

CITY OF MENLO PARK
PLANNING COMMISSION

DRAFT EIR AND DRAFT FIA)
FACEBOOK CAMPUS PROJECT)
_____)

REGULAR MEETING

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

MONDAY, JANUARY 9, 2012

MENLO PARK CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

Reported by: MARK I. BRICKMAN, CSR RPR
License No. 5527

ATTENDEES

THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

Vincent Bressler - Chairperson
Katie Ferrick - Vice Chairperson
Ben Eiref
John O'Malley -
John Kadvany
Henry Riggs
Peipei Yu

THE CITY STAFF:

Justin Murphy - Development Services Manager
Chip Taylor - Public Works Director
Rachel Grossman - Associate Planner
Bill McClure - City Attorney
Leigh Prince - Assistant City Attorney

SUPPORT CONSULTANTS:

Erin Efner
Kirsten Chapman
Mark Spencer
Paul Stanis
Ron Golem

---o0o---

BE IT REMEMBERED that, pursuant to Notice

of the Meeting, and on January 9, 2012, 7:05 PM at the
Menlo Park City Council Chambers, 701 Laurel Street,
Menlo Park, California, before me, MARK I. BRICKMAN, CSR
No. 5527, State of California, there commenced a Planning
Commission meeting under the provisions of the City of
Menlo Park.

---o0o---

MEETING DETAILS (re Facebook discussion)

Page

Presentation by Rachel Grossman	24, 48
Presentation by Chip Taylor	40
Public Comments	59
Planning Commission EIR questions	136
Presentation by Ron Golem	178
Planning Commission FIA questions	184
Adjourned	224

CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: I'd like to call the meeting to order, please.

Welcome to the Planning Commission meeting for January 9th, 2012. I will introduce the Planning Commissioners.

On my far left is Commissioner Jack O'Malley, Ben Eiref, Katie Ferrick, and to my immediate right, John Kadvany, Henry Riggs and Peipei Yu.

My name is Vince Bressler. We have with staff tonight, Justin Murphy, Development Services Manager. Is Chip here?

MR. McCLURE: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Chip Taylor, Public Works Director, welcome. Rachel Grossman, Associate Planner, Bill McClure, our City Attorney, and Leigh Prince, who's the Assistant City Attorney. We also have Deanna -- Deanna Chow.

Okay. Moving on, Reports and Announcements. Under Reports and Announcements, Staff and Commission members may communicate general information of interest regarding matters within the jurisdiction of the Commission. No Commission discussion or action can occur on any of these presented items.

We have one item and three sub-items to update on planning -- pending planning items. We have 3000 Sand

1 Hill Road. I'll let you take it, I guess, Deanna.

2 MS. CHOW: Great. Thank you, Commissioner
3 Bressler.

4 So a couple of updates on pending planning
5 items that will be going before the City Council or will
6 be before the City Council.

7 The first is 3000 Sand Hill Road, which was
8 heard by the City Council on December 13th, 2011. That
9 was for modification and a conditional development permit
10 for modification to a restaurant use at Restaurant 3000.

11 That was unanimously approved by the City
12 Council.

13 The next item is the item appearing before the
14 City Council tomorrow evening is related to a Facebook
15 Draft EIR comment review period.

16 There were several letters received that
17 requested one by the City of East Palo Alto, one by the
18 Sierra Club, and one received by the Committee for Green
19 Foothills to extend the review period for the EIR which
20 currently ends on January 23rd.

21 That will be discussed on tomorrow's City
22 Council meeting, whether or not to maintain existing
23 dates, extend it by one week or to look at options up
24 to -- that the three letters had provided.

25 And then the third item is for 116 O'Connor

1 Street. That was an item that the Planning Commission
2 reviewed on -- four items on the determination for items
3 related to secondary dwelling units, a bathroom addition,
4 non-conforming structure and the use of a garage, and
5 that item has been appealed to the City Council and will
6 be heard on January 24th, and the item that was appealed
7 was determination on the use of the accessory structure
8 as a secondary dwelling unit.

9 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Thank you.

10 I don't see any questions, so we'll move on.

11 Public comments. This is item B. Under
12 Public Comments, the public may address the Commission on
13 any subject which was not listed on the agenda within the
14 jurisdiction of the Commission.

15 When you do so, please state your name and
16 city or political jurisdiction. That goes for any
17 comments we receive on items later, as well.

18 And for the record, the Commission cannot
19 respond to non-agendized items other than to receive
20 testimony and to provide general information.

21 Would anyone like to make a comment on an item
22 that's not on the agenda tonight? No one's coming
23 forward, so I will close public comment section B.

24 Moving on to item C, Consent Calendar. Items
25 on the consent calendar are routine in nature, require no

1 further discussion by the Planning Commission and may be
2 acted under one motion unless a member of the Planning
3 Commission or staff requests a separate discussion.

4 We have two items on the consent calendar. We
5 have approval of the December 2011 Planning Commission
6 meeting, and acceptance of the draft of the attendance
7 report card.

8 I see a light. Henry.

9 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: Yes. I'll move
10 acceptance of the consent item with the updates we've had
11 regarding the Commission meeting report.

12 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Noted.

13 COMMISSIONER FERRICK: Second.

14 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Okay. I'll call for
15 the vote on that item. All in favor? That's unanimous.
16 Okay.

17 Okay. We haven't voted on the attendance
18 report. I'll accept that. Does anyone want to second
19 that?

20 COMMISSIONER YU: I'll second.

21 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Any Comments? All in
22 favor.

23 (Unanimous).

24 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Okay. That's taken
25 care of.

1 Okay. So we're finished with the Consent
2 Calendar. Moving on to Regular Business.

3 Item number 1, review of substantial
4 conformance, Roxy Rapp, 1706 El Camino Real. Review of a
5 proposed material and building design modification for
6 specs for substantial conformance on an approved but not
7 yet constructed medical office building in the C-4
8 general commercial El Camino Real zoning district.

9 Does staff have anything to add to the
10 materials that were previously presented?

11 MS. CHOW: Yes, thank you, Chair Bressler.

12 Since the release of the Planning Commission
13 packet, staff has received one piece of correspondence
14 from Carl Danielson of the Dahlin Group on the subject
15 item.

16 The letter was also e-mailed to the Planning
17 Commission by Mr. Danielson and I provided a hard copy at
18 the dais this evening.

19 In the letter, Mr. Dahlin states that the
20 proposed plans are in substantial conformance with the
21 original design, but that the design modifications do not
22 enhance the project.

23 He asks that the Planning Commission do not
24 accept the design modification.

25 Mr. Dahlin also notes that as the original

1 architect of the project, the Dahlin Group has the
2 copyright to the design and this final approval for the
3 building permit be delayed until the applicant receives
4 the rights to the original design.

5 The City Attorney has reviewed the
6 correspondence and considers the issue of copyright to be
7 a matter between the Dahlin Group and the new applicant
8 and Not an issue for the City.

9 This issue should also not be a basis for
10 jurisdiction for a continuance or to delay the
11 determination of whether the proposed revisions are in
12 substantial conformance with the approved plans.

13 The Planning Commission should this evening
14 therefore consider whether the proposed changes are in
15 substantial conformance with the approved plan.

16 The proposed changes are highlighted in the
17 memo, and the approved colors and material boards are
18 being passed around at the dais currently.

19 The Planning Commission has several options.
20 One, to make a determination that the proposed changes
21 are in substantial conformance; two, to make a
22 determination that the proposed changes are in
23 substantial conformance with minor provisions, and with
24 these two options, there would be no further review and
25 the applicant would proceed with the building permit with

1 these modifications.

2 Alternatively a third option for the Planning
3 Commission is to make a determination that the proposed
4 changes are in southbound conformance.

5 If this is the direction, then the applicant
6 has the option to either modify these plans to -- the
7 approved plans or request an architectural control
8 revision which would be reviewed by the Planning
9 Commission at a future date

10 This concludes staff comments and I'm
11 available for questions.

12 Thank you.

13 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: I just don't want
14 too -- this copyright issue, since you're here, Bill,
15 maybe you can comment on that a little bit.

16 MR. McCLURE: Yeah. It's really an issue
17 between the architect and the architect and not an issue
18 for the city.

19 If there is a copyright violation or an
20 alleged copyright violation, they have certain rights and
21 remedies they can pursue against the applicant.

22 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Okay. Any other
23 questions for staff?

24 At this point, we invite the applicant to come
25 forward, if the applicant is here, and would wish to make

1 any presentation or clarify anything.

2 MR. RAPP: Good evening. I know you've got a
3 long night tonight with Facebook, so I'm going to make it
4 short and sweet.

5 This is -- Michelle Ney with Devcon is our
6 architect and works also for the contractor that will be
7 building the building. So she's here to answer any
8 questions that you may have, and I really look forward to
9 building another beautiful building in Menlo Park.

10 Thank you.

11 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: I'm sorry. I didn't
12 get your name.

13 I'm Roxy Rapp. I'm sorry. And Michelle Ney.

14 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Thank you.

15 MS. NEY: I'm Michelle Ney, architect for the
16 project and I'm here to answer any questions that you may
17 have.

18 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Okay.

19 COMMISSIONER FERRICK: Could you just
20 describe what the changes are just so that --

21 MS. NEY: Sure. As an overview, the
22 previously approved design had a different color pallet.
23 It had an arched entry that was casted in a very
24 whimsical, kind of a fun way.

25 The materials that are being proposed are

1 actually -- instead of a cementitious tile, we're using
2 real French clay tile imported from France.

3 The colors of the plaster are slightly richer.
4 They're kind of more conducive to a more classical
5 conservative style of the building.

6 We've taken the canted arch and made it much m
7 ore classic traditional in feel, and major -- the other
8 changes are very minor, actually, in nature.

9 The trellis, instead of being a wood trellis,
10 it's metal which will certainly assist in maintenance
11 over the course of time.

12 The downspouts, instead of being exposed along
13 the premised building are being collected in collector
14 boxes and routed through the walls. Fairly simple.

15 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Any other questions
16 for this applicant?

17 Thank you. I see no lights.

18 I haven't received any cards on this item, but
19 I'm going to open up the public comment.

20 There's a card for this item? Okay. Welcome.

21 MR. DANIELSON: Good evening. I'm Carl
22 Danielson and I was the original architect.

23 I think the City Attorney's right. This is
24 not a legal matter for you to have any jurisdiction on
25 copyright.

1 I think it's important to bring to your
2 attention that this is going on, as you know you strive
3 to have, you know, very nice design in your city, and
4 it's unfortunate that the time and effort that was put
5 into this, that that -- our efforts's not being
6 recognized and in fact, we were not paid for that effort.

7 One item that was mentioned -- mention that --
8 mention that Michelle Ney was the architect.

9 If that was the case, I would suggest that she
10 stamp and sign the plans, because the set I reviewed of
11 the City had no architectural stamp on, and if there is
12 an architect of record, I think it would be appropriate
13 that that be applied to it.

14 I'm not going to get into the details of the
15 design. The only thing that I've been able to review was
16 a plan set in the Building Department and it is
17 substantially the same as ours, so I would let you go
18 ahead and -- and vote on that.

19 I think there are some tweaks to it. I not
20 necessarily agree with those, but I think I'll let the
21 Commission decide on that.

22 Other than that, I'll let you deliberate and
23 I'm here to answer any questions if you want.

24 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Okay. Thank you.

25 Do we have any other speakers on this item?

1 I don't think so, so I'm going to close public
2 comment on this item and that's how we bring it back up
3 here.

4 Does anyone have comments? Motions? Jack.

5 COMMISSIONER O'MALLEY: I have a comment.

6 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Okay.

7 COMMISSIONER O'MALLEY: I just wanted to make
8 the point that I like the original approved building
9 better than this one, but I agree with staff that the new
10 plans are in substantial conformance with the original
11 plans.

12 So if you want a motion, I'll make a motion
13 that we take staff's recommendations.

14 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Okay. Henry?

15 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: Microphone's falling
16 apart here.

17 I wanted to make an observation. I'm not
18 prepared to make a second because I wanted to raise the
19 issue that concerns me.

20 My -- personally, although I agree with Jack
21 that I preferred the original design and thought it had a
22 signature entry.

23 Mr. Rapp does not build unattractive or low
24 quality buildings. We already know that from experience.

25 I think the question here is whether as a

1 result and part of public hearings back in 2009, the
2 public speakers and the neighbors to the building were
3 expecting to have a building that in one measurable way
4 had a different character to it.

5 And so the question for me is whether I can
6 call this an equivalent or -- or substantially conforming
7 given that this back in 2009 was a very contentious
8 building design.

9 In fact, the original architect, after having
10 done a full building design was dismissed, and the Dahlin
11 Group has hired and they had to start over.

12 So I would just ask -- sort of introduce to
13 the Commission that that might be the issue of our
14 discussion tonight, and we might find that the public
15 probably had enough information that, you know, this and
16 that were interchangeable, or maybe we should allow the
17 public and the neighbors to see the new designs.

18 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Okay.

19 COMMISSIONER FERRICK: I just have a question
20 for Deanna.

21 Is -- were the neighbors notified about the
22 substantial conformance hearing?

23 MS. CHOW: Of this particular hearing, they
24 were not notified. If it was to go through architectural
25 control revision, then there would be notice to the

1 neighbors.

2 COMMISSIONER FERRICK: Thank you. Actually,
3 I'll just continue that.

4 That was my hesitation in seconding, too,
5 because I remember quite a few neighbors having some
6 strong opinions about what they wanted this building to
7 look like.

8 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Okay. So we have a
9 motion. Go ahead.

10 COMMISSIONER YU: I wanted to ask Applicant
11 why they choose to change the entryway.

12 MR. RAPP: The main reason is just more
13 classical. It's going to be a medical building. The
14 doctor's are a little more conservative.

15 I think, you know, the time that this was
16 designed, our economy was different. We wanted to be
17 able to fill it with tenants that want quality and not so
18 much whimsical, and it's just a standard classic you
19 would see at Stanford or a Mediterranean type building,
20 and we're detailing the arch with stone all the way
21 around it on both sides.

22 And most all the other changes are just all
23 cosmetic and just a little bit better materials.

24 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Okay. I don't
25 remember this being controversial so much about the --

1 maybe I'm confusing this with another project, but was
2 the design actually controversial on this? It wasn't
3 just the parking? It wasn't the access?

4 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: Comments about 1906 were
5 in some cases less than -- less than diplomatic, and so
6 when this 1706 came forward with the same architecture
7 essentially --

8 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Okay.

9 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: That was all from
10 memory. CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: I don't want to
11 spend too much time. We -- maybe we can -- I'll give you
12 a change to talk about it, John, if you have something to
13 say.

14 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: No, but I was going to
15 reinforce what you said.

16 My memory was that at this point, when we had
17 the new design, it was more about the parking and the
18 access, neighbors.

19 You know, I agree with what Henry said
20 about -- and Katie about process, but, you know, whether
21 or not it would make -- you know, there were being strong
22 ascent from this option given the materials, I'm not so
23 sure.

24 If this came up first, I'm sure people -- you
25 know, what we talked about two years ago, I'm sure people

1 would be quite happy with it.

2 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Yeah. That's my
3 sense, too. I have no problems going with staff reports.
4 I don't think -- do we have a second on this -- I'll
5 second it.

6 Katie.

7 COMMISSIONER FERRICK: I just wanted to ask
8 the applicant.

9 The parking and access and number of spaces
10 and all of that remains unchanged? Okay. Thank you.

11 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Applicant agrees that
12 that is the case.

13 Okay. So we do have a motion and a second.
14 I'd like to call for the vote unless anybody has
15 something else to say.

16 I'll call for the vote on this. All in favor?
17 All against? Abstaining? Did you call?

18 COMMISSIONER EIREF: I don't have any of the
19 context. I wasn't on the Commission --

20 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Okay.

21 COMMISSIONER EIREF: -- two years ago.

22 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Thank you. We'll call
23 that a discussion.

24 COMMISSIONER EIREF: It looks fine to me,
25 though.

1 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Thank you. It looks
2 like a good quality project, then.

3 COMMISSIONER YU: I've got a question. I
4 wasn't on the Commission when the original decision was
5 made, but I'm voting for the motion.

6 Should I abstain, as well?

7 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: I don't think it
8 matters because you've seen both. It's up to you.

9 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Okay. Moving on to
10 public hearings. We have review and comment on the Draft
11 Environmental Impact Report. Verbal comments may be
12 submitted to this meeting, and we have a lot of them. we
13 have almost thirty cards now, so, let's see. I'll
14 continue with this.

15 Conditional Development Permit Revision,
16 Development Agreement and Environmental Review for
17 Facebook, 1601 Willow Road, East Campus, 1312 and 1313
18 Constitution Drive, that's west campus, Facebook campus
19 project.

20 We have three sub items A, Conditional
21 Development Permit Revision for the East Campus to be
22 amended -- to amend the existing land use approvals to
23 eliminate the maximum employee cap of 3,600 individuals
24 and substitute a vehicular trip cap.

25 The proposed AM and PM two-hour peak period

1 trip caps of 2,600 vehicular trips and a proposed daily
2 trip cap of 15,000 vehicular trips would accommodate an
3 increase in employees at the site beyond the current
4 limitation of 3,600.

5 Sub item B, Development Agreement for the East
6 Campus to define the long-term land use intentions,
7 specific terms and conditions for the development and the
8 public benefits that would apply and create vested rights
9 from the project approvals.

10 And sub item C is the Draft Environmental
11 Impact Report to analyze the potential environmental
12 impacts of the proposed project for the East Campus and
13 to analyze the maximum development potential for the West
14 Campus consistent with the M-2 general industrial maximum
15 floor area ratio for office use of 45 percent, but in
16 excess of the M-2 maximum building height of 35 feet.

17 So we'll -- I'll call these out again in
18 somewhat less detail as we go through them, and I've
19 already introduced staff.

20 So Justin, do you have anything to add to the
21 report we have?

22 MR. MURPHY: Yes, this evening, we do have a
23 presentation that Rachel Grossman, Associate Planner and
24 Chip Taylor, Public Works Director will be providing. So
25 that was the next step of the agenda.

1 I would just like to announce a few things,
2 that we did run out of agendas earlier, but we've made
3 some copies, and for those in the back, hopefully we
4 still have a few left of those. Perhaps we can assist
5 people in understanding where we are in the agenda.

6 And then the other thing is I understood that
7 we ran out of speaker cards. We have provided more
8 speaker cards.

9 From this point forward, if people could bring
10 in speaker cards to me, that would be helpful for the
11 meeting management, and there are three different
12 Facebook items, so it is important for people to put down
13 the specific a agenda item that they're looking to speak
14 under.

15 So with that, I'll turn it over to Rachel,
16 unless there's any other basic procedural questions
17 that --

18 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Actually, I have a
19 question. Of course most of these people have submitted
20 cards and they do know about what you just said.

21 So is there a problem with taking the comments
22 up-front and not worrying too much about that?

23 MR. MURPHY: The -- the only -- I think
24 procedurally, we can handle it as most people are most
25 likely looking to speak on the EIR, which would be item

1 E-1.

2 As people make comments, we do have a court
3 reporter here that's going to be providing -- preparing
4 transcripts of the meeting.

5 When -- as part of the EIR process, there's a
6 need to prepare response to comments for the Final EIR.
7 If people are speaking tonight and it's actually not
8 deemed a comment on the EIR, then that would just be
9 noted in the response to comments.

10 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: I see.

11 MR. MURPHY: So that's the kind of the only
12 issue.

13 So if someone is speaking, it may be helpful
14 that they will clarify that they are indeed speaking
15 about the EIR. If they're not speaking about the EIR,
16 they can preface their comment with that.

17 It would be -- another option is as their name
18 is called, if they didn't intend to speak under the EIR,
19 they can say that they meant to speak under the two
20 subsequent items, one about the fiscal impact analysis or
21 the study session dealing with public benefit.

22 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Okay.

23 MR. MURPHY: So those are a couple options.

24 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: So just to be clear
25 about this, the -- the EIR discussion becomes part --

1 EIR's Environmental Impact Report. That's the big
2 document we have here, and it details the traffic loads,
3 pollution, noise, things of that nature.

4 If you have concerns about that, that's the
5 EIR, that gets into the official transcript. It's a
6 legal document.

7 Okay. We're also going to talk about the
8 Fiscal Impact Report. That's a different -- complete
9 different item here, and we're also going to talk about
10 the Development Agreement.

11 This would be things in the nature of if you
12 want to improve public amenities to be the benefit from
13 this project, that's a completely different item that
14 we're going to talk about here.

15 Now, obviously we can take all that in and
16 we'll be hearing whatever you have to say, but those are
17 the three items, and the first one that we're talking
18 about is the -- the EIR.

19 Okay. So with that, let's -- yes.

20 COMMISSIONER EIREF: So let's say
21 hypothetically that were a lot of people that wanted to
22 talk about bicycle paths, things like that, where do you
23 want to -- I sense this maybe.

24 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: I believe that would
25 be the study session, which is the public is -- it will

1 be item G-1. We're on item E right now, so that's down a
2 lot of ways.

3 On the other land, I'm concerned that some of
4 those people might not want to stick around and make
5 those comments, as well.

6 So I'm not really going to have too tight
7 fisted about this.

8 COMMISSIONER EIREF: Fair enough.

9 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: All right. Rachel.

10 MS. GROSSMAN: Thank you. Good evening
11 Commission and Chair Bressler. Thank you for having us
12 this evening.

13 As you just clarified, the presentation that
14 Mr. Taylor and I are about to provide will focus on the
15 Draft Environmental Impact Report as this is the formal
16 public hearing to take comments on the Draft
17 Environmental Impact Report.

18 Prior to this evening, staff has had seven
19 informational meetings with Commissions and the general
20 public to provide an overview again of the project and
21 the Draft Environmental Impact Report and the processes
22 for commenting on this document.

23 So then we focus again on the project summary
24 and summary of the Draft Environmental Impact Report.

25 So first I'll be going through an overview of

1 the project locations and description of the proposed
2 project, and then I'll give an overview of the California
3 Environmental Quality Act or CEQA, as some of you may
4 have heard it referred to, and next I'll jump into the
5 summary of the conclusions of the Draft Environmental
6 Impact Report focusing on those areas that have
7 significant and unavoidable impacts.

8 Then I'll move into a discussion of the next
9 steps in the process for the project, and then finally as
10 Mr. Murphy and the chair alluded to, we'll be having a
11 formal public comment session with the court reporter
12 here to take all of those comments, and those will be
13 responded to in our Final Environmental Impact Report.

14 So to give you all an overview of the project
15 location, as -- as it says in the staff report, there is
16 a two-phased component of this project. There is the
17 East Campus, which was previously the Sun campus, which
18 is approximately 57 acres in size and is currently
19 developed with nine buildings totaling approximately one
20 million square feet.

21 And across the way, there's the proposed West
22 Campus development, which is approximately 22 acres.
23 Currently a portion of this site is developed and those
24 existing two buildings would be demolished as a part of
25 this project.

1 For context here, we also have Bayfront that
2 divides the two sites where Highway 84, Willow Road being
3 the most proximate intersection of these two sites.

4 So as far as the project description goes,
5 again, this is a two-phased project. So that we're
6 thinking at first, we have existing land use entitlement
7 applications submitted for the East Campus component of
8 the project, and what the applicant is seeking to do on
9 the East Campus is to amend an existing employee cap, to
10 actually get rid of that and instead have a vehicular
11 trip cap.

12 So a little bit more information about the
13 proposed vehicular trip cap.

14 To clarify, this is actually part of the
15 project as proposed by the applicant. This is part of
16 the project components, and the trip cap, the numbers
17 that we have as far as the trip cap are derived from
18 survey rates specific to Facebook employee travel
19 patterns.

20 So there is vehicle surveys done at their old
21 campus in Palo Alto in order to come up with the
22 vehicular trip cap numbers, and you can find those in
23 appendix 3.5E of our Draft Environmental Impact Report.

24 In addition, there's also -- in appendix 3.5F
25 of the Draft Environmental Impact Report, there is a trip

1 cap policy statement, which is a City document, which
2 indicates how the trip cap would be monitored and
3 enforced.

4 So specifically a number of people have asked
5 about what exactly's in the trip cap, so I just want to
6 briefly touch on there. There were three elements of the
7 trip cap, which are specific to the East Campus
8 components of the project site.

9 The first is a 15,000 daily vehicular trip
10 limit, and then there are two peak period trip caps of
11 2,600 trips.

12 There is -- this is an AM peak as well as a PM
13 peak period, and these periods are two hours in length,
14 with the morning running from 7:00 to 9:00 AM and the
15 afternoons running to 4:00 -- from 4:00 to 6:00 PM.

16 So we have the East Campus and then we also
17 have the West Campus component of the project. If you've
18 had the opportunity to look at the project plans, you'll
19 see that it's just bulk and massing of those structures.

20 The applicant has not yet submitted for land
21 use entitlements for the West Campus, but this two-phase
22 project in totality is being analyzed in the Draft EIR.

23 So as part of the part on the West Campus, the
24 applicant is seeking to develop to the maximum floor area
25 permitted under the M-2 or general industrial zoning

1 designation, but exceed the height permissible in that
2 zoning designation.

3 So because of that, a Conditional Development
4 Permit would be required as well as a rezone to include
5 the X zone of the site for that development to be able to
6 move forward, and as I indicated previously, the
7 applicant anticipates submitting land use entitlements
8 sometime later this year.

9 So many of you are familiar with the existing
10 East Campus. Just to give -- by way of context, we've
11 got Bayfront Expressway the Willow Road as a terminus
12 into the campus.

13 The Bayshore Shoreline Trail goes around the
14 perimeter of the campus, and as I referenced previously,
15 there are nine existing buildings here.

16 The applicant does intend improvements around
17 the central courtyard area to make it more with Facebook
18 generally operates where they have the walkable
19 pedestrian oriented center of their campus, and these
20 improvements have been completed and consistent with the
21 requirements of Lead Gold for commercial interiors, and
22 the applicant is currently pursuing certification with
23 those improvements.

24 And then moving on to the West Campus, as I
25 indicated previously, the plans are currently schematic

1 for purposes of the Draft EIR with more specific plans
2 coming forward for land use entitlements.

3 What is currently -- what was analyzed by the
4 Draft EIR -- and as you'll see on the screen -- is a
5 total of five buildings ranging in height from two to
6 five stories with a five-story parking structure over on
7 the left side of the site as I'm pointing to on the
8 screen.

9 Something I would like to highlight as part of
10 the proposal, beginning with anticipation of the East
11 Campus site. Assuming the project is approved, the
12 applicant will be improving the existing undercrossing of
13 Bayfront Expressway.

14 So this would not only be for the use of
15 Facebook employees, but would also become part of the Bay
16 Trail and be available for the public to utilize.

17 So this is merely just a representation to
18 give you an idea. I know the numbers are hard to read,
19 but of the five different buildings that are proposed on
20 the West Campus project site as well as the parking
21 structure and some other amenity areas, including a
22 transit shelter to help with their dropoff and their
23 shuttle trips, as well as a 6,200 square foot public
24 amenities base.

25 And again, just giving you some ideas of the

1 massing, as I indicated, the structures range in height
2 from two to four stories, and you see the existing
3 transmission towers kind of as a representation of the
4 size of the buildings in respect to these transmission
5 towers, and the proposed structures that were analyzed in
6 the Draft EIR go up to a maximum height of 75 feet.

7 And again, just some other visuals on the
8 parking structures on the bottom of this frame.

9 So now that we've gone through kind of a rough
10 overview of what the project is, I just want to briefly
11 touch on the California Environmental Quality Act and the
12 purposes of the California Environmental Quality Act or
13 CEQA.

14 So the purpose of CEQA is to disclose
15 potential physical impacts of a project. It's not
16 supposed to be perfect. The goal is to have adequacy of
17 disclosure to make sure that members of the public as
18 well as decision-makers are fully informed of any
19 potential physical environmental impacts of a project,
20 and as I alluded to, we're focusing on the physical
21 environmental impact, not socioeconomic impacts of a
22 project.

23 And when we do this analysis, the analysis
24 we're required to not only review the impacts of the
25 project, but also the cumulative impacts of the project.

