Recommendation

Staff recommends that the City Council commence the two-year review of the general plan with a study session. The general plan applies to the entire City; however, this two-year review is focused on the Bayfront Area as it was the location identified for additional development potential in the 2016 general plan update commonly known as ConnectMenlo. As a study session, members of public have the opportunity to provide input on the effectiveness of the vision for Menlo Park articulated in the general plan. Following staff’s presentation, public comment and City Council discussion, staff is seeking City Council consensus on any future work that may be required. No formal action will be taken on this item.

Areas of consideration for future study

This report highlights a variety of topic areas that were of community interest during the ConnectMenlo process and that continue to be of interest. As the City Council reviews the report, staff recommends that the City Council consider the following questions and use them as guide to provide feedback.

Community amenities

With the adoption of the general plan in 2016, the City expanded development potential in the Bayfront Area and created three new zoning districts - office (O), life science (LS) and residential mixed use (R-MU.) As part of ConnectMenlo, the City incorporated the concept of bonus level development, allowing greater floor area, density and height in exchange for the provision of community amenities. The list of community amenities to be provided by developers utilizing bonus level development was adopted by City Council Resolution No. 6360 November 29, 2016. This list reflected the input of those stakeholders who participated in the ConnectMenlo process. Staff recommends that the City Council conduct a review of the amenities list given that the first projects subject to the community amenities requirement under the 2016 general plan update are now beginning the entitlement process.

As part of the review, the City Council could also reconsider how community amenities are provided. Currently, community amenities may be provided in one of three ways: (1) constructed as part of the project; (2) payment of an impact fee; or (3) entering into a development agreement. The option for payment of an impact fee is currently unavailable at this time because an impact fee has not been yet established. There is currently no process underway to establish such an impact fee. While the actual construction or implementation of the amenity was preferred to the payment of a fee, the City Council could direct staff to pursue a fee study and bring back an impact fee for City Council’s consideration.

The City Council could also direct staff to consider implementing a requirement through the general plan that would establish a fund for amenities in the Bayfront Area that is separate and apart from the community amenities required for bonus level development.
Housing
During the general plan update process, the addition of housing to the Bayfront Area was identified as desirable to help meet a local and regional need and to create a live/work/play environment. As part of the two-year review, staff recommends that the City Council explore the following:
1. The overall number of units. This includes whether there should be any change to the residential cap of 4,500 new units in the Bayfront Area.
2. The type of units (e.g., townhomes, corporate housing, apartments, for-sale and rental).
3. The mix of units (e.g., studios, one-bedroom, etc.).
4. The level of affordability and whether the City Council is interested in developing regulations to further incentivize additional affordable housing in the Bayfront Area.
5. The appropriate densities (dwelling units per acre) and whether the City Council desires any changes in development regulations (e.g., height, parking ratios, etc.).
6. The location, including whether additional sites should be considered for housing.

Jobs/Housing Balance
Staff recommends that the City Council provide staff with input on the type of information and the reporting mechanism that would be helpful for their conversation on this topic.

Hotels
The general plan sets a development cap of 400 hotel rooms in the Bayfront Area, but did not identify a specific number of hotel rooms in the balance of the City. Since the adoption of the general plan in 2016, 457 additional rooms have been proposed in the Bayfront Area. Other hotel rooms have been approved in the city outside of the Bayfront Area under individual environmental review. These rooms do not count against the cap identified in the general plan because they are not located in the Bayfront Area. If additional hotel rooms in the Bayfront Area or the city more broadly would support the goals or initiatives of the City Council and community, staff recommends that the City Council discuss whether additional rooms should be considered on a project-by-project basis or via a City-initiated general plan amendment to set a new higher hotel room cap either citywide or for the Bayfront Area.

Environmental Review
Finally, staff recommends that the City Council consider whether any changes to the vision articulated in the 2016 general plan update should be conducted on a case-by-case basis for individual projects seeking to exceed the identified limits or through one comprehensive city-initiated amendment.

