



# City of East Palo Alto

---

## Office of the Mayor

August 1, 2016

Deanna Chow, Principal Planner  
Community Development Department  
City of Menlo Park  
701 Laurel Street  
Menlo Park, CA 94025

Subject: Menlo Park General Plan EIR DEIR (Connect Menlo)

Dear Deanna Chow:

This letter and its attachments are provided in response to the Notice of Availability for Public Review of the Draft Environmental Impact Report prepared for the Menlo Park General Plan DEIR (Connect Menlo). Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the DEIR, as well as extending the comment period to August 1, 2016 at 5:30PM. The impacts of this project are critical to East Palo Alto due to its proximity and scale. As indicated in this letter with its attachments, including letters from Richards, Watson, & Gershon (attachment 1) and Krupka Consulting (attachment 2); the DEIR raises a variety of serious legal, public policy and technical questions.

I want to emphasize that East Palo Alto values its relationship with its neighbor, and we hope to continue to work cooperatively on the many issues common to both of our communities. We are accordingly prepared to work hard to resolve our concerns through good faith negotiations with Menlo Park. In light of that prospect, East Palo Alto reserves the right to modify the enclosed comments by a further letter. If you have any questions, please call Guido F. Persicone, Planning Manager at 650-853-3195 or email him at [gpersicone@cityofepa.org](mailto:gpersicone@cityofepa.org).

Yours truly,

---

Donna Rutherford,  
East Palo Alto Mayor  
[drutherford@cityofepa.org](mailto:drutherford@cityofepa.org)

cc: East Palo Alto City Council  
Menlo Park City Council  
Alex D. McIntyre, Menlo Park City Manager

Attachments:

1. Comment Letter from Richards, Watson, and Gershon
2. Comment Letter Paul Krupka
3. Comment Letter (Inconsistencies between Connect Menlo and the Facebook EIR)



RICHARDS | WATSON | GERSHON

ATTORNEYS AT LAW – A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION

355 South Grand Avenue, 40th Floor, Los Angeles, California 90071-3101  
Telephone 213.626.8484 Facsimile 213.626.0078

July 28, 2016

David M. Snow  
dsnow@rwglaw.com

**VIA U.S. MAIL AND ELECTRONIC MAIL**

Sean Charpentier, Assistant City Manager  
Guido Persicone, AICP, Planning Manager  
City of East Palo Alto  
1960 Tate Street  
East Palo Alto, CA 94303

Re: Review of City of Menlo Park Environmental Impact Report for General Plan  
Land Use and Circulation Element Updates (ConnectMenlo)

Dear Mr. Charpentier and Mr. Persicone,

Richards, Watson & Gershon (“RWG”) is pleased to assist the City of East Palo Alto in reviewing the Environmental Impact Report for City of Menlo Park’s proposed updates to the Land Use and Circulation Elements of the General Plan, also referred to as ConnectMenlo.

In reviewing the EIR, we have a number of concerns regarding the document’s accuracy and adequacy, which are set forth in the table attached to this letter. We believe that before the City of Menlo Park could certify the EIR substantial revisions are necessary and recirculation of a revised Draft EIR for further public review and comment is required.

Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Very truly yours,

David M. Snow

cc: Valerie Armento, Interim City Attorney

**City of East Palo Alto**  
**Comments on Menlo Park General Plan Draft EIR**

Draft EIR Section	Page Number	Comment
Project Description	3-30	<p>The Project Description states that the DEIR is analyzing the impact of the “full” development potential of the proposed Bayfront Area and the existing General Plan potential, but also states that it excludes the Facebook Campus Expansion and other cumulative projects.</p> <p>Given the geographic overlap between the Facebook Campus Expansion project and the Bayfront Area being analyzed in the General Plan update, the decision to <i>not include</i> the Facebook Campus Expansion project in the project creates the potential to underestimate the impacts of the General Plan update. The DEIR fails to adequately explain why the project does not include the Facebook Expansion project, as well as other projects that are within the geographic area covered by this General Plan update. This decision makes the DEIR confusing to decipher because it is not clear to a layperson whether the cumulative project impacts are already incorporated into the project impacts based on the planning for those sites. The DEIR needs to include a more expansive discussion of the overlap between the cumulative projects and the General Plan update. In addition, the DEIR should include substantial evidence to support these decisions.</p>
Environmental Evaluation	4-3	<p>The 2040 Horizon Development Potential states that the EIR is calculating population by applying the 2.57 persons per household generation rate. Why is this different from the 2.61 persons per household rate used in the Facebook DEIR?</p> <p>The City cannot choose to use different assumptions in two different EIRs that are being prepared simultaneously without providing substantial evidence to support that decision. The DEIR currently fails to include substantial evidence to support this distinction.</p>
	4-3	<p>In this section, the DEIR provides that employment is calculated based on certain employment generation factors. The DEIR does not, however, provide substantial evidence as to why those assumptions are reasonable. The DEIR should support the use of these employment generation figures with substantial evidence.</p>
	4-4	<p>The “Baseline” section provides a number of figures regarding existing conditions, but the remainder of the DEIR often fails to compare project build-out under the proposed General Plan updates to these existing conditions. This is a fundamental flaw in the current analysis in the DEIR. The DEIR seeks to compare the proposed General Plan build-out to ABAG projections and/or existing General Plan projections. The appropriate baseline, as stated here however, must represent the existing conditions on the ground at the time of the NOP. All potential</p>

Draft EIR Section	Page Number	Comment
		project impacts and potential project plus cumulative project impacts should be compared to these baseline figures. In failing to include this comparison, the DEIR does not adequately analyze the project's impacts under CEQA.
	4-12	With respect to "Population and Housing," this section regarding cumulative impacts states that "impacts from cumulative growth are considered in the context of consistency with regional planning efforts." The cumulative population and housing impacts also must consider the impacts from the project plus cumulative projects as compared to existing conditions. As stated in our specific comments regarding the Population and Housing section, the DEIR's analysis cannot ignore the comparison between the actual cumulative plus project impacts and the existing conditions. Mere "consistency with regional planning efforts" does not adequately disclose the true project impacts and deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment on the proposed project's true impacts.
Air Quality	4.2-21	The failure to analyze the Facebook expansion as part of the General Plan may result in the understating of air quality impacts, given the large impact that project will have on the number of employees in the City and vehicle trips. It seems less likely that the General Plan would be found consistent with existing air quality plans if the Facebook project was included in the General Plan as a reasonably foreseeable project.
	4.2-25	The analysis of consistency with existing air quality plans should focus less on the general policies of the proposed general plan update, and more on the proposed revisions to land use designations and possible increase in population, density, and vehicle trips. This section does not adequately explain whether the proposed general plan amendment would allow for higher densities that might conflict with the growth projections that are the basis of the Bay Area Clean Air Plan. It is not adequate to say that new development will comply with green building requirements – a lack of consistency could arise if the GP contemplates development that would exceed the population/employment projections in the Bay Area Clean Air Plan.
	4.2-33-34	As described above, the Facebook expansion project does not appear to be calculated as part of the projected population under the General Plan. This could result in the impacts of the general plan update with foreseeable projects being understated.
	4.2-34	See above. The finding of less-than-significant impacts does not take into account the Facebook expansion project being considered simultaneously with this General Plan amendment.
	4.2-39	This analysis should include projected changes in land use designation that would result in population growth, vehicle trips, and other factors that would result in air quality impacts in excess of the BAAQMD

Draft EIR Section	Page Number	Comment
		regional thresholds.
	4.2-43-45	It is unclear how these general policies will result in a less than significant impact on CO hotspots. Development under the GP will result in more vehicle trips and more service vehicles that may idle. These general policies are not enforceable enough to reduce impacts to a less than significant level.
Biology	4.3-19 to 4.3-23	<p>Impact BIO-1: The EIR does not examine how increased activity in the project area and accompanying noise, light and runoff could cause direct or indirect impacts to special status species located at the adjacent Don Edwards National Wildlife Refuge.</p> <p>Although identified in the Facebook EIR, the General Plan EIR fails to address increased predation that may occur due to development adjacent to the Refuge.</p> <p>The EIR does not address the loss of special status species' nesting foraging habitat on remaining undeveloped lands in the Bayfront Area. The EIR does not describe any temporary impacts to special status species' habitat due to the removal of trees and/or vegetation until replacement landscaping is matured.</p> <p>The EIR does not identify which special status species in particular could be impacted by the Life Sciences designation of areas of marshland near University Avenue.</p>
	4.3-28	Impact BIO-7: The EIR states that potential impacts on proposed development on biological resources are site specific and fails to identify the scope of cumulative impacts. By contrast, the Facebook EIR identifies the geographic context for analysis of cumulative biological impacts as including the nine counties within the Bay Area. Thus, the EIR fails to identify and describe how development under the proposed General Plan in combination with other development in neighboring communities could impact the Don Edwards National Wildlife Refuge and the San Francisco Bay.
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	4.6-34	The Facebook Campus Expansion project should be analyzed as part of the General Plan for purposes of determining greenhouse gas emissions.
Hydrology	4.8-30	<b>HYDRO-2:</b> The discussion in the 2 <sup>nd</sup> paragraph compares the proposed project to the current General Plan. The DEIR needs to analyze the proposed project to <i>existing conditions</i> on the ground, as well as to the existing General Plan. The analysis should include a more robust discussion of the potential increase in impervious surfaces between the proposed project and existing conditions.
	4.8-31	The sentence that states "Under the Zoning update, no potable water..." includes a double negative that appears to be unintentional. I believe it should state that potable water shall not be used for