1 So that is a project plus any approved or
2 pending developments approximate to the project area, as
3 well as looking at feasible alternatives for those
4 project.

5 Now as far as project proposals, we're here
6 this evening as part of our public comment to solicit
7 verbal public comments on the document. We're also
8 taking in written comments on the document.

9 These comments will be responded to in the
10 Final EIR and could potentially result in changes to the
11 EIR.

12 So to clarify -- again, we keep lumping this
13 into the East Campus/West Campus phase. They're
14 different projects.

15 On the East Campus, they're different elements
16 of the same project -- excuse me. Different phases of
17 the same project.

18 So the East Campus, what's different that is
19 we're only looking at increase in population. The
20 buildings exist. They're just looking to occupy those
21 buildings with more employees.

22 So as such, no ground to service is analyzed
23 in the Draft EIR for the East Campus site. So you will
24 find that the technical analysis for the East Campus
25 component of the project does not look at aesthetics,

1 wind, cultural resources and biological resources because
2 due to the lack of ground disturbance, there's no
3 potential for impact in these issue areas.

4 For the West Campus, we're looking at complete
5 redevelopment and use of the site.

6 So when you look through the EIR, you'll see
7 an analysis in the section about East Campus impact, the
8 West Campus impact and then a combined project impact.

9 And when we look at the potential impacts of
10 the project and these different issue areas, there are
11 three potential classifications that these impacts can
12 fall under: Less than significant.

13 So we look at the project based upon the
14 existing thresholds and guidelines and find there is no
15 potential for the project to have an impact and the
16 impact is less than significant.

17 The second is significant to less significant.
18 So we find that there's a potential for the project based
19 upon thresholds and guidelines to have a significant
20 impact, but we're able to mitigate that impact to a level
21 that is less than significant.

22 And then finally there are significant and
23 unavoidable impacts. For an impact is identified based
24 upon thresholds and guidelines and there were no feasible
25 mitigation measures.

1 So the reason that the document is 800 pages
2 thick, which I want to refer to. We do have a copy back
3 on the table, and this document in its entirety is
4 available on our website, as are the appendices.

5 It looks at a total of -- CEQA requires
6 sixteen different issue areas, as you see identified on
7 the screen, and one additional issue area, which was
8 wind, was also studied for this project as a result of
9 the project location.

10 You'll see that I have a couple of starred
11 items on this list, including agricultural resources and
12 mineral resources. Due to the lack of presence of these
13 issued items on the site, they were not evaluated in
14 depth.

15 So now I'm going to go ahead and focus on the
16 three issue areas that have significant and unavoidable
17 impacts, and those are air quality, noise and
18 transportation.

19 So this next slide provides an overview of
20 what both myself and Mr. Taylor will cover in the next
21 upcoming slide is air quality, noise and transportation
22 impacts.

23 So starting with air quality, and I've
24 identified -- you can see these numbers I've referenced
25 to help you look in the document if you want to follow up

1 on anything I'm saying this evening.

2 All impacts are identified with their subject
3 area, which for this case is the, AQ, air quality and the
4 numbers.

5 So the first impact I'll discuss is air
6 quality, two, and in analysis, it was determined that the
7 project would create new area and mobile sources of air
8 pollutants, and this includes reactive organic gas,
9 nitrogen oxides and particulate matter.

10 And this was predominantly due to the increase
11 in vehicular trips associated with the project.

12 In fact, when we went through the alternatives
13 analysis, it was found that an eighty percent reduction
14 in vehicular trips would be required to get rid of the
15 majority of the air quality impacts.

16 So unfortunately, no feasible mitigation
17 measures were identified to address this impact, and what
18 you find here -- my last imp -- my last bullets's related
19 to cumulative impacts that I discussed previously.

20 When we do the Draft Environmental Impact
21 Report analysis, we're required to look at cumulative
22 impacts on the project, and oftentimes, when you have a
23 project level impact, you find that you also have a
24 cumulative impacts of the project coupled with other
25 approved and pending projects.

1 So this air quality impact also identifies the
2 cumulative impact in the document.

3 In -- in regards to cumulative impacts, the
4 final air quality impact that I'd like to touch on is
5 only a cumulative air quality impact, and this is a
6 project in combination with foreseeable development in
7 the project vicinity would expose sensitive receptors to
8 toxic air contaminants, and just to clarify, sensitive
9 receptors are things identified like residential units,
10 individuals exercising, daycare facilities, elderly care
11 facilities and the like.

12 And when this analysis was completed, it was
13 found that the project contribution to this impact is
14 less than five percent, and that those receptors that are
15 actually being exposed, these toxic air contaminants, are
16 already being exposed to toxic air contaminants even
17 without the project, and that is as a result of where
18 they're located, and per the new Bay Area Air Quality
19 Manage -- air quality guidelines, these receptors are
20 sited in locations that is not recommended because
21 they're too close to major roadways, such as Highway 84.

22 So as such, there is no feasible mitigation
23 due to the location of these existing sensitive
24 receptors.

25 Next I'd like to move on to noise impacts. So

1 the first one I'd like to touch on is NO-1, the first
2 noise impact.

3 The project will result in exposure to noise
4 levels in excess of the General Plan and Municipal Code
5 standards.

6 And this again is tied to traffic noise, and
7 specifically these two impacts would occur on roadway
8 segments within the City of Menlo Park that are both on
9 Caltrans controlled roadways, and this includes Marsh
10 Road between South Drive and Bohannon Drive as well as
11 Willow Road between O'Brien Drive and Newbridge Street.

12 We again -- as we do when we go through this
13 process, we identify an impact. We look for feasible
14 mitigation measures.

15 That's something we did extensively for this
16 impact, including a focus on looking at sound walls, and
17 we found unfortunately that the installation of sound
18 walls was not feasible and would not indi -- mitigate the
19 impact for a number of reasons, one of which is Caltrans'
20 height requirements.

21 The maximum height requirement for these sound
22 walls is fourteen feet and we found that when we put in
23 fourteen foot wall, it did not reduce the impact to a
24 less than significant level.

25 Additional factors include aesthetic impacts,

1 the result of building these walls and actually walling
2 in residential units.

3 And then finally the existing residential
4 driveways, those breaks that would require the sound
5 wall, result in the sound wall being essentially not
6 mitigating any of the impacts.

7 So as such, there's no feasible mitigation
8 measures, and again, we find this is a cumulative impact,
9 similar to what we found with air quality.

10 And then the next impact is just focusing on
11 in. I indicated there are some locations where there
12 might be a West Campus impact, because there's
13 construction.

14 This is one of those instances, which is noise
15 impact too where we found that the construction of the
16 West Campus would result in ground borne vibrations that
17 would disturb vibration sensitive equipment.

18 As you all may be familiar with, there's a
19 number of businesses in close proximity that have
20 high-tech work that use equipment that is sensitive to
21 vibration and equipment sites is vibration sensitive.

22 As such, we looked at mitigation measures,
23 including business notification as well as construction
24 best management practices, and you will find that these
25 are mitigation measures included in the Draft

1 Environmental Impact Report.

2 However, unfortunately even with inclusion of
3 these mitigation measures, we found the impacts to the
4 vibration sensitive uses would still be significant and
5 unavoidable.

6 And then the final noise impact that I want to
7 touch on is noise impact three, which is an increase in
8 ambient noise levels, again resulting from traffic.

9 This is a very similar impact to NO1, just a
10 different criteria that we're looking at when we're
11 evaluating the impacts.

12 So the same roadway segments that I referred
13 to previously on Caltrans jurisdiction roadways are the
14 reasons for these noise impacts, and again we looked at
15 mitigation measures and none were feasible to actually
16 mitigate the impact.

17 And we also found this to be a cumulative
18 impact similar to NO1.

19 And the final thing I want to touch on before
20 I turn the presentation over to Mr. Taylor is alternative
21 study in the EIR.

22 As I indicated, this is a requirement of CEQA,
23 and so alternatives are required to feasibly attain the
24 majority of the project objectives, and those are --
25 objectives are included in the Draft EIR for reference,

1 and they shall avoid or substantially lessen these
2 identified significant and unavoidable impacts.

3 Now, as we went through the process to look
4 for alternatives, CEQA requires us to look at the no
5 project alternative, which was evaluated in the Draft
6 EIR, and then we were looking for lesser project
7 alternatives to evaluate.

8 As I indicated previously in my presentation,
9 the only way to actually get rid of any of the
10 significant unavoidable impacts I spoke to or that Mr.
11 Taylor will speak to in his presentation was to reduce
12 vehicular trips by approximately eighty percent, and this
13 reduction in trips is actually far less than what's
14 currently permitted under the East Campus Conditional
15 Development Permit that was granted for Sun back in the
16 1990s.

17 And in addition to that, it does not feasibly
18 meet the majority of the project objectives, so we did
19 not consider that as a feasible alternative.

20 Two other alternatives that we look did look
21 at were a fifty percent reduction and a 45 percent
22 reduction in vehicular trips.

23 Now these reductions result in less employees
24 than are currently permitted on these campuses and just
25 slightly more than are currently permitted, and again

1 were deemed to be unfeasible because it did not meet the
2 majority of the project objective.

3 So what you will find analyzed in the document
4 as alternatives, a no project alternative as well as a
5 reduced intensity alternative which looked at a 25
6 percent reduction in vehicular trips.

7 This unfortunately did not avoid or
8 substantially lessen any of the impact of the impacts of
9 the project and did not meet one of the key project
10 objectives, which was to have a centralized combined
11 campus that would accommodate the future growth of the
12 proposed -- of the project sponsor.

13 And with that, I'm going to go ahead and turn
14 over the presentation to Mr. Taylor to run through the
15 transportation section of the document.

16 MR. TAYLOR: Good evening. I'm Chip Taylor.
17 I'm the Public Works Director. Thank you for having me
18 here tonight, and I'll go over everyone's favorite
19 subject, traffic tonight on the EIR.

20 So I'll start out, and I'll go over the
21 traffic analysis elements, what's included in the actual
22 document itself.

23 I'll talk about the findings within the
24 document. I'll go over the impacts themselves and I'll
25 talk also about the mitigation measures included in the

1 document.

2 The traffic impact analysis elements that we
3 have essentially we looked at three different time
4 frames. The existing time frame, near-term buildout of
5 the project as well as a long-term or cumulative
6 scenario.

7 With this project, there's actually multiple
8 time frames because there's both the East and the West
9 Campus. So she's talked a little bit about that.

10 We essentially have four different time frames
11 in here. We've got one time frame for just the near-term
12 East Campus only. We have a near-term that's a little
13 bit further down the road that's both the East and is the
14 West Campus, and then we have two different scenarios
15 with a cumulative with only the East Campus and a
16 cumulative with the East and the West Campus.

17 In this particular EIR, we analyze 34
18 signalized intersections for both the AM and the PM peak
19 hours. We also looked at ten different roadway segments.
20 Menlo Park has a roadway segment criteria about how much
21 volume of traffic can be added to a roadway segment.

22 We also looked at routes of regional
23 significance, which are mainly Bayfront Expressway and US
24 101 are larger more regional facilities.

25 We also looked to determine if there were any

1 planned or programmed transportation improvements in the
2 area. Mainly in this particular EIR is the auxiliary
3 lane project on US 101 that's currently under
4 construction to add auxiliary lanes on 101, and that was
5 included in the document as if it was constructed.

6 We looked at public transit. We also looked
7 at pedestrian and bicycle facilities.

8 The study area here, I'll orient everybody.
9 We have the East Campus or current campus here with the
10 West Campus here.

11 This is 101 running down the middle, Bayfront
12 Expressway toward the Dumbarton Bridge, Willow,
13 University and then Marsh over here. So those show the
14 various 34 intersections that were included in the
15 analysis.

16 The transportation findings through the
17 report, I'll go into a little detail on each one of these
18 after I present the summary.

19 The project would have a less than significant
20 impact on both transit and pedestrian and bicycle
21 facilities.

22 In the near-term, the project impacts include
23 eight intersections, four roadway segments and six routes
24 of regional significance, and in the long-term cumulative
25 scenario, it includes ten intersections, four roadway

1 segments and six routes of regional significance.

2 In the near-term with just the East Campus --
3 this is in the 2015 time frame -- you can see these are
4 the five intersections which are impacted as part of the
5 project, namely along Bayfront Expressway and then a
6 couple up here on Middlefield in Palo Alto and in Menlo
7 Park.

8 These are the four roadway segments that were
9 impacted as part of the project along Willow, Middlefield
10 and Marsh. They are consistent -- you'll see these
11 throughout the presentation.

12 Once they were tripped each time, they
13 essentially are tripped each one of the different time
14 scenarios.

15 As we go into the near-term for the East and
16 the West Campuses, these are the eight intersections
17 which are impacted as part of the project. As you add
18 another campus, there are further impacts associated with
19 additional trips along Bayfront, Willow, Marsh and
20 Middlefield.

21 And then the same four roadway segments were
22 impacted with that time frame scenario, as well.

23 As we jump into the cumulative impacts with
24 just the East Campus by itself, these intersections are
25 impacted, which is the East Campus by itself in the

1 long-term, and then the same four roadway segments, and
2 then ultimately this is the East and the West Campus and
3 the cumulative scenario.

4 These are the ten intersections which are
5 impacted as part of the project, and then the same for
6 our four roadway segments.

7 So mitigation measures. To talk about some of
8 the mitigation measures. Ultimately, there were
9 intersection improvements that I'll go into a little bit
10 of detail for each one of the intersections here in just
11 a second that actually help to mitigate the impact;
12 actually reduce the delay at the intersection.

13 There's also a payment into the transportation
14 impact fee from the West Campus that would be made to the
15 City that could be utilized for other improvements
16 throughout the city, and then there's also a trip cap on
17 the West Campus.

18 As Rachel indicated, on the East Campus,
19 there's a trip cap that's proposed as part of the project
20 because they're increasing the employee count, but on the
21 West Campus, it's actually included as a mitigation
22 measure to help reduce the number of trips coming from
23 the West Campus.

24 So ultimately to talk about the mitigation
25 measures. In Menlo Park, we have a large section of the

1 city that's actually within Caltrans' jurisdiction as
2 well as everybody East Palo Alto's portion, there's a lot
3 that's within Caltrans' jurisdiction.

4 So even though we may have a mitigation
5 measure, an improvement that would actually make an
6 impact, we can't guarantee that it could be constructed,
7 because Caltrans would have to approve that.

8 So I'll show those in a slightly different
9 color because they're not guaranteed to happen, although
10 the applicant would have to pursue those very diligently
11 to try to get those approved through Caltrans.

12 So these are the ten intersections that I
13 talked about originally. These are in the cumulative
14 time frame with both the East and the West Campuses.

15 The first intersection I'll talk about is
16 Willow and Middlefield. Willow and Middlefield is an
17 intersection that's fully within Menlo Park and the city
18 has control of that.

19 So the mitigation measure that's included in
20 the document can be fully mitigated as Menlo Park can
21 actually approve that and therefore reduce the impact to
22 a less than significant level.

23 As I go into the next grouping of mitigation
24 measures shown in the yellow here, these are mitigation
25 measures that would actually completely reduce the impact

1 to less than significant, but since they are in Caltrans'
2 jurisdiction, we can't guarantee that they would be done.

3 It's very likely that Caltrans would approve
4 them, but there's no guarantee, and so the three
5 intersections over near Marsh and 101 would be reduced to
6 less than significant, as well as the intersection that's
7 in East Palo Alto/Caltrans at Donahoe and University.

8 Now the next intersections that I show here,
9 these four grouping here are intersections where there's
10 some level of mitigation measure that will improve the
11 intersection, but it doesn't fully mitigate the impact.

12 And so, for example, Marsh and Middlefield is
13 in the Town of Atherton. We can't guarantee that that
14 improvement would be done, but the applicant would pay
15 essentially a fair share contribution toward the
16 improvement at that intersection, and so that would be
17 then partially mitigated by the project with that
18 payment.

19 Another example is at Willow -- yeah. Willow
20 and Bayfront Expressway right at the campus entrance
21 there, there is -- part of the mitigation measure is to
22 add a third right turn lane from Willow on to Bayfront
23 Expressway. Whoops. From Willow on to Bayfront
24 Expressway, and similar to University has three right
25 turn lanes. Willow has only two right turn lanes now.

1 That would help the intersection, but it
2 wouldn't fully mitigate the intersection.

3 There would not be a need for an additional
4 lane coming out of the campus here. There's already four
5 lanes coming out now. There would be a need for an
6 additional fifth lane, but due to the proximity of the --
7 the frontage road or the circular road throughout the
8 project, there's not enough room in there to actually fit
9 the vehicle.

10 So it's not a feasible mitigation measure to
11 help that intersection. So that's why you see only the
12 partial mitigation measure included in the document.

13 And then just to talk about some of the
14 bicycle improvements, Facebook has also included at least
15 two prior to the project or with the project. Let me go
16 back here.

17 On Willow, before the project even starts,
18 they're actually looking -- working with Caltrans to
19 include the bike lanes on Willow by restriping the
20 existing striping along this section of Willow. So
21 they're working with Caltrans currently to get that
22 accomplished.

23 And then the undercrossing that currently
24 exists out there, it's a private undercrossing that was
25 connecting the two properties, that would actually be

1 opened up as part of the project, as Rachel indicated, to
2 allow not only connectivity between the two campuses, but
3 also connectivity for the Bay Trail in that area to
4 create a grade separated area for pedestrians and
5 vehicles -- for pedestrians to cross under Bayfront
6 Expressway.

7 And then at University and Bayfront
8 Expressway, at that intersection, we had talked about,
9 there was a partial mitigation measure to help that
10 intersection.

11 That partial mitigation measure is actually to
12 construct the Bay Trail from Bayfront Expressway to about
13 the railroad tracks, the Dumbarton railroad tracks here.

14 The Bay Trail currently exists over in this
15 area and heads down towards Mountain View and Sunnyvale.
16 So there's a missing link between this trail here and
17 Bayfront Expressway.

18 So this would construct a portion of that
19 trail there to help that particular intersection at
20 University and Bayfront Expressway.

21 With that, I'll hand it back to Rachel to
22 finish the presentation.

23 MS. GROSSMAN: Thank you, Chip.

24 Just jumping into next steps on this process,
25 as I indicated earlier tonight, the comment period for

1 the Draft EIR will close at 5:30 on January 23rd.

2 Something I didn't include on the slide -- but
3 I'd like to highlight tonight -- is that tomorrow night,
4 the City Council will be holding a meeting and will be
5 discussing a number of requests to extend this comment
6 period.

7 So that will be something that they'll be
8 discussing tomorrow night, and we'll of course make the
9 public and the Commission aware if there are any changes
10 to the comment period for this Draft Environmental Impact
11 Report.

12 Upcoming meetings after the -- after that
13 meeting tomorrow night include a study session by the
14 City Council on January 31st to get an overview of the
15 project, as well, and ask for any additional information
16 that they may need on the project and the process, and
17 then on Valentine's Day, on February 14th, the City
18 Council will have a regular business item to discuss the
19 proposed project, including impacts and mitigations,
20 public benefits, parameters for the Development Agreement
21 and other project related items.

22 And finally in April of this year, we
23 anticipate -- we have a tentative publication date for
24 the Final Environmental Impact Report for the project.

25 So with that, I'm going to close. As we

1 discussed earlier this evening, this is the opportunity
2 to make verbal public comments on the document that will
3 be reported by our -- our recorder here and responded to
4 in the Final Environmental Impact Report, and we will be
5 accepting public comments on the document through the
6 23rd of this month at 5:30 PM unless any changes are made
7 by the Council tomorrow night.

8 And also just want to refer to the public as
9 well as the Planning Commission got copies of the
10 Planning Commission's proposed meeting procedure,
11 recommended meeting procedure from staff today just given
12 the numerous topics to kind of give everyone an idea of
13 when a good time to comment or what -- what point of the
14 evening that we'll be talking through certain items.

15 With that, I'll go ahead and close the staff
16 presentation.

17 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Thank you, Rachel and
18 Chip. And with that, we bring it up here, the time that
19 we usually ask the staff any questions that we have about
20 the presentation that was just made.

21 I'm not seeing any lights.
22 Ben, do you have any?

23 COMMISSIONER EIREF: On that -- the subject of
24 Caltrans, have we broached the topic with them of all
25 these different projects we would like them to work with

1 us on? You say it's likely that they would do them, but
2 in the past, we've had lots of discussions about Caltrans
3 being slow to move and --

4 MR. TAYLOR: Yeah. There's certainly a
5 process. I think, you know, most of the improvements
6 that are included in the document are improvements that
7 would meet Caltrans' normal criteria for inclusion on a
8 roadway system.

9 So from that perspective, I think there's
10 something that Caltrans could approve, but certainly you
11 have to go through the process, and that is a long kind
12 of multi-year process at times.

13 So Facebook would be required to go through
14 that.

15 We would help them through that process
16 because it's something that typically Caltrans asks us to
17 be involved as a local jurisdiction, but -- but I think
18 most of them are very likely that they could occur.

19 COMMISSIONER EIREF: One other follow-up.
20 So you showed that there are certain short roadway
21 segments that get -- I thought it strange that there were
22 like little segments on Willow, little segments on
23 Middlefield can affect it.

24 They are so close together. I can understand
25 that mathematically traffic kind of flows in and out, but

1 it just seemed odd that like, for example, in the middle
2 Willow, there's a gap where it's not substantially
3 impacted.

4 How does that make -- work?

5 MR. TAYLOR: There are certain segments that
6 were selected, so not necessarily every single segment is
7 selected.

8 So you see sometimes an impact on one segment,
9 it could be expanded to cover a little bit wider area
10 than just that one little point there.

11 And at times there are different criteria,
12 differ traffic volumes that could occur. As you go on to
13 Willow, there could be more traffic volume at a certain
14 potential part of a segment versus another.

15 It just depends. I'd have to look at each one
16 individually to kind of give you more information.

17 COMMISSIONER EIREF: So just to clarify that
18 you've analyzed certain segments, but not the whole --

19 MR. TAYLOR: We did certain roadway counts at
20 certain location. We can't do them every spot throughout
21 the roadway segment. We have to particular a
22 representation representative segment, essentially.

23 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Katie.

24 COMMISSIONER FERRICK: This is just a
25 follow-on to your question, actually. The -- I was told

1 that the EIR for a couple years -- year or two back that
2 it has to do with road classification for each segment,
3 because I was curious about Marsh Road in particular, and
4 there are segments that were classified as certain types
5 of roadways.

6 The impact and the number of cars from that
7 segment to the next may be the same, but it's considered
8 an impact on one segment versus another.

9 MR. TAYLOR: Yeah. Certainly in some cases,
10 there's different -- there are different classifications.
11 Something like Willow might be classified as a minor
12 arterial, so it does have a criteria, but then as you get
13 on Marsh closer toward 101, it becomes a primary arterial
14 roadway and then it doesn't have a criteria at that
15 point. It doesn't have a threshold.

16 So it could depend on the particular roadway
17 classification, as well.

18 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Jack.

19 COMMISSIONER O'MALLEY: I'm cur -- I've been
20 curious about how there trip cap number as actually
21 produced, and secondly I'd like to know whether or not --
22 I think it's a 2,600 trip -- trips that are in that trip
23 cap, whether that -- whether Facebook feels that will
24 allow them to hire the people they expect to need to hire
25 in order to meet their growth.

1 MR. TAYLOR: The trip cap was actually
2 developed through working with the applicant. So the
3 applicant had a traffic engineer, Fehr Peers, and they
4 did most of the work to actually count their current
5 Facebook campuses, count cars during various time frames
6 and various scenarios to really determ -- calculate a
7 kind of a -- per employee trip number, how many trips are
8 generated by each employee, and then they utilized that
9 information to extrapolate on how employees they expected
10 to have at the campuses in Menlo Park and then they
11 developed the trip cap based on that.

12 So then that helped them determine what they
13 dealt with was an appropriate trip cap for them based on
14 the data that they had from the current campuses and the
15 way that they're running their TDM program, shuttles and
16 those types of thing.

17 So from our understanding, they had proposed
18 it for the East Campus, and I would let them comment on
19 how that would fit for their expansion plans for the
20 future, but I feel that based on our discussions, it
21 would fit for their expansion plans.

22 COMMISSIONER O'MALLEY: Okay.

23 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: John.

24 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: These questions might
25 be appropriate later, and if they are, that's fine. But

1 to detail, since they were just mentioned here, I just
2 thought I'd bring them about.

3 One was that it was -- it was said in the
4 presentation that the trip cap in the West Campus would
5 be not a design feature, but considered a mitigation.

6 What -- what's behind that? Does it change
7 the legal status in some way or something? It was a bit
8 of a surprise to me.

9 MR. TAYLOR: On the East Campus, essentially
10 it's a little bit different.

11 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: West Campus.

12 MR. TAYLOR: Yeah, but I want to talk about
13 the East Campus, because there's a reason why there's a
14 difference.

15 So on the -- on the East Campus, essentially
16 there's already buildings that exist there, and the only
17 thing that they were changing is the employee cap, the
18 employee number.

19 So essentially that became part of the
20 project, to just change that employee number.

21 When we got into the West Campus, the West
22 Campus could actually be any other project at some point
23 in the future, we wanted to ensure that we analyzed it
24 based on the square footage that was there, and then
25 ultimately determine what the true impacts of that

1 project would be, and then determine how to best mitigate
2 those particular impacts, and so that then ultimately
3 became a mitigation measure.

4 So it's still a requirement. It's still
5 monitored the same. The penalties and the enforcement
6 would be the same, so we made it consist with the East
7 Campus, but it's just kind of a legal nomenclature of
8 where it fits.

9 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: Okay. Thanks a lot.
10 That helps quite a bit.

11 The second question, one thing that surprised
12 me, as Rachel mentioned with the alternative scenarios in
13 which the trip -- trip cap is dial -- dialed down,
14 there's -- it's immediately asserted that the number of
15 employees is either infeasible for project objectives or
16 dramatically lower, and so I didn't follow the logic in
17 that.

18 We have a -- we have a basically our nominal
19 project, we have a trip cap and we're assuming employees
20 will be there, and all of a sudden we jump to oh, all of
21 a sudden there's this change in assumptions.

22 So where -- I mean, is that just -- we just
23 take that as a hypothetical of the EIR? I mean, it's not
24 really -- not exactly a causal connection, but we need to
25 talk about that later in the EIR details.

1 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: I want to defer that
2 one.

3 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: Okay. Thanks.

4 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Any more questions?
5 Peipei.

6 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: I have a question
7 about the trip cap. It looks like they will have 2,600
8 in the morning, 2,600 at night resulting in 5,200 trips
9 for the peak hours and they're going to have 1,500 --
10 15,000 total daily cap.

11 And so is the extra trips, are they going to
12 happen during the middle of the day or are they
13 encouraging off work hours? I'm just curious where that
14 traffic's going to happen and -- and how they're going to
15 enforce that with their employees.

16 MR. TAYLOR: I mean, ultimately the -- the
17 rest of the trips throughout the day, the 15,000 trips
18 would occur all throughout the day. I think mostly
19 they're going to occur -- occur during the normal
20 business hours or maybe a little bit after, a little bit
21 before.

22 You won't have obviously as much in the middle
23 of the night, but there could be -- throughout the day,
24 there's going to be deliveries. There's going to be
25 shifted work hours. I'm sure that they're going to do

1 that.

2 There's going to be visitors that visit the
3 campus to work on various projects. So there's a whole
4 host of different trips that would occur.

5 I think that ultimately it will be up to
6 Facebook as to how they work with their employees to
7 monitor and deal with the trip count, so that's something
8 that they'll have to work on, but I know that they're
9 going to use a series of different features such as
10 shuttles to reduce the numbers of trips to the campus,
11 adjusted work hours, those types of thing.

12 COMMISSIONER YU: Second question. You
13 mentioned restriping on Willow Road is already in the
14 works, and I was curious if there's any information about
15 whether that was sufficient to encourage more bicycling
16 on Willow and whether the restriping would be sufficient
17 for cyclists to see.

18 MR. DAY: I mean, from a restriping
19 perspective, obviously it makes the bike lanes more
20 visible, so there's certainly an advantage there.

21 I think trying to quantify that is real
22 difficult. I don't think there's any -- really good data
23 to quantify whether or not a freshly restriped --
24 restriped bike lane would actually encourage bicyclists
25 to use it or not.

