
From: aldeivnian@gmail.com on behalf of Adina Levin <alevin@alevin.com>
Sent: Monday, July 11, 2016 3:55 PM
To: _connectmenlo; _Planning Commission
Subject: ConnectMenlo EIR comments

Dear Planning Commission and staff,

Following are several comments for the ConnectMenlo EIR.

Transportation Demand Management Goal

Currently, the ConnectMenlo plan includes a relatively models vehicle trip reduction requirement of 20%.

Menlo Park could (and should) take an approach from the San Mateo Rail Corridor Plan, which set tiered trip reduction goals, including an easier goal to begin with, and a steeper goal once future transportation improvements are implemented. For example, if and when we get better Dumbarton Corridor transit it would be realistic to have a stronger trip reduction goal. Therefore, the plan and mitigation should set a 20% goal initially, and a stronger goal of 25-30% once transit and active transportation improvements are in place.

Jobs and Housing - Phasing

The ConnectMenlo EIR shows that adding jobs near housing reduces Vehicle Miles Travelled, since some people are likely to take advantage of the opportunity for a shorter commute, if the opportunity is available. To ensure that the community gets the benefits of this reduction, it would be helpful to implement phasing in the plan, allowing buildout of the commercial space with triggers to ensure that corresponding housing has been built.

Thank you for your consideration,

- Adina
Adina Levin
650-646-4344

Subject:

FW: M2 Expansion

From: Amy Roleder <amyrol@gmail.com>

Date: July 9, 2016 at 9:08:14 AM PDT

To: ktperata@menlopark.org

Subject: M2 Expansion

Hi,

I am writing in regards to the proposed general plan changes in the M2 area. I urge you NOT to allow ANY expansion of nonresidential space or hotel rooms in this area, until an effective transit route is put in place to get across the Dumbarton Bridge to the East Bay. The ONLY thing that should be allowed is housing.

I live on Durham St., just West of 101 off of Willow Road. The traffic on Willow Road in the past 8-12 months has drastically increased due to the expansion of FaceBook, because they have clogged up the only access to the East Bay, which is the Dumbarton Bridge. Cars are now lining up along our residential street daily, idling, waiting to get to Willow Road, to get to the Dumbarton Bridge. Emergency vehicles are unable to get down Willow Road for emergencies in our area or East Menlo Park, and I am unable to get out of or into my driveway from 4:30 to 6:30 PM on most weekdays. This increases pollution, is affecting health and well being, and is reducing safety in our community.

I was shocked to read that only 5% of the proposed additional Facebook employees would be living in the community. Adding 6,500 more jobs with only 5% of them living in the area means 6,175 of them will be commuting into Menlo Park to work. This is ludicrous! How can this not affect the traffic ever more drastically? This situation is systemically not sustainable, in a community where people are actually living.

For the health of our City and our citizens, I urge you please do not approve ANY expansion of nonresidential space or hotel rooms in the M2 area, until an alternate and effective route to get to the East Bay is put in place.

Thank you,

A.Roleder

Durham St., Menlo Park



CITY OF
**PALO
ALTO**

PLANNING & COMMUNITY ENVIRONMENT

250 Hamilton Avenue, 5th Floor
Palo Alto, CA 94301
650.329.2441

RECEIVED

July 6, 2016

JUL 11 2016

Ms. Deanna Chow
Principal Planner
Planning Division
City of Menlo Park
701 Laurel Street
Menlo Park CA 94025

CITY OF MENLO PARK
BUILDING

RE: City of Palo Alto Comment Letter for Draft Environmental Impact Report on the ConnectMenlo: General Plan Land Use & Circulation Elements and M-2 Area Zoning update (Clearing House No. 2015062054)

Dear Ms. Chow,

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the ConnectMenlo: General Plan Land Use & Circulation Elements and M-2 Area Zoning update (Clearing House No. 2015062054) Project (Project). Recognizing our many shared interests, the City of Palo Alto offers the following comments on the DEIR.

