

3.12 Public Services

This section describes the existing environmental setting of public services within the City and addresses potential impacts of the Commonwealth Corporate Center Project (Project) on public service providers, including police, fire and emergency services, recreation, libraries, and schools. The analysis identifies the effects of the Project on the ability of the service providers to deliver required services.

Public service impacts are assessed in California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) documents in the context of the 1995 appellate court decision *Goleta Union School District v. The Regents of the University of California*. This decision holds that an increase in demand for public services, such as additional staff or lengthier response times, could lead to potentially significant environmental impacts only if constructing or expanding a public services facility would be required and the construction or operation of that facility might adversely affect aspects of the physical environment. As a result, increases in public service demand alone do not constitute a significant environmental effect, but if it is determined that new public service facilities would need to be constructed, the City must identify appropriate mitigation measures.

Issues identified in response to the Notice of Preparation (NOP) (Appendix 1) were considered in preparing this analysis. Applicable issues that were identified pertain to fire and emergency services.

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 and would be implemented at the time the funds available 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 in order to qualify for Level Two or Level Three fees.

Local

City of Menlo Park General Plan. The following goal and policies 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. Develop and maintain a parks and recreation system to provide areas and facilities conveniently located, sustainable, properly designed and well maintained to serve the recreation needs and promote healthy living of residents, workers and visitors to Menlo Park.

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

The following goal and policies within the Safety Element of the General Plan are relevant to the Project.

Goal S1: Assure a Safe Community. Minimize risk to life and damage to the environment and property from natural and human-caused hazards, and assure community emergency preparedness and a high level of public safety services and facilities.

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 S1.5: 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 S1.29: 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 S1.30: Coordination with the Menlo Park Fire District. Encourage City-Fire District coordination in the planning process and require all development applications to be reviewed and approved by the Menlo Park Fire Protection District prior to project approval.

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 Menlo Park's residents, businesses, workers, and visitors.

Menlo Park Fire Protection District Fire Prevention Code, Ordinance 30. The District 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 Menlo Park Fire Protection District (MPFD) 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 and shall apply 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 square feet (sf) or more, if the building is four or more stories in height, or if the building has a height of 40 feet or more. The 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 would also be 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 [CBSC]) and the California Health and Safety Code Section 13869 et seq., a fire protection district may adopt a fire prevention code by reference. The MPFD adopted a new amended and restated District 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

¹ Menlo Park Fire Protection District. 2007. "District Fire Prevention Code Ordinance #30 & District Standards, Local Ordinance to 2007 California Fire Code & Fee Schedule. Adopted September 5, 2007. Available <<http://www.menlofire.org/fireprevention/forms/Ordinance%2030.pdf>> Accessed October 21, 2013.

calming devices, photovoltaic system installation, 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 MPFD. The MPFD service boundary includes the City, Atherton, and East Palo Alto, plus parts of unincorporated San Mateo County and federal facilities such as the Veterans Hospital, United States Geological Survey, and the Stanford Linear Accelerator. The MPFD's seven fire stations, one administrative building, and one rescue warehouse serve a service population of over 99,050³ and cover 30 square miles. The MPFD's service area is primarily residential, but it also serves some industrial areas on the easternmost part (including the Project site). In addition, the MPFD is part of the greater San Mateo County boundary-drop plan whereby the closest apparatus responds to each call.⁴

Headed by the Fire Chief, the MPFD is organized into the Administrative Services Division, the Fire Prevention Division, Operations Division, and the Training Division. Fully staffed, the MPFD has 87 line safety employees/firefighters, three Fire Inspectors, seven Chief Officers, and 13 staff personnel for a total of 110 employees. This equates to a ratio of 1.11 positions per 1,000 people. Each engine and truck is staffed by a minimum of 3 personnel.⁵

The MPFD responded to approximately 8,500 emergencies incident calls per year with about 60 percent of them being emergency medical incidents.⁶ The response goals are less than 6.59 minutes for an emergency medical incident and under 8 minutes for all units to arrive for a structure fire. However, the actual response time may vary depending on whether the units are in quarters, in their response areas, responding to simultaneous incidents, or are out of their area for training.⁷

Fire Stations 77, 1, and 5 in the City and Fire Station 2 in East Palo Alto are the closest stations to the Project site. Fire Stations 77 and 2 are the only two stations located north of US 101. Station 77, at 1467 Chilco Avenue, is expected to serve the Project site and is approximately 0.6 mile west of the Project site. The driving distance between Station 77 and the Project site is about three-quarters of a mile. Per shift, Station 77 is manned by three firefighting personnel (one Captain and two firefighters), one fleet manager, and one mechanic. The station operates Engine 77 (Type 1 Pierce Saber Fire Engine), an air

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 at <<http://www.menlofire.org/fireprevention/forms/2010%20Ordinance%2032.pdf>> Accessed October 21, 2013.

³ BAE Urban Economics. 2013. Fiscal Impact Analysis Report for proposed Commonwealth Corporate Center. Submitted to the City of Menlo Park, CA: October 25, 2013.

⁴ Menlo Park Fire Protection District. 2013. "Menlo Park Fire Protection District Information." Available at <<http://www.menlofire.org/districtinfo.html>> Accessed August 15, 2013.

