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COMMISSIONER BARNES: We have a public hearing and there are two -- we've got a public hearing. This is Fl and FG, and these are associated items within a single staff report.

What I will to do is I'll read one of these in both Fl and FG and I'll have the same lead in.

Fl, Environmental Impact Report, EIR Scoping Session/Peninsula Innovation Partners/1350 to 1390 Willow Road, 925 to 1098 Hamilton and 1005-1275 Hamilton Court.

This is a request for an Environmental Review, Conditional Development Permit, Development Agreement, Below Market Rate (BMR) Housing Agreement, Zoning Map Amendment, General Plan Amendment, Heritage Tree Removal, Vesting Tentative Map, Fiscal Impact Analysis and an appraisal to identify the Community Amenity Value for a Master Plan to comprehensively redevelop an approximately 9 -- 59-acre site located at 1350-1390 Willow Road, 925-1098 Hamilton Avenue and 1005-1275 Hamilton Court.

The proposed project would demolish approximately one million square feet of existing office, industrial research and development (R&D) and warehousing campus. The project site will be redeveloped with
approximately 1,735 housing units (with a minimum fifteen percent affordable), up to 200,000 square feet of non-office/commercial retail uses (including a grocery store and pharmacy), approximately 1,750,000 square feet of offices, a hotel with approximately 200-250 rooms, an approximately 10,000 square foot community center, and approximately 9.8 acres of publicly accessible open space (including an approximately four acre public park).

The proposal includes the request for an increase in height, floor area ratio (FAR) and density under the bonus level development allowance in exchange for community amenities, as outlined in the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance.

The project site encompasses multiple parcels zones O-B (Office) and R-MU-B (Residential Mixed Use). The project site contains a toxic release -- contains a toxic release site, per Section 6596.2 of the California Government Code that would be remediated as part of the proposed project, in accordance and in compliance with the applicable requirements of the California Department of Toxic Substance Control, the State Water Resources Control Board and/or other responsible agencies.

So there you have it.

Commissioner -- excuse me. Mr. Perata.

MR. PERATA: Thank you. So I will give the
staff introduction to the project tonight and we'll follow up with a presentation of the applicant and then a presentation from the Environmental Impact Report consultant developing the EIR for the project.

So I just want to start from a staff perspective by giving an overview of the meeting purpose for tonight.

As mentioned, we have two items on the agenda for the Willow Village project. These are two public hearings. The first is an Environmental Impact Report Scoping Session, so this provides an opportunity for members of the public and members of the Planning Commission to provide input on the scope and content of topics on items that can be studied in the EIR.

Then following that, we'll have a Study Session tonight which will allow an opportunity for members of the public and the Commission as well as provide feedback on the project plans more generally, so not EIR focused for that, but rather more general design, uses, layout, more conceptual guidance or comments on the plans for the applicant team and the staff.

And then just by way of kind of background, the latest Study Session by the City Council for this project May 7th. And so no actions will be taken at tonight's hearing.
So I just want to start with a little bit of background which is highlighted in blue on the slide.

It is generally located on the east side of Willow Road north of the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission right-of-way and Ivy Drive, then just south of the Dumbarton corridor, the Dumbarton corridor further north of that is Highway 84/Bayfront Expressway.

So the existing site, it's approximately 59 acres in size. It's commonly referred to as a Prologic Menlo Science and Technology Park. The site includes twenty buildings, approximately one million square feet of square footage within those buildings, and existing land uses at the project site include office, research and development and warehouse uses.

Facebook occupies a number of buildings on the project site and uses those buildings for a multitude of uses, including offices, employee amenities, research and development and a employee health center.

There's approximately 3,500 employees at the site currently and the site has two zoning districts, Office Bonus as well as Mixed Use Residential Bonus.

So I'll give a brief overview of the proposed project here and the applicant team can go into further detail.
As part of the project, the existing buildings onsite will be demolished. The proposed project is a Mixed Use Development. It would utilize the City's ordinance allowance for a Master Plan Development which will include a Conditional Development Permit and a Development Agreement as a part of the entitlements for the project.

Some of the main components to talk about briefly. The project includes housing, retail as well as a hotel and office.

As far as housing, there's approximately 1,735 units currently proposed. Retail, you have 200,000 square feet, and that does includes uses such as a grocery store and pharmacy as well as some other non-office commercial uses, restaurants, cafes, commercial services could be within that square footage.

The hotel right now is proposed for up to 250 rooms and the office campus is 1.75 million square feet, and that is a net increase of approximately 750,000 square feet above the existing commercial square footage at the site currently.

The site also includes public space throughout, the majority of which is an approximately four acre publicly accessible park at the southwestern corner of the site.
Adjacent to that site would be a community serving space within the adjacent building.

And so the recommended meeting format for tonight. As mentioned, we have two items, the EIR Scoping Session and Study Session.

For the EIR Scoping Session, staff recommends that the Commission, after staff's review and overview of the proposed project, listen to a presentation by the applicant, and then following that a presentation by the City's EIR consultant of the project.

It's recommended that the Commission hold general questions on the project for the EIR process more generally without -- not comment particularly, but more general clarifying questions.

So after all three presentations, but certainly if you have a question for the applicant or the EIR consultant or myself, we can take that after each presentation if necessary.

Following any clarifying questions, we want to open public comment, and then close that, Commissioner comments on the EIR scope and content, and then after closing the Scoping Session and Public Hearing, move on to the Study Session, item G1.

For that, there will be no presentations.

Staff recommends moving all three presentations to this
time rather than having the applicant present it during the Study Session.

But it would be an opportunity for clarifying questions and we would take Public Comment and Commissioner comments on the project.

So that concludes my presentation. As I stated previously, I'd be happy to answer any general questions, and then I'll turn it over to the applicant team to make their presentation.

CHAIRPERSON BARNES: Any clarifying questions from the Commissioners?

Seeing none, and, too, for the purpose of clarity, just to give an overview one more time, we're going to have the consultant for the EIR give a presentation, and then -- then we'll bring it back to Public Comment and then bring it up here.

We'll do it again as it relates to the session on the project itself as we move to the EIR. In the middle of that will be Public Comment opportunity and then we'll bring it back up here.

So with that, let's call for the applicant.

Good evening.

MR. GHIELMETTI: Hi. My name is Mike Ghielmetti. I'm the founder of Signature Development Group and we're partnering with Facebook on the project.
before you. So thanks for having us tonight. We've been
to a few of these before, so some of these may be repeats
for members of the audience and some of you Commissioners
have been to our study sessions, as well.

So again, I'm Mike Ghielmetti with Signature
Development Group. We're a Bay Area-based private
family-owned development organization; been building
around the Bay Area for twenty years, and we take pride
in building the right project for the community we're
building in.

So a picture of the project we did in Oakland
called The Hive with kind of a derelict district that was
defunct and we brought it alive with a mixture of
residential and retail, building hotels and office space
around there and -- and we build from Novato to -- to San
Jose, San Francisco to Oakland.

And the consistent theme there is not that it's
a specific type of project, but it's hopefully the right
product for the community in terms of scale and scope,
architecture and the theme being connectivity.

Because we want residents to be connected to
these neighborhoods that we're building, be they brown
field or green field or something in between.

So we're excited to be here. We've been
partnering with Facebook for about eighteen months now.
We're trying to envision what this project could be. As you know, Facebook's been in the community for about seven or eight years now. I don't need to go into too much detail. They've been very generous with their time and public dollars and a number of topics here, economic opportunity, housing, mobility, community, sustainability and hopefully this project can carry forward some of those goals.

A little bit of background. This concept has been before you a couple of times. Initially Facebook brought forth the concept in 2017 to help try and envision what -- what could -- what could happen in this area, and there were a number of community workshops. We met with hundreds of people during that timeframe and trying to get ideas from folks.

This wasn't a talking tour. It was really a listening tour to -- to Belle Haven and to the neighborhood surrounding it and broader Menlo Park. What would you like to see here? What's important to you? What are some of the good things? What are some of the bad things? And how can we make this better?

From that process, a number of issues came forth that were things that the community had said hey, can you help solve some of these problems and/or can you
provide opportunities or amenities? Things like retail
amenities, grocery store, pharmacy, things like parks and
open space, bike trails, traffic solutions and general
connectivity were very important.

Educational opportunities, housing and housing
affordability came about. Mobility in a variety of ways,
like I said, bike and pedestrian, public transportation,
vehicular access.

And so we took all of those ideas and meshed
them with some of the conditions at the site to help
create something that we could build forth from there.

As staff indicated, the site is about plus/
minus sixty acres. It's filled with a number of old
buildings, about -- about a million square feet with
capacity for about 3,500 folks working there.

The existing site conditions are ones that were
built from yesteryear. Not what I would call resilient,
not what I would call sustainable and it's not what I
would call connected.

So there's a whole lot of folks working there
that aren't going to be able to provide the broader
benefit we think a future project can deliver to the --
to the neighborhood.

So from all of the workshops that we had with
the community and stakeholder organizations, we started
to come up with some really broad brush strokes, just kind of a back-of-the-napkin kind of first blush, and basically what it shows is that the project wanted to have ample public parks.

We thought moving them together we'd be able to create some parks and open space with better visibility and better use and wanted to have a lot of connectivity, both to the other Facebook campuses, but also to the community as large.

And it didn't want to be sequestered. It wanted to be an open community.

So the dotted lines in there kind of represent places where a campus and a community could kind of come together.

And so we've got office to, you know -- as I'm looking at it to the right in and residential to the left, but also ways for those to kind of blend together.