1. *Population and Housing.*

- i. Overall, the Palo Alto Planning & Transportation Commission was complementary of the City of Menlo Park for proposing housing in excess of ABAG's projections and seeking to address the region's housing crisis. Any such forward-looking plan must adequately address the infrastructure and programmatic requirements that would follow from the additional housing.
- ii. Significant Cumulative Impact. (pg. 4.11-16-20). Implementation of the project would result in an increase of 5, 500 new residential units and the plan also notes that there will be more employees than residents by 2040 with implementation of the project. Without a sustainable TDM program, the impact on both residents and employees could be significant.
- iii. The Draft EIR projects a substantial daytime population (i.e. employment) in addition to an increase in resident population in the City of Menlo Park in the year 2040. However, the impacts of the daytime population change are not addressed specifically in the DEIR. Please discuss potential impacts on public safety, utilities and other relevant topics.



CityOfPaloAlto.org

2. Transportation and Circulation. Review of this section raised the following concerns.

- i. The intersection of Sand Hill Road/El Camino Real/Palo Alto Avenue is located within the City of Palo Alto, just over its border with Menlo Park, and compromises the intersection of two major and minor arterial roads. Please evaluate potential impacts on this intersection in the EIR.
- ii. Figure 4.13-7 shows intersection #57, Woodland Avenue and University operating at LOS E in the a.m. and p.m. peak hour. Observations of this intersection during peak periods suggest differently, and additional data should be collected. Vehicle queues on University Avenue in the eastbound direction approaching the intersection extend well into Palo Alto and occasionally to Downtown Palo Alto, with demand exceeding the capacity of the intersection. Capacity of this intersection is constrained by signal operations that do not optimize throughput demand approaches. While these factors are unique to this intersection, they should be included, along with any unique characteristics affecting capacity, in all transportation evaluation conditions. The estimated level of service is not representative of actual conditions, and the proposed project may result in a significant impact at this intersection if baseline conditions were more accurately represented.
- iii. In the 2040 Plus Project and 2040 No Project conditions, LOS in the AM/ PM peak hour at Woodland Avenue and University Avenue improves the current existing condition without increases in capacity at the intersection. Please include discussion on the methodology and rationale for this change. The City of Palo Alto believes the model may be reassigning trips to other roadway segments due to the operation of the intersection, which is unlikely to occur as University Avenue is a significant regional segment which provides direct access to destinations which are less accessible from other roadway segments.
- iv. The existing bicycle network shown in Figure 3.3-2 is incomplete and is missing a number of class 1, 2, and 3 segments in Palo Alto that directly connect to the City of Menlo Park's bike network. For example, the connection between Bryant Street and Willow Road. These connections are critical to a system suitable for local residents to use to commute to work and shop by bicycle. Please refer to the latest version of VTA's *Clara Valley Bikeways Map* for bike network information in Palo Alto.
- v. Transit.
 - a. The EIR notes that the project would generate a substantial increase in transit riders. It also notes that Menlo Park will update the existing program to guarantee funding for operation of a City-sponsored service that is necessary for

future projects. This raises the question of how this issue will be dealt with regionally in terms of available transit seats and local responsibility. The EIR concludes that the impact on transit riders would remain significant unavoidable because the City cannot guarantee capacity improvements at this time. However, based on the size of the increase in households and employees, additional mitigation may be possible by working with other transit providers and taking a coordinated approach as mitigation.

- b. While the DEIR addresses Caltrain in the Existing Transit Facilities section (pg. 4.13-15) there is not further discussion of the impacts of the project on Caltrain service or how the projected growth in transit ridership could affect service to the rest of the region, including the need for additional capacity, the location of stops and scheduling. There is also mention of the 2015 Draft of the Land Element of support for high-speed rail. The impact of the project on planned high-speed rail facilities and services should be addressed.

3. *Utility and Service Systems.*

- i. UTIL-13. The energy consumption analysis includes analysis of a variety of programs to reduce energy consumption and included a discussion about how infill development focuses activity in areas of existing infrastructure and services, as well as reducing energy expended by transportation (pg. 4.14-76-81). It is also noted that PG&E continues to expand its renewable energy portfolio. However, in addition to reducing consumption, requirements for new commercial development to include solar panels or other means of supplementing energy sources should be considered as part of mitigation to insure that reduce the impact of the project on energy resources remains less than significant.

Thank you again for giving Palo Alto the opportunity to comment on the DEIR for ConnectMenlo. If you have any questions regarding our comments please do not hesitate to contact me or Meg Monroe at Margaret.Monroe@cityofpaloalto.org.