⁵ Harold Schapelhouman, Fire Chief. 2013. Memorandum to Rachel Grossman, City of Menlo Park. April 11, 2013.

⁶ Menlo Park Fire Protection District. 2013. "Menlo Park Fire Protection District Information." Available at <<http://www.menlofire.org/districtinfo.html>> Accessed August 15, 2013.

⁷ Harold Schapelhouman, Fire Chief. 2013. Memorandum to Rachel Grossman, City of Menlo Park. April 11, 2013.

boat, urban search and rescue (USAR) vehicles, and other various utility vehicles owned by the MPFD.⁸ The MPFD is in the initial planning stages for the reconstruction of Station 2.⁹

The MPFD is currently studying a Fire Protection Facilities Impact Fee Program to ensure that new development funds its fair share of the costs of needed capital facilities to serve growth within its boundaries. These capital facilities would include fire stations and buildings, fire protection vehicles, and other fire protection and emergency equipment. The fee would be adopted under the authority allowed by Assembly Bill (AB) 1600, the Mitigation Fee Act, contained in Section 66000 and subsequent sections of the California Government Code. Assembly Bill 1600 established a process for local governments and districts to formulate, adopt, impose, collect, and account for impact fees. As per AB 1600, cities hold the legal authority to impose fees on behalf of the MPFD within their city limits. The fee would be levied on new residential and non-residential development in the MPFD's boundaries to offset the demand for capital facilities generated by new development.¹⁰

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 Project area is located within MPPD's Beat 3.¹¹ The MPPD is headquartered at the Menlo Park Civic Center at 701 Laurel Street, approximately 1.85 miles southwest of the Project site. This main station serves the Project site. A substation is located at 1197 Willow Avenue, at Newbridge Avenue, approximately 1.09 miles southeast of the Project site, which is an auxiliary site for officers who work in the Belle Haven neighborhood to use as office space and is not open to the public. The MPPD is considering locations of a new site for this substation, which would provide more access to the public. The substation would have limited business hours and would be staffed with a part-time clerk. There are no other immediate or near-future plans for expansion MPPD's facilities, staff or equipment, aside from normal replacement schedules.

The MPPD is headed by the Chief of Police and consists of two divisions: Patrol Operations Division and Special Operations Division. The MPPD has a total of 47 sworn officers covering three beats, 5 community service officers (non-sworn), and 22 professional staff. Beat 3, which serves the Project site, is staffed with 2 to 3 sworn officers; however, officers in the City working the shift are available to assist during emergencies. 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 1.11 sworn officers per 1,000 residents, which meets the goals of the MPPD.

From November 2011 to November 2012 (the most recent data available), the MPPD received a total of 10,322 emergency calls, 10,566 calls for services, and 22,043 officer-initiated contacts, for a total of 42,931 calls. The MPPD is committed to maintaining response times that are consistent with industry standards. MPPD's current response times, which are considered acceptable, are as follows.

⁸ Menlo Park Fire Protection District. 2013. "Station 77." Available <<http://www.menlofire.org/station7.html>> Accessed on August 15, 2013.

⁹ Harold Schapelhouman, Fire Chief. 2013. Memorandum to Rachel Grossman, City of Menlo Park. April 11, 2013.

¹⁰ Menlo Park Fire Protection District. 2013. "Fire Protection Facilities Impact Fee Nexus Study – Administrative Draft." Prepared by Seifel Consulting and Urban Economic. June 2013.

¹¹ Dave Bertini, Commander, Menlo Park Police Department, Memo to Rachel Grossman, City of Menlo Park, April 11, 2013.

- Priority 1: Immediate threat of danger to 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 4 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 7 minutes.
- 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.

Schools

Four elementary/middle school districts and one high school district are within the boundaries of the City: the Menlo Park City School District, the Ravenswood School District, Redwood City School District, Las Lomas School District, and the Sequoia Union High School District. However, this analysis does not consider the Las Lomas School District. The portion of the City that includes the Las Lomas Elementary School District, which is generally bound by Alameda de las Pulgas to the north and I-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 since 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 Menlo Park City School District (MPCSD) serves parts of the City, Atherton, and unincorporated San Mateo County. There are approximately 2,795 students, kindergarten through eighth grade, enrolled in the four schools of the District.¹² Oak Knoll Elementary School and Hillview Middle School are located in the City, while Laurel Elementary School and Encinal Elementary School are located in the Town of Atherton.¹³

The MPCSD employed 165 full-time equivalent teachers during the 2011–2012 school year (the most recent data available) with an average student-to-teacher ratio of 16.9 students per teacher.¹⁴ Pursuant to Education Code Section 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.¹⁵ On average the MPCSD exceeds this goal.

¹² Menlo Park City School District, “About Us,” Available: <<http://district.mpcsd.org/modules/cms/pages.phtml?pageid=169038&sessionid=69d7bf3a3142231aa2155898b6f502d9>> Accessed October 22, 2013.