1 So I would hesitate to go anywhere as far as
2 trying to quantify that.

3 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Okay. I don't see any
4 more lights up here. So with that, we're going to move
5 on to public comment. I want to make a couple of brief
6 notes before we do that.

7 We've got something like thirty cards here. I
8 see that we have our timer out. Are we using that? It
9 will make it a little easier if we are. Do we have a way
10 to do that? Okay.

11 This meeting is really about public comment as
12 much as anything. I mean, specifically about the EIR at
13 this structure, but I realize people are going to be
14 commenting on all kinds of things.

15 You're to have about minutes. If you reduce
16 your talk time to two minutes or a minute and a half,
17 that's great. If people -- before you said things are
18 very similar to what you say, you can just make note of
19 that and then move on.

20 Okay. When you come up, please announce your
21 name, also where you're from. That's either your address
22 or political affiliation.

23 The first card is from Dick Givens. Clem
24 Molony will be the next.

25 MR. GIVENS: Chair Bressler, Commission

1 members, my name the Dick Givens. I'm a resident of
2 Menlo Park since 1968 and I'm an attorney in Redwood
3 City.

4 I am here in favor of the processing forward
5 of the EIR, and that's what I'm speaking of for the
6 purpose of the record.

7 The -- it seems to me that we should be happy
8 to have an increase in the population which is a
9 necessity for the project to go forward with these
10 optimistic and fine young people that will be a part of
11 the Menlo Park community, and it also seems to me that
12 the value of having a vibrant, active business at that
13 site far outweighs the -- the advantages of having a very
14 quiet derelict decaying site.

15 And so I would ask that the -- that you all
16 move this forward as soon as we can and with the process,
17 and I do appreciate the significance of your job and the
18 difficulty of it.

19 So thank you very much.

20 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Thank you.

21 Clem Molony, followed by Julien Silland.

22 MR. MOLONY: Thanks for the opportunity to
23 speak. Clem Maloney. I live in The Willows, homeowner
24 for forty years. I'm an environmental manager for 25
25 years in Silicon Valley and the Peninsula.

1 I need to review these EIRs routinely and this
2 Draft EIR I've gone through.

3 Some new things for you folks. Vehicle cap
4 instead of people impact on the General Plan.
5 Interesting EIR.

6 Essentially having visited the site, I can see
7 that -- that this open plan office setup that they
8 have -- you know, it's grown out of the whole IT
9 environment. Modern, highly collaborative, productive
10 work forces. It's huge cubicles instead of individual
11 cubicles or individual offices.

12 So I think that in terms of land use, it's
13 appropriate to have a larger population on the campus.
14 So that's interesting.

15 The transportation impacts. Clearly the --
16 the primary controversy that's in the EIR is around the
17 road impacts.

18 I was -- I was -- I live about eight blocks
19 from the campus in The Willows, and I -- I see some
20 impacts on Willow Road, on the bay side of the freeway,
21 but essentially everything seems to be mitigatable as we
22 saw from -- from the -- the presentation.

23 I think that the mitigations will be eighty to
24 ninety percent effective at -- at handling the traffic
25 flow from the increase.

1 Amazing that this progressive company has
2 incented 46 percent of their employees so far to get out
3 of single occupant vehicles.

4 Nobody gets more than ten percent out of
5 vehicles, individual vehicles, and this young crowd
6 essentially are convinced and are becoming incented to be
7 sustainable freaks, and it's wonderful.

8 I'm former board member of Sustainable San
9 Mateo County, and I'm really pleased about the -- the
10 positive environmental impacts of this -- this project.

11 It's a good project for Menlo Park. New
12 planning approaches you have to look at, obviously. This
13 is a process that you have to go through as planning
14 staff and Planning Commission. I encourage you to
15 continue to do a good job as you've done in the past.

16 It looks like their team is pretty good, and I
17 recommend that you have a positive attitude about these
18 new approaches that they are suggesting for -- for our
19 Planning Commission.

20 Thank you.

21 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Okay.

22 Julien Silland followed by -- I believe it's
23 Debbie Leight.

24 MR. SILLANS: Hi. My name is Julien Silland.
25 I am a software engineer working with Mountain View at

1 Google and I live in San Francisco.

2 I'm coming here because I am a cyclist. I
3 compute twice a week from San Francisco down to Mountain
4 View as part of a group called SF2G. We have daily rides
5 for like all kinds of riders, and basically I'm here to
6 fully support the EIR and especially the part for the
7 continuation of the Bay Trail, which basically means for
8 riders a much safer ride, especially on University, which
9 is a part of -- like this is one of the most dangerous
10 roads that we have to take, and the completion of the Bay
11 Trail would make it so much more safe for, you know,
12 hundreds of riders everyday, and this is one of the great
13 things that this project means to accomplish.

14 And Facebook, I really wish all the best to
15 Facebook in the completion of this project in general,
16 and that would make things so much more safe for a lot of
17 people.

18 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Thank you.

19 Debbie, followed by Brett Lider.

20 MS. LEIGHT: Hi there. Debbie Leight. I
21 also work at Google. I am the founder of the Mountain
22 View Green Committee. I have planned Bike to Work Day
23 for the last three years. I have biked from San
24 Francisco down to Google over sixty times.

25 I -- I applaud Facebook in finding a new,

1 bigger space for them to have their employees.

2 I think that in terms of the EIR and the
3 significant effects on the noise and traffic that the --
4 that a bigger trail that would connect the different
5 roads from Bayshore Expressway down to University would
6 be a better way to get more people to bike, would be a
7 way to get people to bike from all different places,
8 because specifically in that location, trying to connect
9 from the different areas of the Bay Trail, I have
10 actually gotten a bike -- a flat on my bike and I've been
11 stuck on the side of the road with traffic going by at 70
12 miles an hour because there is no real bike lane.

13 It is very poorly paved and we call it Black
14 Licorice, because as you sit on your bike and you go down
15 it, you go boom-boom-boom-boom-boom-boom like a piece of
16 black licorice.

17 So just -- oh, sorry. Debbie Leight. I am
18 from -- I'm sorry. I am actually -- I live in San
19 Francisco and I was born in Stanford Hospital.

20 So I am a Bay Area resident, and I would love
21 a better bike trail, especially for Bike to Work Day when
22 we spend eight hours putting down route arrows to lead
23 people all around from sixteen different locations
24 throughout the Bay Area to get to work, and it's very
25 confusing, complicated and not well marked.

1 Thank you.

2 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Thank you.

3 Next is Brett Lider followed by Maggie
4 Creighton.

5 MR. LIDER: Hi. I'm Brett Lider. I'm a San
6 Francisco resident and a Google employee. I co-founded
7 the group called SF2G, which is a bicycle community work
8 for people who live in San Francisco and commute to
9 points south or vice versa.

10 I've led literally hundreds of people on their
11 first ride to work from the northward Peninsula to the
12 southward Peninsula. I've personally witnessed people's
13 confusion.

14 Typically a new rider takes, it takes them
15 about four times riding the route to learn all the turns.
16 There are approximately ninety turns to get people from
17 San Francisco down to someplace like Mountain View.

18 That shouldn't be necessary. The Bay Trail is
19 so incomplete. You're jumping on and off the Bay Trail
20 continuously.

21 Specifically in East Palo Alto to Menlo Park
22 region, there are eight turns that someone has to learn
23 to get, you know, from Menlo Park to points south or --
24 or vice versa.

25 Seven of those turns would be eliminated if

1 the Bay Trail was actually complete through Menlo Park
2 and East Palo Alto.

3 Two of those turns are extremely exposed and
4 dangerous. Right now we make a left-hand turn at I think
5 it's Willow and -- sorry. I don't know -- I know it
6 spatially, but not -- I don't know all the street names.

7 Basically in front of campus. You make a turn
8 across nine lanes of traffic if you include all the
9 turning lanes.

10 So it feels very exposed as a cyclist to be
11 out there with a ten second light to get a big group of
12 people through there.

13 So not all the mitigations that I see in the
14 EIR are adequate. The half mile section of the Bay Trail
15 that doesn't connect to anything doesn't really help us.

16 That -- that still forces us to make an
17 exposed turn across University to get into East Palo
18 Alto, surface streets and then we've got another seven
19 confusing turns to get back on the Bay Trail on the bay
20 side of East Palo Alto.

21 So we really would like to see leadership from
22 Menlo Park and Facebook to actually complete the Bay
23 Trail.

24 So thank you very much.

25 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Thank you.

1 Maggie Creighton followed by Richard Ellson.

2 MS. CREIGHTON: Hi. I'm going to have to
3 lower this. Hi. This -- my name is Maggie Creighton. I
4 am the coordinator of the Exploratory Experiences
5 Program, a program for local students age -- I should say
6 grades six and up.

7 I have about twenty students right now, both
8 from East -- East Palo Alto and East Menlo Park, Belle
9 Haven community who have been royally treated by Facebook
10 in their student endeavors.

11 I have been tremendously impressed with the
12 work that Facebook is doing in the community.

13 So I've got a combination of supporting the
14 EIR in that I have been tremendously impressed also, and
15 I love the word "sustainable freaks," because these
16 people are really sustainable freaks, and when I think
17 about the time that they spend shifts -- creating shifts
18 where people come at different times so as not to explode
19 traffic on to the various arteries that are so important
20 to everybody.

21 When I think about the fact that they have
22 shuttles going constantly and I think about how they take
23 those people to key transportation areas where they can
24 take public transportation.

25 I'm terribly impressed by the fact that their

1 work hours are -- are -- what shall I say? Their shifts
2 are quite -- they've -- I'm stumbling, but they make it
3 possible for not too many people to be on the roadways,
4 and I'm very impressed with that.

5 But I'm even more impressed with what they're
6 doing in the schools in the area.

7 What they're doing in the schools is they're
8 teaching robotics. They're mentoring. They're creating
9 seminars. We have seminars in our program.

10 They come, they speak, they involve the
11 students in the activities, the content of their
12 speeches. They give tours to the kids. They explain --
13 educationally explain why they are the way they are with
14 the open areas, with their philosophy of -- of
15 management, and the kids have been very impressed.

16 The kids, not just because it's Facebook. I
17 hear that beep, but I want you to know that they are
18 doing tutoring in the schools, in the local schools in
19 Palo Alto and in Menlo.

20 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Thank you.

21 MS. CREIGHTON: And they are available when
22 we need them to help educate our kids.

23 And they just refurbished twenty laptops for
24 these kids that really have never had their own
25 computers. I think we should support them in every way

1 possible.

2 Thank you.

3 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Thank you.

4 Richard Ellson followed by Joshua Hugg.

5 MR. ELLSON: Thank you, Commissioners for the
6 opportunity to speak today. My name is Rich Ellson. I'm
7 the chair of the Moffett Park Business Group or MPG
8 located in Sunnyvale, and I'm here to speak on behalf of
9 that organization and to address the vehicular traffic
10 mitigation financing bicycle access to the Facebook site.

11 For background, MPG is a consortium of the
12 major employers in the Sunnyvale/Moffett Park Area,
13 including NetApp, Lockheed Martin, Yahoo, J.Paul, Juniper
14 Networks, Cotati, Labcyte, Lucsum Ramba and Incinera or
15 about 14,000 employees.

16 We advocate transportation improvements and
17 support TDM efforts to improve environmental and economic
18 health of that area, and for many of the employees that
19 commute on the Peninsula to their worksites located near
20 the Bay Trail, having a safe year-round bicycle access is
21 really critical, and those passages and routes are
22 somewhat limited.

23 Completion of a one mile gap in the Bay Trail
24 near the Facebook site will provide another safe route
25 for more people to use for their commute.

1 I think from what you've heard today, a lot of
2 people are willing to compute very long distances to get
3 to work. People want to get out of their cars and on
4 their bikes, so we'd like to see that and that happen
5 more and more.

6 MPG supports completion of the Bay Trail
7 and improving of the bike lanes in the area. This will
8 benefit not just Facebook, but the many commuters who
9 work along the Peninsula and South Bay, including those
10 as far away as us in Moffett Park in Sunnyvale.

11 We look forward to Facebook taking a
12 leadership role, providing alternatives commutes around
13 the site, and we'd like to work with them on these issues
14 us, and we'll start now by some knowledge sharing.

15 Moffett Park has learned that if you build it,
16 they will come. This is our experience. For worksites
17 like Moffett Park and the Facebook site not near the bay
18 and not walkable to Caltrain, cycling can be an extremely
19 cost-effective move for increasing alternative transport
20 to the site.

21 In the last few years, improvements for
22 cyclists in and around Moffett Park, including bike lanes
23 on Borregos and Bordeaux, completion of two pedestrian
24 bridges on Borregos and the opening of our 2.4 mile gap,
25 that segment of the Bay Trail between Moffett Field and

1 the bay that connects us now with Shoreline Park, Stevens
2 Creek Trail, Mountain View and of course to the
3 Sunnyvale/Moffett Park on the other end and beyond to the
4 bike trails that connect people through Santa Clara and
5 all the way to San Jose.

6 These safe year-round improvements from
7 Moffett Park of bike lanes, bridges and trails are real
8 and measurable.

9 The bridge to Moffett Park Drive was completed
10 in April of 2009. September bike counts in 2009 by the
11 VTA, annual monitoring of conformance report that was
12 released of February 2010 showed a bike traffic flow on
13 Moffett Park at Borregos had increased by 99 percent over
14 the previous year without the bridge.

15 Excuse me. I lost my place.

16 The cumulative impact of bike lanes, bridges
17 and trails are seen in the trends from our own
18 transportation survey that we conduct annually.

19 Typically this is about 10,000 round trip
20 commutes that we document. Our survey this year had
21 16,000 weekday commutes documented and was conducted in
22 October, not necessarily the most favorable time to year
23 to bike.

24 What we found was that improvements from all
25 of this infrastructure, bikes had now -- biking had now

1 risen to being to being fourth as the alternative commute
2 mode, now trailing only cars and vanpools and play
3 shuttles and the VTA bus.

4 If you build them, they will ride them, so
5 let's get the trails in there.

6 So in conclusion, we've had success in
7 improved access and infrastructure in Sunnyvale and MPG
8 supports the Planning Commission's staff report
9 recommendations to improve bicycle circulation and to
10 encourage securing funding for completion of the gap in
11 the Bay Trail near the Facebook site.

12 I've submitted a letter which basically
13 reiterates my remarks so You'll have them in writing.

14 Thank you very much.

15 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: I would request
16 respectfully that speakers use the time in front of them
17 and keep track of it and not run over in respect for
18 everyone here.

19 The next speaker is Joshua Hugg followed by
20 Harold Schapelbaum (sic).

21 MR. HUGG: Good evening. My name is Josh
22 Hugg. I'm the program manager for the Housing Leadership
23 Council of San Mateo County, and we're always glad --
24 first we'd like to say that we're always glad to see new
25 jobs coming to San Mateo County.

1 However, we strongly feel that house -- new
2 housing needs to be a consideration for any project,
3 particularly of this size where you potentially
4 exacerbate the jobs/housing imbalance that we've been
5 experiencing here in San Mateo County for the last thirty
6 years.

7 Last year, the National Low Income Housing
8 Coalition considered San Mateo County as one of the least
9 Affordable counties for housing in the entire country,
10 and projects, as great as it is like this, only makes
11 that worse.

12 So we would also like to point out that sixty
13 percent of the emp -- of the employees that work in San
14 Mateo County live outside of San Mateo County.

15 One of the goals, as -- I'm sure you're
16 familiar with the Sustainable Community Strategy --
17 prescribed under SB 375, where they were looking to
18 reduce vehicle miles traveled.

19 Having housing in close proximity to jobs
20 helps to reduce that. So even if people are driving,
21 they're driving less, and perhaps they can even better
22 utilize those shuttle options that are being made
23 available.

24 So another element to this is that the report
25 by Keyser Marston that looked at the housing impacts on

1 East Palo Alto also pointed out that approximately 45
2 percent of the employees working for Facebook will be
3 below median income.

4 They will have a particularly difficult time
5 finding housing in this circumstance. Drive till you
6 qualify just doesn't work anymore, driving to the Central
7 Valley and computing in.

8 So finally, we would just like to ask that the
9 Planning Commission and the City Council consider a
10 robust response to the growing issue of jobs/housing
11 imbalance, and we look toward to seeing what -- what your
12 actions are.

13 Thank you.

14 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Thank you.

15 Welcome. The next speaker will be Louisa
16 (sic) DeDera. I'm sorry, Schapelbaum (sic). That --
17 you're the next speaker after you. You're all right.

18 CHIEF SCHAPELHOUMAN: Confused there for a
19 second.

20 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: That's all right.

21 CHIEF SCHAPELHOUMAN: Members of the
22 Commission, thank you. My name is the Harold
23 Schapelhouman. I'm the fire chief for the Menlo Park
24 Fire Protection District and I'll try to stay on task
25 here this evening.

1 The Fire District provides not only services
2 to the City of Menlo Park, but also the Town of Atherton,
3 the City of East Palo Alto and the unincorporated
4 portions of San Mateo County. We have about a hundred
5 thousand residents in all of those communities.

6 Tonight I want to take the time to make some
7 general comments regarding the Facebook project,
8 specifically the EIR, and also reference the District is
9 overall is in support of project and in support of
10 Facebook.

11 We've been supporting them at their eastern
12 campus currently and have worked hard to get them into
13 that campus. So we put our money with our mouth is, and
14 obviously have been working diligently to help them in
15 the site that they're currently in.

16 The comments that I'll make tonight we'll
17 follow this up with some specific detail information in
18 written form.

19 The District strongly disagrees with the
20 conclusion in the Draft EIR and the impacts to the Fire
21 District and emergency services will be less than
22 significant. We don't agree with that.

23 The Facebook project will have several
24 significant impacts to the District to significantly
25 increasing the employees and residents, taller

1 structures, roadway congested, existing emergency routes
2 will be impacted for us for our response vehicles in all
3 of the different communities that we serve, and overall,
4 the project will include 9,400 additional employees and
5 result in about 1,100 new residents.

6 We's not opposed to that, but there will be an
7 impact.

8 The District cannot meet the fire service's
9 demand from these new residents, employees and buildings
10 with the existing profile that we have to protect the
11 existing community for our facilities and with our
12 equipment and personnel.

13 These impacts on the District can further
14 exacerbate when Facebook is considering in combination
15 with other new developments in the Fire District, such as
16 the Ravenswood Four Corners, North Fair Oaks, Gateway and
17 the El Camino Downtown Specific Plan.

18 The Facebook project will create the need for
19 new fire safety personnel, equipment, facilities and also
20 maintenance for our facilities.

21 The taller buildings of the Facebook campus
22 will result in the need for a revision to our current
23 profile for our aerial leader equipment, potentially for
24 conversion of an engine into a truck and new employees
25 for those vehicles if necessary based upon call volume.

1 The District's goal is to make sure that any
2 impacts by Facebook and the Facebook campuses on the
3 District are fully addressed and that the District is
4 that the District is willing to try and work with
5 Facebook and the city to have those concerns addressed.

6 It's critical these issues are addressed
7 before the project goes forward, and we want to make sure
8 those comments were on the record tonight.

9 Thank you.

10 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Thank you. Louise
11 DeDera, followed by Karae Lisle.

12 MS. DEDERA: Louise DeDera. I've lived in
13 Menlo Park for 47 years and I look forward to having
14 Facebook be a part of that experience.

15 In September, I met John Pananas and some of
16 the other Facebook folks at a meeting at Kiwanis Club in
17 Menlo Park. We met at Allied Arts Guild, and I
18 discovered in -- within fifteen minutes that they really
19 do have a heart for community service.

20 I asked if they would consider coming to Tally
21 Ho, which is a fundraiser for Packard Hospital and I
22 wanted to buy seven machines that helped kids as they get
23 better, and with -- by two o'clock that afternoon, they
24 signed up for a table for ten.

25 They not only signed up for it, they came,

1 they bid and we raised \$90,000 for Packard Hospital.

2 I know they want to serve and they are
3 considering having a Kiwanis satellite club there so that
4 we can help us serve at St. Anthony's, which is local.
5 So they can help serve special needs kids. We have a
6 thousand of them at De Anza and May and so on.

7 I took a tour also in September of the
8 facilities out there that Facebook was in process of
9 occupying, and it was obvious that the culture of
10 Facebook is to live lightly.

11 There are no ceilings. There's no carpeting.
12 There are no cubicles. Whoever designed that in the
13 first place -- actually, I know it is; he's a friend of
14 mine -- has to be a surprise.

15 The location's idea of not in the center of
16 trip where trips radiate out. Facebook also has a
17 culture of keeping people on campus. They have a dry
18 cleaner, they have a gym, they have all of that, so
19 people don't need to go out and -- and do other things.

20 I don't know how many employees they want. I
21 think it's something like 9,000. Well, that means 9,000
22 full-time jobs, not the 200 -- 250,000 part-time jobs
23 that helped the little blip down so the employment rate
24 looked a tiny bit better.

25 Clean jobs in an environment that's dedicated

1 to employee morale and comfort and support is something
2 I'd like to see, and I can't imagine this being
3 replicated any place else in Menlo Park.

4 I like that it's on the fringe. Facebook
5 is -- on the fringe of Menlo Park, not on the fringe of
6 society.

7 Facebook can do this job for us, and I think
8 they have the money and I think they have the culture and
9 I think they have the will.

10 Thanks.

11 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Thank you.

12 Karae Lisle, followed by Spence Leslie.

13 MS. LISLE: Hi. Good evening. My name is
14 Karae Lisle -- that's okay.

15 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Sorry about that.

16 MS. LISLE: And I'm the chief executive
17 officer for Shelter Network. We're a human services
18 agency with six homeless shelters here in San Mateo
19 County.

20 Our most favorite and I'm sure most on your
21 mind is on Van Buren. We have 24 families, including six
22 veteran families currently sleeping in Menlo Park tonight
23 in our apartment complex.

24 I'm in favor of the revisions that are
25 proposed by Facebook and hope the Commission will vote

1 favorably for them.

2 I -- I believe, as many have spoken, that this
3 is a very progressive company. They have alternative
4 work hours. I think we'll see different patterns of
5 traffic -- I've seen young people work on their computers
6 and the hours that they work -- that will also be
7 affected by the amenities that they bring on campus.

8 I've seen Google. I worked at Oracle. I saw
9 those amenities, so I know how people will stay on campus
10 for a long time.

11 I've been a resident of Menlo Park for over
12 twelve years.

13 I also believe that the type of employee that
14 they're hiring and the culture that I've witnessed during
15 my tours and from working with the executives there
16 brings engaged community.

17 We've seen them volunteering at our campus in
18 Menlo Park; not just doing the computer thing, they
19 actually dug holes and kept gophers out of our organic
20 garden so that our residents can eat their own tomatoes
21 and cucumbers. That's kind of cool for us.

22 They're very, very engaged with time, talent
23 and finance, and I believe that they're a great community
24 member and that the small amount of noise and traffic
25 patterns will be well offset by the tremendous amount of

1 benefit of an increased engaged community with again
2 green and clean technology jobs, and I've also seen them
3 eating dinner in the evenings here and I welcome the foot
4 traffic in downtown Menlo Park and I am in favor of this
5 and hope that you will, too.

6 Thank you so much.

7 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Thank you.

8 Spence Leslie, followed by Harry Bims.

9 MR. LESLIE: Hi. My name's Spence Leslie.
10 I'm the present chair of the Menlo Park Chamber of
11 Commerce. I've also been on employee in Menlo Park for a
12 long time.

13 Every time I come up here, I tell people that
14 I live in Menlo Park, but I sleep in Belmont. So I spend
15 a lot -- lot of my time here, and I really cherish Menlo
16 Park and the things that it does for its citizens.

17 Facebook coming to Menlo Park is obviously an
18 envy of many cities; not only in the Bay Area, but also
19 in the country and outside the US.

20 I travel fairly extensively for my job, and
21 when I mention to people that Facebook has moved to Menlo
22 Park, they ask, "Well, how did they do that? What a
23 tremendous opportunity for Menlo Park."

24 But one of the positive things I've really
25 seen about Facebook so far, which has been mentioned by a

1 number of people, is what they're doing for the community
2 by trying to assimilate their employees into the
3 community and really be a strong community citizen, and I
4 think many of the other companies in Menlo Park are
5 looking at Facebook and saying, "Boy, we're way behind
6 the times."

7 Many companies that have been here for a long
8 time really need spoke step up to the plate when it comes
9 to supporting this community. So we -- we all need to
10 thank Facebook for that and we all need to emulate what
11 they're doing.

12 One of the things I reflected back on since
13 I've been here since 1988. I was originally hired by
14 Raychem, and obviously Raychem was acquired by Tyco in
15 the late '90s.

16 I looked at the population of Raychem in the
17 Menlo Park area and also the influence of the other
18 campuses that exist in Redwood City and also look at the
19 population of Sun and I don't think the population of
20 Raychem and Sun combined when looking at the population
21 of Facebook is really that far off.

22 So we're looking at the mid '90s, and
23 obviously things changed significantly for us after we
24 were acquired and obviously Sun moved or went away, but
25 in that, I don't think the -- the impact on this is going

1 to be as great as people think.

2 But I do applaud Facebook's efforts in
3 mitigating a lot of these issues, and I think a lot of
4 the companies are also looking at what Facebook is
5 trying, and trying to make sure that they are also
6 looking at ways to reduce traffic and any other issues
7 that are being talked about here.

8 So I obviously heavily support the -- the
9 Council and the Planning Commission's support of the EIR
10 for Facebook.

11 Thank you very much.

12 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Thank you.

13 Harry Bims followed Bronwyn Alexander.

14 MR. BIMS: Good evening, Commissioners. I'm
15 Harry Bims, former Planning Commissioner and also I'm on
16 the board of the Menlo Park Chamber of Commerce, but
17 tonight, I'm speaking to you as an eleven-year resident
18 of Menlo Park and in particular in the Belle Haven
19 neighborhood.

20 And with respect to the Draft EIR that is
21 before you, I am speaking in favor of the Draft EIR.
22 I've looked through the document and in particular with
23 great interest the areas of controversy, and so I'd like
24 to run -- run through those bullet points just give you
25 the highlight of my thoughts.

1 With respect to transportation, one thing to
2 note is that at least for Belle Haven residents, our
3 traffic patterns are actually opposite of the flow
4 direction for Facebook, so they're really not impacted by
5 that.

6 Traffic noise. We think that that's not
7 really a significant impact even though it's listed as
8 such.

9 With respect to air quality, I think parking
10 spaces will limit the impact in that regard. So I think
11 you should take note of -- with regard to how many
12 parking spaces are available and its impact on traffic
13 and air quality.

14 With respect to housing, I note from the
15 document that there's a below market rate in lieu fee
16 that's been requested of the applicant, and to that
17 extent, I also noted in the -- and there's an earlier
18 staff report in which the staff report commented on the
19 Redevelopment Agency progress with respect to affordable
20 housing, and within the Las Pulgas project area, the
21 agency has recorded 73 affordable housing unit credits
22 above what is actually required by the redevelopment
23 agency, and has actually spent an additional 2.7 million
24 dollars above what was required to develop those housing
25 units.

1 My ultimate suggestion is to take advantage of
2 those housing unit credits and apply them against this
3 project with respect to below market rate housing.

4 And finally, with respect to public services,
5 including police and fire services and schools, I look
6 forward to the Belle Haven residents working with the
7 applicant to resolve any issues with respect to that on
8 this project.

9 Thank you very much.

10 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Thank you.

11 Bronwyn Alexander followed by William Nack.

12 MS. ALEXANDER: Hi, good evening. My name is
13 Robin Alexander. I have been a teacher at Belle Haven
14 Community School for six years and I'm also a resident of
15 the Belle Haven neighborhood.

16 I'm here with our principal, Rudy Ibarra and
17 with our community school director, Alejandro Vinson.

18 I am here to -- not so much speak about the
19 Environmental Impact Report, but on the effect that
20 Facebook has had already in the last year in our
21 community in Belle Haven.

22 They have given both time and money to our
23 school and our neighborhood. They have funded our Math
24 Squad program, which is an IT program for our students at
25 Belle Haven Community School.