Draft EIR Section	Page Number	Comment
		decorative features.
	4.8-32	A more robust discussion of the City's program to monitor the pumping of groundwater is required to disclose to the public and decision-makers how the monitoring would reduce impacts to groundwater.
	4.8-33	On this page, the DEIR should state "...the City of Menlo Park has adopted more stringent requirements <u>than</u> the C.3 provisions..." Also, for the purpose of disclosing information to the public, the DEIR should identify the specific C.3 provisions that are applicable in each instance.
	4.8-41	The section regarding Sea Level Rise should more directly address the fact that the proposed project encourages development in an area prone to sea level rise. The analysis should detail the number of new residential units and the amount of non-residential square footage that would be added in areas prone to sea level rise under the proposed project.
	4.8-44	The cumulative impacts analysis should discuss the connection between the proposed developments with respect to sea level rise. The discussion should explain how much development is being proposed in areas subject to sea level rise, and how Menlo Park plans to mitigate the risks of adding such development in those areas. In addition, the DEIR should discuss how Menlo Park will require that those projects contribute their fair share to projects intended to protect coastal developments from sea level rise.
Noise	4.10-30, 4.10-34	<p>Impact NOISE-3: On page 30, the EIR states that increases to ambient noise from car traffic would result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels. On page 34, the EIR states that there would be no roadway segments experiencing a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels. These conflicting statements should be reconciled.</p> <p>The EIR does not give a clear picture of how noise is expected to increase both with and without the project. It is unclear whether Table 4.10-10 includes the 2040 forecast conditions with the proposed project.</p> <p>It is unclear whether the increases at roadway segment #42 (O'Brien Drive at Kavanaugh Drive to Willow Road) and #72 (Chilco Street at Ivy Dive to Terminal Avenue) will be substantial. Table 4.10-10 indicates that there will be 3-5 dB increases at these points, but it is unclear what the normally acceptable standards are for each of these study points.</p>
Population and Housing	4.11-4	Given how drastically the Bay Area's housing market and population have changed since 2010, as highlighted in the Facebook Campus Expansion DEIR also prepared by Menlo Park, it is not appropriate to use statistics regarding the City's housing market from 2010.

Draft EIR Section	Page Number	Comment
		<p>Moreover, it seems less appropriate to compare the figures for 2000 and 2010, as opposed to comparing figures from 2010 to 2015.</p> <p>The DEIR should provide the most recent available Census or American Community Survey (ACS) information and/or provide substantial evidence to support the use of the 2010 Census numbers as an appropriate way to analyze population and housing at this point. At the moment, the DEIR fails to provide substantial evidence to support the use of 2010 statistics given that ACS data is available for at least some of these figures from 2015, which is the appropriate baseline given the NOP date.</p>
	4.11-4	<p>The “Future Housing Needs” discussion (see footnote 10) appears to rely on the 2009 ABAG Projections, but the Facebook Campus Expansion DEIR and other portions of this DEIR rely on the 2013 ABAG projections. The DEIR must be consistent with respect to its sources regarding population and housing statistics and support the choice of sources with substantial evidence, especially if the DEIR is not relying on the most recent projections.</p>
	4.11-4	<p>Table 4.11-1 seems to rely on the 2013 ABAG projections, which do not take into account the Facebook Campus Expansion. That project is proposed to add 6,550 jobs to the City of Menlo Park. In light of that fact, how can the City rely on the ABAG projections with respect to anticipated growth in population, housing, and employment? The decision to rely on ABAG projections that do not take into account the Facebook Campus Expansion is not supported by substantial evidence. The General Plan DEIR cannot ignore a project that adds 6,550 jobs to the City, especially given that this figure represents more than a <b>fifth</b> of the City’s current jobs.</p>
	4.11-5	<p><b>POP-1:</b> The title of the impact discussion phrases “POP-1” correctly that the threshold is whether the project will induce substantial population growth, either directly or indirectly. The analysis, however, fails to adequately compare the population, employment, and housing growth to <b>existing conditions</b>. The DEIR does not analyze the impact appropriately but instead of focusing on the threshold above, focuses on the following: “The proposed project would result in a significant impact related to population growth if it would lead to substantial <b>unplanned</b> growth either directly or indirectly.” This statement, and the analysis in this section, mischaracterizes the threshold of significance, and fails to adequately analyze the true impact of the proposed project as compared to existing conditions.</p> <p>Page 3-27 of the DEIR states that under the proposed project the changes in the Bayfront Area could result (directly) in new development potential as follows:</p>

Draft EIR Section	Page Number	Comment
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2.3 million square feet of non-residential space</li> <li>• 400 hotel rooms</li> <li>• 4,500 residential units</li> <li>• 11,570 residents; and</li> <li>• 5,500 employees</li> </ul> <p>The DEIR needs to analyze how allowing for all of this development induces population growth – <i>not</i> whether the General Plan <i>plans</i> for this growth.</p>
	4.11-16	<p>Again, in the conclusion for POP-1, the DEIR fails to analyze the allowable growth under the revised General Plan update as compared to <i>existing conditions</i>. The DEIR cannot simply conclude that implementation of the proposed project would not induce substantial population growth because the General Plan includes a planning framework for that growth. If that were the case, no planning document would ever induce population growth, which surely cannot be the case. The DEIR must disclose to the public the change in population growth and housing demands between <b><u>existing conditions</u></b> and the <b><u>build-out of the General Plan update</u></b>.</p> <p>While Table 4.11-2 appears to provide these figures for project plus cumulative and existing, it does <i>not</i> compare project (without cumulative) to existing conditions. The DEIR must include that comparison. Such a comparison likely would show that the proposed General Plan updates would induce substantial population growth from existing conditions.</p> <p>In addition, the analysis fails to adequately analyze the <b><u>housing demand</u></b> created by the employment positions generated by the full build-out of the General Plan update.</p>
	4.11-17	<p>Table 4.11-2 does not explain how 22,350 new employees would lead to only 17,450 new residents and 6,780 new households. The DEIR needs to include substantial evidence to support these calculations and explain the assumptions behind these figures. Otherwise, the public and decisionmakers are being deprived of a meaningful opportunity to comment on potential impacts.</p> <p>Also, 6,550 of these new 22,350 jobs presumably result from the new Facebook Campus Expansion. The DEIR for that project, however, drastically understates the potential growth in City population because of faulty assumptions regarding workers per household.</p> <p>This DEIR fails to explain how the new employees projected for the City by 2040 results in such a low number of new households. The DEIR must provide substantial evidence for the assumptions underlying these</p>

Draft EIR Section	Page Number	Comment
		calculations and more explicitly explain the origin of these figures.
	4.11-17 & 4.11-18	<p>The DEIR calculates the new development potential under the Land Use and Circulation updates plus the existing General Plan’s development potential and then states that new growth under the proposed project would occur incrementally over a period of approximately 24 years. The DEIR then compares this growth to the ABAG 2013 regional growth projections.</p> <p>In large part, the use of those figures is irrelevant given that the “new development potential” does not include the Facebook Campus Expansion, which is anticipated to be completed by 2018 (or possibly 2022). The DEIR does not justify comparing only the project plus existing General Plan potential without including the cumulative projects to ABAG projections. Choosing to ignore the cumulative projects, especially the Facebook Campus Expansion, drastically understates the true effect of the project build-out, and confuses the timeline.</p> <p>This is especially true given that the timeframe for full build-out extends until 2040, but in actuality <b>over half</b> of the anticipated job growth from cumulative projects will be in place by 2018 or 2022 (depending on when the Facebook Campus Expansion is completed).</p> <p>Without comparing when the <i>job growth</i> will occur as compared to when the <i>residential growth</i> will occur between now and 2040, the cumulative impacts analysis fails to address all possible impacts. For example, if all of the job growth occurs at the beginning of the planning period, then a failure to discuss the timing issue would drastically understate the impacts to the housing market and the need to construct additional housing.</p>
	4.11-17	The DEIR seeks to rely on certain policies in <i>Plan Bay Area</i> including transit-oriented and infill development policies to find that the project build-out would be consistent with <i>Plan Bay Area</i> . The DEIR fails to acknowledge, however, that project build-out (including cumulative projects, as is appropriate) would drastically worsen the jobs/housing balance in the City. The DEIR chooses to address only those portions of <i>Plan Bay Area</i> that are consistent with the General Plan, but fails to discuss the issue of jobs/housing balance, which makes the General Plan update <i>inconsistent</i> with <i>Plan Bay Area</i> .
	4.11-18	<p>The DEIR fails to demonstrate the extent to which the proposed General Plan update would change the growth rates of population, households, and employment growth as compared to ABAG’s prior projections, and more importantly, as compared to existing conditions.</p> <p>According to Table 4.11-1 on page 4.11-4, Menlo Park’s population previously was expected to grow by 15 % between 2015 and 2040. The</p>

