

**APPENDIX D:  
COMMUNITY “LIVABILITY” FACTORS EVALUATIONS**

**Menlo Park Emergency Water Supply Project**  
**Site Evaluation – Phase 2 Community “Livability” Evaluation Criteria**

Site	Criterion	Parameter	Evaluation	Definition	Comments
<b>1A – Willow Oaks Park, 490 Willow Road</b> <i>Along border of large redwood trees in landscaped area adjacent to Willow Road</i>	1—Site Access	1A—Use of residential streets for site access	Favorable	No use of residential streets required for access	
		1B—Access via cul-de-sac	Favorable	Access does not involve cul-de-sac	
		1C—Adequate temporary access for heavy construction equipment	Conditionally Acceptable	Adequate construction access could feasibly be provided	Equipment could access site direct from Willow Road. Access would entail some minor restoration and/or reconfiguration to existing curb, pavement, and landscaping.
		1D—Adequate access for maintenance equipment	Conditionally Acceptable	Adequate maintenance access could feasibly be provided	Long-term access could presumably also occur direct from Willow Road if existing landscaping is reconfigured. Access could be provided for as part of the design. It may also be possible to provide access from the neighboring parcel to the south.
	2—Noise Disturbance Potential	2A—Proximity to residences (including outdoor areas—yards, patios, decks, etc.); potential for construction of project facilities adjacent to residential receptor	Unfavorable	Site is in residential area, is immediately adjacent to residence, and is too small to provide a buffer	Site is adjacent to residential property lines. Additional residences are present across Willow Road.
		2B—Proximity to other sensitive receptors (school, hospital, library, park, etc.); potential for construction of project facilities adjacent to nonresidential sensitive receptor	Conditionally Acceptable	Site is near or adjacent to nonresidential sensitive receptors but is large enough to provide a buffer; this site could be used without constructing project facilities immediately adjacent to nonresidential sensitive receptor(s)	Site is at edge of Willow Oaks Park.
	3—Aesthetic Concerns	3A—Ability of site to support aesthetically appropriate design for context	Conditionally Acceptable	Site is located in an aesthetically sensitive area but would support limited visual amenities	Site is considered aesthetically sensitive because of its location in a park, but there is adequate room to incorporate some level of aesthetic amenities such as landscaped buffers. Note that using this location would have the potential to impact several of the large mature redwood trees along the property line.
	4—Parkland Concerns	4A—Potential for loss of parklands	Unfavorable	Site is in a park	
		4B—Extent of parkland loss	Favorable	Site is not in a park, or Site is within a park, but facility footprint would be small by comparison with park acreage and facility could be sited and designed to avoid disruption of park uses	Site is small by comparison with size of park, and use of this location would not reduce existing developed park uses. The site is adjacent to one of two large open grassy areas available at this park but faces onto Willow Road, and thus is less secluded (and probably less desirable to recreators) than the other, larger grassy area in the rear of the park. If this site is highly scored and remains in serious consideration, we

Site	Criterion	Parameter	Evaluation	Definition	Comments
					should collect community input on sensitivity of this area.
	5—Land Use Planning Consistency	5A—Consistency with General Plan policies	Favorable	Use of this site for a well facility would be consistent with relevant General Plan policies	Project in general (regardless of siting) is consistent with GP Goal I-H (To promote the development and maintenance of adequate public and quasi-public facilities and services...) and Policies I-H-4 (efforts to secure adequate water supplies) and I-H-5 (new wells and reservoirs for supplementary supply).  With proper design, use of this site will also be consistent with Goal I-G (To promote the preservation of open-space lands for recreation, protection of natural resources, the production of managed resources, protection of health and safety, and enhancement of scenic qualities).
		5B—Consistency with current site zoning	Unfavorable	Well facility is not allowed under existing site zoning; project would require re-zoning	Site is zoned OSC (Open Space and Conservation District).  OSC zoning has no permitted uses. Conditional uses include public buildings, but utilities not explicitly mentioned for OSC zoning in zoning code; project would likely require rezoning of project site.
<b>Community “Bonus” Factors</b>					
	6—Bonus Factors	6A—Potential to combine projects (binary criterion, no penalty)	N/A	Site does not offer potential to “piggyback” on other planned project(s)	No piggyback potential identified.
		6B—Potential for green design (binary criterion, no penalty)	Favorable	Site is unusually suitable to support greener design	Site is larger than some, potentially allowing greater design flexibility; and because of its parkland location, could provide good public education opportunities if green design features can be incorporated. Note however that a larger footprint would increase the impact on parklands, so there could be a tradeoff between design flexibility and parkland use.

**Menlo Park Emergency Water Supply Project  
Site Evaluation – Phase 2 Community “Livability” Evaluation Criteria**

Site	Criterion	Parameter	Evaluation	Definition	Comments
<b>1B – Willow Oaks Park, 490 Willow Road</b> <i>Grassy area west of basketball court and south of tennis courts</i>	1—Site Access	1A—Use of residential streets for site access	Favorable	No use of residential streets required for access	
		1B—Access via cul-de-sac	Favorable	Access does not involve cul-de-sac	
		1C—Adequate temporary access for heavy construction equipment	Conditionally Acceptable	Adequate construction access could feasibly be provided	Equipment could access site from Willow Road with some reconfiguration of curb and landscaping.
		1D—Adequate access for maintenance equipment	Conditionally Acceptable	Adequate maintenance access could feasibly be provided	Long-term access could presumably also occur direct from Willow Road; this could be provided as part of the design. It may also be possible to provide access from neighboring parcel to the south.
	2—Noise Disturbance Potential	2A—Proximity to residences (including outdoor areas—yards, patios, decks, etc.); potential for construction of project facilities adjacent to residential receptor	Unfavorable	Site is in residential area, is immediately adjacent to residence, and is too small to provide a buffer	Site is adjacent to residential property line.
		2B—Proximity to other sensitive receptors (school, hospital, library, park, etc.); potential for construction of project facilities adjacent to nonresidential sensitive receptor	Unfavorable	Site is adjacent to nonresidential sensitive receptor and is too small to provide a buffer; use of this site would construct project facilities adjacent to nonresidential sensitive receptor(s)	Site is small and surrounded on all sides by park uses.
	3—Aesthetic Concerns	3A—Ability of site to support aesthetically appropriate design for context	Conditionally Acceptable	Site is located in an aesthetically sensitive area but would support limited visual amenities	Site is small and considered aesthetically sensitive because of its location in a park, but it is located internal to the park and adjacent to existing structures, and is screened from view by the existing fencing around the tennis and basketball courts. In this location, aesthetic impacts would be somewhat reduced, although the site’s small size would make aesthetic design more difficult. Note also that use of this location would require removal of several large mature redwood trees.
	4—Parkland Concerns	4A—Potential for loss of parklands	Unfavorable	Site is in a park	
		4B—Extent of parkland loss	Favorable	Site is within a park, but facility footprint would be small by comparison with park acreage and facility could be sited and designed to avoid disruption of park uses	Site is small and is located adjacent to existing structures; with careful design, facilities would be less likely to disrupt existing uses at this location than elsewhere in park, based on our current understanding. If this site is highly scored and remains in serious consideration, we should verify this with the community.

Site	Criterion	Parameter	Evaluation	Definition	Comments	
	5—Land Use Planning Consistency	5A—Consistency with General Plan policies	Favorable	Use of this site for a well facility would be consistent with relevant General Plan policies	<p>Project in general (regardless of siting) is consistent with GP Goal I-H (To promote the development and maintenance of adequate public and quasi-public facilities and services...) and Policies I-H-4 (efforts to secure adequate water supplies) and I-H-5 (new wells and reservoirs for supplementary supply).</p> <p>With proper design, use of this site will also be consistent with Goal I-G (To promote the preservation of open-space lands for recreation, protection of natural resources, the production of managed resources, protection of health and safety, and enhancement of scenic qualities).</p>	
		5B—Consistency with current site zoning	Unfavorable	Well facility is not allowed under existing site zoning; project would require re-zoning	<p>Site is zoned OSC (Open Space and Conservation District)</p> <p>OSC zoning has no permitted uses. Conditional uses include public buildings, but utilities not explicitly mentioned for OSC zoning in zoning code; project would likely require rezoning of project site.</p>	
	<b>Community “Bonus” Factors</b>					
	6—Bonus Factors	6A—Potential to combine projects (binary criterion, no penalty)	N/A		Site does not offer potential to “piggyback” on other planned project(s)	
		6B—Potential for green design (binary criterion, no penalty)	N/A		Site is not unusually suitable to support greener design	Site is very small and is constrained on three sides by existing park uses.

