a bayside recreational area, coastal mountain woodland areas, and urban sites.¹⁹

The following open space-related General Plan policies are applicable to the project site:

Land Use Element Policies

Policy I-H-3: Plant material selection and landscape and irrigation design for City parks and other public facilities and in private developments shall adhere to the City's Water Efficient Landscaping Ordinance.

Open Space and Conservation Policies and Goals

Goal 2. To encourage the enhancement of boulevards, plazas, and other urban open spaces in residential, commercial, and industrial neighborhoods.

Policy 2. Include landscaping and plazas on public and private lands and well-designed pedestrian facilities in areas of intensive pedestrian activity. Require greater landscaping in extensive parking areas.

b. Parks and Recreation Impacts. The project would have a significant impact on parks and recreation if it would:

- Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreation facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated.
- Create a shortage of park facilities for new residents, such that the standard of 5 acres per 1,000 people is not met.
- Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

(1) Less-Than-Significant Parks and Recreation Impacts. Development of the proposed project would increase the demand for park and recreation space because the increased residential population on the project site would be expected to use local parks. Based on an average household size of 2.4 persons,²⁰ the residential population of the site is expected to be approximately 62 persons. There are sufficient neighborhood and regional parks in close proximity to the project site to satisfy the expected resident demand. As mentioned above, Nealon Park is located less than 0.5 miles from the project site, while Burgess, Fremont, and Jack W. Lyle parks are located within 1 mile of the project site. Regional parks such as Huddart and Wunderlich County Parks are located approximately 7 miles west of the project site. Because of the modest population growth anticipated as part of the project, increased use of existing parks and recreational facilities would not result in the physical deterioration of these facilities. Increased use of parks by project residents would occur in small amounts over time and over several different facilities.

¹⁹ San Mateo County Environmental Services Agency, 2011. Department of Parks: *Wild Place and Friendly Places*. Website: www.co.sanmateo.ca.us/portal/site/parks (accessed March 30).

²⁰ Association of Bay Area Governments, 2009. *Building Momentum, San Francisco Bay Area Population, Household, and Job Forecasts*. ABAG information for persons per household includes data from within the City's sphere of influence.

The City of Menlo Park has established a 5 acres per 1,000 persons standard as a threshold to measure how well its citizens are provided with access to park and recreational facilities. Based on a 2010 population of 31,700, it is estimated that the City exceeds this standard, providing 7.4 acres of parkland per 1,000 persons.²¹ The 62 additional residents added by the project would not substantially change the ratio of park space per 1,000 residents. In addition, the project sponsor would be required to pay an in-lieu recreation fee based on the number of net new dwelling units developed on the site.

In addition, the proposed site includes private and shared open spaces; the shared open space offers amenities such as a barbeque and seating area. The proposed project would include approximately 18,315 square feet of private and shared open space on the site. Because this open space would be developed on an already-developed site, associated environmental impacts would be limited and considered less than significant. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact on parks and recreational facilities.

(2) **Significant Parks and Recreation Impacts.** The proposed project would not result in significant impacts to parks and recreational facilities within the City.

4. Schools

This section includes a brief discussion of schools that would serve the project and evaluates the project's potential impacts on school facilities. As the project includes residential uses, implementation of the proposed project would directly increase enrollment at local schools. However, this enrollment increase would be less than significant, as described below.

a. **Existing Facilities.** The project site is within the vicinity of the Menlo Park City School District and the Sequoia Union High School District. These districts are described below.

Menlo Park City School District. The Menlo Park City School District serves parts of Menlo Park, Atherton, and unincorporated San Mateo County and provides kindergarten (K) through 8th grade education. The Menlo Park City School District operates the following four schools: Laurel School (grades K-3); Oak Knoll School (grades K-5); Encinal School (grades K-5); and Hillview Middle School (grades 6-8). District-wide enrollment for the 2009-2010 school year was 2,529 students and District-wide enrollment for the 2010-2011 school year was 2,633 students.²² The District's projected student enrollment for the 2011-2012 school year is 2,742 students. Enrollment is expected to increase by approximately 4 percent between the 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 school years.²³

Elementary and middle school students generated by the proposed project would attend Oak Knoll Elementary School (grades K-5) and Hillview Middle School (grades 6-8). Table IV.E-2 summarizes each of the school's 2009-2011 enrollments and student capacities. Enrollments for the 2009-2010

²¹ Number of acres per person is based on 2009 ABAG population estimates for Menlo Park, including the City's sphere of influence.

²² California Department of Education, 2011. Education Demographics Unit: *DataQuest, Enrollment Report*. Enrollment by Grade for 2009-2010 and 2010-2011. Website: data1.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/ (accessed March 30).