Draft EIR Section	Page Number	Comment
		<p>number of households and employees was expected to grow by 13 % between 2015 and 2040.</p> <p>On page 4.11-17, Table 4.11-2 indicates that with the proposed project <i>plus cumulative projects</i>, the growth rate would actually be 53 % in terms of population, 52 % in terms of households, and 72 % in terms of employees. Regardless of whether ABAG is in the process of updating its projections, the project plus cumulative growth rates <b><u>drastically</u></b> exceed the ABAG projections from only <b><u>three years ago</u></b>.</p> <p>In order to fully understand the project’s impact, this table <b><u>also</u></b> should include the percentage increase resulting from the project <i>without</i> the cumulative projects. Otherwise, the DEIR fails to disclose the project’s impacts with respect to population growth.</p>
	4.11-18	<p>As stated above, the analysis regarding POP-1 fails to accurately apply the threshold of significance. The DEIR states that: “The General Plan serves as the City’s constitution for the physical development of the city and is implemented by the Zoning Ordinance; thus, the aforementioned existing and proposed goals, policies, and programs, and zoning regulations would provide the long-term planning framework for orderly development under the proposed project through the 2040 horizon year.”</p> <p>Relying on this general statement about the purpose of a General Plan, the DEIR concludes that therefore, “implementation of the proposed project would not induce substantial population growth, or growth for which inadequate planning has occurred, either directly or indirectly, and impacts would be <i>less than significant</i>.” This conclusion misunderstands the threshold of significance.</p> <p>The DEIR fails to analyze the population growth that will be generated by the proposed General Plan update. The DEIR must compare the build-out of the plan <b><u>with existing conditions</u></b> in order to fully disclose the impacts with respect to population growth. At present, the analysis of POP-1 is inadequate to disclose the true impacts of the project to the public and the decisionmakers.</p>
	4.11-20	<p><b>POP-3:</b> The analysis of the project’s potential to displace substantial numbers of <b><u>people</u></b>, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere, is inadequate. Even without the cumulative projects, the General Plan update apparently allows for the construction of 5,500 new units, while allowing for almost twice that number of jobs (9,900). The DEIR currently states simply: “There are no plans for removal of existing housing under the proposed project, thus displacement of people would not occur.” This statement misunderstands the threshold of significance for POP-3. In fact, that statement addresses POP-2, <i>not</i> POP-3.</p>

Draft EIR Section	Page Number	Comment
		<p>The DEIR analysis of the displacement of <b>people</b> needs to discuss whether implementation of the project will result in the displacement of people – not just the actual removal of existing housing. In this instance, the DEIR must analyze how implementation of the project will create market pressures that might displace people and thereby necessitate replacement housing elsewhere. Specifically, this analysis should include a discussion of the project’s impact on the availability of affordable housing as compared to the jobs created by the project. In addition, this will require a discussion of the proposed timeline with respect to anticipated job growth and residential growth.</p> <p>Essentially, the DEIR needs to analyze how the proposed build-out of the General Plan update would affect the housing market, especially the availability of affordable housing units, specifically including impacts in the City of East Palo Alto. A potential lack of affordable housing could very well necessitate the construction of additional affordable housing and/or have impacts on commuting patterns and subsequently air quality impacts. At present, the analysis of this impact is grossly inadequate.</p>
	4.11-20	<p><b>POP-4:</b> The second paragraph of this section again concludes that implementation of the proposed project would not necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. The DEIR fails to include any analysis of the project’s impact on housing needs and thereby fails to support the prior conclusion with substantial evidence. Without a discussion of the housing demand created by the expected population growth, and specifically a discussion of the housing demand at various income levels, the DEIR cannot conclude that the project implementation will not impact population and housing.</p> <p>The DEIR’s subsequent conclusion – that the impacts of the project plus cumulative conditions <i>also</i> would not displace housing or substantial numbers of people – is similarly unsupported by substantial evidence. The DEIR does not analyze the cumulative projects at all – entirely failing to explain whether any of the projects would displace housing units or have impacts on the housing market that would affect the availability of affordable housing and thereby necessitate the construction of additional housing elsewhere.</p>
	4.11-21	<p>The DEIR inappropriately compares the anticipated growth under the General Plan’s build-out to ABAG’s regional projections. The analysis concludes that the implementation of the project plus cumulative projects would result in a significant cumulative impact only because ABAG has not updated its projections. This fails to analyze the necessary impact, which is the anticipated growth of the project plus cumulative projects as compared to <b>existing conditions</b>.</p>

Draft EIR Section	Page Number	Comment
		<p>Although it is sometimes useful to compare a revised planning document with regional projections or with a prior planning document, the analysis in an EIR must compare the build-out of a planning document with the existing conditions in order to fully disclose the impacts of the proposed project. The DEIR currently fails to analyze the project's cumulative impacts by ignoring the existing conditions in its analysis.</p>
	4.11-21	<p><b>Displacement Impacts:</b> In connection with the Facebook Campus Expansion project, the City conducted an "Evaluation of Potential Displacements Impacts in East Palo Alto and Menlo Park's Belle Haven Neighborhood." With respect to the Facebook DEIR, the City of East Palo Alto commented that the Evaluation should have been updated in certain ways and included as part of the DEIR in order to demonstrate and support the potentially significant impacts to population growth and housing demand.</p> <p>Similarly here, the City of Menlo Park should conduct an evaluation of the proposed General Plan update's potential displacement impacts in the City itself, and in surrounding jurisdictions. Specifically, the evaluation must study the project's impacts on affordable housing demand in both the City of Menlo Park and surrounding jurisdictions. This evaluation is necessary to fully disclose the project's impacts to population growth and housing demand, and to disclose the potential to require the construction of new housing due to the displacement of people and households of different income levels.</p> <p>This analysis should be included in the DEIR's discussion of POP-1, POP-3, and POP-4 in order to fully analyze the project's impacts on inducing population growth, on the need for construction of new housing due to the displacement of people, and on cumulative impacts to population and housing.</p>
Public Services and Recreation	4.12-3	<p>The Existing Conditions states that the MPFPD serves approximately 90,000 people, and that there is a service ratio of .85 firefighters per 1,000 service populations. Why is this baseline different from the Facebook DEIR, which states that the MPFPD serves approximately 111,850 people and has a service ratio of .86 firefighters per 1,000 per service population?</p> <p>The City cannot choose to use different baselines in two different EIRs that are being prepared simultaneously without providing substantial evidence to explain that decision. The DEIR currently fails to include substantial evidence to support this distinction.</p>
	4.12-9	<p>The discussion of impacts to fire services states that there will be a less than significant impact because future project applicants will be</p>

Draft EIR Section	Page Number	Comment
		required to pay all applicable fees as set forth on the City’s Fee Schedule. It is not clear how the timing will work such that a potential future applicant pays its fair share of fees for necessary capital improvements, and how it will be determined when the “tipping point” has occurred such that new facilities are necessary. The DEIR should include further information to ensure that the GP update does not result in unmitigated future impacts.
	4.12-18	<b>PS-4:</b> This impact states the project, in combination with cumulative projects, “would not result in less-than-significant cumulative impacts with respect to police services.” This appears to be a typo as it is essentially a double negative.
	4.12-20 and 4.12-23 through 4.12-24	<p>The Existing Conditions states (p. 4.12-20) that the City provides 244.96 acres of parkland for residents, with a ratio of 7.44 acres/1,000 residents. But, the Facebook DEIR states that the City only provides 221 acres of parks, for a ratio of 6.64 acres/1,000 residents. There is no explanation provided for these differing baselines.</p> <p>Furthermore, this difference becomes especially significant in terms of the impact conclusion. This GP DEIR states that upon buildout at Horizon Year 2040, there would still be 5.2 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents. But, if the parkland figure of 221 acres as stated in the Facebook DEIR is used instead, that ratio drops to 4.69 (221 acres divided by 47.1 [(32,900 + 14,150)/1000], the formula stated in footnote 45). This ratio is then <u>below</u> the goal of 5 acres/1,000 residents, and there is a significant impact to parks and recreational facilities. Accordingly, the DEIR understates an adverse impact caused by the project and should be revised and recirculated to address this deficiency.</p>
	4.12-26	<p>The discussion and conclusion in impact PS-6 states that the Menlo Park Community Services Department “has indicated the proposed project could require the construction of new or expanded recreation facilities” but then states that because it is not certain when the need for new or expanded facilities will arise, there is no adverse impact. This conclusion improperly conflates an adverse impact with the timing of mitigation. Because the DEIR acknowledges that new or expanded facilities will need to be constructed as a result of the population increase caused by this project, the project has an adverse impact which should be stated as such and mitigated as appropriate and feasible.</p> <p>Because the DEIR currently understates an adverse impact caused by the project, the DEIR should be revised to reflect the project’s actual impact and should be recirculated for further public review and comment.</p>
	4.12-30	<b>Table 4.12-3:</b> This table contains information on existing capacity at

Draft EIR Section	Page Number	Comment
		certain schools that is inconsistent with the information provided in the Facebook EIR. For example, the Facebook EIR states that Laurel Elementary had a 2014/2015 enrollment of 630, which means that there is less capacity than stated in this project’s EIR. In addition, the Facebook EIR states that Hillview Middle School had a 2014/2015 enrollment of 833 (not 881). The baseline numbers for prior school year enrollment should be accurate and consistent across EIRs.
	4.12-45	The third paragraph on this page states that the project would result “in an incremental increase in demand for fire protection services to be accommodated by the Menlo Park Library.” This appears to be a typo, otherwise the meaning of this sentence is unclear.
Transportation & Circulation	4.13-4, 5	The City of Menlo Park has one Priority Development Area (PDA) identified in the Plan Bay Area, however the location of the main land use intensification contemplated in the General Plan Update is outside of this PDA. Focusing new development in the Bayfront area calls into question consistency with the regional plan, and in particular the eligibility for transportation funding to support the various infrastructure improvements necessitated by the contemplated land use intensifications. This consistency issues is not adequately considered or analyzed in the Transportation and Circulation analysis.
	4.13-10, and generally for Section 4.13	The DEIR relies heavily on transportation demand management guidelines to address traffic impacts of new development contemplated by the General Plan Update. The DEIR must explain how the contemplated management guidelines are consistent with all local, State, and Federal statutes, and how they will be enforceable in the context of plan amendments. Further, because many of the impacted intersections are in the City of East Palo Alto, East Palo Alto must have a role in the monitoring that should include at a minimum, receiving all monitoring reports to verify compliance, and to receive a portion of any penalty fees assessed for non-compliance. Without inclusion of substantially more detail to ensure implementation of the TDM Guidelines will actually occur, this mitigation is not enforceable and cannot be relied upon to reduce the project’s traffic impacts, including but not limited to the impacts in East Palo Alto.
	Figure 4.13-3	This figure does not include any information regarding bicycle or pedestrian facilities in East Palo Alto, which will be heavily impacted by traffic generated by the proposed land use intensification. The Figure, and existing conditions information must be augmented to include this information so that the Project’s impacts can be adequately assessed.
	4.13-21	The discussion of other transit services needs to be expanded to include and address transit options in and through East Palo Alto that will be impacted by the land use intensification in the Bayfront Area. Specific consideration of SAMTRANS routes 397, 296, 297 and 281 must be considered and analyzed.