So this is the start of it and I'm going to introduce Eron Ashley from our land planner and Howard Layton to help explain how involved and I'll come back.

MR. ASHLEY: Thanks, Mike.

Good evening. My name is Eron Ashley. I'm a partner in Hart Howerton. We're planners, architects, interior designers based in San Francisco and New York and we tend to get involved in either exceedingly large
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or exceedingly complex projects where the real focus is
--

CHAIRPERSON BARNES: I'm sorry. Can you move
the mic?

MR. ASHLEY: Sure. We tend to work in
situations where the experience of living there working
there, visiting there is, you know, of the utmost
importance.

And so it's been really kind of fun for us to
get to know Facebook, get to know the community,
especially Belle Haven community, but Menlo Park as a
whole and to understand how a project of this sort can
really make more of a site.

Today it's really a cul-de-sac full of outdated
offices.

The program forward Willow Village is very much
what it was a year ago or two years ago when you first
saw it. It's a mix of office, residential, retail and a
hotel.

I think what's different here is we -- we've
spent a lot of time listening onsite, and if you've ever
sat at a light at Hamilton waiting for it to turn, all
the Facebook bikes and all the people walking across
Willow, you can really understand what connectivity means
in this part of Menlo Park.
And so a lot of what we've been doing is how do you create a place that better interfaces with the community.

And so my pointer doesn't really work here, but one big change is to take the grocery store and some of the other communities, the retail, the hotel, and make them more a part of Willow Road in a way that makes it more accessible for Belle Haven, more accessible to the larger community.

Same for our open space. I think in a previous version, you might have seen open space winding itself through the community, and in this place -- in this case, we really thought about -- well, we're not sure what this open space wants to be yet, but let's consolidate it in a way that's very accessible to the community.

A big theme of Facebook as a place to work, it's connectivity. It's amazing to me that someone has a business that people will be inclined to get on a bike, to walk to meet one face-to-face as opposed to calling them on the phone or e-mail them, and yet that's such a significant part of the culture there.

And so we wanted to really embrace that in a way that made it easier to be a Facebook employee, but not in such a way that it would bother the community.

I think there's a blatant desire in this part
of Menlo Park to connect to things that certainly were from the bay, by the highway. So how do we connect better to the Bay Trail. How do we connect better to each other?

And so some of the key themes are what is this big red line that flashes through the plan? So this is a theme or -- or a -- it's principally a road, but a road dedicated more to people and bikes than it is to cars.

Thus creating a seam between the office campus, which tends to be on the right side, and mixed use of the plan which tends to be on the left side, and that theme connects to -- it's shown with that yellow circle which would be a grade separated crossing over the rail corridor that will start to link people from belle Haven and this Willow Village site to the bay.

We think that's just a huge opportunity that is seamless connectivity.

We're at a site today that's got one way in, one way out. Well, two if you're a UPS driver, I guess. This needs to have as many ways in and ways out as it can. So we've created five meaningful connections for people, for bikes, for vehicles that capitalizes on the redundancy.

You know, mixed use place to work because people are coming and going at different times, and
connectivity means different things to different people. So principally this is a place to walk. In green, there are all -- all the green lines are the pedestrian paths, and if you think about how few pedestrian paths exist on the site today, what a significant increase this is.

Dashed red lines are streets designed so that bikes have the right-of-way. Solid red lines are where bikes have a dedicated space to go from point A to point B.

The idea you could ride safely free of cars through that site and connect to the bay.

Obviously bikes are a big part of working at Facebook, and so in kind of solid areas are these bike parking lots and at the front door to every building.

The really -- the entire project team at Facebook loved the idea that this office campus functions like it's in a real town.

You walk out the front door, you use the real street to get places, and it's not all behind gates and walls.

On the two, on the east side of the property, there's two large parking structures for 3,000 cars total, but on the bottom portion is for the buses.

Obviously you're familiar with the Facebook
buses. The idea is that those buses are coming in and leaving in an efficient way, and we're designing for them, and this continues to allow Facebook to rely heavily on transit and not every -- every employee has a car.

At the heart of the project, we're calling it a town square, and it really is. It's a - it's a hub of activity and this gathering place where a grocery store, a pharmacy, restaurant, shopping all come together with the hotel and the front door of the office complex.

So if I'm a visitor to Facebook, I come to this very civic place. If I'm a neighbor who lives across the street and I want to come to this civic place, and it really is a -- you know, great public space at the heart of the project.

So here is the plan. On the left-hand side is Willow. You can see Hamilton Avenue labeled just below that. Above that would be the Chevron just above that, the Jack-in-the-Box.

And so this square which has a hotel on the top side of it, which is numbers 4 and 6, the office campus to the right, numbers 9, a grocery store number 2 and a pharmacy number 3 really is, you know, in a specific place.

You know, we don't much have as many of the
squares in the West Coast, but certainly if you spend any
time on the East Coast, these squares are a great place
to come together.

The yellow is meant to be kind of a plaza
street. So the idea is that this whole place could be
taken over for farmer's markets and festivals and really
feel like the pedestrians have the right-of-way.

So if you were coming in from Willow Road,
here's the grocery store on the right, here's the
pharmacy in the distance as you come into the town
square.

It's important for us as you arrive to this
place, it felt like a real place. It didn't feel like an
office campus masquerading as a place.

So the office campus is set back and really
kind of community life is at the forefront.

I mentioned this bright red line which we call
Main Street. It's between the office campus, which is on
the right, and the residential mixed use area on the
left. In the distance is the hotel or town square.

The idea is that the office campus would have
retail and other active uses kind of laminated on the
front of it.

So it behaves like it's a real active
participant in the streetscape, in the public realm even
though it does have certain security requirements that
it's going to maintain.

And so you've got this kind of great street-
scape with this dedicated bike lane, all the stormwater
treatment, the street and -- and very few cars.

I think one of the things we're trying to do is
put cars that come here to work and shop into garages.
And so the public realm becomes a place for people and
bikes.

Inside the office campus, kind of borrowing on
a lot of the things that have worked really well in the
classic old Sun Microsystems campus on the other side of
the highway, a place that within that kind of secure
office environment that people can come together and
socialize, a place that feels very California.

You know, buildings that are four and five
stories, but also have lots of outdoor space. You know,
the kind of place that can only be here in Menlo Park.

A big piece of what we're excited about is a
big public park. I'm showing it here with no lines. And
so it's four acres. That's the school on the right
there. There's soccer fields behind. That's Willow Road
in the foreground.

There's a modest parking lot, and I think we
see a lot of value in that open space. We're really
looking to the community to help us figure out what that means.

We don't have the monopoly on good ideas on what should be built here, and a big point of public engagement over the coming months is to understand this.

So here we -- we just drew the lines. This was a college soccer field. So you can put two youth soccer fields across here or two baseball fields, how big it is.

So, you know, here's the campus that we're looking for the community to really share with us. We'd love to hear from you tonight, and then here's the detail of what we're attempting to do.

So with that, I'll turn it back to Mike.

MR. GHIELMETTI: So you heard from staff tonight. This is a Scoping Session. It is a Study Session. We're not here to answer. We're hear to share our initial thoughts about the project, talk to you about some of our goals and listen.

And then along with our -- the City's EIR consultants, study a number of alternatives and variants that meet with community desires.

We do start off with a number of -- of really important goals here, especially in this day and age around sustainability. The LEED goals, all electric, recycled water, no new emissions for gases, et cetera.
And so we've -- we set the bar pretty high compared to -- to the community development standards in the Bay Area, which are quite high, and we'll be studying these throughout the process.

Some other things I just wanted to touch on have to do with phasing. So what we're trying to do here -- and again, we'd love to take input from the community and you and continue to get input on the entire process, but we had to start somewhere. We had to put pen to paper.

We've got a three-phase project as shown here and what we've tried to do is combine elements of different aspects of this.

So, for instance, major community benefits and amenities up-front along with a certain amount of housing, both affordable and market rate and a certain amount of office.

Now, we recognize that these lines are going to move through the process again as we get input from everybody.

The blue area was shown as -- as our initial thoughts on phase one. What we've got are the parks as they may manifest themselves over time.

We have four building -- residential buildings here and a certain amount of office space with a certain
amount of parking and the transit hub.

We -- we do intend to exceed the minimum requirements for affordable housing. How that comes out again depends on community input. Your input to the Council, et cetera, all the various stakeholders, but we do intend to receive those standards. They elected you to go through to go through the environmental and feasibility standards.

The green phase here shown in phase two, again more of the housing and pharmacy, the town square, which is kind of scaled like the Sonoma town square, some office and the balance of the transit hub and parking.

The yellow area that's shown here is phase three which includes the bounds of the office space, the grocery store, the hotel, the visitor center and more residential.

We've already heard from folks in the community about wanting to accelerate the grocery store. So we've already started to look at that. Ways to do that either to accelerate the grocery store or put in some other grocery type use.

We certainly want the grocery store to be successful, as well, and so we're -- we're looking at that.

Part of this plan, too, is looking at, you
know, incorporating senior housing, you know, messing around with the phasing over time.

So this is not something that is, you know, a finished product. This is very early in the process and that's why we're here to get all of your input.

A little bit about the schedule. So in February of this year, we basically re-engaged -- as I said, Facebook had started with the concept plan in 2017 and through parts of '18 and they brought us on board in early '18 to help take that concept forward.

We -- we submitted a revised plan to the City in February and have continued to have open houses, you know, and a number of, as it said, one-on-one or large or small-sized group presentations around the City.

We tried to emphasize Belle Haven because it's the neighborhood most proximate.