²³ White, Diane, 2011. Chief Business Official. Menlo Park City School District. Personal communication with LSA Associates, Inc. May 11.

school year at Oak Knoll and Hillview Middle schools were 746 and 683 students, respectively.²⁴ Enrollments for the 2010-2011 school year at Oak Knoll Elementary and Hillview Middle schools are 739 and 697, respectively.²⁵ Oak Knoll Elementary is currently operating at 19 students over capacity while Hillview Middle School is operating at 23 students under capacity.

Table IV.E-2: 2009-2011 Enrollments and Capacities

School	Total Capacity (Students)	2009-2010 Enrollment (Students)	2009-2010 Over Capacity (Students)	2010-2011 Enrollment (Students)	2010-2011 Over Capacity (Students)
Oak Knoll Elementary (K-5)	720	746	26	739	19
Hillview Middle (6-8) ^a	720	683	-37	697	-23
Menlo Park-Atherton High (9-12)	2,122	1,945	-177	2,024	-98

^a The new Hillview Middle School (planned to open for the 2012-2013 school year) would accommodate 960 to 980 students.

Source: California Department of Education, Menlo Park City School District, and Sequoia Union High School District, 2011.

Student enrollment at Oak Knoll Elementary School decreased by seven students between the 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 school years, and is projected to decrease by three students for the 2011-2012 school year. Student enrollment at Hillview Middle School increased by 14 students between the 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 school year, and is projected to increase by 80 additional students for the 2011-2012 school year.

The District has a maximum classroom student-to-teacher ratio of 22 to 1.²⁶ Table IV.E-3 shows the student generation rates that are used by the District for three tiers of single-family residences. These tiers are generally defined based on property characteristics, including parcel square footage, house size, amenities, and location. A student generation rate is an estimate of the average number of students that would live in each dwelling unit, and is employed to calculate anticipated student yields from new residential development.

Table IV.E-3: Menlo Park City School District Student Generation Rates

Single-Family Residence Value	Student Generation Rate Per Unit
Moderate Value	0.29
Middle Value	0.39
High Value	0.28

Source: Menlo Park City School District, 2011.

Currently, the District is at capacity; however, as described in more detail below, the redevelopment of the Hillview Middle School campus would be able to accommodate up to 260 additional students. The Menlo Park City School District faces increasing pressure to accommodate a growing student population. A 2007 assessment of the District’s facilities and campuses indicated that although the District’s enrollment has been relatively flat for many years, enrollment is projected to grow by 18 percent by 2014.²⁷ Given the projected growth, the sizes of the Laurel School and Oak Knoll School campuses were determined to be inadequate in terms of student capacity; Encinal School, the largest of the elementary school campuses, was expected to be underutilized. As a result, the District adopted

²⁴ California Department of Education, 2011.

²⁵ White, Diane, 2011.

²⁶ Ibid.

²⁷ Menlo Park City School District, 2007. Facility Development, Enrollment Fact Sheet. Website: district.mpcsd.org/ (accessed January 10, 2012).

a reconfiguration plan to adjust school boundaries and grade levels (Encinal School is now K-5) that would reduce the enrollment of Laurel and Oak Knoll schools, and increase the enrollment of Encinal School.²⁸

The District also addressed the existing facility shortcomings through Measure U, a \$91 million facilities bond, approved by 70 percent of voters on the June 2006 ballot. After the passage of Measure U, the District began an aggressive planning process that led to the October 2006 Board adoption of The Plan for Reconfiguration of the Elementary Schools. The Plan was based on specific educational, logistical, operational and financial objectives and is intended to address the projected increase in school enrollment with a combination of new facilities, modernization of existing buildings, and a revision of school boundaries. The District also receives substantial support within the community through the Menlo Park Atherton Education Foundation, a non-profit organization that raises money to support Laurel, Encinal, Oak Knoll, and Hillview schools. In 2010, the Foundation granted \$2.35 million to the schools.²⁹

The 3-year reconfiguration and construction projects at the elementary schools were concluded in the fall of 2010, resulting in the creation of additional classroom space, open space for playgrounds and fields, and the elimination of portable classrooms. Because enrollment growth at Hillview Middle School was projected to reach 38 percent, the District approved the complete redevelopment of the middle school campus.³⁰ The construction of the 85,000 square foot new facility began in the summer of 2010 and is scheduled for completion and occupancy for the start of the 2012-2013 school year. Upon completion of the new school, students will be moved from the existing school to the new classrooms and facilities. The existing school is scheduled to be demolished in the summer of 2012 and converted to a playfield and basketball courts.³¹

Sequoia Union High School District. The Sequoia Union High School District provides high school education (grades 9-12) to students in the City of Menlo Park. During the 2009-2010 school year, approximately 8,479 students were enrolled in the Sequoia Union High School District. District-wide enrollment for the 2010-2011 school year was 8,267 students.³² The projected District-wide enrollment for the 2011-2012 school year is 8,212 students.³³ The District has a maximum classroom student-to-teacher ratio of 27.5 to 1.³⁴ The District uses a student generation rate of 0.2 students for both single-family and multi-family residential developments.³⁵

²⁸ Menlo Park City School District, 2007. Facility Development, Reconfiguration Fact Sheet. Website: district.mpscd.org/ (accessed January 10, 2012).