Policy Issues
The general plan is a policy document that serves as the blueprint for future development in the City. As part of the visioning process for the general plan update, the City developed guiding principles that describe the kind of place that community members want the City of Menlo Park to be. To implement the guiding principles, the general plan sets forth goals, policies and programs. Program LU-1.C (land use element review) requires the City to “conduct an in-depth review of the general plan land use element two

---

1 This number includes 40 additional hotels rooms that have been applied for as an amendment to the entitlements (Conditional Development Permit and Development Agreement) for the Willow Campus Expansion project that approved 200 hotel rooms in a concurrent but separate entitlement process.
(2) years after its adoption and thereafter as directed by the City Council.” This item is the beginning of the City Council’s in-depth policy discussion regarding the general plan.

**Background**

ConnectMenlo identified a vision for a live/work/play environment that fosters economic growth, increased sustainability, housing opportunities, and improved transportation and mobility options in the City of Menlo Park. ConnectMenlo was a long-range planning process that culminated in the adoption of an update to the general plan, which was intended to guide development through 2040. ConnectMenlo affirmed an amount of remaining development potential throughout the city and added new development potential in the Bayfront Area (former M-2 zone). The general plan and associated zoning reflected a balance of interests and the input received during the robust community outreach process that included over 60 public meetings. For reference, the adopted zoning map for the Bayfront Area is included as Attachment A and a link to the ConnectMenlo project page is included as Attachment B.

The general plan update modified land uses in the Bayfront Area and combined those with the remaining development potential under the 1994 general plan. The resulting total development potential throughout the entire city identified in the land use element is approximately 4 million square feet of net new non-residential development, up to 5,350 additional residential units, and up to 400 hotel rooms, as summarized in Table 1. The Bayfront Area includes the majority of that development potential with approximately 3.66 million square feet on non-residential development, 4,500 residential units, and 400 hotel rooms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: General plan development potential</th>
<th>1994 general plan</th>
<th>ConnectMenlo (not new)</th>
<th>Combined total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Residential square footage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayfront Area</td>
<td>1,360,000</td>
<td>2,300,000</td>
<td>3,660,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remainder of City</td>
<td>355,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>355,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,715,000</td>
<td>2,300,000</td>
<td>4,015,000 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayfront Area</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remainder of City</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>5350 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel rooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayfront Area</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remainder of City</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400 rooms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A program level environmental impact report (EIR) was prepared to analyze the potential environmental impact of the proposed development potential in the City. The EIR examined the amount of development identified above in Table 1. Within the EIR, the maximum development potential for the Bayfront Area was defined by the following: 1) the amount of non-residential square footage by land use type (office, life science and commercial); 2) the number of housing units; and 3) the number of hotel rooms. Development above the specific amounts (e.g., office, life science, commercial, residential units or hotel rooms) identified in the program EIR would trigger additional environmental review. While the program EIR was specific to land use type, the general plan land use element more broadly identifies caps on non-residential square footage, housing units and hotel rooms. If a single proposed development or the cumulative amount of new development exceeds the cap identified for non-residential square footage, residential units or hotel rooms established in the general plan, then a general plan amendment would be required, in conjunction with additional environmental review.

Analysis
The general plan seeks to preserve the qualities of the City that Menlo Park residents appreciate, but also to accommodate growth that could benefit the community through increased revenues and the provision of community amenities. Additionally, changes currently being contemplated to the El Real/Downtown specific plan could also result in amendments to the general plan.

Green and sustainable building regulations
One of the key components of the adopted Bayfront Area zoning regulations are the green and sustainable building regulations, which support the guiding principles and goals, policies, and programs of the land use element. Specifically, one of the guiding principles in the general plan is for Menlo Park to strive to be a leader in addressing climate change, promoting green buildings and conservation of energy, water and natural resources. During the past two years, staff has been working to define several of the programs, including the City’s LEED-equivalent program (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design), zero waste management plan, and the water budget guidelines for non-potable water. In addition, the City Council adopted enhanced electric vehicle charging requirements in August 2018 that expanded the requirements from the Bayfront Area to across the City. Because proposed projects are still in the entitlement phase and have yet to fully implement the set of green and sustainable development regulations, staff believes the current focus should remain on program implementation to better understand how existing regulations are working before any modifications are proposed. However, items that may need clarification for improved implementation are appropriate and should be considered as part of any “clean up” amendments.