In May, we had our Council Study Session. The EIR contract was approved in August, and the NOP, Notice of Preparation was posted in September and we're here before you now.

But we have, you know, a while ahead of us. We're -- we are -- we know there are issues out there. We've heard a lot about the traffic and congestion.

We think we have some solutions that can help that, but we know there are issues and we know we have to
be a part of those solutions.

So with that, we're available for any questions you may have and thank you for your time.

CHAIRPERSON BARNES: Thank you very much.

And at this time clarifying questions only if we have some. Your light's on, Commissioner Riggs.

COMMISSIONER RIGGS: So you're taking questions that would be for the study just or just EIR at this point?

CHAIRPERSON BARNES: You know, the fact is that it might be better to hold the project in general because we're going to do the project last, the EIR before that.

We're going to hear from the consultant prior to that. So if it's clarifying, feel free to ask it.

COMMISSIONER RIGGS: I'm happy to hold it.

CHAIRPERSON BARNES: Great. Thank you.

Commissioner Doran.

COMMISSIONER DORAN: Yeah. I'd just like to know on the residential units whether the intention is for those to be earmarked for Facebook employees or are they going to be available for rent, selling condos?

What's the use of this?

MR. GHIELMETTI: Thank you for the question.

At this point, again, I think we're open to
listening. I think there are referred folks in the community talking about, you know, pros and cons either way, but they probably at this point are looking to be public.

Again, some folks have talked about a certain amount that maybe cuts down on traffic if some of are more geared towards Facebook employees, but I think they're -- they're up for grabs in terms of input from you and the community.

COMMISSIONER DORAN: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BARNES: Great. Seeing no other questions, we will progress to the EIR consultant.

MS. CHAPMAN: Good evening, Commissioners and members of the public. Thank you for coming to the Scoping Session for the Willow Village Master Plan Project EIR.

My name is Kirsten Chapman and I work for the environmental consulting firm ICF. We will be preparing the environmental review component for the project.

I'm a project manager. I -- with us tonight we have Erin Efner who's the project director from ICF and then we also Gary Black from Hexagon and they will be preparing the transportation component of the EIR.

So should you have any questions after the
presentation regarding the environmental review process, we can respond to them accordingly.

Let me move to what is shown here. So we'll cover the building process and the environmental review process. We won't get into a project overview because that is the job of the project applicant.

Just a quick introduction to our CEQA project team or California Environmental Quality Act project team.

We have the City of Menlo Park as the lead agency, meaning that they have the principal responsibility for carrying out the project.

ICF will be the lead EIR consultant and we will prepare all sections of the EIR with assistance from Hexagon for the transportation analysis.

We will also have Keyser Marston & Associates on our team and they will be preparing the housing needs assessment which we will then incorporate into the population and housing section of the EIR.

And then also Bay Area Economics will prepare the fiscal impact analysis which part of that will be incorporated into the public services section, but it will also be an interim document separate from the EIR.

So since the project involves discretionary actions by the City, it is subject to the California...
Environmental Quality Act or CEQA, and according to CEQA, because this project may have significant effects on the environment, an EIR is being prepared.

The EIR is a tool for identifying physical impacts to the environment by analyzing the community conducted by our EIR team.

The EIR is also used to inform the public and decision-makers about a project and its potential variance prior to project approval, recommend ways to reduce impacts and also consider feasible alternatives to lessen the item by physical.

So what's shown here, the EIR will cover most of the environmental top -- topics required by CEQA. The EIR analysis will cover topics such as asthetics, air quality, transportation, noise.

Since the project site is going to be developed in an urbanized area of the City, we will not be doing a full analysis of agricultural or rural resources. They do not exist on the project site.

But each of these projects have several sub-issues associated with them. There's one purpose of this meeting tonight is to understand what the Planning Commission and the public think about specific issues under topics such as hydrology, for example.

So this slide shows the general step involved
in the CEQA process for the project. As most of you
know, the NOP was released on October 18th and the NOP
comment period will end on October 18th.

Following close of the scoping period, we will
begin preparing the EIR. When the Draft EIR is released
for public review, a Public Hearing will be held to
solicit comments on the adequacy of the Draft EIR.

A Final EIR will then be prepared and will
address all the comments received during the Draft EIR
review period and make any required changes that are
necessary to the Draft EIR.

And then the third hearing for the Final EIR
will be held before the Planning Commission and City
Council.

After the EIR is certified, the project can
then be approved, and following approval of the project,
Notice of Determination will be issued.

So the purpose of tonight's scoping phase is to
guarantee public input, early investigation of possible
mitigation measures to reduce the impact and also to
consider possible project alternative.

I want you to know that the attempt of the
scoping period is not focused on the project itself or
its merits, but instead the comments should be focused on
the environmental impact of the project.
The next step includes collecting data on existing conditions from which we will evaluate the impacts of the project. We will also begin a preliminary review of the project for potential effects, and as we prepare the EIR, we will consider all public comments received during the scoping period either tonight, received orally or via comment letter.

You can submit comments on the scope of the EIR to Kyle Perata, Principal Planner with the City. You can also speak tonight and we will note your comments and consider them during the preparation of the Draft EIR. As shown here, the comments must be received by October 18th.

So thank you again for coming tonight and we look forward to receiving your comments.

CHAIRPERSON BARNES: Thank you.
Commissioner questions as it relates to the EIR? Seeing no Commissioner questions as it relates to the EIR, I will move to open Public Comment on --

MR. PERATA: Through the chair, can I just chime in before you open public comment?

CHAIRPERSON BARNES: Yes.

MR. PERATA: I just want to make one additional staff clarification or update for the project.
In my opening remarks, I didn't mention that we received four items of correspondence since the staff report. Those were provided via e-mail to the Planning Commission throughout the last few days, and hard copies were available, also in the back of the room.

Members of the public who are interested in hearing additional comments that are not in the staff report due to time permitting after publication of it. I just wanted to get that update prior to opening Public Comment.

CHAIRPERSON BARNES: Great. Thank you.

And I will proceed to open Public Comment, and then after that, will be another opportunity for Commissioners to provide comments at that time, as well. And I have a number of cards. Some of them double up on the EIR portion of this meeting and on the project portion of tonight's meeting.

I'm going to start with a Ms. Patti Fry going first followed by Pamela Jones.

Good evening. Good evening. Please state your name, jurisdiction.

MS. FRY: Patti Fry, Menlo Park. I wanted to make -- make some suggestions regarding the EIR evaluation. One is that since this is the largest project Menlo Park has had it is planned to occur in
phases, that the EIR evaluate each phase separately so that the mitigations for impacts for each phase could be implemented since the implementation of the entire project may take time.

We would not like to see these mitigation measures end up being at the very end of the project, but rather as they occur.

So that's one suggestion.

Another is as an alternate that the reduced intensity alternate be focused on less office as opposed to less retail or housing.

Those two uses are uses that are very important to the community, and office I know is very important to Facebook, but if there were a less intense project, it should be solely less office, in my opinion.

In terms of metrics, we often see EIRs based on ABAG projections. Since Menlo Park just went through a ConnectMenlo General Plan update process, I suggest that that be used for the growth assumptions that comparisons are made regarding population, jobs and housing, et cetera rather than ABAG.

And in terms of transportation and traffic, I know that CEQA likes to look at VMT, vehicle miles traveled solely, but our town, especially in that part of it, is congested incredibly, gridlocked a lot of the
I would suggest that some of our traditional tools also be used also to help inform decisions, and that will be things like local level of service at intersections and roadway segments.

The jobs/housing imbalance in Menlo Park and our region is very, very acute and causing a lot of the problems with traffic and displacement of very important people to our community, so I urge the -- that be looked at in terms of its impact and ways to help our overall community do better at that.

So I thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BARNES: Thank you very much.

Followed by Patti Fry who is in turn -- excuse me. That was Patti Fry. Excuse me. Pamela Jones followed by Ms. Crystal Leach.

MS. JONES: Good evening.

A couple things for this aspect that I would like to see included in the NOP. One is notification. I'd like to see us use the TIERS public engagement process.

The local newspaper, there is none, so for people to find out about the sequencing here is going to be virtually possible. My letter includes some detail.

High level Dumbarton corridor project,
including the train stop, must be a part of this Environmental Impact Report along with a list of any projects that are somewhere in the pipeline, one almost to be completed with the -- with comment on specific discussion items, mixed of land use and Master Plan development.

I think it's critical that all of the team review the CCI meeting -- the City Council meeting, CCI and community role and input to better understand the sentiments of the residents at this time when it comes to development.

I know it can't be a part of the EIR, but it helps to have everything framed.

I also -- under the land use, I would like to see the bar significantly reduced for office and an increase in housing, significance in housing.

The reality is we have an additional 6,000 employees over in that area which means there will be 9,000.

Currently there's about 18,000 -- somewhere between 16 and 18,000 Facebook employees and we've only built 738 units.

So we would further exacerbate the jobs/housing imbalance if we move forward with this configuration. So I would like for the NOP to consider those two areas.
I do want to see increase in BMR, for sale housing and for sale condos. We know that communities are stronger when people buy their property.

All residential and commercial areas should be completed prior to any office regardless of what the configuration is.

On the proposed circulation, the traffic studies must include cross traffic between University Avenue, O'Brien avenue and Willow Road in addition to the usual cut-through traffic, and I would also like for them to look at having a direct access from where the office buildings would be to Bayfront so there would be no need for any of the office people during Monday through Friday to have to access Willow Road or University Avenue for that matter.

In the rest of the impact from Pacific from Bohannon building, hotel, shuttles, private vehicles.