²⁹ Menlo Park City School District, 2011. Website: www.mpscd.org (accessed March 30).

³⁰ Menlo Park City School District, 2011. *Community Relations: Community Report from the Menlo Park City School District -2010-11*. Website: www.mpscd.k12.ca.us/Facilities (accessed March 30, 2011).

³¹ Menlo Park City School District, 2011. *Menlo Park City School District: Facility Development, School Projects*. Website: www.mpscd.org (accessed March 30).

³² California Department of Education, 2011. *Education Demographics Unit: DataQuest, Enrollment Report*. Enrollment by Grade for 2009-2010 and 2010-2011. Website: data1.cde.ca.gov/dataquest (accessed March 30).

³³ Berghouse, Susan, 2011. Director of Enrollment, Registration, and Personnel. Sequoia Union High School District. Personal communication with LSA Associates, Inc. June 1.

³⁴ Ibid.

³⁵ Pacheco, Louise, 2011. Assistant Project Manager-Construction, Sequoia Union High School District. Personal communication with LSA Associates, Inc. May 12.

High school-aged residents generated by the proposed project would attend Menlo-Atherton High School. Menlo-Atherton High School has a capacity of 2,122 students (see Table IV.E-2).³⁶ Student enrollment for the 2009-2010 school year at the high school is 1,945.³⁷ Enrollment for the 2010-2011 school year increased by 79 students to 2,024 students.³⁸ The estimated projected enrollment for the 2011-2012 school year is 2,020 students.

Through Measure J (a \$165 million 10-year technology bond approved in 2008), the District continues to undertake a District-wide expansion of a career technical education program that includes projects such as: upgrading classroom computers, improving energy efficiency, and building classrooms for career, technical, and vocational courses.³⁹

b. School Impacts. The project would have a significant impact on school services if it would require the construction of new facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios or other performance objectives for school services, and these new facilities would result in secondary environmental impacts.

(1) Less-Than-Significant School Impacts. The project includes the development of 26 residential units and would result in an increase of up to 15 school-aged residents within the project site. As shown in Table IV.E-3, the Menlo Park City School District uses varying student generation rates that range from 0.28 to 0.39 elementary and middle school students per single-family residential unit, depending on the category of the residential unit. The Sequoia High School District uses a student generation rate of 0.2 high school students per residential unit. Based on these rates, the proposed project would generate between seven and ten elementary and middle school students and five high school students. As previously described, Menlo Park City District schools that would serve the project are currently operating near or slightly over capacity.

State law (Government Code Section 65996) specifies that the impact of development projects on schools can be offset through the payment of a school impact fee prior to issuance of a building permit. In Menlo Park, a project applicant can either negotiate directly with the affected school districts, or pay a school impact fee of \$2.97⁴⁰ per square foot for each residential unit. In the case of the proposed project, the Menlo Park City School District and Sequoia Union High School District would share the impact fee.⁴¹ The school districts are responsible for implementing the specific methods of mitigating school impacts under the Government Code. The school impact fees and the school districts' methods of implementing measures specified by Government Code 65996 would offset project-related student enrollment. Payment of school facilities mitigation fees has been deemed by the State legislature (per Government Code Section 65995(h)) to constitute full and complete mitigation of the impacts of a development project on the provision of adequate school

³⁶ Berghouse, Susan, 2011.

³⁷ California Department of Education, 2011.

³⁸ Berghouse, Susan, 2011.

³⁹ Sequoia Union High School District, 2011. Bond Updates. Website: www.sequoiadistrict.org/20441082420148270/site/default.asp?2044Nav=1&NodeID=68 (accessed May 10).

⁴⁰ White, Danielle, 2011. Chief Business Official. Menlo Park City School District. Personal communication with LSA Associates, Inc. May 9.

⁴¹ Ibid.

facilities. The proposed project would not result in a substantial increase in new students, such that the construction of new school facilities would be required. Through the payment of associated development fees and compliance with applicable State and local regulations, implementation of the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact on school facilities.

