

3.13 Public Services

This section describes the existing environment and regulatory setting for public services within the city related to the Facebook Campus Expansion Project (Project). It also describes the potential impacts on public service providers, including police, fire, and emergency services; recreation; libraries; and schools, that would result from implementation of the Project. The analysis identifies the potential impacts of the Project on the ability of the service providers to deliver required services.

Issues identified in response to the Notice of Preparation (NOP) (Appendix 1) were considered in preparing this analysis. The applicable issues are related to fire and emergency services, standards of significance, Menlo Park Fire Protection District (MPFPD) and existing emergency services in the environmental setting, impacts due to Project features, the recently completed *Standards of Cover Assessment for the Menlo Park Fire Protection District* (June 16, 2015), the status of the ongoing Draft Nexus Impact Fee Report, and school capacity.

Existing Conditions

Regulatory Setting

State

California Senate Bill 50 (SB 50). Under the provisions of SB 50, school districts may collect Level Two and Level Three fees to offset the costs related to increasing school capacities in response to growing student enrollments associated with development. Level Two fees require a project developer to provide one-half the costs of accommodating students in new schools while the state provides the other half. Level Three fees require a project developer to pay the full cost of accommodating the students in new schools. Fees would be implemented at the time the funds from Proposition 1A (approved by the voters in 1998) are expended. School districts must demonstrate to the state their long-term facilities needs and costs, based on long-term population growth, to qualify for Level Two or Level Three fees.

Local

City of Menlo Park General Plan. The following goal and policy within the Open Space/Conservation Element of the City of Menlo Park's (City's) General Plan are relevant to the Project:

Goal OSC2: Provide parks and recreation facilities.

Policy OSC2.4: Parkland Standards. Strive to maintain the standard of 5 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents.

The following policies within the Safety Element of the General Plan are relevant to the Project:

Policy S1.5: New Habitable Structures. Require that all new habitable structures incorporate adequate hazard mitigation measures to reduce identified risks from natural and human-caused disasters.

Policy S1.10: Safety Review of Development Projects. Continue to require hazard mitigation, crime prevention, fire prevention and adequate access for emergency vehicles in new development.

Policy S1.29: Fire Equipment and Personnel Access. Require adequate access and clearance, to the maximum extent practical, for fire equipment, fire suppression personnel and evacuation for high occupancy structures in coordination with the Menlo Park Fire Protection District.

Policy S1.38: Emergency Vehicle Access. Require that all private roads be designed to allow access for emergency vehicles as a prerequisite to the granting of permits and approvals for construction.

The following goal within the Land Use Element of the General Plan is relevant to the Project:

Goal I-H: To promote the development and maintenance of adequate public and quasi-public facilities and services to meet the needs of the city's residents, businesses, workers, and visitors.

ConnectMenlo. The City's General Plan (Land Use and Circulation Elements) and M-2 Area Zoning Update, also known as ConnectMenlo, is under way. Although not yet adopted, the following draft policies and goal in ConnectMenlo pertain to the Project and are identified for informational purposes:

Policy LU-4.4: Community Amenities. Require mixed-use and nonresidential development of a certain minimum scale to support and contribute to programs that benefit the community and the city, including education, transit, transportation infrastructure, sustainability, neighborhood-serving amenities, child care, housing, job training, and meaningful employment for Menlo Park youth and adults.

Policy LU-6.2: Open Space in New Development. Require new nonresidential, mixed use, and multiple dwelling development of a certain minimum scale to provide ample open space in the form of plazas, greens, community gardens, and parks whose frequent use is encouraged through thoughtful placement and design.

Policy LU-6.3: Public Open Space Design. Promote public open space design that encourages active and passive uses, and use during daytime and appropriate nighttime hours to improve quality of life.

Policy LU-6.6: Public Bay Access. Protect and support public access to the Bay for the scenic enjoyment of open water, sloughs, and marshes, including restoration efforts, and completion of the Bay Trail.

Goal LU-7: Promote the implementation and maintenance of sustainable development, facilities and services to meet the needs of Menlo Park's residents, businesses, workers, and visitors.

Menlo Park Fire Protection District Fire Prevention Code, Ordinance 30. The Fire Prevention Code is adopted pursuant to the Fire Protection District Act of 1987 (California Health and Safety Code Sections 13800 et seq.). This code, which was adopted by the MPFPD in September 2007, adopts by reference the 2006 edition of the International Fire Code (IFC), with necessary state amendments. Under Ordinance 30 of the Fire Prevention Code, fire protection systems are required; this code applies to the design, installation, inspection, operation, testing, and maintenance of all fire protection systems. Automatic fire sprinkler systems shall be required in new buildings if the new structure has a total floor area of 5,000 gross square feet (gsf) or more, if the building is four or more stories in height, or if the building has a height of 40 feet or more. Sprinkler systems are also required in existing buildings where the cost of the improvements made to the building exceeds 50 percent of the assessed valuation of the structure. Fire extinguishers and fire alarms are also required.¹

Menlo Park Fire Protection District Fire Prevention Code, Ordinance 32. Pursuant to Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations (also known as the California Building Standards Code [CBCS]) and California Health and Safety Code Section 13869 et seq., a fire protection district may adopt a fire

¹ Menlo Park Fire Protection District. 2007. *District Fire Prevention Code Ordinance 30 and District Standards, Local Ordinance to 2007 California Fire Code and Fee Schedule*. Adopted: September 5, 2007. Available: <<http://www.menlofire.org/fireprevention/forms/Ordinance%2030.pdf>>. Accessed: September 11, 2015.

prevention code by reference. The MPFPD adopted a new amended and restated Fire Prevention Code in November 2010 that makes local amendments to the 2010 California Fire Code. Ordinance 32 of the Fire Prevention Code includes outlined requirements for burning, fire apparatus access roads, traffic-calming devices, photovoltaic system installations, automatic fire sprinkler systems, fire alarm systems and components, and building access in the event of an emergency.²

Environmental Setting

Fire and Emergency Services

Fire protection services in the Project area are provided by the MPFPD. The MPFPD service boundary covers 30 square miles, including Menlo Park, Atherton, and East Palo Alto, plus parts of unincorporated San Mateo County and federal facilities such as the Veterans Hospital, U.S. Geological Survey office, and the Stanford Linear Accelerator. The MPFPD includes seven fire stations, one administrative building, and one rescue warehouse. The MPFPD's service area, which covers approximately 111,850 people,^{3,4} is primarily residential, but it also serves some industrial areas in the easternmost part of the area (including the Project site). In addition, the MPFPD is part of the greater San Mateo County boundary-drop plan whereby the closest apparatus responds to each call.⁵

Headed by the fire chief, the MPFPD is organized into the Administrative Services Division, the Fire Prevention Division, the Operations Division, and the Training Division. Currently, the MPFPD has eight chief officers, 24 captains, 60 engineers/firefighters, and three fire inspectors, for a total of 95 fire safety personnel employees. Each engine and truck is staffed by a minimum of three people.⁶ Current staffing levels equate to a ratio of 0.85 position per 1,000 persons in the service population. Although the number of safety personnel fluctuates, the MPFPD's goal for staffing includes a total of 98 fire safety personnel and a service ratio of 0.88 position per 1,000 persons in the service area.⁷

The MPFPD responds to approximately 8,200 incident calls per year, with about 63 percent of them being emergency medical incidents.⁸ The MPFPD's response goals are 7 minutes for its first fire unit to arrive at an emergency medical incident and less than 8 minutes for all units to arrive at a structure fire.

² Menlo Park Fire Protection District. 2010. *District Fire Prevention Code Ordinance No. 32-2010, Adopting the 2010 California Fire Code with Local Amendments*. Adopted: November 16, 2010. Available: <<http://www.menlofire.org/fireprevention/forms/2010%20Ordinance%2032.pdf>>. Accessed: September 11, 2015.

³ Schapelhouman, Harold. Fire Chief, Menlo Park Fire Protection District. November 16, 2015—email to Kyle Perata, City of Menlo Park.

⁴ The MPFPD determines service population by accounting for both residents and employees. The MPFPD service population is different from that of the Menlo Park Police Department (discussed below). The MPFPD considers each employee as equivalent to 0.58 resident in its service population, whereas the Menlo Park Police Department includes one-third of all employees (daytime residents) who work in the city in its service population.