Maximum allowable development
Since adoption of the general plan and three new zoning districts in the Bayfront Area in December 2016, the City has received 11 proposed development applications. In August 2018, staff presented an information item to the City Council regarding the status of development proposals. Since that time, staff has received additional applications, has further reviewed the available information and has summarized the currently proposed development in the Bayfront Area in Table 2 below.

2 This included 3,000 unrestricted units and 1,500 corporate housing units on the Facebook Classic Campus.
3 It should be noted that there is a Settlement Agreement with the City of East Palo Alto that requires certain projects, including those utilizing bonus level development, to conduct a project-level EIR, with specific focus on traffic and housing.
The applications include a mix of residential, office, life science and hotels, including a new approximately 60-acre master plan at the Menlo Science and Technology Park (the Willow Village). A map and more detailed description of the proposals are included in Attachments C and D, respectively.

### Table 2: Summary of proposed development in the Bayfront Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Residential square footage</th>
<th>Maximum allowed development potential</th>
<th>Total proposed</th>
<th>Total proposed - net new(^1)</th>
<th>Remaining under EIR development cap</th>
<th>Remaining under general plan development cap(^2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office square footage</td>
<td>1,285,000 sf</td>
<td>1,999,500 sf</td>
<td>887,324 sf</td>
<td>397,676 sf</td>
<td>2,250,674 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life science square footage</td>
<td>2,100,000 sf</td>
<td>453,824 sf</td>
<td>336,786 sf</td>
<td>1,763,214 sf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial square footage</td>
<td>275,000 sf</td>
<td>200,000 sf</td>
<td>200,000 sf</td>
<td>75,000 sf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential units</td>
<td>4,500 units</td>
<td>2,091 units</td>
<td>2,091 units</td>
<td>909 units(^3)</td>
<td>2,089 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel rooms</td>
<td>400 rooms</td>
<td>457 rooms</td>
<td>457 rooms</td>
<td>-57 rooms(^4)</td>
<td>-57 rooms(^4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Net new accounts for the existing square footage (units or rooms) that are being demolished and rebuilt under the proposals. For example, the Willow Village proposal includes approximately 1,750,000 square feet of nonresidential development and there is an existing approximately 1,000,000 square feet of nonresidential development on the site, therefore, the net new total proposed development is approximately 750,000 of nonresidential square feet.

\(^2\) Under the general plan, non-residential square footage is combined into one figure for purposes of creating a development cap.

\(^3\) The EIR considered 1,500 of the 4,500 residential units as corporate housing. Because no corporate housing units have been proposed, the development cap is based on the remaining 3,000 units.

\(^4\) This number includes 40 additional hotels rooms that have been applied for as an amendment to the entitlements (Conditional Development Permit and Development Agreement) for the Willow Campus Expansion project that approved 200 hotel rooms in a concurrent but separate entitlement process. Given the separate processes, the number of excess hotel rooms could be considered to be 17 rooms.

As shown in Table 2, all of the proposed non-residential development falls within the approximately 3.66 million square feet identified in the general plan (inclusive of the reaffirmed development potential and the additional 2.3 million square foot development cap in the Bayfront Area). The proposed non-residential development also complies with the more refined land use category square footages studied in the program EIR for the general plan. However, it should be noted that individual projects will undergo project specific environmental review to determine if there are any potential environmental impacts that were not adequately studied and mitigated in the program-level EIR.