(2) Significant School Impacts. The proposed project would not result in any significant impacts related to schools and mitigation measures are not required since the schools districts are responsible for implementing the specific methods of mitigating school impacts under State law (through the establishment of development fees).

5. Water Service

This section includes a brief discussion of water service in and around the project site and evaluates the project's potential impacts on water supply and infrastructure.

a. Existing Infrastructure and Services. The San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) provides water to the City of Menlo Park and other municipalities. The SFPUC Regional Water System provides an average of approximately 265 million gallons per day (mgd) to 2.5 million users in Tuolumne, Alameda, Santa Clara, San Mateo and San Francisco counties.^{42,43}

The SFPUC Regional System is a complex network of storage and distribution facilities. It supplies water from two primary sources: the Tuolumne River through the Hetch Hetchy Reservoir; and reservoirs in the Alameda and Peninsula watersheds. The local watershed facilities are operated to conserve local runoff for delivery. Water in the Hetch Hetchy Reservoir represents the majority of the water supply available to San Francisco. On average, the Hetch Hetchy Reservoir provides over 85 percent of the water delivered by the SFPUC to the Bay Area. Local reservoirs provide, on average, approximately 15 percent of the water delivered by the SFPUC Regional Water System.⁴⁴

The California Water Service Company (Cal Water) provides water service to parts of Menlo Park, including the project site. Cal Water's service area for Menlo Park is within the Bear Gulch District. The Bear Gulch District, located in southern San Mateo County, serves the communities of Atherton, Portola Valley, Woodside, parts of Menlo Park, and adjacent unincorporated portions of San Mateo County, including: West Menlo Park, Ladera, North Fair Oaks, and Menlo Oaks.⁴⁵ The Bear Gulch District receives 85 to 95 percent of its daily supply from the SFPUC and the remainder from Cal Water's own local water supply.

The Bear Gulch District receives purchased treated water from the Regional Water System. The federal Raker Act prevents privately-owned utilities, like Cal Water, from receiving water from the

⁴² San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, 2011. Water. Website: sfwater.org/mc_main.cfm/MC_ID/13 (accessed March 28).

⁴³ San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, 2005. *2005 Urban Water Management Plan for the City and County of San Francisco*. December. Website: sfwater.org/mto_main.cfm/MC_ID/13/MSC_ID/165/MTO_ID/286 (accessed 2011 28 March).

⁴⁴ Ibid.

⁴⁵ Bay Area Water Supply and Conservation Agency (BAWSCA), 2009. *Annual Survey FY 2008-2009*. January. Website: bawasca.org/docs/BAWSCA_Survey_FY07_08_2.pdf (accessed May 17, 2011).

Hetch Hetchy system, but allows purchases of treated water from local supply sources, such as the local watershed storage reservoirs. By utilizing the storage and conveyance systems within the Regional Water System, the SFPUC meets its retail and wholesale water demands with imported water from Hetch Hetchy and/or locally produced Bay Area water.

Bear Gulch District water is stored in the 215 million gallon Bear Gulch Reservoir, and is treated at the Station 2 Filter Plant before distribution. Station 2 has a capacity of 6 million gallons per day (mgd).⁴⁶ The distribution system consists of 36 pressure zones, 57 booster pumps, and 31 storage tanks and reservoirs. The water collection system operates as a grid system and the Bear Gulch District is within the 220 zone, or the Low Zone.⁴⁷ Currently, Cal Water does not have recycled water capabilities.

Three 6-inch water mains are located on El Camino Real, College Avenue, and Partridge Avenue, respectively. The three water mains range in age from 40 to 70 years old. An SFPUC water connection is located approximately 650 feet from the project site on El Camino Real.

b. Water Service Impacts. The water service criteria of significance are based on the *CEQA Guidelines* Environmental Checklist questions. The proposed project would have a significant impact on water service if:

- The project would require or result in construction of new water or wastewater facilities, or expansion of existing facilities, construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.
- Sufficient water supplies are not available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or new and expanded entitlements are needed.

(1) Less-Than-Significant Water Service Impacts. Water demand from the proposed project would be approximately 2,912 gallons per day.⁴⁸ The Bear Gulch District of Cal Water provides water service to the project site and receives its water allocation from the SFPUC. The Bear Gulch District indicates that it has adequate water supplies to serve the proposed project.⁴⁹ Currently, there are no planned water supply improvement projects in the project area.⁵⁰ Minor upgrades to water lines within and adjacent to the site would be required as part of the project and would conform to Cal Water requirements. If such upgrades are required, they would primarily occur within public rights-of-way and would not be expected to result in environmental impacts beyond those identified in this EIR. Additionally, all landscaping would be required to adhere to the City's Water Efficient Landscaping Ordinance.