Draft EIR Section	Page Number	Comment
	4.13-22	The analysis scenarios studied in the transportation and circulation section reflect cumulative impact analyses and none of them disclose the specific project impacts. A proper “project” level analysis would compare the 2040 buildout scenario with the 2014 existing conditions. However, the only analysis provided layers into the analysis the cumulative projects, like the hugely impactful Facebook Campus Expansion project. In so doing, the analysis hides the impacts of the general plan update project. CEQA requires both a project level analysis and a cumulative project analysis, and this EIR conflates the two. The DEIR admits this defect at page 4.13-89, where it states that “[t]he analysis of the proposed project, above, addresses cumulative impacts to the transportation network in the city and its surroundings; accordingly, cumulative impacts would be the same as those identified above.” The DEIR must be revised to provide a meaningful project level analysis of the transportation and circulation impacts.
	4.13-22	Under discussion of the Travel Demand Modeling Methodology, the DEIR states that the Menlo Park City Model utilizes the same land use data categories, modeling assumptions, etc., as in the current C/CAG Model, but for model years 2013, 2020 and 2040. Using information for a model year 2013, however, would not capture significant changes that occurred after 2013, including but not limited to the various Facebook Campus projects that have been entitled and implemented during that time. Therefore, reliance on the out of date data and information calls into question the sufficiency and adequacy of the model and its results.
	4.13-23	The transportation and circulation analysis applies Dynamic Traffic Assignment to address what are referred to as unrealistic volume-to-capacity ratios. The analysis reroutes vehicles when congestion occurs, however, there is no clear explanation of how rerouting occurs. For example, to avoid congested areas, were the vehicles rerouted onto local streets as cut-through traffic? If so, these assignments are inconsistent with the various policies referenced in the analysis that discourage cut-through traffic on local streets. Further, to the extent that traffic is assigned to these other streets that are not analyzed in the DEIR, the potential impacts on those streets must be disclosed. Without disclosing how the DTA was implemented, the validity of the various assignments cannot be verified.
Transportation and Circulation	General Comment	Section 4.13 does not properly identify the study area intersections that are within the City of East Palo Alto’s jurisdiction. These include: All major intersections along University Avenue; All major intersections along Bay from Willow to Pulgas; University and Woodland. Newbridge and Willow Avenue, Capitol and Donohoe Street, Cooley Avenue and Donohoe, East Bayshore Road and Donohoe, Euclid Avenue and East Bayshore Road/Donohoe Street, and US 101 Northbound and Donohoe Street.
	Table	The study area roadway segments and 2014 Existing ADT Volumes do

Draft EIR Section	Page Number	Comment
	4.13-5	not reflect additional significant developments, including but not limited to the recent Facebook Campus projects. The ADT volumes should be updated accordingly to reflect 2015 baseline conditions. Further, this does not address or acknowledge any roadway segments in East Palo Alto.
	4.13-33	As noted above, the 2014 Existing Conditions does not capture significant projects, including the recently entitled and implemented Facebook Campus projects, which could account for a significant change in the existing conditions from those assumed in 2014. The existing conditions need to be updated accordingly.
	4.13-33	The DEIR states that the regional average VMT was determined by including the entire nine-county Bay Area region. A more refined analysis is necessary in this regard because of the unreasonable expansion to the entire nine county region for this project has the effect of inflating the average VMT, and thus hiding the true VMT impacts of the project. This analysis must be redone with the average VMT calculated using only the more proximate counties San Mateo, Santa Clara, Alameda, and San Francisco. Including the current analysis is misleading and fails to adequately disclose potential impacts.
	4.13-33	The roadway segment daily traffic volumes do not include critical street segments in East Palo Alto. At a minimum the segments studied must include those segments along University Avenue between Bayfront Expressway to the north and Woodland Avenue to the south, and the segments along the full length of Bay Road from Pulgas on the east to the transition to Newbridge Street continuing along Newbridge to Willow Road. Failure to include University Avenue results in a fundamental defect in the EIR that fails to disclose the potential impacts of the project.
	4-13-34	The concept of “unserved demand” is not adequately explained. Further, how this concept was applied in the traffic analysis is unclear and not adequately described in the study. CEQA requires disclosure of the analytical process to allow for meaningful public review. Failure to show the work related to the “unserved demand” factoring that went into the study makes it impossible for interested parties and the public to provide meaningful comment. A revised DEIR explaining this issue is required along with recirculation to allow for public review and comment regarding the new information.
	Table 4.13-7	The PM LOS of F for University Avenue and Woodland Avenue is not consistent with the Facebook Expansion EIR, Figure 3.3-9, which shows existing conditions as LOS E. This inconsistency must be reconciled.
	4.13-43	The 2040 No Project Conditions assumes certain “cumulative projects”, and yet it excludes the Facebook Campus Expansion Project. This inconsistency is problematic. Cumulative projects include those that are reasonably foreseeable, and typically include projects for which applications are pending.

Draft EIR Section	Page Number	Comment
	Table 4.13-8	This table states that there would be 47,750 jobs under 2040 no project conditions. This, however, is inconsistent with the Facebook EIR analysis of VMT, which states that there would be 41,200 jobs in the cumulative 2040 existing general plan. See Facebook EIR table 3.3-11 at page 3.3-47. This discrepancy of over 6,000 jobs undermines the accuracy of both analyses and must be corrected in both EIRs.
	4.13-44	The DEIR states that “by using the MPM model, [the peak hour traffic operations] forecast also incorporates anticipated changes to the jobs/housing balance in adjacent cities and throughout the region by 2040 that will affect peak-hour traffic patterns.” A further explanation of how this model reflects changes in East Palo Alto and other cities so that East Palo Alto (and others) can verify that the appropriate forecasts have been incorporated.
	4-13-44	The comment above regarding page 4.13-34 and the “unserved demand” concept apply here as well.
	Table 4.13-9	This table does not include any East Palo Alto segments. As noted above, at a minimum the segments studied must include those segments along University Avenue between Bayfront Expressway to the north and Woodland Avenue to the south, and the segments along the full length of Bay Road from Pulgas on the east to the transition to Newbridge Street continuing along Newbridge to Willow Road.
	Figure 4.13-9	<p>The 2040 No Project Intersection LOS is not consistent with the Facebook Campus Expansion EIR that was circulated concurrently with the General Plan Update EIR. Specifically, the LOS levels at University Avenue and O’Brien Drive (Intersection 39, AM peak); University and US 101 SB Ramps (Intersection 56; AM and PM peak); University and Woodland Avenue (Intersection 57; AM and PM Peak); and Willow Road and Gilbert Ave (Intersection 18; AM and PM Peak) are not consistent with those shown in Figure 3.3-21 of the Facebook EIR. Figure 3.3-21 is the cumulative 2040 existing general plan conditions, and thus should match Figure 4.13-9 of the General Plan EIR. Further, the PM peak LOS at the intersection of University Avenue and O’Brien Drive (Intersection 39) is inconsistent with Figure 4.13-9 in that an improved LOS A is shown in 2040 No Project, whereas existing conditions show an LOS B.</p> <p>These inconsistencies call into question the accuracy and adequacy of not only the General Plan traffic analysis, but also the Facebook Campus Expansion EIR’s analysis.</p>
	4.13-55	The discussion of impacts to pedestrian and bicycle facilities does not take into account East Palo Alto’s standards. Specifically, the East Palo Alto General Plan identifies University Avenue, Pulgas Avenue, and Bay Road as major bike routes. The analysis must take into account these major routes, the potential impacts that project may have on these routes, and the improvements that may be needed as a result of the proposed project.