CHAIRPERSON BARNES: Thirty seconds.

MS. JONES: Uber, Lyft and limousine. Air quality, we must do local air quality monitoring. The closest monitor in Redwood City. That definitely doesn't address the area where this impact is.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BARNES: Thank you.

Crystal Leach followed by Mr. Matthew Zito.
MS. LEACH: Good evening. My name is Crystal Leach and I am the superintendent at Sequoia Union High School District.

The district does not oppose development within the district boundaries and appreciates the importance of housing.

Rather, the district is solely concerned with ensuring the safety of district families and staff and the viability of the district's educational program.

The district is concerned that the project as presented will have a vast number of significant impacts on the district, including impacts related to transportation, traffic, circulation, safety, noise, population and student housing.

Are we counting the underclass? Often our middle class, especially in the Bay Area, is now our underclass, and realistically we have families living in studios and in one bedroom housing.

So I ask: Why are we excited to build communities without children? Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BARNES: Thank you.

Matthew Zito followed but Luis Guzman.

MR. ZITO: Good evening, Commissioners.

Thanks for the opportunity to speak. I'm Matthew Zito.

I'm the chief facility officer for the Sequoia Union High
School District and the Pueblo Village sits squarely within and near this project.

Menlo-Atherton currently has 2,500 students and is the largest high school in the county, and the scope and content of the EIR as it's being scoped out.

So this project has potential to have profound and lasting impacts on the district, its facilities, our students and staff, and Menlo-Atherton in particular is the high school, the public high school for the entire City of Menlo Park. There are 1,200 students from Menlo at M-A currently.

And it has this impact particularly on this entire project as proposed. You have recently been proposed or approved in the Bayfront area of Menlo Park as well as some of the condominium development, Stanford development on El Camino Real.

So the district hopes to work with the City and the developer to ensure that these impacts are fully and adequately mitigated.

As I mentioned, the district operates two schools within the attendance area, Menlo-Atherton, which is a traditional public high school, plus the two miles from the project site, and we also have a new small high school that's essentially, Bohannon Industrial Park, but it's in the former M-2 area at Jefferson near Chrysler.
So just opened this year. Has a capacity for 400 students, and it costs 56 million dollars.

Imagine the cost of development in the Bay Area, it's astronomical and the cost of school development is particularly challenging for us.

So we bought two acres for 9.6 million dollars. Two acres which are probably now worth eighteen million dollars. To secure land and build facilities is staggering.

We are also a mile and a half from the proposed project and we have many, many students that are in East Palo Alto, and in that area, I know it's not really east, but the El Camino kind of north and south that is behind this development, and the bus that actually takes many students from East Palo Alto to Menlo-Atherton is Q96 currently has an average speed of 5 miles an hour.

And so the traffic impacts in this area are particularly troubling to us. It does look like a very substantial transit center's being developed is what looks like hundreds of buses in and out, I think an additional 3,000 parking spaces and other ancillary traffic, so we're concerned about our students actually being able to move from their location, particularly in East Palo Alto and actually being able to get safely in time and safely to Menlo-Atherton.
So while the miles might seem quickly, might seem a small distance, it's quite a bit of time to travel.

So we have challenges to what the statutory fees are for all intents and pittance. They cover almost none of the construction costs, maybe five to eight percent of the building facilities.

We're concerned about the traffic caused by the project. This will discourage alternative means of traffic and we really would ask that the EIR analyze the existing and anticipated student movement pattern, bus routes to all these two schools, looking at vehicular movement and potential conflict, and this is a key part. Potential conflicts with school pedestrian movement with all the additional cars and buses and our most precious commodity are teenagers that are moving to the two schools.

So the safety issue is first and foremost --

CHAIRPERSON BARNES: Time is expired.

MR. ZITO: -- our concern.

We have other issues that we will outline, noise and air quality concerns, but again, mitigation is just key and the ability to have our students actually be able to.

CHAIRPERSON BARNES: I'm sorry. Your time is
MR. ZITO: Thank you. Appreciate it.

CHAIRPERSON BARNES: Thank you.

With that, I have no other additional cards for the EIR. If anyone -- I do have some more. So for clarification, this is the EIR public comment period. We will be doubling back for another. That relates to the project itself, and -- so I have -- I have two here. They're both for -- these look like EIR.

Is that your understanding for the EIR?

MR. PERATA: Correct. The one should be an EIR comment card. I also another here. So I'm trying to bring them up.

CHAIRPERSON BARNES: Is it your understanding Mr. Bookman is EIR, as well?

MR. PERATA: That one appears to not be EIR.

What I might recommend that the chair does is there's a number of comments that are for the project which might be on the Study Session, but it may be possible that people may want to speak now instead of wading through the Commission deliberation.

So I would recommend giving the public opportunity if they have submitted a card more for a Study Session topic, commenting now in respect.

It might be a good idea to give an opportunity...
to speak on this item prior to the Study Session. The preference would be continue, separately from the EIR comments for the purposes of the record.

CHAIRPERSON BARNES: I have no problem with that.

So for clarification, what I will be doing is we just finished the EIR Public Comment and we'll move right into Public Comment as it relates to the project itself, and I see Ms. Levin coming forward.

It sounds as though she -- so with that in mind, I'm happy to call Ms. Levin.

MS. LEVIN: I'm --

CHAIRPERSON BARNES: Thank you. I had called prior to that for Mr. Guzman. The gentleman who's waiting in front.

Thank you very much. Sorry for the delay.

MR. GUZMAN: Good evening. Luis Guzman, a East Palo Alto resident. Dear Commissioners, we will benefit from the new village Facebook campus and we are excited about the opportunity to have the access to new retail services and recreational amenities on the east side of 101.

However, East Palo Alto residents will also be highly impacted to the increase of Facebook traffic and parking issues.
Therefore, the revised East Palo Alto city trip must be included in the evaluation as part of the EIR and some of the impact projects, the City of East Palo Alto for safety and traffic mitigation measures.

Residents would like to have as much local amenities as many community parks, because we -- we do not have access to public open space at the present in the East Palo Alto area.

Therefore, we would like to have the O'Brien Park much bigger than the current plan site.

The park shall include the complete re-development of Hetch Hetchy right-of-way to connect to the parks with additional park lands.

We would like the current developer of this project to work with relevant parties such as the City in that SF-PUC to increase park, playgrounds, actual on the Hetch Hetchy sight to secure children, toddlers areas and, football, soccer courts to serve future employees and local residents.

Additional pedestrian parks to connect O'Brien and Willow Village shall also be with other nearby landlords.

For example, utilizing the current drainage channel between 1075 and 1105 O'Brien Drive and the previous connection between the Hamilton Court and 960...
and 1350 Hamilton.

In connection with the project and in order to limit traffic, the Willow-O'Brien area should be redeveloped with pedestrian/bicycle traffic in mind.

Such a time was which at the present are mostly non-existent should be constructed, from Capital Way in Menlo Park.

Better lighting shall should be installed and bicycle lanes should be also developed on the O'Brien drive.

Although we are very excited about this new mixed use project with public access needed, nearby residents are looking forward for their developers to improve their areas.

We are also looking forward for the City of Menlo Park and the Planning Commission to encouraging more of such live/work play development in the near future that we will transform the O'Brien Business Park into a more lively community district integrating in the surrounding city neighborhoods.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BARNES: Thank you. Thank you for your patience. Appreciate it.

Next up is Ms. Adina Levin followed by Mr. Colin Bookman.
Good evening.

MS. LEVIN: Good evening. Planning Commissioners. I'm Adina Levin. I serve on Complete Street Commission and was on the Menlo Park General Plan Advisory Committee. I'm speaking for myself. So having served on General Plan Committee, it's exciting to see mixed use proposed moving forward including much needed housing, multiple income levels and needed services.

On the project alternatives for the EIR, because there's a window for opportunity to be studied, the EIR studies a lower office alternative that would rebuild the current office and then use the remaining space for a higher housing alternative with up to 3,000 units for us, for BMR and at the same time office.

The areas seeing tremendous job growth, Facebook is driving displacement of Belle Haven and nearby communities.

These alternatives in the EIR should consider reporting on vehicle miles traveled and the consequences on less office and more housing.

Also the transportation, since there is ongoing study of Dumbarton rail that Facebook is working on, please do include a report of impacts of the vehicle miles traveled when Dumbarton rail is coming forward using that study that is currently in progress.
I know that's a little bit unusual because it's usually only something that is done, but that analysis could be highly relevant.

Let me see. With regard to phasing, phasing has accelerated housing, which is very welcome. I'm glad to hear that the grocery may be accelerated.

In terms of energy, please remove the offset and credit options. That is no longer eligible under the PUC code policy, and this is a big enough development. It should be able to accommodate that without those workarounds.

In terms of the safety of this EIR, pedestrian overcrossing. It seems counterintuitive. A pedestrian overcrossing of arterials.

The latest best practices suggest that that could reduce safety because people will still cross, drivers will expect them less and it might be even less safe, so please do look at the latest and best practices for the safety.

In terms of the housing needs assessment, I'm glad to see that that is being done and we want to see this project and the City as a whole to get total impacts of the housing needs thing invoked by the additional office, and on the housing, please do use the Density Bonus Development Agreement for a higher share of below
market rate housing of twenty-five percent would be a good level, including in a mix of subsidy levels with very low and, you know, a mix of income levels with senior housing also sounds like it would be welcome. And I think those are the comments that I had had. So thank you very much for your consideration on this important project.

CHAIRPERSON BARNES: Thank you.

Mr. Colin Bookman followed by Mr. John Kadvany.