(2) Significant Water Service Impacts. The proposed project would not result in any significant water service impacts.

⁴⁶ Ibid.

⁴⁷ Roberts, Marty, 2011. Superintendent of Construction, Bear Gulch District. California Water Service Company. Personal communication with LSA Associates, Inc. May 12.

⁴⁸ ESA, 2011. *Menlo Park El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report*. April. A multi-family residential rate of 112 gallons per day was used in this analysis.

⁴⁹ Roberts, Marty, 2011.

⁵⁰ Ibid.

6. Wastewater

This section includes a brief discussion of the wastewater infrastructure and service in and around the project site and analyzes the project's potential effects on the wastewater system.

a. Existing Infrastructure and Services. The West Bay Sanitary District (WBSD) serves an area of approximately 13 square miles, and maintains and operates over 200 miles of gravity sewer mains in the City of Menlo Park and portions of the cities of East Palo Alto and Redwood City; the Towns of Atherton, Woodside, and Portola Valley; and portions of unincorporated San Mateo and Santa Clara counties. Pipe sizes range in diameter from 4 to 54 inches and a majority of the pipelines are made of vitrified clay and asbestos cement, with isolated occurrences of reinforced and unreinforced concrete and ductile iron pipe. Recently-installed pipes consist of polyvinyl chloride (PVC).⁵¹ All wastewater collected within the WBSD is transported via main line trunk sewers to the Menlo Park Pumping Station. The South Bayside System Authority (SBSA) Regional Treatment Plant, located in Redwood City, treats wastewater generated by the WBSD, and the cities of Belmont, San Carlos, and Redwood City. The cities of Redwood City, Belmont, and San Carlos own and operate the SBSA regional treatment plant. The SBSA operates the pump stations that are located at the terminus of each collection system, including the Menlo Park Pump Station, located at the northern end of Marsh Road.⁵² Wastewater from the pumping station is conveyed to the SBSA treatment plant for treatment and discharge to San Francisco Bay.

The WBSD owns and operates 13 pump stations located within the collection system that are necessary to convey wastewater flow from low-lying areas to higher elevations where the wastewater can again flow by gravity. The WBSD's pump stations have pumping equipment, standby generators, and telemetry that alert the pump station crew of emergencies. The WBSD also has emergency standby generators and bypass pumps as part of its emergency response equipment.⁵³

The WBSD's share of dry weather flow at the wastewater treatment plant is approximately 7.98 million gallons per day (mgd) and the current average daily dry weather flow is 4.5 mgd.⁵⁴ Wet weather flows vary but peak wet weather flows are approximately 14 mgd due to inflow and infiltration of stormwater.

Existing sanitary sewer service for the project site is provided via a 24-inch sanitary sewer line located along El Camino Real near the eastern boundary of the site. An existing 6-inch line is also located along Partridge Avenue near the southern boundary of the site and an 8-inch line is located along College Avenue near the northern boundary of the site. The proposed project would connect to these existing facilities.

⁵¹ Kitajima, Bill, 2011. Projects Manager, West Bay Sanitary District. Personal communication with LSA Associates, Inc. May 12.

⁵² Ibid.

⁵³ West Bay Sanitary District, 2011. Education. Website: www.westbaysanitary.org/education/what-we-do (accessed April 4).

⁵⁴ Kitajima, Bill, 2011.

b. Wastewater Impacts. The wastewater criteria of significance are based on the *CEQA Guidelines* Environmental Checklist questions. The proposed project would have a significant impact on wastewater service if it would:

- Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board.
- Require or result in construction of new water or wastewater facilities, or expansion of existing facilities, construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.
- Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it does not have adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the providers' existing commitments, and require or result in construction of new wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.

(1) **Less-Than-Significant Wastewater Impacts.** Using the District's wastewater generation rate of 220 gallons per day for residential uses, the proposed project would generate approximately 5,720 gallons per day (gpd) of wastewater.⁵⁵ The proposed project's wastewater flow represents approximately 0.13 percent of the District's share of dry weather flow at the SBSA. Because the implementation of the proposed project would not substantially reduce the capacity of the wastewater treatment system, the proposed project would not exceed the wastewater treatment requirements of the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board or require the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities.⁵⁶

(2) **Significant Wastewater Impacts.** The proposed project would not result in any significant wastewater service impacts.