Sincerely,



Hillary Gitelman
Director of Planning and Community Environment

CC Palo Alto Planning and Transportation Commission
James Keene, City Manager
Jonathan Lait, Assistant Director of Planning and Community Environment
Meg Monroe/File

Subject:

FW: M2 Expansion

From: Keith <keithlupo@gmail.com>

Date: July 9, 2016 at 9:26:27 AM PDT

To: ktperata@menlopark.org

Subject: M2 Expansion

Hi,

I am writing in regard to the proposed general plan changes in the M2 area. I urge you NOT to allow ANY expansion of nonresidential space or hotel rooms in this area. The ONLY thing that should be allowed is housing.

I live in the Willows neighborhood and the traffic over the past year has doubled, due to the Expansion of Facebook. I cannot get into or out of my residential driveway most weekdays between 4:30-6:30 PM due to cars lining up down the street waiting to get to Willow Road to get to the Dumbarton Bridge. Emergency vehicles are unable to get through, and it is affecting the health and well-being of our community.

I am shocked that Menlo Park is willing to add 6500 more jobs to the area without any adequate housing, or transportation solutions. And to read that only 5% of them would be living in the area will just amplify the problem! I was also shocked to read that for all the added problems this will cause, Menlo Park will only receive 1 M extra in income. This is ridiculous and truly not worth the price.

For the health of our City and our citizens, I urge you please do not approve ANY expansion of nonresidential space or hotel rooms in the M2 area. ONLY housing should be approved in this area.

Thank you,

F. Lupo

Durham St., Menlo Park

From: Neilson Buchanan <cnsbuchanan@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, July 09, 2016 5:20 PM
To: Neilson Buchanan; _connectmenlo
Cc: John Guislin; Norman H. Beamer; Deri McCrea; Tim Knuth; Kathy Segura; Emanuela Todaro; Janine Bishar; Irv Brenner; Dante Malagrino; Debbie Wolter; John McCrea
Subject: Lack of good city planning
Attachments: Menlo GP DEIR Response-Deanna Chow (3).pdf; Menlo Facebook DEIR Response-Kyle Perata.pdf

Dear Neighbors in DTN,

This stuff is confusing and it is really important. "EIR" stand for Environment Impact Report. Menlo Park has written two mandated, massive documents about their General Plan (Comprehensive Plan) Update and FaceBook's expansion.

Menlo Park is obligated to identify and publish impact within and outside City of Menlo Park.

City of Palo Alto has opportunity but not obligation to comment on how Palo Alto will be impacted by Menlo Park. See the two attachments below. I am writing to you because your email to city of Menlo Park is urgent and important. **Please express your concerns that traffic/safety on Middlefield (Hawthorne and Everett) is unacceptable and deteriorating. Address your email to**

connectmenlo@menlopark.org

Call or email me if you have any questions. Menlo Park resident are preparing comprehensive pushback but they need individual emails from Palo Alto residents to supplement their objections. Copy me on your email. **THANKS**

Neilson Buchanan
155 Bryant Street
Palo Alto, CA 94301

650 329-0484
650 537-9611 cell
cnsbuchanan@yahoo.com

From: Neilson Buchanan <cnsbuchanan@yahoo.com>
To: Pat Burt Gmail <patrick.burt@cityofpaloalto.org>; Liz Kniss <lizkniss@icloud.com>; Adrian Fine <adrianfine@gmail.com>
Cc: John Guislin <jguislin@gmail.com>; Norman H. Beamer <nhbeamer@yahoo.com>; Deri McCrea <derimccrea@gmail.com>; Tim Knuth <tknuth00@gmail.com>; Kathy Segura <kbuchanansegura@yahoo.com>; Emanuela Todaro <emanuela.todaro@gmail.com>; Janine Bishar <janine@karunaadvisors.com>; Irv Brenner <irvb@pacbell.net>; Dante Malagrino <dantemalagrino@gmail.com>; Debbie Wolter <debbiewolter@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, July 9, 2016 5:07 PM
Subject: Fw: Palo Alto Comments on Menlo Park's EIRs: Facebook expansion and General Plan Update

Are you actually comfortable with lack of Palo Alto comment on accident rates (Middlefield between Willow and Lytton)? See the two attachments.