MR. BOOKMAN: So I'm Colin Bookman.

CHAIRPERSON BARNES: Good evening.

MR. BOOKMAN: Thank you. First off, thank you for your time today.

CHAIRPERSON BARNES: Could you please state your political jurisdiction?

MR. BOOKMAN: I live in East Palo Alto.

CHAIRPERSON BARNES: Thank you.

MR. BOOKMAN: One mile away from this new development.

CHAIRPERSON BARNES: Thank you.

MR. BOOKMAN: My only comment why not build more? Why not build higher? Why not more below market unit rental units? Doubling or tripling the height of these buildings would afford the greater density, to justify
more public transit, more investment.

As that area builds up, so builds the surrounding areas, and I think by extending the height limits, it would benefit the surrounding communities and would enable a lot of the concerns to be addressed.

You get more BMR, you triple the housing density, all that could be used for housing. You triple that, right, hey, we need more public transit, all of those people are paying tax revenue.

Not all of them are commuting very far. Many of them will be working at Facebook and will benefit the surrounding areas.

That's all.

CHAIRPERSON BARNES: Thank you.

Mr. Kadvany followed by Pat Sausedo.

MR. KADVANY: Good evening, Commissioners.

I'm John Kadvany, several decades resident of Menlo -- Menlo Park.

I think this project as it comes forward and assuming it gets past some considerable hurdles, it's going to involve significant negotiation for additional public benefit going well beyond the boundaries of Willow Village that has been presented to us today.

Within the village, the housing looks great.

Its environment looks great. We need to say 1,700 units,
but in terms of the environmental numbers, the housing
and the office, office increase is probably going to
offset each other, especially with transportation
changes.

But I think -- I think within the boundaries of
the project, Facebook can probably come in with a pretty
good -- a pretty good case, but I don't think that's
going to be enough.

We're -- it's not like this is an isolated
project. Menlo Park is at a significant crossroads like
the rest of Silicon Valley in terms of our infra-
structure and our quality of life.

Facebook is proceeding in advance with good
ideas to mitigate that with -- such as their Dumbarton
Rail and Bridge Study, and if that's successful, that can
be a part of our future negotiations, but that's not
going to be nearly enough.

We need a whole lot more as indicated by Mr. --
Mr. Zito and by Adina Levin, that we have to think in
terms of what's really going to be involved here in terms
of public benefit. Then it's going to go well beyond the
borders of this project.

So in terms of the EIR, I suggest -- the EIR
can't be everything, but it can start looking at what
goes beyond.
For example, the discussed transit corridor down the rail line from East Palo Alto to Redwood -- to Redwood City, that would be a big jump. Facebook may be working with Google and other South -- South Bay tech firms can talk about keeping that going down into the South Bay.

As Mr. Zito said, we're going to have significant impacts on the educational system. Maybe we need to look inside the circle of the campus for an ed -- for an educational facility because land is so expensive.

So to the extent -- and as Adina said, also, let's look at how the housing can be expanded different from the parameters that are given here and maybe even looking at changing the zone -- the zoning in the office area, which doesn't allow any -- any housing at all.

So do that somehow so that the public is ready with the knowledge base to intelligently discuss these issues when they come up in the areas of transit, housing, including affordability and education.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BARNES: Thank you. Good evening.

MS. SAUSEDO: Good evening, Commissioners.

I'm Pat Sausedo with BIA Bay Area. BIA Bay Area is very encouraged by the Willow Village project before you this evening.
Willow Village embraces today's urban village concept enabling City residents to work, reside, shop, socialize and generally live a full rewarding life within their local community with minimal dependence on the automobile to fulfill their daily needs.

The village project will enable the City to maintain stable economic growth while significantly increasing its housing supply utilizing smart land use and building design standards to minimize environmental impacts.

In response to prior feedback, the applicants have revised their proposed project to develop at this point over 1,700 residential units and are analyzing single occupancy to family size three-bedroom residential units.

The project's increase for multi-family housing will help balance the proposed office and retail development while reducing vehicle miles traveled by giving employees the opportunity to walk and bike between their homes, their jobs and shopping.

Recognizing the significant issues of housing affordability, over twenty residential units at this point will be committed to affordability standards as determined by the City.

Additionally through the project's town square,
public parks, designated community buildings, it will
allow neighbor-to-neighbor socializing and community
ingagement opportunity that will be fully supported by
the project's community benefits infrastructure.

Willow Village's core components embrace smart
development. Housing, jobs, retail services all in one
location.

BIA believes that this project as it continues
through the process has great core components and the
applicants want to work with you, work with the community
to make it all that it can be.

BIA thanks you for this opportunity to share
our thoughts at this point in time and we look forward to
continuing the dialogue as this project moves through the
processes in the City of Menlo Park.

Thank you again. Good evening.

CHAIRPERSON BARNES: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER RIGGS: Ma'am, could I just ask
for those present if you would tell us. BIA stands for
what?

MS. SAUSEDÉO: Building Industry Association
for the Bay Area.

COMMISSIONER RIGGS: Thank you.

MS. SAUSEDÉO: You're welcome.

CHAIRPERSON BARNES: Thank you.
MR. PERATA: Through the chair?

CHAIRPERSON BARNES: Yes, sir.

MR. PERATA: May I just jump in and clarify the process? At the point that we're at, I just had an additional item labeled Fl for this topic area to dias. It sounds like we're starting to get into comments that were probably identified as G1 Study Session, and so I think it would probably be appropriate for the Planning Commission through the chair to check and see if there's any other items with Fl if the rest are study items, actually close Public Comment, but prior to closing Public Comment on the EIR scoping session, call for any other items or anyone who has submitted a card so far and would like to make their comments or have comments on the EIR content and scope, make those comments now rather than waiting for the Study Session.

CHAIRPERSON BARNES: So I've got maybe five Fl cards.

MR. PERATA: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON BARNES: And the intent is to work through the Fl. That's my intent.

So with that, Sergio Ramirez-Herrera followed by Lushorn Lee.

And good evening. Please state your -- you have three minutes. Please state your name, organization
and political jurisdiction.

MR. RAMIREZ-HERRERA: Good evening, Chair and Commissioners. Thank you for allowing me to speak. My name is Sergio Ramirez-Herrera and I am a member of Carpenters Local 217 and a long resident of Menlo Park.

I'm here to speak in favor of the Willow Village project for the benefit it brings to the surrounding community through housing and job creation.

This development will allow my carpenters like me to continue living in Menlo Park, and will provide me with the necessary benefits and income to provide for myself and my family.

And I am in full support of the Willow Village project. I encourage you to consider the positive benefits of this community center. Responsible development brings to Menlo Park by making certain it is appealing.

All right. Thank you so much.

CHAIRPERSON BARNES: Thank you.

Next is Lushorn Lee followed by Elizabeth Jackson.

Good evening, you have three minutes, please state your name and your organization.

MS. JACKSON: Good evening. My name is Elizabeth Jackson and I am currently live in East Palo
Alto, but for many years, I lived in eastern Menlo Park, and I feel that these two areas, they're the same community.

So whatever you do, it's going to affect both of them because people who live in both areas share in the community.

So I thank you for having the meeting tonight and I wanted to attend to express my support for your Willow Village and for the affordable housing project, and also the traffic improvements that you plan on working on, and that will certainly benefit both areas.

This Willow Village, I think it will deliver good benefits and it will allow Facebook to continue to remain in Menlo Park and to provide jobs for the surrounding areas.

And I'm a carpenter and we look forward to working with Facebook and the development because we know that they understand skilled labor and quality work and that's what we intend to offer.

And as a carpenter, I -- on this project, I feel that I could help build and improve this project because we're well trained. So I urge you to support Willow Village.

Thank you very much for letting me -- allowing me to make comments.
CHAIRPERSON BARNES: Thank you.

So the last two cards I have for Gl is Jose Contreras followed lastly by James Kendle.

Good evening. You have three minutes.

MR. CONTRERAS: Good evening.

CHAIRPERSON BARNES: Excuse me. Your organization represented, if any?

MR. CONTRERAS: Good evening, Commissioner.

My name is Jose Contreras. I'm a resident of Menlo Park, Belle Haven for the past forty years.

CHAIRPERSON BARNES: Would you pull the mic up a little bit?

MR. CONTRERAS: I'm a resident of Menlo Park and Belle Haven for the past forty years. I'm here tonight to support the Willow Village.

Willow Village will bring new retail and housing to the Belle Haven community, but will also create jobs and pay fair wages.

As a carpenter, I look forward to working in the community where I live and close to home and to support my family.

I've lived in Menlo Park for the past forty years. I would encourage you to move the project as far as possible and approve it.

Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON BARNES: Thank you.

And lastly Mr. James Kendall.

MR. KENDALL: Good evening, Chair and Commissioners and staff. My name is James Kendall. I'm a representative from Carpenter's Local 217 for San Mateo County. I'm speaking on behalf of approximately 39,000 carpenter men and women across Northern California, including Menlo Park residents, and some of them are with me here tonight.

We are here in full support of the Willow Village project signature development, and responsible contractors will work on this project. This company has a growing history that respects the workers.

Carpenters will earn a fair wage with medical and retirement benefits that will allow workers a chance to live in the community they work in.

It also means those wages will be invested back into the community as they spend their earnings and tax dollars into the local school and government.

This comes with commitment to apprenticeship programs which guarantee that you will continue to have trained, skilled and experienced workforce and be able to complete high quality projects in a safe and timely manner.