1 They have been participants in the Adopt a
2 Grade program as well as sponsoring it. It is bringing
3 money and volunteers into our classrooms on a daily
4 basis.

5 They recently donated fifty computers to our
6 school that are being used by the school right now.
7 Well, not now. They're all at home.

8 There is a tree planting plan for the Belle
9 Haven School, and with -- in conjunction with another
10 foundation and to help beautify the Belle Haven campus as
11 well as the community.

12 They have sponsored our Eighth Grade Avid
13 Program, which is a college readiness program for our
14 eighth graders at the school, and are planning field
15 trips to the Facebook campus, which is walking distance
16 from our school.

17 We are the closest school to the Facebook
18 campus in the Ravenswood School District, and to top it
19 all off, Mark Zuckerberg spoke at our eighth grade
20 promotion last year.

21 We actively support the Facebook project and
22 so far have seen nothing but good for -- coming from
23 Facebook.

24 Thank you very much.

25 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Thank you.

1 Next up William Nack, followed by Jose
2 Archundia.

3 MR. NACK: Good evening, Chair Bressler and
4 other honorable members of the Planning Commission. My
5 name is William Nack. I'm speaking this evening not only
6 as a resident of Menlo Park, but also on behalf of the
7 San Mateo County Building Trades Council which has a
8 membership exceeding 14,000 of the highest skilled union
9 craftsmen and women in the construction industry today,
10 some of which are in attendance this evening.

11 Building Trades Council or members are here
12 this evening to encourage the Planning Commission to
13 accept the Environmental Impact Report and the
14 development terms as presented by Facebook.

15 We all know we're in a deep recession and many
16 of us are without a job. The average national
17 unemployment rate is close to nine percent, and in
18 California is close to twelve.

19 In the construction industry, we're
20 experiencing 25 percent unemployment rate, more than
21 twice the state average.

22 One in four of our workers and their families
23 are surviving on unemployment insurance, part-time jobs,
24 food stamps, hardship funds and food distributions at
25 food banks.

1 Some are losing their homes and their means to
2 pay their bills and put food on the table for their
3 families.

4 In your staff report, we were asked to comment
5 on how this project could result in a public benefit. I
6 can think of no greater benefit than for the proposed
7 project to produce high-skilled good paying jobs.

8 In addition to the jobs that we created at
9 Facebook, this project would generate 1,750 direct
10 construction jobs and 700 construction related indirect
11 jobs over three to four years.

12 Please think of us and our employment needs as
13 you make your decisions. Our construction workers live
14 in the community of Menlo Park and San Mateo County. We
15 spend our wages here. Our children go to local schools
16 in Menlo Park and San Mateo County.

17 We are part of this community. Please make it
18 possible for Facebook to be a greater success than it
19 already is and benefit our community in the process.

20 Thank you for allowing me to speak to you this
21 evening. We hope that next year at this time, we'll be
22 attended a ground-breaking for a project of the highest
23 quality that we can all look upon with great pride.

24 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Thank you.

25 Next up Jose, followed by Ana Adari. Adriano.

1 MR. ARCHUNDIA: Good evening. My name is
2 Jose Archundia I'm here -- I live in East Menlo Park and
3 I'm here to speak in favor of Facebook, because I think
4 it would really help the community overall because of its
5 impact and its help of the schools and school district.

6 It's donated computers, as stated before, and
7 also because of the other transportation uses that
8 they're providing for the environment, it would help
9 influence other businesses in the area to use alternative
10 transport and more -- there would be a reduction in
11 traffic flow.

12 So it would not impact -- the impact would not
13 be as great, and it would improve the environment of the
14 overall community so that it would help it grow and
15 develop in the future.

16 And I am really grateful for their support in
17 the school district and for their -- the time they put
18 into the community overall.

19 Thank you.

20 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Thank you.

21 Ana.

22 MS. ADRIANO: Hi. Goodnight. My name is Ana
23 Adriano. I live in Ivy Drive in Menlo Park.

24 First of all, I want give thank to the City of
25 Menlo Park to welcome Facebook, because for me, as I was

1 looking at the Belle Haven neighborhood, I see more
2 growth that comes that Facebook is making to our
3 community.

4 I volunteer at the school district and we --
5 I've seen a lot of time that Facebook is -- is going --
6 is giving to the schools.

7 Cesar Chavez, for example, Willows, that is in
8 front of the hospital, and I think it's Reynose and also
9 Belle Haven.

10 Also there is more churches} in the Belle
11 Haven community that they are working with them, so --
12 and also I think we want to -- Facebook to come to the
13 community center including to the community to work
14 together.

15 But I -- I really want the Draft Environmental
16 because I want to say this: Many people here spoke about
17 working at Google, having the bicycles, but in Belle
18 Haven, many of the residents, we -- we want to walk to
19 the markets over there, so we don't use cars.

20 And also with my kids, I take the bicycles to
21 go to the -- to the library, to go to Kelly Park, but we
22 don't have the park trail -- the bike -- the bike lane.

23 So probably it will be -- it will be great
24 that also we can benefit for -- in our Belle Haven
25 neighborhood for this.

1 I want to thank you also for -- for Facebook
2 coming to our community because we really need it in
3 there and the school district.

4 Thank you.

5 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Thank you.

6 Next up is Andrew Boone with donated time from
7 Clarissa Pascive.

8 MR. BOONE: Thank you.

9 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: You have six minutes.

10 MR. BOONE: Thank you.

11 Good evening, Commissioners. My name is
12 Andrew Boone and my comments are in two separate areas.
13 One is about traffic mitigation measures and the other is
14 the traffic analysis itself.

15 So Facebook has impressive goals for promoting
16 alternative modes of transportation. Menlo Park's goals
17 as stated in the General Plan are much the same as
18 Facebook's.

19 Menlo Park's goals include to promote the use
20 of alternatives to the single occupant automobile, the
21 use of public transit, the safe use of bicycles as a
22 compute alternative and for recreation and walking as a
23 compute alternative and for short trips.

24 Facebook has proposed an ambitious and
25 forward-looking trip cap to reduce trips to its campus,

1 and I commend them for this.

2 Hopefully, this will ensure that deep
3 alternative modes of transportation are used by more
4 employees.

5 Since the goal of the trip cap is to reduce
6 vehicle trips, the goal of the mitigation measures
7 proposed in the EIR should also be to reduce vehicle
8 trips.

9 However, almost all of the mitigation measures
10 proposed in this EIR, with the exception of two bike
11 paths, are likely to increase vehicle trips because they
12 would add vehicle lanes on roadways and at intersections.

13 So I have here the list of mitigation measures
14 and it's add lane, add lane, add vehicle lane, add
15 vehicle lane, add vehicle lane, add right turn lane, add
16 right turn lane.

17 Those are all things that research has
18 shown -- research has shown that adding vehicle lanes
19 induces additional driving for demand -- additional
20 demand for driving and discourages the use of alternative
21 modes. So it works against Facebook's goals and Menlo
22 Park's goals.

23 Fortunately, there is a better way. In fact,
24 both Menlo Park City policies and CEQA require it.
25 Section 6-B of the Menlo Park Transportation Impact

1 Analysis Guideline states that, quote: "All feasible and
2 reasonable mitigation measures, whether at the
3 significant level or below, shall be identified," end
4 quite.

5 Section 15126.4 of the CEQA guidelines states
6 that, quote: "Where several mitigation measures are
7 available to mitigate an impact, each should be discussed
8 and the basis for selecting a particular measure should
9 be identified," end quote.

10 The Stanford University Medical Center ER is a
11 great example of following these policies. It
12 prioritized mitigation measures based on the goal of
13 reducing vehicle trips and promoting traffic alternatives
14 to the automobile from highest to lowest priority were
15 traffic adapted signal technology, additional bicycle and
16 pedestrian undercrossings with Caltrain, enhanced
17 transportation demand management measures, intersection
18 improvements, which is EIR code language for add vehicle
19 lanes, and then revoke employee parking lots near freeway
20 interchanges.

21 The Stanford EIR continues. Quote: The City
22 of Menlo Park is also trying to encourage commuters to
23 use alternative modes of travel to the automobile. For
24 these reasons, several of the intersection improvements
25 are considered to be infeasible."

1 So in another EIR, intersection expansions,
2 roadway expansions were considered to be infeasible
3 because they conflict with the city's goals.

4 So it seems to me appropriate that that should
5 be considered in this EIR, as well.

6 There are many feasible and reasonable
7 mitigation measures for Facebook's traffic impacts that
8 align with the City goals, many of which are included --
9 are already included in City plans, and these -- they
10 also align the Facebook's ambitious trip reduction goals.

11 So the assumptions made by the traffic
12 analysis}, page 3.5-44 of the EIR says, quote "Trips
13 generated by the existing land uses in project were
14 assumed to have distribution patterns consistent with the
15 employment patterns outlined in table 6 of the City's
16 circulation document and system assessment document."

17 Appendix 3.5-H. This appendix states how many
18 employees will come -- will use which roadways to get to
19 Facebook and it's based on the assumption that the
20 employees live where other Menlo Park workers live,
21 distribution of employees.

22 However, Facebook is unique. Facebook
23 employees are much younger on average than other Menlo
24 Park workers, and other younger workers tend to prefer
25 dense urban walkable, bikeable environments, such as San

1 Francisco.

2 Twenty-seven percent of Facebook employees
3 live in San Francisco according to the greenhouse gas
4 emission appendix.

5 Only nine percent of other Menlo Park workers
6 live in San Francisco. So there's quite a difference.
7 And a few more percent live in Marin County or south of
8 San Francisco, and that totals 31 percent of employees
9 living north of Facebook, but only generating fifteen
10 percent of the trips on Highway 101.

11 It seems a little bit -- a big difference.

12 Only six percent of Facebook employees live in
13 the East Bay, but somehow generate fifteen percent of the
14 vehicle trips.

15 Now maybe it's because they don't use the
16 shuttles and the San Francisco residents do, but that's
17 not documented anywhere in the EIR that I could find.

18 So there's another way to do the traffic
19 analysis. You could just use where do Facebook employees
20 currently live, and this was done in the Sun Microsystems
21 EIR when the campus was originally built.

22 That EIR didn't say -- didn't assume oh, the
23 employees are going to move somewhere else than they live
24 right now. They just used the data they have, and I
25 think it's probably an unreasonable assumption to say

1 there's going to be a mass exodus of Facebook employees
2 from San Francisco to the East Bay in the next three
3 years.

4 2015 is the first-time horizon in which the
5 traffic analysis is conducted.

6 Thank you.

7 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Thank you.

8 Next up is Adina Levin with donated time from
9 Alexander Kenin. You have six minutes. Welcome.

10 MS. LEVIN: Thank you very much, Commission
11 members. My name is Adina Levin and I'm with Silicon
12 Valley Bicycle Coalition, Menlo Park Green Ribbon,
13 Citizens Committee, and with those hats on, I really
14 would like to commend and appreciate Facebook's
15 commitment to environmental sustainability and their
16 commitment to alternative transportation, helping
17 employees get to work without driving and I also think
18 that the project is really economically fantastic for
19 Menlo Park and have a great many benefits.

20 And building on those goals, I think that
21 there are additional things that Facebook can be doing
22 that will help Facebook meet its goals and help Menlo
23 Park to reduce the traffic impact of the project in the
24 EIR.

25 So as stated before, Facebook does have these

1 ambitious goals of getting -- enabling employees get to
2 work without driving, but the Facebook campus is much
3 more challenging to get to by bike, as a number of the
4 cyclists have mentioned.

5 So we looked at and analyzed how can we
6 provide safe continuous bike routes to Facebook that will
7 enable more people to cycle.

8 At the old Palo Alto location, three to five
9 percent of Facebook employees biked to work, but here in
10 Menlo Park, will we -- will Facebook be able to get back
11 to that level?

12 So look -- in order to figure out what routes
13 will help employees get to Facebook, we need to look at
14 where Facebook employees live.

15 So building on what Andrew said, Facebook
16 employees would not only benefit from the Willow Road
17 location, which Facebook is helping by striping, but also
18 forty percent of Facebook's employees live in town, in
19 Palo Alto, Mountain View, Sunnyvale and points south.

20 So for them, Willow doesn't help very much,
21 and they're going to need University Avenue, which runs
22 through East Palo Alto, as well as the real tremendous
23 potential for cycling is the Bay Trail, as some of the
24 cyclists have already pointed out.

25 Right now you need to get off the Bay Trail,

1 and therefore Bay Road which runs through East Palo Alto
2 would also benefit as a route.

3 So four routes, if they were made safe and
4 continuous, Willow, University, Bay Road and the Bay
5 Trail.

6 Willow and University, even with the
7 restriping supported by Facebook, still has gaps. There
8 are gaps in intersections. There are gaps by bus stops,
9 and we have those specifically documented, and if those
10 gaps were filled in, that would help significantly.

11 University also has similar gaps that could be
12 filled in to make that route continuous. The most
13 challenging gaps are over the highway overpass at 101.

14 The challenge years ago was that Caltrans used
15 to be a major obstacle in putting bike lanes over the
16 overpass, but since 2008, Caltrans has had a complete
17 change policy.

18 They have a full-time staff person dedicated
19 towards helping to implement some of the complete street
20 policy, and if a -- bike lanes on the overpass are deemed
21 to meet their guidelines, then Caltrans will approve it.

22 So if Menlo Park or East Palo Alto submit,
23 then there's a much greater likelihood that that will be
24 approved. So there is a question where there's enough
25 room to do this, and as a -- a subsequent slide will

1 show, we've actually done some measurement analysis
2 suggesting that there is room to do this, meaning that it
3 would be feasible to get the bike lanes on the overpass
4 which would create a continuous route and that's what
5 helps get the level of cycling up.

6 And lastly, but not at all least on the map as
7 you can hear from demand is the Bay Trail. The --
8 Facebook's offer to build a section down University
9 paralleling the bike lane is somewhat helpful, but it
10 doesn't connect. It doesn't -- it -- there's still a
11 gap.

12 And so what we would like -- Facebook to do as
13 environmental mitigation for traffic impact is to also
14 invest to put some money towards connecting that missing
15 gap in the Bay Trail, which as Rich Ellison is when you
16 connect the gap, that's when the bike use really spikes
17 up.

18 So if you can move that -- move that forward,
19 you can see there's some detail -- you can fast forward
20 to that, but detail on how to makes those on University.

21 One of the questions on University and Bay
22 Road, they travel through East Palo Alto. How can we in
23 Menlo Park feel confident the -- that if they're
24 specified in East Palo Alto, that they will be done?

25 So first of all, the community in East Palo

1 Alto is very concerned about the traffic impact, and
2 therefore any improvements that help alleviate the
3 traffic impact and improve safety on their streets are
4 viewed as favorable.

5 City Staff has looked at these
6 recommendations, and those are in line with existing
7 plans in East Palo Alto.

8 So this is something that if Menlo Park will
9 support, that is something that is reasonable to do,
10 also, that East Palo Alto would support and we should
11 feel confident requesting those as mitigations in the
12 EIR.

13 Let's see. So on the Bay Trail, that's the
14 documentation showing the bike lane. This also -- there
15 are pedestrian safety issues when we add to the bike
16 lanes, it actually makes thing less safe for pedestrians.

17 Those are unmitigated impacts for pedestrians
18 that should be mitigated.

19 And lastly on transit, the shuttles that
20 Facebook provides could be made open to the public like
21 the Marguerite helping our citizens also avoid driving.

22 Thank you very much.

23 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Thank you.

24 And if you wouldn't mind e-mailing that, I'm
25 sure that everyone here would like to get a copy of your

1 presentation.

2 Thanks.

3 Okay. I've got two more cards coming in. I'm
4 going to really have to close down the opportunity to
5 bring in more cards. If you want to submit a card, do it
6 in the next couple of minutes. Okay?

7 The next speaker is Ian Bulla followed by
8 Jamie Morgan.

9 MR. BULLA: My name's Ian Bulla. I'm from
10 Redwood City. I bike in the area, so like a lot of
11 people mentioned, I also for bicycle safety.

12 Having a continuous Bay Trail would be a very
13 positive thing for me to have. Having just safe streets,
14 bike lanes, that would be great.

15 Based on the presentation, what they showed on
16 presentation, the half mile extension of the Bay Trail
17 which deadends, that doesn't help anybody.

18 One road with five bike lanes, I guess that's
19 good with more bike lane trips on the road.

20 Apart from that, the one thing that no one's
21 commented on is it looks like the new campus, the West
22 Campus, I'm not sure if I'm correct here, but it looks
23 like the area of parking is about as much as of the
24 office spacing.

25 So I'm not sure what standard was used, how

1 they came up with 3.5 spacing per thousand feet. It
2 doesn't seem to be a very aggressive standard. It also
3 doesn't look to help to alleviate the traffic.

4 So I think for bicycle and pedestrian safety,
5 reducing the vehicles miles traveled is great. Some of
6 the impacts they talked about where you're expanding
7 roadways or the triple right turn lane.

8 As a cyclist, I don't think a triple right
9 turn is going to be safe for me. I don't think it's
10 going to be safe for pedestrians.

11 So I think expanding bike facilities is
12 positive. Having the 500,000 foot parking garage, it
13 would be nice if maybe that could be cut down a little
14 bit, because that will reduce impacts of additional
15 trips.

16 So that's about it. Thank you.

17 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Thank you.

18 Next up, Jamie Morgan followed by Colin Heyne.

19 MR. MORGAN: My name's Jamie Morgan. I'm a
20 resident of Willows and also a bike commuter. Thank you
21 for the opportunity to speak to the Planning Commission.

22 I -- I just want to say I'm excited about
23 Facebook's efforts to encourage vision of multiple modes
24 of transportation in their interest in completing key
25 bike paths through their campus.

1 I think they should support getting involved
2 in the limited access to bike routes to mitigate the
3 environmental impact of the proposed density increase of
4 their new home.

5 Alternate modes of transportation should be
6 fast, easy and safe to encourage use, because everybody
7 makes a decision every -- every day when they get up how
8 am I going to get to work.

9 Limited access bike routes double the amount
10 of area that bicyclist -- that a cyclist can reach from
11 wherever their -- their origination is.

12 Cyclists, if there's limited access, they're
13 safe and they don't get lost. With my proposed
14 improvements, more people would find a better means --
15 would find bicycles to be a better means of
16 transportation.

17 The completion of the Bay Trail would be a big
18 first step towards a vision to complete a network of
19 limited access bike paths on the Peninsula.

20 The next step should be to create limited
21 access bike routes between Facebook and the downtown
22 cores of Menlo Park and Palo Alto.

23 I support Facebook's request for increased
24 density provided they fund mitigation efforts and reduce
25 congestion and pollution.

1 Thank you.

2 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Thank you.

3 Next up -- does it say Jamie. That was Jamie.

4 MR. HEYNE: Thank you, Chair Bressler,
5 members of the Commission. My name is Colin Heyne. I'm
6 deputy director of Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition. Our
7 organization's goal is to get more people on bikes and
8 more bikes on the road, so we often work with our area's
9 large employers, and I want to take the chance to commend
10 Facebook for its enthusiastic support of biking and other
11 forms of active transportation as a transition to its new
12 campus.

13 We'd also like to encourage both Facebook and
14 the City of Menlo Park to use this relocation as an
15 opportunity to change the surrounding community for the
16 better.

17 The Draft EIR lists several areas of
18 controversy, as we heard, related to the project,
19 including traffic conflicts, noise from traffic and
20 negative air quality impacts.

21 We urge you to turn to the bicycle in order to
22 mitigate these concerns. Bicycle commuting the rapidly
23 growing in popularity and participation in Silicon
24 Valley, and the City of Menlo Park and Facebook can work
25 together to harness that popularity and meet Facebook's

1 aggressive goals to limit vehicle motor trips.

2 With Facebook's support, Menlo Park can pursue
3 some responsible ecologically sound transportation
4 mitigation measures such as improving the bike routes on
5 Willow Road, University Avenue and Bay Road and closing
6 the one mile gap in the nearby Bay Trail, as we've heard
7 this evening.

8 This last measure would help bring the Highway
9 101 of bicycling to Menlo Park and East Palo Alto and
10 with a significant environmental, social, health and
11 economical beneficial that come with an active population
12 and bicycle friendly community.

13 Thank you very much.

14 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Thank you.

15 Next up the Sheryl Bims Followed by Luis
16 Archundia.

17 MS. BIMS: Good evening, Commission members.
18 My name is Sheryl Bims and I'm an eleven-year resident of
19 Menlo Park, and I live specifically in the Belle Haven
20 section of Menlo Park, so I -- I personally feel if
21 there's anyplace that's going to feel the impact of the
22 traffic, it's the Belle Haven section of Menlo Park.

23 In short, I've had a chance to observe some of
24 Facebook's movement, because I'm doing things throughout
25 the day, and I can honestly say it has been very

1 uneventful. I've been waiting for this really big
2 traffic incident and impact, and I'm aware that, you
3 know, they do play up to scale and there will be some
4 changes, but so far, there's not really much to say about
5 it, and that's a good thing.

6 And I would also like to say that so far, they
7 have really been a good neighbor. They have reached out
8 to the community. They're very transparent in terms of
9 what they would like to do in their plans.

10 They of course will have ask for our input,
11 and it's clear that they do want to try to help the
12 various parts of the city to the degree that they can, so
13 for that, I commend them, also.

14 I guess just moving forward, I would hope that
15 the City and the Commission can be very engaging with
16 respect to the community when it comes to determining how
17 we want to move forward or what types of benefits to
18 negotiate for the public.

19 There are a lot of people in the community
20 that have a lot of great ideas, and so I really hope that
21 we're able to incorporate some of those things.

22 And just some quick ones, for example. This
23 is a really easy one. A lot of the signs on Willow Road
24 are illegible, so perhaps we can just put some new signs
25 up would really be a good reflection on the City of Menlo

1 Park.

2 The other thing is I've been here engaged for
3 about eleven years in the community and I've already
4 heard about Police and City Service Center. Maybe we can
5 get that project on the fast track at this point in time.

6 If there's ever been a point in time to make
7 something happen, this is the time to make it happen, and
8 I am convinced that we do have the talent here in the
9 city to make such a thing happen.

10 So that's another quick -- maybe not quick,
11 but a thing we need in the near future.

12 As far as the housing stock goes, Belle Haven
13 has -- the existing housing stock, a lot of it is old,
14 but I think there's opportunity to make improvements
15 there.

16 I do realize that a lot of the employees are
17 young, but if they're lucky, like a lot of the people in
18 this room, they won't be young forever and their needs
19 may change.

20 They may determine that they don't want to
21 stay in San Francisco all their lives and they would like
22 to settle down, and I would like to see even Belle Haven
23 section be considered a part in which they would like to
24 settle down.

25 And lastly, I'm hoping for a lot of

1 improvements when it comes to education, and I think
2 that's something that we really, really need to focus on
3 as a community.

4 I commend them for what they have done so far
5 in reaching out to the Ravenswood City School District.
6 However, I have a vision that is much greater than even
7 what has happened so far.

8 So I fully support what has happened so far,
9 and if what's going on right now is any indication, I
10 truly look forward to seeing what happens.

11 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Thank you.

12 Luis followed by Les Koonce.

13 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Good evening. My name
14 is Luis Archundia. I live in -- in East Menlo Park and I
15 think that a successful company as Facebook will
16 positively impact our community.

17 Facebook has already started to work with our
18 local schools and has made some -- has worked with
19 schools, has made some donations, and I would like to see
20 Facebook working with the community -- with the community
21 and encourage kids to -- to pursue a career.

22 You know, I know that the traffic in East Palo
23 Alto and East Menlo Park is an issue or it might become
24 an issue. We have seen as part of the plans also there
25 are some alternatives.

1 Now, if the traffic in East Menlo Park and
2 East Palo Alto need to be decreased, I think if this
3 intersection of Marsh/Bay Road was improved, we could
4 take most of the traffic that goes through the city and
5 resurrect the traffic to that intersection.

6 I know that it will increase the commute from
7 people coming from the -- from the south of 101, but it
8 will take all the traffic out the community, and if we
9 improve all the bike roads and the alternatives which
10 have been proposed, I think that we should not see a
11 significant impact on our community. That is the
12 positive impact of having Facebook there.

13 Thank you.

14 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Thank you.

15 Next up Les, followed by William Byron
16 Webster.

17 MR. KOONCE: Good -- good evening. I
18 appreciate your time very much. Like most of the other
19 people, I rise in favor of what you've heard and -- and
20 certainly heard tonight about the EIR.

21 I'm sure there are slides have presented some
22 issues and some questions and some concerns and I only
23 ask that all of you and hopefully the city in the same
24 way that Facebook dealt when they started their own
25 business some seven or eight years ago are creative and

1 unique in solving of these issues, and it is a challenge,
2 but I -- I welcome that and hope that you can come to
3 terms, because as you've heard, many communities, maybe
4 all almost communities, would love to have this problem.
5 That is the problem of Facebook moving into its
6 community.

7 I just make one last point. We've heard
8 tonight a lot about the culture of Facebook and the
9 people and the things they're doing for the community
10 already, and I've had a chance to experience that
11 personally.

12 I would also ask us to think about the culture
13 of Menlo Park as a town that I've lived in for sixteen
14 years and have had my business here for about nine years.

15 According to some, we are not exactly friendly
16 toward businesses and we only have to walk down sadly
17 Santa Cruz Avenue or El Camino and see the vacant lots,
18 and for whatever reasons those have occurred, I would
19 suggest that we have an opportunity now to rise above
20 some of those problems and demonstrate to the world that
21 we in Menlo Park can convene that community that can make
22 Facebook welcome, ask them to do things certainly, but to
23 recognize that we have an opportunity.

24 Roughly one out of eight people, I think, are
25 using Facebook service right now in the world, one out of

1 eight.

2 This is a chance to put Menlo Park on the map
3 and in an even better position. I would hope you work
4 towards that goal.

5 Thank you.

6 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Thank you.

7 Next up William. He doesn't appear to be
8 here.

9 MS. GROSSMAN: He's right here.

10 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Okay. Followed by
11 Sharon Williams.

12 MR. WEBSTER: Chairman Bressler, members of
13 the Planning Commission, my name is William Webster. I
14 reside at 480 East O'Keefe, Unit 307 in East Palo Alto.

15 I'm a senior member of East Palo Alto's Rent
16 Stabilization Board. I'm in my 20th consecutive year of
17 service, and I am here to take exception to the report
18 drafted by Keyser Marston Associates claiming that there
19 would be no significant impact upon affordable housing or
20 housing in general in the City of East Palo Alto.

21 I consider the report highly defective, to put
22 it charitably. There make the claim that over the next
23 five years, you can expect no more than sixteen to twenty
24 employees from Facebook settling in East Palo Alto over
25 the next five years.

1 The reality is is that there is an urgent need
2 for a mitigation because of the fact -- major factor
3 in -- in the determination of housing impact upon East
4 Palo Alto that's completely overlooked in the Keyser
5 Marston Associates report dated December 21st, 2011.

6 There's no excuse for the fact that they
7 ignore totally the impact of the purchase of the entire
8 formal Page Mill property for a total of 1,812 units on
9 the west side of East Palo Alto which constitutes the
10 bulk of the affordable housing under the rent
11 stabilization program of East Palo Alto, which represents
12 fifteen percent of the affordable housing stock in San
13 Mateo County.

14 We are threatened by the -- by Equity
15 Residential, by specifically the chief investment officer
16 and executive vice-president of Equity Residential with
17 the demolition of a high percentage of the buildings
18 under the rent stabilization program, and specifically
19 this is due to the impact of Facebook coming to Menlo
20 Park and the impacts that are anticipated.

21 On August 16th, there were two meetings with
22 representatives from Equity Residential and Wells Fargo
23 prior to the consummation of the transfer of ownership
24 from Wells Fargo to Equity Residential, just completed in
25 this past month of December, in which Mr. Alan George,

1 the chief executive officer of Equity Residential
2 promised repeatedly that buildings would be torn down.

3 The issue of the impact of Facebook came up
4 specifically. I have distributed -- I'm having
5 distributed to you a copy of an article that appeared in
6 the Wall Street Journal which makes the allege between
7 the Facebook presence, Equity Residential purchasing the
8 large part of our housing stock and the -- and the
9 expected impacts.