Draft EIR Section	Page Number	Comment
	4.13-56	The VMT standard utilized inflates the current conditions and thus hides the true impact of the proposed Project. Specifically, the EIR relies on a nine-county average VMT of 20.8 miles per person rather than the 15 miles per person document in the EIR as the current conditions in Menlo Park. By starting with the inflated VMT, the analysis hides the true impact of the land use intensification envisioned by the Plan, and leads to a less than significant conclusion when in fact land use mix will drastically increase the VMT above that existing. The VMT analysis must be redone with a more appropriate baseline VMT tailored to Menlo Park and adjacent areas.
	4.13-57	The study states that the 2040 No Project scenario includes shifts in background traffic pursuant to the Dynamic Traffic Assignment (DTA), but does not disclose how these shifts were done. The acknowledged outcome of this is the “apparent decrease in traffic” in certain locations, however there is no explanation or disclosure of the basis for these shifts. Further, to the extent that any of these shifts moved traffic to local streets as cut-through traffic, those assumptions conflict with the various policies that discourage cut through traffic on local streets. Specifically, how does this DTA process conform to various policies under Goal CIRC-2 related to neighborhood streets and minimizing cut-through traffic, and discouraging use of city streets as alternatives to or connectors of State and federal highways. See policies on DEIR p. ,13-60. Further disclosure of the application and implications of the DTA assumptions must be included in the DEIR, and recirculated for public review and comment.
	4.13-60	The City of Menlo Park will need to coordinate with East Palo Alto regarding implementation of various circulation policies, including updates to travel pattern data per Program CIRC-1.D, and Regional Transportation Improvements per Policy CIRC-2.15.
	4.13-62, 63	The DEIR concludes that there will be significant unmitigable impacts on various roadway segments. Prior to overriding these significant and unmitigable impacts, all feasible mitigation must be adopted, including mitigation that may require implementation in the City of East Palo Alto. Specifically, mitigation must be considered for University Avenue in East Palo Alto, including improvements for pedestrian and bicycle users. In addition to specific mitigation measures, and funding, impacts could be addressed by changing the mix of uses to include additional residential opportunities in the Bayfront Area.
	4.13-63	The comments above regarding page 4.13-34 and 4.13-44 and the “unserved demand” concept apply here as well.
	Figure 4.13-11	The 2040 plus Project Intersection LOS levels on this figure are not consistent with those in the Facebook EIR, Figure 3.3-25. Specifically, the LOS on Figure 4.13-11 is worse than that shown in the Facebook EIR for the intersections of University and Obrien (Intersection 39, AM and PM peak); University and Runnymede (Intersection 52, PM peak);

Draft EIR Section	Page Number	Comment
		University and Bell Street (Intersection 53; PM peak); Willow and Newbridge (Intersection 33; PM peak); Willow and Coleman (Intersection 19; AM peak); University and 101 SB Ramps (Intersection 56; PM peak); and University and Woodland Ave (intersection 57; PM peak). These inconsistencies call into question the accuracy of both the General Plan Update traffic study and the Facebook Expansion Project EIR, and must be addressed in both documents.
	4.13-70	Mitigation Measure TRANS-1b. must take into account the infrastructure needs that the intensified land uses enabled by the General Plan Update will necessitate not only in Menlo Park, but also East Palo Alto. The mitigation measure must be modified to specifically acknowledge that the TIF program will account for and collect funds for improvements needed in East Palo Alto and a mechanism to transfer those funds to East Palo Alto to pay for the needed improvements. The funding should take into account pedestrian, bicycle, transit and vehicular improvements necessitated by the land use intensification in the General Plan Update.
	4.13-71	The discussion of Willow Road and Hamilton Avenue (intersection 36) states that improvements are not recommended because of the potential to encourage cut-through traffic, and yet, the discussion concludes that the improvement should be incorporated into the updated free program. The inconsistency should be reconciled.
	4.13-71	Mitigations for Bayfront Expressway and Willow Road (intersection 37) and Bayfront Expressway and University Avenue (intersection 38) defer determinations as to feasibility to some unknown point in the future. The feasibility of these measures must be determined now, and if feasible must be incorporated as binding and required mitigation measures.
	4.13-72	Mitigation for University Avenue and Bay Road (intersection 51), University Avenue and Donohoe Street (intersection 54), and University Avenue and US 101 Southbound Ramps (intersection 56) call for various intersection modifications and improvements. Any such improvements must be reviewed by and, if acceptable, coordinated with the City of East Palo Alto. Further, the proposed TIF program must include a specific mechanism for transferring funds to East Palo Alto for any such improvements. The process for determining an individual project's fair share must be clearly set forth and ensure that impacts in East Palo Alto are fully mitigated.
	4.13-73	The EIR states that the existing VMT in Menlo Park is 15 miles per person, and yet the nine-county average is used for determining whether the project would reduce VMT. The analysis should be redone with a more appropriate baseline VMT that reflects only those areas more proximate to Menlo Park rather than the inflated nine-county VMT.

Draft EIR Section	Page Number	Comment
	4.13-75	The EIR states that there are 3 CMP intersections studied, however, those intersections are not clearly identified. Further, the EIR states that not a single CMP roadway segment was analyzed. These defects call into question the adequacy of the CMP analysis, and further study and disclosure is required. AS presently drafted there is not sufficient evidence to support the conclusion that CMP impacts would be less than significant.
	4.13-80-81	University Avenue is a critical street for emergency responders in East Palo Alto, and as such the substantial increases in traffic on this roadway have the potential to impact the ability to timely respond to emergency situations and transport patients to medical facilities. This impact must be more fully analyzed and disclosed in a revised and recirculated EIR.
	4.13-82	The EIR (and General Plan Update) must specifically consider how policies CIRC-2.4 (Equity) and CIRC-2.6 (Local Streets as Alternative Routes) will be coordinated with the City of East Palo Alto. Specifically, the needs of transit dependent areas of East Palo Alto will require additional pedestrian, bicycle, and transit enhancements as a result of the Project's land use intensification. Further, the increased traffic caused by the Project will result in inevitable impacts to local streets in East Palo Alto, and Menlo Park must assist East Palo Alto in addressing those impacts.
	4.13-86-87	Mitigation Measure TRANS-6a calls for an update of the Menlo Park Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) program. Part of the program involves undertaking a nexus study. Any such nexus study must include not only improvements in Menlo Park, but also all improvements in East Palo Alto to determine what components will be funded through the TIF program, and the appropriate percentage of contribution from Menlo Park projects. We request that Mitigation Measure Trans-6a be modified to specifically require inclusion of East Palo Alto improvements, and involvement of the City of East Palo Alto in the development of the scope of and methodologies for the nexus study.
	4.13-87	Pedestrian improvements are called out for University Avenue, however, there is no discussion of needed bicycle improvements. The analysis and discussion of needed improvements must be expanded to address bicycle needs.
	4.13-88	Mitigation Measure TRANS-6b must also account for shuttle service in East Palo Alto, including in the Shuttle Fee program component of Menlo Park's nexus study.
	4.13-88	Impact TRANS-6c states that it would result in traffic delays at University Avenue, thus adversely impacting the performance of transit services and increases in transit costs. Mitigation measure TRANS-6c makes no reference to mitigating impacts along University Avenue. The mitigation measure must be modified to address the identified impacts.
Utilities and	4.14-17	The DEIR's discussion of future water demand is inaccurate and fails to

Draft EIR Section	Page Number	Comment
Service Systems	through 4.14-19	<p>sufficiently state the extent of the future demand. First, despite the significant population increases caused by the Facebook Expansion Project, the GP DEIR fails to include the Facebook project as part of the project's future water demand, instead simply calling it a currently planned but separate project (p. 4.14-19, Table 4.14-2, note b; WSE, Table 7). There is no explanation as to why this significant project is not analyzed as part of the GP project.</p> <p>Furthermore, the analysis of the Facebook project's water demand is incomplete because it fails to account for the proposed hotel use on the site. The analysis accounts only for new workers in the office buildings (6,400) and new workers in the hotel (150) but fails to account for any guests in the hotel. As stated in the Project Description for the Facebook EIR, the hotel would include a 200-room, limited service hotel with office space, food and beverage areas, a fitness room, pool, and deck areas. Plainly, hotel guests will use water over and above that used by hotel workers, yet the Facebook DEIR fails to account for any such use. As a result, that Project's water demand is understated.</p> <p>Moreover, the Facebook DEIR cherry-picks when it assumes that no employees currently work at the site and, in the case of water supplies, takes credit for existing uses in order to understate the Project's water demands. For example, in discussing solid waste, the Facebook DEIR states that it "assumes that no employees currently work at the Project site; therefore, it is assumed that no solid waste is currently generated at the Project site." (Facebook DEIR, p. 3.14-28.) Yet, in discussing water demand, the Facebook DEIR states that the total existing annual water use is 58 mg, and therefore essentially takes credit for that use in concluding there will be a net annual water demand of only 30 mg (rather than the Project's stated demand of 88 mg).</p> <p>Because the annual water demand for the Facebook project is 88 mg and not 30 mg, the GP EIR understates future water demand by claiming that "other planned projects," which includes the Facebook project, will have a future water demand of only 31 mg combined. The total water demand will, in fact, be significantly greater. The GP DEIR should be revised and recirculated with a proper statement of the project's water demand.</p>
	4.14-24 through 4.14-25, 4.14-27; 4.14-29 through 4.14-30	<p>The DEIR's analysis of impacts to water supplies is significantly flawed and fails to acknowledge or attempt to mitigate the Project's adverse impacts. The DEIR acknowledges that the proposed project creates an incremental water shortfall of approximately 21 percent in 2040 during single dry years and between 17 and 31 percent during multiple dry years between 2020 and 2040. Thus, the Project will have a significant, adverse impact on water resources.</p>