**Menlo Park Emergency Water Supply Project  
Site Evaluation – Phase 2 Community “Livability” Evaluation Criteria**

Site	Criterion	Parameter	Evaluation	Definition	Comments
<b>1C – Willow Oaks Park, 490 Willow Road</b> <i>Basketball court/ asphalt area west of preschool and south of tennis courts</i>	1—Site Access	1A—Use of residential streets for site access	Favorable	No use of residential streets required for access	
		1B—Access via cul-de-sac	Favorable	Access does not involve cul-de-sac	
		1C—Adequate temporary access for heavy construction equipment	Conditionally Acceptable	Adequate construction access could feasibly be provided	Equipment could access site from Willow Road or existing parking lot with some reconfiguration and temporary loss of landscaping.
		1D—Adequate access for maintenance equipment	Conditionally Acceptable	Adequate maintenance access could feasibly be provided	Long-term access could presumably also occur direct from Willow Road or via new access from existing parking lot. This could be provided as part of the design.
	2—Noise Disturbance Potential	2A—Proximity to residences (including outdoor areas—yards, patios, decks, etc.); potential for construction of project facilities adjacent to residential receptor	Unfavorable	Site is in residential area, is immediately adjacent to residence, and is too small to provide a buffer	Site is immediately adjacent to residential uses.
		2B—Proximity to other sensitive receptors (school, hospital, library, park, etc.); potential for construction of project facilities adjacent to nonresidential sensitive receptor	Unfavorable	Site is adjacent to nonresidential sensitive receptor and is too small to provide a buffer; use of this site would construct project facilities adjacent to nonresidential sensitive receptor(s)	Site is small and surrounded on three sides by park uses, including the preschool. Construction would likely create adverse disturbance conditions for preschool and could also be a concern for users of the basketball courts.
	3—Aesthetic Concerns	3A—Ability of site to support aesthetically appropriate design for context	Conditionally Acceptable	Site is located in an aesthetically sensitive area but would support limited visual amenities	Site is visually sensitive because of its location in a park and adjacent to preschool, but is large enough to support some level of visual amenities and with the right design could provide a visual benefit for preschool in particular, because of the potential to improve on existing views of the paved basketball courts.
	4—Parkland Concerns	4A—Potential for loss of parklands	Unfavorable	Site is in a park	
		4B—Extent of parkland loss	Unfavorable	Site is within a park, and facility footprint would be larger by comparison with park acreage, and/or facility could not be sited in a location that avoids disruption to park uses	Use of this site would result in loss of the basketball court. If this site is highly scored and remains in serious consideration, we should verify whether loss or partial loss of the court would be a concern for the community.
	5—Land Use Planning Consistency	5A—Consistency with General Plan policies	Favorable	Use of this site for a well facility would be consistent with relevant General Plan policies	Project in general (regardless of siting) is consistent with GP Goal I-H (To promote the development and maintenance of adequate public and quasi-public

Site	Criterion	Parameter	Evaluation	Definition	Comments
					<p>facilities and services...) and Policies I-H-4 (efforts to secure adequate water supplies) and I-H-5 (new wells and reservoirs for supplementary supply).</p> <p>With proper design, use of this site will also be consistent with Goal I-G (To promote the preservation of open-space lands for recreation, protection of natural resources, the production of managed resources, protection of health and safety, and enhancement of scenic qualities).</p>
		5B—Consistency with current site zoning	Unfavorable	Well facility is not allowed under existing site zoning; project would require re-zoning	<p>Site is zoned OSC (Open Space and Conservation District)</p> <p>OSC zoning has no permitted uses. Conditional uses include public buildings, but utilities not explicitly mentioned for OSC zoning in zoning code; project would likely require rezoning of project site.</p>
	<b>Community “Bonus” Factors</b>				
	6—Bonus Factors	6A—Potential to combine projects (binary criterion, no penalty)	N/A	Site does not offer potential to “piggyback” on other planned project(s)	
		6B—Potential for green design (binary criterion, no penalty)	N/A	Site is unusually suitable to support greener design	Site is large enough to support some design flexibility, and because of its location in a park and adjacent to preschool would offer the potential for public education.

**Menlo Park Emergency Water Supply Project**  
**Site Evaluation – Phase 2 Community “Livability” Evaluation Criteria**

Site	Criterion	Parameter	Evaluation	Definition	Comments
2A – Veterans’ Administration Hospital, 700 Bay Road  <i>Southerly corner, NE of intersection btw South            Perimeter Road and West Perimeter Road</i>	1—Site Access	1A—Use of residential streets for site access	Favorable	No use of residential streets required for access	Presumably site would be accessed via the VA facility Perimeter Road. Using South Perimeter Road from Willow Road would avoid all residential streets.
		1B—Access via cul-de-sac	Favorable	Access does not involve cul-de-sac	
		1C—Adequate temporary access for heavy construction equipment	Favorable	Adequate construction access already exists	Equipment could access site via Perimeter Road from Willow Road or Bay Road.
		1D—Adequate access for maintenance equipment	Favorable	Adequate maintenance access already exists	Long-term access would presumably also occur from Perimeter Road.
	2—Noise Disturbance Potential	2A—Proximity to residences (including outdoor areas—yards, patios, decks, etc.); potential for construction of project facilities adjacent to residential receptor	Conditionally Acceptable	Site is in residential area, but is not immediately adjacent to residences, <i>or</i> is large enough to provide a buffer	Site is across Perimeter Road from backyards of residences in adjacent neighborhood. If needed, temporary noise barriers could be installed along VA side of roadway.
		2B—Proximity to other sensitive receptors (school, hospital, library, park, etc.); potential for construction of project facilities adjacent to nonresidential sensitive receptor	Conditionally Acceptable	Site is near or adjacent to nonresidential sensitive receptors but is large enough to provide a buffer; this site could be used without	Site is adjacent to existing VA hospital buildings (use to be confirmed during design), but is large enough to permit a design that incorporates sound buffer features if needed.
	3—Aesthetic Concerns	3A—Ability of site to support aesthetically appropriate design for context	Favorable	Location is not aesthetically sensitive, <i>or</i> site is large enough and configured in such a way as to support acceptable design	Site is visually sensitive because of proximity to residences, but is large enough to support visual amenities. We should also confirm age of VA facility; it may also be listing-eligible and therefore aesthetically sensitive to the extent aesthetics contribute to context and integrity; if VA is listed or listing-eligible, design would need to be sensitive to aesthetics of existing buildings and structures.
	4—Parkland Concerns	4A—Potential for loss of parklands	Favorable	Site is not in a park	
		4B—Extent of parkland loss	Favorable	Site is not in a park, <i>or</i> Site is within a park, but facility footprint would be small by comparison with park acreage and facility could be sited and designed to avoid disruption of park uses	

Site	Criterion	Parameter	Evaluation	Definition	Comments
	5—Land Use Planning Consistency	5A—Consistency with General Plan policies	Favorable	Use of this site for a well facility would be consistent with relevant General Plan policies	Project in general (regardless of siting) is consistent with GP Goal I-H (To promote the development and maintenance of adequate public and quasi-public facilities and services...) and Policies I-H-4 (efforts to secure adequate water supplies) and I-H-5 (new wells and reservoirs for supplementary supply).
		5B—Consistency with current site zoning	Conditionally Acceptable	Well facility would be allowed with conditional use permit	Site is zoned PF (Public Facilities District) Conditional uses include public utility facilities.
	<b>Community “Bonus” Factors</b>				
	6—Bonus Factors	6A—Potential to combine projects (binary criterion, no penalty)	N/A	Site does not offer potential to “piggyback” on other planned project(s)	
6B—Potential for green design (binary criterion, no penalty)		Favorable	Site is unusually suitable to support greener design	Site is large enough to offer design flexibility.	