Table 2 shows that the proposed number of hotel rooms would exceed the 400 rooms evaluated in the program EIR and capped in the general plan. Approval of hotel rooms in excess of 400 would require both a general plan amendment and additional environmental review. The City is currently evaluating three hotel proposals, which are either stand-alone projects or part of a larger development, shown as numbers 1, 8 and 9 on the proposed Bayfront development projects map in Attachment C. One of the hotels was previously approved as part of the Facebook West Campus Expansion project (No. 9), but the applicant is seeking to increase the number of hotel rooms from 200 to 240. The environmental impact of those additional 40 hotel rooms will be evaluated using an addendum to the Facebook Campus expansion EIR and approved as an amendment to the existing entitlements (conditional development permit and development agreement.) If those rooms are viewed separately, the proposed number of rooms still exceeds the general plan cap by 17 rooms, which, to approve, would require a general plan amendment.
and environmental review. In addition to the three sites with proposed hotel developments, staff notes that there are two additional sites zoned O-H in the Bayfront Area that were identified as potential hotel sites, but have not yet come forth with a proposal. Staff has not yet evaluated how many additional rooms these sites could generate. These sites should be considered as part of conversations about hotels in the area. While hotels are a major source of general fund revenue through the transient occupancy tax, the City Council should consider how hotels contribute to the overall vision for the area.

Currently, the total number of proposed housing units falls within the 4,500 unit cap identified for the Bayfront Area. Staff has received three applications totaling 2,091 units within the R-MU district, two formal applications and two under study session review. The projects are labeled as numbers 1, 2, 9, and 10 on the proposed development map. Staff has also been in preliminary conversations about additional residential development, which would likely have a cumulative total above the 3,000 non-corporate housing units studied in the EIR, but not the more generic 4,500 net new residential units allowed in the general plan. The topic of housing is further discussed in the Housing section below.

Community amenities

All of the proposed developments currently on file, with the exception of the hotel developments, are proposing bonus level development. In exchange for bonus level development, community amenities must be provided.

Community amenities are deeply embedded in the general plan and associated Bayfront Area zoning. The desire for future development to contribute toward community amenities remains a consistent theme. One of the nine guiding principles was that in exchange for added development potential, projects would provide physical benefits in the adjacent neighborhood (such as Belle Haven), including jobs, housing, schools, libraries, neighborhood retail, childcare, public open space, high speed internet access, and transportation choices. Policy LU-4.4 requires mixed-use and nonresidential development of a certain scale to support and contribute to programs that benefit the community and the City. It should be noted that the community amenities requirement resulting from the ConnectMenlo approval has yet to be applied to any development in the Bayfront Area.

During ConnectMenlo, the creation of the community amenities process included the following primary components: 1) identification and prioritization of the community amenities through public outreach and input; 2) crafting the development regulations for bonus level development (increased floor area ratio, density and/or height) in exchange for the provisions of community amenities in the area between Highway 101 and the Bay; and 3) creating the process for how community amenities would be implemented. The City Council then adopted a community amenities list that identified community needs, which is included as Attachment E. The community amenities list can be updated, at the discretion of the City Council by resolution, in order to reflect community needs and priorities. The City has a number of proposed bonus level development projects currently under review, some of which are beginning to conduct the appraisal process to determine the required community amenity value. The next step would be for projects to propose community amenities, which could be implemented as part of a proposed development or approved as part of a development agreement. If the City Council undertakes a process to generate a new community amenities list, this could potentially delay the processing of projects if applicants are unable to identify and evaluate an amenity given uncertainty as to what community amenities will be on the approved list at the time the proposed project reaches decision makers.

While the concept for community amenities is the same as ‘public benefit’ in the El Camino Real/Downtown specific plan area, the process for determining the community amenity is different from the specific plan. The establishment of a uniform process for consistency and predictability was identified
as a preferred approach, and the community amenities process is codified in the zoning ordinance for the office, life science and residential mixed-use zoning districts in the Bayfront Area. The value of the community amenities is determined through an appraisal process and the community amenity value must be equal to 50 percent of the fair market value of the additional gross floor area of the bonus level development. The City recently completed the appraisal instructions and those are now available for applicants to use. An applicant’s proposal for community amenities is subject to the review by the Planning Commission concurrent with the development application. Once an amenity from the list has been provided, it is no longer an option available to other applicants. This was deliberate and the intent was to achieve a variety of amenities rather than many of a few items.