¹³ Menlo Park City School District, “District Boundaries,” Available: <<http://district.mpcsd.org/modules/cms/pages.phtml?pageid=171241&sessionid=ace8f1cbb3bf78dafce27dbfc3ecf22b&sessionid=ace8f1cbb3bf78dafce27dbfc3ecf22b>>. Accessed October 22, 2013.

¹⁴ California Department of Education, Data Reporting Office. 2013. “Certified Staff by Ethnicity for 2011-2012 - # of Staff by District by Ethnicity.” Staff Type: Teachers. 4168965 – Menlo Park City Elementary. Available <<http://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/>> Accessed October 22, 2013.

¹⁵ 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 October 22, 2013.

The MPCSD's schools and associated capacity for the 2012–2013 school year is listed in Table 3.12-1 below. As shown, Encinal School, Oak Knoll School, and Hillview Middle School have additional capacity available for new students. However, Laurel School is over capacity.^{16,17} Nonetheless, if a school is at

Table 3.12-1. Menlo Park City School District—Capacity and Enrollment 2012–2013

School	Grades	Total Capacity ^a	Current Enrollment (2012–2013) ^b	Additional Capacity
Laurel School	K-3	484	489	-5
Encinal School	K-5	763	755	8
Oak Knoll School	K-5	763	739	24
Hillview Middle School	6-8	950–1,050	812	138–238
Total		2,960/3,060	2,795	165–275

Sources:

a. Menlo Park School District. 2013. "Facility Master Planning Update."

b. California Department of Education, 2013.

capacity, students have the potential to attend another elementary school in the district. The MPCSD is required to accommodate the students 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 0.21 students per single-family dwelling; 0.26 students per townhouse dwelling; and 0.13 students per multifamily dwelling.¹⁸

Ravenswood City School District. The Ravenswood City School District (Ravenswood CSD) primarily serves the communities of East Palo Alto and the Belle Haven neighborhood in the City. Ravenswood CSD serves approximately 4,077 students kindergarten through eighth grade in seven elementary schools. Ravenswood CSD also includes Ravenswood Child Development Center (pre-kindergarten, 3 through 5 years of age) 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.^{19,20}

¹⁶ Menlo Park School District. 2013. "Facility Master Planning Update." Presentation at the Special Board Meeting May 29, 2013. Available <<http://www.district.mpcsd.org/modules/groups/homepagefiles/cms/1602720/File/FINAL%20Board%20Meeting%20May%2029.pdf?sessionid=d71284ef773f18797e998c18007e01dd>> Accessed October 22, 2013.

¹⁷ California Department of Education, Education Demographics Unit. 2013. "Enrollment by Grade for 2012-2013, District and School Enrollment by Grade." 4168965 – Menlo Park City Elementary. Available <<http://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/>> Accessed October 22, 2013.

¹⁸ Bay Area Urban Economics. 2013. "Fiscal Impact Analysis of the Housing Element Update." April 1, 2013. Available <http://www.menlopark.org/departments/pln/he/fia/he_fia.pdf> Accessed October 22, 2013.

¹⁹ Ravenswood City School District. 2013. "Homepage." Available <<http://www.ravenswood.k12.ca.us/>> Accessed October 22, 2013.

²⁰ California Department of Education, Educational Demographics Unit. 2013. "Enrollment by Grade for 2012-2013, District and School Enrollment by Grade." 4168999 – Ravenswood City Elementary. Available: <<http://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/>> Accessed October 22, 2013.

As of the 2011–2012 school year (the most recent data available), Ravenswood CSD employed 232 teachers,²¹ resulting in a ratio of approximately 17.6 students per teacher. According to the Ravenswood City School District Final Demographic Report, Belle Haven Elementary School’s enrollment is expected to decrease from 564 to 424 students, while Willow Oaks Elementary School’s enrollment is expected to increase from 700 to 1,065 students by 2018. Belle Haven Elementary School and Willow Oaks Elementary School can accommodate up to 816 students and 1,075 students, respectively.²² As shown in Table 3.12-2, these two schools are currently under capacity. The Ravenswood CSD uses a student generation rate of 0.39 students per single-family dwelling and 0.12 students per multifamily dwelling.²³

Table 3.12-2. Ravenswood City School District Schools in Menlo Park—Capacity and Enrollment 2012–2013

School	Grades	Total Capacity ^a	Current Enrollment (2012–2013) ^b	Additional Capacity
Belle Haven Elementary School	K-8	1,075	564	511
Willow Oaks Elementary School	K-8	816	700	116
Total			1,264	627

Sources:

a. Ravenswood City School District. 2011. “Final Demographic Report.”

b. California Department of Education, 2013.

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.²⁴ There are approximately 9,210 students, kindergarten through eighth grade, enrolled in the 16 schools of the district. Taft Elementary School, which has an enrollment of approximately 578 students, and John F. Kennedy Middle School, which has an enrollment of approximately 798 students, serve portions of Menlo Park.²⁵ However, since Redwood CSD is a “district of choice,” it is not likely that all students generated from future development under the General Plan in this area would go to these two schools.²⁶

²¹ California Department of Education, Educational Demographics Unit. 2013. “Certified Staff by Ethnicity for 2011-2012, # of Staff by District by Ethnicity.” 4168999 – Ravenswood City Elementary. Available: <<http://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/>> Accessed October 22, 2013.

