

Chapter 3

Environmental Impact Analysis

Chapter 3 of this Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR) presents an analysis of the potential impacts that the Willow Village Master Plan Project (Proposed Project) could have on existing environmental conditions. The environmental analysis has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), as amended (Public Resources Code Section 21000, et seq.), and the CEQA Guidelines.

CEQA Methodology

CEQA Guidelines Section 15151 provides guidance for the preparation of an adequate EIR:

- An EIR should be prepared with a sufficient degree of analysis to provide decision-makers with information that enables them to make a decision that intelligently takes account of the environmental consequences of a project.
- An evaluation of the environmental impacts of a project need not be exhaustive, but the sufficiency of an EIR is to be reviewed in light of what is reasonably feasible.
- Disagreement among experts does not make an EIR inadequate, but the EIR should summarize the main points of disagreement among the experts. (The courts have looked not for perfection but for adequacy, completeness, and a good-faith effort at full disclosure.)

In practice, this guidance suggests that EIR preparers should adopt a reasonable methodology upon which to estimate impacts and make reasonable assumptions using the best information reasonably available.

As discussed in Chapter 1, *Introduction*, because the Proposed Project's location and development parameters, including density, are consistent with the General Plan and M-2 Area Zoning Update (ConnectMenlo), the ConnectMenlo Program EIR (2016) serves as the first-tier environmental analysis for some of the effects of the Proposed Project (e.g., pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15152 and 15130(d)). Thus, this EIR tiers from the Program EIR, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15152, 15168, 15162, 15183, and 15130(d). Where an EIR has been prepared or certified for a program or plan, the environmental review for a later activity consistent with the program or plan should be limited to effects that were not analyzed as significant in the prior EIR or that are susceptible to substantial reduction or avoidance by the choice of specific revisions in the project, by the imposition of conditions, or by other means (CEQA Guidelines Section 15152[d]). By tiering from the ConnectMenlo EIR, the environmental analysis for the Proposed Project relies on the ConnectMenlo EIR, where applicable.

In many topic areas, the impacts of the Proposed Project are within the scope of the ConnectMenlo Program EIR, as determined in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Sections 15168 and 15162. In those cases, the Proposed Project would not have new or substantially more severe impacts than identified in the ConnectMenlo EIR, and there are not new or considerably different mitigation measures or alternatives that would substantially reduce significant impacts that the applicant has declined to adopt. Likewise, in many topic areas, there are no impacts peculiar to the Proposed Project that were not addressed in the ConnectMenlo EIR, or that would be substantially more severe than impacts identified in the ConnectMenlo EIR, or that cannot be substantially mitigated by the imposition of uniformly applied

development policies or standards, as determined in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15183. For such impacts, CEQA does not require preparation of a new EIR. Nonetheless, given the magnitude of the Proposed Project and the substantial public interest, the City of Menlo Park (City) chose to prepare an EIR that discusses all CEQA impacts of the Proposed Project, including those adequately addressed in the ConnectMenlo EIR. Thus, although the EIR tiers from the ConnectMenlo EIR, in accordance with CEQA, for purposes of providing comprehensive information, the EIR discusses all impacts, even when not required by CEQA.

On December 29, 2016, the City of East Palo Alto filed suit to challenge certification of the ConnectMenlo Final EIR. To resolve the litigation, the City of Menlo Park and the City of East Palo Alto entered into a settlement agreement. This EIR was prepared in accordance with the terms of the 2017 settlement agreement, which allows simplification in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15168 for all topic areas, except housing and transportation.

Organization of This Chapter

Each CEQA topic or environmental issue in this chapter is given its own section, each containing the subsections listed below.

- **Environmental Setting**—describes existing baseline conditions, including the environmental context and background. The environmental baseline for purposes of the analysis is discussed in detail below. As discussed in Chapter 2, *Project Description*, the Project Site includes the 59-acre main portion of the Project Site, which encompasses the Menlo Science and Technology Park, along with the 3.7-acre Hamilton Avenue Parcels with commercial uses.
- **Regulatory Setting**—describes federal, state, and local regulations regarding the impact topic that would be applicable to construction and operation of the Proposed Project.
- **Environmental Impacts**—makes reference to, and tiers from, the ConnectMenlo Final EIR, where appropriate. Standards of significance are identified and the Proposed Project's effects on baseline conditions are evaluated. If the change to baseline conditions would exceed the significance thresholds, this would constitute a significant impact, and mitigation measures to reduce, eliminate, or avoid the significant impacts would be suggested. This section also analyzes cumulative impacts, as described in detail below.