⁵ Menlo Park Fire Protection District. 2013. "Menlo Park Fire Protection District Information." Available at <<http://www.menlofire.org/districtinfo.html>>. Accessed: September 11, 2015.

⁶ Schapelhouman, Harold. Fire Chief, Menlo Park Fire Protection District. November 16, 2015—email to Kyle Perata, City of Menlo Park.

⁷ Schapelhouman, Harold. Fire Chief, Menlo Park Fire Protection District. January 20, 2016—email to Kyle Perata, City of Menlo Park.

⁸ Menlo Park Fire Protection District. 2013. *Menlo Park Fire Protection District Information*. Available: <<http://www.menlofire.org/districtinfo.html>>. Accessed: September 11, 2015.

In 2014, the district-wide response time was 6.34 minutes. However, the actual response time may vary, depending on whether the units are in quarters, in their response areas, responding to simultaneous incidents, or out of their area for training.⁹

Fire Stations 5 and 77 in Menlo Park and Fire Station 2 in East Palo Alto are the closest stations to the Project site. Station 77, located at 1467 Chilco Avenue, south of the Project site, is expected to serve the Project site. The driving distance between Station 77 and the Project site is about 0.6 mile. In addition to providing fire protection within the district, Station 77 provides automatic aid to Redwood City and mutual aid to Fremont. In 2015, Station 77 responded to 984 emergency incidents.¹⁰ Per shift, Station 77 is manned by three firefighting personnel (one captain and two firefighters).¹¹ The station operates Engine 77 (Type 1 Pierce Saber fire engine), an airboat, urban search and rescue (USAR) vehicles, and various utility vehicles, which are owned by the MPFPD.¹² Station 1, at 300 Middlefield Road, approximately 1.6 miles south of the Project site, could serve the Project if a 100-foot aerial ladder truck were needed to reach taller buildings.¹³

With respect to improvements to MPFPD facilities, the MPFPD is in the process of reconstructing Station 2, which is located at 2290 University Avenue, approximately 1.2 miles southeast of the Project site. Once complete, Station 2 will include a three-bay, drive-through 12,747 gsf fire station as well as a new detached communication tower. In addition, the MPFPD is in the process of enlarging Station 6, located at 700 Oak Grove Avenue, approximately 2.3 miles south of the Project site. Station 6 is currently 3,200 gsf. Once complete, Station 6 will include a two-story 7,452 gsf firehouse, detached vehicle storage garage, emergency generator, 500-gallon fuel tank, and the relocation of an existing carriage house from its present location on Middlefield Road.¹⁴

On February 16, 2016, the MPFPD Board of Directors approved a Nexus Impact Fee Study, presented by the MPFPD Fire Chief. The Nexus Impact Fee Study is part of a Fire Protection Facilities Impact Fee Program that ensures that new development provides its fair share of the cost of needed capital facilities to serve the population within MPFPD's boundaries. These capital facilities include fire stations and buildings, emergency response vehicles, and other fire protection and emergency equipment. The fee was adopted under the authority of Assembly Bill (AB) 1600, the Mitigation Fee Act, contained in Section 66000 and subsequent sections of the California Government Code. AB 1600 established a process for local governments and districts to formulate, adopt, impose, collect, and account for impact fees. As per AB 1600, cities, including the City of Menlo Park, hold the legal authority to impose fees on behalf of the MPFPD within their city limits.

⁹ CityGate Associates, LLC. 2015. Standards of Cover Assessment for the Menlo Park Fire Protection District: Volume 2 of 3, Technical Report. June 16. Available: [http://www.menlofire.org/pdf/soc/V2%20-%20Menlo%20Park%20FPD%20SOC%20Final%20-%20Technical%20Report%20\(06-30-15\).pdf](http://www.menlofire.org/pdf/soc/V2%20-%20Menlo%20Park%20FPD%20SOC%20Final%20-%20Technical%20Report%20(06-30-15).pdf).

¹⁰ Schapelhouman, Harold. Fire Chief, Menlo Park Fire Protection District. January 20, 2016—email to Kyle Perata, City of Menlo Park.

¹¹ Schapelhouman, Harold. Fire Chief, Menlo Park Fire Protection District. January 20, 2016—email to Kyle Perata, City of Menlo Park.

¹² Menlo Park Fire Protection District. 2008. *Station 77*. Available: <http://www.menlofire.org/station7.html>. Accessed: September 11, 2015.

¹³ Schapelhouman, Harold. Fire Chief, Menlo Park Fire Protection District. November 16, 2015—email to Kyle Perata, City of Menlo Park.

¹⁴ Menlo Park Fire Protection District. 2015. Fiscal Year 2015-2016 Adopted District Budget & CA-TF3 US&R Budget. June 30. Available: http://www.menlofire.org/pdf/ab2015_16.pdf. Accessed on April 18, 2016.

Although the City has not yet imposed the fee, it is anticipated that the fee will be levied on new residential and non-residential development in the MPFPD's boundaries to offset the demand for capital facilities generated by new development.^{15,16} An effective date for the impact fee has not yet been identified by the city.

Police

Police services in the vicinity of the Project site are provided by the Menlo Park Police Department (MPPD), which serves the city, with mutual aid provided on an as-needed basis from neighboring law enforcement agencies. The MPPD is headquartered at the Menlo Park Civic Center at 701 Laurel Street, approximately 2 miles southwest of the Project site. This main station serves the Project site.

A new substation opened in spring 2014 at the corner of Hamilton Avenue and Willow Road, approximately 0.3 mile east of the Project site. The substation is an auxiliary site for officers who work in the Belle Haven neighborhood to use as office space. The substation has limited business hours and is staffed with a part-time clerk. There are no other immediate or near-future plans for expansion of MPPD facilities, staff, or equipment, aside from normal replacement schedules.¹⁷

The MPPD is headed by the chief of police and consists of two divisions: Patrol Operations and Special Operations. The MPPD has a total of 48 sworn officers, covering three beats, and 22 professional staff members. Beat 3, which serves the Project site, is staffed with at least two sworn officers; however, officers in the city who work the shift are available to assist during emergencies.^{18,19} The MPPD service population is 42,046 people, which includes the total resident population of the city and one-third of all employees (daytime residents) who work in the city. The current service ratio is 1.14²⁰ sworn officers per 1,000 residents, which exceeds the MPPD's preferred ratio of one sworn officer per 1,000 residents.

The MPPD is committed to maintaining response times that are consistent with industry standards. From November 2014 to November 2015, the MPPD received a total of 290 Priority 1 calls, 10,204 Priority 2 calls, and 10,316 Priority 3 calls. MPPD's current response times, which are considered acceptable, are as follows.

- Priority 1: Immediate threat of danger to a person or a large amount of property, and the crime is in progress and/or there is a chance of immediate apprehension of the suspect. The response time for Priority 1 calls for the MPPD is slightly more than 5 minutes.
- Priority 2: Emergency is in progress, but it is not life threatening or does not immediately threaten a large amount of property. Alternatively, the situation could be life threatening, but the threat has passed and the suspect is in custody. The response time for Priority 2 calls for the MPPD is 8 minutes.

¹⁵ Menlo Park Fire Protection District. 2013. Fire Protection Facilities Impact Fee Nexus Study – Administrative Draft. Prepared by Seifel Consulting and Urban Economic. June.

¹⁶ Menlo Park Fire Protection District. 2016. *Menlo Park Fire Protection District Emergency Services and Fire Protection Impact Fee Nexus Study*. February.

¹⁷ Jonsen, Robert, Chief of Police, Menlo Park Police Department. November 5, 2015—memorandum to Kyle Perata, City of Menlo Park.

¹⁸ Jonsen, Robert, Chief of Police, Menlo Park Police Department. November 5, 2015—memorandum to Kyle Perata, City of Menlo Park.

¹⁹ Jonsen, Robert, Chief of Police, Menlo Park Police Department. January 7, 2016—memorandum to Kyle Perata, City of Menlo Park.

²⁰ Service ratio = (48 sworn officers/42,046 residents) × 1000 = ~1.14.