During the 2016 general plan update, construction of the amenity was identified preferable to the payment of a fee. In addition, all community amenities, except for affordable housing, are required to be provided within the area between U.S. Highway 101 and the San Francisco Bay. Community amenities must be provided using any one of the following three mechanisms: 1) include the amenity as part of the project, 2) pay an impact fee, or 3) enter into a development agreement. Payment of an impact fee is currently unavailable at this time because an impact fee has not been established. If such a fee were established, the money collected from the impact fee would be applied to items identified in the community amenities list. Because an impact fee would be based on a specific list of community amenities, a new fee would need to be reviewed and adopted each time the community amenities list is updated, potentially providing less flexibility overall and less timeliness than some may desire.

**Housing/Affordable housing**

The need for housing was a high priority during the ConnectMenlo process and continues to be a regional issue. A strong housing component was important to the success of a live/work/play vision that was desired for the area. One of the key changes to the Bayfront Area was the introduction of residential uses, up to 4,500 new units, of which approximately 1,500 units were identified as corporate housing units at the Facebook Classic Campus in the ConnectMenlo EIR. To help facilitate the development of housing, the R-MU zoning district requires housing as part of every project and sets a minimum density of 20 dwelling units per acre (du/ac.) A maximum density of 100 du/ac was established and additional height was supported in appropriate areas given the limits on land area and the likelihood for the need to build upward to achieve such densities.

At the time of the general plan update, inclusionary zoning for rental projects was not enforceable. Therefore, all bonus level projects in the R-MU zoning district were required to provide affordable housing as a community amenity. After State law changes, however, the City updated its zoning code and the city’s inclusionary requirements now apply to both for-sale and rental housing projects. All residential projects of 20 or more units must set-aside a minimum of 15 percent of the total number of units at below market rates. In August 2018, the City Council adopted changes to the R-MU zoning district to reflect the changes in State law. While affordable housing beyond the minimum required by the inclusionary ordinance can be considered a community amenity, it is no longer mandated as the first amenity (although there is a stated preference for additional affordable housing as the amenity in the R-MU zoning district.)

As noted earlier, the City has received study session or full applications for approximately 2,100 new unrestricted residential units in the Bayfront Area. While the general plan sets a cap of 4,500 new residential units in the Bayfront Area, the analysis in the program EIR limits the net new housing units to 3,000 unrestricted units. The remaining 1,500 units would be limited to corporate housing. If changes or additional housing units are desired, the City Council should provide feedback on the housing-related questions noted earlier in the report.
## Jobs/Housing balance

As part of ongoing housing discussions, the jobs/housing balance has been a major theme. This topic was addressed previously at a high level in the EIR for ConnectMenlo. As noted in the certified EIR for ConnectMenlo, the job-to-housing unit ratio is used to evaluate whether a community has an adequate number of jobs available to provide employment for residents within the community seeking employment. The job-to-housing-unit balance is an indicator of the extent to which the workforce may have the opportunity to live and work in that same community. The job-to-housing-unit ratio, however, is often best analyzed at the regional level due to the tendency of people to commute to jobs outside of their community. Employees regularly cross jurisdictional boundaries when going from their place of residence to their place of work. Housing choice is highly individualized and the location of one’s employment is only one factor among many in the decision. Staff is seeking input from the City Council regarding what information the City Council desires relative to this issue.

## “Clean up” modifications

Staff has identified several “clean up” zoning amendments needed in Bayfront Area zoning districts. These zoning ordinance amendments would be for internal consistency. In addition, staff would recommend evaluating two changes: 1) increase the average height in the R-MU zoning district in the Jefferson Drive area for consistency with the additional height allowed for the maximum height and 2) allow the use of hazardous materials as an administratively permitted use in the M-2 zoning district similar to the new Bayfront zoning districts. Finally, per direction from the City Council in August 2018, staff will bring forward changes to the zoning map to remove the new Independence Drive street connection. Although the change to the new street connection has not been formally adopted, staff has proceeded with the City Council’s direction in mind and applicants are designing their projects with no new street connection.