**Menlo Park Emergency Water Supply Project  
Site Evaluation – Phase 2 Community “Livability” Evaluation Criteria**

Site	Criterion	Parameter	Evaluation	Definition	Comments
2B – Veterans’ Administration Hospital, 700 Bay Road <i>Northwest corner</i>	1—Site Access	1A—Use of residential streets for site access	Conditionally Acceptable	Limited use of residential streets required for access	Shortest route to site would use Bay Road from Willow Road. Longer access via South and West Perimeter Roads from Willow Road would entirely avoid residential roadways.
		1B—Access via cul-de-sac	Favorable	Access does not involve cul-de-sac	
		1C—Adequate temporary access for heavy construction equipment	Favorable	Adequate construction access already exists	Equipment could access site direct from Bay Road, or alternately from West Perimeter Road South Perimeter Road, and Willow Road.
		1D—Adequate access for maintenance equipment	Favorable	Adequate maintenance access already exists	Site would be easily accessible via the Perimeter Roads, internal VA roadways, and/or Bay Road.
	2—Noise Disturbance Potential	2A—Proximity to residences (including outdoor areas—yards, patios, decks, etc.); potential for construction of project facilities adjacent to residential receptor	Conditionally Acceptable	Site is in residential area, but is not immediately adjacent to residences, <i>or</i> is large enough to provide a buffer	Site is across West Perimeter Road from backyards of residences in adjacent neighborhood. If needed, temporary noise barriers could be installed along VA side of roadway or in landscaped buffer area immediately adjacent to fencelines.
		2B—Proximity to other sensitive receptors (school, hospital, library, park, etc.); potential for construction of project facilities adjacent to nonresidential sensitive receptor	Conditionally Acceptable	Site is near or adjacent to nonresidential sensitive receptors but is large enough to provide a buffer; this site could be used without	Site is within VA facility but is slightly removed from existing buildings, and is large enough to accommodate temporary noise barriers if needed, and could accommodate a design that incorporates permanent sound buffer features if needed.
	3—Aesthetic Concerns	3A—Ability of site to support aesthetically appropriate design for context	Favorable	Location is not aesthetically sensitive, <i>or</i> site is large enough and configured in such a way as to support acceptable design	Site is visually sensitive because of proximity to residences, but is large enough to support visual amenities; in addition, this portion of the VA campus is more utilitarian in appearance, and already supports a fenced wellhead. An additional wellhead facility would not be out of character with existing site aesthetics. Note that we should confirm age of VA facility; it may be listing-eligible and therefore aesthetically sensitive to the extent aesthetics contribute to context and integrity; if VA is listed or listing-eligible, design would need to be particularly sensitive to aesthetics of existing buildings and structures.
	4—Parkland Concerns	4A—Potential for loss of parklands	Favorable	Site is not in a park	
		4B—Extent of parkland loss	Favorable	Site is not in a park, <i>or</i> Site is within a park, but facility footprint would be small by comparison with park acreage and facility could be sited and designed to avoid	

Site	Criterion	Parameter	Evaluation	Definition	Comments
				disruption of park uses	
	5—Land Use Planning Consistency	5A—Consistency with General Plan policies	Favorable	Use of this site for a well facility would be consistent with relevant General Plan policies	Project in general (regardless of siting) is consistent with GP Goal I-H (To promote the development and maintenance of adequate public and quasi-public facilities and services...) and Policies I-H-4 (efforts to secure adequate water supplies) and I-H-5 (new wells and reservoirs for supplementary supply).
		5B—Consistency with current site zoning	Conditionally Acceptable	Well facility would be allowed with conditional use permit	Site is zoned PF (Public Facilities District). Conditional uses include public utility facilities.
	<b>Community “Bonus” Factors</b>				
	6—Bonus Factors	6A—Potential to combine projects (binary criterion, no penalty)	N/A	Site does not offer potential to “piggyback” on other planned project(s)	
	6B—Potential for green design (binary criterion, no penalty)	Favorable	Site is unusually suitable to support greener design	Site is large enough to offer design flexibility.	

**Menlo Park Emergency Water Supply Project  
Site Evaluation – Phase 2 Community “Livability” Evaluation Criteria**

Site	Criterion	Parameter	Evaluation	Definition	Comments
3A – Seminary Oaks Park, 299 Santa Monica Avenue  <i>Along south property line adjacent to pathway</i>	1—Site Access	1A—Use of residential streets for site access	Unfavorable	Extensive or otherwise problematic use of residential streets required for access	Construction traffic would presumably access the site via Santa Monica from Willow Road. Residents of Vintage Oaks neighborhood have repeatedly expressed concern about presence of construction traffic on narrow 2-lane roads; use of residential roadways to access this site would not be extensive but because of resident concerns should be considered problematic.  It might be possible to negotiate alternate access from the Seminary property.
		1B—Access via cul-de-sac	Favorable	Access does not involve cul-de-sac	
		1C—Adequate temporary access for heavy construction equipment	Conditionally Acceptable	Adequate construction access could feasibly be provided	Equipment access could be provided from Santa Monica Avenue with some temporary disruption/loss of landscaping.
		1D—Adequate access for maintenance equipment	Conditionally Acceptable	Adequate maintenance access could feasibly be provided	Maintenance access could be provided from Santa Monica Avenue along park property line.
	2—Noise Disturbance Potential	2A—Proximity to residences (including outdoor areas—yards, patios, decks, etc.); potential for construction of project facilities adjacent to residential receptor	Unfavorable	Site is in residential area, is immediately adjacent to residence, and is too small to provide a buffer	Site is across Santa Monica (a narrow quiet street that provides minimal buffering) from numerous residences, and it may be difficult to use temporary noise barriers without impinging on tot lot and other park uses.
		2B—Proximity to other sensitive receptors (school, hospital, library, park, etc.); potential for construction of project facilities adjacent to nonresidential sensitive receptor	Unfavorable	Site is adjacent to nonresidential sensitive receptor and is too small to provide a buffer; use of this site would construct project facilities adjacent to nonresidential sensitive receptor(s)	Site is adjacent to tot lot (approximately 75 feet away) and other park uses, including grassy area heavily used by families. Site also neighbors Seminary property, but closest buildings are at least 400 feet from work area.
	3—Aesthetic Concerns	3A—Ability of site to support aesthetically appropriate design for context	Conditionally Acceptable	Site is located in an aesthetically sensitive area but would support limited visual amenities	Site is visually sensitive on all fronts – residents, park users, and Seminary are all expected to be concerned about finished appearance of facilities. Site is large and open enough to support a wide range of visual amenities, but note that more extensive amenities (landscaping, etc.) would increase footprint-related impacts on parklands.
	4—Parkland Concerns	4A—Potential for loss of parklands	Unfavorable	Site is in a park	
		4B—Extent of parkland loss	Conditionally Acceptable	Site is within a park; facility would unavoidably create some (limited) disruption to park uses, but disruption/ loss of uses would not	Facility could be configured to minimize long-term loss/disruption of park uses.

Site	Criterion	Parameter	Evaluation	Definition	Comments
				be extensive	
	5—Land Use Planning Consistency	5A—Consistency with General Plan policies	Favorable	Use of this site for a well facility would be consistent with relevant General Plan policies	Project in general (regardless of siting) is consistent with GP Goal I-H (To promote the development and maintenance of adequate public and quasi-public facilities and services...) and Policies I-H-4 (efforts to secure adequate water supplies) and I-H-5 (new wells and reservoirs for supplementary supply).  With proper design, use of this site will also be consistent with Goal I-G (To promote the preservation of open-space lands for recreation, protection of natural resources, the production of managed resources, protection of health and safety, and enhancement of scenic qualities).
		5B—Consistency with current site zoning	Conditionally Acceptable	Well facility would be allowed with conditional use permit	Site is zoned R1S (Single Family Suburban Residential). Conditional uses include some types of utilities.
<b>Community “Bonus” Factors</b>					
	6—Bonus Factors	6A—Potential to combine projects (binary criterion, no penalty)	Favorable	Site offers potential to “piggyback” on other planned project(s)	Depending on timing, it might be possible to coordinate wells project with pathway paving proposed for implementation in 2012.
		6B—Potential for green design (binary criterion, no penalty)	Favorable	Site is unusually suitable to support greener design	Site is large enough to offer design flexibility and because of its parkland location could provide good opportunities for public education if a greener design is used.