²² Ravenswood City School District. 2011. “Final Demographic Report.”

²³ Bay Area Urban Economics. 2013. “Fiscal Impact Analysis of the Housing Element Update.” April 1, 2013. Available <http://www.menlopark.org/departments/pln/he/fia/he_fia.pdf> Accessed October 22, 2013.

²⁴ Redwood City School District. 2013. “District Profile.” Available: <<http://www.rcsd.k12.ca.us/domain/5>>. Accessed December 13, 2013.

²⁵ California Department of Education, Data Reporting Office. 2013. “District Enrollment by Ethnicity, 2012-2013.” 4169005 – Redwood City Elementary. Available <<http://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/>> Accessed December 13, 2013.

²⁶ 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 December 13, 2013.

Redwood CSD employed 444 full-time equivalent teachers during the 2011–2012 school year (the most recent data available) with an average student-to-teacher ratio of 20.7 students per teacher.²⁷ Redwood CSD considers its population stable and projects an increase of approximately 500 additional students by 2017. Redwood CSD is currently updating its facilities master plan and a demographic study is in progress. A student generation rate of 0.3 students per dwelling unit is used for the Redwood CSD.²⁸

Sequoia Union High School District. Sequoia Union High School District (SUHSD) is the only high school district within the City. The SUHSD serves approximately 9,247 students²⁹ 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. The schools that serve the district include Carlmont High School, Redwood High School, Woodside High School, Sequoia High School, Menlo-Atherton High School, and Sequoia District Adult Education.³⁰

SUHSD currently employs 475 teachers with an average student-to-teacher ratio of 19.5 students per teacher.³¹ The district is projected to increase by over 1,000 students by 2020. The district is currently looking for potential sites for additional schools and is looking at expansion of its existing campuses. SUHSD has not established its own student generation rate and uses the statewide average of 0.2 students per dwelling unit.³²

Parks and Recreation

The Menlo Park Community Services Department (Department) is responsible for providing recreational and cultural programs for the residents of the City. The Department's facilities located within City boundaries include 221 acres of parkland distributed among 13 parks, 2 community centers, 2 public pools, 2 child care centers, and 2 gymnasiums. Included in the parks and recreational areas are tennis courts, softball diamonds, picnic areas, playgrounds, swimming pools, gymnastics centers, soccer fields, and open space.³³ 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 3.12-3.

²⁷ California Department of Education, Data Reporting Office. 2013. "Certified Staff by Ethnicity for 2011-2012 - # of Staff by District by Ethnicity." Staff Type: Teachers. 4169005 – Redwood City Elementary. Available <<http://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/>> Accessed December 13, 2013.

²⁸ Bay Area Urban Economics. 2013. "Fiscal Impact Analysis of the Housing Element Update." April 1, 2013. Available <http://www.menlopark.org/departments/pln/he/fia/he_fia.pdf> Accessed October 22, 2013.

²⁹ California Department of Education, Educational Demographics Unit. 2013. "Enrollment by Grade for 2012-2013, District and School Enrollment by Grade." 4169062 – Sequoia Union High School. Available: <<http://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/>> Accessed October 22, 2013.

³⁰ Sequoia Union High School District. 2013. "Home Page." Available <<http://www.seq.org/>> Accessed October 22, 2013.

³¹ California Department of Education, Educational Demographics Unit. 2013. "Certified Staff by Ethnicity for 2011-2012, # of Staff by District by Ethnicity." 4169062 – Sequoia Union High. Available: <<http://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/>> Accessed October 22, 2013.

³² Bay Area Urban Economics. 2013. "Fiscal Impact Analysis of the Housing Element Update." April 1, 2013. Available <http://www.menlopark.org/departments/pln/he/fia/he_fia.pdf> Accessed October 22, 2013.

³³ City of Menlo Park Community Services Department. 2013. "Community Services Department." Available <http://www.menlopark.org/departments/dep_comservices.html> Accessed August 15, 2013.

Table 3.12-3. Parks and Community Facilities Located Within the Vicinity of the Project Site

FacilityName	Location	Size	Distance from Site (miles) ^a	Description
Park Facilities				
Bedwell– Bayfront Park	Bayfront Expressway & Marsh Road	155 acres	0.60	An extensive trail system, as part of the San Francisco Bay Trail, allowing hiking, running, bicycling, dog walking, bird watching, kite flying, and photography.
Kelly Park	100 Terminal Avenue	8.3 acres	0.25	A synthetic turf soccer field with lights, full size track with four different exercise apparatuses, lighted tennis courts, lighted basketball court, benches, bleachers, and a full men’s and woman’s bathroom facility.
Marketplace Park	Ivy Drive & Market Place	1 acre	0.46	Playground, open grass areas, and walkways.
Hamilton Park	Hamilton Avenue (Sage Street and Hazel Street)	1.2 acres	0.67	A play structure, picnic tables, and open grass area.
Community Facilities				
Belle Haven Child Development Center	410 Ivy Drive	6,600 sf	0.14	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 sf	0.58	Licensed by the Department of Social Services to provide care for children in kindergarten to sixth grade.
Senior Center	110 Terminal Avenue	11,000 sf	0.26	Health, recreational, and educational programs, as well as cultural events and social services to older adults. Hot meals provided for minimal cost.
Onetta Harris Community Center	100 Terminal Avenue	11,000 sf	0.26	A gym, weight room, computer lab, a large multipurpose room with adjacent kitchen, three classrooms, and office space.
Belle Haven Pool	100 Terminal Avenue	6,300 sf	0.26	Currently a seasonal pool that is open from mid-June to the end of August. A 25 meter pool with an 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.