## Transportation Master Plan

During development of the circulation element, a key topic discussed throughout the update process was transportation infrastructure needs in the region, particularly around the Dumbarton Bridge and the connections to U.S. 101 and beyond that occur through Menlo Park. The Transportation Master Plan, which will link the circulation element, the City's infrastructure priorities and an implementation strategy, is under development. In conjunction with the preparation of the Transportation Master Plan, the City will be updating its Traffic Impact Fee (TIF.) The TIF would guarantee funding for citywide roadway and infrastructure improvements that are necessary to mitigate traffic impacts and would be assessed when there is new construction, an increase in square footage of an existing building, or a conversion of existing square footage to a more intense use. Until the TIF is updated, each individual project will have to conduct a transportation impact analysis and determine what, if any, mitigations are necessary and appropriate. Staff is bringing an update on the Transportation Master Plan as a separate agenda item on the March 26, 2019, City Council meeting.

## Dumbarton Rail corridor

One of the most critical infrastructure projects discussed during ConnectMenlo development was the reactivation of rail service along the Dumbarton corridor. On December 6, 2017, the San Mateo County Transit District (SamTrans) board of directors approved the Dumbarton transportation corridor study, which assessed various improvements to the highway and railroad alignments, including reactivation of rail service. On June 6, 2018, the SamTrans board of directors entered into an agreement with a development team, Cross Bay Transit Partners LLC, to form a public-private partnership to explore alternatives for a high-capacity public transit system along the Dumbarton Corridor. Cross Bay Transit Partners is a partnership between Plenary Group and Facebook Inc. Cross Bay Transit Partners is currently completing early project planning, and recently hosted a series of community outreach meetings in February and March 2019. One of the meetings was held at the Menlo Park Senior Center and was attended by several residents and City staff. Cross Bay Transit Partners’ current schedule shows the...
environmental analyses, technical feasibility studies, and financial analyses are being initiated, with an anticipated completion in mid to late 2020, environmental certification in 2021, and construction in 2022. The City will continue to track progress on this effort and update the City Council as more information is available. Staff anticipates bringing an item forward later this year to frame the City Council’s desired policy direction for this project.

Next steps
Following the study session, staff will review the comments and guidance from the City Council and prepare additional information and a more detailed review of topic areas for future discussion with the City Council, and commissions if directed to do so by City Council. When staff returns to the City Council on this two-year review, the City Council would provide direction to staff on what changes to the general plan and/or zoning ordinance, if any, should be evaluated. Depending on the direction from the City Council, staff may engage a consultant to assist with the modifications to the general plan.

The general plan review was not identified as a work plan item during the City Council’s recent goal setting session. Work could be delayed given priority with the El Camino Real/Downtown specific plan review and single-family residential design review as work plan items.

Correspondence
Staff has not received any correspondence as of the writing of this report.

Environmental Review
Study sessions do not require analysis under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). A program level EIR was prepared and analyzed the general plan and M-2 Area Zoning Update, and was certified in November 2016. Individual development projects seeking a discretionary action will be subject to CEQA, but may tier from the ConnectMenlo EIR as appropriate. Per the terms of the 2017 Settlement Agreement with the City of East Palo Alto, all projects seeking bonus level development will prepare an EIR that evaluates transportation and population and housing. Regardless of the CEQA review process, all projects must incorporate applicable mitigation measures included in the ConnectMenlo EIR's Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.

The level of any additional environmental review would depend upon the proposed changes to the general plan and/or zoning ordinance directed by the City Council. Any increases to the development caps would likely trigger an EIR and take approximately a year to prepare.

Impact on City Resources
As part of the master fee schedule update in 2016, a general plan surcharge totaling 3 percent of all planning and building fees was implemented. This fee has generated $233,027.69 and will be used to help maintain the City’s general plan.

Depending on the proposed changes to the general plan and/or zoning ordinance, contract services may be required to supplement staff and to prepare the environmental documents. Staff is anticipating budgeting for contract services as part of the upcoming 2019-2020 budget review, which may need to be augmented as the scope of work is further defined.
Public Notice
Public Notification was achieved by posting the agenda, with the agenda items being listed, at least 72 hours prior to the meeting.