**Menlo Park Emergency Water Supply Project  
Site Evaluation – Phase 2 Community “Livability” Evaluation Criteria**

Site	Criterion	Parameter	Evaluation	Definition	Comments
3B – Seminary Oaks Park, 299 Santa Monica Avenue  <i>West end of park parcel, in grassy area adjacent to curve in footpath</i>	1—Site Access	1A—Use of residential streets for site access	Unfavorable	Extensive or otherwise problematic use of residential streets required for access	Construction traffic would presumably access the site via Santa Monica from Willow Road. Residents of Vintage Oaks neighborhood have repeatedly expressed concern about presence of construction traffic on narrow 2-lane roads; use of residential roadways to access this site would not be extensive but because of resident concerns should be considered problematic.  It might be possible to negotiate alternate access from the Seminary property.
		1B—Access via cul-de-sac	Favorable	Access does not involve cul-de-sac	
		1C—Adequate temporary access for heavy construction equipment	Conditionally Acceptable	Adequate construction access could feasibly be provided	Equipment access could be provided from Santa Monica Avenue with some temporary disruption/loss of landscaping. Disruption would be greater than with Site 3A because Site 3B is internal to the park property.
		1D—Adequate access for maintenance equipment	Conditionally Acceptable	Adequate maintenance access could feasibly be provided	Maintenance access could be provided from Santa Monica Avenue along park property line. Maintenance access would result in additional (permanent) loss of park land.
	2—Noise Disturbance Potential	2A—Proximity to residences (including outdoor areas—yards, patios, decks, etc.); potential for construction of project facilities adjacent to residential receptor	Unfavorable	Site is in residential area, is immediately adjacent to residence, and is too small to provide a buffer	Site is in close proximity to residential property line. Existing vegetation would remain and should offer some noise buffering. Site is probably too “tight” on the northwest side to accommodate use of noise barriers without disruption of path use and/or existing vegetation.
		2B—Proximity to other sensitive receptors (school, hospital, library, park, etc.); potential for construction of project facilities adjacent to nonresidential sensitive receptor	Unfavorable	Site is adjacent to nonresidential sensitive receptor and is too small to provide a buffer; use of this site would construct project facilities adjacent to nonresidential sensitive receptor(s)	Site is proximal to tot lot, which is probably the most noise-sensitive part of the park, and to grassy area heavily used by families. Site is also in proximity to Seminary property line, but closest buildings are more than 200 feet from work area.
	3—Aesthetic Concerns	3A—Ability of site to support aesthetically appropriate design for context	Conditionally Acceptable	Site is located in an aesthetically sensitive area but would support limited visual amenities	Site is visually sensitive on all fronts – residents, park users, and Seminary are all expected to be concerned about finished appearance of facilities. Site is small but might support limited visual amenities.
	4—Parkland Concerns	4A—Potential for loss of parklands	Unfavorable	Site is in a park	
		4B—Extent of parkland loss	Conditionally Acceptable	Site is within a park; facility would unavoidably create some (limited) disruption to park uses, but disruption/ loss of uses would not	Use of this site would decrease available grassy area at the park., but disruption of existing uses might be slightly less with Site 3B than with Site 3A, since 3B is at the back of the park, farther from play equipment.

Site	Criterion	Parameter	Evaluation	Definition	Comments
				be extensive	This assumption should be verified with the community if Site 3B remains in serious consideration.
	5—Land Use Planning Consistency	5A—Consistency with General Plan policies	Favorable	Use of this site for a well facility would be consistent with relevant General Plan policies	Project in general (regardless of siting) is consistent with GP Goal I-H (To promote the development and maintenance of adequate public and quasi-public facilities and services...) and Policies I-H-4 (efforts to secure adequate water supplies) and I-H-5 (new wells and reservoirs for supplementary supply).  With proper design, use of this site will also be consistent with Goal I-G (To promote the preservation of open-space lands for recreation, protection of natural resources, the production of managed resources, protection of health and safety, and enhancement of scenic qualities).
		5B—Consistency with current site zoning	Conditionally Acceptable	Well facility would be allowed with conditional use permit	Site is zoned R1S (Single Family Suburban Residential). Conditional uses include some types of utilities.
<b>Community “Bonus” Factors</b>					
	6—Bonus Factors	6A—Potential to combine projects (binary criterion, no penalty)	Favorable	Site offers potential to “piggyback” on other planned project(s)	Depending on timing, it might be possible to coordinate wells project with pathway paving proposed for implementation in 2012.
		6B—Potential for green design (binary criterion, no penalty)	Favorable	Site is unusually suitable to support greener design	Site is large enough to offer design flexibility and because of its parkland location could provide good opportunities for public education if a greener design is used.

**Menlo Park Emergency Water Supply Project  
Site Evaluation – Phase 2 Community “Livability” Evaluation Criteria**

Site	Criterion	Parameter	Evaluation	Definition	Comments
4 – 878 Pierce Road	1—Site Access	1A—Use of residential streets for site access	Unfavorable	Extensive or otherwise problematic use of residential streets required for access	Principal access would be via residential streets.
		1B—Access via cul-de-sac	Favorable	Access does not involve cul-de-sac	Pierce Road supports two-way north- and southbound traffic as far north as the parking “bulb” south of Newbridge Street, and one-way southbound from Newbridge to the bulb. Construction access could be provided from Willow Road via Newbridge and southbound Pierce Road, but note that this would require heavy equipment and haul truck access via one-lane portion of Pierce Road, immediately in front of small businesses. Traffic control would likely be important.
		1C—Adequate temporary access for heavy construction equipment	Favorable	Adequate construction access already exists	Equipment could access the site directly from Pierce Road.
		1D—Adequate access for maintenance equipment	Favorable	Adequate maintenance access already exists	Maintenance access could be provided from Pierce Road.
	2—Noise Disturbance Potential	2A—Proximity to residences (including outdoor areas—yards, patios, decks, etc.); potential for construction of project facilities adjacent to residential receptor	Conditionally Acceptable	Site is in residential area, but is not immediately adjacent to residences, <i>or</i> is large enough to provide a buffer	Site is across the street from residences along Pierce Road. Site is large enough to accommodate temporary construction noise barriers. Over the long term, presence of a new structure plus associated fencing, landscaping, etc. could provide improved noise buffering for Pierce Road residences.
		2B—Proximity to other sensitive receptors (school, hospital, library, park, etc.); potential for construction of project facilities adjacent to nonresidential sensitive receptor	Favorable	Site is not in vicinity of nonresidential sensitive receptors	
	3—Aesthetic Concerns	3A—Ability of site to support aesthetically appropriate design for context	Favorable	Location is not aesthetically sensitive, <i>or</i> site is large enough and configured in such a way as to support acceptable design	Site is considered visually sensitive because of its location across the street from residences, but at almost 1 acre is large enough to support a visually sensitive design. The site is currently vacant and disturbed; the right design could offer a visual benefit.
	4—Parkland Concerns	4A—Potential for loss of parklands	Favorable	Site is not in a park	
		4B—Extent of parkland loss	Favorable	Site is not in a park, <i>or</i> Site is within a park, but facility footprint would be small by comparison with park acreage and facility could be sited and designed to avoid	

Site	Criterion	Parameter	Evaluation	Definition	Comments
				disruption of park uses	
	5—Land Use Planning Consistency	5A—Consistency with General Plan policies	Favorable	Use of this site for a well facility would be consistent with relevant General Plan policies	Project in general (regardless of siting) is consistent with GP Goal I-H (To promote the development and maintenance of adequate public and quasi-public facilities and services...) and Policies I-H-4 (efforts to secure adequate water supplies) and I-H-5 (new wells and reservoirs for supplementary supply).
		5B—Consistency with current site zoning	Conditionally Acceptable	Well facility would be allowed with conditional use permit	Site is within a Landscape Median area adjacent to R3 (Apartment) zoning. Conditional uses include some types of utilities.
<b>Community “Bonus” Factors</b>					
	6—Bonus Factors	6A—Potential to combine projects (binary criterion, no penalty)	N/A	Site does not offer potential to “piggyback” on other planned project(s)	
		6B—Potential for green design (binary criterion, no penalty)	Favorable	Site is unusually suitable to support greener design	Site is large enough to offer substantial design flexibility.