- Priority 3: The situation is not life threatening and time is not significant. The response time for Priority 3 calls for the MPPD is 10 minutes.

In addition to standard police services, the existing Facebook Campus requires additional police service for investigations, search warrants, protests, and dignitary/celebrity visits. Police service is required for investigations related to identity theft and other crimes that involve Facebook users. In addition, search warrants from out-of-state police agencies for active out-of-state investigations that have connections to the information stored on Facebook servers require police service. On an irregular basis, major events occur at the Facebook Campus that attract a large number of visitors as well as dignitaries/celebrities. Police services for these events are often required for crowd control, protest abatement, personal protection and security, and motorcades.

Schools

Four elementary/middle school districts and one high school district are within the boundaries of the city: the Menlo Park City School District (MPCSD), the Ravenswood School District, Redwood City School District, Las Lomas School District, and the Sequoia Union High School District. However, the portion of the city that includes Las Lomas School District, which is generally bounded by Alameda de las Pulgas to the north and Interstate 280 to the south, is built out, with no substantial potential for new housing units. Thus, this school district is not further analyzed in this section because the Project would not indirectly induce the construction of new housing in this area and result in the generation of new students.

Menlo Park City School District. The MPCSD serves parts of the city, Atherton, and unincorporated San Mateo County. There are approximately 2,941 students, kindergarten through eighth grade, enrolled in the four schools of the district.^{21,22} Oak Knoll Elementary School and Hillview Middle School are located in the city, while Laurel Elementary School and Encinal Elementary School are located in Atherton.²³

The MPCSD employed 178 full-time-equivalent teachers during the 2014–2015 school year, with an average student-to-teacher ratio of 16.5 students per teacher.^{24, 25} Pursuant to Education Code Sections 52121–52128, the MPCSD strives to provide class sizes of 20 students for grades kindergarten through third and 24 students for grades fourth through eighth.²⁶ On average, the MPCSD meets this goal.²⁷

The MPCSD's schools and associated capacity for the 2014–2015 school year are listed in Table 3.13-1, below. As shown, with the expansion of the Laurel School, all of the schools in MPCSD have additional capacity available for new students. Nonetheless, if a school is at capacity, students have the potential to attend another elementary school in the district. The MPCSD is required to accommodate the students

²¹ Menlo Park City School District. n.d. *About Us*. Available: <<http://district.mpcsd.org/modules/cms/pages.phtml?pageid=169038&sessionid=69d7bf3a3142231aa2155898b6f502d9>>. Accessed: September 15, 2015.

²² Enrollment Projection Consultants. 2015. *Concluding Documentation to Latest Forecast Update*. November 2, 2015.

²³ Menlo Park City School District. n.d. District Boundaries. Available: <<http://district.mpcsd.org/modules/cms/pages.phtml?pageid=171241&sessionid=ace8f1cbb3bf78dafce27dbfc3ecf22b&sessionid=ace8f1cbb3bf78dafce27dbfc3ecf22b>>. Accessed: September 15, 2015.

²⁴ Menlo Park City School District. 2015. *District Profile 2014–2015*. Available: <http://district.mpcsd.org/modules/cms/pages.phtml?pageid=169038&sessionid=69d7bf3a3142231aa2155898b6f502d9>. Accessed: November 2, 2015.

²⁵ Menlo Park City School District. 2015. *District Profile*. Available: <http://district.mpcsd.org/modules/cms/pages.phtml?pageid=169038&sessionid=69d7bf3a3142231aa2155898b6f502d9>. Accessed: November 23, 2015.

²⁶ Menlo Park City School District. 2008. *Class Size and School Assignment*. Menlo Park Board Policies, Board Policy 5116.2, Class Size and School Assignments. Adopted: June 2003; revised: April 2008. Available: <<http://district.mpcsd.org/modules/cms/pages.phtml?pageid=171089#Philosophy>>. Accessed: September 15, 2015.

²⁷ Sheikholeslami, Ahmad. Chief Business and Operations Officer, Menlo Park City School District. January 10, 2016—email to Kyle Perata, City of Menlo Park.

within its boundary. If all classes are at capacity, then the MPCSD may accommodate additional students by either increasing the class size or opening new classrooms. The MPCSD currently uses student generation rates of 0.44 student per single-family dwelling unit and 0.18 student per townhouse dwelling unit.²⁸

Ravenswood City School District. The Ravenswood City School District (Ravenswood CSD) serves primarily East Palo Alto and the Belle Haven neighborhood in the city. Ravenswood CSD serves approximately 3,291 students, kindergarten through eighth grade, in seven elementary schools.²⁹ Ravenswood CSD also includes Ravenswood Child Development Center (pre-kindergarten) and San Francisco 49er's Academy (sixth through eighth grades, located at Costaño Elementary School). In addition, Ravenswood CSD holds charters for five charter schools, including one high school. Two Ravenswood CSD schools, Belle Haven Elementary School and Willow Oaks Elementary School, are located within the city.³⁰

Table 3.13-1. Menlo Park City School District—Capacity and Enrollment, 2014–2015

| School | Grades | Total Projected Capacity (2016–2017) ^a | Resident Population (2014–2015) ^b | Additional Capacity |
|------------------------|--------|---|--|---------------------|
| Laurel School | K-5 | 720 | 630 | 90 |
| Encinal School | K-5 | 720 | 589 | 131 |
| Oak Knoll School | K-5 | 720 | 638 | 82 |
| Hillview Middle School | 6-8 | 1,100 | 833 | 267 |
| Total | | 3,260 | 2,690 | 570 |

Note: This table is based on the resident student population for planned attendance areas in 2016–2017. Laurel School is under construction and will result in two schools: a lower campus for grades K–2 and an upper campus for grades 3–5. The school is scheduled to open in 2016. The capacity and enrollment information for the school provided herein reflects the information provided by the MPCSD.

Resident population is based on where the students live rather than the schools they happen to attend (enrollment population). Resident population differs from enrollment population because of intra-district attendance and known incoming inter-district enrollment from addresses outside the MPCSD.

Sources:

- a. Williams, Tom. Enrollment Projections Consultants. November 2, 2015—projected enrollment from 2015 to 2025.
- b. Enrollment Projection Consultants. 2015. *Concluding Documentation to Latest Forecast Update*. November 2, 2015.

As of the 2014–2015 school year, Ravenswood CSD employed 224 teachers,³¹ resulting in a ratio of approximately 14.7 students per teacher. According to the Ravenswood City School District Population Projections Report, Belle Haven Elementary School's enrollment is expected to decrease from a current enrollment of 578 to 527 students by 2020, while Willow Oaks Elementary School's enrollment is

²⁸ Enrollment Projection Consultants. 2015. *Concluding Documentation to Latest Forecast Update*. November 2, 2015.

²⁹ Sved, Kevin. Planning and Development Consultant, Ravenswood CSD. November 16, 2015—memorandum to Kyle Perata, City of Menlo Park.

³⁰ Ravenswood City School District. 2015. *About RCSD*. Available <http://www.ravenswoodschools.org/about.html>. Accessed: November 23, 2015.

³¹ California Department of Education, Educational Demographics Unit. 2015. *Certified Staff by Ethnicity for 2014–2015, Number of Staff by District by Ethnicity*. 4168999 – Ravenswood City Elementary. Available: <http://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/>. Accessed: November 30, 2015.

expected to increase from a current enrollment of 685 to 856 students by 2020.^{32,33} Belle Haven Elementary School and Willow Oaks Elementary School can accommodate up to 622 students and 722 students, respectively.³⁴ As shown in Table 3.13-2, these two schools are currently under capacity. The Ravenswood CSD uses a student generation rate of 0.39 student per single-family dwelling unit and 0.56 student per multi-family dwelling unit.³⁵

Table 3.13-2. Ravenswood City School District Schools in Menlo Park—Capacity and Enrollment, 2015–2016

| School | Grades | Total Capacity | Current Enrollment (2015–2016) | Additional Capacity |
|-------------------------------|--------|----------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|
| Belle Haven Elementary School | K-8 | 622 | 578 | 44 |
| Willow Oaks Elementary School | K-8 | 722 | 685 | 37 |
| Total | — | 1,344 | 1,263 | 81 |

Note: Capacity values include the remaining 3 to 5 years of useful life of temporary portable buildings.