Neilson Buchanan
155 Bryant Street
Palo Alto, CA 94301

650 329-0484
650 537-9611 cell
cnsbuchanan@yahoo.com

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: "Gitelman, Hillary" <Hillary.Gitelman@CityofPaloAlto.org>
To: Neilson Buchanan <cnsbuchanan@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, July 8, 2016 1:39 PM
Subject: RE: Palo Alto Comments on Menlo Park's EIRs: Facebook expansion and General Plan Update

Neilson:

I've attached our comment letters, which went out this week by US Mail.

If you believe these projects will have impacts that have not been adequately analyzed in the Draft EIR, the most effective way to ensure that your concerns are addressed is by communicating with the City of Menlo Park directly.

Hillary



Hillary Gitelman | Planning Director | P&CE Department
250 Hamilton Avenue | Palo Alto, CA 94301
T: 650.329.2321 | **E:** hillary.gitelman@cityofpaloalto.org



Please think of the environment before printing this email – Thank you!

From: Neilson Buchanan [mailto:cnsbuchanan@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, July 08, 2016 10:50 AM
To: Gitelman, Hillary; Keene, James; Pat Burt Gmail
Cc: Bill Johnson; Jason Green; Dave Price
Subject: Palo Alto Comments on Menlo Park's EIRs: Facebook expansion and General Plan Update

Hillary, when will Palo Alto citizens see the city's comments submitted to Menlo Park? I am certain that citizens will want to comment on the city's official comments. Please send me a copy of the letter at your earliest convenience.

I have come to realize that it is standard practice across California for cities to make rather minimal comments on adjacent city developments and EIRs. This was and is a shock to my sensibilities, especially since both Menlo Park EIRs seem to have

1. technical deficiencies
2. profound impact on the region, including Palo Alto

3. such short comment periods for ultra complex documents and impacts.

By necessity the Palo Alto comment process has been essentially delegated to staff. I personally think that official city comment requires much greater public scrutiny.

However, as a practical matter, citizens really cannot be involved with the city's comments. Nevertheless, residents must be able to their submit their comments to Menlo Park based on the Palo Alto official comments. Thank you.

Who will sign the letter from Palo Alto? Mayor, Jim or you?

Neilson Buchanan
155 Bryant Street
Palo Alto, CA 94301

650 329-0484
650 537-9611 cell
cnsbuchanan@yahoo.com



PLANNING & COMMUNITY ENVIRONMENT

CITY OF
**PALO
ALTO**
250 Hamilton Avenue, 5th Floor
Palo Alto, CA 94301
650.329.2441

July 6, 2016

Ms. Deanna Chow
Principal Planner
Planning Division
City of Menlo Park
701 Laurel Street
Menlo Park CA 94025

RE: City of Palo Alto Comment Letter for Draft Environmental Impact Report on the ConnectMenlo: General Plan Land Use & Circulation Elements and M-2 Area Zoning update (Clearing House No. 2015062054)

Dear Ms. Chow,

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the ConnectMenlo: General Plan Land Use & Circulation Elements and M-2 Area Zoning update (Clearing House No. 2015062054) Project (Project). Recognizing our many shared interests, the City of Palo Alto offers the following comments on the DEIR.

1. *Population and Housing.*

- i. Overall, the Palo Alto Planning & Transportation Commission was complementary of the City of Menlo Park for proposing housing in excess of ABAG's projections and seeking to address the region's housing crisis. Any such forward-looking plan must adequately address the infrastructure and programmatic requirements that would follow from the additional housing.
- ii. Significant Cumulative Impact. (pg. 4.11-16-20). Implementation of the project would result in an increase of 5, 500 new residential units and the plan also notes that there will be more employees than residents by 2040 with implementation of the project. Without a sustainable TDM program, the impact on both residents and employees could be significant.
- iii. The Draft EIR projects a substantial daytime population (i.e. employment) in addition to an increase in resident population in the City of Menlo Park in the year 2040. However, the impacts of the daytime population change are not addressed specifically in the DEIR. Please discuss potential impacts on public safety, utilities and other relevant topics.



CityOfPaloAlto.org

2. *Transportation and Circulation.* Review of this section raised the following concerns.