7. Solid Waste

This section includes a brief discussion of solid waste services at the project site and analyzes the project's potential effects on the solid waste disposal system.

a. Existing Infrastructure and Services. The City is a member agency of the South Bayside Waste Management Authority (RethinkWaste), a joint powers authority created in 1982 to facilitate waste management and recycling programs for its member agencies. The primary goal of RethinkWaste is to provide cost effective waste reduction, recycling, and solid waste programs to member agencies through franchised services and other recyclers to meet and sustain a minimum of 50 percent diversion of waste from landfills, as mandated by California State Law, AB 939.⁵⁷

(1) **Non-Hazardous Solid Waste.** On January 1, 2011, Recology San Mateo County (formerly Norcal Waste Systems of San Mateo County), started providing recycling, compost, and garbage collection services to all residential, multi-family, and commercial customers that reside

⁵⁵ Ibid. The wastewater generation rate for residential uses is likely higher than the water demand rate due to inflow and infiltration of stormwater into the wastewater treatment system.

⁵⁶ Ibid.

⁵⁷ South Bayside Waste Management Authority, 2011. Website: www.rethinkwaste.org (accessed March 31).

within the city limits of the of the 12 member agencies of RethinkWaste.⁵⁸ Non-hazardous solid waste is taken to the Shoreway Environmental Center, located at 333 Shoreway Road in San Carlos, for processing, staging, and shipment to end markets. The Shoreway Environmental Center serves as a regional solid waste and recycling facility for the receipt, handling, and transfer of solid waste and recyclables collected from the RethinkWaste service area.⁵⁹ Recyclable materials are also delivered to the Shoreway Environmental Center, where they are processed.

The Shoreway Environmental Center consists of the solid waste Transfer Station, Materials Recovery Facility (MRF), Recycling Buy-Back and Drop-off, and the Public Batteries, Oil, and Paint Drop-off, which are operated by South Bay Recycling under contract with RethinkWaste as of January 1, 2011.⁶⁰ The Shoreway Center has a maximum allowable capacity of 3,000 tons of waste per day.⁶¹ After undergoing processing, waste from the Shoreway Center is delivered to the Ox Mountain Sanitary Landfill near State Route 92 in Half Moon Bay. The landfill handles construction, demolition, and mixed municipal waste, and has a total estimated capacity of 37.9 million cubic yards. As of the year 2000, the landfill's total estimated capacity used was 6,746,148 cubic yards, or 17.8 percent of the landfill's total capacity. The landfill has a permitted throughput of 3,598 tons per day⁶² and is anticipated to have sufficient capacity until 2018.⁶³

(2) Hazardous Solid Waste. Curbside Inc, contracted by Rethink Waste, offers door-to-door household hazardous waste collection services upon request for all residents in selected cities (Belmont, Foster City, East Palo Alto, Hillsborough, Menlo Park, San Carlos, and San Mateo) and West Bay Sanitary District. Hazardous waste generated by residential uses includes: paint, insecticides and herbicides, automotive parts, florescent lights, tubes, compact florescent lamps, batteries, computers, cell phones, cleaning products, solvents, and sharp objects. The County of San Mateo Health System's Household Hazardous Waste Program educates the public about the dangers of toxic household wastes and assists people in disposing of waste properly at collection events and collection centers. Collection centers accept only residential waste; a separate program for small businesses that generate small quantities of toxic waste is offered for qualified San Mateo County businesses.⁶⁴

(3) Regulatory Context. The following discussion summarizes regulations that apply to solid waste generation and disposal in the City.

The California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 (AB 939) requires counties to adopt an Integrated Waste Management Plan (IWMP) to establish objectives, policies, and programs related to

⁵⁸ Recology San Mateo County, 2011. Website: www.recologysanmateocounty.com/index.php (accessed March 31).

⁵⁹ South Bayside Waste Management Authority, 2011. Shoreway Overview. Website: www.rethinkwaste.org/shoreway-facility/overview (accessed June 1).

⁶⁰ Ibid.

⁶¹ CalRecycle, 2011. *Transfer Station Profile for Shoreway Center*. Website: www.calrecycle.ca.gov/Profiles/Facility (accessed March 31).

⁶² Permitted throughput is the maximum permitted amount of waste a landfill can handle and dispose of in one day. This figure is established in the current solid waste facilities permit issued by the Integrated Waste Management Board.

⁶³ CalRecycle, 2011. *Facility/Site Summary Details, Ox Mountain Sanitary Landfill*. Website: www.ciwmb.ca.gov (accessed March 31).