Attachments
A. Bayfront Area zoning map
B. Hyperlink – ConnectMenlo project page: www.menlopark.org/connectmenlo
C. Map of proposed developments in the Bayfront Area
D. Bayfront Area project summary table
E. List of adopted community amenities
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Existing Zoning
- M-2 Light Industrial/M-3-X Business Park
- P-F Public Facilities
- C-2-B Neighborhood Commercial, Restrictive
- C-2-S Neighborhood Commercial, Special
- FP Flood Plain
- R-4-S(AHO) High Density Residential/Special

Potential Zoning
- R-MU Residential Mixed Use/ R-MU-B (-B = Bonus Available)
- LS Life Sciences/ LS-B (-B = Bonus Available)
- O Office/ O-B (-B = Bonus)/O-CH (-CH= Corporate Housing)/ O-H (-H= Hotel)

New Connections
- New Public Street
- Paseo

M-2 AREA ZONING
Adopted: December 6, 2016

ATTACHMENT A
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADDRESS/PROJECT</th>
<th>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>OFFICE SF</th>
<th>LIFE SCIENCE SF</th>
<th>COMMERCIAL SF</th>
<th>RESIDENTIAL UNITS</th>
<th>HOTEL ROOMS</th>
<th>OFFICE SF</th>
<th>LIFE SCIENCE SF</th>
<th>COMMERCIAL SF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Willow Village</td>
<td>Mixed Use - Office, Residential, Commercial and Hotel</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>1,750,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>775,035</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111 Independence</td>
<td>Residential - Rental</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-15,100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1490 O'Brien Drive</td>
<td>Life Science</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31,142</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1505 Adams Court</td>
<td>Life Science</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>57,010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9,463</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1105 O'Brien Drive</td>
<td>Life Science</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>105,272</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66,404</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151 Commonwealth/164 Jefferson</td>
<td>Office</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>249,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>249,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1350 Adams Court</td>
<td>Life Science</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>260,400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>260,400</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3723 Haven Avenue (Hotel Moxy)</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>Study Session</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>-13,700</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Facebook Way (Citizen M)</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180-186 Constitution/141 Jefferson/172 Constitution (Menlo Uptown)</td>
<td>Residential - Mix Rental and For-Sale Townhomes</td>
<td>Study Session</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>-108,411</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ATTACHMENT E

COMMUNITY AMENITY SURVEY RANKINGS

The following is a table of the community amenities that have been requested during the planning process; the categories and the amenities within each category are listed in order of how they were ranked by respondents at a community workshop on March 12, 2015 and in a survey that followed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MARCH 12 WORKSHOP RANKING ONLINE - REGISTERED RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>ONLINE - UNREGISTERED RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>PAPER - COLLECTED IN BELLE HAVEN</th>
<th>PAPER - MAILED IN</th>
<th>TOTAL SURVEYS COMBINED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22 RESPONSES</td>
<td>13 RESPONSES</td>
<td>26 RESPONSES</td>
<td>55 RESPONSES</td>
<td>40 RESPONSES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transit and Transportation Improvements
- Transit and Transportation Improvements
- Bus service and amenities
- Innovative transportation solutions (i.e. personal rapid transit)
- High-Quality Affordable Housing
- Jobs and Training at M-2 Area Companies
- Senior service improvements
- Education and enrichment programs for young adults
- Job training programs and education center
- Paid internships and scholarships for young adults
- Social Service Improvements
- Energy, Technology, and Utilities Infrastructure
- Undergraduate power lines
- Telecommunications investment
- Incentives for private home energy upgrades, renewable energy, and water conservation
- Soundwalls adjacent to Highway 101
- Park and Open Space Improvements
- Bedwell Bayfront Park improvements
- Tree planting
- Dog park
- Community garden(s)
- WHERE SURVEY RESPONDENTS LIVE:
  - Belle Haven
  - Pine Forest
  - Palo Alto/ East Palo Alto
  - Central Menlo Park
  - Downtown
  - East Menlo Park
  - Undisclosed
  - TOTAL 194