10 There needs to be mitigation such as --

11 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Mr. Williams (sic), do
12 you have any donated time?

13 MR. WEBSTER: What's that?

14 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Would anyone care to
15 donate time to Mr. Williams? I think he's got more to
16 say.

17 MR. WEBSTER: I just want to -- well, there
18 will be a written report coming from me.

19 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Thank you.

20 Sharon Williams is next, followed by Patricia
21 Boyle.

22 MS. WILLIAMS: Good evening. My name is
23 Sharon Williams and I'm the executive director of Job
24 Train located at 1,200 O'Brien Drive in Menlo Park, and
25 that's right between Willow Road and University Avenue.

1 Job Train is an accredited non-profit job
2 training and placement program. It has been located in
3 east side Menlo Park on O'Brien Drive since 1965. Last
4 fiscal year, fiscal year 2011, we served about 8,000
5 mostly unemployed low income people.

6 I am here tonight attending the Facebook
7 lovefest to say how excited Job Train is -- several of
8 our -- my Job Train colleagues are here, as well -- about
9 having Facebook in our community.

10 We're convinced that Facebook is going to
11 creatively avoid the potential negative impact they could
12 have had on this -- on our neighborhood, and that instead
13 they're investing in our community in very positive way
14 to make it a healthier and more vibrant community.

15 You've already heard from so many people about
16 the positive impacts of Facebook, so I won't go into a
17 lot of the details, but just to hear what they're doing
18 with the schools, with Shelter Network, and I'd like to
19 mention what they're doing for Job Train.

20 Before they even moved into their campus,
21 Facebook employees, John Pananas and crew, came to Job
22 Train and went on a tour of the organization to try to
23 find out what they could do to strengthen us.

24 So we've already benefited from our new
25 neighbors.

1 Then the next thing Facebook did was that they
2 supported our golf tournament by purchasing a table,
3 being a sponsor and bidding seriously during the auction.

4 They provided funds and volunteer elves --
5 some of them are here tonight, but they're out of
6 costume -- for our Winter Wonderland for children of Job
7 Train students and they made a pledge of -- for a
8 substantial amount for our -- Job Train's program
9 operations.

10 But most important -- and this is the main
11 point I want to make. Job Train is currently in
12 conversation with Facebook to develop a strong internship
13 and employment program for our -- our graduates for
14 career opportunities, and they're focusing mainly on our
15 office skills class, our construction class, our solar
16 class and culinary arts.

17 So I would just like to -- to mention that the
18 broader -- the way that they've opened up to the broader
19 community is impressive, as well. They had a big open
20 house, they had a sharette, and we think that they're
21 breathing new life and vibrancy into a community that
22 really could use it.

23 So I encourage you to do everything you can to
24 support and encourage Facebook.

25 Thank you.

1 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Thank you.

2 Patricia Boyle is next followed by Fran Dean.

3 MS. BOYLE: Good evening. I'm Patty Boyle
4 and I'm recently retired after eight years on the Housing
5 Commission, and so I am going to bring up housing
6 initially here because I think it's something that we
7 haven't done a very good job of all along, and I think
8 it's something we really have to get behind now.

9 The affordable housing issue, listening to
10 William Webster and his fears of what's going to happen
11 in East Palo Alto, I think we need to assure him that
12 we're going to create some housing in Menlo Park,
13 affordable housing, and that I do know that the City of
14 Redwood City has a large acreage of infill that they're
15 planning to do affordable housing, also.

16 So it isn't just going to be East Menlo Park
17 or East Palo Alto. It's going to be our whole community
18 surrounding.

19 The other thing I wanted to bring up is
20 that -- by the way, I do support the Facebook proposal,
21 and I wanted to bring up that San Mateo County Transit
22 Authority recently -- or is in the process of
23 transferring 5.5 million dollars from the Dumbarton rail
24 funds for shuttle program from the East Bay across the
25 Dumbarton Bridge, and I think it's something to look at

1 as a possibility for other kinds of shuttle services that
2 we can -- we can ask for.

3 It's not everything. It has to be -- we can
4 do shuttle services along the Bay Road. We can do it --
5 I mean, I think what's happening here is we're focusing
6 only on Willow Road, but I think there are other ways
7 that we can provide transportation to Facebook and to the
8 community in general.

9 The Belle Haven community particularly
10 could -- would benefit from free shuttles, and one more
11 thing. I think what I thought was very creative with
12 Facebook is they're supporting Zim Ride.

13 I don't know if you know what that is, but
14 it's a subscription service for ride sharing, and they
15 are willing to pay for other people's subscriptions.

16 So if anyone is interested in joining Zim
17 Rides, they're willing to pay for user subscription.

18 Thank you.

19 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Thank you.

20 Next up is Fran Dean, followed by Nathan
21 Dushman.

22 MS. DEAN: Good evening. Fran Dean, and I am
23 a resident of Menlo Park and a CEO of the Chamber of
24 Commerce. Also if addition time is needed, I have board
25 members here to donate time.

1 Revitalization of Menlo Park. It's time to
2 move forward. It's time to establish our position in
3 Silicon Valley.

4 The former Sun campus is alive once again and
5 Facebook is the change agent creating jobs, additional
6 revenue opportunities and rebranding Menlo Park as a
7 social media capital of the world.

8 We've spent the last four years nurturing the
9 El Camino Downtown Specific Plan, and now the opportunity
10 to realize the possibilities of our underutilized
11 business geography, the M-2, is before us.

12 Yes, communities need to evaluate consequences
13 of change, and that's one of the things that we're here
14 to do this evening.

15 So what change does Facebook bring to Menlo
16 Park? Yes. I think we all agree, Facebook brings jobs,
17 both direct and indirect, and that's a very important
18 consequence.

19 But most importantly, Facebook brings a
20 standard of responsibility, of stewardship and community
21 involvement.

22 Facebook should be viewed as the new standard
23 for Menlo Park. The standard for community focus,
24 creativity, environmental sustainability and leadership.

25 In terms of the community, Facebook is a good

1 neighbor. It's not an insular organization. They have
2 and continue to listen to the community through the
3 design group and doing community meetings and outreach.

4 Creativity. Facebook's approach is to solve,
5 not to create problems. For example, the trip cap is
6 more realistic way to assess and minimize the impact of
7 traffic.

8 Environmental sustainability, as well.
9 Facebook is environmentally conscious as shown through
10 their present and future buildings standards.

11 Energy efficiency, solar devices, Lead
12 building standards for current and future construction.

13 But most importantly to me, it's leadership.
14 Facebook has already set an aggressive standard for
15 employee commute patterns unparalleled by other
16 organizations in our area.

17 The Chamber of Commerce welcomes Facebook to
18 the community and supports their expansion plans. As a
19 city, we can learn from Facebook and hopefully extend
20 their philosophy to future plan growth within our city.

21 Thank you very much.

22 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Thank you.

23 Nathan Dushman followed by Alexander
24 Fabrikant. Okay. So I guess not. So Alexander. Next
25 up will be Terry Barton.

1 MR. BARTON: Good evening, ladies and
2 gentlemen of the Commission. My name is Alexander
3 Fabrikant, and I live in The Willows and I commute to
4 work by bike everyday.

5 My wife commutes to SRI, and about ten percent
6 of the time, she manages to get over her fear and get on
7 her bicycle.

8 The difference between her and me, we both use
9 Menlo Park streets, and I personally benefit greatly from
10 the quiet neighborhood of The Willows, Menalto and Pope,
11 and then I happily take the route through Palo Alto and
12 out through Mountain View.

13 My family, even though not a formal study, is
14 a great case study in the differences between bike
15 commuting to Palo Alto and bike commute to Menlo Park.

16 With Palo Alto's wide spread bike lanes and
17 continuous Bay Trail, you can get pretty much everywhere
18 if from point A to point B on a wide bike lane with
19 enough room for a bicycle and enough room to avoid the
20 doors of parked car, which is as you know one of the top
21 causes of injury for cyclists.

22 And on the weekends, my wife and I do enjoy
23 cycling quite a bit and we always head south where the
24 Bay Trial is a continuous network that connects with the
25 rest of Silicon Valley and we can go for dozens and

1 dozens of miles, enjoy the birds, enjoy saying hello to
2 people on the street and not have to worry.

3 We never go north because the Bay Trail has a
4 small but significant gap in the middle, because once get
5 on the Bay Trail and start heading north, we hit a dirt
6 patch and then a chunk of road with no bike lane with
7 zooming traffic and all sorts of risks.

8 My wife does commute by bicycle on days when
9 school's out or days before holidays when there's not as
10 much traffic on the road, and I notice that neither I nor
11 she work at Facebook, but Facebook does affect us as
12 commuters because of the extra traffic.

13 She is that much less likely to commute
14 anywhere at all because her route takes her down Willow,
15 and that's the side of Willow that's south of the 101.

16 Facebook's EIR as you might notice actually
17 lists impacted intersection on Willow south of 101 and my
18 wife will feel that traffic will stop commuting by bike,
19 which she does now.

20 Now, if you ever end up working for our
21 erstwhile competitor -- I happen to work in the Google
22 Plus right now -- I would probably be three times closer
23 to the Facebook campus and I would probably stop bike
24 commuting entirely, because the way things are and the
25 way Facebook has -- the way things Facebook has proposed

1 to improve the roads still leaves the death trap of the
2 Willow Bridge and the rest of Willow Road which has
3 intermittent with right turn lanes criss-crossing them
4 every which way.

5 I happen to have been on the road for a
6 personal errand this weekend was quite literally this
7 close to scale, about six inches by being hit from a
8 pickup truck trying to make its way on to the 101.

9 So Facebook's move and Facebook's proposals
10 for the route improvements are a great first step, but
11 much like the fabled bridge to nowhere, this is the exact
12 opposite. It's the bike lane halfway to everywhere.

13 Finish off the Bay Trail and connect
14 continuous routes on University and Willow and Menlo Park
15 will be hooked into the rest of the bike network in the
16 South Bay and the Peninsula and will be a great place for
17 bike commuting.

18 Without those parts, Facebook's proposed
19 improvements are pretty much one hand clapping in a
20 forest and nobody can hear it.

21 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Appreciate your
22 comments. Thank you.

23 Terry Barton, followed by Ted Tudor.

24 MR. BARTON: Good evening. Thank you for
25 your time, Commissioners. My name is Terry Barton. I'm

1 here representing myself. I work at Facebook and I'm a
2 bike commuter.

3 I have unique perspective in that I also
4 worked at Sun in that campus for over eight years. I
5 tried to commute to Sun, and I was successful, but it
6 wasn't attractive. It was much more difficult.

7 Facebook has already done its part. When I
8 worked at Sun, I used to allow about 55 minutes of riding
9 time and logistic time to pick up clothes, to go to the
10 gym, to ride back from the gym after being cleaned in the
11 shower -- hopefully it wasn't wet, to store my bike and
12 to walk into my office.

13 With Facebook, I can allow about 42 minutes,
14 but I'm already twelve or thirteen minutes less, because
15 there's showers in every building, there's indoor bike
16 storage, there's a laundry storage, so I can leave my
17 clothes at work, and there's clothes storage for when I'm
18 at work.

19 So Facebook has already done its part on the
20 campus to make it tremendously easy and effective to bike
21 commute.

22 My route from Mountain View is about ten miles
23 away. If you ask most people from Facebook why also they
24 don't ride within a ten mile radius, they'll tell you
25 it's a safety issue. There are not continuous bike

1 networks.

2 A lot of people will not ride over Willow
3 without a bike lane. They will not ride over University
4 without a bike line. They will not navigate through the
5 four stoplights and two left turns and two stop signs
6 that it takes to make the transition from the Bay Trail
7 where it ends at Runnymede in East Palo Alto.

8 Not to mention -- I guess they called it the
9 Black Licorice or whatever at Google, the pavement on
10 University.

11 So Facebook has done its part. I think it's
12 up to the Menlo Park Commissioners and planners and City
13 Council to work with East Palo Alto to make those
14 connections continuous.

15 As you've heard, traffic dissuades bicyclists
16 and connected networks attract them. So when that last
17 link is completed, bicycling tends to spike. You remove
18 the excuses.

19 So talk to the cyclists who ride the route,
20 ask them about what it would take them to get on a bike
21 and their employer or wherever they may work, and you'll
22 see that Facebook has done its side on campus. The
23 cities have to do its side.

24 I have a tremendous ride when I was at
25 Facebook in Palo Alto through Mountain View, Los Altos

1 and Palo Alto with bike lanes and bike paths the whole
2 way and a very relaxing ride.

3 That's not the case with the current campus,
4 but it could be.

5 So thanks for your consideration. As far as
6 the EIR comments, every bike off the road -- every bike
7 on the road is a car that's not on -- a car trip that's
8 not happening.

9 Now the mechanics of the EIR and how you
10 equate that are not clearly dictated, I guess, by the
11 formula and loading that the planners use, but I think
12 each of you know that you'd much rather have bikes on
13 your roads and being quiet and not polluting and getting
14 to their jobs and where they want to go than cars.

15 So thanks for your efforts. I encourage you
16 to work with East Palo Alto and make those networks
17 connected so that people who are not as courageous as me
18 can also make their trips.

19 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Okay. Next up is Ted
20 Tudor followed by John Doughty.

21 MR. TUDOR: Good evening. My name is Ted
22 Tudor and I'm a fourteen-year resident of Menlo Park
23 living across from the VA. So it's refreshing that we
24 actually get to have some input into a project like this,
25 as opposed to the VA, which seems to have its own

1 jurisdiction.

2 I am also aware of traffic issues having lived
3 so close to the VA and frankly I'm not worried about the
4 Facebook impact.

5 I was a seven-year Sun employee and am very
6 familiar with how Sun operated. Sun was about 45,000
7 employees worldwide. Granted they're not all from here,
8 but they had a very large presence.

9 I took a look at the statistics here, about
10 3,600 people being allocated from the Sun campus, and
11 that seems to me quite low considering the fact that a
12 lot of people were able to go to the Sun campus. If they
13 were working from home, they could go directly to the
14 campus and work from there, as well.

15 So I think the traffic that Sun generated is
16 greatly underestimated in this report.

17 Sun also had locations and Bohannon. They
18 also had locations in the west section that we're talking
19 about right here. So really there shouldn't be much of a
20 difference in terms of traffic issues regarding Facebook.

21 I also wonder how much traffic we're really
22 talking about here. We're talking about all these people
23 coming from East Bay, as well, from us going over to the
24 East Bay, and as a percentage, the total traffic that's
25 coming through seems to be quite small.

1 I'm not willing to bet on any certain numbers,
2 but I would think there's a lot of traffic coming through
3 on Bayshore Expressway.

4 And so the concern about 300 cars or something
5 along those lines seems to be a little superfluous in
6 this particular case.

7 I was posted in Santa Clara, but as I said
8 earlier, I got to work over in the Menlo Park location,
9 and I really enjoyed it because I was able to take my
10 bike a lot and go to the local campus.

11 It was kind of walking distance, but frankly
12 there was a lot of rain, so I didn't walk too often to
13 the campus.

14 I think that a lot of people who did work at
15 Sun enjoyed the ability to have a local company to go to.

16 Incidentally, just as a fine note, I don't
17 think there was a run on property just because Sun was
18 there, as a lot of people are trying to claim.

19 That argument would be sort of akin to
20 investing in a school or infrastructure to better the
21 system would invite more people in and therefore raise
22 the property prices. That would be a bad thing.

23 I'm not sure that's a really good argument.

24 So at any rate, to conclude this, I would like
25 to say that I actually really enjoyed having a company

1 that was very close by, having worked at Sun for seven
2 years.

3 Knowing the campus that was there, living
4 right by it where a lot of the traffic would go by my
5 house, I didn't feel like it was any impact, and Facebook
6 is a lot smaller than Sun is, and I think that Menlo Park
7 should consider itself lucky to have such an vibrant and
8 community oriented company.

9 Thank you.

10 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Thank you.

11 John, followed by Jarrett Mullen.

12 MR. DOUGHTY: Good evening. John Doughty for
13 the record. I'm the community development director for
14 the City of East Palo Alto.

15 I'd like to first thank your staff for
16 attending our Council meeting recently to present the --
17 the Environmental Impact Report and the process. Our
18 Council really appreciates that, and we see that as an
19 extension of good neighbors and we want to be a good
20 neighbor to you, as well.

21 We are not here tonight to present any
22 comments to you. We will be presenting those in written
23 form.

24 We again are hopeful that you at the Planning
25 Commission would understand your role, but also that the

1 city as a whole will understand our desires for and other
2 people's desires for simply a twelve-day extension of
3 comments.

4 This is a large project, large implications.
5 The City of East Palo Alto is a very close neighbor to
6 this project. It will have some implications that we did
7 not believe were fully addressed in the EIR, and we'd
8 like to have that opportunity.

9 Given the holiday period that was part of this
10 review period, we think that twelve days is a -- a very
11 reasonable request.

12 We understand that's not before you and we
13 understand that Council will take that up tomorrow night,
14 but as a city and its representatives, we would like to
15 push that forward and we think that -- we thank you for
16 the opportunity to comment. We look forward to greater
17 participation and cooperation.

18 Thank you.

19 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Jarrett.

20 MR. MULLEN: Good evening, Commissioners. My
21 name is Jarrett Mullen. I'm a resident of Mountain View
22 and I'd just like to echo the idea that there's a
23 discrepancy between the goals of the city and the goals
24 of Facebook when it pertains to the trip reduction goals
25 and the mitigation measures that actually appear in the

1 EIR.

2 Most of the mitigation measures are purely
3 auto oriented, and I won't go into me detail as Andrew
4 has already done that, but I would like to comment on the
5 pedestrian impacts that the auto mitigation measures
6 would have on pedestrians.

7 And I believe it's required that CEQA look at
8 the impacts that mitigations may have on other -- other
9 topics like pedestrians and the auto oriented mitigation
10 measures will seriously impact pedestrians, specifically
11 at the intersection of Willow Road and Middlefield where
12 there will now be two right-turn lanes and a pedestrian
13 island would be removed.

14 And so you'd have to deal with two right
15 turning lanes as you're crossing the street, and I also
16 think the EIR should look into improving pedestrian
17 crosswalks, possibly with new striping or high visibility
18 striping, and examine Bayfront Expressway and Willow Road
19 to see if it can be improved to -- can be made easier to
20 cross the street there.

21 So just please look at pedestrian impacts and
22 the impacts that mitigation measures will have on
23 pedestrians.

24 Thank you.

25 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Thank you.

1 That's our last speaker card, so I'm going
2 to -- do we have a speaker card that I haven't called
3 out?

4 MS. GROSSMAN: I gave all the speaker cards
5 to Commissioner. I don't have any more.

6 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: There's a speaker
7 card. Okay.

8 MS. ST. AUBIN: Hi. I'm Adrienne St. Aubin
9 and I live in San Francisco and I'm one of the few people
10 who's ever forgotten how to ride a bicycle.

11 You might wonder how that can happen. I grew
12 up in a town with no bike lines. I grew up on a busy S
13 curve of a road. I learned to bike in parking lots and
14 driveways.

15 And so when I finally moved to a bicycle
16 friendly community as an adult, which happened to be in
17 Germany, I had to teach myself how to ride a bike again.

18 So I taught myself how to ride a bike as an
19 adult. I learned to ride my bike everywhere. To go
20 shopping, to go to school, to go, you know, to the park,
21 to go to the bar, to go back home, like anyone else in
22 that community did, because if you've been to Germany,
23 you'll know everyone bikes there. People bike to work,
24 kids bike to school, families bike to the library,
25 grandmothers bike to the symphony. Everyone bikes. It's

1 not like here.

2 There's not a lot of spandex. They use them
3 to get around and they use them instead of their cars.

4 And the stuff that Facebook is proposing as
5 part of their plan is commendable, because it's a step in
6 the right direction, but I'm concerned because it
7 doesn't -- doesn't bridge the gap between what we have in
8 most American cities now and what you have in a community
9 like the community in Germany where I was where grandmas
10 bike and where people bike to work even if they're not
11 like crazy spandex wearing nuts about it, who are all
12 well represented here, and God bless them, but they're
13 different than the rest of us.

14 I have a bike. I bike in San Francisco. It
15 terrifies me. I do it because I think it's important. I
16 haven't biked down to Mountain View where I work at
17 Google, even though I'm a very active person.

18 I've biked a century in the past, but it's not
19 safe enough for someone like me to want to bike to where
20 I work.

21 My employer is happy to have me show up
22 whenever I want. I'm physically fit. I have the bike,
23 but I'm not going to do it if I have to cross, you know,
24 all of these lanes of traffic, making a turn, look for
25 the difficult paths on the way and go through conditions

1 that even my crazy cycling friends that want everyone to
2 cycle admit are pretty downright treacherous.

3 So I think that completing the trails and
4 filling some of the gaps would be what could be a really
5 good tipping point from turning this from a community to
6 where the crazy people cycle around to making things a
7 little bit more accessible for the rest of us, people
8 like me feeling comfortable getting on my bike, biking
9 down the work, biking to the library, even potentially
10 considering moving from San Francisco to a place like
11 Menlo Park because that's one way to become a community
12 where it's possible to go about your life on your bike
13 and not just your car.

14 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Thank you.

15 So do we have any other missing cards? I
16 don't see anyone coming forward.

17 Okay. Thank you. Thanks all for your
18 patience, great comments. I know I learned a lot. I'm
19 speaking for everyone up here.

20 I'm just going to call a five-minute recess
21 and I do want to keep it no five minutes.

22 MR. McCLURE: Before you do that, do you want
23 to close the public hearing?

24 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: I want to close the
25 public comment section.

1 (Recess taken).

2 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: I'm going to call the
3 meeting back to order. Were's on item E-1 still, which
4 is the EIR, and it's -- I just want to cover one thing
5 before we move on.

6 It's come to my attention that we have a
7 consultant here tonight for the fiscal impact report. It
8 would be good if we can finish that, and so that end, I'm
9 hoping that we can keep the questions about the EIR not
10 into the too deep end of the pool, and also that we can
11 defer the study session to Thursday, at which point some
12 of those more detailed questions than we have time to
13 bring up.

14 I'm just looking for some agreement on that,
15 or if you want to talk about that, we can do that.

16 Does that sound okay?

17 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: Could I first agree?
18 But also you might want to clarify to those present and
19 to the millions watching on television that we had
20 previously set aside Thursday at 7:00 PM.

21 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Right. Right. So, I
22 mea, I'm happy to sort of keep the comments on the -- the
23 questions on the EIR and keep us focused on that, and
24 it's my understanding we will have an opportunity to get
25 into more detail on that if we need to do so.

1 Okay. I'm not seeing anyone complaining, so
2 that's the way it's going to be.

3 MR. MURPHY: Through the chair, just one bit
4 of clarification, because I think I understand the basics
5 of the study session, which is an -- item G-1 would be
6 continued to a Special Planning Commission meeting, which
7 would be this Thursday starting at 7:00 PM.

8 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Correct.

9 MR. MURPHY: One thing about the questions on
10 the EIR, we do appreciate the brevity in terms of
11 questions on that, but we do have a number of consultants
12 here tonight.

13 So if there is a question that the Planning
14 Commission could at least get on the table tonight on the
15 EIR, that would be helpful because then those consultants
16 don't need to come back on Thursday. We can truly focus
17 on the study session.

18 If there are other questions that come up on
19 Thursday, we can follow up with our consultants on that
20 if need be.

21 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Yeah. I guess what
22 I'm looking at is a lot of the -- the issues that came up
23 tonight are going to be questions about the Development
24 Agreement, and there were some specific things about what
25 constitutes a mitigation and what not.

1 So I think we should be able to get through
2 the EIR. That's our goal, anyway.

3 Okay. With that, we bring it back up here and
4 we can start our questions about the EIR, some discussion
5 about the things that were -- were said here.

6 Henry.

7 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: First I want to note
8 that -- that the Commissioners to either side of me have
9 already covered three-quarters of my questions, so this
10 will help me not get too deep in the pool.

11 I -- I asked this earlier of our
12 transportation division, but I'd like to ask it here as
13 part of this -- this meeting.

14 One can't help but note that a great deal of
15 traffic is generated as part of -- and this existing
16 conditions, the Bayfront Expressway, which in spite of
17 its connections to the 101, most directly leads to the
18 Dumbarton Bridge.

19 So I wanted to through the chair perhaps for
20 Chip to try to put at least a rough idea of how much
21 traffic indeed is Dumbarton generated or oriented.

22 MR. TAYLOR: I -- you know, unfortunately I
23 don't have a specific number of what's generated between,
24 let's say, the Dumbarton Bridge and Bayfront Expressway
25 and 101, but obviously there is a large percentage.

1 A very large percentage of the traffic does
2 travel from the Dumbarton Bridge and Bayfront Expressway
3 to 101, and in past years, C/CAG, the City and County
4 Association of Governments, has recognized that link
5 essentially between two freeways, of Bayfront Expressway
6 and 101, and has worked on several projects.

7 So one of them's called a Gateway 20/20 Study
8 to try to improve the length between their mainly
9 University, Willow and Marsh and even looked at
10 potentially some large projects to try to accomplish
11 that.

12 So they recognized the fact that there is a
13 large percentage that does connect between those two
14 roadways.

15 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: Right. I appreciate
16 that, and we'll get back to that later in the comment
17 section regarding some alternatives.

18 Given that our level of service, I notice the
19 majority of the intersections in question, the ten are
20 already level of service D with a couple of them already
21 hit F.

22 Then I wanted to just clarify. It's from a
23 question from more than an hour ago, but it came up
24 specifically -- I was asked by a couple members of the
25 public early this afternoon.

1 The traffic cap or the trip cap that is
2 discussed. In -- in effect, the EIR covers trip caps for
3 both the East Campus and West Campus; is that correct?

4 MR. TAYLOR: For the East Campus, the
5 existing buildings, the trip cap is what's analyzed with
6 the Sun Microsystem employees being the baseline.

7 For the West Campus, the EIR actually analyzes
8 just the buildings using the Institute for Transportation
9 Engineers trip generation calculations for that square
10 footage of building.

11 That's what's actually analyzed, and then as a
12 mitigation measure, the trip cap was put on to there and
13 the mitigation measure analyzed.

14 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: So in effect, the East
15 Campus used the approved Sun employee cap, which was
16 3,600, looked at the appropriate trip generation with the
17 reduction of 25 percent that currently goes with the
18 approval for that site.

19 And so that was that basis, whereas for the
20 West Campus, it was based on the current standards based
21 on the employee numbers expected for 444,000 square feet,
22 or was it informed -- I believe I heard earlier -- by the
23 historic use at the -- or historic ratio of vehicles
24 versus vehicle alternatives at the Palo Alto Facebook
25 campus?

1 MR. TAYLOR: The West -- West Campus was --
2 utilized the ITE standard rates when it was analyzed, but
3 when the trip cap was put on there as a mitigation
4 measure, then that utilized the data from the Palo Alto
5 campus to help derive a new trip generation number that
6 was lower for the trip cap.

7 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: So the target for the
8 reduction was to be similar to the Palo Alto campus use?

9 MR. TAYLOR: Say that one more time. Sorry.

10 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: I may have missed how
11 you phrased it when I was making a note, to be honest.

12 You're saying for the West Campus that the ITE
13 numbers were reduced by the current -- in proportion to
14 current pattern of the -- or the previous or the recent
15 pattern of the Palo Alto campus as a target for the
16 mitigation?

17 MR. TAYLOR: Yes. So -- so it was originally
18 analyzed with no reduction, and that was what the -- what
19 the project was analyzed in the document, and then when
20 looking for mitigation measure for that campus, the West
21 Campus, then that's when we utilized the trip gap which
22 did utilize the data from the Palo Alto campus to help
23 derive that, you know, essential number of trips per
24 employee that was used to define the trip cap mitigation
25 measure.

1 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: Okay. And that's a
2 fairly aggressive reduction, obviously.

3 MR. TAYLOR: It is.

4 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: All right. Thank you.
5 All right. That's it for now. Thank you

6 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: John.

7 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: Okay. You know, I'm
8 just going to enumerate -- I've got several points here,
9 so maybe it would be just be better if I laid them out --

10 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Okay.