⁶⁴ San Mateo, County of, 2011. Health System, Health Divisions, Environmental Health. Website: www.co.sanmateo.ca.us/portal/site/health (accessed March 31).

waste disposal, management, source reduction, and recycling. AB 939 mandates that cities and counties adopt a Source Reduction and Recycling Element (SRRE) to specify how the community would meet the established 50 percent landfill diversion goal. Each jurisdiction is also required to take measures to reduce solid waste generation and to provide for the safe disposal of special and hazardous wastes. Certain special and hazardous wastes are included within the purview of the SRRE, but communities are also required to adopt a separate Household Hazardous Waste Element (HHWE) to address hazardous wastes generated by households. The City's SRRE was approved in September 1994 and the City's HHWE was approved in January 1996 by the California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle), formally known as the California Integrated Waste Management Board. The SRRE Biennial Review was also accepted in January 1996. The City reached a 50 percent diversion rate for the first time in 2000. As of 2006, a 55 percent diversion rate was reported by CalRecycle.⁶⁵ The City of Menlo Park Climate Action Change Plan⁶⁶ includes strategies, such as expanded recycling services, to increase the City's diversion rate. The Plan indicates that single stream recycling⁶⁷ is expected to increase diversion of City-generated bottles, cans, paper, and plastic by about 15 percent and if food waste and other compostable materials are included in the service, there could be another 15 percent increase in tonnage diverted from the landfill.

Since 1989, San Mateo County and its cities have implemented a variety of programs to reduce solid waste, including through the implementation of curbside recycling, commercial recycling programs, organics collection, backyard composting, electronics recycling, construction and demolition recycling ordinances, and green building programs. Most of the diversion programs are focused around green waste, as well as on the residential and commercial sectors, through operation and planned expansion of recycling services.⁶⁸ The Menlo Park Municipal Code requires that structures planned for demolition be made available for deconstruction and salvage prior to demolition. In addition, the code requires all contractors to recover the maximum feasible amount of materials prior to demolition for reuse or recycling. Furthermore, the code requires all commercial demolition projects over 5,000 square feet to divert 60 percent of all demolition-generated debris. Plans for diverting these materials must be described by projects applicants and approved by the City.⁶⁹

b. Solid Waste Impacts. The solid waste criteria of significance are based on the *CEQA Guidelines* Environmental Checklist questions. The proposed project would have a significant impact on solid waste if it would:

⁶⁵ CalRecycle, 2011. *Jurisdiction Profile for City of Menlo Park*. Website: www.calrecycle.ca.gov/Profiles (accessed March 31).

⁶⁶ Menlo Park, City of, 2009. *Climate Change Action Plan*. Website: www.menlopark.org/departments/env/cap.html (accessed March 31).

⁶⁷ Single stream recycling is a system in which recyclables are mixed together instead of being sorted prior to pickup.

⁶⁸ CalRecycle, 1999. Board Meeting, Agenda Item 4. September 21. Website: www.ciwmb.ca.gov/agendas/mtgdocs/1999/09/00001674.doc.

⁶⁹ Menlo Park, City of, 2001. City of Menlo Park Municipal Code, *Chapter 12.48, Recycling and Salvaging of Construction and Demolition Debris*.

- Be served by a landfill with insufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs.
- Violate applicable federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

(1) **Less-Than-Significant Solid Waste Impacts.** CalRecycle has developed residential disposal rates for counties and regions throughout the State. Using San Mateo County's rate of 0.42 tons of waste per unit per year, residents at the completed project would produce approximately 11.34 tons of solid waste per year.⁷⁰ As noted previously in this section, the Ox Mountain Sanitary Landfill has a maximum allowable capacity of 3,598 tons of waste per day through the year 2018. The increase in waste generation resulting from the proposed project would represent approximately 0.3 percent of the landfill's daily permitted throughput. The anticipated life of the Ox Mountain Sanitary Landfill would not be significantly reduced by implementation of the proposed project, particularly if occupants accomplish recycling at rates that mirror the City-wide average.

The proposed project would be designed and developed in accordance with State and local solid waste regulations (federal solid waste regulations do not apply to the proposed project). Demolition debris generated by the proposed project would be reduced to the greatest extent feasible, in accordance with the Menlo Park Municipal Code, and would not substantially affect the remaining capacity of the Shoreway Center or the Ox Mountain Sanitary Landfill. The proposed project would not violate applicable federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. Therefore, impacts associated with solid waste disposal would be considered less than significant.

(2) **Significant Solid Waste Impacts.** The proposed project would not result in any significant solid waste impacts.

8. Energy and Telecommunications

The following discussion provides background information on the energy and telecommunication systems that relate to the proposed project.

a. Electricity and Natural Gas. Electricity and gas service to the project site would be provided by Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E). PG&E charges connection and user fees for all new development, in addition to sliding rates for electrical and natural gas service based on use. Existing electricity and gas lines in the vicinity of the site would serve the project.