Draft EIR Section	Page Number	Comment
		<p>Despite this, the DEIR states that MPMWD has developed a Water Shortage Contingency Plan which will “manage” shortages by reducing water demand up to 50%. The DEIR then assumes, without any basis, that unstated measures from this Plan will reduce the total future potable water demand within the MPMWD service area, and therefore the Project will not create any impacts. There is simply no support for this conclusion. The DEIR fails to discuss any of the measures or explain how they will achieve a 50% reduction in water demand. Accordingly, the conclusion of a less than significant impact is wholly unsupported.</p> <p>The DEIR’s analysis of cumulative impacts is similarly flawed, and is based on the same deficient analysis which assumes, without support, that unspecified measures would reduce demand so greatly that the acknowledged water supply shortages would cease to exist. There is no support for this conclusion.</p>
	4.14-56	<p><b>MM UTIL-10:</b> This mitigation measure purports to address the acknowledged cumulative impact to solid waste facilities, but it is an illusory mitigation measure that does not sufficiently reduce impacts. Specifically, the measure only states that the City shall “continue its reduction programs and diversion requirements” and “monitor solid waste generation volumes in relation to capacities at receiving landfill sites to ensure that sufficient capacity exists...” Neither of these activities addresses the prospect of what happens if sufficient waste is not diverted or if landfill capacities reach their maximum prior to the horizon year for the GP project. Accordingly, this mitigation measure does not actually demonstrate that impacts will be reduced to less than significant.</p>
	4.14-80 through 4.14-81	<p>The DEIR fails to adequately discuss transportation-related energy impacts. The DEIR assumes, without support, that future technology will further the goal of conserving energy and thus the project will have less than significant energy impacts. There is no support for this conclusion.</p>
	4.14-81	<p>The DEIR fails to include any analysis of <u>cumulative</u> transportation-related energy impacts. The single sentence analysis states only that the discussion in the preceding section (UTIL-13) describes the project’s impacts “in relationship to the PG&amp;E service territory and therefore, includes a discussion of cumulative impacts.” The analysis of energy impacts related to PG&amp;E does not include any analysis of transportation-related energy impacts, including depletion of fuel resources. These impacts are likely to be significant given the cumulative increases in population through the horizon year of 2040. The DEIR must be revised and recirculated to include this analysis.</p>
Alternatives	5-3	<p>The alternatives section considers only two alternatives, in addition to the No Project alternative required by CEQA. This number of alternatives does not reflect an adequate range of reasonable</p>

Draft EIR Section	Page Number	Comment
		<p>alternatives to the Project.</p> <p>The Analysis must be expanded to include, at a minimum, an alternative that would include additional residential land uses while reducing other land uses or allowed intensities of non-residential land uses in order to further the objective s of improving mobility for all travel modes and preserving neighborhood character. An alternative that would incorporate additional residential land uses would also further the other objectives of establishing and achieving the community’s vision, realizing economic and revenue potential by helping to meet the pent up demand for housing in the project area and neighboring communities. Further, an expanded residential component could still directly involve Bayfront Area property owners and streamline development review. Therefore, failure to meet objectives is no basis for rejecting this alternative, and in fact, the EIR provides no evidence for why such an alternative was not considered. Including additional residential development opportunities while reducing other land uses (or intensities of such land uses) could reduce or eliminate significant and unavoidable air quality, greenhouse gas, housing, and transportation/circulation impacts. As such, the alternatives analysis and the EIR are inadequate without consideration of this type of alternative. A revised EIR must be prepared, including the additional alternatives analysis, and must be recirculated for review pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5 (a)(3). Finally, the narrow selection of the alternatives serves to unduly limit the policy choices available to the decision makers by failing to disclose the availability of an enhanced residential alternative and the potential environmental benefits of such an alternative.</p>
Alternatives	5-11	<p>The analysis of the land use impacts of the No Project alternative, states that “the enhanced General Plan Land Use and Circulation Elements [sic] goals and policies that better promote sustainability and circulation improvements would not be adopted.” However, in the very next paragraph the analysis concludes with an inconsistent statement that “because the No Project Alternative would result in development in the same setting and would be subject to the same existing land use regulations, including Mitigation Measure LU-2, which would ensure future projects in Menlo Park are consistent with the City’s General Plan policies, land use impacts when compared to the proposed project, would be similar.” The discussion and analysis of the land use impacts of the No Project alternative needs to be revised and made internally consistent.</p>
Alternatives	5-11; 5-12	<p>The noise analysis of the No Project Alternative fails to take into account the impact of noise resulting from increases in traffic. Both the Project and the No Project Alternative will result in increases in traffic levels, and thus increased in traffic related noise. The discussion of the No Project Alternative noise impacts not only ignores this source of impact, but provides no comparison to the increased traffic noise</p>

Draft EIR Section	Page Number	Comment
		associated with the Project. This analysis, when provided, must include analysis and disclosure of the potential noise impacts that will accompany the many significant and unavoidable traffic impacts, including those in the City of East Palo Alto.
Alternatives	5-12	The discussion of housing impacts of the No Project Alternative concludes that the impacts would be less than that of the proposed project. This, however, is not supported by the fact that the Project provides more housing than would the existing General Plan, and thus would have fewer impacts on housing demand in light of the increase in housing opportunities.
Alternatives	5-23	The noise analysis of the Reduced Non Residential Intensity Alternative fails to take into account the impact of noise resulting from increases in traffic. Both the Project and the Reduced Non Residential Intensity Alternative will result in increases in traffic levels, and thus increased in traffic related noise. The discussion of the Reduced Non Residential Intensity Alternative noise impacts not only ignores this source of impact, but provides no comparison to the increased traffic noise associated with the Project. This analysis, when provided, must include analysis and disclosure of the potential noise impacts that will accompany the many significant and unavoidable traffic impacts, including those in the City of East Palo Alto.
	5-24	The population and housing discussion of the Reduced Non Residential Intensity Alternative concludes that the impacts of this alternative would be similar to the proposed Project. This, however, does not seem to take into account the reduction in the housing demand that would accompany the reduction in the amount of job producing development. As such, it appears that the impacts on housing demand would be reduced, and that there may also be a reduction, when compared to the existing Project, because of the reduction in the employment contemplated by the Project and thus a reduced impact with respect to the new employees and their demand for housing. The analysis should be revised to reflect this type of analysis.
	5-26	In discussion of the Reduced Non-Residential Intensity Alternative, the EIR acknowledges that no traffic model run was completed. We request that model runs be undertaken for this and the Reduced Intensity alternative in order to provide meaningful information with which to compare the alternatives to the Project. The model should also be run for the Reduced non-residential, increased residential alternative suggested above.
	5-29	The discussion of the Air Quality impacts concludes that impacts will be less than the project, but does not disclose whether the residual impacts would be significant and unmitigable or not. The analysis must be revised to include this additional information.
	5-34	The noise analysis of the Reduced Intensity Alternative fails to take into account the impact of noise resulting from increases in traffic. Both the

Draft EIR Section	Page Number	Comment
		Project and the Reduced Intensity Alternative will result in increases in traffic levels, and thus increased in traffic related noise. The discussion of the Reduced Intensity Alternative noise impacts not only ignores this source of impact, but provides no comparison to the increased traffic noise associated with the Project. This analysis, when provided, must include analysis and disclosure of the potential noise impacts that will accompany the many significant and unavoidable traffic impacts, including those in the City of East Palo Alto.
	5-35	The population and housing discussion of the Reduced Intensity Alternative concludes that the impacts of this alternative would be less than the proposed Project. This, however, does not explain the increased housing impacts associated with additional jobs and the offset of the additional housing units contemplated in the Alternative. The analysis should be revised to reflect this type of analysis.



**KRUPKA CONSULTING**

409 Rolling Hills Avenue  
San Mateo, CA 94403

T 650.504.2299  
[paul@krupkaconsulting.com](mailto:paul@krupkaconsulting.com)

[www.pkrupkaconsulting.com](http://www.pkrupkaconsulting.com)

July 22, 2016

*via email only to:*

[gpersicone@cityofepa.org](mailto:gpersicone@cityofepa.org), cc: [scharpentier@cityofepa.org](mailto:scharpentier@cityofepa.org), [DSnow@rwglaw.com](mailto:DSnow@rwglaw.com)

Mr. Guido F. Persicone, AICP  
Senior Planner  
City of East Palo Alto  
1960 Tate Street  
East Palo Alto, CA 94303

RE: Final Comments on Transportation and Circulation Section of Menlo Park  
General Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) (June 1, 2016)

Dear Guido:

This letter presents my comments on the Section 4.13 Transportation and Circulation of the DEIR for ConnectMenlo: General Plan Land Use & Circulation Elements and M-2 Area Zoning Update (City of Menlo Park, June 1, 2016). It was prepared in accordance with my Agreement with the City of East Palo Alto dated June 20, 2016. This version incorporates changes to reflect feedback from you and David Snow during our telephone discussion on July 21, 2016.

\*\*\*\*\*

I used the prefix “TC” for my numbered comments.

TC 1 - Page 4.13-1, second paragraph states “...information in this chapter is based ***in part*** on travel demand....analysis...conducted by TJKM Transportation Consultants.” Please identify what other information is based on.

TC 2 - Page 4.13-1, same paragraph notes the “analyses were conducted in accordance with the standards...(City)...(C/CAG).” Other agencies’ standards are noted in the body of this section and should be so stated.

TC 3 - Page 4.13-1, same paragraph references “...technical appendices...in Appendix K...”, but does not state what is included in the technical appendices. Please clarify.

TC 4 - Page 4.13-2, first complete sentence on page: “The California...State highways” is relevant to the next subsection “California Department of Transportation”, not CTC, correct? Please clarify.

TC 5 - Page 4.13-12, text reference to Figure 4.13-2 states "City's existing bicycle facilities in the study area..."; given the noted figure shows bicycle facilities in the study area, it appears "City's" is not needed. Please clarify.

TC 6 - Figure 4.13-2: Class I path adjacent to Bayfront Expressway appears to be ON the expressway and it is not. Please clarify.

TC 7 - Figure 4.13-2: The key lists "Study Intersections" and they do not appear to be shown on this figure. Please clarify.

TC 8 - Page 4.13-15, second paragraph, second sentence states "Existing pedestrian facilities within the study area are shown on Figure 4.13-3." However, the noted figure shows only City of Menlo Park pedestrian facilities. Please clarify.

TC 9 - Page 4.13-15, last sentence: the sentence is awkward with "description" at the beginning and "described" at the end. Please clarify.