Determination of Significance

In accordance with Section 15022(a) of the CEQA Guidelines, the City uses the impact significance criteria designated by CEQA and suggested by CEQA Guidelines Appendix G. These criteria, as well as City-adopted significance criteria from the City's transportation impact analysis (TIA) guidelines for transportation impacts, are used to evaluate the impacts of the Proposed Project throughout this document. These criteria are listed at the beginning of the *Environmental Impacts* subsection under "Thresholds of Significance" throughout this chapter.

In determining whether impacts are significant, an EIR compares the potential impacts of a project with pre-project environmental conditions. Sections 15125(a) and 15126.2(a) of the CEQA Guidelines specify that the baseline normally consists of physical conditions that exist at the time the Notice of Preparation (NOP) is published or the time the environmental analysis begins. With the Proposed Project, the NOP

release date of September 18, 2019, serves as the environmental baseline from which impacts of the Proposed Project are measured. However, for some resource areas with data that were gathered at a later date, this date is considered the baseline and noted in each topical section as needed.

For each impact identified, a level of significance is determined using the classifications listed below. Significance determinations are indicated in ***bold, italicized*** text.

- ***No Impact (NI)*** denotes situations in which there is no possibility of an adverse effect on the environment.
- ***Less-than-Significant (LTS)*** impacts are effects that are noticeable but do not exceed established or defined thresholds or already are reduced below such thresholds (e.g., through compliance with applicable law or features of the Proposed Project).
- ***Significant*** impacts occur in cases in which the Proposed Project would have a significant impact on the environment.
- ***Potentially Significant (PS)*** impacts occur in cases in which it is not precisely clear whether a significant effect would occur. The analysis in these instances assesses probable conditions using conservative assumptions, but the discussion acknowledges that there is some uncertainty regarding the credible extent of the impact.

For each impact identified as being significant or potentially significant, the Draft EIR provides mitigation measures to reduce, eliminate, or avoid the adverse effect. Following analysis of the mitigation measures, a final conclusion is provided, as follows:

- ***Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation (LTS/M)*** is concluded when impacts would be significant or potentially significant, but implementation of Project-specific mitigation measures and/or mitigation measures from the ConnectMenlo EIR would reduce impacts to a level of less than significant.
- ***Significant and Unavoidable (SU)*** is concluded if the mitigation measures would not diminish the effects to less-than-significant levels.

CEQA does not require an analysis of impacts of the Project itself on Project occupants. Nonetheless, in the interest of full disclosure, this EIR does consider the impact of Project-related construction noise and vibration and air quality impacts on the Project's future residents and users that would occupy the Project Site following completion of the initial phase of the construction but before completion of construction of the full Project.

In addition, although transportation impacts under CEQA are no longer judged by the level of service (LOS) at intersections, this topic is addressed in the EIR for informational purposes only.

In Chapter 3, impacts are defined using an alphanumeric system that identifies the environmental topic of the impact. For example, NOI-1 denotes the presentation of the first impact in the Noise section. The abbreviated codes used to identify the environmental issues discussed in this chapter are listed below.

- AES—Aesthetics
- AQ—Air Quality
- BIO—Biological Resources
- CUL—Cultural Resources
- EN—Energy
- GEO—Geology and Soils
- GHG—Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- HAZ—Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- LU—Land Use
- NOI—Noise
- POP—Population and Housing
- PS—Public Services
- TRA—Transportation
- UT—Utilities and Service Systems
- HY—Hydrology and Water Quality

Mitigation Measures

The Proposed Project would be required to comply with all applicable mitigation measures identified in the ConnectMenlo Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP), which is a requirement of any proposed development project in the city. Mitigation measures identified in this Draft EIR were first tiered from the ConnectMenlo MMRP; then, if required, further measures were developed during the analysis to reduce, minimize, or avoid potential environmental impacts associated with the Proposed Project. Project-specific mitigation measures presented in this EIR have been developed by the City and ICF, the City's environmental consultant, unless otherwise noted. For certain mitigation measures, Peninsula Innovation Partners, LLC (Project Sponsor), provided the measures within technical studies, as cited in the respective sections. Mitigation measures provided by the Project Sponsor in technical studies have been peer reviewed by ICF and integrated as warranted.