11 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: I can give you the
12 consultants some time to think about it if they think
13 that's necessary.

14 So I had my earlier question about how
15 employee growth gets capped and associated in the
16 different alternative analyses.

17 Another small question is whether or not the
18 actual parking spaces are cap -- are limited in the
19 parking lot.

20 We have parking lots out there with spaces,
21 but can we over -- can the parking lot be overparked more
22 than the number of spaces? That's just -- that's a
23 question.

24 I think it would be useful to hear just a
25 little bit of expansion on the toxic -- toxic air

1 contaminants, because that was one of -- I believe that
2 was one of the unmitigatable outcomes, and it sounds like
3 it's a cumulative impact having to do with the area
4 there.

5 Let's decode, you know, the language of
6 receptors and so on, know a little bit more about that.

7 And then finally I would just like to know
8 what are the kind of procedural technical options for
9 addressing as mitigation options much of the discussion
10 that we heard this evening, and I think these are
11 summarized under two main headings.

12 One is this idea of being able to prioritize
13 mitigation measures associated with traffic, so
14 pedestrian/bike parking, TDM, intersections,
15 signalization, can that be put in, how easy is that.

16 And then the other thing is -- is simply
17 consideration of -- I guess it's the Bay Trail and there
18 are these three major roadway segments that have been
19 mentioned, and what I'd like to know is basically can
20 they be integrated into the EIR without necessarily
21 dictating responsibility for -- responsibility to payment
22 in shares.

23 I know we do that all the time. If we say,
24 well, Atherton's going to do that or another. There's a
25 question whether they agree to it and how much they would

1 contribute and the applicant would contribute and so
2 forth.

3 That may be a similar here, so just how that
4 might work, so --

5 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: I think that last one
6 in particular is a really good point. There are a few
7 interlocking pieces --

8 COMMISSIONER BRESSLER: Yeah.

9 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: -- to that.

10 I mean, the specific question that came up
11 again and again was related to the -- it really boils to
12 prior -- prioritization, because the emphasis has been on
13 increasing traffic flow instead of reducing the number of
14 trips by increasing the -- the way that bikes can get
15 through the area.

16 And there doesn't seem to be any consideration
17 or evaluation of that. So I really think everybody out
18 there would like to hear what anybody on staff and
19 consultant can say about that.

20 Can that be incorporated into the EIR?

21 MS. GROSSMAN: Thank you for your questions.

22 I think Chip and I are going to answer these collectively
23 and look to our consultants for guidance, as well.

24 Chip, would you like to start with a
25 discussion on the alternatives analysis and how we came

1 up with that number and how that may factor in the data
2 that's in the trip generation in Menlo prepared by Fehr &
3 Peers based upon the existing vehicle trips at the Palo
4 Alto campus?

5 MR. TAYLOR: So I -- in -- hopefully I'll
6 Your question. I'll try to.

7 Essentially in order to develop the trip cap,
8 the trip cap was Fehr Peers, the consultant for the
9 Facebook actually did lots of counts at the current
10 property to help develop what their trip patterns were
11 and essentially develop a new rate per employee.

12 So ITE is our standard rates that we have per
13 employee for various types of uses. So since they're
14 different than that, they wanted to help develop a rate
15 per employee.

16 So that's how they developed that, by doing
17 all those counts. Then they have this rate per employee,
18 and then they essentially applied that utilizing how many
19 employees they anticipated having at the Facebook campus
20 to develop the trip cap. So that's how that was
21 ultimately developed.

22 And maybe you can refresh me if there's more
23 to that question that you wanted to know.

24 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: Well, there's a little
25 bit more, but I think we can leave it for later. I would

1 say take these questions in reverse order given the
2 bikes -- unless you want to take them.

3 MR. TAYLOR: I can talk about bicycles, too,
4 if that's what you wanted.

5 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: I just think -- I just
6 gave them as a list. My thought was sort of we're trying
7 to get through the evening, and so I was just trying to
8 get them out as a list. I don't want us to get bogged
9 down on that one.

10 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Whatever you want to
11 do, Chip. Let's make sure we get to that last one.

12 MR. TAYLOR: Okay. And Rachel I think has
13 some additional information maybe about the alternatives
14 analysis.

15 MS. GROSSMAN: Yeah. I think Chip did a
16 great job explaining how the -- it was -- the data that
17 was developed by Fehr & Peers was developed as a rate per
18 an employee.

19 And so then when we did the percent reduction,
20 there was a similar percentage reduction in trips applied
21 based upon the trip generation rates determined for the
22 trip cap. So there's 25 percent reduction across the
23 board.

24 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: But, you know -- I
25 mean, I -- I really don't want to get bogged down, but

1 clearly if you read the EIR and you get to the
2 alternatives and it says, you know, you're looking at
3 reduced trip count and it just says flat out the
4 employee -- the -- the company could not function.

5 You know, it's a non-- it's just a non
6 sequitur.

7 I mean, if there's an issue like saying
8 there's a decision made by the applicant that we really
9 don't think we can function at that level, it becomes too
10 problematic with that kind of a trip cap, I'd rather just
11 hear that than saying -- than sort of like this magical
12 connection.

13 But I really -- I don't want to belabor -- I
14 don't want to belabor it.

15 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: Through the chair, if I
16 could just clarify. The question is regarding the
17 project alternative.

18 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: Correct. Again, I
19 think -- I think we're not going to make progress on
20 this, so let's leave it for some other -- other time.
21 It's not -- I don't think it's worth pursuing.

22 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: All right.

23 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: Later.

24 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: So can we get on with
25 the -- the issue about the alternatives analysis?

1 MR. TAYLOR: Okay. So now you want to talk
2 about the bicycle component or do you --

3 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: The question really
4 is: Is there a way -- can we introduce the concept of
5 prioritizing mitigations and can we start using bike
6 mitigations as a way to reduce the traffic count to -- I
7 mean, that -- I think that's really what it comes down
8 to.

9 Because the thing is if you -- if you are
10 making these intersections more difficult for bicycles to
11 travel through, then therefore you'll have fewer bicycles
12 traveling through these. You will tend to increase the
13 need for trips.

14 I mean, that's one aspect of this, and it has
15 to do with -- with being able to prioritize these.

16 So right now, what was stated is the main
17 mitigation is to just add lanes, turn lanes, stuff like
18 that, and we're not really looking at ways to -- to
19 satisfy the trip count based on getting people on bikes
20 doing this.

21 I mean, I guess that's already folded into
22 your -- maybe the answer is well, that's -- that's --
23 based on the way that we did this, we know how many
24 people are going to come on bikes because that's what
25 they do in Palo Alto.

1 Is that -- I mean, I need a little
2 clarification on that.

3 MR. TAYLOR: Well, I'll start a little bit
4 with this about how we did the mitigation measures, how
5 they're included in the document, talk a little bit about
6 bicycles, and then maybe Bill McClure can weigh in on any
7 sort of prioritization or some of the legal aspects of
8 doing that.

9 But ultimately in the environmental document,
10 the way that our standards today are written for Menlo
11 Park is they're based on intersection delay.

12 So you add a certain amount of intersection
13 delay, and so ultimately, then, we have to look at ways
14 to reduce that delay to something that's less than
15 significant.

16 And so typically it starts with some sort of
17 intersection improvement, whether it's an additional
18 lane, changing the signal timing in some way, dealing
19 with traffic. That's the way that our standards are put
20 together today.

21 Right now, there isn't an easy way to
22 quantify. If we build a bike trail two miles away that
23 it's going to reduce the number of trips at this
24 intersection by some percentage, that would then help to
25 mitigate that impact.

1 There's no equation or formula or models that
2 can really determine that right now, and that's where it
3 becomes very difficult to create that nexus between this
4 is the mitigation measure for this intersection when it's
5 not at the intersection.

6 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Okay.

7 MR. TAYLOR: So that's why there's focus on
8 these intersection improvements.

9 Now, when we looked at the intersections and
10 looked at ways to improve them for traffic, we were also
11 keeping in mind how pedestrians and bicycles would
12 interact with those intersections, as well, and a good
13 example of that is at Bayfront Expressway and Willow.

14 So as there is a third right turn lane that
15 would be added to Willow to get on to Bayfront
16 Expressway, the bike lane that's there today would
17 actually be taken off of the road and put on to what we
18 call a Class I pathway adjacent to the road where it's a
19 completely separated facility that would then connect to
20 the Bay Trail along Bayfront Expressway, and then you
21 also have an undercrossing that Facebook will be putting
22 in under Bayfront Expressway which improves that overall
23 connection for bicyclists at that particular
24 intersection.

25 And we did that at the other intersections, as

1 well, to make sure that we weren't mitigating an impact
2 for traffic, but then creating an impact for bicyclists
3 or pedestrians. So we took that into account.

4 But unfortunately, at the end of the day,
5 there's just -- there's not a way to quantify a bicycle
6 improvement to the Bay Trail some distance away to
7 actually reducing trips on Bayfront Expressway or on
8 Willow or on University.

9 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Okay. Just quick
10 follow-up. If it's not possible to quantify it, does
11 that mean that it's not possible to put that down into
12 some type of a mitigation?

13 MR. TAYLOR: It's easier when it actually is
14 right at the intersection itself and you can have -- just
15 like we had one of those included where we had the Bay
16 Trail connected to University and Bayfront Expressway,
17 because we were connected to the intersection.

18 As you get further and further away from that,
19 it's much more difficult to say that there's a nexus
20 between a certain improvement and then another
21 intersection.

22 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Okay. I think that
23 answers the question for right now.

24 COMMISSIONER EIREF: Through the chair, so as
25 a Planning Commission, we can -- we can make a

1 recommendation that in no cases should the ability for
2 bicycles and pedestrians, crossroads get worse.

3 In fact, they should get better in all cases
4 as a result of all these changes; right? So we can sort
5 of say -- I think the reaction that we heard multiple
6 times is, okay. We're putting in all these turning
7 lanes. It seems things are getting better for cars, but
8 not for bicycles and pedestrians.

9 So can't we just make a recommendation that in
10 all cases, they intersections should get better for both
11 somehow?

12 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Well, the question is:
13 What -- what impact does that have in other areas? I
14 guess that's a question for Chip.

15 MR. TAYLOR: I mean, currently, like I
16 indicated before, we looked at all the mitigation
17 measures to ensure that they weren't going to be any
18 worse for bicyclists or pedestrians.

19 So we don't anticipate the way that they're
20 put together now would make it any worse for pedestrians
21 or bicyclists. It's already incorporated in,
22 essentially.

23 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: All right.

24 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: Well, just quick -- I
25 mean, I thought I heard one of the comments from the

1 audience was that Stanford in the Stanford EIR, they had
2 included in some way some kind -- some kind of, you know,
3 load change analysis or something.

4 Maybe it was because -- because everything was
5 very close. As you say, I don't know.

6 We can certainly come up with some kind of an
7 es -- of estimate. You know, you can estimate the number
8 of people who live to the south of Facebook. That's one
9 multiplicative factor.

10 You have another multiplicative factor of the
11 number of those who may be riding bicycles on the -- you
12 know, on the east side, you know, and that a -- there's a
13 range. There's a low, medium and a high.

14 So I -- you know, maybe it's too -- it's
15 crude. I don't know if there's a problem of legal
16 defensibility or something, if that's what's the scare
17 here, but I -- this is -- this is a very important issue,
18 and I think people need to know what will be the most
19 effective way of getting this through the city, probably,
20 at this point to keep it alive.

21 And so we want to really know what -- you
22 know, if this is a bad mechanism, we do want to know
23 that, but if -- but if there are ways to do it based on
24 other -- you know, and if it's good to set a precedent
25 here, that's a good thing, too, so we want to find that

1 out.

2 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: To me, it's sounding
3 likes the EIR may not be the best way to go at this. I
4 mean, I'd like an answer to -- to what Ben said.

5 If we say: "The Planning Commission
6 recommends to whatever you do to an intersection doesn't
7 make it worse for bicycles and pedestrians," I mean, it
8 sounds like you're already satisfied that that's the
9 case.

10 There's some dispute about that. I don't know
11 how we resolve that.

12 So is that -- does that actually do anything
13 if we make that recommendation and the City Council
14 adopts it?

15 MR. TAYLOR: I mean, from -- from our
16 perspective, we're already looking at that and it's
17 already built into our consideration.

18 So certainly the Planning Commission can feel
19 free to do that, but it's built into our thought process
20 already.

21 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: All right. Peipei.

22 COMMISSIONER YU: So I have a question. So
23 are we -- are we removing the pedestrian island on Willow
24 and Middlefield?

25 MR. TAYLOR: Yes. One of the pedestrian

1 islands would be removed.

2 COMMISSIONER YU: So then I think that
3 example, I guess, is confusing to me how not impacting
4 pedestrians would be looked at if we were looking at
5 removing an island.

6 MR. TAYLOR: Very good answer to that. Those
7 islands, those traffic islands are actually -- we
8 actually get a lot of complaints from people in The
9 Willows neighborhood especially, and throughout the
10 state, these are a big issue.

11 As you cross those particular areas, when you
12 cross from the corner to the island, you're crossing a
13 free right movement where that vehicle doesn't have to
14 stop. It can make a free right turn lane there. So
15 they're not stopping.

16 When you remove that island, the right turners
17 are required to stop before they make their right turn.
18 So you actually make it a much safer condition for
19 pedestrians when you remove that pork chop island and
20 cross the entire street there.

21 COMMISSIONER YU: Well, I guess I use that
22 intersection very frequently and I -- I like the island
23 because I find it to be a buffer between me and the cars.

24 But, you know, obviously that's my experience
25 versus, you know, the studies show that it's actually

1 safer.

2 And my other question is also about -- you
3 know, I think Mr. Taylor mentioned that we can't really
4 quantify, you know, improving the bypass and how that
5 impacts car traffic.

6 And so I wonder if it's possible to do
7 something like -- you know, not maybe restriping Willow
8 Road, but also making that there's some kind of right
9 turn bike and car collision potential

10 Can we experiment to see does that really
11 decrease traffic on Willow versus going in and creating a
12 whole lane? Which seems much more -- you know, it just
13 seems like a bigger project and bigger commitment than
14 trying to improve the bike paths and seeing if an
15 experiment into whether or not that does make an impact.

16 Is that possible?

17 MR. TAYLOR: You're saying to -- after the
18 bike lane is restriped, then do an analysis to determine
19 whether it improved the situation for bicyclists or more
20 bicyclists are there?

21 COMMISSIONER YU: Yeah. I don't mean do an
22 analysis that will take months or be very costly, but I
23 just wonder if you could just simply measure more
24 bicyclists using Willow Road because they find it safer?

25 I think it could be just an easy count to see

1 how many people used it before it's changed and how many
2 people use it after the change

3 Because I'm thinking that, you know, I hear a
4 lot from the community tonight that they want better bike
5 paths, but I'm also hearing that's hard to quantify.

6 So we need a way to make a decision about how
7 best to create better bicycle paths. So I think of
8 potentially doing short-term an experiment, a short-
9 term --

10 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: I like what you're
11 saying. Unfortunately, that's -- I think we're getting
12 beyond the questions about EIR with this, and we
13 definitely need to get back to all this stuff.

14 Okay? So I'm sorry about that.

15 COMMISSIONER YU: Okay.

16 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Katie.

17 COMMISSIONER FERRICK: Thanks. So I have a
18 few things, and I think like John, I'll kind of just go
19 through them.

20 Most of the traffic issues have already been
21 brought up, but one table that I was trying to read with
22 interest that I think I understood it, but maybe it's
23 Chip could refer to page 3.5-122, table 3.5-29.

24 On it, it has the -- some of the regional
25 routes of significance and their -- their condition

1 grade, and it seems like -- tell me if I'm reading this
2 wrong -- that they're already rated D, E and F for most
3 of them, and then with the -- with the project, they
4 would be -- continue to be poor.

5 But, you know, could you explain that, how --
6 what the summary -- how would you summarize the -- that
7 table?

8 MR. TAYLOR: Yeah. So the route's of
9 regional significance. So as you can tell, some of them
10 are already at the lower end of the level of service. So
11 that's very clear.

12 So if it's already at, let's say, an E or an
13 F, then if a project starts to contribute at least one
14 percent of the capacity of that roadway to that
15 particular roadway, then that's considered an impact.

16 So that's how you determine when you're
17 already at the lower range whether or not the project
18 would be an impact on that roadway or not.

19 COMMISSIONER FERRICK: And could you tell me
20 about the -- the 101 to Bayfront Expressway? It says:
21 Condition level of service C" and then level of service
22 standard E?

23 So are you saying that it will actually be --
24 it will remain better than the standard with the project?

25 MR. TAYLOR: In -- in that particular case,

1 the standard is E. So that's what the actual standard
2 is. That's not necessarily what it is today.

3 COMMISSIONER FERRICK: Mm-hmm.

4 MR. TAYLOR: And so then you have the
5 condition of level of service, which is at C.

6 COMMISSIONER FERRICK: Right.

7 MR. TAYLOR: So it doesn't mean that it's at
8 E and it's going to go back to C. It's just that it's at
9 C today.

10 COMMISSIONER FERRICK: Right. So it wouldn't
11 even get to the point where it's below the standard --

12 MR. TAYLOR: It hasn't reached that
13 threshold. It hasn't gone past that threshold of E.

14 COMMISSIONER FERRICK: All right. Thank you.
15 That helps me.

16 And then the other concerns that I had --
17 the -- that I came across in both the EIR and an FIA, one
18 that stood out for the -- both in the EIR and the FIA,
19 the school district impact, and it's wonderful to hear
20 the great work that Facebook has done thus far for
21 Ravenswood School District and some others.

22 We haven't yet talked about the impact to
23 Menlo Park City School District, and in it, one thing
24 that stood out is the enrollment -- the current
25 enrollment is already a year out of date.

1 I know that it says the data was collected on
2 August 31st, 2001, and just for reference for everybody,
3 I'm looking at the EIR page 3.15-7, and it's also in the
4 FIA on page 63 and 4, but not the specific data that I'm
5 talking about.

6 And this should have been brought up during
7 the FIA discussion.

8 So, for example, Encinal School, it says:
9 "Total capacity, 744, current enrollment, 746."

10 There's actually 773 students registered there
11 this year. So things like that, what I'm asking is could
12 the real current enrollment be recalculated as part of
13 the FIA so that the City Council and the development
14 agreement teams can have a better more timely figures?

15 One reason is the school district has been
16 growing by leaps and bounds, 34 percent in the last five
17 years, and it's -- it's become a very attractive school
18 district, and I feel like one -- I know the EIR states
19 that it doesn't rise to the level of a significant
20 impact.

21 I -- I disagree with that conclusion and I
22 think with proper figures, the EIR may come to
23 different -- a different conclusion, and I'm worried
24 that -- I just feel like the school district will
25 have -- will be a big benefit to Facebook's ability to

1 attract and retain great employees because it benefits
2 Facebook to have several great school districts in its
3 proximity.

4 And so I just feel like I don't want to --
5 because that school district is a basic aid district,
6 there is no additional dollars that go into that school
7 district when additional students go to that school,
8 unlike the other school districts that are part of the
9 FIA and EIR.

10 So I just want to bring that up in terms of
11 one, updating the figures to recalculate; and then two,
12 if there is a way that the City Development Agreement
13 team could work with the school district leadership to
14 figure out what their concerns are.

15 If I was -- if I were the school district
16 leadership, I'd be having some anxiety over the
17 additional students that the project should generate.

18 And then lastly, I just wanted to support the
19 many, many comments about improved bike and pedestrian
20 improvements, the continuous bike routes, as the D-11
21 noted, and I do hope that the -- that the project
22 ultimately fills in the entire Bay Trail gap as well as
23 improvements along University Avenue, Willow Road and Bay
24 Road in East Palo Alto.

25 That's all for now.

1 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Okay.

2 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: And I'm going to reserve
3 my comments for later, but I do have a couple of follow-
4 up questions, and one is just for clarification.

5 Again through the chair, if I can look to Chip
6 Taylor.

7 Yes, we talk about levels of service,
8 particularly LOS standards. Is there a brief way to
9 explain how one can have a level of service standard that
10 is F, that that would be the standard?

11 MR. TAYLOR: Yeah. In -- for the -- the
12 Congestion Management Plan for the county -- this is
13 talking about the routes of regional significance. Let's
14 talk about that one specifically.

15 So that one -- when the City and County
16 Association of Governments developed the Congestion
17 Management Plan for the county, it was a plan that they
18 were required to -- to create, they picked a certain
19 point in time and measured the level of service on all of
20 these roadways, and at that point in time is what the
21 level of service standard was set for those particular
22 roadways, and then any changes from that were then
23 developed, essentially.

24 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: Okay. Thank you.

25 And then following up on an earlier discussion

1 where since a bike route would solve the connection --
2 where a revision to a bike route would solve the
3 connection where a revision to the bike route or
4 completing a link would solve transit for a bike route,
5 you note that under CEQA, that doesn't solve the
6 intersection that's being examined because the
7 intersection has to do with traffic flow; right, and
8 delay?

9 MR. TAYLOR: That's correct.

10 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: However, in terms of
11 what this Commission could support and what we could see
12 as documents for this project, I'll give as an example
13 where a mitigation for something on Bayfront Expressway
14 might be made by putting money into a general traffic
15 fund that might then be used on Middlefield Road or even
16 an El Camino.

17 That clearly is not at the intersection, and
18 yet it's considered a mitigation because it handles the
19 issue of traffic.

20 Isn't that correct? As sort of a plan B.

21 MR. TAYLOR: Are you talking about the
22 traffic impact fee or just another mitigation measure
23 that --

24 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: No. I'm talking about
25 mitigation.

1 So am I solely confusing this with impact fees
2 and mitigation only designated as that specific
3 intersection?

4 MR. TAYLOR: Yes. For the specific
5 mitigation measures, there are the specific
6 intersections.

7 Are you also maybe talking about if they
8 weren't able to construct a particular mitigation, if
9 Caltrans didn't allow them to?

10 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: Well, I'm talking about
11 not being able to solve the literal CEQA challenge of
12 greater throughput at the intersection of -- of
13 automobiles.

14 So I'm just testing our flexibility as to
15 whether or not we could in effect direct as a mitigation
16 an improvement on a bicycle loop even though there is not
17 data that would support that would alleviate the
18 intersection, we could nonetheless indicate a future
19 intention or faith that it would ultimately have an
20 effect.

21 Can -- can the city do that?

22 MR. McCLURE: So the problem is -- is a
23 nexus. There needs to be a nexus between the mitigation
24 measure and the impact that you're trying to address.

25 And so we do have a traffic impact fee for the

1 general unmitigated impacts to reduce the overall
2 unmitigated impacts --

3 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: Mm-hmm

4 MR. McCLURE: -- but if there is a specific
5 mitigation measure that will address the specific impact
6 at an intersection, unless that is unacceptable to the
7 City, then CEQA would require that we implement that to
8 the extent that it's feasible.

9 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: Right. I guess I'm
10 looking at it in a reverse way. If -- say the
11 intersection of Willow and Bayfront Expressway, I would
12 call that the front door to campus in virtually all -- or
13 at least East Campus and virtually all employees will
14 probably go through that, or at least within a hundred
15 feet of it even if they walk or take bikes.

16 So if the current data would imply that we
17 would only reduce the traffic turning left or right from
18 the expressway into the campus by twenty cars during the
19 peak hour, but those twenty turn into bicycles, is the
20 city in the position to say: "We deem that to be a -- a
21 mitigation" even though it's not shown by the numbers?

22 MR. McCLURE: It would probably not be
23 politically -- I mean, legally defensible without the
24 specific study that indicates that, in fact, it is going
25 to mitigate impact.

1 So you then basically have to make a finding
2 that you have an unmitigated impact. You have to adopt a
3 Statement of Overriding Considerations and a statement of
4 why you're not adopting the mitigation measure that would
5 do that.

6 So unless it is, you know, defensible from an
7 expert analysis from the City's traffic analysis that, in
8 fact, making the bicycle improvements would reduce the
9 number of trips, then you can't reach the conclusion to
10 say it's mitigated.

11 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: I appreciate that. I
12 just wanted to test it all the way --

13 MR. McCLURE: Right.

14 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: -- before dropping the
15 issue.

16 And then the only other point -- test that I
17 wanted to make at this point has to do with removing the
18 pedestrian islands.

19 I'll note that Union Square in San Francisco
20 would likely come to complete gridlock if it weren't for
21 the pork chop pedestrian islands, and I have biked Willow
22 Road and biked Middlefield. I'm not always successfully,
23 and I have also used that right turn to go from
24 Middlefield so-called northbound to Willow so-called
25 eastbound, and the loss of that I think would be

1 significant for traffic flow.

2 So is that still on the table to maintain that
3 island?

4 MR. TAYLOR: I mean, in order to institute
5 the mitigation measure included in the document, the
6 traffic island would need to be removed.

7 So if you -- unless that mitigation measure's
8 not completed and you leave the intersection exactly as
9 it is today; otherwise, in order to put the mitigation
10 measure in the document, you would have to remove the
11 traffic island.

12 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: All right. And this
13 would be in order to provide the right turn lanes.

14 MR. TAYLOR: Well, it's essentially providing
15 a right turn lane that's there today and then it would
16 turn the through lane into a through and right turn lane.

17 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: Even though within 150
18 feet, the two lanes of Willow merge into one.

19 MR. TAYLOR: That's correct, but you're able
20 to get more throughput through the intersection there,
21 which helps to reduce the level -- not reduce level of
22 service, but reduce the overall delay on the
23 intersection.

24 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: Okay. I'll leave it at
25 that. Thank you.

1 MR. McCLURE: Just a reminder that unless you
2 vote to extend the meeting beyond 11:30, you'll need
3 to --

4 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Right. Jack.

5 COMMISSIONER O'MALLEY: Henry, thanks so much
6 for asking those questions. On my mind, I've looked at
7 the great concern among a large number of people, many of
8 whom by the way are not from Menlo Park, about this Bay
9 Trail gap and the desire on -- on the part of many
10 people, including those in Menlo Park, to do something
11 about that.

12 And I -- I concluded that I just didn't see
13 any way legally it could be done, and I believe that's
14 the response you got from our lawyer friend over there.

15 Is that correct? There's no way legally that
16 this Planning Commission could -- could impose upon
17 Facebook the cost of extending -- connecting the gap in
18 the Bay Trail?

19 MR. McCLURE: Well, the -- the issue is that
20 could be done through other -- through Development
21 Agreement negotiations or -- or other matters.

22 I don't think there's sufficient data or
23 analysis or impact that's addressed in the EIR that would
24 support it as a mitigation measure to be imposed on the
25 project.

1 COMMISSIONER O'MALLEY: All right. So there
2 are other ways of doing it, but not --

3 MR. McCLURE: There are other ways that that
4 issue could be potentially partially funded or -- you
5 know, if that becomes a priority of the City Council to
6 be use in Development Agreement negotiations to address
7 that issue.

8 COMMISSIONER O'MALLEY: It wasn't clear to
9 me, by the way, that doing that would improve any of the
10 situations that have been brought up in the EIR.

11 It's an opinion that many people had, but
12 there's no data to back it up.

13 Okay.

14 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: I wanted to ask the
15 commission if they'd be willing to go past 11:30 tonight.

16 COMMISSIONER FERRICK: I'd rather not since
17 we have a scheduled meeting Thursday.

18 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Anybody else want to
19 comment on that?

20 COMMISSIONER YU: I have children
21 consideration.

22 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Okay.

23 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: I'd be willing to -- if
24 it's necessary to completes the FIA and at least get to a
25 stopping point, but not by much.

1 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Okay. Well, it
2 doesn't -- to me, it doesn't sound like we have support
3 for going past 11:30, so we're going to try to wrap this
4 one up sooner later than later.

5 We resolved the issue about using mitigation
6 measures on the bikes. I'll get to you in a second,
7 maybe.

8 John, you have your light on.

9 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: Oh, yeah. We can get
10 to this later. There was this other issue about
11 prioritizing mitigations so as opposed no specifying
12 additional mitigation measures.

13 Prioritizing them, is that in our purview to
14 add that to the EIR?

15 So even though a bicycle mitigation trail may
16 not appear as a mitigation if it appears a public
17 benefit, then it would have kind of this priority with
18 respect to the project, possibly.