Source:

Sved, Kevin. Planning and Development Consultant, Redwood CSD. November 16, 2015—memorandum to Kyle Perata, City of Menlo Park.

Redwood City School District. Redwood City School District (Redwood CSD) serves elementary school students in Redwood City and portions of San Carlos, Menlo Park, Atherton, Woodside, and incorporated areas near Redwood City.³⁶ There are approximately 9,042 students, kindergarten through eighth grade, enrolled in the 18 schools of the Redwood CSD.³⁷ Taft Community School, which has an enrollment of approximately 524 students, and John F. Kennedy Middle School, which has an enrollment of approximately 728 students, serve portions of Menlo Park.³⁸ However, because Redwood CSD is a “district of choice,” it is not likely that all students generated from future development in the Redwood CSD service area would go to these two schools.³⁹

³² Sved, Kevin. Planning and Development Consultant, Redwood CSD. November 16, 2015—memorandum to Kyle Perata, City of Menlo Park.

³³ Davis Demographics and Planning. 2014. *Fall 2013/2014 Report: Student Population Projections by Residence, Fall 2013–Fall 2020*. June 11. The 2020 enrollment for Belle Haven Elementary School and Willow Oaks Elementary School was calculated by adding the number of students in 2020 for transitional kindergarten through eighth grade.

³⁴ Sved, Kevin. Planning and Development Consultant, Redwood CSD. Memo to Kyle Perata, City of Menlo Park, November 16, 2015.

³⁵ Davis Demographics and Planning. 2014. *Fall 2013/2014 Report: Student Population Projections by Residence, Fall 2013–Fall 2020*. June 11.

³⁶ Redwood City School District. 2013. *District Profile*. Available: <<http://www.rcsd.k12.ca.us/domain/5>>. Accessed: September 15, 2015.

³⁷ California Department of Education, Data Reporting Office. 2016. *District Enrollment by Grade, 2014–2015*. 4169005 – Redwood City Elementary. Available <<http://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/>>. Accessed: January 12, 2016.

³⁸ California Department of Education, Data Reporting Office. 2013. *District Enrollment by Ethnicity, 2014–2015*. 4169005 – Redwood City Elementary. Available: <<http://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/>>. Accessed: September 15, 2015.

³⁹ The Redwood City School District offers a combination of neighborhood schools and “schools of choice.” Neighborhood schools have residential boundaries, and students are generally assigned to them based on where the students live. Redwood CSD offers four schools of choice—Adelante Spanish Immersion School, McKinley Institute of Technology (MIT), North Star Academy, and Orion School—that do not have neighborhood boundaries. All students within the district are eligible to apply to attend one of the four schools of choice or a neighborhood school outside their boundary area. From: Redwood City School District. 2013. *Schools of Choice*. Available: <<http://www.rcsd.k12.ca.us/site/Default.aspx?PageID=228>>. Accessed: September 15, 2015.

As shown in Table 3.13-3, Taft Community School and John F. Kennedy Middle School are currently under capacity. Redwood CSD employed 431 full-time-equivalent teachers during the 2014–2015 school year, with an average student-to-teacher ratio of 21 students per teacher.⁴⁰ Redwood CSD updated its facilities master plan and a demographic study in May 2015. Redwood CSD projects a decrease of approximately 178 students by 2024. A student generation rate of 0.35 student per single-family dwelling unit and 0.14 student per multi-family dwelling unit is used for the Redwood CSD.^{41,42}

Table 3.13-3. Redwood City School District Schools in Menlo Park—Capacity and Enrollment, 2014–2015

| School | Grades | Total Capacity | Current Enrollment (2014–2015) | Additional Capacity |
|-------------------------------|--------|----------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|
| Taft Community School | K–5 | 947 | 524 | 423 |
| John F. Kennedy Middle School | 6–8 | 1,218 | 728 | 490 |
| Total | — | 2,165 | 1,252 | 913 |

Source:

Saleh, Wael, Chief Business Official, Redwood CSD. October 20, 2015—memorandum to Kyle Perata, City of Menlo Park.

Sequoia Union High School District. Sequoia Union High School District (SUHSD) is the only high school district within the city. The SUHSD serves approximately 8,887 students from ninth grade to twelfth grade in the communities of Atherton, Belmont, East Palo Alto, Menlo Park, Portola Valley, Redwood City, Redwood Shores, San Carlos, and Woodside as well as unincorporated portions of San Mateo County. The schools that serve the SUHSD include Carlmont High School, Redwood High School, Woodside High School, Sequoia High School, Menlo-Atherton High School, and East Palo Alto Academy.⁴³

The SUHSD currently employs 550 teachers, with an average student-to-teacher ratio of 17.6 students per teacher.⁴⁴ By 2020, the SUHSD is projected to increase enrollment by more than 1,000, with the additional students at Carlmont, Redwood, Woodside, Sequoia, and Menlo-Atherton High Schools.⁴⁵ Therefore, the SUHSD is increasing the capacities of Carlmont, Menlo-Atherton, Sequoia, and Woodside High Schools through construction and renovation of the existing campuses. The SUHSD has not established its own

⁴⁰ California Department of Education, Data Reporting Office. 2013. *Certified Staff by Ethnicity for 2014–2015, Number of Staff by District by Ethnicity*. Staff Type: Teachers. 4169005 – Redwood City Elementary. Available: <<http://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/>>. Accessed: September 15, 2015.

⁴¹ Decision Insite Enrollment Impact Specialists. 2015. *Residential Research Summary Prepared for Redwood City School District*. August 10. Decline in enrollment is based on historical enrollment trends and projected new residential development.

⁴² The student generation rate for single-family dwelling units is the average of the student generation rates for single-family detached units and single-family attached units.

⁴³ Zito, Matthew. Chief Facilities Officer, Sequoia Union High School District. November 24, 2015—email to Kyle Perata, City of Menlo Park.

⁴⁴ California Department of Education, Educational Demographics Unit. 2013. *Certified Staff by Ethnicity for 2014–2015, Number of Staff by District by Ethnicity*. 4169062 – Sequoia Union High. Available: <<http://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/>>. Accessed: September 15, 2015.

⁴⁵ Enrollment Projection Consultants. 2015. *Concluding Documentation to Latest Forecast Update*. December 30.

student generation rate but uses the statewide average of 0.2 student per dwelling unit.⁴⁶ A new public magnet high school is proposed for development within the SUHSD. The public magnet high school would be located at 150 Jefferson Street and have an estimated enrollment of 400 students.⁴⁷

Parks and Recreation

The Menlo Park Community Services Department (Department) is responsible for providing recreational and cultural programs for the residents of the city. Department facilities located within the city boundaries include 221 acres of parkland, distributed among 13 parks, three community centers (one with an attached gymnasium), two public pools, three childcare centers, one gymnasium, and one gymnastics center.⁴⁸ Included in the parks and recreational areas are tennis courts, a skate park, softball diamonds, picnic areas, playgrounds, soccer fields, shared-use performing arts center, and open space. The parks and facilities administered by the Department that are located on the north side US 101, in the vicinity of the Project site, are identified in Table 3.13-4.

The Department is currently able to meet overall demand for park and recreational services. However, the Department is currently at capacity during peak times (4:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m. Monday through Friday and Saturday mornings) for sports field rentals, pre-school and developmental gymnastics classes, the Burgess Pool, gymnasium (sports activities), and two of the community centers for various classes. The City has adopted a goal of maintaining a ratio of 5 acres of developed parkland per 1,000 residents.⁴⁹ Currently, the city provides approximately 221 acres of parkland for residents of Menlo Park, which equates to a ratio of 6.64 acres per 1,000 residents, thereby exceeding its goals.⁵⁰ In addition to the parks and facilities in Table 3.13-4, the San Francisco Bay Trail (Bay Trail) extends along the Bayfront Expressway to an area north of the Project site. The Bay Trail is a series of existing and planned regional hiking and bicycle trails, administered by the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), that will eventually connect around the perimeter of San Francisco and San Pablo Bays and link 47 cities with 500 miles of trails. Please refer to Sections 3.1, *Land Use and Planning*, and 3.3, *Transportation/Traffic*, for more information about bicycle and pedestrian connections in the vicinity of the Project site.