- i. The intersection of Sand Hill Road/El Camino Real/Palo Alto Avenue is located within the City of Palo Alto, just over its border with Menlo Park, and compromises the intersection of two major and minor arterial roads. Please evaluate potential impacts on this intersection in the EIR.
- ii. Figure 4.13-7 shows intersection #57, Woodland Avenue and University operating at LOS E in the a.m. and p.m. peak hour. Observations of this intersection during peak periods suggest differently, and additional data should be collected. Vehicle queues on University Avenue in the eastbound direction approaching the intersection extend well into Palo Alto and occasionally to Downtown Palo Alto, with demand exceeding the capacity of the intersection. Capacity of this intersection is constrained by signal operations that do not optimize throughput demand approaches. While these factors are unique to this intersection, they should be included, along with any unique characteristics affecting capacity, in all transportation evaluation conditions. The estimated level of service is not representative of actual conditions, and the proposed project may result in a significant impact at this intersection if baseline conditions were more accurately represented.
- iii. In the 2040 Plus Project and 2040 No Project conditions, LOS in the AM/ PM peak hour at Woodland Avenue and University Avenue improves the current existing condition without increases in capacity at the intersection. Please include discussion on the methodology and rationale for this change. The City of Palo Alto believes the model may be reassigning trips to other roadway segments due to the operation of the intersection, which is unlikely to occur as University Avenue is a significant regional segment which provides direct access to destinations which are less accessible from other roadway segments.
- iv. The existing bicycle network shown in Figure 3.3-2 is incomplete and is missing a number of class 1, 2, and 3 segments in Palo Alto that directly connect to the City of Menlo Park's bike network. For example, the connection between Bryant Street and Willow Road. These connections are critical to a system suitable for local residents to use to commute to work and shop by bicycle. Please refer to the latest version of VTA's *Clara Valley Bikeways Map* for bike network information in Palo Alto.
- v. Transit.
 - a. The EIR notes that the project would generate a substantial increase in transit riders. It also notes that Menlo Park will update the existing program to guarantee funding for operation of a City-sponsored service that is necessary for

future projects. This raises the question of how this issue will be dealt with regionally in terms of available transit seats and local responsibility. The EIR concludes that the impact on transit riders would remain significant unavoidable because the City cannot guarantee capacity improvements at this time. However, based on the size of the increase in households and employees, additional mitigation may be possible by working with other transit providers and taking a coordinated approach as mitigation.

- b. While the DEIR addresses Caltrain in the Existing Transit Facilities section (pg. 4.13-15) there is not further discussion of the impacts of the project on Caltrain service or how the projected growth in transit ridership could affect service to the rest of the region, including the need for additional capacity, the location of stops and scheduling. There is also mention of the 2015 Draft of the Land Element of support for high-speed rail. The impact of the project on planned high-speed rail facilities and services should be addressed.

3. Utility and Service Systems.

- i. UTIL-13. The energy consumption analysis includes analysis of a variety of programs to reduce energy consumption and included a discussion about how infill development focuses activity in areas of existing infrastructure and services, as well as reducing energy expended by transportation (pg. 4.14-76-81). It is also noted that PG&E continues to expand its renewable energy portfolio. However, in addition to reducing consumption, requirements for new commercial development to include solar panels or other means of supplementing energy sources should be considered as part of mitigation to insure that reduce the impact of the project on energy resources remains less than significant.

Thank you again for giving Palo Alto the opportunity to comment on the DEIR for ConnectMenlo. If you have any questions regarding our comments please do not hesitate to contact me or Meg Monroe at Margaret.Monroe@cityofpaloalto.org.

Sincerely,


Hillary Gitelman
Director of Planning and Community Environment

CC Palo Alto Planning and Transportation Commission
James Keene, City Manager
Jonathan Lait, Assistant Director of Planning and Community Environment
Meg Monroe/File

From: Romain Tanière <rtaniere@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, July 10, 2016 5:10 PM
To: _connectmenlo
Subject: Comment on the draft ConnectMenlo M-2 Area Zoning Update environmental impact report

Dear Deanna,

Here's an additional comment on the draft ConnectMenlo M-2 Area Zoning Update environmental impact report:

Traffic concerns and congestion management are significant issues also deserving extensive study, particularly for those intersections in Menlo Park / East Palo Alto that may experience an increase in cut-through traffic from new commuters to the M-2 Area. For instance the **O'Brien Drive - Kavanaugh Drive between Willow Road and University Avenue** is already currently heavily used as pass-through corridors from U.S. Route 101 to Highway 84 and the Dumbarton Bridge. Traffic counts and an analysis of the diminution of service levels that may occur along these roadways are vital and should be assessed/mitigated.

Thanks a lot for your consideration.