According to CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4:

The discussion of mitigation measures shall distinguish between measures that are proposed by project proponents to be included in a project and other measures proposed by the lead, responsible, or trustee agency or other persons that were not included but the agency determines could reasonably be expected to reduce adverse impacts if required as conditions of approving the project. This discussion shall identify mitigation measures for each significant environmental effect identified in the EIR.

In this Draft EIR, mitigation measures are provided immediately following each significant or potentially significant impact. For mitigation measures from the ConnectMenlo EIR, the titles and numbers correspond with those in the ConnectMenlo EIR. Project-specific mitigation measures are numbered to correspond to the impacts they address. For example, Project-specific Mitigation Measure CUL-2.1 refers to the first mitigation measure for Impact CUL-2 in the Cultural Resources section.

If the Proposed Project is approved by the City Council, an MMRP must be adopted. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15097, an MMRP is a mechanism for monitoring and reporting revisions to a project or conditions of approval that the public agency required as mitigation to lessen or avoid a significant environmental effect. The City can conduct the reporting or monitoring, or it can delegate the responsibilities to another public agency or private entity that accepts the delegation. The MMRP for the Proposed Project will identify the specific monitoring actions that shall be completed, the various City departments or other entities that shall oversee completion of the mitigation, and a timeline for implementation of the measures. The responsible departments shall ensure that due diligence is carried out during implementation of the measures. Implementation of the MMRP would eliminate or reduce the severity of the significant impacts identified in this EIR.

Impacts Requiring No Further Analysis

Section 15128 of the CEQA Guidelines states that “an EIR shall contain a statement briefly indicating the reasons that various possible significant effects of a project were determined not to be significant and were therefore not discussed in detail in the EIR.” Implementation of the Proposed Project would not result in significant environmental impacts on agricultural and forestry resources or mineral resources. Therefore, these issues are not discussed further in Chapter 3 of this Draft EIR but are briefly summarized below.

Agricultural and Forestry Resources

The Project Site is within an urban area of the city. Specifically, the Project Site is within the Residential Mixed-Use (R-MU), Office (O), and Neighborhood Commercial, Special (C-2-S) zoning districts and classified as “Urban and Built-Up Land” by the State Department of Conservation. The Project Site is not used for agricultural production. Furthermore, it does not support forestry resources. Therefore, there would be no impact on agricultural and forestry resources, and no further analysis is required.

Mineral Resources

The Project Site is currently developed within an urban area. The ConnectMenlo Final EIR determined that there are no mineral resource recovery operations within the city. Therefore, there would be no impact related to mineral resources, and no further analysis is required.

Approach to Cumulative Impacts

In addition to the evaluation of project-specific impacts, CEQA also requires an evaluation of cumulative impacts. In accordance with CEQA, the discussion of cumulative impacts must reflect the severity of the impacts and the likelihood of their occurrence; however, the discussion need not be as detailed as the discussion of environmental impacts attributable to a project alone.

According to Section 15355 of the CEQA Guidelines:

The term “cumulative impacts” refers to two or more individual effects that, when considered together, are considerable or capable of compounding or increasing other environmental impacts.

- (a) The individual effects may be changes resulting from a single project or a number of separate projects.
- (b) The cumulative impact from several projects is the change in the environment that results from the incremental impact of a project when added to other closely related past, present, and reasonably foreseeable probable future projects. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant projects taking place over a period of time.

Throughout this EIR, cumulative impacts are denoted by a “C” (e.g., Impact C-NOI-1). An analysis of cumulative impacts follows the Project-specific impact evaluation and recommendation of mitigation measures in each section. In some instances, a Project-related impact may be considered less than significant but result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to significant cumulative impacts in combination with development in the surrounding area. Conversely, depending on the facts and circumstances, a Project-specific significant impact may not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact.

