

# memorandum



**Whitlock & Weinberger  
Transportation, Inc.**

475 14<sup>th</sup> Street  
Suite 290  
Oakland, CA 94612

voice (510) 444-2600

website [www.w-trans.com](http://www.w-trans.com)  
email [m Spencer@w-trans.com](mailto:m Spencer@w-trans.com)

Date: March 10, 2014

To: **Mr. Jesse Quirion**  
City of Menlo Park

From: Mark Spencer  
Tony Henderson

Project: MPA010

Subject: Response to Comments on 500 El Camino Real – El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan Vehicular Traffic Consistency

W-Trans has completed a *Draft 500 El Camino Real – El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan Vehicular Traffic Consistency*, January 3, 2014. We are in receipt of comments regarding this memorandum from the following individuals and organization:

- Mr. Stefan Petry, via email to Jesse Quirion dated January 16, 2014
- Mr. Kevin Vincent-Sheehan, via email to Jesse Quirion dated January 16, 2014
- Mr. George C. Fisher, via letter to Jesse Quirion dated January 17, 2014
- Mr. John Donahoe, Stanford University, via letter to Jesse Quirion dated January 17, 2014

For reference, comments within these letters have been individually identified and copies of the comment letters are attached.

## **Master Response to Comments**

Some of the commenters have made similar comments. Therefore the following master responses have been prepared to address these comments. These master responses have been cross-referenced with the respective comment.

### Master Response 1

Figures and text have been updated in the memorandum to provide additional information about the assumptions and methodologies utilized for the assignment of project-generated traffic. A summary table has been provided at the beginning of the memorandum to provide a side-by-side comparison of the proposed project and the Specific Plan Conceptual Development Program assumptions for the 500 El Camino Real site. Also, additional graphics have been created to show the distributed traffic generated by the Conceptual Development Program for the 500 El Camino Real site in the Specific Plan analysis.

### Master Response 2

As part of Task A2 of our scope of services, the distributed trips that would be generated by the 500 El Camino Real proposed project were compared to trips analyzed in the *El Camino Real/Downtown Specific Plan EIR*. Since the Specific Plan EIR was a program-level analysis, data for individual opportunity sites (such as 500 El Camino Real) was not published in the EIR transportation analysis, and only information about development in an overall sub-area was published. As such, the actual data developed for the

Specific Plan was requested and has been reviewed to determine site-specific assumptions applied in the Specific Plan analysis. The consistency analysis and associated memorandum has been updated to compare the proposed project to just the 500 El Camino Real site rather than the entire El Camino Real South Sub-area.

#### Master Response 3

It was determined that there is a typographical error on the Net Project Added Traffic Volumes figure, and traffic volumes were not printed in the correct location in a few places. The traffic volumes shown on University Drive and Middle Avenue west of Yale Road have been updated to correct this error. It is noted that correcting this error does not change any of the findings presented in the memorandum.

#### Master Response 4

It is acknowledged that the Tesla sales and service center may have experienced a different trip generation profile than what is presented in the ITE *Trip Generation Manual* for a New Cars Sales center (Land Use 841). W-Trans, in coordination with City staff, has reviewed data previously collected in the vicinity of the site and determined that it is appropriate to adjust the site-specific trip generation data for the prior use on the site. This has been incorporated into the revised memorandum.

#### Master Response 5

As stated in the memorandum, it was determined that the proposed development would generally be consistent with the Specific Plan Conceptual Development Program. However, it is acknowledged that this memorandum only addressed the areas of trip generation and traffic distribution. Other aspects of the proposed project were not reviewed.

### **Individual Response to Comments**

#### Commenter: Stefan Petry

##### *Comment SP-1*

See Master Response 1.

##### *Comment SP-2*

See Master Response 1 and Master Response 3.

##### *Comment SP-3*

See Master Response 1 plus the additional response below.

Comment Part A – the driveway utilization was based on the location of parking and the availability of internal circulation. It was assumed that internal drive aisles would provide access to all parts of the site, and therefore the vast majority of northbound traveling drivers would enter the site before reaching the northernmost driveway located at El Camino Real/Middle Avenue. The driveway at El Camino Real/Partridge Avenue was projected to experience the highest volume of northbound right-turn movements because this driveway provides access to the underground parking area.