Libraries

The City has two libraries that are accessible to local residents and part of the Peninsula Library System. These libraries include the Main Menlo Park Library and the Belle Haven Community Library. The Main Menlo Park Library is a 34,200 gsf, single-story building in the Civic Center, located at 800 Alma Street. In 1999, the City opened a 3,600 gsf branch library in the Belle Haven Elementary School at 413 Ivy Drive as part of a joint venture with Ravenswood CSD. In total, the two libraries have approximately 37,800 gsf of space and a staff of approximately 20. The libraries provide approximately 158,780 print volumes of books, 12,240 electronic books, and more than 16,000 audio books to patrons.⁵¹

⁴⁶ Zito, Matthew. Chief Facilities Officer, Sequoia Union High School District. 2015. November 24, 2015—email to Kyle Perata, City of Menlo Park.

⁴⁷ Murphy, Justin, City of Menlo Park. September 11, 2015—email to Kirsten Chapman, ICF International.

⁴⁸ City of Menlo Park Community Services Department. 2015. *Existing Conditions Questionnaire Response for Facebook Campus Expansion Project*. November 3.

⁴⁹ City of Menlo Park Community Services Department. 2015. *Existing Conditions Questionnaire Response for Facebook Campus Expansion Project*. November 3.

⁵⁰ $6.64 = (221 \text{ acres/January 1, 2015 population of } 33,273) \times 1,000 \text{ residents}$.

⁵¹ City of Menlo Park Libraries. 2015. *Existing Conditions Questionnaire Response for Facebook Campus Expansion Project*. November 5.

Table 3.13-4. Parks and Community Facilities Located within the Vicinity of the Project Site

| Facility Name | Location | Size | Distance from Site (miles)^a | Description |
|---|--|---------------|---|--|
| Park Facilities | | | | |
| Bedwell– Bayfront Park | Bayfront Expressway and Marsh Road | 155 acres | 0.45 | An extensive trail system, part of the San Francisco Bay Trail, for hiking, running, bicycling, dog walking, bird watching, kite flying, and photography. |
| Kelly Park | 100 Terminal Avenue | 8.3 acres | 0.10 | A synthetic-turf soccer field with lights, full-size track with four different types of exercise apparatus, lighted tennis courts, lighted basketball court, benches, bleachers, and a full men’s and women’s bathroom facility. |
| Marketplace Park | Ivy Drive and Market Place | 1 acre | 0.21 | Playground, open grass areas, and walkways. |
| Hamilton Park | Hamilton Avenue (Sage Street and Hazel Street) | 1.2 acres | 0.06 | A play structure, picnic tables, and open grass area. |
| Community Facilities | | | | |
| Belle Haven Child Development Center | 410 Ivy Drive | 6,600 gsf | 0.34 | Licensed by the Department of Social Services to provide quality subsidized full-time child development services. |
| Belle Haven After-School Center | 100 Terminal Avenue | 2,485 gsf | 0.10 | Licensed by the Department of Social Services to provide care for children in kindergarten to sixth grade. |
| Senior Center | 110 Terminal Avenue | 11,000 gsf | 0.06 | Health, recreational, and educational programs as well as cultural events and social services for older adults. |
| Onetta Harris Community Center | 100 Terminal Avenue | 11,000 gsf | 0.07 | A gymnasium, weight room, computer lab, large multi-purpose room with adjacent kitchen, three classrooms, and office space. |
| Belle Haven Pool | 100 Terminal Avenue | 6,300 gsf | 0.10 | Currently a seasonal pool that is open from mid-June to the end of August (a 25-meter pool with additional shallow areas as well as a small kiddie pool). |

Source:

City of Menlo Park. 2013. *City of Menlo Park General Plan – Open Space, Conservation, Noise, and Safety Elements*. Adopted: May 21, 2013.

^a. As measured from the boundary of the Project site closest to the park or community facility.

According to the general plan, the goal of the Menlo Park Library is to maintain a ratio of 3.29 books per capita and 1.02 gsf of library space per capita.⁵² As explained above, the Main Menlo Park Library and Belle Haven Branch Library combined have approximately 37,800 gsf of library space. With a service population of approximately 33,273 residents and approximately 158,780 printed books, this equates to a ratio of 4.77 books per person and 1.14 gsf of library space per person, exceeding the existing goal.⁵³ The Main Menlo Park Library currently experiences a shortage of reading room space; overcrowding occurs at children's story times because of an increasing number of children. Additionally, the Belle Haven Branch Library is unable to handle additional demand because of limited space, the hours of operation, and its location. There are plans to renovate the Main Menlo Park Library in the future.⁵⁴

Environmental Impacts

This section describes the impact analysis related to public services for the Project. It describes the methods used to determine the impacts of the Project and lists the thresholds used to conclude whether an impact would be significant. Impacts are determined to be either no impact (NI), less than significant (LTS), less than significant with mitigation (LTS/M), or significant and unavoidable (SU). Measures to mitigate (i.e., avoid, minimize, rectify, reduce, eliminate, or compensate for) significant impacts accompany each impact discussion, as needed.

Thresholds of Significance

In accordance with Appendix G of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, the Project would be considered to have a significant impact if it would result in any of the conditions listed below.

- Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities or a need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, or other public services and facilities.

Methods for Analysis

Potential impacts on public services are evaluated by

- Assessing the potential for the Project to increase demand for public services, based on goals established by service providers, and
- Comparing the ability of the service provider/public facility to serve the Project and accommodate the associated increase in demand.

⁵² City of Menlo Park. 1994. *City of Menlo Park General Plan*. General Plan Background Report, Public Facilities and Services. Page B-VI-8.

⁵³ The service population is the same as the City's jurisdictional population, which is provided in Section 3.12, *Population and Housing*.

⁵⁴ City of Menlo Park Libraries. 2015. *Existing Conditions Questionnaire Response for Facebook Campus Expansion Project*. November 5.

A determination is then made as to whether the existing services and facilities are capable of meeting the demand of the Project and, if not, if expansion of existing facilities could cause an adverse environmental effect. The analysis is based on a review of City documents and maps, field reconnaissance, and direct communications with City service providers.

Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact PS-1: Impacts on Fire Services. The Project would not result in the need for new or physically altered fire service facilities. (LTS)

The MPFPD has indicated that demands associated with the Project could place a strain on current staffing levels, requiring additional resources to provide adequate fire and emergency medical service protection.⁵⁵ The Project is anticipated to increase the daytime population by approximately 6,550 people;⁵⁶ therefore, the Project is expected to increase fire and medical calls. Based on MPFPD standards, with each employee equivalent to 0.58 resident,⁵⁷ the Project would add approximately 3,799 people to the service population. The Project would generate a housing demand of 175 units in the city (and in the MPFPD's service area) and could result in 457 new residents, as explained in Section 3.12, *Population and Housing*.⁵⁸ In total, the Project could result in approximately 4,256 people added to MPFPD's service population.⁵⁹

If there were no increase in MPFPD staffing (95 fire safety personnel), then the ratio would decrease from 0.85 to 0.82 position per 1,000 residents upon implementation of the Project.⁶⁰ To maintain the current ratio, approximately four new fire safety staff employees would need to be hired. As described above, the MPFPD currently plans to expand Station 2 and Station 6. Therefore, additional personnel could be accommodated within the expanded Station 2 and Station 6, or other existing MPFPD stations. Although the Project could require additional staff members to maintain the service ratios, the Project alone would not trigger the need for new or expanded facilities.

Even if expanded facilities would be needed, the existing stations are located on infill lots in the city and neighboring jurisdictions, which are highly developed. The scale of the expansion necessary is unlikely to result in significant and unavoidable environmental impacts. Given the nature of the projects (fire stations) and their size, environmental documents for fire station construction or expansion are typically processed as categorical exemptions or negative declarations. Some lead agencies have determined that fire station expansions qualify for a categorical exemption under Section 15301 of the

⁵⁵ Schapelhouman, Harold. Fire Chief, Menlo Park Fire Protection District. November 16, 2015—email to Kyle Perata, City of Menlo Park.