**Menlo Park Emergency Water Supply Project  
Site Evaluation – Phase 2 Community “Livability” Evaluation Criteria**

Site	Criterion	Parameter	Evaluation	Definition	Comments
5 – 40 Middlefield Road	1—Site Access	1A—Use of residential streets for site access	Favorable	No use of residential streets required for access	Site access is direct from Middlefield Road.
		1B—Access via cul-de-sac	Favorable	Access does not involve cul-de-sac	
		1C—Adequate temporary access for heavy construction equipment	Favorable	Adequate construction access already exists	Equipment could access the site from Middlefield Road, from the adjacent parking lot, or via Woodland Avenue from Middlefield.
		1D—Adequate access for maintenance equipment	Favorable	Adequate maintenance access already exists	
	2—Noise Disturbance Potential	2A—Proximity to residences (including outdoor areas—yards, patios, decks, etc.); potential for construction of project facilities adjacent to residential receptor	Conditionally Acceptable	Site is in residential area, but is not immediately adjacent to residences, <i>or</i> is large enough to provide a buffer	Residences are present across the street to the east and south, but noise buffers could be installed along the site boundary if needed.
		2B—Proximity to other sensitive receptors (school, hospital, library, park, etc.); potential for construction of project facilities adjacent to nonresidential sensitive receptor	Conditionally Acceptable	Site is near or adjacent to nonresidential sensitive receptors but is large enough to provide a buffer	A preschool is located adjacent to the parking lot immediately northwest of the site.
	3—Aesthetic Concerns	3A—Ability of site to support aesthetically appropriate design for context	Favorable	Location is not aesthetically sensitive, <i>or</i> site is large enough and configured in such a way as to support acceptable design	Site is adjacent to commercial uses and is currently in a degraded, disturbed condition. It would have some visual sensitivity because of its location across the street from residences, but is large enough to support a visually sensitive design. The site is currently vacant; the right design could offer a visual benefit, and could serve to buffer adjacent residences from traffic noise and visual disturbance along Middlefield Road. This should be verified with the community, and community input should be collected for design input if this site is selected.
	4—Parkland Concerns	4A—Potential for loss of parklands	Favorable	Site is not in a park	
		4B—Extent of parkland loss	Favorable	Site is not in a park, <i>or</i> Site is within a park, but facility footprint would be small by comparison with park acreage and facility could be sited and designed to avoid disruption of park uses	

Site	Criterion	Parameter	Evaluation	Definition	Comments
	5—Land Use Planning Consistency	5A—Consistency with General Plan policies	Favorable	Use of this site for a well facility would be consistent with relevant General Plan policies	Project in general (regardless of siting) is consistent with GP Goal I-H (To promote the development and maintenance of adequate public and quasi-public facilities and services...) and Policies I-H-4 (efforts to secure adequate water supplies) and I-H-5 (new wells and reservoirs for supplementary supply).
		5B—Consistency with current site zoning	Conditionally Acceptable	Well facility would be allowed with conditional use permit	Site is zoned C4 (General Commercial, Other Than El Camino Real). Adjacent residential area is zoned R1U (Single Family Urban Residential). Conditional uses in areas zoned C4 include some types of public utilities.
	<b>Community “Bonus” Factors</b>				
	6—Bonus Factors	6A—Potential to combine projects (binary criterion, no penalty)	N/A	Site does not offer potential to “piggyback” on other planned project(s)	
		6B—Potential for green design (binary criterion, no penalty)	Favorable	Site is unusually suitable to support greener design	Site is large enough to offer some design flexibility.

**Menlo Park Emergency Water Supply Project**  
**Site Evaluation – Phase 2 Community “Livability” Evaluation Criteria**

Site	Criterion	Parameter	Evaluation	Definition	Comments
6A – Burgess Park, 555 Ravenswood Avenue  <i>Near intersection of Alma Road and Burgess Drive</i>	1—Site Access	1A—Use of residential streets for site access	Conditionally Acceptable	Limited use of residential streets required for access	Site access is either via Alma Road from Ravenswood Avenue and El Camino Real or Middlefield, or via Burgess Drive from Laurel Street and Willow Road. Access via Ravenswood avoids residential travel (Alma turnoff is west of residential portion of Ravenswood).
		1B—Access via cul-de-sac	Favorable	Access does not involve cul-de-sac	
		1C—Adequate temporary access for heavy construction equipment	Favorable	Adequate construction access already exists	
		1D—Adequate access for maintenance equipment	Favorable	Adequate maintenance access already exists	
	2—Noise Disturbance Potential	2A—Proximity to residences (including outdoor areas—yards, patios, decks, etc.); potential for construction of project facilities adjacent to residential receptor	Conditionally Acceptable	Site is in residential area, but is not immediately adjacent to residences, <i>or</i> is large enough to provide a buffer	Residences are present across the street to the south, but noise buffers could be installed along the site boundary if needed.
		2B—Proximity to other sensitive receptors (school, hospital, library, park, etc.); potential for construction of project facilities adjacent to nonresidential sensitive receptor	Conditionally Acceptable	Site is near or adjacent to nonresidential sensitive receptors but is large enough to provide a buffer; this site could be used without	Site is adjacent to ballfields at Burgess Park, but space is available to allow installation of noise barriers if needed. Site is also probably large enough that design could incorporate permanent noise-reduction features if need is identified.
	3—Aesthetic Concerns	3A—Ability of site to support aesthetically appropriate design for context	Conditionally Acceptable	Site is located in an aesthetically sensitive area but would support limited visual amenities	Site is adjacent to Burgess Park and residential uses. It is large enough to allow some design flexibility but the well facility would still be visually intrusive in this location.
	4—Parkland Concerns	4A—Potential for loss of parklands	Unfavorable	Site is in a park	
		4B—Extent of parkland loss	Favorable	Site is not in a park, or Site is within a park, but facility footprint would be small by comparison with park acreage and facility could be sited and designed to avoid disruption of park uses	
	5—Land Use Planning Consistency	5A—Consistency with General Plan policies	Favorable	Use of this site for a well facility would be consistent with relevant General Plan policies	Project in general (regardless of siting) is consistent with GP Goal I-H (To promote the development and maintenance of adequate public and quasi-public facilities and services...) and Policies I-H-4 (efforts to secure adequate water supplies) and I-H-5 (new wells and reservoirs for supplementary supply).

Site	Criterion	Parameter	Evaluation	Definition	Comments
					With proper design, use of this site will also be consistent with Goal I-G (To promote the preservation of open-space lands for recreation, protection of natural resources, the production of managed resources, protection of health and safety, and enhancement of scenic qualities)
		5B—Consistency with current site zoning	Conditionally Acceptable	Well facility would be allowed with conditional use permit	Site is zoned PF (Public Facilities). Conditional uses in areas zoned PF include public utilities.
	<b>Community “Bonus” Factors</b>				
	6—Bonus Factors	6A—Potential to combine projects (binary criterion, no penalty)	N/A	Site does not offer potential to “piggyback” on other planned project(s)	
		6B—Potential for green design (binary criterion, no penalty)	Favorable	Site is unusually suitable to support greener design	Site is large enough to offer some design flexibility and because of its location in a park would also offer public education opportunities if a green design is used.