Note:

^a. As measured from the address of 151 Commonwealth Drive, Menlo Park, CA, 94025.

The City has adopted a goal of maintaining a ratio of 5 acres of developed parkland per 1,000 residents.³⁴ Currently, the City provides a net of approximately 221 acres of parkland for the residents of Menlo Park, which equates to a ratio of 6.76 acres per capita.³⁵ The City currently exceeds its goals.

Libraries

The City has two libraries accessible to local residents that are 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-sf, one-story building in the Civic Center located at 800 Alma Street. In 1999, the City opened a 3,600-sf branch library in the Belle Haven Elementary School at 413 Ivy Drive as part of a joint venture with Ravenswood CSD. Students of Belle Haven Elementary have easy access to the 18,128 volumes of books in circulation at this library on the school campus.³⁶ In total, the two City libraries comprise approximately 37,846-sf and have staffs of approximately 53 people, including 7 librarians. The two libraries provide approximately 150,017 volumes of books in circulation to its patrons, with over 10,000 audio books.³⁷

According to the General Plan, the Menlo Park Library has a goal to maintain a ratio of 3.29 books per capita and a ratio of 1.02 sf of library space per capita.³⁸ Currently, there are approximately 150,017 children's books, adult/juvenile books, and serial volumes and 37,846 sf of library space between the Main Menlo Park and Belle Haven branches. With a service population of approximately 32,679 residents, this equates to a ratio of 4.59 books per person and 1.16 sf of library space per person, exceeding the existing standard. The Menlo Park Library currently experiences a shortage of reading room space and overcrowding at children's story times because of an increasing number of children.

Environmental Impacts

This section describes the impact analysis relating 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. Measures to mitigate (i.e., avoid, minimize, rectify, reduce, eliminate, or compensate for) significant impacts accompany each impact discussion.

Thresholds of Significance

In accordance with Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines, the Project would be considered to have a significant effect 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, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, or other public services and facilities.

³⁴ City of Menlo Park. 2013. City of Menlo Park General Plan – Open Space, Conservation, Noise, and Safety Elements. Adopted May 21, 2013.

³⁵ $6.76 = (221 \text{ acres} / \text{January 1, 2013 population of } 32,679) * 1,000 \text{ residents}$

³⁶ Lapkoff & Gobalet Demographic Research, Inc. 2010. Demographic Analysis of the Belle Haven Community for the Menlo Park Library. August 5, 2010.

³⁷ California State Library. 2011-2012. "Public Library Survey Data (2011-2012 Fiscal Year). Available <<http://library.ca.gov/lids/librarystats.html>> Accessed October 21, 2013.

³⁸ City of Menlo Park. 1994. City of Menlo Park General Plan. "General Plan Background Report, Public Facilities and Services." Page B-VI-8.

Methods for Analysis

Potential impacts on public services are evaluated by (a) assessing the potential for the Project to increase demand for public services based on goals established by service providers, and (b) comparing the ability of the service provider/public facility to serve the Project and accommodate the associated increase in demand. 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 the 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 Project is anticipated to increase daytime population by approximately 1,300 people³⁹ and, based on MPFD standards of each employee as the equivalent of 0.5 residents,⁴⁰ this equates to approximately 650 people added to the service population. In addition, the Project is anticipated to generate approximately 102 new employees who could live in the City and in the MPFD's service area. Assuming that each of these employees would form a household with the City average of 2.57 persons per household, the population would increase by approximately 262 residents. In total, the Project could result in approximately 912 people added to the service population. If there were no increase in MPFD staffing (110 fire safety personnel), then the ratio would decrease slightly from 1.11 to 1.10 positions per 1,000 residents.⁴¹ In order to maintain the current ratio, approximately one additional fire safety staff member would need to be hired. This one additional person could be accommodated by the upcoming Station 2 expansion or within the existing facility at Station 77.

Upon Project completion, the MPFD would continue to serve the Project area and respond to calls for assistance from its existing stations. Three MPFD fire stations are less than 2 miles from the Project site. In addition, the MPFD has an automatic aid agreement with the City of Redwood City to provide back up and respond in the event of a major fire and an automatic aid agreement with the City of Palo Alto. Within an 8 to 9 minute response time, Station 1 houses the MPFD's one aerial ladder truck that would be available, if necessary.⁴²

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

³⁹ Although there are currently 30 people employed at the Project site (the Jefferson Site), this number is insignificant, and 1,300 people is a conservative estimate that represents all new employees under the Project.