⁵⁶ This draft environmental impact report assumes that no employees currently work at the Project site.

⁵⁷ Schapelhouman, Harold. Fire Chief, Menlo Park Fire Protection District. November 16, 2015—email to Kyle Perata, City of Menlo Park.

⁵⁸ As stated in Section 3.12, *Population and Housing*, approximately 7.6 percent of all city residents also work in the city. However, for purposes of this analysis, it is assumed that 4.8 percent of the employees generated by the Project would seek and find housing in the city because it is more representative of Facebook's existing employment patterns. Using 7.6 percent, the Project would increase the number of new residents in the city by approximately 722. For purposes of this analysis, the historic Facebook employment patterns (4.8 percent) are used to determine the impacts.

⁵⁹ $4,256 = 3,799$ people from Project employees + 457 new residents from the Project.

⁶⁰ $0.82 = (95 \text{ fire safety personnel} / \text{new service population } [111,850 + 4,256 = 116,106]) \times 1,000$ residents.

CEQA Guidelines.⁶¹ As such, if expanded facilities would be needed, beyond the existing planned expansions of Station 2 and Station 6, the physical environmental impacts would likely be less than significant.

The Project would be required to comply with all applicable MPFPD codes and regulations and meet MPFPD standards related to fire hydrants (e.g., water fire-flow requirements, spacing of hydrants), the design of driveway turnaround and access points to accommodate fire equipment, and other standards. Specifically, MPFPD Fire Prevention Code Section 903.2 requires automatic fire sprinkler protection for commercial occupancies of more than 5,000 gsf if the building is 40 feet or taller.

The MPFPD Board of Directors recently approved a Nexus Impact Fee Study as part of a Fire Protection Facilities Impact Fee Program. Once adopted by the City, the Project Sponsor would be required to pay applicable facilities fees, as outlined in the Fire Protection Facilities Impact Fee Program for new construction at the Project site. Payment of this fee would further address the potential need for any additional fire service equipment.

Upon Project completion, the MPFPD would continue to serve the Project area and respond to calls for assistance from its existing stations. As described above, Stations 1, 2, 5, and 77 are less than 2 miles from the Project site. In addition, the MPFPD has an automatic aid agreement with the City of Redwood City and the City of Palo Alto to provide backup and respond in the event of a major fire and an automatic aid agreement with the City of Palo Alto. At this time, it is assumed that the additional firefighters that could be needed as a result of the Project, and any additional necessary equipment to serve the Project, could be accommodated by currently planned expansion of Station 2, by the currently planned expansion of Station 6, or within existing Station 77. As such, the Project would not result in substantial adverse physical environmental impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered fire and emergency service facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives. Fire service impacts as a result of the Project would be ***less than significant***.

Impact PS-2: Impacts on Police Services. The Project would not result in the need for new or physically altered police service facilities. (LTS)

The Project could affect the MPPD by intensifying site activity, adding new employees and visitors, increasing square footage, and increasing traffic incidents. In addition, the Project could increase the need for police service related to investigations, search warrants, protests, and dignitary/celebrity visits. Potential traffic impacts from the Project could increase incident response times. In total, the Project would increase the number of employees at the Project site to approximately 6,550. As stated above, when calculating the service population, the MPPD considers employees who work in Menlo Park as a one-third of a resident. As such, the MPPD's service population resulting from Project-related employment would increase by approximately 2,183 people, from 42,046 to 44,229. This would result in a nominal decrease in the officer-per-resident ratio, which would reduce from 1.14 officers per 1,000 residents to 1.07 officers per 1,000 residents.⁶² In order to maintain the current ratio, approximately three additional officers would need to be hired. However, a service ratio of 1.07 officers per 1,000 residents would continue to exceed the MPPD's service goal of one sworn officer per 1,000 residents; as such, the Project would not degrade ratios beyond established goals. Police surveillance in the Project

⁶¹ *City of Hayward v. Board of Trustees of the California State University*. Court of Appeal of the State of California, First Appellate District, Division Three. Filed on November 30, 2015. Available: <<http://www.courts.ca.gov/opinions/documents/A131412A.PDF>>. Accessed on April 15, 2016.

⁶² $1.07 = (48 \text{ officers/new service population } [42,046 + 2,183 = \sim 44,229]) \times 1,000 \text{ residents}$.

area would continue with routine patrols and responses to calls for assistance. As stated previously, the Project could increase incident response times; if that occurs, response times may become excessive (i.e., above industry standards), which would have to be addressed. The Project would not require the MPPD to expand its current service boundary to include the Project area because it is already included in Beat 3.

The Project site would most likely be served by private security for basic monitoring of the site and buildings, which would supplement police patrol services already provided by the MPPD. In addition, the perimeter of Buildings 21 and 22 would be secured with an approximately 8-foot-high fence, comparable in design to the perimeter fencing at Building 20, with security stations at each entry to monitor and secure access to the private buildings. As part of the City's review process, the MPPD would review plans and safety features of the Project to ensure that safety standards are properly designed. As part of this process, additional safety and security measures could be added as the Project design is refined, such as controlled access points, intrusion barriers, additional security cameras, and/or area alarms in specific areas of the site and inside the buildings, where appropriate.

The Project is anticipated to put an additional demand on MPPD because of an increased number of employees and residents. The increase in service population would change the existing ratio of 1.14 sworn officers per 1,000 residents to 1.07 sworn officers per 1,000 residents. However, this ratio would continue to exceed the MPPD's service goal of one sworn officer per 1,000 residents. Therefore, no additional MPPD staff members or equipment would be required, and MPPD facilities would not need to be expanded or constructed. As such, impacts on the MPPD would be *less than significant*.

Impact PS-3: Impacts on School Facilities. The Project would not result in the need for new or physically altered school facilities. (LTS)

As previously stated, four elementary/middle school districts and one high school district serve the city. However, the Las Lomitas School District would not be affected by the indirect population increases associated with the Project and, therefore, is not considered in this analysis. The Project would consist of office uses and would not construct residential units that would generate school-age students in these school districts. However, as stated in Section 3.12, *Population and Housing*, the Project would indirectly induce housing demand by increasing employment within the city. Specifically, it is estimated that 175 new households would be expected to be generated in the city as a result of the Project.

To ensure a conservative analysis, for elementary/middle school students, the MPCSD generation rate for single-family dwelling units is used because it is the highest compared with rates of other districts. Similarly, the Ravenswood CSD generation rate for multi-family dwelling units is used because it is the highest compared with rates of other districts. Using these rates, each new single-family dwelling unit would generate approximately 0.44 student, and each new multi-family unit would generate approximately 0.56 student. For high school students, each new dwelling unit would generate 0.2 student, according to the rate used by the SUHSD. At this time, the types of housing units that the Project employees would occupy are unknown. Therefore, this analysis assumes a breakdown in housing units similar to that of existing housing unit types within the city. According to the City's Housing Element, approximately 63 percent of housing units within the city are single-family units/townhouses and 37 percent are multi-family units.⁶³ Therefore, for the purposes of this analysis, it is assumed that the 175 new households generated by the Project would occupy 110

⁶³ City of Menlo Park. 2014. *Housing Element*. Adopted April 1, 2014.

single-family dwelling units and 65 multi-family dwelling units. Therefore, in total, Project could generate approximately 84⁶⁴ elementary/middle school students and approximately 35 high school students.⁶⁵

Elementary and Middle Schools. Three elementary/middle school districts would serve the new housing, an indirect result of the Project. Based on enrollment statistics from existing Facebook employees, it is assumed that approximately 82 percent of the projected students would attend MPCSD, 9 percent would attend Ravenswood CSD, and 9 percent would attend Redwood CSD. This equates to approximately 68 projected students attending MPCSD, approximately 8 projected students attending Ravenswood CSD, and approximately 8 projected students attending Redwood CSD.