19 MR. McCLURE: So -- I mean, again, I -- I
20 didn't look at the Stanford EIR, Medical Center EIR, so I
21 don't know how that was done in their -- I know other
22 people for the City reviewed certain portions of that.

23 So I think there were actual mitigation
24 measures that were prioritized that were designed to
25 address the specific impact that was identified.

1 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: Mm-hmm.

2 MR. McCLURE: So within that, I --
3 prioritizing the specific identified mitigation measures
4 I think is what took place in that document.

5 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: So it's not a
6 directive. It's a hypothetical.

7 MR. McCLURE: Correct. So something that's
8 not already --

9 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: Not the mitigation
10 space.

11 MR. McCLURE: Right.

12 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: Just let me -- we
13 don't have to go into this, but since pedestrian safety
14 has been brought up, there is the -- I don't quite
15 understand what its status is about, if it's sort of an
16 optional project feature, but just removal of the current
17 pedestrian sidewalk at Willow and Bayfront -- did I get
18 that right -- right across from the entrance to the --

19 MR. McCLURE: So the crosswalk is being
20 removed across Bayfront Expressway at Willow to the
21 Facebook site.

22 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: What -- what I recall
23 reading was that it's a request -- you know, so what is
24 that? What is the status of that removal? And then what
25 -- how -- it does fall into this pedestrian -- how do we

1 understand the pedestrian -- I know that there's a tunnel
2 there, but people make other choices, too.

3 Anyway, I need clarification on that. We can
4 take that up later.

5 MR. McCLURE: Okay.

6 MR. TAYLOR: Maybe we can answer that.
7 You're talking about the -- the removal of the crosswalk.

8 So removal of that crosswalk, the reason why
9 it's being removed is because the undercrossing would
10 replace it.

11 So then we would direct pedestrians to use the
12 undercrossing so they wouldn't have to compete with
13 traffic on the surface.

14 So once both campuses are constructed, then
15 there wouldn't be a need for that crosswalk and they
16 would request Caltrans to remove it so you'd use the
17 undercrossing.

18 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: Where does the --
19 where does the tunnel come out on the west side?

20 MR. TAYLOR: On the west side, it comes out
21 just near the intersection of Willow and Bayfront
22 Expressway right near the intersection.

23 It comes out right there, and then there would
24 be a sidewalk that would just link right out --

25 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: Right. Within ten

1 yards?

2 MR. TAYLOR: Yes.

3 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: Okay.

4 MR. TAYLOR: It's very close. If you look at
5 a map, it's very close to the intersection.

6 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: That wasn't entirely
7 apparent from all the drawings.

8 MR. TAYLOR: It's very close. If you can
9 drive out there, you can see it. It's very close to
10 Willow.

11 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Okay. Thank you.
12 Peipei.

13 COMMISSIONER YU: I just wanted to respond to
14 a comment that Commissioner O'Malley made. I appreciate
15 your comment. They're very practical and they're always
16 well thoughts.

17 But this one in particular -- I didn't
18 particularly agree with, because -- I just wanted to say
19 that he mentioned that we don't necessarily have a
20 verifiable intersection between bike routes, traffic and
21 many people that were here weren't Menlo Park residents.

22 I guess I just wanted to comment that I really
23 hope that the Commission looks forward, and I think a lot
24 of people that spoke here. They - they work for the next
25 generation of Menlo Park. They're young -- young

1 professionals and tech professionals, and I really like
2 when -- when one of the speakers said that Menlo Park has
3 the opportunity to be the headquarters for social media.

4 And I think it's amazing. It's amazing when
5 he just kind of summarized that opportunity, and so I
6 kind of want to challenge us to think a little bit out of
7 box so that we create Menlo Park for the future, not
8 necessarily looking backward. We quantify everything
9 backwards, right?

10 And so, you know, I just wanted to comment on
11 that, because I feel very strongly that we wanted to kind
12 of target and create a beautiful place that we can have
13 for the future.

14 COMMISSIONER O'MALLEY: I hope I didn't give
15 the impression that I didn't agree with you on that. I
16 don't disagree.

17 I think it would be great, but the EIR is
18 maybe not the place where it could be done.

19 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Yeah.

20 COMMISSIONER O'MALLEY: That's where I am.

21 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Let's try and wrap up
22 the EIR stuff right now.

23 Ben.

24 COMMISSIONER EIREF: Okay. I'll just
25 reiterate that.

1 So -- yeah. I guess on Thursday is when we
2 can really talk about the project and we're -- the public
3 benefit and where we want to kind of think that through,
4 and I actually am struggling a little bit in the sense
5 that there's a lot of -- all sorts of things we should be
6 thinking about as a result of this revitalization.

7 I think Fran was the one that brought that up,
8 but I'm not sure that we can sort of expect that
9 Facebook's going to fund all that, be responsible for it.
10 We have to think through it.

11 There's some sort of balance of trade here and
12 responsibility that maybe the community has, as well.
13 Maybe on Thursday, we can talk about that.

14 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Fine. Henry.

15 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: Yeah. Just one last EIR
16 point, and again through the chair, if I could ask Chip.

17 If I remember right, and I -- and I can't in
18 spite of all my tabs find the right page.

19 It's -- one of the mitigations is to add a
20 right turn lane to Willow, and I believe to -- to cross
21 Willow if you're starting, shall we say, on the wrong
22 side and want to get over to the tunnel, you would still
23 need a crosswalk across Willow.

24 Correct?

25 MR. TAYLOR: Yes. You still have to cross

1 Willow and then you would go under Bayfront Expressway.

2 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: Correct, but now that
3 crossing would be going to twelve feet longer if we add
4 an additional right turn lane?

5 MR. TAYLOR: That's correct, but it is a
6 signalized intersection. That right turn lane is
7 signalized.

8 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: Right. So presumably if
9 currently the signal is set in order to allow someone the
10 necessary time to cross six lanes or whatever that
11 currently exists, that time would be increased twelve
12 percent or whatever the magic number is to cross an
13 additional lane?

14 MR. TAYLOR: Yeah, that's correct. There
15 would be some increase. Whenever a pedestrian pushes the
16 button, there would be a little of increased red time
17 there.

18 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: All right. So is that
19 taken into account that the cycle of the lights changing
20 and therefore allowing automobiles to -- to flow through
21 is now increased by that?

22 MR. TAYLOR: I would have to confirm, but
23 typically, yes, we do that into account.

24 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: Okay. And typically
25 there's a net gain in that.

1 MR. DAY: Overall, even though you have a
2 little bit of additional red time, you've got a whole
3 additional lane. So then overall, you get a positive
4 benefit from that.

5 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: Okay. Thank you.

6 MR. TAYLOR: One thing I wanted to just add
7 about that connection to the Bay Trail that has been
8 discussed.

9 That connection to the Bay Trail does go
10 across private property. So it's also something that
11 the -- the city or the county does not have control of.

12 So it's just another factor to consider for
13 that connection to the Bay Trail there.

14 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: I'm glad you brought
15 that up, because I guess it's just as good that I bring
16 this up as an EIR question.

17 Can the EIR identify that as it does -- or
18 perhaps the wording is such that similar to our
19 Caltrains -- Caltrans intersections where the -- the
20 preferred improvement is identified even though it's
21 acknowledged that we don't have financial control.

22 Is -- does the EIR frame this gap in the trail
23 such that it would encourage Facebook, Menlo Park and
24 East Palo Alto to work together outside of the official
25 mitigations?

1 MR. TAYLOR: I mean, currently the -- the
2 document doesn't speak to that particular trail
3 connection, I don't think.

4 So at this point, it doesn't, but just to
5 give -- maybe give you a little bit of information about
6 that particular piece, the Mid-Peninsula Regional Open
7 Space has been looking at that connection, and Menlo Park
8 in the past as well as East Palo Alto have been involved
9 in looking at that connection.

10 Mid-Peninsula Regional Open Space actually has
11 funding right now to work to try to obtain a trail
12 easement across that property and also working to do an
13 Environmental Impact Report to get that trail easement.

14 They've been working with East Palo Alto and
15 most recently have brought Menlo Park in to look at that.

16 So that's currently ongoing. They're working
17 to try to get that in place, and then ultimately likely
18 go after some sort of grant dollars.

19 If they did they were able to obtain the trail
20 easement, then likely go after some sort of grant dollars
21 to construct it at some point in the future.

22 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: All right. I think
23 that's great for everyone here, and apologies for another
24 sidestep. Thank you.

25 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: I have a couple of

1 really specific questions about the EIR if we can cover
2 them very quickly here.

3 When you calculate things like the need for
4 water, sewer, stuff like that, are you actually using the
5 increased number of employees or is it based on square
6 footage?

7 MR. TAYLOR: Increased number of employees.

8 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Right, okay. When you
9 are considering the economic impact of the reduced sales
10 tax revenue, is that something that figures into -- to
11 the EIR as a significant impact?

12 MS. GROSSMAN: No. The EIR's evaluating
13 physical impacts to --

14 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Okay.

15 MS. GROSSMAN: -- the project.

16 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: So it's just economic.
17 Okay. Anything else. Katie.

18 COMMISSIONER FERRICK: A quick one that you
19 just reminded me of.

20 Just wanted to confirm that when the
21 pollution, the air quality is calculated, you're taking
22 into account the increase in miles per gallon that cars
23 would have over future years?

24 MS. GROSSMAN: Correct. That's factored into
25 the -- called the Calley Model that was utilized to run

1 the baseline data versus the projected project data.

2 COMMISSIONER FERRICK: Thank you.

3 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Okay. Anything else?

4 I think that we can close this item out, then.

5 We're going to move on to regular business
6 item F. Review and comment on the draft for the Facebook
7 campus project.

8 Justin or Rachel, we have -- I assume we have
9 a presentation on this.

10 MS. GROSSMAN: We do have a presentation
11 here. The City's consultant, BAE Consultant, Ron Golem
12 will BAE will be presenting an overview of the Fiscal
13 Impact Analysis prepared for the project.

14 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Okay.

15 MR. GOLEM: Thank you, Rachel.

16 Good evening, Commissioners. In the interest
17 of time, I'll try to make this as brief as I can.

18 Obviously the fiscal impact analysis is a
19 fairly complex piece of analysis, and so I hope to do
20 this this presentation is give you a feel for how we
21 approached it and in kind of a big picture why it's done
22 the way it is, and also share with you some of the key
23 findings to -- to inform your consideration.

24 So to start with, the purpose of the Fiscal
25 Impact Analysis, there's several things we're trying to

1 do. One is we're trying to understand what is the net
2 fiscal impact.

3 By "net fiscal impact," I mean the
4 relationship between new revenues that come in versus new
5 expenses that occur for all the local government budgets.

6 So we're dealing with the City of Menlo Park's
7 general fund. We're also deal with special districts.
8 We're dealing with the school district and so on.

9 And we did that for the project set forth in
10 the Draft EIR.

11 Now beyond that, we're also trying to address
12 what some of the indirect impacts are. Specifically,
13 what is the implication of the potential new housing
14 demand, looking at that in terms of fiscal impact for the
15 City as well as some of the special districts.

16 One of the questions that was just asked which
17 was about the alternative analysis of potential business
18 and business sales tax, that was another task we were
19 given.

20 And so finally to note that even though I'm
21 going to do this in a fairly quick fashion, the Draft
22 Fiscal Impact analysis does have a complete set of tables
23 and details of methodology and so on, if you want to get
24 into the particulars.

25 So in terms of the scope of the fiscal impacts

1 analysis, as I mentioned, we were addressing both the
2 revenues plus the cost of new services as well as the
3 potential facilities, equipment and staffing that we
4 required.

5 I won't list through all the jurisdictions
6 here, but you will see that it is really the City of
7 Menlo Park, the then redevelopment project area, fire,
8 water, sanitary school districts and various county
9 functions.

10 So let me talk for a minute about how we
11 approached the fiscal costs, fiscal impacts analysis
12 study.

13 The beginning point for us is to look at the
14 actual current year budgets for all of these
15 jurisdictions so we can help identify where the current
16 cost of service delivery.

17 We worked through a series of interviews with
18 various department agency heads to help us identify what
19 are the marginal costs of these services, and by marginal
20 costs, what I'm referring to is the actual increment of
21 costs that will be caused by the project. So that we can
22 actually make that clear connection.

23 And again, looking at not just personnel, but
24 the equipment, overhead, all these other factors.

25 Now, some on of these services, it's not

1 practical to do this as a marginal cost, especially, for
2 example, with sort of general government types of
3 expenses and so one.

4 Some of those costs we actually do what we
5 call an a costs methodology, and what that involves is
6 coming up with a service population for the projects.

7 And so typically the rule of thumb that we use
8 is that a serious population for a project represents
9 residents plus non-resident workers at about fifty
10 percent, and that fifty percent is because workers in the
11 city aren't here as long throughout the day as residents
12 are.

13 And so we define what the total current
14 service population is. You can divide it by the cost to
15 come up with a curve population figure and then you can
16 apply it to a population associates with the project.

17 And again, in doing this methodology, we used
18 these methods, we interview the department heads and then
19 we reviewed it with them so we could fine-tune this and
20 come up with figures so that we felt that the departments
21 and special districts felt were accurate.

22 So in terms of revenue, the sources that we
23 considered were really the major revenue sources. New
24 property taxes, new sales taxes, transient occupancy
25 taxes.

1 And in particular, one of the things that we
2 did is we looked at what were some of the factors that
3 might affect these receipts, and particularly how the
4 nature of this operation might affect the collection of
5 sales tax as well as the kind of demand that might occur
6 from hotel rooms and occupancy and so on.

7 And as a result of that, we decided to come up
8 with two scenarios that really dealt with alternative
9 assumptions for sales tax and transit occupancy counts.

10 And the reason for that is that when you
11 consider a sales tax, it really becomes a question of
12 Facebook does provide a tremendous amount of services on
13 their campus to their employees.

14 So there's really no convenient rule of thumb
15 or clear examples you can look at well gee, for sure,
16 they're going to spend this on campus versus off-campus.

17 And so we thought if it was appropriate in
18 working through the project is to help with different
19 sets of assumptions, and this was based on our
20 discussions with Facebook's representatives as to what
21 were reasonable assumptions.

22 Similarly, when you talk about hotel rooms,
23 Facebook will generate a very definite demand for
24 additional hotel rooms, both they pay for hotel rooms
25 when they interview people, they have people coming to do

1 business with them and so on.

2 So it becomes a question of when you look at
3 the existing supply of hotel rooms in Menlo Park, do
4 those hotels match the type of hotels that their
5 employees and visitors will want to use and how is that
6 being captured from the city.

7 Obviously that becomes a function of what is
8 the supply of hotel rooms in Menlo Park, and of course,
9 as you know, we have projects that are lined up to
10 potentially add hotel rooms to Menlo Park in the future.
11 So it becomes part of the consideration.

12 So for the two scenarios, the first one was an
13 assumption that of the sales tax increase associated from
14 the Facebook project, that half that will be captured in
15 the city, and that of the transient occupancy tax, 25
16 percent will be captured in the city.

17 For the second scenario, we assume that 75
18 percent of the potential sales tax will be captured in
19 the city and 65 percent of the potential transient
20 occupancy tax will be captured in the city.

21 Now, in addition to those resources, we also
22 use sources -- these are the full gamut of new revenue
23 sources, so anything from vehicle license fees, utility
24 user tax, various license and permits and franchise fees.

25 In addition to those ongoing annual sources,

1 we also calculated the one-time revenue sources. So
2 those include items such as property transfer tax,
3 various development impact fees and capital facility
4 charges and so on.

5 So to get to our first set of findings, with
6 respect to the general fund, you will see several
7 different analyses in the report, including one that
8 looks over a twenty-year period, but the first most
9 simple way to present this is what we call the net fiscal
10 impact stabilization, and by stabilization, we mean after
11 the project's fully built out and after the full
12 employees are there onsite.

13 And so with respect to the general fund, what
14 we found for the two scenarios for that net fiscal impact
15 is that in scenario one, there be a positive fiscal
16 impact to the City's general fund of \$74,000 per year.

17 In scenario two, that impact would be higher
18 because of a higher sales tax and TOT, which will be
19 \$167,000.

20 COMMISSIONER O'MALLEY: Through the chair,
21 could I ask you a question?

22 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Yes.

23 COMMISSIONER O'MALLEY: Your scenarios one
24 and scenario two, does scenario one represent a realistic
25 figure or is that representing a low figure?

1 And likewise, is scenario two representing a
2 high figure or somewhat less than that? Where are they
3 with respect to reality in your judgment?

4 MR. GOLEM: I don't think it's much a
5 question of reality. I think if I can explain the
6 concept behind scenario one and scenario two, what I
7 would say is that scenario one is more conservative with
8 respect to how much of Facebook's employee spending
9 occurs within the City of Menlo Park as opposed to other
10 locations, and most significant on the transient
11 occupancy tax, it assumes that there probably is not much
12 of an increase any time soon in hotel rooms in Menlo
13 Park.

14 So because of the nature of current hotel room
15 inventory in the city, most of that hotel room activity
16 occurs outside the city.

17 Whereas I would say that scenario two tends to
18 assume that a little bit higher proportion of sales tax
19 activity is captured within the city, but more
20 importantly, that you do have an increase in the hotel
21 inventory in Menlo Park, such as, for example, the
22 Gateway project.

23 So that you have a much higher proportion of
24 hotel rooms that Facebook is spending money on occurring
25 in Menlo Park.

1 So in that sense, those are the two concepts.

2 I don't think it's a matter of being realistic. It's
3 just a matter of what circumstances lead to the two
4 scenarios, but I do think that those two scenarios do
5 bracket the likely outcomes with respect to --

6 COMMISSIONER O'MALLEY: That's what I was
7 trying to get from you.

8 MR. GOLEM: Okay.

9 COMMISSIONER O'MALLEY: Okay. So it's
10 likely -- the likely outcome is bracketed between those
11 two?

12 MR. GOLEM: That would be our opinion, yes.

13 COMMISSIONER O'MALLEY: That's fine.

14 MR. GOLEM: Now, we also did do an analysis
15 with respect to the reduced trip generation alternative
16 to understand what will be the implication of that on
17 these general fund fiscal impact findings, and as you'll
18 see, it had a slight impact for the scenario one.

19 The net positive fiscal impact increased to
20 62,000 per year, and for scenario two, it decreased to
21 174,000 per year.

22 Now in addition to those general fund impacts,
23 the one-time -- the total amount of various one-time
24 facility, development impact fees and so on paid to not
25 just the City, but also special districts ended up being

1 a total of 8.6 million dollars.

2 Now the next slide is actually already a
3 perspective or a historical look at what might have been,
4 in the sense as you know, because of the State Supreme
5 Court's ruling, redevelopment agencies will be dissolved
6 as of February 1st.

7 So that ruling had not occurred at the time we
8 did the analysis, and so what we did is we looked at the
9 Las Pulgas redevelopment project area, and we actually
10 did a calculation based on the increase in property value
11 and the tax income that flows from that, we'll do that
12 amount of money and how that would be distributed to
13 various agencies.

14 Now, what's going to happen is that these
15 amounts are basically not going to occur, and what's
16 going to happen is is rather than having them flow in the
17 ways that this is laying out in terms of affordable
18 housing and various kinds of aspects, incremental
19 projects and so on, all of that money is going to
20 basically be just ending up distributed as is general
21 property tax revenue without redevelopment.

22 And so what it means is -- and we have not
23 done the calculation. So there will not be tax increment
24 available for redevelopment purposes, but the increase in
25 property taxes that results from the Facebook project

1 will end up pulling through to not just the city, but the
2 county, the schools and special districts just as all
3 other property tax money does.

4 So the end result is that the numbers I just
5 talked about a minute ago will actually end up being a
6 little bit higher because of the additional general fund
7 money that the City will get, but that additional
8 increment will be nowhere near the amounts of money we're
9 talking about here, because again, when you look at
10 overall property tax revenues, the city only gets a small
11 slice and most of it ends up going to the county and
12 schools and -- and other agencies.

13 So I realize that's a little bit confusing and
14 not terribly clear, but that's sort of the situation
15 we're in right now with respect to redevelopment.

16 Next I'll talk about the impacts on some of
17 the special districts. We went through a fairly
18 exhaustive process of trying to understand what is the
19 net fiscal impact to the fire district, and basically
20 what we did is we looked at what are the property tax
21 revenues that would flow to the fire district.

22 Now, again, there will be some additional
23 money because of how redevelopment is changing, but we
24 have not analyzed that. So this is a number that is
25 based on the assumption that redevelopment was still in

1 place.

2 What we saw that the fire district would gain
3 just over a hundred thousand dollars a year in new
4 revenues.

5 Now, in addition to that, there are all of the
6 needs per the Draft EIR that there would be a need for
7 additional firefighter or fire safety person, and so we
8 accounted for that cost, as well.

9 When we looked at the carbon tax revenues and
10 the -- the cost of that, the actual net difference -- I
11 should have said this more clearly -- is actually the net
12 positive fiscal impact to the fire district is actually a
13 hundred thousand dollars per year.

14 Now, that's on the operating basis. That does
15 not address this other topic of what is the need for fire
16 equipment and what you heard the chief talk about.

17 As you may know, there's currently a process
18 going -- and the city is party to this -- where there is
19 a development impact fee nexus study that is going to be
20 prepared by the fire district in cooperation with the
21 city and the other affected parties.

22 And the intent of that is to establish a
23 development impact fee for fire services that will pay
24 for the cost of new equipment and station improvements
25 and so on that are identified to support not just

1 Facebook, but all the other potential development that
2 will happen in the service area.

3 Since that nexus study has not been done, we
4 don't know what that amount of money is, and so for our
5 purposes, we just noted that if that fee is in place by
6 the time when Facebook would be paying its building
7 permits, that they would of course pay that particular
8 fee.

9 Now, what it means is that when you look at
10 some of costs the fire district identified, specifically
11 the need for additional ladder truck, additional staffing
12 and station improvements, we are making assumption that
13 all those costs get pulled into the nexus study and will
14 be part of that calculation. But this is a series of
15 assumptions that we're making at this particular moment.

16 Next I'll talk about school districts. The
17 Facebook project itself lies within the Ravenswood
18 Elementary and Sequoia Union High School Districts. It's
19 an office project, there's no residential, so there's no
20 direct school impacts which occur.

21 Now, in talking about what this means -- and I
22 think with the benefit of not everyone's clear on this --
23 is there's basically two different ways the school
24 districts are dealt with financially in the state.

25 The largest number, the overwhelming majority

1 of districts in California are what are known as revenue
2 limit districts. So what that means is the state
3 guarantees a certain amount of per student funding.

4 And so what ends up happening is is that the
5 districts with a revenue limit district, it gets more
6 property tax money.

7 The state funding is offset by a certain
8 amount, so there's no net benefit for more property tax
9 revenues to our revenue limit district, and the
10 Ravenswood Elementary School District is a revenue limit
11 district.

12 By comparison, the Sequoia Union High School
13 District is a basic aid district, so that means that they
14 do not receive that same guaranteed per pupil aid that
15 the regular limit districts do.

16 Instead, they're relying upon the property tax
17 money, but what it means is that when there's more
18 property tax revenue, the basic aid district gets to keep
19 that.

20 So we looked at what the Facebook project
21 would generate for the Sequoia Union High School
22 District, and what it means is they have a net benefit
23 over \$309,000 per year, and it's such a high number
24 because there is a lot of value that's created and it
25 does free a lot of additional prior kept money, and

1 there's no direct cost because there will not be students
2 in the Facebook project itself.

3 Just -- I'll go through this quickly. We
4 also looked at a wide range of the other special
5 districts, the water and sewer districts.

6 Those are self-funding through the various
7 connection fees and capital facilities charges, and so
8 Facebook would generate 165,000 in water capital facility
9 charges, a million dollars in sewer connection fee.

10 For the community college district, they are
11 not currently accepting any more community college
12 students, so there's no increase in students, so there's
13 no increase in costs, but they will receive an additional
14 137,000 per year.

15 The County Office of Education's a revenue
16 limit district, so there's impact for them. And then
17 finally the Mid-Peninsula Open Space District, they do
18 not expect to see any increase in cost. They would have
19 a slight increase in property tax revenues of 33,000 per
20 year.

21 And again, all of these amounts of money will
22 go up slightly as a result of the redevelopment project
23 area going away.

24 So now I'll shift and talk about the potential
25 in reduced housing demand.

1 The housing needs analysis that was done by
2 Keyser Marston Associates identified a need for a
3 potential reduced housing demand up to 254 units, and
4 these 254 units are allocated among households at
5 different levels of area median income corresponding to
6 the assessment that Keyser Marston did on what the
7 salaries of those positions would be.

8 So what we ended up doing was taking those
9 household income levels and converting them to housing
10 prices so that we could assign them to different kinds of
11 housing prices and making assumptions about some of the
12 houses would be, for example, potentially taxpayer
13 projects.

14 You know, for households that earn sixty
15 percent of the area median or less, they would
16 potentially be living in new housing that we funded
17 through low income housing tax credit projects, which are
18 tax exempt -- typically tax exempt rental projects.

19 Other projects would be rental projects. Some
20 units would be actually for-sale projects. So we sort of
21 split those all out.

22 We went ahead and did the same type of fiscal
23 impact analysis based on how we had assigned those
24 different households to different types of housing units,
25 and from that analysis, we found that the reduced housing

1 demand would actually have a net fiscal cost to the City
2 of \$20,000 per year.

3 So that is a negative amount, but it is still
4 considerably less than the net positive fiscal impact
5 from the project overall.

6 Now one thing to note is that this kind of
7 analysis is based on averages. So that's not to say that
8 each project has the same sort of impact.

9 The actual impact from any particular project
10 makes a difference. So for example, if you're building a
11 project in one particular location and it so happens that
12 the police department has capacity as B structure, the
13 fire appears to have capacity, from may be very minimal
14 sorts of impact for that particular project even though
15 the analysis that we did as an average cost basis assumes
16 that each unit has a very proportional impact across the
17 board.

18 So the next topic was to look at the reduced
19 housing and what that fiscal impact would be for the
20 school district.

21 Now the challenge is is that again we at this
22 point don't have a way of saying where will these new
23 housing units be built necessarily, and so we ended up
24 making an assumption that first of all for the high
25 school, all students be would be going to the Sequoia

1 Union High School District, but with respect to the
2 elementary/middle school, we assumed that fifty percent
3 of the new housing will be the Ravenswood district and
4 fifty percent would be within Menlo Park City Elementary,
5 and again, that's not a forecast, that's not an
6 expectation. That's really an analytical device to say
7 if we have a mix of that two, how might that work?

8 Because it wasn't plausible to say they'll all
9 be in Ravenswood, and we didn't think it was plausible to
10 say that they would be in the Menlo Park city district,
11 either.

12 So what that means is -- it creates an
13 interesting dynamic, because as you heard me about, the
14 project is giving property tax revenue to Ravenswood,
15 even though they don't benefit from it, as well as to the
16 Sequoia Union High School District.

17 For the Menlo Park City Elementary School
18 District, which was part of the housing institute, does
19 not get any new property tax revenues from the project.

20 So to jump to the bottom line, what we did is
21 we looked at the net fiscal impact based on for each
22 district, its consideration, considering both the amount
23 of students that would come from the various housing
24 units as well as the property tax rates received.

25 Because Ravenswood's revenue limit, there is

1 no net fiscal impact program with respect to the housing
2 units in the district.

3 With respect to Sequoia, because they are
4 basic aid, they would still have a positive fiscal impact
5 of \$120,000 a year even after having to deal with the
6 education of the students for the reduced housing demand.

7 However, for the Menlo Park City District,
8 which is basic aid district, there is a negative fiscal
9 impact of \$270,000 per year.

10 Now that's a pretty substantial number, and I
11 think what I would suggest is that this needs to be taken
12 in context a little bit and it needs to be understood as
13 the way that this exercise was set up, because it's
14 looking at just this project, and because the Facebook
15 project property tax revenues do not go to Menlo Park
16 city, you have a situation where you have no revenues and
17 all costs.

18 So that will lead to a very large negative
19 number, and when we looked at that, we started thinking
20 about what does that mean or what's the way of thinking
21 about that.