**Menlo Park Emergency Water Supply Project  
Site Evaluation – Phase 2 Community “Livability” Evaluation Criteria**

Site	Criterion	Parameter	Evaluation	Definition	Comments
6B – Burgess Park, 555 Ravenswood Avenue  <i>Along Ravenswood Avenue on west side of parcel, north of library</i>	1—Site Access	1A—Use of residential streets for site access	Favorable	No use of residential streets required for access	Site access is via Ravenswood Avenue from El Camino Real or Middlefield Road.
		1B—Access via cul-de-sac	Favorable	Access does not involve cul-de-sac	
		1C—Adequate temporary access for heavy construction equipment	Favorable	Adequate construction access already exists	
		1D—Adequate access for maintenance equipment	Favorable	Adequate maintenance access already exists	
	2—Noise Disturbance Potential	2A—Proximity to residences (including outdoor areas—yards, patios, decks, etc.); potential for construction of project facilities adjacent to residential receptor	Conditionally Acceptable	Site is in residential area, but is not immediately adjacent to residences, <i>or</i> is large enough to provide a buffer	Residences are present immediately across Ravenswood Avenue from the site, but site is large enough to accommodate construction noise and visual buffers if needed.
		2B—Proximity to other sensitive receptors (school, hospital, library, park, etc.); potential for construction of project facilities adjacent to nonresidential sensitive receptor	Conditionally Acceptable	Site is near or adjacent to nonresidential sensitive receptors but is large enough to provide a buffer	Site is adjacent to City library but is large enough to allow installation of noise barriers if needed. Site is also probably large enough that design could incorporate permanent noise-reduction features if need is identified.
	3—Aesthetic Concerns	3A—Ability of site to support aesthetically appropriate design for context	Conditionally Acceptable	Site is located in an aesthetically sensitive area but would support limited visual amenities	Site is in Burgess Park and adjacent to City library, and is visible to residents across the street, and is therefore aesthetically sensitive. Site is large enough to support some visual amenities but note that if tree removals are needed, this is expected to be a concern for residents because of expressed priority on retaining green space.
	4—Parkland Concerns	4A—Potential for loss of parklands	Unfavorable	Site is in a park	
		4B—Extent of parkland loss	Favorable	Site is not in a park, or Site is within a park, but facility footprint would be small by comparison with park acreage and facility could be sited and designed to avoid disruption of park uses	
	5—Land Use Planning Consistency	5A—Consistency with General Plan policies	Favorable	Use of this site for a well facility would be consistent with relevant General Plan policies	Project in general (regardless of siting) is consistent with GP Goal I-H (To promote the development and maintenance of adequate public and quasi-public facilities and services...) and Policies I-H-4 (efforts to secure adequate water supplies) and I-H-5 (new wells and reservoirs for supplementary supply).

Site	Criterion	Parameter	Evaluation	Definition	Comments
					With proper design, use of this site will also be consistent with Goal I-G (To promote the preservation of open-space lands for recreation, protection of natural resources, the production of managed resources, protection of health and safety, and enhancement of scenic qualities).
		5B—Consistency with current site zoning	Conditionally Acceptable	Well facility would be allowed with conditional use permit	Site is zoned PF (Public Facilities). Conditional uses in areas zoned PF include public utilities.
<b>Community “Bonus” Factors</b>					
	6—Bonus Factors	6A—Potential to combine projects (binary criterion, no penalty)	N/A	Site does not offer potential to “piggyback” on other planned project(s)	
		6B—Potential for green design (binary criterion, no penalty)	Favorable	Site is unusually suitable to support greener design	Site is large enough to offer some design flexibility and because of its location in a park would also offer public education opportunities if a green design is used. Note however that any need to remove existing large trees is unlikely to be viewed as “green” by community.

**Menlo Park Emergency Water Supply Project**  
**Site Evaluation – Phase 2 Community “Livability” Evaluation Criteria**

Site	Criterion	Parameter	Evaluation	Definition	Comments
7A – City Corporation Yard, 333 Burgess Drive  <i>Grassy area to left of Corp Yard entrance</i>	1—Site Access	1A—Use of residential streets for site access	Unfavorable	Extensive or otherwise problematic use of residential streets required for access	Site access is via Burgess Drive from Alma Street, Ravenswood Avenue, and El Camino Real, or from Laurel Street and Ravenswood Avenue. Burgess Drive and a portion of Ravenswood Avenue are residential.
		1B—Access via cul-de-sac	Favorable	Access does not involve cul-de-sac	
		1C—Adequate temporary access for heavy construction equipment	Favorable	Adequate construction access already exists	
		1D—Adequate access for maintenance equipment	Favorable	Adequate maintenance access already exists	
	2—Noise Disturbance Potential	2A—Proximity to residences (including outdoor areas—yards, patios, decks, etc.); potential for construction of project facilities adjacent to residential receptor	Conditionally Acceptable	Site is in residential area, but is not immediately adjacent to residences, <i>or</i> is large enough to provide a buffer	Residences are present across Burgess Street to north, but site probably would permit installation of temporary noise barriers if needed.
		2B—Proximity to other sensitive receptors (school, hospital, library, park, etc.); potential for construction of project facilities adjacent to nonresidential sensitive receptor	Favorable	Site is not in vicinity of nonresidential sensitive receptors	
	3—Aesthetic Concerns	3A—Ability of site to support aesthetically appropriate design for context	Favorable	Location is not aesthetically sensitive, <i>or</i> site is large enough and configured in such a way as to support acceptable design	Proximity to residences makes site aesthetically sensitive, but wellhead facilities would be consistent with general character of existing City corp yard.
	4—Parkland Concerns	4A—Potential for loss of parklands	Favorable	Site is not in a park	
		4B—Extent of parkland loss	Favorable	Site is not in a park, <i>or</i> Site is within a park, but facility footprint would be small by comparison with park acreage and facility could be sited and designed to avoid disruption of park uses	
	5—Land Use Planning Consistency	5A—Consistency with General Plan policies	Favorable	Use of this site for a well facility would be consistent with relevant General Plan policies	Project in general (regardless of siting) is consistent with GP Goal I-H (To promote the development and maintenance of adequate public and quasi-public facilities and services...) and Policies I-H-4 (efforts to secure adequate water supplies) and I-H-5 (new wells and reservoirs for supplementary supply).

Site	Criterion	Parameter	Evaluation	Definition	Comments
		5B—Consistency with current site zoning	Conditionally Acceptable	Well facility would be allowed with conditional use permit	Site is zoned PF (Public Facilities). Conditional uses in areas zoned PF include public utilities.
<b>Community “Bonus” Factors</b>					
	6—Bonus Factors	6A—Potential to combine projects (binary criterion, no penalty)	N/A	Site does not offer potential to “piggyback” on other planned project(s)	
		6B—Potential for green design (binary criterion, no penalty)	Favorable	Site is unusually suitable to support greener design	Because of its location at City corp yard, site would offer substantial design flexibility.

**Menlo Park Emergency Water Supply Project**  
**Site Evaluation – Phase 2 Community “Livability” Evaluation Criteria**

Site	Criterion	Parameter	Evaluation	Definition	Comments
7B – City Corporation Yard, 333 Burgess Drive  <i>Paved parking area east of entrance driveway</i>	1—Site Access	1A—Use of residential streets for site access	Unfavorable	Extensive or otherwise problematic use of residential streets required for access	Site access is via Burgess Drive from Alma Street, Ravenswood Avenue, and El Camino Real, or from Laurel Street and Ravenswood Avenue. Burgess Drive and a portion of Ravenswood Avenue are residential.
		1B—Access via cul-de-sac	Favorable	Access does not involve cul-de-sac	
		1C—Adequate temporary access for heavy construction equipment	Favorable	Adequate construction access already exists	
		1D—Adequate access for maintenance equipment	Favorable	Adequate maintenance access already exists	
	2—Noise Disturbance Potential	2A—Proximity to residences (including outdoor areas—yards, patios, decks, etc.); potential for construction of project facilities adjacent to residential receptor	Conditionally Acceptable	Site is in residential area, but is not immediately adjacent to residences, <i>or</i> is large enough to provide a buffer	Residences are present across Burgess Street to north, but site probably would permit installation of temporary noise barriers if needed.
		2B—Proximity to other sensitive receptors (school, hospital, library, park, etc.); potential for construction of project facilities adjacent to nonresidential sensitive receptor	Favorable	Site is not in vicinity of nonresidential sensitive receptors	
	3—Aesthetic Concerns	3A—Ability of site to support aesthetically appropriate design for context	Favorable	Location is not aesthetically sensitive, <i>or</i> site is large enough and configured in such a way as to support acceptable design	Proximity to residences makes site aesthetically sensitive, but wellhead facilities would be consistent with general character of existing City corp yard.
	4—Parkland Concerns	4A—Potential for loss of parklands	Favorable	Site is not in a park	
		4B—Extent of parkland loss	Favorable	Site is not in a park, <i>or</i> Site is within a park, but facility footprint would be small by comparison with park acreage and facility could be sited and designed to avoid disruption of park uses	
	5—Land Use Planning Consistency	5A—Consistency with General Plan policies	Favorable	Use of this site for a well facility would be consistent with relevant General Plan policies	Project in general (regardless of siting) is consistent with GP Goal I-H (To promote the development and maintenance of adequate public and quasi-public facilities and services...) and Policies I-H-4 (efforts to secure adequate water supplies) and I-H-5 (new wells and reservoirs for supplementary supply).