As discussed in Chapter 1, *Introduction*, this EIR tiers from the ConnectMenlo Program EIR, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15152 and 15168. ConnectMenlo included changes to the City's zoning map and rezoned specific properties to reflect City General Plan updates, including the new land uses within the Bayfront Area of the city. ConnectMenlo specifically identified the new development potential in the Bayfront Area (i.e., up to 2.3 million square feet of non-residential space; 400 hotel rooms; 4,500 residential units, of which 3,000 were assumed to be unrestricted units and 1,500 were assumed to be corporate housing units; 11,570 residents; and 5,500 employees).¹ The buildout potential for future development is expected to occur over a 24-year buildout horizon (from approximately 2016 to 2040).² CEQA Guidelines Section 15130 (d) permits a pertinent discussion of cumulative impacts contained in one or more previously certified EIRs to be incorporated by reference, pursuant to CEQA's tiering and program EIR provisions. When a project is consistent with a general plan and the lead agency determines that the cumulative impacts of the project were adequately addressed in the EIR for a general plan update, no further cumulative impacts analysis is required. The ConnectMenlo Program EIR adequately addressed the cumulative impacts of ConnectMenlo, and the Proposed Project is consistent with ConnectMenlo.³ Accordingly, the cumulative impacts analysis contained in the ConnectMenlo EIR is summarized in this Draft EIR.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15130(b)(1) sets forth two primary approaches to the analysis of cumulative impacts. The analysis can be based on (1) a list of past, present, and probable future projects producing related impacts that could combine with those of a proposed project or (2) a summary of projections contained in a general plan or related planning document. The methodology used depends on which approach appropriately captures the cumulative context for the resource topic being analyzed. An introductory statement that defines the cumulative geographic context that is being analyzed and whether the approach is a list-based or projections-based approach is included at the beginning of each cumulative impacts section. Unless otherwise noted, the approach taken is consistent with that of the ConnectMenlo EIR, with the following refinements:

- Where a projections-based approach was used in the ConnectMenlo EIR and the projections have been updated since the ConnectMenlo EIR was prepared (e.g., Association of Bay Area Governments/Metropolitan Transportation Commission projections), the projections are updated accordingly.
- Where a list-based approach was used, the following two projects, which were not included in the buildout considered in the ConnectMenlo EIR, are considered:
 - **123 Independence Drive.** This project proposes 432 residential dwelling units, which exceeds the number of unrestricted units studied in the ConnectMenlo EIR by 151 but does not exceed the number included in ConnectMenlo (i.e., 4,500 units). This EIR considers the additional unrestricted residential units. (The balance of the 123 Independence Drive project is within the ConnectMenlo assumptions.)

¹ The ConnectMenlo Final EIR included an evaluation of 4,500 residential units in the Bayfront Area, consisting of 3,000 unrestricted residential units and 1,500 corporate dormitory-style housing units on the Facebook East Campus (also known as the Classic Campus).

² Although the ConnectMenlo Final EIR assumed a buildout horizon of 2040, the maximum development potential may be reached sooner than anticipated. However, the ConnectMenlo Final EIR evaluated the maximum development potential that could occur at any given time and did not consider phased buildout of the development potential; therefore, no new or additional impacts are anticipated as a result of the expedited buildout.

³ As evaluated in this EIR, the minor revisions to the circulation plan proposed by the Project do not affect the environmental analysis.

- **East Palo Alto Projects.** In June 2016, in response to a water shortage, East Palo Alto adopted a moratorium that prohibited new or expanded water service connections for a period of 2 years.⁴ The moratorium effectively halted new development within East Palo Alto’s jurisdictional boundary; for that reason, the ConnectMenlo EIR did not consider East Palo Alto projects in the cumulative scenario. In 2018, the City of Palo Alto entered into an agreement with the City of East Palo Alto to permanently transfer 1.5 million gallons of water per day.⁵ Because of the increased water supply, the moratorium was lifted, and East Palo Alto was again able to proceed with development applications. For this reason, and given the proximity of currently proposed projects in East Palo Alto to the Project Site, the cumulative scenario for the Proposed Project considers development projects that are under construction, approved, or pending in East Palo Alto.

Past, present, and probable future projects known at the time of preparation of this Draft EIR are included in Tables 3.0-1 and 3.0-2 and shown in Figure 3.0-1, Cumulative Projects. These include Menlo Park projects, which are listed in Table 3.0-1, and East Palo Alto projects, which are listed in Table 3.0-2. These are projects for which an application is on file or projects that have been entitled but have not, as of the time when the EIR analysis was initiated (September 2019), begun construction, and projects currently under construction.⁶ As shown, these projects include new residential, office, hotel, and mixed-use projects. As described above, with the exception of the additional unrestricted residential units proposed as part of the 123 Independence Drive project, all of the listed Menlo Park projects were considered in ConnectMenlo. Thus, where a list-based approach was used, this EIR adds to the ConnectMenlo analysis only the additional unrestricted units in the 123 Independence Drive and the East Palo Alto projects.

⁴ City of East Palo Alto. 2021. *City Council Staff Report, Proposed Minimum Purchase Obligation Transfer from the City of Mountain View to the City of East Palo Alto*. February 16.