TC 10 - Page 4.13-18: a column between "Service Provider" and "Peak Headway" called "Description" (or similar) would be very helpful to the reader. Please clarify.

TC 11 - Page 4.13-19, under SamTrans: a map showing these routes serving the Bayfront Area would be very helpful to the reader. Also, in the discussion of Route 276, are Redwood City Transit Center and Redwood City Caltrain Station the same thing? Please clarify.

TC 12 - Page 4.13-20, first paragraph, second to last sentence: to be consistent, please cite the number of Baby Bullet trains that operate in each direction/peak period (the sentence only cites a number for northbound service). Please clarify.

TC 13 - Page 4.13-20, under Caltrain Short-Range Transit Plan: this section is apparently based on the 2008 version of the referenced plan. Given the 2015 version was adopted in October 2015, it seems this section should be updated to reflect the latest version. Please clarify.

TC 14 - Page 4.13-20, under City of Menlo Park Shuttles, please clarify whether the noted shuttles are open to all riders, who operates them, and when they operate.

TC 15 - Page 4.13-21, are there any other transit shuttles serving the study area, perhaps operated by East Palo Alto? Please clarify.

TC 16 - Page 4.13-21, first sentence under Airport Land Use Comprehensive Plans states "Moffet Federal Airfield." The correct spelling is Moffett.

TC 17 - Page 4.13-22, under Menlo Park City Model (MPM): 1) this section provides some information about the model and how it was refined for this study; however, it does not provide any actual data reflecting the model structure, which is essential for the reader to interpret the project population and employment by TAZ; furthermore, this section does not provide sufficient descriptive discussion of how the MPM addresses and integrates, for example: a) projects that were occupied after the base year (2013), like Facebook West (Building 20); and b) cumulative projects discussed

and enumerated in Table 4-1 and pages preceding at the beginning of Chapter 4; 2) please clarify whether the MPM used the “most current version of the C/CAG Model, received on July 19, 2015...”; 3) in paragraph three of this sub-section there is reference to “...VMT information for the entire trip length required by SB 743 guidelines...”; please clarify whether this is “required” in SB 743 law or is a proposed procedure in the OPR Guidelines issued in January 2016 and referenced on page 4.13-3.

TC 18 - Page 4.13-23, under Dynamic Traffic Assignment (DTA): 1) Although the issue of “...overestimation of link volumes because physical congestion was not represented in vehicle rerouting.” is well known, and it is commendable to introduce a new procedure called DTA, this document provides no apparent descriptions and details of the procedure to allow the reader to understand and interpret its implications; please expand and clarify, with suitable details; 2) please document the “base” C/CAG trip tables and the “revised” trip tables that were used in the DTA; also, the last paragraph in this subsection is repeated from page 4.13-22 (paragraph 3 under Menlo Park City Model).

TC 19 - Page 4.13-23, under Intersection Level-of-Service Analysis Methodology: please clarify whether planning or operations procedures in HCM 2010 were used.

TC 20 - Page 4.13-25, under Vehicle Miles Traveled: please expand the discussion in paragraph three to clarify why the sum of population and jobs is used in the denominator of the VMT per capita calculation (e.g. would this double count intra-area trips?). Page 4.13-33, under Vehicle Miles Traveled, a related issue is the matter of fact introduction of the regional average VMT per person (20.8 miles per person) from the 2013 Plan Bay Area EIR as an appropriate threshold without any justification or explanation. It is noted the proposed guidelines for implementing SB 743 indicate a metric of VMT per employee (not person) as the appropriate regional threshold to consider, but also states it us up to lead agencies to consider data aggregations more proximate to a project under study (e.g. subregional) (State of California, Governor’s Office of Planning and Research, January 20, 2016). Also, the use of a metric documented in 2013 may simply be inappropriate or out of date. Please explain and provide suitable details.

TC 21 - Page 4.13-26, under Study Intersections: first sentence is missing “and” between “control type” and “jurisdiction.”

TC 22 - Page 4.13-29, Table 4.13-5: 1) This table appears to show only Menlo Park roadway segments, whereas the study area intersections table (Table 4.13-4) shows all study intersections in the study area, including ones in other cities. Please clarify and provide rationale. 2) There is no explanation of the connection between existing traffic counts and recently occupied developments (like Facebook West (Building 20). Please explain whether recently occupied developments are captured in these 2014 counts and, if they are not, how their traffic impacts are captured in the analysis.

TC 23 - Page 4.13-33, first paragraph: The word “buildout” in the last sentence is not relevant to 2014 Existing Conditions. Please clarify.

TC 24 - Page 4.13-33, first sentence under Roadway Segments Daily Traffic Volumes” indicates 2014 Existing daily traffic volumes on all study segments are shown in Table 4.13-5, but they are not. See comment TC 22 above. Please clarify and provide rationale.

TC 25 - Page 4.13-34, fourth paragraph under Peak Hour Traffic Operations: please document sources of signal timing for non-Menlo Park intersections.

TC 26 - Page 4.13-34, sixth paragraph under Peak Hour Traffic Operations: Please explain what “Vistro” is. More importantly, this document does not provide any explanation of procedures and details used to determine “...level of service results... based on level of service as identified by the City to reflect ‘unserved demand.’ “ Therefore, the reader has little or no information to develop an informed understanding of what this really means. This is related to the insufficient documentation for DTA cited in comment TC 18 above. Please explain and provide suitable details.

TC 27 - Page 4.13-42, Table 4.13-7: 1) notes for Willow Road interactions reference “...southbound” approaches...” whereas this roadway is designated as East-West. Please clarify. 2) Why are there just “n/a” designations under “Notes” for the last four University Avenue intersections on the list? The poor LOS and delay volumes would suggest some explanation would be helpful. Please clarify.

TC 28 - Page 4.13-44, under Roadway Segment Daily Traffic Volumes: Please explain why Standards of Significance are not presented **before** the discussion of 2040 No Project conditions. This is inconsistent with the discussion of Format of the Environmental Analysis on page 4-1 and is confusing to the reader.

TC 29 - Page 4.13-45, Table 4.13-9: This table presents Menlo Park intersections only. See comment TC 22 above. Please clarify and provide rationale.

TC 30 - Page 4.13-51, Table 4.13-10: 1) note for number 33 uses “southbound” reference. See Comment TC 27 above. Please clarify. 2) Why is the >35 designator used for numbers 34 and 35? 3) Why is there a “n/a” designation for number 37?

TC 31 - Page 4.13-53, Section 4.13.2 STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE: This section appears out of place and inconsistent with the discussion of Format of the Environmental Analysis on page 4-1. It should be **before** the discussion of 2040 No Project. This introduces confusion. Please explain.

TC 32 - Page 4.13-53, first sentence: the phrase “significant impact” refers to “significant transportation impact” correct? Please clarify.

TC 33 - Page 4.13-55, Roadway Segment Daily Traffic Volume Standards subsection refers to City of Menlo Park standards only, correct? Why are other standards not presented? Please clarify.

TC 34 - Page 4.13-55, Pedestrian and Bicycle Standards: what is the source of these standards? Please clarify.

TC 35 - Page 4.13-56, Vehicle Miles Traveled Standards: what is the source of this standard?

TC 36 - Page 4.13-56, Section 4.13.3 IMPACT DISCUSSION: This section appears out of place and inconsistent with the discussion of Format of the Environmental Analysis on page 4-1. It should be after the discussion of 2040 Plus Project. This introduces confusion. Please explain.

TC 37 - Page 4.13-57, top of page: It appears that a sub-section side title is missing (i.e. 2040 PROJECT CONDITIONS). Please clarify.

TC 38 - Page 4.13.59, Table 4.13-11: This table presents Menlo Park intersections only. See comment TC 22 above. Please clarify and provide rationale.

TC 39 - Page 4.13-62, under Impact TRANS-1a: What is the justification for introducing Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a given the result is "Significant and Unavoidable"? Is this not saying the Circulation Element is insufficient?

TC 40 - Page 4.13.63, discussion indicates "... proposed Zoning regulations...anticipated to eliminate impacts on eight roadway segments,...". There does not appear to be any analysis or documentation of this finding. Please clarify. Similarly, the discussion states "...[street] reclassifications would...eliminate or reduce impacts...". There does not appear to be any analysis or documentation of this finding. Please clarify.

TC 41 - Page 4.13-70, discussion of Impact TRANS 1b and Mitigation TRANS 1b: Please explain whether it is feasible for the TIF program to "guarantee funding for roadway and infrastructure improvements...".

TC 42 - Page 4.13.72, discussion of potential improvements to University Avenue at Bay Road, Donohoe Street and US 101 Southbound Ramps: please clarify whether any analysis, investigation, or communication with Caltrans or East Palo Alto staff was undertaken for this study.

TC 43 - Page 4.13-73, under Mitigation TRANS 1b: What is the justification for introducing Mitigation Measure TRANS-1b given the result is "Significant and Unavoidable"? Is this not saying this mitigation measure is not feasible? Please explain.

TC 44 - Page 4.13-76, discussion of Impact TRANS-2 and Mitigation TRANS-2: See comment TC 39 above.

TC 45 - Page 4.13-79, TRANS-5 states "...project would not result in inadequate emergency access." This seems unrealistic given the predominance of poor (LOS F) conditions at many study intersections on major emergency access roadways. The first full paragraph on page 4.13-80 includes this questionable statement: "However, future development permitted under the proposed project would be concentrated on sites that are already developed where impacts relative to inadequate emergency access would not likely occur." Are there not LOS F conditions near "sites that are already developed..."? Please explain why there would be "less than significant impacts" under TRANS-5.