Opportunities not just for jobs on this
project, but a career path for many men and women
apprentices, hard hat program for returning veterans.
Community members look forward to more than
their income. They're excited to have a chance to
revitalize their own community at the same time as
increasing the housing stock so badly needed by this
region.

The carpenters are in full support of this
project to expedite Willow Village the benefits bring to
the community as well as housing and union job creation.
Thank you for your time.
CHAIRPERSON BARNES: Thank you.

So with that, having no other cards specific to
FI and GI, seeing no one coming forward, I will close
Public Comment.
There's another public for public after this
which we will get to later.

And I'm going to bring it back up to the dais,
my fellow Commissioners for comments related to the EIR
Scoping Session.
Remarks at this time. Commissioner Doran.
COMMISSIONER DORAN: Through the Chair, I'd
like to ask the people on the EIR about this mention of a
toxic site, toxic release site on the building site.
Could you just give us a little bit more
information about what that toxic site is, what the
toxins are? If you have any preliminary things to say.

MS. CHAPMAN: No. We actually do not have any
information on that at this time. A Phase I
environmental site has been prepared by the project
applicant, and as part of our environmental review, we
will be reviewing that and incorporating that into the
EIR.

But at this time it has not been reviewed yet.

But it will definitely be.

CHAIRPERSON BARNES: Good. Commissioner
Riggs.

COMMISSIONER RIGGS: Yes. Thank you, Chair
Barnes.

I have -- I have a few comments to make. First
I did want to acknowledge more than half a dozen comments
tonight that addressed the EIR.

For the most part, they seem to deal with the
potential alternate projects. So our first speaker
suggested that there be a project that holds the existing
million square feet of office and that the new
construction or new square footage consisting of housing
and non-commercial retail spaces.

There was also the comment that in review of
transportation and traffic, VMT alone ignores local
That can be local gridlock. That can be neighborhood lockdowns. That can be diversion of traffic through Wayz to go through neighborhoods.

We'll note the suggestion to add back levels of service for related intersections, and per my comments from several months ago, I would also add that neighborhoods that are adjacent to these arterials that are so impacted but are not listed as -- were not normally listed as candidates for study under LOS, that these should be included also because in fact if traffic does divert.

And then there was the overall comment about the jobs to housing balance. I believe that that refers to in the case of this immediate area, the Facebook campuses, that the last two projects of half a million square feet each actually did not include any housing.

They were entirely negative to the jobs/housing balance, and I would note that it's self-evident what the transportation situation is and we haven't even occupied the buildings that are currently under construction.

The next speaker made a similar suggestion regarding the balance to note they have an alternative noticeably reducing office and boosting housing. With the emphasis on the fact that this proposal will make the
situation worse.

There was a comment from the school district that the EIR should include a study of student traffic, and I realize that VMT would include likely vehicles, but the new school does not have a history and would not have been measured to date, and I don't know that it would come up with full numbers if it were measured here in October or in the next few months compared with 2020 or 2021.

We might want to look ahead to that, including Mr. Zito's comments about pedestrian access.

But I will note in response to an earlier comment that we don't -- Facebook or I should say Signature Development is not proposing pedestrian overcrossing at Willow, but an undercrossing as I understand it, which is much more inviting to people in a hurry than having to climb -- rather than having to climb fifteen feet when there is only ten to cross.

Another comment to reduce office square footage to the existing one million square feet and put the increased development and housing.

There was a comment that to the degree that this conforms to the ConnectMenlo guidelines -- and I'll note since this is looking to a development agreement that doesn't actually necessarily attempt to do so, that
1 particular effort perhaps outside of the zoning, which
2 would indeed be a public benefit discussion, that a lead
3 item would be activating the rail which already exists
4 and is in occasional use for Caltrain when it opens
5 between Facebook and Redwood City junction.
6 In other words, the infrastructure is sitting
7 there, and that essential transportation link could
8 indeed be an impact on overall traffic.
9 And I would have more comment on that later.
10 And also the suggestion that I assume is for
11 the City Council that potentially ConnectMenlo should be
12 reconsidered in that the OB, office and bonus area does
13 not currently allow housing.
14 I think that reflects the fact that the RM, the
15 mixed use residential on the other hand does allow office
16 which perhaps was not what everyone anticipated.
17 And then there was an interesting comment from
18 one of our neighbors outside of Menlo Park that this
19 person looks forward to this project and its potential
20 traffic improvements, resulting improvement in current
21 traffic conditions, and for that, I have a couple of
22 questions for the transportation consultant through the
23 chair.
24 CHAIRPERSON BARNES: Yes, please.
25 COMMISSIONER RIGGS: So is that Mr. Black?

COMMISSIONER RIGGS: Good evening.

I guess the key question is through the team, you would have an idea at perhaps the proposed additional 750,000 square feet about how many new employees that would indicate or as we have in recent meetings, assuming fifty percent diversion from a single car occupancy, how many additional drivers were likely to be associated with another 750,000 square feet of office?

MR. BLACK: Yes. Unfortunately I'm not prepared to answer that question tonight because that's part of the study that will be done, and it's anticipated that that office would be occupied by Face -- Facebook.

And so we are scoped to engage with a study of Facebook of their existing campus and their existing number of employees and their mode of getting to work versus bus versus drivable car, et cetera and to apply those same numbers to the projected occupancy of the office on this site.

But we haven't done that study yet, so we're not prepared to provide that information tonight.

COMMISSIONER RIGGS: All right. Thank you.

And Kyle, I'll turn to you. For building 21 we knew roughly how many employees resulted from 500,000
square feet, 490 or whatever it was, and again the latest information that I recall is somewhere around fifty percent diversion from single occupancy cars, and I guess perhaps that doesn't exactly count the additional buses and Lyft drivers and so forth.

But just looking at the single car, do we have a rough idea -- well, for example, for the 500,000 square feet, do we know? Was that an additional 4,000 employees, for example?

MR. PERATA: Sure. So I don't have off the top of my head the breakdown for building 21 and 22, but I can tell you the total.

It was approximately 962,000 square feet and the employment was 6,400 to be anticipated employment based on Facebook's utilization of square footage within the offices.

COMMISSIONER RIGGS: All right. So doing a very rough shot at this, we could anticipate, assuming some similarities, another 5,000 vehicles using seventy-five percent of 100,000 square feet for 750 versus 940 or whatever the number was. That can be improved.

MR. PERATA: I'm not prepared to answer how many vehicles here and the building would equate in terms of number of employees per vehicle at the time.
COMMISSIONER RIGGS: That's all right. I'm willing to do that because I have a history of three building approvals. So if we're talking about -- for the moment, until we get Mr. Black's actual analysis, we're talking an additional 5,000 vehicles for an office portion alone for this project, not counting vehicles associated with close to 2,000 residents, residences.

So maybe 3,000 additional humans of which a percentage will either work in another location or will come as tech workers do to in the future work in a another location or have a spouse that works in another location.

So just for perspective, I wanted to note that this project will not on the surface of it reduce traffic.

So I'll jump ahead and -- and make a couple of suggestions for the EIR alternatives. I think we're reflecting the comments tonight and e-mails to the Planning Commission and I'll confess that I have not in the last six or eight days looked at CCIN for e-mails to the City Council, that an alternative -- one alternative might be to indeed hold the existing office space at the existing one million square feet.

Of course that existing is actually R&D space...
and is a lower intensity than full-on office space. But it's a handy target.

And then again I would support adding LOS measurements to the VMT -- I'm sorry. For those who don't speak the lingo, vehicle miles traveled is the latest and most hip way of measuring traffic flow because in theory, it measures how much time -- it's actually mileage, automobile engines are running and therefore how much pollution they're causing.

But it does not serve well to measure how much time a resident is stuck in traffic, including a bus or a fire truck.

Whereas LOS, which is levels of service says at this intersection, that we're going to be stuck there for three traffic lights or from this block to the next block, it will take you seventeen minutes to go one block, and we do that in some situations in Menlo Park.

And then I think the alternative reflects the note that I had made which was that there should be a real residential component.

I think in terms of traffic there should be an alternative project which has no increase in traffic associated with it, at the peak hour and through the day, because many people know, our morning commutes ends at around 11:30 am and our evening commute begins somewhere
around 2:45 or 3:00. I think earlier in that area.

And then maybe just a -- an overall comment

that this project which -- I should stop for a moment and
say I am impressed with this project.

I like a lot about it. I do have some
experience in the last thirty years with town planning,
and I think this is something very much to look forward
to, including a certain level of curiosity on my part
just how well it will work trying to be a center of
residential and social activity.

But this is not what is referred to I believe
in the project description as an urban area served by
transit. It simply is not.

The fact that there are shuttle buses and Lyft
drivers available two to three miles away from the train
station does not make the area served by transit.

So in and of itself, it lacks transportation,
but I believe there are significant transportation
opportunities, and as one speaker noted, perhaps one of
those should be linked to this project when we move from
environmental into scoping.

So those are my comments this evening.

CHAIRPERSON BARNES: Thank you.

A couple questions for our consultants. Before

I start, thank you to everyone that made public comment.
this evening. I have taken copious notes and there's just a trove of good thoughts here to bring down.

I'll focus on a couple of things. I'd like to ask the consultants for the record as it relates to the ability or inability to spec out future transportation projects, for instance, a regional project like the Dumbarton corridor cross by Transbay Partners.

For the record, does that at all fit into or will become part of your analysis as it relates to traffic flows?

MR. BLACK: It's in our scope of work to study the effects of rail service on the Dumbarton rail -- in the Dumbarton rail corridor.

CHAIRPERSON BARNES: Say more about that.

From where to where?