Romain Taniere
7 Clarence Court
East Palo Alto, CA 94303

July 11, 2016

Dear Menlo Park City Staff, Menlo Park City Council and San Mateo County Board of Supervisors:

The following comments are being submitted for both the Facebook and ConnectMenlo Draft EIRs. It is important to note that many of the concerns existed long before Facebook began its expansion in Menlo Park. In many cases, the mitigations for current and forthcoming development are things that should already be getting more attention from the City of Menlo Park. Because it is not clear that these matters are getting adequate attention from the City, they are being listed in this letter with hopes that the appropriate amount of development impact fees is actually used to mitigate the impacts of this unprecedented amount of development in Belle Haven. Below are some issues that need further consideration with respect to the Facebook and ConnectMenlo DEIRs.:

Traffic

Residents have voiced concerns for over a year regarding the challenges experienced when trying to exit and enter Belle Haven during the morning and evening commutes. Due to the extremely heavy traffic on the portion of Willow Road bordering the Belle Haven community, residents often have to allocate 15 minutes of their commute just to exit the Belle Haven neighborhood in the morning. The evening commute presents equal if not greater challenges due to the traffic on Willow Road as a majority of the traffic is heading toward the Dumbarton Bridge.

The amount of cut through traffic in Belle Haven continues to escalate at an alarming rate. The residential portion of Chilco Street has become the street of choice for cut through traffic. The 15 mph speed limit signs on Chilco near the Belle Haven School are almost never heeded. The no left turn sign on the corner of Chilco and Hamilton is also ignored. Those who do comply with the sign simply use other streets in the neighborhood in order to get to Hamilton Avenue and then proceed to Willow Road with hopes of avoiding a portion of the slow commute traffic on Bayfront Expressway. To date, the minimal changes that have been made within the neighborhood in order to control traffic have been largely ineffective. We needed more effective measures now.

If there is a comprehensive plan in place to address neighborhood traffic, that plan needs to be made known to the general public. If there is no plan, resources must be allocated immediately to address our current traffic woes. Residents have expressed concerns that traffic impact fees are collected by our city in the face of development, however it is not evident that sufficient funds are being directed to the part of town most impacted by the development.

Capital Improvements, Infrastructure, Goods and Services

As the City prepares to benefit from the new revenue streams generated by all of the development it is imperative that the part of town which is most impacted by the development also see a corresponding reinvestment of the revenue. There will be a \$13.6 million impact fee from the Facebook project alone. The ongoing TOT from the hotels that will be built in the M-2 area, along with the increased property and sales taxes, need to have a plan for their allocation. That information needs to be made known to the public in a manner which allows us to see where the funds are going. At the very least, a portion of the fees should be used to do things such as improve the streetscapes on Belle Haven's busiest streets. The improvements that were made on a portion of Hamilton Avenue under the Redevelopment Agency (RDA) serve as reasonable example of what should be happening throughout the neighborhood. Under the RDA, the utilities were put underground and new sidewalks, streetlights and trees were installed.

Because of the absence of many goods and services in Belle Haven, residents often travel to other cities to obtain basic goods and services. In many cases it is faster to commute to another city to shop than it is to commute to downtown Menlo Park. The population density of our City is increasing rapidly. Most of that growth is happening in or near Belle Haven in the form of residents who will occupy all of the new high density housing and the thousands of employees that will be added to the headcount at Facebook. With growth at this level, our City is poised to accommodate more than one area for shopping, dining and entertainment. As Downtown Menlo Park undergoes a renaissance, our city is uniquely positioned to also have what I will call an Uptown District. The Uptown District would not detract from our beautiful downtown area, but it would serve as an enhancement to what Menlo Park has to offer. The sooner we can get the Uptown portion of Menlo Park built, the sooner we can take more of our cars off the road and perhaps capture more tax revenue from the thousands of commuters from other cities that travel on Willow Road daily.

Education

During the school year, a caravan of buses takes Belle Haven students to other school districts. There are also many parents driving their kindergarten through junior high aged children to schools outside of the neighborhood. I mention this commute phenomenon only to highlight the fact that Belle Haven residents are the only Menlo Park residents in the Ravenswood City School District (RCSD). The Willows used to be a part of (RCSD) but they successfully had their properties removed from the district. Some residents are currently looking into the possibility of forming a new school district which would include Belle Haven, the M-2 area and

the new Haven Avenue properties. The city limits of Menlo Park would serve as the boundary for the district. The desire would be to have Belle Haven School become a part of the new school district. Should this change happen, it could have an incredibly positive impact on the morning and evening commute patterns as it is likely that more local residents would opt to send their children to the neighborhood school.