⁵ City of Palo Alto. 2018. *City Council Staff Report, Approval of the City of Palo Alto’s Addendum to the Negative Declaration Adopted by the City of East Palo Alto, and Approval of an Agreement for the Permanent Transfer of a Portion of the City of Palo Alto’s Individual Supply Guarantee to the City of East Palo Alto*. May 7.

⁶ Although this list of projects is based on the Proposed Project’s NOP date, the City subsequently determined that the list of projects should be updated as of December 2020. Table 3.0-1 and Table 3.0-2 reflect the planned projects as of December 2020, with the exception of the proposed 123 Independence Drive project, which was subsequently revised by the Project Sponsor in June 2021 to remove the office component and increase the residential dwelling units.

Table 3.0-1. Cumulative Projects – Menlo Park

ID	Address	Land Use (net change) and Unit						Status
		Office (sf)	Retail/ Commercial (sf)	R&D/Light Industrial (sf) ^a	Other (sf)	Hotel (rooms)	Residential (du)	
1	105–155 Constitution Dr (Menlo Gateway Phase 2)	361,362	—	—	—	—	—	Under construction, temporary occupancy
2	1285 El Camino Real (aka 1283–1295 El Camino Real)	-4,474	—	—	—	—	15	Completed
3	133 Encinal Ave (Roger Reynolds)	—	-6,166	—	—	—	24	Completed
4	1010–1026 Alma St	25,156	-9,948	—	—	—	—	Completed
5	650–660 Live Oak Ave (Minkoff Group)	10,858	—	—	—	—	15	Completed
6	1275 El Camino Real	9,334	603	—	—	—	3	Approved, under construction
7	301–309 Constitution Dr (Facebook Expansion Project)	835,388	—	-384,675	—	200	—	Under construction, Building 21 completed, temporary occupancy granted for Building 22, hotel construction proposed
8	500 El Camino Real (Stanford)	142,840	10,286	-70,545	—	—	215	Approved, under construction
9	150 Jefferson Dr (new magnet high school)	—	—	-43,986	40,000 ^b	—	—	Partially completed (9 th , 10 th , and 11 th grades only)
10	1300 El Camino Real (Greenheart)	203,000	8,600	—	—	—	183	Approved, under construction
11	1021 Evelyn St (841 Menlo Ave)	6,610	—	—	—	—	3	Approved, proposed construction
12	2111–2121 Sand Hill Road (Stanford)	39,010	—	—	—	—	—	Pending construction
13	1430 O'Brien Dr	—	7,652	66,583	10,223 ^c	—	—	Completed

ID	Address	Land Use (net change) and Unit						Status
		Office (sf)	Retail/ Commercial (sf)	R&D/Light Industrial (sf) ^a	Other (sf)	Hotel (rooms)	Residential (du)	
14	40 Middlefield Rd	3,584	—	—	—	—	—	Approved, proposed construction
15	949 El Camino Real (Guild Theatre)	—	—	—	6,682 ^d	—	—	Approved, under construction
16	1540 El Camino Real	40,759	-23,536	—	—	—	27	Approved, under construction
17	115 El Camino Real	—	1,543	—	—	-13	4	Approved, proposed construction
18	506-556 Santa Cruz Ave	17,877	-7,458	—	—	—	—	Under construction, temporary occupancy
19	1125 Merrill St	4,366	-1,887	—	—	—	1	Under construction, temporary occupancy
20	409 Glenwood Ave	—	—	—	—	—	5	Approved, proposed construction
21	1350 Adams Court (1315 O'Brien Drive)	—	—	260,400	—	—	—	Pending construction
22	111 Independence Dr	-15,000	746	—	—	—	105	Pending construction
23	1125 O'Brien Dr	—	2,760	68,881	—	—	—	Pending construction
24	162-164 Jefferson Dr (151 Commonwealth Dr)	249,500	—	—	—	—	—	Pending construction
25	555 Willow Rd	-1,400	—	—	—	—	3	Pending construction
26	1704 El Camino Real (Boutique Hotel - Hampton Inn)	—	—	—	—	18	—	Pending construction
27	706-716 Santa Cruz Ave	23,454	-3,140	—	—	—	4	Approved, proposed construction
28	1345 Willow Rd	—	—	—	—	—	58	Approved, proposed construction
29	201 El Camino Real	—	1,127	—	—	—	10	Approved, proposed construction