⁴⁰ Menlo Park Fire Protection District. 2013. "Fire Protection Facilities Impact Fee Nexus Study – Administrative Draft." Prepared by Seifel Consulting and Urban Economic. June 2013.

⁴¹ $1.10 = (110 \text{ fire safety personnel} / \text{new service population } [99,050 + 912 = 99,962]) * 1,000 \text{ residents}$

⁴² Menlo Park Fire Protection District. 2007. "District Fire Prevention Code Ordinance #30 & District Standards, Local Ordinance to 2007 California Fire Code & Fee Schedule." Adopted September 5, 2007. Available <<http://www.menlofire.org/fireprevention/forms/Ordinance%2030.pdf>> Accessed October 21, 2013.

At this time, the MPFD is considering the adoption of an impact fee for Fire Protection Services. If adopted prior to project approval, the Project Sponsor would be required to pay applicable facilities fees, as would be outlined in the Fire Protection Facilities Impact Fee Program for the new construction at the Project site if the fee is adopted prior to the issuance of a building permit. Payment of this fee would address the potential need for any additional fire service equipment.

The one additional firefighter that could potentially need to be hired as a result of the Project, and any additional necessary equipment, could be accommodated in the expansion of Station 2 or within 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 impact the MPPD by intensifying site activity, adding new employees and visitors, increasing square footage, and increasing traffic incidents. In total, the Project would increase employees at the Project site to approximately 1,300. As mentioned 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 would increase by approximately 433 people for a total of 42,479 people. This would result in a nominal decrease of the officers per resident ratio, which would remain at 1.11 officers per 1,000 residents. Police surveillance in the Project area would continue with routine patrols and responses to calls for assistance. 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 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. As part of the City's review process, the MPPD would review plans and other safety features of the Project to ensure that safety standards are properly located and 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 not anticipated to put an additional demand on MPPD. The increase in service population would not change the existing ratio of 1.11 sworn officers per 1,000 residents. Therefore, no additional MPPD staff 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)

The Project would consist of office uses and would not construct residential units that would generate school-age students. However, as discussed in Section 3.11, *Population and Housing*, the Project would indirectly induce housing demand by increasing employment within the City. The Project could result in a demand of approximately 102 new households in the City (assuming that each new employee who would also live in the City would form a household).

As previously stated, four elementary/middle school districts and one high school district serve the City. However, one of the elementary/middle school districts would not be affected by the indirect population

increases associated with the Project. The portion of the City that includes the Las Lomas Elementary School District is built out, and there is a very limited potential for the construction of additional housing. Therefore, 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.

To ensure a conservative analysis, for elementary/middle school students, the generation rate for the Ravenswood CSD is used since the student per household ratio is larger. Using these rates, each new single-family/ townhouse unit would generate approximately 0.39 new students, and multifamily units would generate approximately 0.12 new students. For high school students, each new dwelling unit would generate 0.2 new students. At this time, the type of housing units that the Project employees would occupy is unknown. Therefore, this analysis assumes a similar breakdown in housing units as 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 multifamily units. Therefore, the 102 new households generated by the Project would occupy 64 single family units and 38 multifamily units. The Project would generate approximately 30⁴³ elementary/middle school students and approximately 21 high school students.

Elementary and Middle Schools. Three elementary/middle school districts would serve the new housing that would be an indirect result of the Project. For the purposes of this analysis, it is assumed that one-third of the projected students would attend MPCSD, one-third would attend Ravenswood CSD, and one-third would attend Redwood CSD, which equates to approximately 10 students per district.

Menlo Park City School District. As shown in Table 3.12-1, there is currently capacity for a total of 165 to 275 additional students within the MPCSD, with elementary schools having the least remaining capacity of approximately 27 total students. The 10 students generated by the Project, if evenly distributed between the brackets (elementary [kindergarten through fifth] and middle [sixth through eighth]), would result in approximately 7 new students at the elementary schools and 3 new students at the middle school.

With the recent completion of the Hillview Middle School expansion, there is additional capacity for approximately 138 to 238 new students. As such, the 3 new middle school students generated by the Project would be able to be accommodated within Hillview Middle School. However, one of the three elementary schools currently exceeds capacity and, when combined, the elementary schools are close to capacity. Regardless, the 7 new students at the elementary schools would be able to be accommodated in the existing facilities without increasing class sizes. If a school reaches capacity within the school district, then students would be sent to the next closest school.

Ravenswood City School District. As shown in Table 3.12-2, there is additional capacity for a total of 627 additional students within the Ravenswood CSD. The 10 students generated by the Project, if evenly distributed between the grade levels, would result in approximately 7 new students at the elementary schools and 3 new students at the middle school. Hence, Ravenswood CSD would be able to accommodate the increase in students potentially generated by the Project.

Redwood City School District. Because the Redwood CSD is the "district of choice," this analysis assumes 70 percent of the 10 students (7 students) generated by the Project would attend Taft Elementary School and John F. Kennedy Middle School. This growth is consistent with the 1 percent growth per year

⁴³ (64 single family units * 0.39 students / unit = 25 new students) + (38 multifamily units * 0.12 students / unit = 5 new students) = 30 total new students.

projected by Redwood CSD. Therefore, 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, serves the City. As such, it is assumed that all high school students generated by the Project would attend the SUHSD, which equates to approximately 21 students. As explained above, the SUHSD is close to capacity and is looking for potential sites for additional schools and considering the expansion of its existing campuses. Adding 21 students to the school district could trigger the need for new or expanded facilities.