TC 46 - Page 4.13-86, under Impact TRANS-6a: What is the justification for introducing Mitigation Measure TRANS-6a (update the TIF) given the result is "Significant and Unavoidable"? Is this not saying this mitigation measure is not feasible? Is this not saying the Circulation Element is insufficient? Please explain.

TC 47 - Page 4.13-88, under Impact TRANS-6b: What is the justification for introducing Mitigation Measure TRANS-6b (update the Shuttle Fee Program) given the result is "Significant and Unavoidable"? Is this not saying this mitigation measure is not feasible? Is this not saying the Circulation Element is insufficient? Please explain.

TC 48 - Page 4.13-88 and 89, under Impact TRANS-6c: What is the justification for introducing Mitigation Measure TRANS-6c (support the Dumbarton Corridor Study) given the result is "Significant and Unavoidable"? Is this not saying this mitigation measure is not feasible? Is this not saying the Circulation Element is insufficient? Please explain.

\*\*\*\*\*

I suggest we discuss these and other comments as needed so you have ample information to write the City's formal comments.

Please call me if you have any questions or other requests.

Sincerely,  
KRUPKA CONSULTING



Paul J. Krupka, P.E.  
Owner

cc (by email only):  
Sean Charpentier, City of East Palo Alto  
David Snow, Richards|Watson|Gershon



**CITY OF EAST PALO ALTO**  
**Community and Economic Development Department**  
**Planning and Housing Division**

1960 Tate Street • East Palo Alto, CA 94303  
Tel: (650) 853-3189 • Fax: (650) 853-3179

---

August 1, 2016

Kyle Perata, Senior Planner  
Community Development Department  
City of Menlo Park  
701 Laurel Street  
Menlo Park, California 94025

Re: Inconsistencies between City of Menlo Park Environmental Impact Reports for General Plan Land Use and Circulation Element Updates (ConnectMenlo) and Facebook Campus Expansion Project

Dear Mr. Perata:

The City of East Palo Alto previously submitted detailed comments on the draft environmental impact report for the Facebook Campus Expansion Project (the “Facebook EIR”). Given that Menlo Park circulated both the Facebook EIR and the EIR for its General Plan Land Use and Circulation Element Update (the “ConnectMenlo EIR”), East Palo Alto requested reasonable extensions of the time to comment on both EIRs. While, very shortly before the end of the comment period for the ConnectMenlo EIR, a 15-day extension was granted for comments on that EIR, no such extension was granted as to the Facebook EIR.

In completing its review of the ConnectMenlo EIR, for which comments are submitted separately, numerous inconsistencies between the Facebook EIR and the ConnectMenlo EIR were identified. This letter is intended to supplement the comments East Palo Alto previously provided on the Facebook EIR, and we respectfully request that each of these comments be considered and addressed as Menlo Park proceeds with CEQA compliance for the Facebook Campus Expansion Project.

1. The 2040 Horizon Development Potential in the ConnectMenlo EIR calculates population by applying the 2.57 persons per household generation rate. This is, however, different from the 2.61 persons per household rate used in the Facebook DEIR. The City cannot choose to use different assumptions in two different EIRs that are being prepared simultaneously without providing substantial evidence to support that decision. The Facebook DEIR, like the ConnectMenlo DEIR, fails to include substantial evidence to support this distinction.
2. The “Future Housing Needs” discussion (see footnote 10 on page 4.11-4 of the ConnectMenlo EIR) appears to rely on the 2009 ABAG Projections, but the Facebook Campus Expansion DEIR relies on the 2013 ABAG projections. The DEIRs must be consistent with respect to the sources regarding population and housing statistics and the choice among various sources must be supported with substantial evidence.
3. The analysis of the future projected employees, and the number of new housing units needed to accommodate the employees, must use consistent assumptions in both the ConnectMenlo EIR and the Facebook EIR. Further, any assumptions utilized must be supported by substantial evidence. As noted previously, the Facebook EIR includes faulty assumption regarding the

number or workers per household, and must be consistent with the assumptions in the ConnectMenlo EIR.

4. East Palo Alto previously commented on the displacement study completed in conjunction with the Facebook Expansion Project, and has requested that further displacement analysis of the ConnectMenlo project be undertaken. The revised and updated Facebook Project study must be consistent in methodology and assumptions with the necessary ConnectMenlo displacement study.
5. The existing conditions for public services and recreation in the Connect Menlo EIR (at p. 4.12-3) states that the MPFPD serves approximately 90,000 people, and that there is a service ratio of .85 firefighters per 1,000 service populations. This baseline, however, is inconsistent with the Facebook DEIR, which states that the MPFPD serves approximately 111,850 people and has a service ratio of .86 firefighters per 1,000 per service population. The City cannot choose to use different baselines in two different EIRs that are being prepared simultaneously without providing substantial evidence to explain that decision. The DEIR currently fails to include substantial evidence to support this distinction.
6. The existing conditions for public services and recreation in the ConnectMenlo EIR (at p. 4.12-20) states that the City provides 244.96 acres of parkland for residents, with a ratio of 7.44 acres/1,000 residents. But, the Facebook DEIR states that the City only provides 221 acres of parks, for a ratio of 6.64 acres/1,000 residents. There is no explanation provided for these differing baselines. Furthermore, this difference becomes especially significant in terms of the impact conclusion. This ConnectMenlo states that upon buildout at Horizon Year 2040, there would still be 5.2 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents. But, if the parkland figure of 221 acres as stated in the Facebook EIR is used instead, that ratio drops to 4.69 (221 acres divided by 47.1 [(32,900 + 14,150)/1000], the formula stated in footnote 45). This ratio is then below the goal of 5 acres/1,000 residents, and there is a significant impact to parks and recreational facilities as to the ConnectMenlo project. This inconsistency between the two EIRs must be resolved, and the resolution must be based on substantial evidence.
7. Table 4.12-3 of the ConnectMenlo EIR contains information on existing capacity at certain schools that is inconsistent with the information provided in the Facebook EIR. For example, the Facebook EIR states that Laurel Elementary had a 2014/2015 enrollment of 630, which means that there is less capacity than stated in the ConnectMenlo EIR. In addition, the Facebook EIR states that Hillview Middle School had a 2014/2015 enrollment of 833 (not 881). The baseline numbers for prior school year enrollment should be accurate and consistent across the EIRs.
8. In table 4.13-7 of the ConnectMenlo EIR, the PM LOS is F for University Avenue and Woodland Avenue, whereas in the Facebook Expansion EIR, Figure 3.3-9, this is shown as an existing condition of LOS E. This inconsistency must be reconciled.
9. Table 4.13-8 of the ConnectMenlo EIR states that there would be 47,750 jobs under 2040 no project conditions. This, however, is inconsistent with the Facebook EIR analysis of VMT, which states that there would be 41,200 jobs in the cumulative 2040 existing general plan. See Facebook EIR table 3.3-11 at page 3.3-47. This discrepancy of over 6,000 jobs undermines the accuracy of both analyses and must be corrected in both EIRs, based on substantial evidence.
10. The 2040 No Project Intersection LOS in ConnectMenlo EIR Figure 4.13-9 is not consistent with the Facebook Campus Expansion EIR that was circulated concurrently with the General Plan Update EIR. Specifically, the LOS levels at University Avenue and O'Brien Drive (Intersection 39, AM peak); University and US 101 SB Ramps (Intersection 56; AM and PM peak); University

and Woodland Avenue (Intersection 57; AM and PM Peak); and Willow Road and Gilbert Ave (Intersection 18; AM and PM Peak) are not consistent with those shown in Figure 3.3-21 of the Facebook EIR. Figure 3.3-21 is the cumulative 2040 existing general plan conditions, and thus should match Figure 4.13-9 of the General Plan EIR. Further, the PM peak LOS at the intersection of University Avenue and O'Brien Drive (Intersection 39) is inconsistent with Figure 4.13-9 in that an improved LOS A is shown in 2040 No Project, whereas existing conditions show an LOS B. These inconsistencies call into question the accuracy and adequacy of not only the General Plan traffic analysis, but also the Facebook Campus Expansion EIR's analysis.

11. The 2040 plus Project Intersection LOS levels on Figure 4.13-11 in the ConnectMenlo EIR are not consistent with those in the Facebook EIR, Figure 3.3-25. Specifically, the LOS on Figure 4.13-11 is worse than that shown in the Facebook EIR for the intersections of University and Obrien (Intersection 39, AM and PM peak); University and Runnymede (Intersection 52, PM peak); University and Bell Street (Intersection 53; PM peak); Willow and Newbridge (Intersection 33; PM peak); Willow and Coleman (Intersection 19; AM peak); University and 101 SB Ramps (Intersection 56; PM peak); and University and Woodland Ave (intersection 57; PM peak). These inconsistencies call into question the accuracy of both the General Plan Update traffic study and the Facebook Expansion Project EIR, and must be addressed in both documents.

In conclusion, we request that Menlo Park specifically address each of these additional comments in Facebook EIR process. We continue to believe that before the City of Menlo Park could certify the Facebook EIR substantial revisions are necessary and recirculation of a revised Draft EIR for further public review and comment is required.

We appreciate your comments and open communication throughout the process. If you have any questions, comments please call Guido F. Persicone, Planning Manager at (650) 853-3195 or email him at [gpersicone@cityofepa.org](mailto:gpersicone@cityofepa.org). We look forward to hearing from you.

Yours truly,



---

Donna Rutherford,  
East Palo Alto Mayor  
[drutherford@cityofepa.org](mailto:drutherford@cityofepa.org)