MR. BLACK: From the East Bay to this area and then continuing where the tracks meet up with the existing Caltrain tracks. It -- the exact scope of that has not been identified yet --

CHAIRPERSON BARNES: Mm-hmm.

MR. BLACK: -- but it is going to be part of the study.

CHAIRPERSON BARNES: So there's enough information available to create a scenario where -- so educate me. How does that show up in your scenarios?
1 Say a little more about that.

2 MR. BLACK: Well, we need to -- we are still
3 to study a scenario that has that and a scenario that
4 does not have that.

5 So we need to identify what the scenario with
6 the rail is going to look like. We're not prepared to
7 say right now tonight what that area is going to look
8 like, but we do believe there's enough studies that
9 looked at that corridor that we could identify a likely
10 possibility of a transportation improvement there.

11 CHAIRPERSON BARNES: And is that only for rail
12 or does it include some of the bus expressway lines,
13 dedicated lines that are contemplated, any improvements
14 in that service transportation?

15 MR. BLACK: We are scoped to look at only
16 improvements that are reasonably expected to be in place
17 by the year 2040.

18 I don't know if that answers your question, but
19 if it's just somebody's idea that's not in the Regional
20 Transportation Plan, then that would not be part of this
21 study.

22 But of course the reason for this hearing is
23 the -- you could add things to the study that aren't
24 already part of the scope.

25 CHAIRPERSON BARNES: And so to clarify, that's
an in-service date of 2040 which is some time between now and 2040, twentyish years from now.

MR. BLACK: Yes. If the project is in the Regional Transportation Plan.

CHAIRPERSON BARNES: And I would assume that service is in there, and if it's not, certainly to be talked about through samTrans through -- as a component of the Dumbarton corridor, that shows up in there somehow.

MR. BLACK: I'll make a note that the Commission is interested in seeing that studied.

CHAIRPERSON BARNES: It's in the context of a hypothetical, of course. That's what scenarios are for, and being able to in this EIR to understand the interplay between the potentiality for regional solutions for transportation and how it fits into what's being contemplated here in Menlo Park and what it alleviates, what it doesn't, how it impacts. That's what the scenario is for.

So yes, to the extent that it's out there, and whatever vetting process you have for its plausibility, it should be in there.

Do me a favor, because we talk about acronyms a lot. Educate me, if you would, about VMT and LOS and why one is included, why VMT is used and how it relates to
this particular project and what would be the role of for
instance in level of service, as well, what your
methodology is.

MR. BLACK: Well yes. Right now we're scoped
to do both VMT and level of service. VMT is vehicle
miles traveled.

As I'm sure you're aware, the California
legislature passed a bill a number of years ago that
requires that EIRs look at vehicle miles traveled instead
of intersection level of service when assessing projects
from a transportation standpoint for EIRs.

And that new rule goes into effect in July of
2020, which is before we anticipate that this EIR would
be available.

And so we are required to include a discussion
of vehicle miles traveled in the EIR and to come to the
conclusion whether it -- the project would or would not
have significant impact on vehicle miles traveled.

But we do recognize as -- as some people have
commented, including the Commission, that that doesn't
answer the question about how long is it going to take me
to drive down Willow Road, for example, and that gets
into level of service and traffic flow and delays on the
streets, and it's in our scope to analyze that, as well.

Even though starting in July 2020 that would
not be a -- what we call CEQA impact, but it would be studied in the traffic study.

CHAIRPERSON BARNES: And when you do an EIR study, whether it's this project or something in our Life Sciences District, how are you able to ferret out what is a specific project for what the EIR is done on, what that contribution is to overall traffic flows in terms of the general public being able to understand and contextualize?

You've got -- in any given arterial, you've got X traffic generated by Y locations. Y locations could be disparate throughout the area, could be local.

To what level of granularity are you able to pull out the -- the origination destinations for traffic and be able to get to net new trips, where they're coming from, where we're going, what they impact?

And this gets to the bigger issue of data driven discussions about what's contributing to what, where the circulation is getting held up and by whom and how it is to address that.

So if you could educate a little bit on how that works in terms of what you what work that you do in the EIR.

MR. BLACK: Yes. Well, we look at scenarios that are with and without the project, and so that would
clearly show how the transportation system would change
as a result of the project.

In terms of sort of background of the
transportation system and who's going where, the tool
that we use to do the analysis is the regional travel
demand model that accounts for where trips originate and
where they're destined for, and we can look at patterns
in there and pretty much answer whatever question might
come up in the EIR process about -- if you want to know,
for example, let's look at the traffic on Bayfront
Expressway, where is it coming from and where is it going
to? Is it originating in Menlo Park? Is it originating
somewhere else and where is it going to?

Those types of questions can be answered with
the tools that we intend to implement.

Though this EIR's on a specific project, so it
will be focused on what will happen to the system with
this project.

CHAIRPERSON BARNES: So the -- the before-
mentioned data which is on the Bayfront, we have X amount
of cars and where is it coming from, where is it going
to? I'm sorry. That data exists, but it's outside the
scope of this? Is that what you said?

MR. BLACK: It does exist. That would not
normally be a product of this EIR process to report
something like that, but if it's the interest of the
community to really dig down and know more about what's
happening on Bayfront Expressway, for example, the tools
exist to be able to do that.

And perhaps a question that might be related to
the project is well, what will happen to Bayfront
Expressway?

I can posit a scenario where the traffic would
not increase on Bayfront Expressway with this project
because the capacity is limited.

And so what would happen is -- is that there
would be more traffic from this project or from Menlo
Park that would use Bayfront Expressway, thereby
displacing perhaps longer distance trips today using
Bayfront Expressway.

Maybe this is getting a little too wonky, but
we would expect questions like that, could very well come
up.

CHAIRPERSON BARNES: Well, it's -- it's not
too wonky. We have sat in this chamber over and over
again with Planning Commission meetings as a ConnectMenlo
process and as projects come through the cycle now is the
data that relates to what's happening on our streets,
who's going where.

And on the smaller projects, it's very
difficult to get detailed data -- to use a particular project as a conduit to extract more detailed data.

On a project this big, there is no more worthy endeavor for this whole process than to move the discussion from, you know, I was on this street this many years ago and this was my experience with traffic and now I'm on this street now and this is my experience of traffic. Therefore do something.

Move it from the visceral reaction of what we think congestion is to really understand what congestion is. Who's on the roads -- to the extent we can get the data, DODs, all of it. Who's on the roads, what's coming through our town.

For this particular development, and we've heard tonight a number of times this is the largest single development in -- to be proposed in Menlo Park's history.

So there is no better time, opportunity to get some real data on this, and we -- we have been through and are still in the last leg of our Transportation Master Plan which we did without data, as well.

So I personally have been waiting for the right moment where we can get in and dig in and understand to where, from where, when, whose sit, what are the trips, who's adding to the trips, what's the complexion of those
night trips, what's mass transit, what can we do to get there, and certainly to use this project as a lever to better understand and have more data discussions so we're all working off the same information when we extrapolate impacts.

I think it's the most critical piece that we can have information about what's going on.

So with that said, how close can you get us to that?

MR. BLACK: Well, I'm making notes that the Commission is quite interested in that, and I guess the good news is we're getting better tools every day to be able to answer that question about where traffic is coming from and going to, and it is in our scope to study that as part of putting together the tool that we're going to use.

And so we could report out some of the facts from that exercise that I think would be of interest to the Commission.

CHAIRPERSON BARNES: And to the community.

MR. BLACK: Yeah.

CHAIRPERSON BARNES: A community discussion. And so to that extent, you have, for instance on this project the tentative Facebook, and Facebook runs extensive Transportation Demand Management programs and
shuttles and has data available to it based on its own workforce, where they're going, how they're getting there, what they're doing.

To what extent do you have the ability to tap into them or other sources to get real data from existing patterns?

And is there a firewall between what you do and what for instance data they might have and how is it that what they have in terms of knowledge can -- can be validated and come to use so we can use it, as well?

MR. BLACK: Well, it is our expectation that we're going to get that type of data from Facebook, exactly the questions that you just asked.

There is a concern about -- from -- about privacy for Facebook workers, so we're not going to identify, you know, specific people, but we will identify aggregated data about mode split and place, you know, where people live, basically, working at Facebook, not individual addresses, of course, but perhaps zip code data would be available or at least by City. That will definitely be available, and mode split will be available, I'm told.

CHAIRPERSON BARNES: Incredibly important, the ability to understand what's happening in our town as it relates to traffic patterns.
MR. BLACK: I'll also say that that would be information that we would know for Facebook, but you probably also would like to know what about traffic that's not Facebook that's out there, and --

CHAIRPERSON BARNES: Well, as part of it, that's contextualizing the whole flow. You have it in X, Y and Z. However granular that gets, obviously better.

MR. BLACK: That's the type of data that I said we're fortunate that more data's becoming available every day that we can tap into where there are companies that are keeping track of where people are coming from and going to.

CHAIRPERSON BARNES: Thank you.

I wanted to bring up two other points. One of them is the ability to -- the ability to look at the project over multiple phases, and you're going to do an EIR and it's going to assume a completed project and we're looking at Phase I, Phase II, Phase III.

What's your flexibility to do that and how would that look and is it something you've done before?

MR. BLACK: Yes. We can certainly look at the project in whatever phases it's presented. I believe we heard tonight that there would be three phases, and so we can do the analysis on three phases.