ID	Address	Land Use (net change) and Unit						Status
		Office (sf)	Retail/ Commercial (sf)	R&D/Light Industrial (sf) ^a	Other (sf)	Hotel (rooms)	Residential (du)	
30	141 Jefferson Dr (Menlo Uptown)	—	2,940	-108,411	—	—	483	Pending construction
31	1162 El Camino Real	—	-11,062	—	—	—	9	Pending construction
32	3723 Haven Ave (Hotel Moxy)	—	—	-13,700	—	—	163	Pending construction
33	110 Constitution Dr and 115 Independence Dr (Menlo Portal)	-4,922	1,608	-25,091	—	—	335	Pending construction
34	301 Constitution Drive (Citizen M Hotel Conditional Development Permit Amendment) ^e	—	—	—	—	40	—	Approved, proposed construction
35	1075 O'Brien Dr	94,617	9,869	-26,715	—	—	—	Pending construction
36	1550 El Camino Real	18,500	—	—	—	—	8	Pending construction
37	165 Jefferson Drive (Menlo Flats)	-24,300	15,000	—	—	—	158	Pending construction
38	123 Independence Drive (Sobrato Mixed Use) ^f	88,750	—	-108,461	—	—	432	Pending construction
Total		2,120,395	-1,304	-385,720	56,905	245	2,278	

Source: City of Menlo Park. 2020.

Notes:

Although this list is based on the Proposed Project’s NOP date, the list is updated to reflect the various projects’ status as of December 2020 and more recent setting conditions relative to the Proposed Project.

Table includes all projects in Menlo Park that have filed a complete development application for five or more net new residential units or 5,000 sf or more of net new commercial development.

Some projects involve structure demolition. Demolished buildings are listed for only projects that receive credit for traffic purposes.

- a. This category includes manufacturing.
- b. This is a school that will accommodate up to 400 students.
- c. This is a fitness gym for the campus.
- d. This is an entertainment venue.
- e. Forty additional hotel rooms are being requested, beyond the 200 listed in the Facebook Campus Expansion Project detailed earlier in this list; project remains subject to the West Campus trip cap.
- f. The property at 123 Independence Drive exceeds the number of residential units studied in the ConnectMenlo EIR but does not exceed the total cap on residential units. A full EIR is required; the 151 additional units should be considered in cumulative analyses for other projects in the city.

sf = square feet; du = dwelling unit

Table 3.0-2. Cumulative Projects – East Palo Alto

ID	Address	Land Use (net change) and Unit						Status
		Office (sf)	Retail/ Commercial (sf)	R&D/Light Industrial (sf) ^a	Other (sf)	Hotel (rooms)	Residential (du)	
A	1039 and 1063 Garden Street (KIPP School)	—	—	—	—	—	—	Approved
B	1960 Tate Street (Woodland Park Euclid Improvements)	—	—	—	—	—	444	Proposed
C	1893 Woodland Avenue (Glory Mobile Home Park Conversion Impact Report)	—	—	—	—	—	-30	Approved
D	717 Donohoe Street	—	—	—	—	—	14	Proposed
E	2340 Cooley Avenue	—	—	—	—	—	6	Proposed
F	1201 Runnymede Street	—	—	—	—	—	32	Approved
G	760 Weeks Street	—	—	—	—	—	10	Approved
H	990 Garden Street	—	—	—	—	—	7	Proposed
I	2519 Pulgas Avenue (The Sobrato Office Project)	65,000	—	—	—	—	—	Proposed
J	2535 Pulgas Avenue (JobTrain Office Project)	102,478	—	-4,500	—	—	—	Proposed
K	2050 University Avenue (University Circle Phase II)	180,00	—	—	—	—	—	Proposed
L	151 Tara Street/264 Tara Street/230 Demeter Street/ 350 Demeter Street/391 Demeter Street (East Palo Alto Waterfront Project)	750,000	50,000	550,000	40,000	—	260	Proposed
M	1990 Bay Road/1175 Weeks Street/ 1250 Weeks Street (The Landing at EPA - Harvest Properties)	879,979	23,521	-15,000	23,500	—	—	Proposed
N	1675 Bay Road (Four Corners)	—	40,000	500,000	—	—	180	Proposed
O	2020 Bay Road	1,381,460	3,500	—	18,000	—	—	Proposed
P	1804 Bay Road	—	1,903	—	5,936	—	75	Approved
Total		3,178,917	118,924	1,035,000	87,436	0	998	

sf = square feet; du = dwelling unit