MPCSD. As shown in Table 3.13-1, there is currently capacity for a total of 303 additional elementary school students and 267 additional middle school students within the MPCSD. The 68 students generated by the Project, if evenly distributed between the brackets (elementary [kindergarten through fifth] and middle [sixth through eighth]), would result in approximately 45 new students at the elementary schools and 23 new students at the middle school.⁶⁶ The elementary school students and middle school students generated by the Project would represent approximately 14.9 percent and 8.6 percent of the existing capacity in MPCSD, respectively. The 68 new students would be able to be accommodated in the existing facilities without increasing class sizes. Furthermore, with the expansion of Laurel School, there will be additional capacity for 90 students. If a school reaches capacity within a school district, then students would be sent to the next closest school. Therefore, it is anticipated that the MPCSD would be able to accommodate the increase in students potentially generated by the Project.

Ravenswood CSD. As shown in Table 3.13-2, there is currently capacity for a total of 81 additional students within the Ravenswood CSD. The 8 students generated by the Project would represent approximately 9.9 percent of the existing capacity in the Ravenswood CSD. Therefore, it is anticipated that the Ravenswood CSD would be able to accommodate the increase in students potentially generated by the Project.

Redwood CSD. As shown in Table 3.13-3, there is currently capacity for a total of 913 additional students within the Redwood CSD. The 8 students generated by the Project would represent approximately 0.9 percent of the existing capacity in the Redwood CSD. Therefore, it is anticipated that the Redwood CSD would be able to accommodate the increase in students potentially generated by the Project.

High Schools. Only one high school district, the SUHSD, currently serves the city. A new public magnet high school is proposed in the SUHSD and could accommodate approximately 400 students. Without considering any current capacity in the existing high schools within the SUHSD, the 35 high school students generated by the Project would represent 4.4 percent of the future capacity at the new high school proposed in the SUHSD. Additionally, as explained above, the SUHSD is expanding four of its existing high school campuses. Expansion of these four high schools could increase available capacity within the SUHSD, which would further reduce the portion of the capacity of the SUHSD represented by the Project. Therefore, it is anticipated that the SUHSD would be able to accommodate the increase in students potentially generated by the Project.

⁶⁴ $(110 \text{ single-family units} \times 0.44 \text{ student/unit} = 48 \text{ new students}) + (65 \text{ multi-family units} \times 0.56 \text{ student/unit} = 36 \text{ new students}) = 84 \text{ total new elementary/middle school students.}$

⁶⁵ $(110 \text{ single family units} * 0.2 \text{ student/unit} = 22 \text{ new students}) + (65 \text{ multi-family units} \times 0.2 \text{ student/unit} = 13 \text{ new students}) = 35 \text{ total new high school students.}$

⁶⁶ The 68 total students, distributed evenly by grade (nine total grades) = 7.6 students per grade. $7.6 \times 6 \text{ grades} = 45 \text{ elementary school students; } 7.6 \times 3 \text{ grades} = 23 \text{ middle school students.}$

Overall School Impacts. As discussed above, the Project could result in an increase in students within the city, which could affect the MPCSD, the Ravenswood CSD, the Redwood CSD, and the SUHSD. It should be noted, however, that the actual generation of new students would be a tertiary impact of the Project. The Project would directly increase employment, which is expected to generate housing demand, and thus induce more housing, a secondary impact. Construction of more housing units would generate more students, a tertiary impact.

Non-residential development, including the Project, is subject to SB 50 School Impact Fees (established by the Leroy F. Greene School Facilities Act of 1998). As a result of the wide-ranging changes in the financing of school facilities, including the passage of state school facilities bonds, which are intended to provide a major source of financing for new school facilities, Section 65996 of the State Government Code states that the payment of school impact fees that may be required by any state or local agency, as established by SB 50, is deemed to constitute full and complete mitigation for school impacts from development. In addition, the new residential development that may indirectly result from the increase in employment and generate students would be subject to separate CEQA review as well as residential school impact fees, which are higher than non-residential school impact fees. As a result, the impacts related to schools would be *less than significant*.

Impact PS-4: Impacts on Parks and Recreational Facilities. The Project would not result in the need for new or physically altered parks and recreational facilities. (LTS)

The Project site would be organized around a publicly accessible open space that would be owned and managed by Facebook. The final design of the open space would be subject to review and approval by the City. The open space would be approximately 2 acres in size and provide a connection through the Project site to the Bay Trail. As a privately owned public space, the open space would not be considered part of the Department's parkland and would not affect the parks service ratio, which is discussed in more detail below. The Project would also include a multi-use bicycle/pedestrian bridge over State Route 84 that would provide access to the Bay Trail and Bedwell Bayfront Park (Bayfront Park) from the Project site and the Belle Haven neighborhood. In addition, a new approximately 1-acre terraced garden space, primarily for employee use, would be provided between Buildings 20 and 21. Furthermore, an outdoor terraced area would be located adjacent to the food court/dining area on the south side of Building 22. The proposed onsite features provided for employee use would reduce the likelihood of employees utilizing City facilities.

As stated in Section 3.12, *Population and Housing*, the Project could generate approximately 457 new residents in the city. These employees and their families could use the City's park facilities during non-work hours. As explained above, the Department currently exceeds its goal of 5 acres per 1,000 residents and has not identified any existing capacity issues. The 457 new residents in the city would reduce the park service ratio from 6.64 to 6.55⁶⁷ residents per 1,000 acres of parklands, thereby still exceeding the City's service goal of 5 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents. In addition, given the availability of City-maintained parks, population growth related to the Project is not anticipated to increase the use of recreational resources such that substantial physical deterioration would occur. The Project would be subject to supplemental property taxes to pay for bonds issued for park and recreation.

⁶⁷ 6.55 = (221 acres/33,273 + 457 population) × 1,000 residents.

As discussed above, the Department is currently at capacity during peak times (4:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m. Monday through Friday and Saturday mornings) with respect to sports field rentals, pre-school and developmental gymnastics classes, the Burgess Pool, gymnasium (sports activities), and two of the community centers for various classes. Because of the employee and residential population in the city, which would increase as a result of the Project, the use of these existing facilities may increase somewhat. However, it is not anticipated that the increase in population would exacerbate existing capacity issues because the increased use of recreational facilities is expected to be spread out among several parks and recreational facilities in the area, including the facilities proposed as part of the Project. The Project would not trigger the need for the construction or expansion of parks or other recreational facilities. Therefore, impacts would be *less than significant*.

Impact PS-5: Impacts on Library Facilities. The Project would not result in the need for new or physically altered library facilities. (LTS)

As discussed above, the City's libraries have a wide range of resources accessible to the community. As stated in Section 3.12, *Population and Housing*, the Project would result in approximately 457 new residents in the city. As discussed above, the goal of the Menlo Park Library is to maintain a ratio of 3.29 books per capita and 1.02 gsf of library space per capita. The 457 new residents would slightly degrade the existing ratios from 4.77 to 4.71⁶⁸ books per capita and from 1.14 to 1.12⁶⁹ gsf per capita. Nonetheless, this would still be above the current goals and standards.

As discussed above, the Main Menlo Park Library currently experiences a shortage of reading room space, and overcrowding occurs at children's story times because of an increasing number of children.

As calculated in Impact PS-3, the Project would generate approximately 75 elementary school students, which could increase demand at children's story time. However, the Project would not result in a significant new demand that would result in the need for new or physically altered facilities because the increased demand for children's story time is expected to be spread out between both of the City's libraries.

It is expected that the existing libraries in the city would be able to accommodate an increase in employment at the Project site and the associated increase in residents. Therefore, impacts would be *less than significant*.

Cumulative Impacts

The geographic context for this cumulative public services analysis is the service area of the service in question. For instance, the geographic context for cumulative impacts on police services and park/recreational facilities is the city because these services are provided on a citywide basis, and the service ratios by which demand is estimated are based on citywide figures. However, the fire protection cumulative context area would include the Menlo Park and the cities of Palo Alto, Atherton, East Palo Alto, and parts of unincorporated San Mateo County to correspond with the MPFPD's service area. Likewise, the cumulative analysis for impacts on schools would include the communities served by the four school districts discussed in this analysis.

⁶⁸ 4.71 = 158,780 print books/(33,273 + 457 new residents).

⁶⁹ 1.12 = 37,800 gsf of library space/(33,273 + 457 new residents).