One of the comments was that we wanted -- we
1 don't want to wait until the very end to get our
2 improvements that -- that would go along with the
3 project.
4 And so that part of that phasing would be to
5 identify which improvements, transportation and
6 otherwise, would occur with each phase.
7 CHAIRPERSON BARNES: I think it's helpful
8 because it helps to add clarity to impacts, and so I -- I
9 would propose that, as well.
10 And then the question of using -- as it relates
11 to statistics, using Menlo Park statistics versus ABAG
12 statistics and the Menlo Park statistics is done with the
13 ConnectMenlo process, and I remember -- I can see in my
14 head the staff line of jobs, population, employment, all
15 of that.
16 Tell me a little bit about what's used for what
17 and respond to that question.
18 MR. BLACK: Well, it's in our scope of work to
19 use the ConnectMenlo dataset for Menlo Park that we would
20 obtain from the City.
21 For the context outside of Menlo Park, we would
22 use the ABAG 2040 forecasts, but ConnectMenlo inside
23 Menlo Park.
24 CHAIRPERSON BARNES: Okay. And then if there
25 were to be -- this is a half applicant question about to
get back over to you.

If there was the ability to look at access
directly from Bayfront to the project -- and I don't know
how it gets scoped out, but would that change materially
scenarios that you're running?

MR. BLACK: It could, and the first I've heard
of that was just suggested tonight and I wrote it down on
my list of things to look at, that -- that direct
connection.

That could be looked at in the context of -- of
mitigation, in which case it wouldn't really be an
additional scenario, but I haven't really thought that
through about how that would be -- how that would be
analyzed.

CHAIRPERSON BARNES: And of course I don't
know what, so let me elevate that as something to be
considered and looked at.

So thank you.

Additional Commissioner questions? And I
forget who was next. So Commissioner Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: So I did scribble a lot
of notes that I've now confused myself. So, you know, I
want to add something that maybe hasn't been said before,
and I generally -- you know, I -- I agree with
Commissioner Riggs it's a -- that the project is a very
It's -- it's very unique in both its size and complexity, its phasing.

I think for me from a visual perspective, it's very important to see an overlay of all the -- all the different campuses, the phases that the tenants can occupy within the communities because it is -- the Belle Haven -- the classic Belle Haven community is bounded on three sides by significant development that is phasing driven, and I don't think that's either a good thing or a bad thing. It's just what it is. It's the amount of zoning of the development.

But I think what's -- what's hard is that there's -- I'm trying to figure out a good -- a visual, but it really is a tsunami coming from this development that just overtakes that community, and whether we phase in community amenities that, you know, have been vetted by the community and the people have asked for it, phasing is really important.

And so I think frontloading all of the community development in Phase I is -- is incredibly important, but beyond that, any -- any privately owned public space is just that, it is a privately owned public space, and so it comes with a tremendous number of restrictions, and potentially it sends not belonging.

And so if residents say, "Well, a significant
portion of the residents who will be living in Willow Village are Facebook workers," but they're residents who live there, as well, those community amenities are designed in part for them, but it is also designed in part to benefit the classic commuter, which to me seems to be the most important driver in how -- how these phases are programmed.

That being said, the -- the hope of creating more jobs in the Belle Haven community for existing Belle Haven residents, and some of people have lived there, and I think that's really important to have skilled craftsman jobs that are local so you don't have to drive from Modesto, because that's where you can afford to live, as a union carpenter or electrician.

But just thinking more holistically on this project, not just from -- not just from an EIR perspective, but from the planning perspective on how -- what does that overlay look like and who does it impact and how do we make it such that, as my colleagues up here and talked about all the traffic, and that is -- if you're able to count it, if you're able to collect all that data and then analyze it.

But beyond that, people have to live there. They want to live there. They've lived there for decades and there seems to be this ongoing -- this ongoing
situation where we -- things get built and then in hindsight, we'll say, "We'll correct that next time."

That won't happen again, but I have yet to see that as part of the Commission or as parts of the residents of Menlo Park that being corrected, right?

So I think this is an opportunity to watch Belle Haven and for Menlo Park to actually correct the things that have gone wrong and create tools and paths forward that will work beyond the next twenty or thirty or forty years.

I also believe that and feel that regional solutions have to be tied to all of this and how to make that a possibility.

I don't have the answers to that, but my general sense is that this is a -- the project itself is a very -- this is a good project and the question is how -- how is that project implemented in reality as opposed to being really lovely.

I do support this kind of development, but it is it needs to be looked at.

CHAIRPERSON BARNES: Commissioner Riggs.

COMMISSIONER RIGGS: Yeah. Thank you.

This isn't really anything new. I think if anything, I just wanted to take the opportunity to add to what Chair Barnes said regarding -- let me put it this
way: What happens to the traffic after it is only measured as what we used to call LOSF or it wasn't moving and it won't be moving after the new project?

So in context, it was maybe six years ago we had a project on El Camino Real where we were considering reducing -- holding the number of traffic lanes through downtown at two lanes and reducing it north and south of downtown to two lanes, as well, in order to provide better bicycle lanes.

And I asked the question given that that is the main highway connecting the twenty-three cities, if the traffic right now needs the three lanes and it's quite evident when we get to the two lane portion for the four lanes through Menlo Park that that is a bottleneck, where does the traffic go if we enlarge the bottleneck?

And by the way, where is the traffic going right now as a result of the existing bottleneck?

We were told by our transportation consultants -- not Hexagon at the time -- that people would find other routes and everything works out, and so I said well, what other routes would those be that associate with El Camino Real? Well, Alameda de las Pulgas and Middlefield.

Well, but during commute hours, they come to a full stop. Well, then people change their behavior, but
if they were going to 101, they go to 280. Well, but 280 is no longer a clear shot south of Palo Alto or up near San Mateo.

Well, we don't study the freeways, and actually Alameda and Middlefield are outside of our study, so the answer is that everything looks fine on El Camino.

So I have not forgotten that exchange or the fact that this went down just fine with City Council at the time, and they concluded that there would be no impact as a result of fewer lanes, and we had similar discussions when projects of 10,000 square feet or larger on El Camino were built.

So when traffic is diverted to routes outside of our study area, we don't -- have not in the past necessarily responded.

Recent traffic studies I have seen absolutely that Middlefield and Alameda de Las Pulgas are included, but the traffic when it is diverted through, say -- in the last six years roughly through the Willows, no one could say in a traffic impact analysis that traffic is significantly increased on McKendry Drive because there were no previous estimates of traffic on McKendry Drive, and McKendry Drive is a residential street and wasn't meant to take commuter traffic. Therefore, no impacts were identified.
Can we just assure that we won't similarly miss an impact? And -- and I'll note that's why I -- and I don't word things anywhere near as well as Chair Barnes, but that's why I have noted a few months ago and tonight that we need to look at impacts in neighborhoods and the -- within the neighborhood and an increase in access.

Is that all doable and is that in the current scope or can be in the scope?

MR. BLACK: Yes. I -- I already took a note from one of the comments that we don't want to just study intersections.

Typically when we do intersection levels of service, we're looking at intersections, but what you're talking about is traffic that would use -- what I -- I use the term cut-through. It would cut through of residential streets to avoid certain congested intersections.

We have a very extensive area that we're scoped to look at for this project, and it does include many residential streets, but we'll definitely take your comment in -- to heart and be on the lookout for that type of potential impact.

CHAIRPERSON BARNES: Commissioner Tate.

COMMISSIONER Tate: So I'd like to move us just a bit and that is to that housing needs portion, and
I was wondering if it is possible to make sure the study looks at twenty-five percent BMR as well as having some condo units and just really what would be the difference -- the impact I should say in the community with having twenty-five percent BMR or higher and some units that are for sale?

CHAIRPERSON BARNES: And that's to the consultant?

COMMISSIONER TATE: That is to the consultant.

MS. EFNER: Erin Efner for ICF. We can take that to the consultant and talk about adding that analysis to their scope of work.

COMMISSIONER TATE: Thanks.

CHAIRPERSON BARNES: Process question as it relates to the scope of work. And you're bidding it out and understanding how much money it takes to get it done.

How is it that we don't end up with a situation where you don't have enough money -- specific on traffic, that we don't run into a situation where you don't say you have a scope of work and funds allocated to cover some of the -- explicitly what we talked about tonight as it relates to traffic and we don't end up with a situation which -- again, I'll call out the Transportation Master Plan where we said we didn't have the money to go through and go through the type of data
that we think we have the opportunity to do now.

Do you think that the things that we're telling
you about now just all included in the scope, how we make
sure that there's a budget for this and what you need to
ask Council for this and what would it look like?

MR. BLACK: Oh, well, I can answer with the
transportation scope that there's -- everything that you
mentioned tonight could be reasonably construed by me to
be included in our scope.

So I'll stay tuned if -- if something else
comes up that seems like it's out of scope and then we
would need to communicate with our client that that's out
of scope and what do you want to do about it.

CHAIRPERSON BARNES: Great.

MR. BLACK: Yeah.

CHAIRPERSON BARNES: Thank you.

So looking for any more EIR specific questions,
comments from my fellow Commissioners, and if I don't
have any, then we will move to the Project Proposal Study
Session.

Mr. Perata.

MR. PERATA: Sure. So -- so you're looking to
closing the EIR Public Hearing?

CHAIRPERSON BARNES: Yeah. I'm looking to you
to see if you have any thoughts, and if not, if you're
blank on thoughts, I'll just close it.

MR. PERATA: Yeah. I --

CHAIRPERSON BARNES: If you want to think what you're having for lunch tomorrow, that's fine.

MR. PERATA: I don't know. You may close the public hearing portion now.

CHAIRPERSON BARNES: Right. Thank you.

(This record was concluded at 9:14 PM).
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