Site	Criterion	Parameter	Evaluation	Definition	Comments
		5B—Consistency with current site zoning	Conditionally Acceptable	Well facility would be allowed with conditional use permit	Site is zoned PF (Public Facilities). Conditional uses in areas zoned PF include public utilities.
<b>Community “Bonus” Factors</b>					
	6—Bonus Factors	6A—Potential to combine projects (binary criterion, no penalty)	N/A	Site does not offer potential to “piggyback” on other planned project(s)	
		6B—Potential for green design (binary criterion, no penalty)	Favorable	Site is unusually suitable to support greener design	Because of its location at City corp yard, site would offer substantial design flexibility.

**Menlo Park Emergency Water Supply Project  
Site Evaluation – Phase 2 Community “Livability” Evaluation Criteria**

Site	Criterion	Parameter	Evaluation	Definition	Comments
7C – City Corporation Yard, 333 Burgess Drive  <i>Materials storage area on east side of parcel (note that materials storage area is planned for future relocation)</i>	1—Site Access	1A—Use of residential streets for site access	Unfavorable	Extensive or otherwise problematic use of residential streets required for access	Site access is via Burgess Drive from Alma Street, Ravenswood Avenue, and El Camino Real, or from Laurel Street and Ravenswood Avenue. Burgess Drive and a portion of Ravenswood Avenue are residential.
		1B—Access via cul-de-sac	Favorable	Access does not involve cul-de-sac	
		1C—Adequate temporary access for heavy construction equipment	Favorable	Adequate construction access already exists	
		1D—Adequate access for maintenance equipment	Favorable	Adequate maintenance access already exists	
	2—Noise Disturbance Potential	2A—Proximity to residences (including outdoor areas—yards, patios, decks, etc.); potential for construction of project facilities adjacent to residential receptor	Unfavorable	Site is in residential area, is immediately adjacent to residence, and is too small to provide a buffer	Site is adjacent to property line shared with residential properties to the south, and spacing may be too close to allow effective use of temporary noise barriers could be placed along the property line if needed.
		2B—Proximity to other sensitive receptors (school, hospital, library, park, etc.); potential for construction of project facilities adjacent to nonresidential sensitive receptor	Favorable	Site is not in vicinity of nonresidential sensitive receptors	
	3—Aesthetic Concerns	3A—Ability of site to support aesthetically appropriate design for context	Favorable	Location is not aesthetically sensitive, <i>or</i> site is large enough and configured in such a way as to support acceptable design	This portion of the corp yard is not visible from Burgess Drive. Views from residential properties to the south are at least partially blocked by fencing along property line. In addition, wellhead facilities would be consistent with general character of existing City corp yard.
	4—Parkland Concerns	4A—Potential for loss of parklands	Favorable	Site is not in a park	
		4B—Extent of parkland loss	Favorable	Site is not in a park, or Site is within a park, but facility footprint would be small by comparison with park acreage and facility could be sited and designed to avoid disruption of park uses	

Site	Criterion	Parameter	Evaluation	Definition	Comments
	5—Land Use Planning Consistency	5A—Consistency with General Plan policies	Favorable	Use of this site for a well facility would be consistent with relevant General Plan policies	Project in general (regardless of siting) is consistent with GP Goal I-H (To promote the development and maintenance of adequate public and quasi-public facilities and services...) and Policies I-H-4 (efforts to secure adequate water supplies) and I-H-5 (new wells and reservoirs for supplementary supply).
		5B—Consistency with current site zoning	Conditionally Acceptable	Well facility would be allowed with conditional use permit	Site is zoned PF (Public Facilities). Conditional uses in areas zoned PF include public utilities.
	<b>Community “Bonus” Factors</b>				
	6—Bonus Factors	6A—Potential to combine projects (binary criterion, no penalty)	N/A	Site does not offer potential to “piggyback” on other planned project(s)	
		6B—Potential for green design (binary criterion, no penalty)	Favorable	Site is unusually suitable to support design	Because of its location at City corp yard, site would offer substantial design flexibility.

**Menlo Park Emergency Water Supply Project  
Site Evaluation – Phase 2 Community “Livability” Evaluation Criteria**

Site	Criterion	Parameter	Evaluation	Definition	Comments
8 – Fire Station No. 1; 300 Middlefield Road  <i>Northern portion of parcel, specific location TBD pending proposed remodel</i>	1—Site Access	1A—Use of residential streets for site access	Favorable	No use of residential streets required for access	Site is accessed directly from Middlefield Road.
		1B—Access via cul-de-sac	Favorable	Access does not involve cul-de-sac	
		1C—Adequate temporary access for heavy construction equipment	Favorable	Adequate construction access already exists	
		1D—Adequate access for maintenance equipment	Favorable	Adequate maintenance access already exists	
	2—Noise Disturbance Potential	2A—Proximity to residences (including outdoor areas—yards, patios, decks, etc.); potential for construction of project facilities adjacent to residential receptor	Conditionally Acceptable	Site is in residential area, but is not immediately adjacent to residences, <i>or</i> is large enough to provide a buffer	Site is internal to fire station property, providing some buffering, but may be too small to permit use of sound barriers.
		2B—Proximity to other sensitive receptors (school, hospital, library, park, etc.); potential for construction of project facilities adjacent to nonresidential sensitive receptor	Conditionally Acceptable	Site is near or adjacent to nonresidential sensitive receptors but is large enough to provide a buffer	See previous.
	3—Aesthetic Concerns	3A—Ability of site to support aesthetically appropriate design for context	Favorable	Location is not aesthetically sensitive, <i>or</i> site is large enough and configured in such a way as to support acceptable design	Site is internal to fire station property, and wellhead facilities would be consistent with general character of existing facilities on the site.
	4—Parkland Concerns	4A—Potential for loss of parklands	Favorable	Site is not in a park	
		4B—Extent of parkland loss	Favorable	Site is not in a park, <i>or</i> Site is within a park, but facility footprint would be small by comparison with park acreage and facility could be sited and designed to avoid disruption of park uses	
	5—Land Use Planning Consistency	5A—Consistency with General Plan policies	Favorable	Use of this site for a well facility would be consistent with relevant General Plan policies	Project in general (regardless of siting) is consistent with GP Goal I-H (To promote the development and maintenance of adequate public and quasi-public facilities and services...) and Policies I-H-4 (efforts to secure adequate water supplies) and I-H-5 (new wells and reservoirs for supplementary supply).
5B—Consistency with current site zoning		Conditionally Acceptable	Well facility would be allowed with conditional use permit	Site is zoned R1S (Single Family Suburban Residential).	

Site	Criterion	Parameter	Evaluation	Definition	Comments
					Conditional uses in areas zoned R1S include some types of public utilities.
<b>Community "Bonus" Factors</b>					
	6—Bonus Factors	6A—Potential to combine projects (binary criterion, no penalty)	N/A	Site does not offer potential to "piggyback" on other planned project(s)	
		6B—Potential for green design (binary criterion, no penalty)	N/A	Site is not unusually suitable to support greener design	Site would offer some design flexibility but would be spatially constrained due to overall site size and need to avoid encroachment on fire station functions.