Impact C-PS-1: Cumulative Fire Service Impacts. The Project, in combination with other foreseeable development in the city, would not result in the need for new or physically altered fire service facilities. (LTS)

Other development projects within the city would include commercial, industrial, office, mixed-use, hotel, educational, and residential developments, as shown in Table 3.0-3, and would increase the demand for fire and emergency services. Population and employment growth would increase service calls and potentially create a need for additional facilities to maintain existing MPFPD service levels. Additionally, new development and intensification of existing land uses could result in taller buildings. These changes would result in the need for larger fire suppression apparatus, new specialized equipment, and added personnel, which would require either the expansion or relocation of existing fire stations.⁷⁰

As noted above, the firefighter-to-resident ratio of the MPFPD is currently 0.85 firefighter per 1,000 residents. The MPFPD's staffing is currently adequate for daily operations, based on the current risk profile, population, and call volumes. The MPFPD considers growth forecasts during its annual budgeting process. The MPFPD currently anticipates a 22.6 percent increase in the service population by 2040, increasing by approximately 24,000 people.⁷¹ Assuming steady growth, this would represent a growth rate of approximately 960 new people per year and approximately 4,800 additional people by 2020. Additional firefighters and facilities would be required to accommodate projected cumulative growth and maintain the same level of service as under existing conditions.

As discussed above in Impact PS-1, additional personnel could be accommodated within the expanded Station 2 or Station 6, or other existing MPFPD stations. The physical environmental impacts resulting from potential future expansions of stations (other than the planned expansions of Station 2 and Station 6) located within the urban setting of the city and neighboring jurisdictions would very likely be less than significant. In addition, the MPFPD Board of Directors recently approved a Nexus Impact Fee Study as part of a Fire Protection Facilities Impact Fee Program. Therefore, the project sponsors for other development projects within the city would be required to pay applicable facilities fees, as outlined in the Fire Protection Facilities Impact Fee Program for new construction. While the effective date for this impact fee is unknown at this time, the payment of this fee would further address the potential need for any additional fire service personnel or equipment. Therefore, cumulative development is not expected to result in a significant cumulative impact on fire protection services. Overall cumulative impacts are considered *less than significant*.

Impact C-PS-2: Cumulative Police Service Impacts. The Project, in combination with other foreseeable development in the city, would not result in the need for new or physically altered police service facilities. (LTS)

Other development projects within the city would increase the demand for police protection services. As noted, the MPPD's current service ratio is approximately 1.14 sworn officers per 1,000 residents. ABAG's *Projections 2013* anticipates 1,000 additional residents and 2,210 new jobs in the city in 2020 compared to 2015.⁷² This would result in an anticipated total service population increase of approximately 1,736

⁷⁰ Menlo Park Fire Protection District. 2013. *Fire Protection Facilities Impact Fee Nexus Study – Administrative Draft*. June. Prepared by Seifel Consulting and Urban Economic.

⁷¹ Menlo Park Fire Protection District. 2013. *Fire Protection Facilities Impact Fee Nexus Study – Administrative Draft*. June. Prepared by Seifel Consulting and Urban Economic.

⁷² Association of Bay Area Governments. *Projections 2013*. December.

people (assuming the MPPD standard of each worker in the city as one-third of a resident). The Project, in combination with other projected growth in the city, would increase population, employment, and housing in the city.

Population forecasts are reviewed during the annual budgeting process to determine whether additional police services will be required to accommodate growth. In 2020, a resident population of 38,700 persons and a worker population of 11,377⁷³ persons (based on MPPD calculation of each employee as one-third of a resident⁷⁴) would result in a total MPPD service population of 50,077 persons. Given current MPPD staffing (48 sworn officers), this would result in a ratio of 0.96 officer per 1,000 residents, which is below the current service ratio of 1.14. Additional police officers would be required to accommodate projected cumulative growth and maintain the same level of service as under existing conditions. However, it is not anticipated that a substantial number of additional officers, which would require additional facilities, would be hired because the MPPD would prefer to maintain a ratio of one sworn officer per 1,000 residents. Therefore, cumulative development is not expected to result in a significant cumulative impact on police protection services. Overall cumulative impacts are considered *less than significant*.

Impact C-PS-3: Cumulative School Service Impacts. The Project, in combination with other foreseeable development in the city, would not result in the need for new or physically altered school facilities. (LTS)

The geographic context for an analysis of cumulative school impacts is the area served by the MPCSD, the Redwood CSD, the Ravenswood CSD, and the SUHSD. Future housing projects in this area would generate additional students who would need to be accommodated within the school districts.

As previously discussed, Section 65996 of the State Government Code explains that payment of school impact fees established by the Leroy F. Greene School Facilities Act of 1998 is deemed to constitute full and complete mitigation for school impacts. The aforementioned school districts have enacted development fees in accordance with the Leroy F. Greene School Facilities Act and levy these fees on development projects within its service area. Development projects would be required to pay the school impact fees, which are based on the amount of proposed residential and commercial space. This process and fee payment would ensure that services to accommodate current and future citywide growth could be reasonably provided within the cumulative context. Therefore, cumulative development is not expected to result in a significant cumulative impact on schools, and overall cumulative impacts are considered *less than significant*.

Impact C-PS-4: Cumulative Park and Recreational Impacts. The Project, in combination with other foreseeable development in the city, would not result in the need for new or physically altered parks and recreational facilities. (LTS)

The geographic context for an analysis of cumulative impacts on parks and recreation is the city, because the Department is responsible for providing recreational and cultural programs for the residents of the city. The City has adopted a goal of maintaining a ratio of 5 acres of developed parkland per 1,000 residents. This results in a current ratio of 6.64 acres per 1,000 residents, which exceeds the goal. According to ABAG's *Projections 2013*, the population in Menlo Park could increase to 38,700 by 2020.⁷⁵ A total population of 38,700 people, utilizing 221 acres of parkland, yields a ratio of 5.71 acres

⁷³ Based on the 34,130 estimated jobs in Menlo Park in 2020, as discussed in Section 3.12, *Population and Housing*.

⁷⁴ Note that based on MPPD standards, each employee is equivalent to 0.58 resident, while MPPD standards considers each employee equivalent to one-third of a resident.

⁷⁵ Association of Bay Area Governments. *Projections 2013*. December.

per 1,000 residents, which still exceeds the goal. Therefore, cumulative development is not expected to result in a significant cumulative impact on parks and recreation, and overall cumulative impacts are considered *less than significant*.

Impact C-PS-5: Cumulative Library Service Impacts. The Project, in combination with other foreseeable development in the city, would not result in the need for new or physically altered library facilities. (LTS)

The geographic context for an analysis of cumulative impacts on library services is the area served by the Peninsula Library System, a consortium of 32 city, county, and community college libraries in San Mateo County. Other development in this service area would place additional demand on library services. This would be a significant cumulative impact if new libraries are not constructed to accommodate regional growth. According to the general plan, the goal of the City is to maintain a ratio of 3.29 books per capita and 1.02 gsf of library space. According to ABAG's *Projections 2013*, the population in San Mateo County could increase to 325,400 by 2020.⁷⁶ Cumulative growth, in combination with ambient growth in the county, would, without construction of new libraries or expansion of existing libraries, result in a reduction in the number of books per capita and could force the existing ratio of 4.77 books per person and 1.14 gsf of library space per person to below the acceptable threshold. This is a potentially significant cumulative impact.

The Project would not directly add resident population to the city, although some employees may choose to reside within the city. As noted earlier, the Project is expected to increase the population in the city indirectly by approximately 457 residents. As stated above, the goal of the Menlo Park Library is to maintain a ratio of 3.29 books per capita and 1.02 gsf of library space. The increase in 457 residents would slightly degrade the existing ratios from 4.77 to 4.70 books per capita and from 1.14 to 1.12 gsf per capita. Although the Main Menlo Park Library currently experiences a shortage of reading room space and overcrowding occurs at children's story times, the Project would not contribute to a significant cumulative demand for these services because only approximately 75 elementary school students would be generated by the Project. The increased demand for children's story time is expected to be spread out between both City libraries, which would most likely accommodate the development projects in the city. Therefore, the Project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to any potential cumulative impact on library services, and the cumulative impact would be *less than significant*.

⁷⁶ Association of Bay Area Governments. *Projections 2013*. December.