Gas supplies in northern California come primarily from gas fields in the Sacramento Valley.⁷¹ However, PG&E produces much of its energy from renewable sources and has plans in place to increase reliance on renewable energy sources. Of the energy provided to PG&E customers in 2010, approximately 16 percent came from renewable resources. In 2010, 24 percent of energy provided to PG&E customers came from nuclear generation; 16 percent came from large hydroelectric facilities; and 16 percent came from renewable resources such as wind, geothermal, biomass, and small hydroelectric sources. In addition, PG&E has plans to increase the use of renewable power. For

⁷⁰ CalRecycle, 2011. *Estimated Solid Waste Generation Rates*. June 13. Website: www.calrecycle.ca.gov/wastechar/ResDisp.htm.

⁷¹ California Gas and Electric Utilities, 2011. *2010 California Gas Report*. Website: www.pge.com/pipeline/library/regulatory/downloads/cgr10.pdf (accessed November 8).

instance, PG&E purchases power from customers that install small-scale renewable generators (e.g., wind turbines or photovoltaic cells) up to 1.5 megawatts in size.⁷²

Because many agencies in California have adopted policies seeking increased use of renewable resources (and have established minimum standards for the provision of energy generated by renewable resources), it is expected that PG&E will continue to meet future demand for energy via an increasing reliance on renewable resources, including small-scale sources such as photovoltaic panels and wind turbines, in addition to larger-scale facilities, such as wind farms.

The PG&E gas transmission pipeline system serves approximately 4.2 million gas customers in northern and central California. The PG&E electric system is designed to deliver safe and reliable energy to customers throughout Northern and Central California. PG&E produces or buys its energy from a mix of conventional and renewable generating sources, which travel through PG&E's electric transmission and distribution systems.⁷³

Regulatory requirements for efficient use of electricity and gas are contained in Title 24, Part 6, of the California Code of Regulations, entitled "Energy Efficiency Standards for Residential and Nonresidential Buildings." These regulations specify the State's minimum energy efficiency standards and apply to new construction of both residential and nonresidential buildings. The standards regulate energy consumed for heating, cooling, ventilation, water heating, and lighting. Compliance with these standards is verified and enforced through the local building permit process.⁷⁴

b. Telecommunications. Telecommunications and cable service would be provided by AT&T and other providers (which would be selected by individual residents of the site). AT&T also provides or hosts a variety of other telecommunication services, including Digital Subscriber Line (DSL), Internet Service Provider (ISP), web hosting, virtual private networking, U-verse, Multi-protocol Level Switching (MPLS), and wireless/cellular paging services.

The California Public Utilities Commission requires that AT&T anticipate and serve new growth. To meet this requirement, AT&T continually upgrades its facilities and infrastructure, adding new facilities and technology to remain in conformance with California Public Utilities Commission tariffs and regulations and to serve customer demand in the City and elsewhere.

c. Energy and Telecommunications Impacts. The project would have a significant impact on energy and telecommunications if it would require the construction of additional electricity, gas, or telecommunications infrastructure facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.

(1) Less-Than-Significant Energy and Telecommunications Impacts. Development of the proposed project would incrementally increase demand for electricity, gas, and telecommunication services in order to serve the residential development (although increased demand for these services

⁷² Pacific Gas & Electric Company, 2011. *Clean Energy Solutions*. Website: www.pge.com/mybusiness/environment/pge/cleanenergy/index.shtml (accessed February 17).

⁷³ Pacific Gas and Electric Company, 2011. *Electric System*. Website: www.pge.com/mybusiness/edusafety/systemworks/electric/ (accessed November 8).

⁷⁴ Locally-adopted amendments to Title 24, Part 6 would further increase the energy efficiency of the project.

would comprise a very small proportion of overall demand in the region). Despite long-term State-wide increases in energy consumption, the energy demand estimated for the proposed project would not contribute to a substantial increase in energy consumption within PG&E's northern and central California service area. The City is already served by gas and electricity infrastructure, and the net increase in energy demand from the proposed project and reasonably foreseeable projects, relative to the regional service area would be minimal and would not require expanded or new energy facilities as a direct result of project development. Although the proposed project and other future projects within the City and the region would be expected to increase the demand for energy-producing facilities, this increase in demand would likely be met through the development of renewable resources that would have a more benign environmental effect than the development of new conventional gas- or coal-fired power plants. In addition, new construction associated with the project would be serviced by existing electricity, gas, and telecommunications lines (and major upgrades to these lines would not be required). Therefore, the extension of utilities infrastructure to serve the project would result in a less-than-significant impact to these services.

(2) Significant Energy and Telecommunications Impacts. The proposed project would not result in any significant energy and telecommunications impacts.