**Menlo Park Emergency Water Supply Project  
Site Evaluation – Phase 2 Community “Livability” Evaluation Criteria**

Site	Criterion	Parameter	Evaluation	Definition	Comments
<b>9A – Flood Park, 215 Bay Road</b> <i>Grassy area near end of Iris Lane, between tennis courts and former pétanque court site (currently disrupted for SFPUC Hetchy Hetchy pipeline upgrade)</i>	1—Site Access	1A—Use of residential streets for site access	Conditionally Acceptable	Limited use of residential streets required for access	Site access from Bay Road via internal park roadways. Alternately, the site could be accessed from the end of Iris Court but this would require establishing access via areas that are currently in landscape grass.
		1B—Access via cul-de-sac	Favorable	Access does not involve cul-de-sac	Access from Bay Road does not involve a cul-de-sac.
		1C—Adequate temporary access for heavy construction equipment	Favorable	Adequate construction access already exists	
		1C—Adequate access for maintenance equipment	Favorable	Adequate maintenance access already exists	
	2—Noise Disturbance Potential	2A—Proximity to residences (including outdoor areas—yards, patios, decks, etc.); potential for construction of project facilities adjacent to residential receptor	Conditionally Acceptable	Site is in residential area, but is not immediately adjacent to residences, <i>or</i> is large enough to provide a buffer	Site is internal to Flood Park, and construction noise would be buffered by existing vegetation and park features.
		2B—Proximity to other sensitive receptors (school, hospital, library, park, etc.); potential for construction of project facilities adjacent to nonresidential sensitive receptor	Conditionally Acceptable	Site is near or adjacent to nonresidential sensitive receptors but is large enough to provide a buffer	Site is in a less noise-sensitive portion of the park due to its location in courts area, and may be large enough to allow use of noise barriers during construction, but still has some noise sensitivity.
	3—Aesthetic Concerns	3A—Ability of site to support aesthetically appropriate design for context	Conditionally Acceptable	Site is located in an aesthetically sensitive area but would support limited visual amenities	Site is somewhat separated from landscaped portions of the park, and would be partially buffered by existing tennis court fences. However, site footprint is small, supporting limited visual amenities, and this part of the park is quite open, so facility would be highly visible to park users.
	4—Parkland Concerns	4A—Potential for loss of parklands	Unfavorable	Site is in a park	
		4B—Extent of parkland loss	Favorable	Site is not in a park, or Site is within a park, but facility footprint would be small by comparison with park acreage and facility could be sited and designed to avoid disruption of park uses	If constructed in this location, well facilities would occupy a small undeveloped “gap” between existing tennis and pétanque courts and are not expected to disrupt use of the park.

Site	Criterion	Parameter	Evaluation	Definition	Comments
	5—Land Use Planning Consistency	5A—Consistency with General Plan policies	Favorable	Use of this site for a well facility would be consistent with relevant General Plan policies	<p>Project in general (regardless of siting) is consistent with GP Goal I-H (To promote the development and maintenance of adequate public and quasi-public facilities and services...) and Policies I-H-4 (efforts to secure adequate water supplies) and I-H-5 (new wells and reservoirs for supplementary supply).</p> <p>With proper design, use of this site will also be consistent with Goal I-G (To promote the preservation of open-space lands for recreation, protection of natural resources, the production of managed resources, protection of health and safety, and enhancement of scenic qualities).</p>
		5B—Consistency with current site zoning	Unfavorable	Well facility is not allowed under existing site zoning; project would require re-zoning	<p>Site is zoned OSC (Open Space and Conservation District).</p> <p>OSC zoning has no permitted uses. Conditional uses include public buildings, but utilities not explicitly mentioned for OSC zoning in zoning code; project would likely require rezoning of project site.</p>
<b>Community “Bonus” Factors</b>					
	6—Bonus Factors	6A—Potential to combine projects (binary criterion, no penalty)	N/A	Site does not offer potential to “piggyback” on other planned project(s)	No piggyback potential identified.
		6B—Potential for green design (binary criterion, no penalty)	Favorable	Site is unusually suitable to support greener design	Site is large enough to offer some design flexibility; and because of its parkland location, could provide good public education opportunities if green design features can be incorporated. Note however that a larger footprint would increase the impact on parklands, so there could be a tradeoff between design flexibility and parkland use.

**Menlo Park Emergency Water Supply Project  
Site Evaluation – Phase 2 Community “Livability” Evaluation Criteria**

Site	Criterion	Parameter	Evaluation	Definition	Comments
<b>9B – Flood Park</b> , 215 Bay Road <i>Southeast corner of park, off Bay Road</i>	1—Site Access	1A—Use of residential streets for site access	Favorable	No use of residential streets required for access	Site could be accessed from Bay Road via internal park roadways, or direct from Bay Road with some modification of curbs etc.
		1B—Access via cul-de-sac	Favorable	Access does not involve cul-de-sac	
		1C—Adequate temporary access for heavy construction equipment	Favorable	Adequate construction access already exists	
		1C—Adequate access for maintenance equipment	Favorable	Adequate maintenance access already exists	
	2—Noise Disturbance Potential	2A—Proximity to residences (including outdoor areas—yards, patios, decks, etc.); potential for construction of project facilities adjacent to residential receptor	Conditionally Acceptable	Site is in residential area, but is not immediately adjacent to residences, <i>or</i> is large enough to provide a buffer	Site is near residential property lines, but is separated from homes by existing mature vegetation that would offer some noise buffering. Site is large enough to allow use of temporary noise barriers if needed.
		2B—Proximity to other sensitive receptors (school, hospital, library, park, etc.); potential for construction of project facilities adjacent to nonresidential sensitive receptor	Conditionally Acceptable	Site is near or adjacent to nonresidential sensitive receptors but is large enough to provide a buffer	Site is near noise-sensitive uses such as picnicking (about 100 feet away) but is large enough to allow use of temporary noise barrier if needed during construction. Site 9A may be more noise-sensitive from the recreational perspective than Site 9B; if this site is under serious consideration, suggest verifying community perspectives.
	3—Aesthetic Concerns	3A—Ability of site to support aesthetically appropriate design for context	Conditionally Acceptable	Site is located in an aesthetically sensitive area but would support limited visual amenities	Site is visible from neighboring picnic areas and the pedestrian path. Some buffering would be provided by remaining mature trees, and the site is large enough to accommodate some level of visual amenities, but use of this site would nonetheless place built elements in a currently natural area of the park.
	4—Parkland Concerns	4A—Potential for loss of parklands	Unfavorable	Site is in a park	
		4B—Extent of parkland loss	Favorable	Site is not in a park, or Site is within a park, but facility footprint would be small by comparison with park acreage and facility could be sited and designed to avoid disruption of park uses	If constructed in this location, well facilities would occupy a small portion of the undeveloped area at the southeast corner of the park. It would not impinge on recognized park uses.
	5—Land Use Planning Consistency	5A—Consistency with General Plan policies	Favorable	Use of this site for a well facility would be consistent with relevant General Plan policies	Project in general (regardless of siting) is consistent with GP Goal I-H (To promote the development and maintenance of adequate public and quasi-public

Site	Criterion	Parameter	Evaluation	Definition	Comments
					<p>facilities and services...) and Policies I-H-4 (efforts to secure adequate water supplies) and I-H-5 (new wells and reservoirs for supplementary supply).</p> <p>With proper design, use of this site will also be consistent with Goal I-G (To promote the preservation of open-space lands for recreation, protection of natural resources, the production of managed resources, protection of health and safety, and enhancement of scenic qualities).</p>
		5B—Consistency with current site zoning	Unfavorable	Well facility is not allowed under existing site zoning; project would require re-zoning	<p>Site is zoned OSC (Open Space and Conservation District).</p> <p>OSC zoning has no permitted uses. Conditional uses include public buildings, but utilities not explicitly mentioned for OSC zoning in zoning code; project would likely require rezoning of project site.</p>
<b>Community “Bonus” Factors</b>					
	6—Bonus Factors	6A—Potential to combine projects (binary criterion, no penalty)	N/A	Site does not offer potential to “piggyback” on other planned project(s)	No piggyback potential identified.
		6B—Potential for green design (binary criterion, no penalty)	Favorable	Site is unusually suitable to support greener design	Site is large enough to offer some design flexibility; and because of its parkland location, could provide good public education opportunities if green design features can be incorporated. Note however that a larger footprint would increase the impact on parklands, so there could be a tradeoff between design flexibility and parkland use.