Comment Part B – Drivers traveling to/from the proposed development site were assumed to be able to circulate within the site. The new driveway at El Camino Real/Middle Avenue would allow drivers to access Middle Avenue by making a westbound-through movement at this intersection. This would reduce the likelihood that drivers would access Middle Avenue by using a different project driveway then completing a northbound left-turn movement at El Camino Real/Middle Avenue, compared to the existing site configuration.

Comment Part C – The difference in a.m. verses p.m. peak hour traffic volumes is attributed to varying trip generation and distribution profiles for the three different uses on the site, which includes different travel profiles during the respective peak hours.

*Comment SP-4*

See Master Response 4 as well as the following.

It is common for traffic generated by a previous land use to be considered when completing a transportation impact analysis. This approach is used so that the analysis is based on the net increase in traffic that would be generated by the site, acknowledging the pre-existing impact of traffic generated by the previous use. Per City of Menlo Park procedures, a previous use would be considered if the site was occupied within two years of a development application being submitted. Since the Tesla sales and service center was in operation at the time the current 500 El Camino Real project application was submitted, the traffic generated by Tesla has been considered as part of this analysis to conform with City procedures.

Commenter Kevin Vincent-Sheehan

*Comment KVS-1*

See Master Response 1.

*Comment KVS-2*

See Master Response 3.

*Comment KVS-3*

The cut-through analysis will include consideration of both total traffic volumes and the net increase in traffic related to the proposed project.

*Comment KVS-4*

See Master Response 4.

*Comment KVS-5*

The 10,000 vehicles per day capacity cited by the commenter appears to be based on standards adopted by the City of Menlo Park in the *Circulation System Assessment (CSA)*, 2004. Although this threshold is identified as being the streets “capacity” in the CSA, it is truly a threshold established by the City to represent a quality of life target. These target capacity thresholds established in the CSA will be considered when completing the cut through traffic analysis and will be used to determine if additional environmental review of the proposed project is recommended.

*Comment KVS-6*

See Master Response 3.

*Comment KVS-7*

See Master Response 5.

*Comment KVS-8*

It is not clear what this comment is referring to, as the figures in the memorandum do not indicate Yale Road connecting to Partridge Avenue.

*Comment KVS-9*

See Master Response 1 as well as the following:

The trip distribution profiles presented in the City's CSA and used for this analysis are based upon empirical data collected and published by the City of Menlo Park.

Commenter George Fisher

*Comment GF-1*

See Master Response 1, Master Response 2 and Master Response 5, as well as the following:

It is acknowledged that differing trip distribution and trip assignment assumptions were utilized for the analysis of the 389 El Camino Real project. This is because there would be neither inbound nor outbound left-turn access on El Camino Real for the 389 El Camino Real site, thereby restricting route choice options available to drivers traveling to/from the site.

Furthermore, the 389 El Camino Real project included only residential uses, and not a mix of uses such as those proposed for the 500 El Camino Real site. Since the trip distribution profiles presented in the CSA are partially based on the type of land use, it is expected that there would be an overall difference in how trips would be distributed for the 389 El Camino Real project verses the 500 El Camino Real project.

*Comment GF-2*

See Master Response 1 and Master Response 5, as well as the following:

Traffic operations and neighborhood analysis will be completed as part B of the scope of services.

*Comment GF-3*

See Master Response 5.

*Comment GF-4*

See Master Response 4.

*Comment GF-5*

The comment is a summary of previously identified comments.

Commenter John Donahoe, Stanford University

*Comment SU-1*

At the time of the analysis, the data available to the City indicated that the Tesla sales and service center occupied approximately 20,690 square feet of building space the site. It is acknowledged that there is more building space on the site; however, not all of the space was occupied by Tesla. W-Trans and the City has reevaluated the prior use trip generation based on data collected at the site, as described in Master Response 4.

*Comment SU-2*

See Master Response 2.

*Comment SU-3*

It is acknowledged that there is potential for project-site residents or employees to choose to walk to adjacent retail uses or Downtown Menlo Park. However, to conduct a conservative analysis it was decided that the internal capture reduction would be calculated for the proposed development only.

*Comment SU-4*

See Master Response 1.

MS/tdh/MPA010.R2C1.doc

**Attachments:**

Comment letter from: Mr. Stefan Petry, via email to Jesse Quirion dated January 16, 2014

Comment letter from: Mr. Kevin Vincent-Sheehan, via email to Jesse Quirion dated January 16, 2014

Comment letter from: Mr. George C. Fisher, letter dated January 17, 2014

Comment letter from: Mr. John Donahoe, Stanford University, letter dated January 17, 2014