Overall School Impacts. As discussed above, the Project could result in an increase in students within the City, which could impact 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. In addition, the housing needed to serve these 102 households would have to be constructed for any of the possible impacts to occur.

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 intended to provide a major source of financing for new school facilities, Section 65996 of the State Government Code explains that payment of school impact fees established by SB 50 is deemed to constitute full and complete mitigation for school impacts from development that may be required from a developer by any state or local agency.

In addition, the new residential development that may indirectly result from the increase in employment and that would generate students would be subject to separate CEQA review and would also be subject to residential school impact fees (which are higher than non-residential school impact fees). As a result, the tertiary impacts related to schools would be *less than significant*.

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

The Project would provide onsite amenities to the employees such as a lawn, active recreation space, and picnic tables. These proposed features would reduce the likelihood of employees utilizing or overburdening City facilities. The Project would add approximately 1,300 new employees to the area. Although the number of employees would increase, it is likely that these employees would mainly use the onsite facilities during work hours rather than the neighboring City parks.

As stated in Section 3.11, *Population and Housing*, 102 new households are expected to be generated in the City as a result of the Project. These employees and their families could use the park facilities during non-work hours. Nonetheless, as explained above, the Department currently exceeds its goal of 5 acres per 1,000 residents and has not identified any existing capacity issues. Currently, the Department of Finance (DOF) estimates that the City averages approximately 2.57 persons per household. The addition of approximately 262 new residents as a result of the Project would slightly reduce the parks service ratio from 6.76 to 6.70⁴⁴ residents per 1,000 acres of parklands. However, this would still exceed 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

⁴⁴ $6.70 = (221 \text{ acres} / 32,679 + 262 \text{ population}) * 1,000 \text{ residents}$

recreational resources such that substantial physical deterioration would occur. Regardless, the Project would be subject to supplemental property taxes to pay for bonds issued for park and recreation.

Although the employee and residential population in the City would increase as a result of the Project, there are no capacity issues and the existing facilities would be able to accommodate the increase in residents. 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. The Project would add approximately 1,300 new employees to the area. As a result, the Project is expected to increase the population in the City by approximately 262 residents. As stated above, the Menlo Park Library has a goal to maintain a ratio of 3.29 books per capita and a ratio of 1.02 sf of library space per capita. The increase in 262 residents would slightly degrade the existing ratios from 4.59 to 4.55 books per capita and from 1.16 to 1.15 sf per capita. Nonetheless, this would still be above the current goals and standards. As discussed above, the Menlo Park Library currently experiences a shortage of reading room space and overcrowding at children's story times because of an increasing number of children. However, the Project would not result in a significant new demand for these services. 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 service and park/recreational facilities is the City because these services are provided on a citywide basis, and service ratios by which demand is estimated is based on citywide figures. However, the fire protection cumulative context area would include the City and the cities of Palo Alto, Atherton, East Palo Alto, and parts of unincorporated San Mateo County to correspond with the MPFD's service area. Likewise, the cumulative analysis for impacts on schools would include the communities served by the five school districts discussed in this analysis.

The projects associated with the Tier 2 analysis (as included in Table 3.0-2 and illustrated in Figure 3.0-1 in Section 3.0, Introduction to Environmental Analysis) span a larger geographical area. The identified Tier 2 projects are relevant to the Menlo Park, East Palo Alto, and Redwood City areas. This cumulative analysis examines the effects of the Project in the relevant geographic area, in combination with other current projects, probable future projects, and projected future growth.

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)

Tier 1 and Tier 2

Cumulative development in the MPFD service area will result in increased demand for fire and emergency services to accommodate growth. Population and employment growth would increase service calls and potentially create a need for additional facilities to maintain existing MPFD 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 more personnel, which would require either an expansion or relocation of existing fire stations.⁴⁵

As noted above, the firefighter-to-resident ratio of the MPFD is currently 1.11 firefighters per 1,000 residents. The current staffing model is a minimum daily staff of 110 fire safety employees or 1 employee per 4,062 service population served. The MPFD's staffing is currently adequate for daily operations based on the current risk profile, population, and call volumes. The MPFD considers growth forecasts during its annual budgeting process. The MPFD currently anticipates a 22.6 percent increase in the service population by 2040, increasing by approximately 24,000 people.⁴⁶ Assuming a steady growth, this would represent a growth rate of approximately 860 new people per year, and approximately 6,000 additional people by 2020.