Housing and the Dumbarton Rail Corridor

The housing crisis in the Peninsula is unparalleled. Rents are soaring to levels we have never seen. Those who already own homes are benefiting from this sellers market, but those who rent are subject to the ever rising prices. My housing comments will focus on three issues that I think are often ignored in Menlo Park's discussion when considering the challenges of housing in Menlo Park. The three issues of concern are: the distribution of our housing stock, the effectiveness of helping Menlo Park residents who are being displaced, and the need to focus on activating the Dumbarton Rail Corridor.

When the City was sued for failure to update the housing element, the solution was to locate most of the needed housing in Belle Haven. Since the most recent update, there is discussion of building even more units of housing in and near the M-2 area of Menlo Park. Our city must plan to locate all forms of housing throughout Menlo Park, including affordable housing. To date, Belle Haven has been the City's primary repository for affordable housing, however that pattern must change to include an equitable distribution of affordable housing throughout our city.

As the city develops affordable housing, it is important to ensure that Menlo Park residents are being considered for the affordable units being developed in Menlo Park. To state that you are concerned about residents being displaced, but not be able to target the residents that are at risk of being displaced is a disservice to your residents. Although there are agencies that maintain lists of San Mateo County residents who could qualify for affordable housing, the number of people on the lists far exceeds the availability of the housing. It would be beneficial for our City to maintain lists of residents who live in the various parts of Menlo Park and are at risk of displacement so that they can be given priority consideration for the affordable housing being built in their city.

Due to the high cost and low inventory of housing in the Peninsula, most people commute from the East Bay to the Peninsula via the Dumbarton Bridge. The activation of the Dumbarton Rail Corridor could have the largest impact on decreasing emissions in our city. A railway system that comes over the Dumbarton

Bridge and connects to the Caltrain system in Redwood City would have compounded benefits for our environment and quality of life in Menlo Park and the entire Peninsula. More effort must be put into assembling the local, regional and state political support for this project.

I recognize that some of the information mentioned in my letter extends beyond the scope of commenting on the DEIRs. For that reason I have also addressed this letter to the Menlo Park City Council and the San Mateo County Board of Supervisors. It is important for our elected officials to be informed about some of the issues mentioned in this letter. I look forward to your responses and actions regarding the concerns about the traffic patterns and the need for more infrastructure and commercial improvements that will make the Belle Haven and M-2 areas more livable. By making the Belle Haven section of town more livable, there will be fewer vehicles on the road, a decrease in emissions, and an improvement in the quality of life.

Kind Regards,

Sheryl Bims
Menlo Park Resident
Belle Haven Neighborhood

From: Gita Dev, FAIA <gd@devarchitects.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 07, 2016 7:47 PM
To: Chow, Deanna M
Cc: Barbara Kelsey; Sierra Club Gladwyn D'Souza; Mike Ferreira
Subject: Request for extension - General Plan Update comment period for Draft EIR

To Deanna Chow

Senior Planner, Menlo Park Planning Department

Ref: General Plan and M2 Area Update - Request for extension of deadline for Comments on Draft EIR

Dear Ms Chow,

The Sierra Club is supportive of much that is in the General Plan and M2 Area Update. We very much look forward to providing some useful input in our comments on the draft EIR.

However, given the numerous projects that we have been following in Menlo Park, we find that we are not able to keep up with the vast amount of material that needs to be reviewed for both the Facebook proposal, and its bridge and the General Plan Update and M2 area, which are both due next week.

Running both these large projects simultaneously -with just the usual 45 day comment period- makes soliciting public input less effective as it presents a very large volume of material to be reviewed, understood and useful comments made. We always find that thoughtful public input is useful to council in making the projects better and more responsive.

We look forward to providing comments to the DEIR. However, we find the volume of material makes it impossible to complete a reasonable review of both projects in the time given to the public.

Therefore, we would like to respectfully request a slight extension of the deadline for comments to the DEIR .

With kind regards,

--

Gita Dev FAIA
Sierra Club Loma Prieta
Sustainable Land Use Committee
415-722-3355