22 This is just one point of comparison, but, for
23 example, because we recently worked on the El Camino Real
24 Downtown Specific Plan, what we observed there, when we
25 were looking at a much broader range of projects that

1 involve both revenue and expenses for the Menlo Park City
2 Elementary School District, that specific plan fiscal
3 impact analysis actually showed a fairly substantial
4 positive fiscal impact for the school district -- for
5 Menlo Park City District of 275,000 per year.

6 So what I'm suggesting here is that this is an
7 analysis, but you also have to understand that in a way,
8 we're bumping up against some of the limits of how you do
9 this kind of analysis.

10 The final topic is the topic of the business
11 to business sales tax revenues. This is something we
12 looked at because it's been mentioned before.

13 When Sun campus was at the East Campus, they
14 were very substantial generator of sales tax revenue for
15 the city.

16 The question came up, because although Sun
17 generates those kinds of sales tax revenues, the nature
18 of Facebook's business is that does not generate those
19 revenues.

20 So we ended up coming up with two methods to
21 estimate what might be the potential sales tax generation
22 from an alternative tenant and of mix of tenant at both
23 the East and West Campus than, for example, Facebook.

24 In the two methods we used, the first one was
25 to actually work with the city and look at the

1 confidential sales tax data from class A office buildings
2 in Menlo Park.

3 So we profiled basically class A office
4 buildings in Menlo Park and their current tenant mix and
5 looked at what is the type of sales tax generation that
6 comes from those tenants with the idea that that is a
7 good proxy for what might happen if the -- the East and
8 West campus were opened up to similar types of office
9 tenants.

10 The other method that we did -- and I think
11 this has not been done before, as far as I know -- is we
12 broadened our look because we wanted to look at Silicon
13 Valley overall.

14 By Silicon Valley, I mean San Mateo and Santa
15 Clara Counties, and what we did is we actually went to
16 the state and did a custom data run from the State Board
17 of Equalization where we looked at all of the different
18 categories that represent high-tech companies in Silicon
19 Valley.

20 We were able to use their data and to find out
21 and calculate what is the average per employee taxable
22 sales generated by high-tech companies in Silicon Valley,
23 and once we had derived that per employee number, then we
24 could apply it to the potential employment count that
25 would occur at the East and West Campus.

1 So using those two methods, again, that
2 defined a range in terms of what we could feel was the
3 potential business to business sales tax
4 revenues that could come from an alternative mix of
5 tenants at the site, and we felt that that range would be
6 between 431,000 to 827,000 per year.

7 Now it's important to understand that what I
8 just described is a way of calculating an average. And
9 so that's not to say that any particular tenant would
10 necessarily fall from that range.

11 For example, you could have another single
12 tenant come in that was not Facebook that did not
13 generate any sales tax, so you'd be at zero.

14 Alternatively, you could have somebody have
15 more, but again, this is just a way of trying to get at
16 an answer to what is that potential range you might have
17 if you had a different use on that campus.

18 I realize that was a lot of material in a
19 short amount of time, and I look forward to answering
20 your questions.

21 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: I have a question
22 about the revenue generation. I've read recently that
23 there's consideration in Sacramento of revising the --
24 the revenue models so that revenue -- actually, sales
25 tax-like revenue would be generated from companies like

1 Facebook.

2 Are you familiar with this?

3 MR. GOLEM: You know, there is discussion --
4 I think, you know, given the budget consideration and the
5 governor's proposal, there is a lot of discussion about
6 alternative mechanisms, including, as you're mentioning,
7 the idea that sales tax would charge in services.

8 I have not read any specific legislative
9 proposals, so I'm not clear as to what extent the
10 services that they're talking about would be personal
11 services like going to a dry cleaner, professional
12 services such as attorneys or what we do, or the kinds of
13 services that Facebook would do.

14 But certainly, you know, it's very plausible
15 that it would be part of the discussion. But at this
16 point, we're just relying on what's in the law, so we're
17 not really --

18 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Right.

19 MR. GOLEM: -- doing anything that's trying
20 to forecast or speculate.

21 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: All right. Henry.

22 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: Maybe four questions,
23 and I'm going to start with a background one. Right now,
24 what is our worker population in Menlo Park? I think
25 I've read 15,000, and I think I also read a higher number

1 at one point.

2 MR. GOLEM: I don't have that offhand, but
3 I'll look that up for you as you're going to your next
4 question.

5 MR. MURPHY: I'm not sure we have that exact
6 number tonight, but sometimes 15,000 may be private
7 companies. I've also seen 30,000 that have business
8 licenses with the city.

9 I think 30,000 is what includes the Federal
10 Government, local government, things like that. So those
11 are the two different reported numbers.

12 MR. GOLEM: Actually, I just looked it up.
13 This is the number we use from the US census from the
14 American Community Survey. I'm rounding, but 30,300
15 employees in Menlo Park.

16 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: All right. That is the
17 other number that I thought I heard. Okay.

18 And therefore, it would be logical to look at
19 them in terms of user services.

20 MR. GOLEM: Right. So our formula is that
21 30,300, we took half of them, so approximately 15,000
22 some, and the idea being that workers are typically here
23 eight hours plus or minus, as opposed to residents. You
24 know, if they don't work in the city, are maybe here
25 sixteen hours a day, if they work and live here, they're

1 24 hours a day.

2 And so there's a lower level of service for
3 workers who do not live in the city, and that's why we
4 make that adjustment.

5 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: Understood. So if over
6 the course of the next few years, we recover what had
7 been on the Sun campus and then add to the West --
8 proposed West Campus, that 30,000 would move to 39,000,
9 roughly.

10 MR. GOLEM: In terms of gross numbers, but
11 again, when we do our calculations. We take the increase
12 in employment above --

13 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: Right. I'm not looking
14 at impacts right now. I'm just looking at proportion.
15 It looks like Facebook will be 25 percent of our employee
16 base in Menlo Park. Just an interesting observation.

17 I mean, assuming that their predicted growth
18 actually occurs.

19 Under annual recurring expenses, and -- I
20 think I'm looking at page 13 -- I'm sorry. Page 28.
21 Administrative services is right about fifty percent,
22 although these are net numbers, I believe, coming up with
23 \$245,000 net cost.

24 But when I look at the breakdown and
25 proportionately, administrative services is notably

1 greater than the police department effect and the library
2 combined, but the administrative services includes 1.2
3 million per category bulk asset preservation.

4 Are you familiar with what that category is?

5 MR. GOLEM: I would have to defer to the
6 finance director to give you a detailed explanation of
7 what that category is, but basically what that category
8 represents is a lot of the staffing activities around the
9 finance department and the functions that are done that
10 involve kind of overall general management functions.

11 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: Well, I cheated. I
12 asked, and it's all the finance, which includes budget,
13 treasury. I didn't actually know we had a treasury
14 department in Menlo Park, and we can get to how to solve
15 budget problems later.

16 Revenue management, which includes account
17 receivable, business licenses, taxes, water and garbage
18 revenue management, accounting and reporting, accounts
19 payable, purchasing, risk management and payroll.

20 So the costs for those departments are
21 projected to rise by 1.2 million.

22 Is this something that you find is consistent
23 with the costs of increasing employment in the city?

24 MR. GOLEM: Well, actually, what we found is
25 that it would increase by just under 245,000 per year,

1 would be for the total of that entire function that
2 includes both asset preservation and the other items That
3 are listed under administrative expenses.

4 So if the question you're asking is do these
5 expenses necessarily increase in a very linear way on a
6 permanent employee basis, it's a fair question.

7 This is one of these items where we are using
8 the average cost methodology, and I think that may be
9 something that could potentially be somewhat debatable.

10 From our perspective, we were trying to be a
11 little bit conservative with respect to the potential
12 costs to the city.

13 And so we are making the argument that when we
14 look at these costs, that, you know, there is some
15 incremental amount of additional services that the city
16 provides based on the increasing population and that
17 therefore it's appropriate to calculate it as we have.

18 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: So it would be a twenty
19 percent increase because we have a new business, an
20 additional business with more employees.

21 MR. GOLEM: I think the more appropriate way
22 to look at it is that for administrative services, the
23 current budget is just over four million dollars a year,
24 and so what we're saying is that if \$245,000 increase
25 against four million, not doing math in my head right

1 now, but it's probably around a six or seven percent
2 increase.

3 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: Okay. Okay. And then
4 you spoke earlier about redevelopment funds, which is
5 something that I did want to ask about.

6 You indicated that -- perhaps I should say
7 confirmed that the redevelopment funds end up assuming
8 taxes continue to be collected, since they're no longer a
9 target of redevelopment so they go into the pool, for
10 which perhaps one of the -- perhaps the largest recipient
11 is the school system.

12 MR. GOLEM: Mm-hmm.

13 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: Right. So when you
14 looked at the net loss, what was it? 270 something
15 thousand for the Menlo Park School District as opposed to
16 the Sequoia High School District, that was prior to
17 figuring in --

18 MR. GOLEM: All -- all the figures I shared
19 was prior to when the State Supreme Court made its
20 ruling.

21 And so we would need to go back and revise
22 that based on what's happened.

23 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: Okay. But unlike the
24 tax base, which is in the Ravenswood District, this
25 property tax increase, would this also go to Ravenswood

1 or go countywide?

2 MR. GOLEM: It would be distributed -- we're
3 talking about the property taxes that come from where the
4 units are located as well as the Facebook project.

5 So you still have the same relationship where
6 the Facebook project does not result in any increased
7 property tax revenues for the Menlo Park City School
8 district.

9 So when we're talking about redevelopment, all
10 of that money as being distributed would not result in
11 any more money for the Menlo Park City School District
12 because they're not within that particular boundary.

13 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: All right. So if it's
14 cooks in another one percent or something, that also goes
15 to Ravenswood?

16 MR. GOLEM: Right. So they'd see no net
17 impact because their amount is going to be offset.
18 Sequoia would receive additional funding, though, because
19 they are a basic aid district.

20 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: Right. And then
21 finally, on the housing impacts, you used -- actually,
22 you have -- you have a chart there. You looked at some
23 assumptions on where the housing would be located, but
24 did you use or refer to the current preferences for
25 Facebook employees which as I recall differ markedly from

1 the average Menlo Park employee, preferences for housing
2 location?

3 For example, the preference for San Francisco,
4 whereas the average Menlo Park employee prefers -- or the
5 lead city preference is Redwood City.

6 MR. GOLEM: The Keyser Marston housing needs
7 analysis went through an exercise where it calculated
8 what percentage of Menlo Park -- I'm sorry.

9 What percentage of Facebook residents would be
10 interested in living in Menlo Park, and I can't quote
11 chapter and verse on that particular methodology, but I
12 know that in a round way, I believe it was about 7.8
13 percent of Facebook employees they felt would be
14 interested in living and would demand housing units in
15 Menlo Park.

16 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: All right. And when you
17 looked specifically at the East Palo Alto impacts --

18 MR. GOLEM: Our scope did not involve looking
19 at East Palo Alto impacts.

20 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: All right. I apologize.
21 No more questions.

22 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Katie.

23 COMMISSIONER FERRICK: Just follow on to what
24 Henry was saying. Good evening. On page 54, there was a
25 housing demand table that's broken out by income.

1 MR. GOLEM: Mm-hmm.

2 COMMISSIONER FERRICK: And I'm wondering if
3 that is incorporated with the -- I guess you were
4 explaining earlier why you kind of have to make an
5 estimate on which school district those housing units
6 might end up producing students from within either
7 Ravenswood or Menlo Park City --

8 MR. GOLEM: I think there's two separate
9 things going on. There's a question about where the
10 units are located.

11 And again, we did a fifty percent to
12 Ravenswood and fifty percent to Menlo Park City School
13 District, and of course a hundred percent to Sequoia.
14 That was how the allocation went.

15 The other part of the calculation is how the
16 tax revenues are generated, which is a function of what
17 is the value of the housing unit, which in turn is the
18 function of what type of housing unit is and what the
19 household can afford.

20 For example, just to briefly walk you through
21 this, starting at the bottom of the table, when you see
22 the units that we identify as being for very low income
23 and low income units, we're assuming that those are
24 associated with tax credit affordable housing type
25 project, and most commonly those are projects that

1 generate zero property tax revenues because they're tax
2 exempt.

3 As you go up the scale, for moderate income,
4 we assume that those are for sale units, because of the
5 City's 110% AMI affordable housing program.

6 When you go up to the next one, for above
7 moderate income, we assume those are rental units based
8 upon what those household and other income levels can
9 afford relative to current market rates for both rental
10 and for sale housing in Menlo Park.

11 And then finally for the highest category of
12 upper income units, we assume that those were all new for
13 sale market rate housing in the city.

14 COMMISSIONER FERRICK: Okay. I guess I'm --
15 that's helpful to figure out for the income categories.
16 Definitely good clarification, but I guess what I'm
17 wondering is why -- I guess it's just not part of your
18 methodology, but the -- it seems like it would make sense
19 to look at the housing stock within the city and make an
20 assessment based on the school district lines and how
21 much might fall into which category.

22 Because just looking at this, it -- it seems
23 like it's not a 50/50 split of just the existing housing
24 stock for a 50/50 split on where the students will end up
25 that are generated from these households, which is what

1 the school district estimates were.

2 Like I guess I'm saying is that I feel like it
3 will be a higher school impact to Menlo Park City School
4 District than Ravenswood.

5 MR. GOLEM: Right. You're -- because you're
6 assuming that there would be more interest in housing
7 being built in Menlo Park City School District and
8 therefore that's where the units will be.

9 COMMISSIONER FERRICK: I mean, right here, it
10 says: Projected housing units. 104 of them are upper
11 income units, and there's just simply -- the reality is
12 there's more stock of units, but that that income
13 category would probably buy -- things could change.

14 MR. GOLEM: Right.

15 COMMISSIONER FERRICK: Who knows?

16 MR. GOLEM: Yeah. The challenge in doing
17 this is that when you're dealing with a small number of
18 units, in some ways you can start making assumptions.

19 When we're dealing with this number of units,
20 it's a function of both where sites are available and
21 when they're available and when the market demand occurs,
22 and there's a lot of interaction back and forth.

23 So I think that to be quite honest with you,
24 it's a very interesting thing to say for sure well, here
25 is some sort of refined estimate that is going to be x

1 percentage in one district versus in another one.

2 There's a lot of different scenarios you can
3 lay out and I'm not sure that I have a good enough
4 knowledge in presenting which one of those scenarios
5 would be any more likely an another one.

6 COMMISSIONER FERRICK: Right. Thank you.

7 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: I just want to quickly
8 follow up on that.

9 So to the extent that Facebook employees drive
10 demand, let's say, for houses in Menlo Park that aren't
11 new, but have been assessed at very low tax rate because
12 somebody's lived this for a long time.

13 Now this demand's coming in, people are buying
14 these houses, these houses obviously are being reassessed
15 so that their property taxes go up a lot.

16 We're not -- we're not covering that scenario
17 here, really; are we?

18 MR. GOLEM: That amount is not included in
19 here. Part of the challenge is is that we are focusing
20 on incrementally what is the additional new housing
21 demand.

22 When you look at what's happening to the city
23 in general, you know, lots of people who are homeowners
24 in Menlo Park are some houses really away from being able
25 to buy some housing units.

1 So what I would say is that, you know, if you
2 look at the overall housing market in Silicon Valley,
3 that the effect that you're describing does occur and is
4 driven by both the economy here and when Facebook does
5 come in, to the extent they buy an existing housing
6 units, they're contributing to that dynamic that as
7 housing is turned over, it gets reappraised, but the
8 property revenue stays up quite a bit.

9 But trying to calculate that amount on a
10 citywide basis and trying to figure out how much of that
11 will be broken out to Facebook employees was not
12 something that we tried to do.

13 COMMISSIONER FERRICK: Through the chair,
14 though, I thought -- and maybe I need a clarification
15 from -- from you.

16 On the table on page 64, I thought the 94,000
17 additional projected annual revenues for Menlo Park City
18 School District was that incremental increase in property
19 tax revenue based on the -- and that the offset --

20 MR. GOLEM: What that 94,000 is, it's for the
21 new housing units that will be built in that district.

22 COMMISSIONER FERRICK: Oh. It's not for
23 turnover. Okay.

24 MR. GOLEM: It's not existing housing.

25 But if you have fifty percent of units in that

1 district, those new housings do generate property taxes.

2 COMMISSIONER FERRICK: Okay. Thanks.

3 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: I mean, my basic
4 contention is that it's probably not as bad as what your
5 report says --

6 MR. GOLEM: Right.

7 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: -- based on the dynamic
8 I'm talking about there.

9 MR. GOLEM: Right. I mean, the only point I
10 would make is that, you know, if we step back and we
11 looked at the City's overall financial picture and looked
12 at all the sources of revenue of how they're changing,
13 that would be a different study than the one we did.

14 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Okay.

15 COMMISSIONER EIREF: Two short -- just to
16 follow that up, this is kind of a conservation of math
17 situation. In Menlo Park, there's not a hundred empty
18 lots waiting to be built out.

19 So there's gonna be a dynamic where if people
20 are going to move in, it's most likely they're going
21 already buying other properties in Menlo Park that's
22 already there or something.

23 I, I guess, kind of went through all this and
24 it seemed like -- I picked up on the same thing. The
25 administrative services number seemed, I guess to your

1 point, very conservative because I'm not sure how many
2 financial controllers and various other things we need to
3 support one more business kind of thing.

4 So I kind of netted it all out with the bottom
5 line. I said, worst case scenario, there's not a lot of
6 additional net revenue to the city, but it doesn't look
7 like it's being negative, which is a good thing.

8 There's no scenario here that says that we end
9 up losing money overall in the city.

10 MR. GOLEM: So, for example, the feeling is
11 that we were overly conservative in overestimating the
12 administrative services cost. Those costs should be
13 lower, then that means our findings would actually be
14 more favorable for the city than what I laid out.

15 COMMISSIONER EIREF: Correct. I mean, it
16 doesn't seem like there's a scenario here that you laid
17 out where we end up impacting the general fund negatively
18 overall.

19 That's what -- that's kind of the way that I
20 read this whole report at the end of the day.

21 MR. GOLEM: Right. Based on the assumptions
22 in terms of the value of the project and the sales tax
23 generation, the transit occupancy tax generation and so
24 on, that is correct.

25 COMMISSIONER EIREF: It's not a big boon to

1 us, but on the other hand, it doesn't look like we're
2 going to end up losing, and to me, that was almost the
3 most important aspect of this is that we -- we
4 acknowledge that we're not -- it's not another computer
5 company that's going to come in and build tons of
6 infrastructure and sell it to other businesses, but on
7 the other hand, we're not going to end up losing out at
8 the same time, which would have been a difficult
9 situation.

10 MR. GOLEM: In terms of the baseline.
11 Of course, the other part of this discussion is there
12 will be a development renegotiation.

13 So the final picture for the city will be a
14 function of the outcome of those Development Agreement
15 negotiations.

16 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: We're running up to
17 almost 11:30, and I realize at this point that I have not
18 opened this item up for public comment which I'm required
19 to do, so that's what I'm going to do right now.

20 Would anyone like to make a public comment on
21 this item?

22 Okay. No one's coming forward. I'm going to
23 close the public comment.

24 John.

25 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: I think I know the

1 answer to this question, but just to -- to clarify it.
2 Suppose after all is said and done, we sort of look and
3 say just for purposes of -- of thinking or argument we
4 have the city, as a policy judgment has a general fund
5 target that they'd like to associates with the project.

6 It sounds like we -- we can't -- if we want to
7 go, for example, you provide us with this good
8 information -- for example, the business to business
9 taxes, that we can't use that. We can't just make up our
10 own.

11 We can't go this kind of -- if we have a
12 target like that, we have to put it into the Development
13 Agreement just specifically as a number, goal, but we
14 don't -- we shouldn't waste -- is it true we shouldn't
15 waste time looking for some kind of instrument or
16 mechanism?

17 Are those only for illustrative calculating
18 value to say look at the number of workers, look at the
19 square footage and so one. Just think about that.

20 MR. GOLEM: What the Fiscal Impact Analysis
21 does is that on the revenue side, there is formulas that
22 are set in long-term how the city obtains property taxes,
23 revenues since housing is built, sales tax revenue,
24 transit occupancy tax revenues and so on. So that's what
25 we were calculating.

1 On the service positive side, we're trying to
2 think what we think is an estimate of what that's going
3 to cost and what's the relationship. That's kind of one
4 way of answering the question.

5 I think the other part that you're asking
6 about, this part I would defer to Bill, but basically
7 that there's other goals that the city has, revenues or
8 otherwise, is that becomes part of the agreement and
9 that's not a function of what's this relationship of the
10 formulas for revenues or costs for providing services,
11 but it's a matter of what the parties agree to.

12 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: Okay. I think I
13 understand. I just wanted to confirm that, make sure.

14 MR. GOLEM: All right.

15 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: It's kind of the same
16 issue we were dealing with earlier with where is it -- is
17 it a mitigation or is it some other entity.

18 MR. McCLURE: Exactly. His sales tax
19 analysis, that bracketed sales tax analysis was done
20 simply to try to see if there were some metrics out there
21 to look at.

22 If Facebook wasn't there and this was some
23 other time of user, what would be the potential sales tax
24 revenue that we're giving up by Facebook being there and
25 to provide information.

1 COMMISSIONER KADVANY: Yeah. Understand, and
2 it is very useful information, too, and I'm glad it's
3 there.

4 Thanks.

5 COMMISSIONER EIREF: So through the chair, so
6 there was some discussion somewhere in the appropriation
7 journals about there being -- the City Council is going
8 to be developing a concept for public benefit, and this
9 was actually ideas through this -- this medium.

10 Is that -- is that where this concept would --
11 would need to be addressed?

12 MR. McCLURE: Yes.

13 COMMISSIONER EIREF: Public benefit?

14 MR. McCLURE: Well, public benefit is revenue
15 generation. There are a lot of different ways of looking
16 at public benefit, one of which is ongoing revenue.

17 COMMISSIONER EIREF: Creating an endowment
18 for computer education in Menlo Park or something as a
19 result of this project.

20 That would be a project benefit or how would
21 that be --

22 MR. McCLURE: It could be annual revenue
23 payable to the city. We've done that in the development
24 agreements in the past, guaranteed revenue streams.

25 I mean, there are a number of different

1 things, or it could be paying for the Bay Trail --

2 MR. McCLURE: Right. Completion of the Bay
3 Trail. I mean, it could be a lot of different things.

4 COMMISSIONER EIREF: In the Gateway
5 project -- you know, I wasn't on the Commission at that
6 point in time -- there was a lot of discussion about
7 making sure the city didn't end up getting the short end
8 of the stick or there were other expectations, right?

9 MR. McCLURE: Yes.

10 COMMISSIONER EIREF: That's another big
11 project that was very recent and fresh in everyone's
12 mind.

13 So that would be done through the public
14 benefit.

15 MR. McCLURE: That's correct, and that is
16 essentially part of what you will be doing on Thursday
17 evening is having some discussion around those topics.

18 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: All right. Peipei.

19 COMMISSIONER YU: I was kind of agreeing with
20 Greg how I think the outlook for Menlo Park city schools
21 will be weaker than is in the report.

22 So I wonder if there's, you know, a way to --
23 much as you've bracketed the impact, you know, on other
24 sites as it pertains to schools.

25 You know, because I'm looking at page 54 in

1 the chart, if I assume that households with over a
2 hundred thousand dollars in income would prefer to go to
3 Menlo Park schools versus Ravenswood, we're looking at 72
4 percent going to Menlo Park versus twenty percent to
5 Ravenswood.

6 That's much different than fifty percent do
7 tonight, you know.

8 So I know that there's no great way to project
9 these things, but I think that you've bracketed other
10 things because you don't -- you can't get a precise
11 number.

12 I think it would make sense if schools were
13 bracketed, as well. Maybe it could mean, you know,
14 income level or something like that.

15 MR. GOLEM: You know, We can run as many
16 scenarios as the city directs us to do. I think the
17 point I was trying to make before is that if you want to
18 understand the context of the Menlo Park City School
19 District, obviously, you know, depending on what scenario
20 you use, this is one impact, but you might want to
21 consider the citywide impact, because, as is the case,
22 there are some projects that generate revenues and some
23 projects that generate cost.

24 And so it's really -- if you look at their
25 overview future, it's going to be all the projects and

1 how the pluses and minuses balance each other out.

2 This project by itself is going to have this
3 amount of impact where other projects would probably have
4 a plus amount, as well.

5 COMMISSIONER YU: I think for the other --
6 for the other items we were looking at, we were looking
7 at as though we didn't have Facebook.

8 So I think -- you know, I understand that
9 you're saying there's going to be other impacts for
10 downtown plan and all that, but if we're looking at just
11 Facebook, but the other items may appear, too.

12 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Henry.

13 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: Short question. Has
14 anyone asked the Facebook population, worker population
15 how many have children.

16 MR. GOLEM: Our calculation was based on the
17 average number of children per household. We did not
18 survey the Facebook worker population as it exists today.

19 The other point to make is that the
20 population's going to change as both the work force
21 increases in size and also the work force potentially
22 ages.

23 So we felt the current average population per
24 house in Menlo Park was the right place to start.

25 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: Okay. I guess I would

1 suggest that maybe if you look at otherwise, because if
2 the character of Facebook as a company tends to be
3 younger, then even across maybe the next five or ten
4 years, there would potentially be a cycle of employees
5 that will keep it younger.

6 MR. GOLEM: Right.

7 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: And it does appear, at
8 least from the data we have on preferred housing
9 locations, that Facebook employees are not a mirror of
10 the average Menlo Park employee.

11 MR. GOLEM: Right. So, for example, if we
12 obtain that information, and as you're suggesting, it
13 might be fewer people per household in Menlo Park, that
14 would reduce the costs that we identified.

15 And so some of the impacts that we're seeing
16 to, for example, Menlo Park City School District would
17 decline.

18 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: Just for example, when
19 we had a housing project before us where the developer
20 indicated that his likely market -- and theoretically he
21 knew his market because he was putting a lot of money
22 into it -- would not have school-aged children.

23 We then had a district superintendent review
24 the project and said I'm not even going to pay attention
25 to this. They won't have any children.

1 We have our doubts because it's our job to be
2 concerned, but anecdotal review proved that to be true.
3 So this might be an example where we are making
4 assumptions that -- that are not appropriate.

5 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Okay. Katie.

6 COMMISSIONER FERRICK: Well, I mean,
7 obviously there are assumptions to be made, but contrary
8 to what Henry just said, I feel like the assumptions are
9 incredibly conservative.

10 If you have 9,000 employees and you think that
11 there's going to be a total of thirty students to the
12 Menlo Park City School District generated from that,
13 that's pretty conservative.

14 So I don't think we're, you know, overstating
15 the potential school impact here.

16 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: No, but first you have
17 to live in Menlo Park and then --

18 COMMISSIONER FERRICK: Right.

19 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: -- you have to have
20 children.

21 COMMISSIONER FERRICK: I'm not saying there's
22 going to be 5,000 more children in Menlo Park City School
23 district as a result of this project, but I just -- I
24 understand we have to make assumptions, but I definitely
25 don't think that these were on the side of a high

1 assumption. I think they're incredibly conservative
2 assumptions.

3 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: Anybody else?

4 Okay. I think that's -- that's going to do it
5 for that item, and we're going to do the Development
6 Agreement discussion -- I forget what it's called.

7 Are we going to do the next item?

8 MR. McCLURE: Study session on the project.

9 CHAIRPERSON BRESSLER: On Thursday, 7:00 PM.
10 Be here. With that, I'm going to adjourn the meeting.

11 (The meeting concluded at 11:39 PM).

12 ---o0o---

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO)
2

3 I, the undersigned, hereby certify that the
4 discussion in the foregoing meeting was taken at the
5 time and place therein stated; that the foregoing is a
6 full, true and complete record of said matter.

7 I further certify that I am not of counsel or
8 attorney for either or any of the parties in the
9 foregoing meeting and caption named, or in any way
10 interested in the outcome of the cause named in said
11 action.

12
13 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have
14 hereunto set my hand this
15 _____day of _____,
16 2012.

17 _____
18
19 MARK I. BRICKMAN CSR 5527
20
21
22
23
24
25