The Project would add approximately 1,300 employees, which translates to a service population of 650 Project employees (considering each employee as half of a resident) and 262 new residents, for a total of 912 new people in the service area. The additional service population and residents as a result of the Project represents only 15.2 percent of the MPFD forecasted population growth in the service area by 2020. Station 77, at 1467 Chilco Avenue, is expected to serve the Project and is approximately 0.5 miles southwest of the Project site. The MPFD is planning on reconstructing Station 2 and has a Capital Improvement Plan that identifies improvements to other facilities. While the Project could have a considerable contribution to the overall expected growth in service population by 2020, with improvements district wide as well as implementation of the impact fee discussed above, cumulative impacts are not anticipated. The Project's cumulative impact would be *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)

Tier 1 and Tier 2

The cumulative development projects within the City would include commercial, industrial, office, mixed-use, hotel, and residential developments and would increase the demand for police protection services. As noted, the MPPD's current service ratio is approximately 1.11 sworn officers per 1,000 residents. According to 2009 ABAG Projections, there are expected to be 3,100 additional residents and 1,000 new jobs in the City in 2020.⁴⁷ This would result in an anticipated total service population increase of approximately 3,433 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 39,300 persons and worker population of 10,130⁴⁸ persons (based on MPPD calculation of each employee as one-third of a resident) would result in a total MPPD service population of 49,430 persons. Based on the

⁴⁵ Menlo Park Fire Protection District. 2013. "Fire Protection Facilities Impact Fee Nexus Study – Administrative Draft." Prepared by Seifel Consulting and Urban Economic. June 2013.

⁴⁶ Menlo Park Fire Protection District. 2013. "Fire Protection Facilities Impact Fee Nexus Study – Administrative Draft." Prepared by Seifel Consulting and Urban Economic. June 2013.

⁴⁷ Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG). Projections 2009. December 2009.

⁴⁸ Based on the 30,390 estimated jobs in Menlo Park in 2020 as discussed in Section 3.11, *Population and Housing*.

current MMPD staffing (47 sworn officers), this would result in a ratio of 0.95 officers per 1,000 residents, which is below the current service ratio of 1.11. Additional police officers and facilities would be required to accommodate the growth envisioned by the projected cumulative growth and to maintain the same level of service as under existing conditions. This would be a potentially significant cumulative impact.

The Project would result in 1,300 new employees in the City of Menlo Park. This would translate to a daytime population of 433 people (based on MPPD calculations of each employee as one-third of a resident) and 262 fulltime residents, which would place an additional demand on the MPPD, require additional staff, and potentially increase response times. However, the one new police officer required to accommodate the Project would not require the construction or expansion of police protection facilities to house additional staff as the existing MPPD facilities could house the new officers. Thus, the Project would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to the increased demand for police services, and the cumulative impact would be *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)

Tier 1 and Tier 2

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

Projects identified for consideration in the Tier 1 and Tier 2 cumulative scenario would be addressed case-by-case during the review of the respective development. In addition, 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. Cumulative 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.

The Project would not directly contribute new students to the cumulative enrollment growth since the development of housing units is not proposed as part of the Project. On a tertiary level, the Project would add approximately 30 elementary school students and 21 high school students to the respective school districts. This contribution would not be considerable to the cumulative enrollment growth that is assumed to necessitate construction of new facilities. Therefore, the Project's cumulative impact would be *less than significant*.

Impact C-PS-4: Cumulative Parks and Recreation 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 recreation facilities. (LTS)

Tier 1 and Tier 2

The geographic context for an analysis of cumulative impacts on parks and recreation is the City, as the Menlo Park Community Services 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 6.79 acres per 1,000 residents, which exceeds the goal. According to ABAG Projections, which reasonably includes the Tier 1 and Tier 2 projects as well as ambient growth, the population in Menlo Park could increase to 39,300 by 2020.⁴⁹ A total population of 39,300 people utilizing 221 acres of parkland yields a ratio of 5.62 acres per 1,000, which still exceeds the goal. Therefore, cumulative development is not expected to result in a significant cumulative impact on parks and recreation.

The Project would add approximately 1,300 new employees and 262 residents to the City. Based on the existing population of 32,679, a total residential population of 32,941 would result in a parkland ratio of 6.70 acres per 1,000 residents. Even with projected population growth, the City's parkland ratio would still be above the acceptable threshold, even without the construction of any new parks or recreational facilities. Therefore, the cumulative impact would be *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)

Tier 1 and Tier 2

The geographic context for an analysis of cumulative impacts to 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. Cumulative 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 City has a goal to maintain a ratio of 3.29 books per capita and a ratio of 1.02 sf of library space per person. Cumulative development of the Tier 1 and Tier 2 projects, in combination with ambient growth would, without construction of new libraries or expansion of existing libraries, result in a reduction of the number of books per capita and could force the existing ratio of 4.59 books per person and 1.16 sf 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 indirectly increase the population in the City by approximately 262 residents. As stated above, the Menlo Park Library has a goal to maintain a ratio of 3.29 books per capita and a ratio of 1.02 sf of library space per capita. The increase in 262 residents would slightly degrade the existing ratios from 4.59 to 4.55 books per capita and from 1.16 to 1.15 sf per capita. Although, the Menlo Park Library currently experiences a shortage of reading room space and overcrowding at children's story times because of an increasing number of children, the Project would not result in a significant new demand for these services. Therefore, the

⁴⁹ Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG). Projections 2009. December 2009.

Project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to any potential cumulative impact on library services. The Project's cumulative impact would be ***less than significant***.

